

ARCHITECTURES
OF THE
UNBUILT ENVIRONMENT
Helen Runting

© HELEN RUNTING 2018
SCHOOL OF ARCHITECTURE
KTH ROYAL INSTITUTE OF TECHNOLOGY
STOCKHOLM, SWEDEN

TRITA - ARK AKADEMISK AVHANDLING 2018:02
ISSN 1402-7461
ISRN KTH/ARK AA—18:02—SE
ISBN 978-91-7729-718-5

Academic dissertation, which, with due permission of the
KTH Royal Institute of Technology, is submitted for public defense
for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy on Friday May 18, 2018,
at 2pm in Kollegiesalen, Brinellvägen 8, Stockholm, Sweden.

ARCHITECTURES
OF THE
UNBUILT ENVIRONMENT
Helen Runting

KTH Royal Institute
of Technology
Architecture
School of Architecture
and the Built
Environment
SE-100 44 Stockholm,
Sweden

Abstract

This doctoral thesis offers a critical theorization of architecture's shifting orientations towards the lives that it inevitably shapes and molds. The fourteen essays that comprise this thesis address a range of seemingly superficial transformations in architecture's disciplinary landscape, which occur in Sweden in the second decade of the twenty-first century. When viewed in aggregate, these transformations point to a decisive shift in what architecture does, evidencing phases of withdrawal (through deregulations and enclosures) and facilitation (through exercises in projection and connection), ultimately suggesting the arrival of a condition that I refer to as *the unbuilt environment*, wherein the project replaces the building as architecture's primary outcome.

Through this doctoral research, architecture is also examined as a key technology in the neoliberal project. A discipline that is vested in the production of subjects and environments, architecture is shown here to draw, write, and dream forth a vast range of "container technologies" that enclose, move, shape, support, and produce us as subjects, facilitating certain kinds of lives and not others, from the interior out.

The research was motivated by the need to find the words to think, write, transform, and even negate what architecture was doing, when it was doing what it was doing, to lives led and to life itself, in the architectural present. My aim was always to produce thick, transformative, and essayistic theorizations of *the state of things*, which would be operative in a critical register. I also wanted to show, that the present constitutes a crucial site for the

making of architectural theory. In running alongside and in excess of architectural practice, critical architectural theory, I argue, can produce a space for a yet-un-thought architecture: an architecture that might aspire to facilitate life at the scale of the population.

Keywords

The Unbuilt Environment; Preoccupations; Withdrawal Symptoms; The Pastel Cell; The Indebted Woman; Container Technologies; Instant Archives; A Facilitative Environment; The Fog; Neoliberalism; The Promise of a Lack; After-Images; The State of Things; The Liquid Seam; Architecture in Aggregate; Ghosts in Shells; Images of Desire.

Preface

“Architectures of the Unbuilt Environment” is a doctoral thesis submitted for public defense for the Degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Architecture with a specialization in Critical Studies in Architecture. The research was undertaken at the School of Architecture at the KTH Royal Institute of Technology in Stockholm, Sweden, as part of a full-time Excellence Position, between January, 2012, and December, 2016, and then continued in a part-time, non-funded capacity between January, 2017 and March, 2018. The thesis takes the form of a thesis by publication, and as such includes four articles that have been published in internationally recognized peer-reviewed journals, in line with the requirements for a doctoral thesis within the subject Architecture. These four peer-reviewed articles are accompanied by ten additional papers, and supported by three sets of project documentation, as well as an introductory chapter, or *kappa*.

This thesis complements a research education largely undertaken within ResArc, the Swedish Research School in Architecture, with additional coursework undertaken within Designfakulteten—both national platforms for architectural and design research in Sweden. The research was informed and discussed within that coursework, and was also subject to regular internal review via internal seminars within the KTH School of Architecture. It has also been subject to public review by a number of established international scholars in four public seminars held throughout the period of the research (opponents: Keller Easterling, Tahl Kaminer, Peg Rawes, and Isabelle Doucet). The primary supervisor of this research has been H el ene Frichot, and the secondary supervisors were Daniel Koch and

Katja Grillner. Katja Grillner was primary supervisor in 2012, before she took up the position of Dean of Faculty at KTH.

This thesis has the specific purpose of acting as an object of assessment for the Degree of Doctor in Philosophy. Given this purpose, it is important that the reader doesn't anticipate that the thesis will perform in the same way that a conventional book might: it has, quite simply, too many other things to do. There is, for instance, more metadata than would be polite in other settings; names, dates, publications, and formats are necessary to the task of assessment. There is also a range of temporal glitches at work in the thesis—not only in the papers themselves, which discuss a now that is clearly over, but also in the *kappa*, which precedes the papers in terms of its position within the publication and yet speaks about them in past tense, because it was written last. As Pablo Miranda Carranza notes, theses by publication can give an impression of provisionality and fragmentation, but this is a provisionality “that is not unproductive”—it mirrors, he argues, not only the diverse financing arrangements and tasks that structure contemporary doctoral research, but also the organization of work within the architectural discipline at large.¹ The thesis by publication format is thus not only suitable but perhaps even necessary in architecture, a field in which expectations of over-productivity (the ultimate result of “a not unproductive provisionality”) are rampant and the logic of the project dominates. The choice to present my work in the multiple—as many discrete, co-authored, chunks of texts and projects—deliberately reflects this necessity and this norm.

Setting aside discussions of content for the moment, in this preface I address the form and structure of the thesis.

The Papers

The papers form the heart of this work, despite being formally described as being “appended” to the thesis, in line with the regulations of my institution. It is the papers that represent the outcome of the work as it progressed over six years, and it is the papers that have been subject to the most rigorous review and revision processes.

A thesis by publication must include a minimum of four articles that have been previously published in internationally recognized peer-reviewed journals. Of the fourteen papers included here, three were published in special issues of *Architecture and Culture*, and one in *Drawing On*, thereby fulfilling this requirement. Of the remaining papers, three were published in non-peer reviewed architectural publications (namely, *The Avery Review*, *The Real Review*, and *LO-RES*); and four papers were published as chapters in anthologies within my field (namely, *This Thing Called Theory*; *Rethinking the Social – Making Effects*; *After Effects: Theories and Methodologies of Architectural Research*; *Architecture and Feminisms: Ecologies, Economies, Technologies*). I have also chosen to include two unpublished papers that were presented at international conferences within architecture (one at the London Metropolitan University in 2012, and one at KTH in Stockholm in 2016, which built on an earlier paper presented in Trondheim in 2013), and one short text that formed the introduction to an exhibition catalogue (*Aiming for Democratic Architecture*), partly in order to ensure the inclusion of a number of single-author texts in addition to the co-authored papers and partly in order to show the breadth of formats that theory can adopt. For similar reasons, three exhibition-based projects are also included, in the form of project documentation. These projects are included in support of the papers, and they help me to elaborate my methodologies in ways that show the points where theory runs alongside practice. I address this within the methodological discussion that is set out in the first chapter of the *kappa*. I note that of the fourteen articles included, nine were presented at international conferences in architecture prior to their publication. Further, ten of the fourteen articles were co-authored, a decision that I also explain further in the method chapter.

The text of each paper is reproduced as it was initially published or presented (i.e., it is taken directly from the published proofs, copyedited, and then re-typeset), emphasizing the role of the papers as objects of assessment and outcomes of a practice within architectural theory. The papers have been structurally altered in three ways. Firstly, the thesis has been typeset and designed by Tristan Main, and the consistent treatment of the whole produces,

it is hoped, a smooth surface across which the discrete chunks of the articles can be read comparatively. Secondly, the papers have been arranged in four sections—Projections, Connections, Deregulations, and Enclosures—which reflect the transformations studied. Thirdly, I have taken the liberty to shorten and even change the titles of the papers, to better convey the overall narrative structuring their disposition (original titles are also given). Fourth, I have copyedited the texts, which primarily affects footnotes and citations, as well as italicization. A shared bibliography closes the volume.

The *Kappa*

At once introduction and conclusion, the *kappa* is the Swedish term for the text that opens a thesis by publication in Sweden. *Kappa* means “coat” in Swedish. Enclosing the articles and holding them firmly in place, the *kappa* is, like architecture itself, a *container technology*, a key term within this thesis. As feminist scholars have consistently warned, to act as a container is not to act neutrally, and this is particularly important to remember in relation to architecture: the *kappa* gathers the articles that make up the thesis, and molds its contents, shaping them in advance (of their being read) and after the fact (of their being written). The version of the *kappa* included here was developed over a period of approximately eight months, with the majority of the material written in the six weeks between February 6, 2018, and March 19, 2018, wherein I took a break from other paid employment to concentrate on the writing. The papers form both the material from which the *kappa* is constructed and, simultaneously, the content that it holds. Cosmetic yet decisive, it is applied last, on the way out the door; at the same time, it sets the tone for the public presentation that follows. It is therefore what I have elsewhere termed “organisartorial”:² it structures by dressing.³

Like all of us working under the conditions of not-late-enough capitalism, the *kappa* must do a number of things at once—too many things, one might argue—and the boundaries between its various tasks do not exist in advance of their performance. Although it operates within a foggy and largely unregulated space (the question of what a *kappa* should do is guided by academic convention,

precedent, and taste, rather than any written requirements), its primary task is here understood as being to facilitate the examination of the thesis. My aim in writing the *kappa* has been to provide the reader with an insight into the methodological approaches that were developed through the research; the key theoretical frames that were borrowed, tested, and modified; the lines of communication that needed to be opened in order to produce, disseminate, and verify the material; and an overview of my findings. In elucidating those “findings,” a term that in many ways fails to acknowledge the capacity of critical architectural theory to produce anew, I describe a range of transformations in the architecture discipline in Sweden in the second decade of the twenty-first century. I end the *kappa* with a discussion of a speculative condition that I call “the unbuilt environment.” A Swedish summary is offered in closing the front matter.

Within the *kappa*, you may notice a propensity for the diagonal. All of the terms that are set in italics at their first use are concepts that were developed through the research; these are discussed further within the *kappa* and constitute the contribution made by the research to the discourses to which it relates. Italics are otherwise reserved for foreign terms (usually in Swedish) and the titles of publications. “Overused,” as all good editors know (along with what to put in a footnote and what not), “italics quickly lose their force”⁴—as such, emphasis is conveyed through sentence structure rather than italicization, and the italicization of these terms in turn avoids the overuse of quotation marks. The aim of the style of writing used in this thesis has been, throughout, to show the force within the superficial, and at times this has required a forcefully emphasized superficiality of its own. This style of writing, which is clearest here in the *kappa*, may also provide a trail of crumbs for the reader if they choose to approach the co-authored papers in a search of an authorial voice for assessment purposes.

Acknowledgements

I am forever grateful to the taxpayers of Sweden for financing this education.

I also wish to express my thanks to my brilliant supervisors, mentors, teachers, and collaborators for making this project intellectually possible. H el ene Frichot fits in all four of these categories and thus deserves quadruple thanks, and a million more. Daniel Koch and Katja Grillner produced research as a possible trajectory for me, and provided me with a theoretical ground within social theory and gender studies—the foundation upon which this thesis is built. Along with so many other colleagues and friends from ResArc, Fredrik Torisson and Erik Sigge made for excellent partners in crime throughout this period, and should be thanked deeply for their contribution, Fredrik in particular for all of the thousands of words that we wrote together. Arthur R oing Baer’s thoughts on technology, remotely conveyed through screens and satellites, should also be acknowledged for their impact on our shared paper. The decisions of a great number of editors, curators, conference organizers, and opponents facilitated the inclusion of the papers and projects as objects of assessment, and I wish to acknowledge the important role that those spaces of review and dissemination played, as well as the work of Tristan Main, the mastermind behind the graphic design of this publication.

My heartfelt thanks go out to Svensk Standard, in particular the talented Markus Wagner, and the architecture office Secretary, in particular Rutger Sj ogrim and Karin Matz, for the spaces of warmth, experimentation, and friendship in which almost all of my ideas about architecture were developed.

I am grateful to my parents, Elizabeth Rix and Peter Runting, for facilitating a very wonderful life; and to my family and friends in Melbourne, Stockholm, and abroad, for populating that life and enriching it beyond measure throughout this period.

Stockholm, March 2018
Helen Runting

Contents

Abstract 1

Preface 3

KAPPA 13

Introduction 15

Aims of the Research 16

Methods and Theoretical Frameworks 17

Relevance and Findings 18

Chapter 1: Method 21

In and On the Background 22

Alongside 26

Together 27

Within Reach 31

Restless 34

Time Travels Fast Today 35

The Age of Semiocapitalism 37

Preoccupations 41

In Aggregate 44

Instant Archives 45

Evidence Bases 47

Performing Excess 51

Making Liquid Seams 57

Chapter 2: Findings 61

Withdrawal Symptoms	62
<i>Last Night in Sweden...</i>	63
<i>The Fog</i>	69
A New Programming	70
A Space of Differences	72
Young, Smart, and Raised by Wolves	73
The Future's Here, Said the Pioneer	76
<i>In the Papers...</i>	77
Deregulations	77
Enclosures	78
Facilitations	79
<i>Disciplinary Frames</i>	81
<i>Container Technologies</i>	84
<i>Ghosts in Shells</i>	86
<i>In the Papers...</i>	89
Connections	90
Projections	91
The Unbuilt Environment	92

Chapter 3: The Metadata 95

Contexts of Production	95
Contexts of Dissemination	97
<i>Conferences</i>	97
<i>Journals</i>	99
<i>Books</i>	100
<i>Exhibitions</i>	100
List of Appended Papers	103

Svensk sammanfattning 109

PAPERS 113

Projections 113

- Managing the Not-Yet 115
- Anticipation 127
- Pop Theory 139
- Desiring Democracy 153

Connections 159

- The Liquid Seam 161
- A City of Bits and Atoms 181
- Yes Boss! 195

Deregulations 213

- Welcome to the Promenade City 215
- Vertigo 233
- Let The Right One In 243

Enclosures 261

- The Promise of a Lack 263
- White, Wide, and Scattered 277
- The Pastel Cell 291
- In Captivity 309

PROJECTS 325

- Bygglovsboken 326
- Housework 338
- The Continuous Surface 358

ENDNOTES 369

BIBLIOGRAPHY 407

KAPPA



Introduction

This is all going to sound terribly superficial. And it is. Just not in the way that you might think.

This thesis is an excursion in architectural theory that deliberately confines itself to the surface (there: you've been warned). It is, I argue, in the seemingly superficial that we can see signs of tension, dissolution, and cohesion forming, moments when architecture starts to become *unbuilt*. Lens flares on Photoshop files. Images plastered onto hoardings. The thin layer of Stockholm White (NCS Code S0502Y) that lines the interior of tens of thousands of inner-city apartments in Sweden's capital. Metal cladding catching afternoon light in Ørestad, Copenhagen. Rough brown paper enclosing draft policy documents on public exhibition at Kulturhuset in Stockholm one summer quite some years ago . . . In these scenes, architecture shapes life itself, and it does so on a scale that exceeds the individual building. Here on the surface lies a politics—more specifically, a *biopolitics*—that is worthy of speculative exploration and critique.

Through my doctoral research, I have aimed to critically theorize architecture's shifting orientations towards the lives that it inevitably shapes and molds. In this, I have chosen to view architecture as a disciplinary action that unfolds at environmental scales: an architecture that is operative at the scale of the population. When viewed *in aggregate*, the transformations addressed in each of the fourteen essays point to a decisive shift in architecture's disciplinary landscape, passing through phases of *withdrawal* (evidenced in *deregulations* and *enclosures*) and *facilitation* (through exercises in *projection* and *connection*), to a

state that I refer to as *the unbuilt environment*, wherein *the project* replaces the building as architecture's primary outcome.

Surfaces are multiple, and layered, and sometimes thick, opaque, and sometimes; the research took as its point of departure the observation that a low-lying *fog*, a neoliberal mentality, had settled over the Swedish architectural landscape, and that within that fog, a particular form of inhabitable surface was taking form. The results of those transformations are yet to be determined, although we may see them more clearly now in the rear mirror, as the mist disperses. Ultimately, I argue in the *kappa*, in all of these changes we witness the birth of the unbuilt environment: a shimmering assemblage of *container technologies* located at the edge between the present and the near future.

Aims of the Research

Architecture forms the broad object of inquiry in each of the fourteen papers: architecture is the *thing* whose *state* the research is concerned with, that I have wanted to speak to and wanted to understand, intimately and in detail. With a nod to my own background in urban planning and urban design, and perhaps as a result of my reliance on the discourse of biopolitics, throughout the thesis I chose to view architecture in aggregate—by which I mean as operative *at the scale of the population*.

In order to approach this *continuous surface*, a range of more specific objects were needed. These were in turn extracted from disciplinary terrains that often exceeded architecture (art, planning, marketing, interior design, political economy) or from archives that did not know they were archives (real estate websites, photo-sharing platforms, and building permission catalogues, for instance). I have tried to write to and about an architecture, then, that at times has not looked like architecture, and to address the diverse and ambiguous outcomes of contemporary architectural practice—atmospheres, installations, images, ratings, fictions, archives, opinions, panel discussions, databases and archives, policy documents, plans, drawings, buildings, and landscapes—as valid

objects for architectural theory. These are objects are capable of acting as *evidence bases*, through which broader reorientations within the architecture discipline can be witnessed. Given widespread acknowledgement within architecture of the social nature of the production of space, few would argue that architects “only” “draw” “buildings”—as such, mine is not unusual position to take, and may in fact reflect the current norm.

The research was motivated by the need to find the words to think, write, transform, and even negate what architecture was doing, when it was doing what it was doing, to life, in Sweden, in the second decade of the twenty-first century. My aim was always to produce thick, transformative, and essayistic theorizations of the architectural present that were operative in a critical register. In attempting to theorize the present, I wanted to write theory that would open up spaces, voids, in *the state of things*, for a yet-un-thought architecture: an architecture that aspires to facilitate life at the scale of the population. This is the normative proposition that informs the thesis. I also wanted to show, by doing, that the present constitutes a crucial site for the making of architectural theory and that a critical orientation remains necessary in confronting architecture’s ever-changing now.

Methods and Theoretical Frameworks

This research should be read as pursuing a method of deliberate (over-) production, whereby critical architectural theory is practiced through acts of writing, surveying, arranging, compiling, selecting, coding, stitching, transposing, superimposing, negating, and performing. Each of the papers that make up this thesis should be read as the outcome of an instance of that practice. I discuss my methodological choices in terms of theory operating *in and on the background; alongside* (that is, *together and within reach*); *restlessly* (working *in time with*, and against the *preoccupations* of other types of architectural practice); and *in aggregate* (through acts of constructing *evidence bases*, *performing excess*, and producing *liquid seams*). These terms are explained within Chapter 1: Method.

Adopting a methodology that encouraged starting over again and again in step with changes in the architectural present also meant that I was constantly searching for new materials to work on and to work with. Theory was not only an outcome but also an input in this process. Under the auspices of social theory, for instance, and particularly with respect to discourses surrounding *neoliberalism* and *semiocapitalism*, architecture's various *deregulations* could be understood, I learned, as indexing a shift "from a disciplinary society to a society of control."¹ With recourse to the (re)productive feminist theorizations of *container technologies*, *chora*, and *infrastructure*, the changes I tracked could be read in terms of a *lack* that, although it appeared to be a *promise*, was in fact the result of being denied a "facilitative environment." These two theoretical frameworks are respectively discussed in terms of *withdrawal* and *facilitation* within Chapter 2: Findings.

Theory, I insist throughout the *kappa*, is not a personal practice. Not only does it spill over the edge of every text, but it also requires networks of dissemination and spaces of reception that are sprawling and distributed. The contexts in which the fourteen papers that make up the thesis were published, are described in Chapter 3: The Metadata.

Relevance and Findings

What is at stake in this research's attempt to critically theorize a discipline in transition is the negation of withdrawal. This withdrawal can be described in terms of architecture's retreat to the private sphere, through its facilitation of private *enclosures* and public *deregulations*. In negating this withdrawal, I contend, theory can play a role in opening up the possibility to think through a more livable facilitative agenda for architecture, beyond the *bad restlessness* of the present moment, with its false promises of *connection* and *projection*. This argument is explored in Chapter 2: Findings.

I identify my work as operating within the field of architectural theory and suggest that it is relevant to the established history, practices, and preoccupations of architectural

theory, but also to the discipline of architecture more broadly, via practices of architectural design. It may also be of relevance to architecture's sister disciplines, urban planning and urban design.

The research makes a contribution to the field of architecture in the form of a series of methods that might be applied in the task of theorizing the architectural present and understanding Swedish architecture's recent past. Within the latter, distinct phases of *withdrawal* (evidenced in *deregulations* and *enclosures*) and *facilitation* (through exercises in *projection* and *connection*) can be discerned. A review of these shifts allows me to suggest a new disciplinary object in closing—the *unbuilt environment*. I offer up this concept as a provocation to the reader and to architecture, hoping that it might act as a *restless object*, able to move the discipline to action.

Chapter 1

Method

“Yougottadance. Aslongasthemusicplays. Yougottadance.
Don’teventhinkwhy. Starttothink, yourfeetstop, wegetstuck.
Sodon’tpayanymind, nomatterhowdumb. Yougottakeepthesteep.
Yougottalimberup. Yougottaloosenwhatyoubolteddown.
Yougottauseallyougot. Weknowyou’reired, tiredandscared.
Happenstoeveryone, okay? Justdon’tletyourfeetstop.”

—Haruki Murakami, *Dance Dance Dance*, 1994 [1988], 86.

It’s difficult to start at the start when the start is still happening.

Architectural theory can be understood as an operation of making the architectural present, with all its gaps and absences, appear. The goal of architectural theory is to move the architectural discipline to action. Sometimes, theory must also negate that which it describes, producing new and restless “things,” or voids for others’ production.

Practicing architectural theory meant, in the context of this research, starting anew each time a new present installed itself in the existing *state of things*.¹ Transformation is an aim of a critical theory, but it can also form its object, if the present moment—its frustrations, suffering, and ideas of “the good life”—find themselves in a state of constant change.² When confronted with a new situation, we may need to seek new points of orientation, or sources of *restlessness* that can unsettle an emerging status quo. Each of the fourteen essays that make up this thesis have tried to suggest

the possibility of change to an audience, by means of working *in and on the background*, *alongside*, and *in excess* of the architectural processes, practices, archives, and products that were addressed.

In setting out my ideas about method here, I hope to not only explain how I arrived at the practice of theory documented through this thesis, but to also to provide the basis for a future theory practice. As such, this is also an argument for the importance of doing architectural theory at all (which is not self-evident in the post-critical present),³ which is accompanied by a series of propositions about how theory might be done in the twenty-first century. In line with the act of enclosure that a *kappa* must perform, the chapter makes extensive reference to the papers, and particularly the three supporting projects, that make up the thesis.

In and On the Background

What can theory do in relation to the moving present that forms its site of production and its object of inquiry?

In the six years between January 2012 and March 2018—the duration of this doctoral research—the present was a period that constantly exceeded my attempts to grasp it, that ended abruptly as each deadline was met, each policy released, each building built or not built, with the conclusion of each *project*. In addressing the present, we inevitably slam into the near future and a new present. Faced with constant transformation, the theorist is thus asked to take a position in relation to that transformation, and if faced with the untenable, to push for a different kind of change.

Fredric Jameson once famously described theory under postmodernism as “the effort to take the temperature of the age without instruments and in a situation in which we’re not even sure that there is so coherent thing as an ‘age,’ or a *zeitgeist* or ‘system’ or ‘current situation’ any longer.”⁴ Jameson went on to locate this crisis in orientation in a shift in the nature of space. It is in the lobby of John Portman’s Bonaventure Hotel in Los Angeles, an atrium space in which depth is said to collapse and the city beyond to recede, that the theorist located an architecture that both indexed

and exaggerated this broader cultural condition of disorientation, providing him with the material upon which to mount a critique.⁵

A parallel exists in Joan Didion's accounts of the same city, Los Angeles.⁶ Writing in the period directly preceding the Bonaventure's construction, Didion also addresses a collapse of meaning in the experience of contemporary American life, using her own experience of the city and what she sees around her as her material. In *The White Album*, a collection of essays written in the first person during the late 1960s and early 1970s, we confront a model of "taking the temperature of an age" that is based on a form of immersion. Didion seems to tackle the conditions from within herself, a strategy that narrowly avoids introspection by means of the dispassionate tone of the professional writer. She explains it like this:

... I was supposed to have a script, and had mislaid it. I was supposed to hear cues, and no longer did. I was meant to know the plot, but all I knew was what I saw: flash pictures in variable sequence, images with no "meaning" beyond their temporary arrangement, not a movie but a *cutting room experience*. In what would probably be the middle of my life I still wanted to believe in the narrative and in the narrative's intelligibility, but to know that one could change the sense with every cut was to begin to perceive the experience as rather more electrical than ethical.⁷

It is the same sensation of senseless contingency that Jameson confronts in the Bonaventure, albeit armed with the knife of critical theory rather than the tools of the film editor. Both writers struggle to find the right words to give the senseless world they find themselves within not necessarily a narrative but at least a *background*. They both attempt to orient their audiences in relation to the scene that they face, to explain how it happened that these conditions were the ones that presented themselves, and not others. This is a task that I sympathize with deeply, and a productive starting point for thinking about critical architectural theory in methodological terms.

In the essay "Orientations: Towards a Queer Phenomenology," theorist Sara Ahmed interrogates how objects are able to appear to

us in the present and provide us with points of orientation.⁸ Ahmed's text is helpful in thinking through the questions: Why *Arkitektur Stockholm*? Why stripes on façades? Why co-living? Why Uber? Why these objects of inquiry and not others? Not cases and not samples, neither systematically nor randomly selected, the architectural objects addressed in the fourteen essays that comprise this thesis were arrived at because they needed to be faced by and with theory. These architectures were shiny in the way that new things are—it was not that they appeared out of nowhere or that they were radically unfamiliar per se: rather, they had that sharp, projective quality that attaches to things that have not yet been made blunt by use. They were yet to be theorized, yet to be unsettled, and yet to be negated if necessary. Their arrival was sudden in a way that suggested they came with little baggage, or that their background stories didn't fit (the liquid seam was not really a subdivision, co-living was not really collective, and Uber was so much more than an app): it was if they had just appeared one day, out of a fog.

“Orientations are about the directions we take that put some things and not others in our reach,”⁹ states Ahmed. An orientation—critical, queer, or otherwise—emerges, in her queer phenomenology, as a matter of proximities (what is near to hand, and what is not) and tendencies (“Bodies tend toward some objects more than others, given their tendencies”).¹⁰ These are in turn conditioned by desire (what we tend towards) and background (how we arrived at an object, and all the other arrivals that preceded it). The theorist makes the point that which objects appear to us depends on the way in which we are facing (what is in “front” of us, and what is “nearby”?) and the object's own appearance at the scene (objects do not “face” all subjects, or offer themselves up to contemplation, equally). Life in Sweden, like the Swedish language and the architectural discipline that I encountered upon arrival in Stockholm in 2007, came with its own orientations and nearnesses, proximities and impossible distances, I quickly learned, and my background meant that I was faced in particular ways too. I arrived at this research through a 5-page research proposal, an interview, and the offer and acceptance of a doctoral position at the Royal Institute of Technology (KTH) in Stockholm, Sweden.

I arrived at KTH from a job as an urban designer at one of Sweden's largest architecture offices, Tengbom, where I mainly worked with masterplanning. I arrived in the architecture discipline as an urban designer, and in urban design from urban planning; and I arrived in Stockholm from Melbourne, where I was born. Coming from Melbourne, I tended to, and continue to if I am honest, be met with faces filled with nostalgia: one can get the impression, as an Australian in Sweden, that every Swede spent a year in Australia in their early twenties. Other people's memories of warmth and leisure saturate the meetings that you have with strangers; a privileged place to start, I guess, in an encounter. While I will not explain the conditions of all of the reorientations that informed these decisions, it seems important to note that I did not begin with a position "inside" of either architecture or Sweden: those positions had to be constructed. It is also important to note that as a doctoral student at a publically funded university, my position was one supported by full-time five-year employment: it was from within the State that I faced architecture. This is a position not unfamiliar to those educated in urban planning, as I am.

In "Orientations," Sara Ahmed situates the philosopher Edmund Husserl on the winning side of an uneven distribution of attention. Husserl, in addressing his desk as an object of philosophical contemplation, actively backgrounds the domestic work required to keep his study free of children and thus quiet; although it is literally behind him, this work "explains the conditions of emergence or an arrival of something as the thing that it appears to be in the present."¹¹ Feminist thinkers have repeatedly emphasized the role played by the erasure of such backgrounds in the maintenance of capitalist patriarchies, both in relation to the question of what counts as work (as in Silvia Federicci's famous call to arms, "Wages Against Housework") and in critical response to the market logic of an invisible hand (in the Swedish context, we might look to Katrine Marçal's *Who Cooked Adam Smith's Dinner?* for a popular version of this critique).¹² A powerful example of this critique lies in Judith Butler's exposé of the work that is done in the background to actively gender subjects: the iterative "girthing" of the girl by herself and others that means, amongst other things, that she may

be less likely to land on the favorable side of the political economy of attention enjoyed by the philosopher at “his” desk.¹³ A great deal of feminist intellectual labor has been spent in the background and on the background, undoing the essentialist understanding of relations like that of the writer to the table, or girls to girlhood. By giving a scene a background, by showing that relations are actively constructed rather than simply arrived at, we are reminded that they are able to be changed: that things could be (radically) different.

Theory too has its own background. Unlike Newton’s theory of relativity, which isn’t *itself* a particle in motion, Raymond Geuss reminds us that “a critical theory is itself always a part of the object-domain which it describes; critical theories are always in part about themselves.”¹⁴ As “a kind of knowledge inherently productive of enlightenment and emancipation,”¹⁵ critical theory by definition (as a contemporary exercise that I argue extends well beyond its Frankfurt School roots, and with which, in this extended form, I identify my work) is tasked with making the transformation of intolerable existing conditions (to quote Michel Foucault) “very urgent, very difficult, and entirely possible.”¹⁶ To think about this task methodologically, and in reflection upon the fourteen attempts at writing such theory that make up this thesis, I propose that critical theories of architecture face three key tasks. First, in order to do anything at all, such theories must work *alongside* the processes and actors that they address. Second, they must urgently find ways to prompt transformation, which I suggest might be in part a matter of producing the right kind of *restlessness*. Third, critical theories of architecture must produce means of drawing it all together and of exceeding present conditions—of dealing with an *architecture in aggregate*. I discuss each of these moves below.

Alongside

Theory is not a personal practice: it is conducted with others, and shaped and molded by others; it uses the material of others (their work, their bodies sometimes); and it is done for them and alongside them, too.

Together

All research is unruly. As a thing done, architectural theory is amorphous, its sites of production and reception are numerous and messily distributed: theory is made around dinner tables and photocopiers, on word processing software on laptops surrounded by stacks of books and empty coffee cups, on trains and at airports, in scribbled notes in the margins, in bed on rainy days, and in bars late at night, in between all the other things, in snatched hours amidst the mess of twenty-first century life. Publicly, though, theory is restrained, disciplined, and serious. It is almost exclusively presented in the academic equivalent of the white cube—in seminar rooms or lecture halls, or occasionally in galleries or museums or conference centers. The props, too, are surprisingly consistent: the printed manuscript, the reading glasses (to be laid on the aforementioned manuscript for emphasis), a bottle or glass of water, and a projector that, whilst it inevitably fails to pick up the right signal first time around, eventually produces a warm, glowing backdrop, throwing the speaker's face into stark relief. And on that screen, canonical buildings and figures frame and legitimize the theorist's practice, through well-executed, institutionally sanctioned namedropping. Theory also has a specific voice, a clipped academic enunciation that says "I am doing theory now," and this tonality reflects, and perhaps also results in, the particular style of writing that is expected. Theory is also accompanied by expectations of authorship that, whilst they protect our labor from being misused (an important aspect of academic labor politics), also constitute a contrived enclosure that is worth complicating, messing with, and muddying when given the opportunity.

In this dissertation, ten of the fourteen texts were co-authored and thus the outcome of a collective labor. In each case of co-authorship, texts were written via iterations of Microsoft Word documents that were stored on file-hosting platforms like Dropbox and Google Drive, with authors being responsible for rounds of additions and revisions after an initial sketch was prepared over several meetings in person or on Skype, Facetime, or Google Hangouts.

Whilst hundreds of versions were written of the solely authored *kappa*, each co-authored paper required around ten drafts, roughly, if I look quickly through the chronologically ordered directory of project files that is named “PhD” and linked to my hard drive from the totally inconceivable space of “the cloud,” which I access through a file-sharing service. These documents were often marked up using editing functions in Word, and many have panels of colored text showing inserts and unfinished sections. Both authors tended to read all the references referred to, although not in all cases, and due to this, each paper is accompanied by a physical folder containing handwritten notes on texts, copied excerpts, and (many) diagrammatic scribbles. These scribbles, far from being contained to the folders in the shelves next to my desk at the School of Architecture in Stockholm’s Östermalm, spill over to a desk in an old TV studio at the passenger ferry terminal of Värtahamnen, some stops north by subway, where Secretary, the architecture practice that I started with Rutger Sjögrim and Karin Matz in 2017, has an office.

Throughout the papers written with Fredrik Torisson, and beyond, the research has again and again returned to the notion of the “project” as an organizational device. This is the format through which, I would suggest, most architects think of the structure of their labor, and it is the format in which this thesis was compiled. Projects, sociologists of management Luc Boltanski and Ève Chiapello remind us, make production and accumulation possible in a world of pure flow; they are an integral part of the way we operate today, in “late,” “third,” “cognitive,” and “distributed” capitalisms.¹⁷ The project constitutes a ubiquitous technology in a world that is widely understood in reticular terms: the project both anticipates and obeys the diagrammatic rendering of the “network society” and its attendant architectures. In the projective society, the home is a project, work is a project, the family is a project, and—most importantly—the self is a project, an open configuration that is constantly to be worked upon.

Within the contained space of any given theory project (meant deliberately in the managerial rather than utopian sense), there are forms of distribution at work. Drafts tended to start with

a series of more discrete sections written by one person, and slowly became more entangled, although this was not always the case. For instance, I wrote the majority of the text for “A City of Bits and Atoms” based on extensive notes from nearly a year of regular Skype conversations with Arthur Röing Baer, who provided the majority of the empirical sources and made a number of insertions into the text as we developed it into a conference paper. In parallel, Arthur produced a video that ran in the background of our presentation, which simulated an Uber ride through a city using LIDAR data. The material that makes up “The Pastel Cell” is more complicated: for this paper, H el ene Frichot had encountered Pierre Huyghe’s 2014 video work *Human Mask* and the exhibition *Designer of the Year: Note Design Studio*, both within the complex of buildings made up by ArkDes and Moderna Museet in Stockholm; whilst I had attended Pier Vittorio Aureli’s lecture on the Mitth user Syndikat at the same venue, and had visited Tobias Sj din’s exhibition *Storytelling*. We had both visited the British Pavilion separately, returning again and examining Dogma’s “totem” together, a little later in the year. I wrote a large part of the theoretical framing in that text, based on readings of the work of Pier Vittorio Aureli and the introduction to Dolores Hayden’s *The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Designs for American Homes, Neighborhoods, and Cities*.¹⁸ This was certainly not always the routine—H el ene wrote the majority of the theoretical framing in “In Captivity,” which bookended my detailed inventory of the architectures, marketing, and reporting on three different co-living models. In “Welcome to the Promenade City,” we were asked by journal editors Katie Lloyd Thomas, Nick Beech, and Adam Sharr to produce a “mash-up” of two conference papers, a brilliant suggestion that in many ways marked the beginning of our long collaboration. H el ene’s analysis of “S der Pops” thus found itself interleaved with my account of the development of Stockholm’s architecture policy, and whilst the accompanying theorization of “the fog” was taken from my initial paper, it was H el ene who had alerted me to the work of Zo  Sofia and her essay “Container Technologies” in the first place, through the course “Philosophies,” which H el ene coordinated. This in

turn linked to the work I had done in my Master's thesis, which included a chapter on chora and a comment on "facilitation" that I did not develop there—Hélène helped to link this to processes of subjectivation, producing a theorization that is picked up repeatedly and developed in the subsequent essays that we wrote together ("The Promise of a Lack," "White, Wide, and Scattered," "The Pastel Cell," and "In Captivity").

Similarly, in "Managing the Not-Yet," Fredrik Torisson wrote the majority of the section "The Future's Here," whilst I wrote the majority of the section "Holding It Together," and we together wrote the concluding "Dead or Alive." "Managing the Not-Yet" and "Anticipation," further, were actually two halves of the same essay, which we decided to split for publication purposes—this, then, was an economic decision, and I still prefer the original, which was written, on my side, from the State Library of Victoria, during a period spent in Melbourne in 2014. These essays sit side by side in this thesis, and I think the places where they were detached are quite clear if one knows the history. In "Pop Theory," the three authors met in Lund, and we talked the paper through over the course of an afternoon until finding a thread with which to hold it all together; here, it was Rutger Sjögrim that made the video upon which the piece is based, Fredrik and myself that did the writing, and Rutger and I that tested and developed a large part of the argument in our teaching. I attended to the extensive edits requested during the peer review process, which fundamentally changed both the references and the argument, and Fredrik submitted the final draft. Many decisions about who did what, when it came to the essays that Fredrik and I wrote, were based on where we were at in our respective doctoral projects, with their attendant schedules of seminars, hand-ins, and defenses.

The to-and-fro of the editing process does not create neat divisions and even these examples do not describe entirely clean breaks; they are *seams* that are partially contrived, and painted onto texts. There are many parts of many of the papers which are not authored by one author but by both, and which could not be produced by either alone.

A host of other actors are not assured of cited status in the metadata of a text, who are nonetheless integral to its production. The production behind each paper spilled over to include, for instance, the editors and conference organizers who wrote the calls for papers that we responded to; the reviewers and conference delegates that commented on the material; the copyeditors and graphic designers that skillfully imposed their own much neater frames on the work; the people who looked after my co-authors' children, and those who made food and kept house in the late-night productions that deadlines sometimes required; the friends who discussed the work at bars and over meals at their homes and mine; and the architects who contributed their own work and stories from their own practice, placing architectural objects within reach and motivating the research by supplying it with urgency. This work is done twice over in the case of a thesis by publication, as the work is revisited, reformatted, and compiled in active anticipation of its assessment as a thesis. In such a process, graphic designers shape the material qualities of the thesis, and supervisors also shape the text's structure through careful reading; the internal quality assessor, committee members, and opponent all exert entirely involuntary pressure on the text, by virtue of their various powers to assess and the public nature of academic interests. In many ways, one is reminded of the relation between architect, planner, and client, as each run ahead of the other, propelled by anticipation of the other's reaction, within the frames set around the possible and the plausible. This "metadata" is presented in Chapter 3.

Within Reach

Distributed, multiple, merged, and stitched production responsibilities are commonplace in commercial architectural practice, wherein an output (be it a summer house in Stockholm's archipelago, a tower, a strategic document, or a competition entry) is seldom the work of a single "man," despite desperate attempts to preserve the myth that such a figure exists. Neither is singular authorship attributable in municipal architecture and planning roles, where one operates with delegated decision-making

power in assessment tasks, and generally works in large multi-disciplinary teams when addressing policy-making tasks. Amorphous authorship arrangements are also commonplace within architectural research within university settings, particularly in the Swedish context. Not only was co-authorship encouraged explicitly within the coursework that made up my doctoral education—this imperative defined the event “Co-Laborations,” which was hosted by ResArc at the Division of Architecture at the Faculty of Engineering (LTH) at Lund University in 2015¹⁹—but it has also characterized the educational context of the KTH School of Architecture more generally. This can, for instance be seen in the importance of the “network practice” of servo Stockholm / servo Los Angeles (Ulrika Karlsson and Veronica Skeppe in Sweden, and Marcelyn Gow and William Mohline in the United States),²⁰ as well the critical practice FATALE (Katarina Bonnevier, Brady Burroughs, Katja Grillner, Meike Schalk, and the late Lena Villner), and even the subsequent and the related groups of Critical Studies in Architecture (within which H el ene Frichot has been an important actor) and Brrum (an office and a Masters studio teaching team that saw Ulrika and Veronica joined by Cecilia Lundb ack). It can also be noted within the research output of Critical Studies in Architecture, wherein Katja Grillner’s *Ramble, Linger, and Gaze: Dialogues from the Landscape Garden* adopts multiple voices through partly fictionalized dialogues; and Brady Burroughs’ *Architectural Flirtations: A Love Storey* adopts a tripartite authorial voice, also grounded in the genre of critical fiction.²¹

In my own practice, I have had the great pleasure of being part of the group Svensk Standard, which has provided its sixteen-odd members with a space for socially awkward, messy, ineffective, and deeply unprofessional architectural practice for over a decade, outside the space and pressures of our “real jobs.” Such constellations form a relatively common format for architectural practice, and one that has gained mainstream commercial acceptance (for better or worse) in the wake of the British collective Assemble’s shock victory in the Turner Prize in 2015. Another

important element in Stockholm's architectural research world has, moreover, been the groups that are not easily located in disciplinary or institutional terms: in this respect, Economy, which was founded by architect Tor Lindstrand and choreographer Jessica Watson-Galbraith in 2010, and Arkitekturens Grannar ("Neighbours of Architecture"), which was founded in 2012 by journalist Björn Ehrlemark and curator Carin Kallenberg, are indicative of the work being done within architecture's borderlands to compose and transform architecture's *background*.

It seems that it is almost always others that "put things in reach" for us. As H el ene Frichot and myself propose in the essay "The Promise of a Lack," "not all debt is bad debt," and theory is built on a series of good debts, of the kind that put things within reach as objects of inquiry. Not in the market for an apartment myself, a friend let me follow her to apartment showings in order to write parts of that essay, and I owe my friend in turn for her patience and goodwill in *becoming the material* needed, alongside Maurizio Lazzarato's formulation, to produce the figure of "the indebted woman."²² Referring to the work of Theodor Adorno and J urgen Habermas in particular, and then later the Frankfurt School in general, Geuss holds that critical theory is always "addressed" to a particular group, taking their experience of frustration or suffering as a starting point, as "material"—"it takes their epistemic principles and their idea of the 'good life' and demonstrates that some belief that they hold is . . . a source of frustration for agents trying to realize this particular kind of 'good life'."²³ Perhaps it is Michel Foucault, however, who advances the most sensitive view of such a move, when he refers to his practice as "an activity conducted alongside those who struggle for power, and not their illumination from a safe distance."²⁴ The word "alongside" is important here, I feel. Theory runs *alongside* the objects, processes, practices, and publics that it *addresses*.

It cannot help but do so in any case. It is dependent on them already. Beyond the death of the author celebrated within poststructuralism, if those who must call themselves authors run alongside those others who can or do not, these two figures may

share a fundamental (perhaps disciplinary) ground. In 2011, and then later in 2016, philosopher Judith Butler offers us a useful critique of bodily “independence” as masculinist, advancing instead an understanding of the body as “vulnerable” to an “environment” and to others.²⁵ This vulnerability is thus a dependency and an interdependency that begins to speak of a world not where we are necessarily equal (vulnerability is not equally distributed), but where in putting ourselves within reach of others and facing them, we may share a vital ground with them, which may be so crucial that without them we might not be able to continue. As Bifo Berardi writes in relation to the work of Félix Guattari, the lesson of 1968 for him lay in understanding the importance of friendship, of a shared orientation to things. Berardi poignantly describes friendship as:

provisional community that is not based on any common origin, on any written destiny, on any historical necessity, but instead only on provisionally assembling refrains. It means love for the same situations, pursuing the same provisional objectives, taking pleasure in following the same path together, or failing together, and falling.²⁶

Restless

To run alongside is not to direct. In my version of theory, theorists do not produce narratives or instructions or scripts, but rather “restless objects,” to borrow from Jane Rendell’s useful theorization of the relation between theory and design in architectural research. In giving us this term, she raises the possibility of making restless theoretical or research objects, “that provoke us, that refuse to give up on their meaning easily but instead make us question the world around us.”²⁷ Never a matter of problem solving per se, theory rather problematizes; theory is thus a matter of making things “urgent” and “unsettling,” and of instilling the right kind of “restlessness.”

We must, however, be careful with restlessness.

Postmodernism: Or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism, the text

with which this chapter opened, was written a quarter of a century ago. Compared to the rampant confusion of the early 1980s (to which I was quite oblivious, as a baby and then infant), it's important to acknowledge that few have found themselves lost in a city, let alone a lobby, in years. Today, we are surrounded by screens and interfaces, status updates, cartographic software, and the comforting bleep of geographically specific notifications: in the second decade of the twenty-first century, the instruments all seem to be in place to facilitate constant, real-time temperature-taking. Oddly, though, this proliferation hasn't made the orientation that is the basis for theorizing the (architectural) present any easier. The Bonaventure continues to crop up in discussions of contemporary architecture at large, evidencing that "the structural distraction of the decentered subject" continues to take front and center stage as "the very motor and existential logic of capitalism itself."²⁸

Time Travels Fast Today

Our orientation devices clearly continue to fail us. Pegman, for instance—the anthropomorphic movable marker in Google Maps—is not coping at all well with the architectural present. Pegman is the figure that one “grabs” and then “drops” into most locations in Maps in order to activate the Street View function. This cheerful orange positioning device acts a kind of synthetic body-container that we can temporarily occupy: it is from Pegman's point of view that we look upon the panorama of images that form Street View. “Today we perceive and understand our built environment more through a filter of technology than subjective experience ... today we fly over landscapes made by an algorithm in a re-programmed missile-guiding software,” observes architect Tor Lindstrand.²⁹ This is true. However, when we descend from the satellite overview into the streets below, we are in fact provided with an (artificial) vessel for our subjective experience: whilst we might not think about Pegman much whilst using the service, I would suggest that we are more likely to feel that we inhabit Pegman's orange body than that we inhabit a camera placed on top of a car (which is how the images are of course actually gathered). In this sense, Pegman conforms to

“the logic of the mannequin” described by Daniel Koch, following Vanessa Osborne: in his or her abstraction, Pegman allows us to “try on a body,” which in this case means a bodily location, with an orientation, in a digital double of the urban environment.³⁰

This orientation is not stable, and this relates to the instability of the urban environment upon which we are invited to gaze. Pegman’s Stockholm is in many places lagging and splintering, in a manner that is not so far off the effects achieved by Portman with his multiple lift cores, ring of fountains, scattered seating, replicated gangways, and symmetrical mirrored towers in the Bonaventure Hotel. On some streets, like Norra Stationsgatan on the northern fringe of inner-city Stockholm, glitches are opening up: as one moves from one side of the street to the other, the scene flickers between a carpark and a construction site, while in the background, whole city blocks appear out of nowhere and disappear. In the ten meters between the two footpaths of Norra Stationsgatan, Pegman straddles two versions of the recent past. Street View lacks the updated images that would place a row of buildings—specifically, the block “Cellen” by Vera Arkitekter, which accommodates the “Haga Nova” complex; the Nya Karolinska hospital; and a large commercial building at the intersection of Solnavägen designed by BAU—firmly on this site to produce a cohesive panorama. Pegman’s view of the world is highly fragmented: it has delaminated from the city “out there,” just like the Bonaventure’s interior. The expression of this dislocation is a hallucination of outdated versions of the very recent past; the technologically augmented vision afforded to us by Maps is simply unable to cope with the instant obsolescence of the architectural present. By the time this thesis is printed, this gap may have been closed. Certainly, OMA’s “Norra Tornen” may even be nearing completion, pressing itself against Pegman’s present, as it engages in what its architects term a “passionate embrace of the inevitable in order to conquer and overcome one’s initial fears.”³¹

Don’t get me wrong here, the collapse of continuity is certainly not to be mourned, as if a more authentic urban experience once existed—we should be highly weary of narratives of loss in any discussion of the urban.³² Rather, what we must remind ourselves

is that this fragmentation has a background, which in turn is lived. The speed of change witnessed by Pegman is lived by Stockholm's architects; the area of Stockholm that has "crashed" in Street View has done so under the weight of their labor, as well as that of the builders, planners, and mortgage-ridden prospective tenants, amongst others, working hard to make areas like Hagastaden grow. It is the sleepless nights of these actors who have produced a sleepless city, and it is the task of theory to ask what kind of restlessness is at work here, and what kind of transformations it is resulting in.

Architects Sweden (*Sveriges Arkitekter* in Swedish, or SA), the association for architects tasked with acting as both union and industry association, reported an unemployment rate of 0.6% amongst members in their most recent sectoral report, from 2017.³³ The reports of recent years track an economic boom in the architecture sector: SA's 2015 report, the first of this kind that they released, was titled "A Unique Chance to Advance," and the market analysis was subtitled "Good Times!"; the 2016 report was titled "Architects Have Become a Scarce Commodity," and the market analysis was titled "The Golden Days Continue"; in 2017, the report was titled "Towards New Markets," with the ominous phrase "The Locomotive Slows" heading an analysis which started with the more reassuring line "the architecture sector continues to expand powerfully."³⁴ All three reports warn of an ongoing labor shortage within architecture, which aligns with the pressurized "atmosphere" that could be palpably felt amongst Stockholm's architects during the years of this research. Long nights and early mornings, late meals dominated by the discussion of working weekends, breakdowns, and burnouts, combined with the constant frustration that there was "never enough time to do it right" characterized this period in architecture, as I saw it. A generalized mood of anxiety seemed palpably present.

The Age of Semiocapitalism

Fredric Jameson attributed his inability to orient himself in the lobby of the Bonaventure to an intentional obfuscation of depth in

the architecture, whereby “constant busyness gives the feeling that emptiness is here absolutely packed, that it is an element within which you yourself are immersed, without any of that distance that formerly enabled the perception of perspective or volume.”³⁵ This sensation in many ways anticipates the conditions we might now refer to as characteristic of “semiocapitalism,” a theoretical position that argues that capitalism has undergone a fundamental mutation, and that, as a result, we now confront a series of entirely new relations of production and exploitation that operate within the space and networks that link subjects and signs.

The semiocapitalism thesis emphasizes first and foremost shifts in the nature of labor in the post-Fordist mode of capitalist production, which can be understood in terms of a widespread semioticization, intellectualization, and immaterialization of labor. “From the point of view of the existence and time of cognitive workers,” writes Berardi, “productive activity has the character of recombinant fragmentation in cellular form.”³⁶ In the service of semio-capital, workers are expected to deliver a discontinuous flow of choppy bits and to therefore tolerate being subject to “constant busyness”—as Gilles Deleuze notes in his important essay “Postscript on the Societies of Control,” in the control society “one is never finished with anything.”³⁷ This busyness extends work deep into activities not usually understood as such. The semio-capitalist critique also highlights the ways in which activities that fix tastes, fashions, express preferences, and reinforce norms are also work that is performed on the information content of commodities. We can see this basic formulation in Maurizio Lazzarato’s scholarship on “immaterial labor,”³⁸ in Josef Vogl’s analysis of the “vital politics” of finance capital,³⁹ in Bifo Berardi’s phenomenology “of the end,”⁴⁰ in work on “noopolitics” (which philosopher Sven-Olov Wallenstein has in turn related to architecture),⁴¹ and in the ongoing struggle to reconceptualize domestic labor (a theme picked up in the Swedish context by Catharina Gabrielsson, for instance).⁴² An opposite force is needed to hold all of this together, in advance. As such, the content and the container for all these countless chunks of production, all that compulsory communication, is the automated

interface. Such interfaces “machine” this otherwise fragmented surface, smoothing over discontinuities in the raw content. In Berardi’s words:

Reducers of complexity such as money, information, stereotypes, or digital network interfaces have simplified the relationship with the other ... The video-electronic generation does not tolerate armpit or pubic hair. One needs perfect compatibility in order to interface corporeal surfaces in connection. Smooth generation.⁴³

This smoothness can be thought in architectural terms, as Douglas Spencer does in his critique of the architectures of folding, complexity, parametricism, and connection in *The Architecture of Neoliberalism: How Contemporary Architecture Became an Instrument of Control and Compliance*.⁴⁴ In the sensuous curves and extensive surfaces of what he calls “New Architecture”—a category exemplified by the work of architects like Reiser + Umemoto, UNStudio, Morphosis, Mecanoo, Zaha Hadid Architects, and Foreign Office Architects, amongst others—Spencer reads a patterning of experience that produces a neoliberal gaze. This gaze “does not apprehend, calculate, or gauge; it is enjoined to project itself into the play of movement presented to it, to surf the field of vision, reveling in the sensuous freedoms offered up to it.”⁴⁵ The “smoothing” of this architectural interface, he suggests, disables the subject’s critical faculties, removing our capacity to understand these spaces as products of ideology—as historically and socially constituted (and thus as able to be changed). Building upon Spencer’s comments, what I am interested here is the kind of pressure that neoliberal capitalism, and particularly the informational work of semiocapitalism, place on the architect in terms of the organization of their labor (which tends towards chunks rather than smoothness), and what response might be required of theory.

The cultural theorist Mark Fisher described with gentle acuity a world gradually being taken over by work, characterized by precarity, long work hours, the constant intrusions of digital communication technology, and debt. Fisher’s was a world in which we were, and continue to be, exposed to a “generalized

anxiety” that takes the form of “a constant twitching, an inability to settle.”⁴⁶ This atmosphere eats both at the unemployed and the gainfully employed, with the need to efficiently use the time that is “a life” and to use it well leading to a pervasive sense of panic. At the same time, we may not actually be in control of our situation enough to demonstrate our managerial skills. As Wendy Brown notes: as human capital, the subject is “at persistent risk of failure, redundancy, and abandonment through no doing of its own, regardless of how savvy and responsible it is.”⁴⁷ We can see an illustration of such a scenario in the following statement made by the Head of Negotiations for SA, Ulrik Östling:

In architecture offices, the average chargeability rate has risen to just under 80%. The inability of companies to adjust business models or raise hourly rates is putting pressure on employees to charge all worked hours to projects, leaving no time over for internal meetings or work breaks. The result is overwork and absence, and in the worst cases to burnout and long-term sick leave, which increases costs for businesses and leads employees to suffer.⁴⁸

In an odd contradiction of one of the many promises of capitalism, living in “Good Times!” doesn’t seem to spare us from a vicious optimization of the finite hours that constitute lives, or the application of economic models to the realm of the social and lived experience. During the period of this research, just such a contraction seemed to take place: far from allaying the anxiety of precarity, the ready availability of architectural work in Stockholm seemed, at least to my mind, to only strengthen the sense of a generalized anxiety. Whilst acknowledging the relevance of the interview form—something demonstrated with great acuity by the architect-ethnographer Jennifer Mack within the Swedish context⁴⁹—and whilst I had previously interviewed practitioners about their sense of agency in another context,⁵⁰ this thesis did not take those discussions as its material, but rather attempted to theorize the conditions that produced them.

It was with this aim in mind that I approached the anxious relation between planners, residents, neighbors, and

high-rise towers in the essay “Vertigo”; and the relation between the property owner and their prospective flat in “The Promise of a Lack” and “White, Wide, and Scattered.” This is why I was also interested in dissecting the mechanics of the project and the act of photoshopping images as products and processes of architectural labor in “Managing the Not-Yet” and “Pop Theory.” The theme of labor is recurrent in these pieces and others besides (for instance, “A City of Bits and Atoms”), and this is deliberate: in trying to show how we arrived at these situations, it was important to demonstrate whose work produced *the things that emerged from the fog*, a recurrent metaphor in the thesis that first appeared in “Welcome to the Promenade City,” and is picked up in Chapter 2 of the *kappa*. What did it take, I wanted to know, to make and draw the new architectures that we suddenly found so close to hand, facing us out of the fog of a neoliberal present?

Preoccupations

“What it took” in the sense of what was sacrificed, in retrospect, was time to think, to reflect, to theorize, and to plan; and this has a bearing on a discussion of method by indicating an important role for practices of theorization and theory writing. It also affects the way in which theory can be written. Mark Fisher describes a situation within contemporary capitalism wherein “exhaustion bleeds into insomniac overstimulation,” and intellectual and creative processes are effectively foreclosed. “Cyberspatial urgencies . . .” he continues, “function like trance-inhibitors or alarm clocks that keep waking us out of collective dreaming. In these conditions, intellectual work can only be undertaken on a short-term basis.”⁵¹ Bifo Berardi, who I mentioned earlier, describes a similar turn in global labor politics within disciplines like architecture, whereby a global “cognitariat” must endure the harvesting of their “neuropsychical energies” and use of their “emotional hardware,” which are both put to work like electronic machinery.⁵² Berardi links the resulting “frustrated hyperexcitement” to withdrawal and depression: “energy just shuts itself off.”⁵³ The point of referring to Fisher and Berardi’s comments here is not to perform some kind

of psychological diagnosis on the profession (I will leave that to the professionals); it is rather to argue that as we increasingly optimize cognitive labor in a range of fields, theory becomes all the more necessary, not as a cathartic or therapeutic commentary, but in order to combat this passive restlessness with a critical restlessness: with an urgency that speaks of transformation and change.⁵⁴ Architectural theory—especially when undertaken from the security of a full-time academic position within a non-totalitarian state like Sweden that is open to the writing of critique—can use its (lived and livable) time to think and write architecture, alongside an otherwise heavily “preoccupied” practice with little time left over after drawing so much of it.

As theorist Vija Kinski puts it, “The present is harder to find. It is being sucked out of the world to make way for the future of uncontrolled markets and huge investment potential. The future becomes insistent.”⁵⁵ To be straight with you, Vija is not a real theorist. Vija is not even a real person. Rather, she is the fictional Head of Theory at the fictional Packer Capital in Don DeLillo’s *Cosmopolis*.⁵⁶ The real theorist Josef Vogl, however, recognizes an adequate description of a derivative-based, algorithmic capitalism in her fictional accounts. This is a capitalism that dreams of its own oblivion via the complete abandonment of the physical world for a world of flows.⁵⁷ “He was the undead,” Don DeLillo writes of the protagonist of the novel, Eric Packer, in moment that actively anticipates his later novel, *Zero K*, “He lived in a state of occult repose, waiting to be reanimated.”⁵⁸ Critical theory can be viewed as the practice of denying exactly this kind of transcendence. Eric Packer’s confrontation with his Head of Theory is particularly interesting in this sense, despite being fiction, and I have shown a clip of this scene, taken from David Cronenberg’s film of the book, repeatedly in my teaching.⁵⁹ From the inside of Packer’s limousine, in this scene we watch a confrontation between a form of capitalism obsessed with transcendence of material conditions and referents, and a form of theory that places precisely those conditions at the heart of its concerns. “It’s interesting, isn’t it?” Kinski says to him, as they watch a protestor burn themselves to death outside the

window of the car, “About men and immortality.”⁶⁰ It is as if the theorist’s role is to bring the conversation back to *life*, in all its finiteness, at every instance of their discussion. This is a life that Packer in turn deprives her of, describing Kinski as “a voice with a body as an afterthought, a wry smile that sailed through heavy traffic.”⁶¹ Packer’s position relies on an insistent removal of the background—“Give her a history,” his train of thought continues, “and she’d disappear.”⁶² His theorist must argue with equal urgency that his dream of immortality is material, real, and lived—that it is constructed and that it can be changed. His life depends on this, quite literally.

This scene tells us much about what theory can do, which in turn affects how it can be done. “The basic image that theory offers to us,” the art and media theorist Boris Groys argues, “is the image of our own death—an image of our mortality, of radical finiteness and lack of time. By offering us this image, theory produces in us the feeling of urgency—a feeling that impels us to answer its call for action now rather than later.”⁶³ Groys provides the example of Lars von Trier’s 2011 film *Melancholia*, citing Kerstin Dunst’s character Justine’s reaction as responding to the “urgency” of the impending collision with the oncoming planet Melancholia, which faces her with a “neutral, objectifying gaze” that Groys equates with the gaze of theory. Whilst I agree with Groys’ claim that “life” (and its lack, “death”) might be one of the few commonalities left in the face of a market society of difference, his placement of the theorist in the skies over Earth seems redolent of the “God trick” that Donna Haraway has so effectively warned us of.⁶⁴ Whilst theory can certainly induce desire, I imagine theory working against the type of desire that Justine experiences, entranced by the rapidly growing orb that “faces” her, and that is increasingly “put within her reach.” Justine’s character is like Eric Packer’s character, in this sense: both yearn for a form of transcendence that theory actively works to unsettle, rather than to advance.

Architectural theory in the twenty-first century must negate *the forms of restlessness that wake us from our collective dreaming*, and seek out the forms of restlessness that produce

emancipatory change. There is, to my mind, good restlessness and bad restlessness, and the difference between the two lies in the difference between the production of urgency and the reproduction of anxiety. This is a line that some of the papers that make up this thesis negotiate more successfully than others, and it something that must be tested, I have learned, through doing: the boundary between anxiety and urgency is not easy to locate and is not easy to perform, but it means everything.

Theory must perform the negations necessary in order to produce voids; not thinking *for* others, but producing gaps within which a range of actors might think and dream alongside one another. I think this is what K. Michael Hays and Alicia Kennedy mean by architectural theory's "properly utopian vocation," when they state that "The theoretical text seeks out for us what we cannot otherwise imagine (this is its properly utopian vocation), but it does so not by presenting us with a concrete representation, or even a guide to one, but rather by exposing the gaps and holes in our discipline and our discourse that are our own inability to see beyond the present and its ideological closure."⁶⁵ This is also why theory must resist the constant demands of students of architecture to provide "the good example"—the good example (no matter how good, effective, critical, feminist, or prescient it might be), by being an object of emulation and adoration, forecloses exactly the kind of space that theory works to create. Good examples fail to trouble us, and this is why they are not the restless objects that theory needs to have within reach.

In Aggregate

If architectural theory works by giving the objects and practices of architecture a background that allows them to be changed, it can produce the urgent impetus for change by working alongside and inducing restlessness of the productive kind. In a final step, an architectural theory of the twenty-first century must work with excess. Rather than with reductive abstraction—a necessary part of the design process—theory adds layers to a situation, working above

and beyond the optimized demands of practice, through techniques of aggregation, exaggeration, and connection.

Instant Archives

The present is not only glitching, but it is also becoming massive, heavy, and difficult to theorize in active and critical terms.

The heavily trafficked platforms of the popular and professional online architectural press—ArchDaily, Dezeen, and Architizer come to mind, although there have been and will come others—attest to the scale of the present when it is to be taken seriously as an object of inquiry for architectural theory, inducing a sense of vertigo in even the bravest theorist. The “instant archives” of the architectural press are swelling exponentially, amassing projects at a speed that results in monolithic aggregations of architectural material. Drawings, visualizations, and photographs accrete on such websites, largely for the purposes of promoting and selling architectural services. Architects have become skilled at formatting “chunks” that can be smoothly pushed into such interfaces; “at least six images (interior and exterior) and a short text plus a bio” is a standard formula. This work is indicative of semicapitalism’s projects: it is an unpaid activity, a kind of “housework,” halfway between meditative social media use and angst-inducing compulsory self-promotion. As Bifo Berardi reminds us, “the flow of semicapitalist production captures and connects cellularized fragments of depersonalized time . . . Social labor time becomes an ocean of valorizing cells that can be summoned and recombined in accordance with the needs of capital.”⁶⁶ The build-up of self-generated content in these archives acts in just such a way: it is chunked and banked, stored for further use, for free, perhaps by the architect herself in her promotional efforts, but also by other cognitive workers tasked with combinatorial tasks like mood-boarding a concept or compiling a Hot or Not list, or its architectural equivalent. Such activities, however *superficial*, are crucial components of architectural production: both uploading and remixing such content works to establish taste, fashions, preferences, and norms, producing the information content of

commodities. Such activities are seldom waged and tend to extend deep into what we understand as home, leisure, or the social. Maurizio Lazzarato urges that we view such work as “immaterial labor” and formulate a politics commensurate with that status.⁶⁷

A similar expansion of architectural production and thus of the architectural present can be seen in the repositories of social media—Instagram, Facebook, Pinterest, as well as older sites like Flickr—where architectural projects, built and unbuilt, also pool and circulate. Similarly, the online marketplaces for the sale and exchange of architecture as commodity (apartments and villas on real estate websites, or fragments of buildings through online scrap retailers, rare monographs from online auction houses, or apartment swap services) form high-tech flip-books browsed rapidly by millions on a daily basis. In Sweden, these sites are literally household names: *hemnet.se*, the country’s most popular real estate site, attracts 2.8 million unique visitors to the site per week (Sweden’s population is just under 10 million).⁶⁸ These services have in turn spawned a range of support apps to aid in the bidding process, and styling and curation services have emerged to dress the commodity for its online appearance.

Even the State itself has recently emerged as site for the mass storage and even dissemination of raw architectural representation as a material—we might consider the building permit submission systems, for instance, in which representations of a future city (plans, sections, certain details and specifications) are uploaded, approved, and made available for download as automated archives of a (yet) unbuilt architecture. All holders of a Swedish personal number and thus digital ID have access, for instance, to the building permit system of the City of Stockholm (access arrangements vary across municipalities). Approved building permits include documentation of the decision to approve, but also have attached architectural drawings of the approved building or buildings.

“Time travels fast today,” wrote Denise Scott-Brown and Robert Venturi, in their controversial 1968 architectural manifesto for mass-produced commercial kitsch,⁶⁹ but in a world where

customized architecture accretes in instant archives at a rate that can no longer be read by human subjects, we must have a very serious discussion about what how architecture might respond to this new and overwhelmingly massive “commercial landscape.”

Evidence Bases

Throughout the doctoral research, I have been fascinated by these instant archives and the strategies that might be required to theorize the material that they hold. Many cannot be accessed, and one can only point towards them: in “A City of Bits and Atoms,” Arthur Røing Baer and myself tried to reimagine Uber’s “riders” as points in a network, whose actions are viewed in aggregate by Uber, although these maps can no longer be “read” by human subjects. The big data generated by the Uber system, as Jeff Schneider of the Uber Advanced Technologies Center admits, “is now so large that the real bottleneck becomes allocating the computation to even look at that data ... so we have smart algorithms to decide what computation is worth doing.”⁷⁰ As such, we tried to write about this size in terms of “pounds of flesh,” translating the data back into lived form and labor politics by engaging with Uber’s orientations as interlocutors, and offering a different account.

But sometimes the archive can be accessed, and by extracting material from it, consistencies can be foregrounded and aggregates produced. In “Wide, White, and Scattered,” H  l  ne Frichot and myself examined the real estate brokering website hemnet.se. We addressed hemnet.se as a site of lazy weekend perusal, substituting the exercise of idle flicking with one of a more concentrated coding of surfaces. Here, I undertook the short analytic exercise of quantifying the color of apartment walls for all of the apartments for sale in a given area on a given day. In “Yes Boss,” Fredrik Torisson and myself experimented with the superimposition of fan photography of Bjarke Ingel’s 8 House, downloading all the available photographs of the building from flickr.com and coding them according to vantage point, before overlaying them to produce a video that morphs between the most popular locations. These two examples deployed an exceedingly simple content analysis, which took Gillian Rose’s

canonical *Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to the Interpretation of Visual Materials* as a starting point.⁷¹ The material we worked with was highly manageable: a day's work for one person and a matter of scribbled notes and mental arithmetic, but it points methodologically towards forms of extraction that are achievable.

It was *Bygglövsboken*, one of the three supporting projects included in the thesis, that performed the best “cut” through one of these archives.⁷² The project was produced by Svensk Standard (in this project, primarily Markus Wagner, Rutger Sjögrim, Karin Matz, Ola Keijer, Joël Jouannet, Sara Liberg, and myself), in response to an open call for public art proposals that would negotiate the space between art and architecture, issued by Eva Bonniers donationsnämnd, a private foundation for public art based in Stockholm, Sweden, in 2014. Svensk Standard was one of ten winners awarded a budget of 30,000SEK and the opportunity to exhibit their work at the Royal Swedish Academy of Fine Arts in Stockholm. The proposal was simple: the building permission process is a public space, and the permits that are stored in its archive represent important documentation of a city yet to be built. Whilst the space of that archive is accessible, it is never viewed in aggregate: permits are only ever extracted as discrete documents, and never compiled as a single, architectural layer, let alone a single “public space.” In this project, we used a database obtained from the engineering company Sweco, who had won the contract to manage this public resource, in order to extract plans and sections of all of the apartment buildings approved in a single year, from the municipal database, which has a web login that is open all to those with digital ID. These drawings were compiled, with their metadata, within a clear graphic layout and a cost-effective book design, and the result was an “un-curated catalogue of un-doctored floor plans and sections, from the 51 multi-residential developments that were a building permit within the City of Stockholm [in 2014].”⁷³ We consistently described *Bygglövsboken* as an “evidence base,” playing on the popularity of “evidence-based policy” in planning discourse at that time. This was an archive that we chose not to theorize ourselves, but rather produced as an object that was meant to travel, providing an

odd glimpse into a world fractured by the targeted search protocols that arrange the information that we can all access. We handed the book over to the theorization of others, inviting architect and editor Jack Self, architect and philosopher H el ene Frichot, economic historian Erik Bengtsson, and architect and anthropologist Jennifer Mack to dissect it in English; and architect Petra Petersson, architect and researcher Erik Stenberg, and architect Bj orn Wiklander to work upon it in Swedish, through two public discussions based on the book that were held at the Royal Academy of Fine Arts in Stockholm in late 2015, and distributed it via the exhibition and post for free, to those who heard about it and wanted a copy.

Acts of *aggregation* are hardly foreign to architectural theory's sister discipline, architectural history, and it would be remiss not to mention the important work undertaken by Aggregate Architectural History Collaborative in the United States in this discussion. Whilst the group describe their interest in aggregation in knowledge terms (i.e., as a coming together with others to produce),⁷⁴ their approach to architecture also points to a view of architecture as a technology that operates on a scale that exceeds the building, and perhaps many of the traditional objects of the architectural historian. The questions that the collaborative pose in opening their anthology *Governing by Design: Architecture, Economy, Politics* certainly point towards such an expansion: "How does change happen? ... Who authors design? How does architecture participate in modernization? How does architecture govern?" are productive in suggesting an architecture that itself operates most potently in aggregate, although the texts themselves do not follow this logic beyond the traditional formats of architectural history: on their website, the group hint that their name is more to do with coming together to produce "books, conferences, and edited journal volumes" than an agenda for architecture in itself.⁷⁵

Another group that have tested the bounds of what architectural history can do, deploying aggregation as a method directly on their material, is the team at the research agency Forensic Architecture (which is how they refer to themselves, although one might note that the "desk" these scholars arrive

at each morning is located at Goldsmiths, University of London, an identification they seldom make in their work). In *Forensic Architecture: Violence at the Threshold of Detectability*,⁷⁶ agency director Eyal Weizman describes in painstaking detail the processes of reconstruction that his team deploy in supplying evidence for juridical processes prosecuting state and corporate violence. Whilst a vast number of projects are presented in the book, pertinent to the present discussion in particular is their work in exposing the scale of the Israeli army's attacks on civilians on the deadliest day of the Gaza conflict of 2014. Addressing the accidental archives of the internet, Weizman's team data-mined social media channels like YouTube in order to source, code, categorize, and compile images of an architecture that has been atomized twice-over (once in war, and once by its mediation). The images that they searched for were of bomb clouds, which they collected in their thousands and painstakingly re-assembled in three-dimensions in line with sun angles and techniques borrowed from meteorology, painting, and architectural design. In such a way, the group were able to extract an architectural aggregate, made up of the fragmented material of a range of instant archives, in order to prove a disappearance: what was in the bomb cloud was not on the ground any more, and had thus passed over into a condition of ruin and death. Weizman contends that beyond this line, the matter still remained "architecture." A second "aggregation" thus occurs in this move, which expands our disciplinary understanding of what the architectural object is when it faces us, transformed. "The soft, temporary, and ever-changing architecture of bomb clouds contrasts," he writes, "with the solid, hard architecture of buildings on the ground, but it is architecture nonetheless, a temporary, gaseous architecture with a life span of seven to ten minutes."⁷⁷

The conversion of instant archives into evidence bases puts very different architectural objects within our reach; this is a useful move when those objects are clearly intolerable (*Forensic Architecture*), or in situations where we are simply unsure whether they are livable, because we cannot see them yet (as in *Bygglövsboken*). Such evidence bases can, depending on the

techniques of aggregation used, in turn constitute restless objects, and be used to move the world that they refer back to, and even to negate it entirely.

Performing Excess

Art theory can prove instructive in starting to think through what these expansions of architecture might mean when they are coupled to the infinite archives of the internet and the capabilities that space suddenly provides us with. Boris Groys' recent book *In the Flow* describes digital archives as preserving the aura of art objects but essentially ignoring the object itself: on the internet, with its abundant metadata, it's all aura, claims Groys, riffing off Walter Benjamin's canonical analysis of the art object in "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction."⁷⁸ This argument is similar to that which Fredrik Torisson and myself advance in our work, which traces (particularly in "Managing the Not-Yet," but also through "Anticipation" and "Pop Theory") a move wherein the representations of architecture begin to perform in ways that make the subsequent building largely irrelevant. We have referred to this effect in terms of "pad thai," comparing the building to the remains of a performance Rirkrit Tiravanija, whose infamous relational aesthetics pieces saw art publics eat Thai food that he had prepared in gallery spaces, leaving little behind in terms of an art object beyond the remains of the meal.⁷⁹

Groys argues that, having left the world of museums, contemplation, and interpretation, contemporary art on the internet rather demands "the reenactment of the documented event—an attempt to fill out the emptiness in the middle of the aura."⁸⁰ I can't help but wonder whether Groys' assertion partially explains Weizman's team choice to so closely "reenact" the neutral terminology and precise scientific aesthetics of the military and State forensics (through, language, diagram, and epistemological orientation) that they place themselves in opposition to. Clearly the material has to perform a high level of precision in order that it can function in the context it is designed for (the human rights tribunal, for instance); but in the traditional academic format of the book, or

the architectural design context of the Biennale, the “agency” brings this military aesthetic with them. There is an obvious danger in an excessive identification with the object one critiques, and as such I wonder whether in their faithful performance of the aesthetic of war, we witness a desire to not only negate the events they describe but to also negate the *background* of those events (to take it all down, the whole thing).

To continue the parallel with current debates within contemporary art, it could be claimed that such a move aligns with what critic Hal Foster, writing in a recent compilation of essays entitled *Bad New Days* dubs, following Adorno and Benjamin, “mimetic exacerbation.”⁸¹ Foster uses this term to designate a genre of work that he sees as worthy of the status of a new, albeit “caustic” and “immanent,” avant-garde.⁸² Foster’s analysis refers to the installation work of Jon Kessler and Robert Gober from the early 2000s, which he describes as a mimesis of political kitsch and political infotainment and as confronting the viewer with a dystopian spectacle of death and violence in order to reveal the state of emergency which is the state of things. This definition is helpful in understanding what I see as the implications of Forensic Architecture’s work with a view to my own methodology. Foster argues that the examples he gives successfully manage a move whereby they manage to expose an existing symbolic order “as failed, or at least as fragile.”⁸³ The success of these works relies on a degree of distance—and here we are reminded of the role of irony in postmodernism—that Foster maintained cannot be produced through withdrawal but, importantly, must be fashioned out of excess.

This interests me, as it allows me to think about an architecture in aggregate in terms of the theories of performativity that have formed an important link between my work and the work of previous doctoral students within the same research group of Critical Studies in Architecture. Through *Behind Straight Curtains: Towards a Queer Feminist Theory of Architecture*, from 2007, Katarina Bonnevier works with Judith Butler’s notion of the performative address to rethink the construction of gender within and through architecture in theatrical terms, extending the act of drag to the building and the design act itself.⁸⁴ In the more

recent *Architectural Flirtations: A Love Storey* from 2016, Brady Burroughs, following Gavin Butt, speaks of a “misperformativity” that can destabilize not only the canon but also the all-too-serious architectural subject him- or herself (the architect, the architect-educator, the architect-author, etc.).⁸⁵ Her misperformativity takes the form of a queer academic civil disobedience that works on the level of structure as much as content (the thesis has multiple fictional authors, as I already mentioned, but it also integrates a dazzling array of formats, and styles of practice).

As Jane Rendell reminds us, we need to “pay attention to the various ways in which we can look, touch, speak and write, from scrutinizing close-ups, to sideways glances, to views from afar; from prepared speeches, to casual remarks, to engaged dialogues,” and these modes of situating ourselves also position others.⁸⁶ In a later essay that refer explicitly to Katja Grillner’s work and that of *Critical Studies in Architecture* at KTH, Rendell writes of a material practice of theory that “considers the modes in which we practice theory and criticism to be more than a description of content,” and which, by seeing itself as possessing an architecture, “takes into account the structure, processes and materials of the medium employed.”⁸⁷ Theories of performativity open up “the architecture of theory” in this way, as a zone of excess production for an architecture of excess that is located within the text itself, an idea shared between more recent queer feminist work within architectural theory and the historical development of critical theory: both acknowledge that theory is always in part about itself—this results from an epistemological position that is located within (rather than above or outside) the field that one is addressing, and also from the ethical imperative to address the *background*.

Forensic Architecture expose the existing order of the Gaza Strip as pervious to legal procedure; they use architecture to demonstrate this by producing evidence bases out of instant archives, and in the process expand what architecture is and what it can do. The architecture of their theory remains, however, doggedly militarized. Forensic Architecture thus deploys a reverse teleology that approaches a kind of anti-performativity: reconstructing

absence, the architectural drawings made by the team must actively negate their future realization. They sketch the contours of a cloud-architecture that must, in fact, never be allowed to happen again. The future, here, has already been lost and, unable to facilitate a dignified life, architecture is only called upon to facilitate a dignified death. In a world where architecture and theory both are easily weaponized (and here we can consider Weizman's earlier essay "Lethal Theory"),⁸⁸ both become impossible. Despite their impossibility, the team deploy the tools of these practices for a task that might be described as "the unmaking of the master's house."⁸⁹ The adoption of the hyper-masculine aesthetics of a tooled-up tech-team engaging in field operations are, though, only critically effective if they manage to demonstrate, paradoxically, the *ineffectiveness* of precisely this point of departure. The risk remains otherwise present that the researchers unintentionally reenact parts of the "background" to the atrocity that they foreground. The line that decides this seems to me to lie in the performance of fragility within the excess.

I raise Forensic Architecture's important work here in order to access a discussion of a risk that I perceive as relevant in relation to my own work, and a line that I do not always successfully negotiate. I have several times now referred to my methodology as one verging on *over-production*, and in this formulation I hint at an odd conjunction between a research methodology and the processes that it addresses, whereby the tempo of academic production can be used to speak back to the context it critiques, to demonstrate its fragility through a performance of excess.

In the face of a widespread semioticization, intellectualization, and immaterialization in labor in general and a number of professions (architecture in particular), we witness an expectation that workers not only cope with optimization, but tolerate constant busyness.⁹⁰ This busyness extends work deep into activities not usually understood as such. Staying close and keeping *alongside* requires that one keep pace with the processes that are being theorized (in my case, the disciplinary transformation of architecture in its relation to living and to life), and thus living

that pace, along with the actors involved in them. This is why this thesis is comprised of fourteen essays, three projects, and a *kappa*, rather than four articles and a *kappa*. This is why I have attempted tonalities that resonate with the contexts I work within. This is why I have also co-written the majority of articles, a move that allows one to put more objects within reach.

In Secretary's project "Housework", architects Rutger Sjögrim and Karin Matz sat in front of the Adobe program Photoshop for six sessions of up to twelve hours (Karin for one session and Rutger for five). In these sessions, which were not continuous but extended in blocks over days and weeks, the two architects enacted a performance that the three of us had designed, based on the theorization constructed by Rutger, Fredrik Torisson, and myself in the article "Pop Theory." Each of the six performances, which were recorded using software that filmed the screen when the user was in the program Photoshop, involved starting with an everyday architectural environment and "restoring" it to the impossible status of an architectural visualization. The idea was to take it to a point where it became restless, uneasy, glossy, and "ideal." The six videos were then sped up (to up to approximately ten times their original speed) and complemented with a before-to-after swipe-effect at the end that showed the transition from the first frame to the final frame. The completed work was shown in the Norm Form exhibition at ArkDes in Stockholm in 2017–2018. The videos are, I think, oddly meditative; we watch 72 hours of labor in approximately 12 minutes. At the time, our practice Secretary was newly started; it was the Swedish summer and there was, for once, time. As we didn't have any commissioned work, those 72 hours could be found: they were in themselves a kind of excess space.

What we attempt to "foreground" through these six videos and those 72 hours of screen time (to which we can add another 10 hours for discussions), were the myriad of design decisions, many pointless and later deleted, needed to achieve the necessary "gloss," and the way in which deviations in the content (in an image of a hipster café street, we notice that all the figures in the public realm, including children, are men; in another, of a designed

interior, obsessive scrubbing and cleaning is suddenly paused in order to “paint” a reclining lover into the bed, almost as an afterthought) seemed entirely reasonable if they too were “glossed over.” Building on a series of Masters-level elective courses run by Rutger Sjögrim and myself at the KTH School of Architecture in 2015 and 2016 called “Architecture and Gender: Images of Desire,” the “Housework” project attempts to locate audiences on the wrong side of the screen, plunging them into the manic “late night work” of the visualization architect, in a process of design that is both hyperactive and oddly passive, targeted and highly provisional: where work and voyeurism ran alongside one another. We wanted to implicate our audiences, to see how much excess would be accepted as *plausible* and at what point self-identification with the process being viewed might start to feel uncomfortable.

This form of performance does not conform to the misperformativity suggested by Brady Burroughs; not does it enter the dark world of anti-performativity present in Eyal Weizman’s work. Neither is it drag in the sense offered up by Katarina Bonnevier. Rather it simulates a form of restlessness that oscillates between the “bad restlessness” of undervalued, time-pressed, and meaningless work and the “good restlessness” of a desire to improve the scene the architect is presented with. The end result, which is bold and glossy, deliberately betrays a highly fragile sequence of uncertain, tentative, or even unreasonable choices.

The Swedish architect Malin Zimm, in a recent science fiction essay, presents us with the gentle nightmare of a post-human future populated by hyper-sensitive surveillance workers, who constantly risk heart failure in their optimized bodies.⁹¹ Echoing the world illustrated by Zimm, “Housework” is sped up in a similar way—it has to be, if it is to fit into everyone else’s time, if they are to watch. Many feminist scholars, however, describe processes of slowing down as critical acts. Hélène Frichot, drawing on Claire Colebrook’s “extinct theory” and Isabelle Stengers’ proposal for “slowing down,” warns us of the depletion of our resources, intellectual and otherwise.⁹² Frichot advocates for the necessity of slowing down, of “even becoming ‘slow learners’ as a

means of creative resistance.”⁹³ I remain, however, interested in testing what an optimized production can do. What I have begun to wonder, specifically, is this: if semiocapitalism is built on an uneven political economy of attention—wherein life and work are chunky, discontinuous, and precarious on one hand, and smooth (and smoothed) on the other—instead of working with the projects, what happens if we work to rather manipulate the flow? If we return to where we started, with the instant archives of the internet, what this would mean is not only the refusal to submit “chunks” of image-work to these sites, but rather to reconfigure the material of these archives to produce other aggregates, that suggest a shared ground, and a facilitative environment.

Making Liquid Seams

What kind of critical theory—and thus what kind of emancipation—is possible in the face of a world of work aiming for smooth connection? Perhaps a mode of theory that operates as a *cutting room* exercise, which not only stitches together, but also applied seams to cohesive surfaces. Like a woman tracing a line down the back of her leg to fake a stocking, the theorist might work by means of faking a seam.

In January, 2017, Secretary (Rutger Sjögrim, Karin Matz, and myself) produced an installation that was shown at Mossutställningar in Stockholm. Part of a small group exhibition curated by Malin Zimm and Mattias Bäcklin of Zimm Hall, the work, entitled *The Continuous Surface of the Welfare State*, comprised of documentation of the material surfaces of the publically owned interior of the Swedish Welfare State. Having photographed the surfaces, and meetings of surfaces, in a diverse range of spaces (the government alcohol store, System Bolaget; the tax office; the City’s planning office; the Parliament; the State dental service; a hospital; a library), we arranged the images in an array around the gallery space, ordering material samples from the various companies that supplied the ubiquitous linoleum, suspended ceiling panels and profiles, the blonde wooden veneers, and the hand disinfectant that cropped up again and again within the spaces we

surveyed. Our aim was to explore the surfaces where we literally “touch” democracy: where we meet the publically owned interior. Together, we argued, these spaces constituted a milieu—what Foucault might perhaps have called an “environmentality”⁹⁴—that embraces Swedes as impersonally as possible, facilitating a life (any life, all life) in a manner that radically exceeds the tight familial and communitarian circles of care envisaged by liberal bourgeois civil society. This very particular “state of things” is met by Swedish citizens (and even there we have an important qualifier), we argued, as an interface: slick and sticky; permeable and durable; slow, monumental, and quotidian; and always deeply material. It is seldom, we proposed to our audiences, as we sit and wait for test results or ease a sleepy body into a swimming pool before work, that we perceive these spaces as components of a broader infrastructure, and yet this is what they are—vital parts of what Judith Butler refers to as a “supportive environment,” a broader “surface” that bears, affects, shapes, and facilitates life.⁹⁵

In this project, an instant archive did not exist, and an evidence base therefore had to be produced, quickly, from scratch—this project had almost no budget and a tight deadline. Once the photographs were taken and printed, a number of techniques were deployed to enforce a consistency upon the material: a strict grid, made up of 150 mm x 150 mm square images was used; a color sequence that swept around the room, grouping images not by function or environment, but in line with the desire to produce as “smooth” a surface as possible from the chunky visual information that we had gathered; a regular grid of lamps was hung from the ceiling to illuminate a floor lined with a grid made up of material samples. We wanted to present the architecture *in aggregate*, to suggest the entire environmentality that the Welfare State interior comprised; we also aspired to present this as a product of the architectural practice of thousands of architects, a source of pride, but also a fragile space, threatened not only by deregulation but by a loss of specificity via its mimetic reproduction by private welfare providers emulating state institutions. Here, we wanted to call forth the whole, and to celebrate its specificity.

I have discussed aggregation and exaggeration as methods for theory, but what I would like to draw out of this final example is a proposal for the production of “liquid seams,” a concept which I developed in working on the paper of the same name. In that essay, I describe the use of a cosmetic line, usually designated by the introduction of a different color, on the façade of a building to “fake” a subdivision. I call this the liquid seam, as it works in the same way as the leg cosmetics used by ladies during the second world war in order to fake a stocking seam by drawing it on the back of one’s legs with a special pencil instead. My critique of the liquid seam as an architectural device was its association with a restoration of “decorum” in urban planning. Whilst it pretends to divide, it in fact produces an infinitely extendable space of expansion. In this way, it operates in much the same way as the urban grid, or the grid we used in *The Continuous Surface*, which makes reference to Superstudio’s use of the grid as a projection of global capitalist managerialism run wild.⁹⁶

Repurposing the liquid seam, and critically aware of its capacities and the risks involved in its use, theory might yet, I suggest, explore its applications in bringing the present moment into view. In the paper “Yes Boss,” I have already told you about how we mined an instant archive in order to produce an evidence base in relation to the 8 House in Copenhagen. The video that we made, which superimposed the flickr images, was a way of producing a liquid seam, in three ways: firstly, by slowly superimposing individual instances of fan photography, we were able to show through the tight alignment between the fan photography and the “money shots” of the building, and thus between marketing and inhabitation. Secondly, we overlaid the music played in Bjarke Ingel’s original promotional video for the building, a sleazy club hit called “Yes Boss” by the Danish “collective project” Hess Is More, tying the building back to its “not-yet” state as a mere proposal, constructing a seam between built reality and unbuilt project. A similar seam is constructed in the real estate papers (“The Promise of a Lack”; “White, Wide, and Scattered”; “The Pastel Cell”; “In Captivity”) wherein Hélène Frichot and myself perform a critique of the view of the apartment that positions it as a unique, discrete, yet

entirely exchangeable commodity object. In contrast to this established real estate imaginary, we attempted to theorize an endless interior: a “facilitative environment” that must be critiqued on its biopolitical capacities as a habitable ground. Other kinds of aggregates would serve us better, we argue.

The architectural present accretes around us, project by project, forming a geological mass that actively *waits*, anticipating its materialization, circulation, or sale, and that is lived in its production by its producers. Living this present constantly risks passivity, and a deficit in our interpretive efforts. We must therefore approach the present with the kind of critical eye that is excluded in algorithmic analysis, not only “making selections” but *a making anew, out of our selections*. Theory emerges here as an activity that, much like Joan Didion’s comment with which I began, is not about finding or producing narrative, so much as situating scenes from the present as objects within sequences. Theory give architecture a background, exposing it as aggregated and connected in the process. In and through the cutting room exercise that is the practice of architectural theory, the discipline of architecture is transformed.

Chapter 2

Findings

“The whole thing was amazing. They seemed to be spotlighting the cloud for us as if it were part of a sound-and-light show, a bit of mood-setting mist drifting across a high battlement where a king had been slain. But this was not history we were witnessing. It was some secret festering thing, some dreamed emotion that accompanies the dreamer out of sleep. Flares came swooning from the helicopters, creamy bursts of red and white light. Drivers sounded their horns and children crowded all the windows, faces tilted, pink hands pressed against the glass.”

—Don DeLillo, *White Noise* (New York: Picador, 1984), 128.

Whether it is through the curated real estate interior, the convenient and movable containers delivered by ride-sharing apps, the ubiquitous counterfeit of the nineteenth century perimeter block, or the closeness of the co-living cell, in the *unbuilt environment*, I argue, we inhabit neoliberal economic logics as form. Whilst architecture’s biopolitical capacities have been theorized at length within the context of the Swedish welfare state of the twentieth century,¹ in the foggy conditions of the neoliberal present, the subjectivating force of the unbuilt environment encourages us to draw upon ourselves as a material and our future as a resource in ways that leaves us, as embodied biopolitical subjects, withdrawn and vulnerable.

The defining feature of unbuilt environment is, I argue, the uneasy relation it maintains with the present: in the unbuilt

environment, the future is part of the equation. The day after tomorrow is active, and anticipation, plausibility, projection become important architectural operations. This requires us to develop and extend earlier theorizations of architecture, and offers up a series of new issues upon which architecture might take a position. This thesis represents an attempt to begin to undertake just such a move.

Withdrawal Symptoms

When I began this research, in 2012, it seemed that a thick and politically ambiguous fog had descended upon Swedish architecture, instilling a mood of fever-pitch enthusiasm for deregulation, enclosure, facilitation, and projection. It was a moment colored by participatory art's revival of "non-planning"; and by a naïve and negligent infatuation amongst planners and architects with the sharing economy, despite our knowledge then and now about the intolerably harsh forms of "work" that such an economy demands. Everyone around me was either buying apartments or talking about buying apartments, and if they weren't buying them, they were renovating them; and at the endless seminars that aimed to address "The Housing Crisis," architects again and again advocated that the citizen themselves, individualized or formatted as households, should become the lender, builder, and developer of their own residential futures. The state has seemingly been evacuated from all of these models as a body that might facilitate through regulation, or project through planning. Architecture was also side-lining itself as a discipline capable of acting on the city at large. Design regulation became a party, and it tasted like champagne. We would control what was built through the image—images of facades and facades as images; and we would feel it out together, in affect. Debt would discipline us now.

Throughout this period, the architects drew. Apartment building after apartment building. These were, as I mentioned earlier, what the Swedish association for architects, SA, called "The Golden Times." A drawing boom that would proceed a building boom. An "image-machine" was set in motion that was productive from all

angles: the architectural visualization dripped with an oily green the color of money; the interior designers knocked out pastel cube after pastel cube; the architects proffered their faces to sell their buildings; and the fan photographers reenacted the renders after the event, one after the other after the other.

What a time to retreat to the scale of the individual, to the means of conducting conduct proffered by bourgeois liberal civil society, to the cells of private property as our subjectivating enclosures; what a time to *deregulate*. It was within foggily opaque conditions that this research was initiated, with the aim of performing an emergency suture: a liquid seam was needed, that could stitch a delaminating architectural discipline back onto the society it was manically producing, and the lives it was shaping. It was thus with a sense of urgency that the research set out to theorize the Swedish *state of things* in the second decade of the twenty-first century.

Last Night in Sweden...

You may never have been to Stockholm. You may have only seen its many bridges in crime thrillers or vampire movies. The place names that follow may seem exotic, or might be terribly familiar, their present transformation a source of excitement, indifference, or devastation, depending on what you expected. I had never visited the Swedish capital before moving to it in August, 2007, and am really not sure what I expected when I arrived, suitcase in one hand, in this archipelagic city on the northern edge of Europe. Coming from Melbourne, on the southern coast of Australia, it took me a while, many years in fact, to put a finger on the intoxicating mix of exuberance and melancholia that characterizes the city, with its cake-colored pastel buildings and warm interiors, contrasted with ever-present expanses of black water and seemingly unending winters.

Stockholm is a city of islands, located at the point at which the Baltic Sea meets the Lake Mälaren. “Island” can be understood in two senses here. Stockholm’s islands are firstly topographic: they are granite land masses which rise up out of the fresh and salt water. They are prone to sharp drops, often exposing cliff faces; and

they are connected by openable or at least very, very high bridges. The islands are also typological, even morphological: on either side of the water that transects the center, the islands continue on land, formed by neighborhoods that were planned and built comprehensively, one after the other, throughout the twentieth, and now twenty-first, century. These chunks of city are connected by roads and subways, rather than bridges, and divided by planned swathes of green space, which often isolate them, functionally, from one another.

The archipelago city structure amplifies an ongoing process of renewal that violently segregates along socio-economic and even ethnic lines, as certain “islands” are valorized and others are not, in line with predominant tenure forms, the age and style of their architecture, and the demographics of their inhabitants.² This segregation has only worsened with the comprehensively planned but market-led urban renewal programs that continue to push the socio-economically disadvantaged out of the inner city and out of the modernist suburbs, through rent hikes associated with building improvements, in a move that housing scholars Guy Baeten, Sara Westin, Emil Pull, and Irene Molina have described as “profit-driven, traumatic, and violent displacement.”³ Like many things within semicapitalism, these practices also intersect with the production of signs, as renewal is in turn adjusted to and justified by profiled lifestyles: here, segregation intersects with segmentation. Take the former working class area of Hornstull on Södermalm in Stockholm as an example, which might not be the most urgent but is one that you will be familiar with from the essay “Welcome to the Promenade City.” Here we see a manufactured shift wherein the popular moniker of “knife Söder” (*knivsöder*) was rebranded “knife and fork Söder,” signaling and formalizing a two-decade-long transition from working-class area to hipster restaurant and bar district.⁴ Branding strategies like this ran ahead of, and alongside, gentrification, prompting and promoting transformations: in this sense, architectural theory finds a dark double, and an uncomfortable companion, in marketing and communications (a fact not lost on OMA, who reversed their

acronym to produce AMO, the Dutch architecture office's branding and research, even theory, division).⁵

It used to be the church spires, then it was the television and radio masts, and now it is the cranes; the city is ringed with tall things right now, none of which are buildings (the cranes are always taller). The planning for many of the largest developments (and large in the Swedish context means whole neighbourhoods) had been approved in the preceding decade, and as such—with the exception of Stockholm Waterfront, which seemed to arrive overnight—the cranes that circle the city were more or less “anticipated,” and were certainly “plausible” apparitions when they arrived on the horizon. New neighborhoods are nearing completion now in the north of the city in Norra Djurgårdstaden and Hagastaden and Annedal; the final stages of Hammarby sjöstad and Liljeholmskajen are also close to completion; large infill projects have also been undertaken at Telefonplan, Älvsjö, and on the western edge of Kungsholmen; and new luxury apartments have sprung up throughout the older inner-city, landing like dice on rooftops and within blocks, from Södermalm to Östermalm and even out into the green and leafy suburbs of Lidingö, Täby, and Bromma. The enormous new housing area of Årstafältet has just begun to rise from its field. And this is only the “inner city,” taken in by the City of Stockholm. In neighboring municipalities, the pace is equally if not even more, apparent.

Between 2010 and 2018, the City of Stockholm's planners referred to this newly minted urban world in terms of a “Promenade City,” the title of the City's last comprehensive plan (*Promenadstaden*), and a theme picked up in the essay “Welcome to the Promenade City,” which forms part of this thesis.⁶ From February 19, 2018, a new comprehensive plan was introduced, which doesn't have a title like the old one.⁷ Despite many fundamental departures, like its predecessor, Stockholm's new comprehensive plan emphasizes Stockholm's exemplary status when it comes to the valorized conditions of the post-industrial city in the twenty-first century, in particular, its ability to *do* attractiveness and growth *simultaneously*. Stockholm, like many cities, continues to be haunted

by the ghost of “the urban age,” the ideological position that posits urban growth as natural, emergent, and only subject to planning after the event. This is a line that is for instance pushed on a global scale not only by actors like the European Union and the United Nations but also by researchers and theorists. The London School of Economics’ 2007 “Global Cities” exhibition at the Tate Modern, and *The Endless City*, the fluorescent orange, Deutsche Bank-sponsored, Phaidon coffee table book, sets out this agenda quite clearly, with the explicit aim of acting alongside, and influencing, government policy internationally.⁸ The urban age thesis is discussed within this thesis within the essay “The Liquid Seam.”

In the second decade of the twenty-first century, Stockholm found itself facing a severe shortage of housing, despite all of this growth. Projections produced by the Swedish National Board of Housing, Building, and Planning (Boverket) in 2016 estimated that 700,000 new dwellings would need to be built by 2025, if the country would be able, on a purely quantitative basis, to have enough dwellings to house its population.⁹ The projected housing deficit was attributed to projected population growth, and the 700,000-dwelling figure responded directly to the Central Bureau of Statistics’ release of a revised population forecast in 2016 that upped its projection to predict an increase of 1.2 million people in the coming 10 years (the Swedish population was just under 10 million at the time this projection was released).

The Swedish State has of course famously planned dramatic expansions of the “designed living environment” before. In a tale that all Swedes know intimately, between 1965 and 1974, a Social Democrat government undertook the much researched Million Program, a project which promised to see one million new dwellings constructed in Sweden in a decade. The legacy of this program, which is generally associated with the production of modernist architecture and suburban neighborhoods accessible by subway lines outside major cities (even though in reality it also took in a range of lower-rise typologies in a range of situations), answers for around 25% of Sweden’s existing housing stock. Architecture was a central technology of government during this period, mediating a moment of

radical change and mass migration by contributing to the production of a new citizen-subject capable of integrating the complex demands of the time: a subject capable of participating in the workforce, education, social reproduction, and—importantly—in “rational” consumption.¹⁰ Whilst the consumer-citizens of the Swedish Welfare State may have been encouraged to sate themselves on consumer goods as a means of self-actualization, the vast majority of the flats they inhabited were rental tenure (*hyresrätter*) and thus subject to the corporatist model of rent negotiation. The rental tenure model in Sweden constitutes “public housing” rather than “social housing,” meaning that it is non-means tested and not oriented towards a particular social group or profile. As an environment, this housing stock was to facilitate a life conducive to labor force participation, rational consumption, and social reproduction on the terms of the nuclear family. Gradually and by way of a series of minor alterations, this landscape was, however, radically transformed.

Deregulation has a history in Sweden that could take us all night and all year to even start to map, together. As such, to give some background to Sweden’s plunge into real estate, and primarily with the aim of orienting foreign readers, a few important dates can be elucidated as points of orientation. Following a change in government in 1991 from a long period of rule by Socialdemokraterna (the left-leaning Social Democrat Party) to Moderaterna (the more conservative Moderate Party), the Swedish Department of Housing (Bostadsdepartementet) was dissolved. In 1993, the Swedish National Board of Public Buildings (Kungliga Byggnadsstyrelsen, KBS)¹¹ and the State housing and construction research organ (Statens institut för byggnadsforskning, SIB) were dissolved and their responsibilities reshaped. Looking back, the Swedish National Board of Housing, Building, and Planning—itsself brought into being in 1988 through an amalgamation of the Board of Housing (Bostadsstyrelsen) and Statens planverk (the State Planning Authority)—describes this as initiating a phase in the 1990s of the “wholesale deregulation of construction.”¹² David Harvey designates this moment as “the real shift towards neoliberalism” in Sweden, but also cautions that “the way had

already been partially prepared by the Social Democrats, who were increasingly pressed to find ways out of the economic stagnation [of the 1980s].”¹³ The deregulations of the 1990s resulted in the removal of a host of State-level financial support mechanisms, in particular subsidies for borrowing capital for housing construction; the law providing the State with means to direct municipalities on matters of housing provision (and thus to direct housing provision at all at a national level) was repealed; and differences in taxation between the three most prevalent tenure forms—rental tenure (*hyresrätter*), cooperative ownership / condominium (*bostadsrätter*), and private ownership (*egna hem*) were removed.¹⁴

Although these roll-backs continued throughout this period, a second wave of particularly intense deregulations can be noted in the second half of the first decade of the twenty-first century when the conservative government that came into power in 2006 removed the previous restrictions on municipalities’ rights to sell off all or parts of their housing stock.¹⁵ On July 1, 2006, a new model for setting rents in newly constructed rental housing was introduced. This change in regulation exempted newly built housing from the general rent negotiation system, in order to allow construction costs to be factored into the rent for a 15-year period (called *presumtionstiden*). On January 1, 2011, Sweden’s 2009 law on municipal housing companies and rents was amended (*Allmännyttiga kommunala bostadsaktiebolag och reformerade hyressättningsregler*). The changes preempted a decision to be issued by the European courts. Fastighetsägare, the organization for property owners, had reported the Swedish State for breach of economic competition laws. The prospect of a decision that ruled against the Swedish Government sparked a governmental review that recommended that the market be charged with setting rents in Sweden’s considerable stock of rental housing, and an agreement between Hyresgästförening (the association for renters), the Government, and Fastighetsägare was reached. The resulting reform stipulated that municipal housing associations would be required by law to operate in accordance with business principles (including a profit motive) and that rent levels would need to be set

in consultation with private property owners in the municipality.¹⁶ These three deregulatory events changed the face of housing in Stockholm, which, under a conservative municipal government, made possible an unprecedented sell-out, initiated and undertaken by residents, of previously regulated rental flats. In the period between 2007 and 2014, 26,000 dwellings were transferred from rental to private ownership in the condominium form (*bostadsrätter*) in Stockholm, taking the percent of apartments owned by municipal housing companies from 26% in 2006 to 17% in 2013.¹⁷

What we witness in these minor alterations to the “designed living environment” in Sweden is a move whereby first, in the 1990s, financial risk was transferred from the State to the municipal housing companies,¹⁸ and then a second shift, wherein individual households assumed that risk themselves. In November 2016, Sweden’s central bank, Riksbanken, had observed that household debt levels were rising at a rate greater than incomes, with the average level of household debt increasing from 324% in 2010 to 343% in 2016, with an increase of 5% witnessed in the preceding 12 months.¹⁹ Between 2005 and 2017, the average square meter price of condominiums (*bostadsrätter*) rose nationally from 15,293 SEK/m² to 40,028 SEK/m²; and in the City of Stockholm it rose from 30,412 SEK/m² to 72,765 SEK/m².²⁰ Half of the current number of dwellings being produced are rental nationally (this figure is lower in Stockholm), meaning that over half of the residential environment being built at present is being put on a market where only 50% of residents are making any attempt to pay back their debts.²¹ These, I argue, are architectural concerns.

The Fog

Neoliberalism is a fog. Like all fogs, it is atmospheric, melancholy, and exuberant. From within its dense opacity, figures and objects become hazy, lost; their borders may only be recovered through acts of proximity and moments of close-range encounter that more often than not begin as (or lead to) accidental entanglements. Within its thick mists, subtle alterations can be made, and from this fog, unfamiliar “things” may emerge. Neoliberalism is a fog that pervades the content of this thesis, against and from within which its objects emerge.

A New Programming

In his 1979 lectures at the Collège de France, which went under the title *The Birth of Biopolitics*, Michel Foucault describes neoliberalism as a “new programming” and an “internal reorganization” of liberal governmentality.²² In Foucault’s view, the defining feature of this reorganization was the installation of an economic rationality at the center of the social and the governmental, representing a radical break with previous *laissez-faire* policies. This active, interventionist turn, in contrast to liberal democracy, “does not ask the state what freedom it will leave to the economy, but asks the economy how its freedom can have a state-creating function and role, in the sense that it will really make possible the foundation of the state’s legitimacy . . .”²³ Whilst the preceding governmentalities of liberal democracy had maintained an essentialist ontological stance in relation to markets (leaving them alone in order that they might constitute an uncorrupted site of “truth” for governmental self-limitation), at the heart of this “neo”-liberalism lay instead a constructivist rationality, wherein the market was viewed not as given or true, but rather as a logic which would be constructed through its practice, and in these acts sovereignty would be secured. Foucault traces the intellectual roots of neoliberalism to a shift in understandings of sovereignty via the postwar work of the Freiburg school of economics in Germany. As such, he situates the birth of neoliberalism in a moment where, following the atrocities wrought by National Socialism, the German people and the German state were both considered untenable as bases for government. He explains their logic in the following manner:

Since it turns out that the state is the bearer of intrinsic defects, and that there is no proof that the market has these defects, let’s ask the market economy itself to be the principle, not of the state’s limitation, but of internal regulation from start to finish of its existence and action.²⁴

Taking up this “economization of political life” as a basis for her own work in *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism’s Stealth Revolution*, Wendy Brown usefully summarizes Foucault’s theorization of neoliberalism as constituting “a distinctive mode of

reason, of the production of subjects, a ‘conduct of conduct,’ and a scheme of valuation.”²⁵ Here, I would like to unpick this definition in order to demonstrate how it has been important to the critique offered within the papers that make up the thesis. To suggest that neoliberalism acts in the manner of a fog, as I do, is to emphasize the spatiotemporal and affective dimensions of this new form of governmentality, a framing that suggests that neoliberalism has atmospheric qualities that both index its logics and diagram them for us, making neoliberalism a “project” that is worked within and toward, and that also arrives and might therefore end.

Neoliberalism is imposed from the outside twice-over, to my mind: it is a governmentality that has a history of often being imposed upon a nation state from the outside (in the Swedish case, we cannot underestimate the role played by the European Union, in this respect),²⁶ but it is also a theorization that tends to be applied from the outside and thus used primarily in critique—seldom does one see the word “neoliberal” used in self-identification. At the same time, to think about neoliberalism as a fog is to imply that even when critical we confront this logic from already being within it, standing on a shared ground that in turn shapes the way the fog behaves. In this sense, “neoliberalism” is inescapably local in its theorizations and its implementations. We may not even be able to talk about it in the singular.

By virtue of the social democratic character of the Swedish landscape upon which Swedish neoliberalism settled in the 1980s and densified in the 1990s, commentators like David Harvey have described the Swedish experience in terms of a “circumscribed neoliberalism,” which left large parts of the social democratic welfare state infrastructures and ideologies intact.²⁷ The Swedish story is thus a complex one, which takes into account a myriad of micropolitical decisions taken within and outside government, that resulted not only in the kind of “hollowing out” of public infrastructure described by Wendy Brown in relation to the United States, but rather the creation of odd hybrids, parasitic and symbiotic pairings, and a series of ghostly developments that looked like one thing, but were in fact something quite other.²⁸

A Space of Differences

Whilst neoliberal practices of governing (which may in fact no longer be confined to the object of the state) map onto existing democratic landscapes, often adopting their legitimating functions as a kind of aesthetic, their underlying rationality has no need for democracy per se. This is what leads Wendy Brown to claim that neoliberal governmentality is bringing about a crisis in democracy, contending that “liberal democracy cannot be submitted to neoliberal political governmentality and survive.”²⁹

Neoliberal mentalities certainly in theory exclude, and must actively work against, the possibility of the kinds of “equalization” strategies deployed in the post-war social policies of the social democratic Welfare States like Sweden. “Equalization,” under neoliberalism, is replaced by the act of facilitating a “game of differentiations.” In this game, social inequality is not only tolerated, but is to some degree desirable. In explaining the intellectual roots of neoliberalism in its development by the Freiburg School, Foucault highlights the impossibility of equalization:

In broad terms, for regulations to take effect there must be those who work and those who don't, there must be big salaries and small salaries, and also prices must rise and fall. Consequently, a social policy with the objective of even a relative equalization, even a relative evening out, can only be anti-economic. Social policy cannot have equality as its objective.³⁰

As Peck, Theodore, and Brenner remind us, “uneven development does not signal some transitory stage, or interruption, on the path to ‘full’ neoliberalization; it represents a coevolving and codependent facet of the neoliberalization process itself.”³¹ Further, because neoliberal states no longer have to insure individuals against death, illness, or accident, the population must rely on the success of their own actions in what Foucault terms “an economic space”: it is within this space that we are expected to confront risks, and to do so alone. This “economic space,” I would argue, maps onto concepts of property, ownership, and the domestic interior.

Foucault unambiguously reminds us that neoliberal social policy is one which “instead of transferring one part of income to another part, will use as its instrument the most generalized capitalization possible for all the social classes, the instrument of private property.”³² This interest in property is not, in my reading, an interest in promoting widespread property ownership as a means of equalization (which is antithetical to the neoliberal project), but rather a call for property as a repository for income which can act as an economic space of reckoning when life itself is placed at risk (old age or illness), and particularly forms of difference subsequently generated. It is this idea that must be generalized and made attractive to the population: this is the “lack” that must be made to seem like a “promise,” that must be made to shimmer.

Young, Smart, and Raised by Wolves

The subject of neoliberalism is a split subject, who emerges from the fogs of this new programming as someone who *perceives themselves as a material*, who treats their subjectivity, their future, and that which they lack as resources to deploy and even exhaust. Through the writings of theorists like Wendy Brown, who have built upon the schemas set out by Michel Foucault, we are by now well acquainted with this figure of the neoliberal subject “who treats ‘life’ as a ‘market,’ making economic choices between various social, political, and economic options: *homo oeconomicus*, the entrepreneur of the self.”³³ Under the sign of the entrepreneur, individuals are fully responsible for themselves, irrespective of their specific situation, and a mismanaged life is attributed to biographical, rather than a structural, causes. This goes for failures as much as successes. “For the majority of the population,” remarks Maurizio Lazzarato, “to become an economic subject (‘human capital,’ ‘entrepreneur of the self’) means no more than being compelled to manage declining wages and income, precarity, unemployment, and poverty in the same way one would manage a corporate balance sheet.”³⁴

“It is at the soft center of capitalism, in the temperate zones of the bourgeoisie,” write Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari, “that the colony becomes intimate and private, interior to each person.”³⁵

In such a world, “there are no longer even any masters, but only slaves commanding other slaves; there is no longer any need to burden the animal from the outside, it shoulders its own burden . . . ‘I too am a slave’—these are the new words spoken by the master.”³⁶ In this process of becoming personified capital, even the capitalist, like all other “private persons,” becomes “images of images—that is, *simulacra*,”³⁷ and the worker becomes “human capital.” Using the fashion house Benetton as a case in point, Maurizio Lazzarato describes the new mode of production in Italy, which emphasizes the entrepreneurial role of the corporation, the individual, and the politician: in such a system, he argues “self-exploitation is self-organised by enterprise-individuals.”³⁸ The entrepreneur can be viewed as one side of a very dark coin, in Lazzarato’s reading. “Capital,” he reminds us, “has always required a territory beyond the market and the corporation and a subjectivity that is not the entrepreneur; for although the entrepreneur, the business, and the market make up the economy, they also break up society.”³⁹ The subjectivations that seek to hold things together too tightly, to return to pre-capitalist territories and values, to reinstate, in the face of a lack of relations, ancient bonds that we were wise to break in the first place: neo-feudalism, neo-fascism, and the neo-conservatism of strict “nuclear” household formations all come to mind as potential flipsides, alongside the smooth interfaces discussed earlier in the *kappa*.

The entrepreneur of the self is deeply bound up with the self-image of the architect, both historically and within contemporary practice. Particularly instructive accounts of the fraught construction of the entrepreneur-architect are offered to us by a range of theorists and historians, including Tahl Kaminer, Roemer van Toorn, Felicity Scott, Reinhold Martin, and Claudia Dutton, who each describe quite different moments whereby a radical political agency, bound up in a particular figure or lifestyle, is “reterritorialized” or “recuperated” by a neoliberal logic which in turn is advanced by a particular architectural discourse or practice. Scott’s *Architecture or Techno-Utopia: Politics after Modernism* proves a particularly useful account of the commercial

reterritorialization performed by the semiotic discourses of architectural postmodernism—in particular those of Denise Scott Brown and Robert Venturi—in relationship to the countercultural movement of the late 1960s and early 1970s.⁴⁰ Reinhold Martin also links neoliberalism to architectural postmodernism, describing the birth of neoliberalism in terms of a controlled demolition of the modernist project—what he describes in *Utopia's Ghost: Architecture and Postmodernism, Again* as a deliberate “unthinking of utopia” on the behalf of architects and government agencies.⁴¹ Taking a different approach, Tahl Kaminer attributes the turn towards “the real” in the Superdutch moment in architecture in the 1990s as a particularly poignant moment of legitimation for neoliberalism, which had the effect of propagating idolized images of the existing, losing sight of the future in the process.⁴² Similarly, Roemer van Toorn speaks of a “fresh conservatism” in the work of Dutch architects of this period, which he describes as an “unconscious mode of self-censorship experienced as ultimate freedom.”⁴³ Claudia Dutton has also productively addressed the construction of entrepreneurial subject positions within architecture, which she, with the aim of critically developing Peggy Deamer’s work of architectural labor, tackles in terms of a contradictory claim to both autonomy and an inside position that is exemplified in the injunction to secure “a seat at the table.”⁴⁴

In “White, Wide, and Scattered,” Hélène and myself offer three reasons why the entrepreneur of the self must be “faced” critically. Firstly, we argue, because the conduct of the entrepreneur is self-governed via an internalized regime founded on individuation, there cannot exist solidarity between entrepreneurs, and as such entrepreneurs loses the possibility to act as collective subjects at work, and bargain for wages as such. Secondly, because the entrepreneur operates on the basis of a regime of internalized control via “normalization,” she has no recourse to political power, i.e., the constitutional power that finds legitimacy in law rather than in norms. Finally, lacking, as a result of the first two points, both recourse to solidarity and to politics, the entrepreneur is discouraged from and largely unable to engage in the task of initiating structural change.

The Future's Here, Said the Pioneer

Crawling beneath the surface of the entrepreneurial world, one cannot help but wonder where the biopolitics is at. When the tattooed twenty-something representing the management of a pod hotel in LA calmly explains to a camera crew that “there is no pod sex,” even in the queen-size pods, we have to wonder what kind of neo-Victorian world we’ve stumbled into, and how it is ever going to reproduce itself.⁴⁵ The world of the entrepreneur itself has a *background*: whilst reproductive labor is fastidiously hidden, as feminism has taught us, this doesn’t mean it isn’t being done. When housework is baked into the monthly lump sum for rent, or when it is apparently being taken care of by the austerity of the architecture itself, we might question who this architecture benefits, and who it makes invisible. Hélène and myself explore this in the essay “In Captivity.”

Partly, questions of “life” have in fact been deferred in such scenarios—like so many repayments on a mortgage, they are something to be taken care of tomorrow. Children, parents, sex, and anything else to do with reproduction can be postponed, constituting a future scenario that occurs after the extended teenagehood of entrepreneurial nomadism. The problem with this kind of projection though is that it treats the future as a resource, which we can draw upon in the present. “Upon arriving in the capital-F Future, we discover it, invariably, to be the lower-case now,” William Gibson once famously commented: and how many times have we heard this since!⁴⁶ Neoliberalism has oftentimes been described in terms of a “loss of the future,” wherein the future literally recedes as a site for transformation.

At the scale of the population, one of the mechanisms behind this loss of the future lies in the loss of the possibility of planning as a means of initiating coordinated structural change within the city. David Harvey, for instance, describes neoliberalism in terms of “nonplanning.”⁴⁷ In describing architectural postmodernism, Reinhold Martin uses the term “ubiquity” to refer to “a quasi-stasis, a running in place, a circularity capable of taking everything into its feedback loops.”⁴⁸ He goes on to describe a “sense of going nowhere . . . a kind of exhausted dynamism” that is present in postmodern

architecture.⁴⁹ Tahl Kaminer also alludes to a similar “running in place,” brought about by an illusion of progress propagated by a politics dedicated to the production of “a phantasmagoria of fashions, styles and trends, while, in fact, remaining in stasis—a transformation devoid of any substantial change, a transformation of inessentials.”⁵⁰ These critiques strengthen the need for architecture to consider its work to operate on scales beyond the individual and in ways that speak to a broader distribution of resources. Such matters are not only issues for its sister discipline, planning: these are architectural concerns too.

In the Papers...

In a very partial and specific contribution to the task of identifying what this fog does when it hits one particular landscape (Sweden and Stockholm), the papers that make up this thesis have attempted to address some of the spatial manifestations of the neoliberal project as they have played out within and through architecture. I have tried to outline a small portion of the many “deregulations” through which neoliberal logics were installed into the built environment of Swedish cities in the *kappa*, primarily for the purpose of orienting the reader towards the scenes explored within the papers. I have also tried to give a background to the country’s “plunge into real estate,” to borrow the title of Italo Calvino’s short story.

To discuss neoliberalism as a fog is to suggest the possibility that, like a meteorological event, this too may pass. Whilst this research certainly attempted to theorize a series of withdrawals and deregulations within architecture that I attributed at the time to a broader neoliberalization, at the moment of writing this *kappa*, one could speculate that the landscape is again shifting and that this fog may be on the move again. I conclude the *kappa* in anticipation of a present in which the fog has cleared.

Deregulations

Two of the papers that make up this thesis address the matter of deregulation directly: that is, from a policy perspective. These papers make up the section of the thesis that entitled Facilitation,

a designation that refers to a shift in governmentality in Sweden that, in line with many of the core spatial logics of neoliberalism, saw the state and the municipality act as facilitators of the designed living rather than as regulators of architecture in aggregate.

The first, “Welcome to the Promenade City,” advances the idea of a post-regulatory design policy. This paper began in reflection on the experience of a project undertaken within Svensk Standard, wherein we were invited to “perform” a critique, as part of the public exhibition of the City of Stockholm’s new architecture policy in 2011. Here, I reflect on what a “post-regulatory” turn might mean within the planning policy that is closest to architecture in Stockholm: *Arkitektur Stockholm*. I consider this policy as operating through mechanisms that are linked to an “environmental kind of intervention” (to paraphrase Foucault), via images of ideal architectures and statements about what “good” architecture should be. The second paper that addresses deregulation directly is “Let the Right One In,” which offers a critique of the deregulatory force of participatory art practice in its interaction with the formal planning system. This was the first paper that I wrote as part of this doctoral research, and it deviates substantially in framing and in the position I take from the remainder of the thesis, representing a state of things that drew to what I felt was an abrupt close soon after it was written. Here, I consider the intersection of relational aesthetics and participation, in order to question a set of practices that I saw as eroding the democratic mandate of planning. I also offer the short reflection, “Vertigo,” as support for thinking about what might be a broad “affective turn” within design regulation. This paper builds on my memories of working as a planner in Melbourne in the mid-2000s, but I believe it useful in thinking through the post-regulatory and relational turns via the notion of affect.

Enclosures

During the period examined within this doctoral research, Sweden in general and Stockholm in particular experienced a plunge into real estate, which transformed the role of architecture in

shaping a habitable ground for the Swedish population. Together with H el ene Frichot, I wrote four papers that tackled this shift from the perspective of the architect and the inhabitant. Here, the figure of the architect was reframed and complicated by the introduction of the notion of a population of “involuntary architects”—the consumers of architecture as a commodity in the form of condominiums, or *bostadsr atter*—and by a critique of the “entrepreneurial spirit” present in the architectural discourse in this period. It was also here that we introduced the notion of the “indebted woman” in order to consider how to deal with debt, good and bad, from a feminist position. These papers are grouped under the heading of “enclosure,” a term I use to evoke the importance of private property, but also of the sense of a spatial withdrawal into the enclosed spaces of the individualized domestic environment.

The first of these papers, “The Promise of Lack,” addresses the role played by debt in conducting conduct. The second of these papers, “White, Wide, and Scattered” addresses the way in which real estate is mediated in its marketization and entry onto a rapidly swelling residential real estate market. The paper that most closely attends to the notion of the enclosure is “The Pastel Cell,” which uses art practice in order to examine the underlying narratives of autonomy that justify the transformation of apartments into real estate commodities. The final paper in this bracket, and perhaps the darkest of the work I undertook during the period of my doctoral research, “In Captivity,” addresses the model of “co-living” as a fundamental technology in the production of a society of entrepreneurs, wherein FOJI (“fear of joining in”) can be crippling, and social control nears a point of total environmental saturation. The only place left to go in this world of individualized cells is “to bed”—and even here, H el ene and I argue, a hushed silence reigns.

Facilitations

This brings us to the notion of biopolitics, which permeates the essays that make up this thesis. A complex concept, and one that must be treated with great care, “biopolitics” can broadly be

understood in terms of a political intervention in (and regulation of) “life” in terms of what Michel Foucault describes in first volume of *The History of Sexuality* as “the species body, the body imbued with the mechanics of life and serving as the basis of the biological processes: propagation, births and mortality, the level of health, life expectancy and longevity, with all the conditions that can cause these to vary.”⁵¹ In this book, which precedes his lectures on *The Birth of Biopolitics*, Foucault sketches a new arrangement of power established not on the sovereign’s right to kill, but on a governmental power to “foster life, or to disallow it to the point of death.”⁵² He describes this power as being organized around two poles: at the one end, the disciplines administer performances of the individualized body, and at the other, biopolitics manages the processes of life at the scale of the population. Here, we confront “the life of the body” and “the life of the species,” which become not only objects subjected to techniques of power, but also opened up to knowledge and even self-knowledge. “For the first time in history, no doubt, biological existence was reflected in political existence,” and this meant that both life and death became accessible to reflection, to being understood, but also to being managed, facilitated, and manipulated.⁵³

We must be terribly careful and pay close attention to the history of biopolitics in the twentieth century and its relation to the atrocities wreaked by fascism when thinking about what such management could mean. This is a task confronted by philosophers Roberto Esposito and Miguel Vatter, who both build on the work of Michel Foucault amongst others in order to examine the histories of the horrors of the twentieth century with a view to extricating biopolitics from the “thenatopolitics” (politics of death) of Nazism, and reframe the possibilities of “an affirmative biopolitics that is yet to come.”⁵⁴ Sven-Olov Wallenstein’s *Bio-Politics and the Emergence of Modern Architecture* takes up the task of stitching the biopolitical discourse onto the architectures of modernity, tracing the alliance of the two in the architectural treatises, schools, and hospitals of modernity.⁵⁵ In closing, the Swedish philosopher suggests that architecture continues to be loaded with a nascent potential for

biopolitical resistance that may be crucial in “our disciplinary society today.”⁵⁶ Writing in 2009, in the afterglow of the American post-critical debate in architectural theory, in a final footnote he also states his reservations about architecture’s efficacy, which he warns may be compromised by theory’s “projective” cast at that moment in time.⁵⁷ I would suggest that the notion of an affirmative biopolitics remains, nearly a decade later, still largely un-thought in architectural terms, despite my sense that the post-critical moment is behind us. Such a theorization forms a much larger project that will continue to haunt my work as it precedes into the architectural present that follows this doctoral research. For the present purpose of “coating” this thesis, it is important that I explain the relation of architecture to one end of the polarity, discipline, and provide a speculative take on a possible biopolitical outlook for architecture, in the form of a “container technology,” at the other.

Disciplinary Frames

“Disciplines” by definition are, in Michel Foucault’s account, inseparable from the actions upon actions which constitute power.⁵⁸ The theorist uses the term discipline, which forms a key term in his genealogy of the modern subject, to describe complex assemblages of knowledge and power that contributed to producing that subject.⁵⁹ Disciplines, for Foucault, lie behind the emergence of modern man, the self-reflexive, living being that calls herself “I”. As distinct from professions (the institutionalized, formalized, legitimized, and protected categories of work), disciplines in the Foucauldian sense constitute complex assemblages of techniques, technologies, machines, things, and subjects, which first and foremost relate to the various types of knowledges which can be extracted from human subjects, through what he terms “diagrams” of power and forces.⁶⁰ Here, knowledge and power are inextricably linked: by bringing phenomena to light through rational enquiry, we open those phenomena up as sites of intervention. With the development of the human sciences at the turn of the eighteenth century, it was the human subject herself that was in this way scrutinized, “opened up,” and thereby produced anew.

Architecture is a “discipline” in precisely these terms: doing architecture involves making things that are capable of illuminating, modifying, and facilitating who we are and who we can be. As architectural theorist Beatriz Colomina notes in “The Split Wall: Domestic Voyeurism,” an essay that has been terribly important to me throughout this work, “Architecture is not simply a platform that accommodates the subject, but that produces the subject . . . It precedes and frames its occupant.”⁶¹ Foucault famously proffers Jeremy Bentham’s Panopticon in order to illustrate the classifying and ordering techniques invented in modernity, which used an architectural regime of visibility and enclosure in order to produce “docile bodies” and “useful” individuals (for Bentham, a humanist aim).⁶² In Bentham’s diagrammatic schema for a prison, the guard is given total visual access to the body of the prisoner—the prisoner is always “visible” to the guard, and by means of screening, the guard is always invisible to the prisoner. The latter is always perceived as present and always understood to be watching. In fact, both figures are watching—the guard watches the prisoner and the prisoner watches herself being watched. Disciplinary architectures like the panopticon thus *make us appear to ourselves as a surface of application for power*, whereby:

He who is subjected to a field of visibility, and who knows it, assumes responsibility for the constraints of power; he makes them play spontaneously upon himself; he inscribes the power relation in which he simultaneously plays both roles; he becomes the principle of his own subjection.⁶³

When thinking about the image of modernity that Foucault sketches, I often return in my head to images from Cormac McCarthy’s powerful dystopia *The Road*, a novel which portrays a world characterized by rogue bands of violent and nomadic individuals, wherein all infrastructural technologies have collapsed, all perspective has been lost, and we are confronted with a world without order (an undisciplined space).⁶⁴ It is against such a scenario that disciplinary architectures were invented and installed. “That is why discipline fixes,” Foucault writes, “it arrests or regulates

movements; it clears up confusion; it dissipates compact groupings of individuals wandering about the country in unpredictably ways; it establishes calculated distributions.”⁶⁵ The prison and *The Road* are, however, misleadingly dramatic examples to employ, however well-matched they are in their degrees of violence. The play of gazes, the production of perspective, and the act of (ad)“dressing” a subject in order to produce in them a consciousness—these architectural operations might easily and more productively be thought of in terms of more benign urban environments and more pleasurable circumstances. We would do better, I think, to think here of suburban lawns, of Las Vegas casinos, of the tree-lined avenues of Stockholm’s posh Östermalm district, or of the labyrinthine and fish-tanked interior of Liljeholmen’s Medical Center in the city’s inner south. As Sven-Olov Wallenstein takes care to point out, Foucault’s reading of architecture as a disciplinary does not automatically place it in an oppressive relation to the subject; rather, it frames an understanding of architecture as a technology that “both produces individuals *and* sets them free to produce themselves.”⁶⁶ Architecture is a “discipline” (like medicine, for instance) which has had a stake in this history, constituting a set of practices that shed light on, intervene in, and ultimately shape selves: that “subjectivate.”

It’s important to note, I think, at this point that there is no single pre-defined form that this “subjectivation” works towards: subjectivation is described in verb-form, in process. Maurizio Lazzarato, for instance, follows in the footsteps of Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari in pointing to the multiple directions that subjectivation takes, even within the mechanations of contemporary capitalism. On one hand, Lazzarato points to the individualizing forces of capitalism, which are brought to bear on the subject by means of a “social subjectivation,” which “equips us with a subjectivity, assigning us an identity, a sex, a body, a profession, a nationality and so on”; and on the other, what Deleuze and Guattari call “machinic enslavement,” which “dismantles the individuated subject, consciousness, and representations, acting on both the pre-individual and supra-individual levels.”⁶⁷ Against these two directions, Lazzarato, like the generation of ’68 thinkers he draws

upon and to some extent belongs to, argues for the proliferation of subjectivities, locating the possibility of “another world” and “another life” in an “existential affirmation and apprehension of the self, others, and the world.”⁶⁸ This is what is at stake in a range of “ethical-aesthetic” approaches within theory, which hold that to “produce a new discourse, new knowledge, a new politics, one must traverse an unnamable point, a point of absolute non-narrative, non-culture, and non-knowledge”⁶⁹—a move which places great political weight on architecture, to my mind, as a discipline oriented towards the production of environments, of spaces, “nearnesses from which things emerge,” to borrow from the Australian philosopher Zoë Sofoulis (who tends to write under the pen name Zoë Sofia).⁷⁰

Container Technologies

Zoë Sofia’s essay “Container Technologies” has been fundamental to this research, helping me to think through a subjectivating architecture that operates as a “nearness” able to affirmatively enclose in a manner that facilitates life. In the essay, Sofia describes the way in which “the thing emerges in a ‘nearness’ or rather a process of ‘nearing’ that gathers remote elements into itself.”⁷¹ She refers to this nearness as an “environment” but also as a “container technology”—it forms an unobtrusive life support system that can operate both at the scale of mother-infant relations, but, importantly, also at the scale of the planet itself. This places the container technology at an intersectional point that, a little like the notion of “sex” for Foucault, can operate both ends of the life-of-the-body/life-of-the-species polarity discussed earlier, and providing us with an important tool in thinking an affirmative biopolitics in the process.

Deploying the term “technics of the unobtrusive,” the philosopher emphasizes the paradoxical demand for both nearness and for distance in the intersubjective social development of the specific “thing” (body and human being) that is a child in relation to its post-uterine container technology, its environment-mother surroundings. Despite the necessity of *being a nearness*, of *constituting an environment*, in such a schema the mother must “remain sufficiently separate to serve as the container and

interpreter” for the infant’s experience.⁷² The child emerges from the midst of this environment, under the influence of this environment, and the environment from which it emerges must, to it at least, appear invisible.

It might be the planner in me, but I like to think about this schema of the post-uterine matrix in terms of an “infrastructure.” Judith Butler describes the demand for infrastructure as “the demand for a certain kind of inhabitable ground,”⁷³ going on to note that “No one moves without a supportive environment and a set of technologies. And when those environments start to fall apart or are emphatically unsupportive, we are left to ‘fall’ in some ways.”⁷⁴ As such, infrastructures support us, presenting us from falling; our mutual vulnerability in the face of their failure attests, further, not only to our dependence on them, but our interdependence—a condition whose affirmation is described by Butler as “feminist.” “Infrastructure” is a concept, then, that at its limit calls into question understandings of the body as discrete, singular, and self-sufficient.

The work of feminist philosopher Luce Irigaray can be used to think through Butler’s claim, from a different angle. Reworking Plato’s notion of “chora,” Irigaray places *the failure to acknowledge the facilitating environments that support our own development as subjects* at the heart of an expansive violence that has been wrought in relation to the maternal-feminine.⁷⁵ This violence, argues Irigaray, involves a disastrous double-move, which sees woman, who embodies this originary environment, relegated to unobtrusiveness (woman is deprived of a ‘place’ by being relegating to being a ‘place’) whilst at the same time being confined in other artificial places, which are inevitably constructed by man to *replace her place*. In this process, man confirms his role as a “builder of worlds,” of language and of dwellings within which he, in his “elemental homesickness,” seeks to enclose both himself and woman.⁷⁶ Whilst man, in this schema, becomes both builder (architect, even) *and* occupier, woman is “assigned to place without occupying a place.”⁷⁷ She is place and she is put in place.

Architecture “holds” (stores-keeps-encloses) objects and bodies, including the bodies of the architects who participate in its

production. The surface of the discipline of architecture is oftentimes rigid and impermeable, formed by layered, guarded, yet seductive coatings (a series of *kappor*, or coats) that are designed to both attract and repel simultaneously and thereby to act as filters—the education, the profession, the craft, the culture, the discourse. One can, to some extent, understand this protective attitude, given the discipline’s subjectivating and performative capacities, both of which are discussed at length in this thesis. With reference to the performative, which I touched on briefly in the discussion of method, architecture is, we have to admit, rather magical. Whilst child, a doctor, a teacher or a politician can all draw a picture of a house (open square, triangle on top), the chances of that house becoming a house, and becoming *the house that was drawn*, are slim. In contrast, if a body that has managed, through brute force, charm, privilege, luck, skill, misfortune or any other means to be able to become an “architect” performs the same gesture, there is every likelihood that what is drawn appears, at some point. It might even get built as it was drawn, even if it were only a square and a triangle. Technically, the architect could make other drawings that would make that possible. This magic trick depends on plausibility, persuasion, and power. For architecture to be able to hold, it must have something to hold; it must hold financiers, politicians, planners, builders, and engineers, and then the “everyone else” who will ever be held by it. The drawing, the specification, the visualization, the building: these are all scripts that must gently nudge a world into action. This is why architecture is magic: it takes form by holding, and in being held, we “perform”—give form to—it.

Ghosts in Shells

A car speeds across a winter landscape. Pine forests, dark water, and snow drifts form the background against which we trace the red tail lights of the vehicle. The sky is grey, brooding; sun does not penetrate the thick clouds overhead. The scene cuts, repeatedly, and we are transported to a series of interior scenes: a club, under thick strobe light; a mountain shack; a bed in a summer-house; and the car itself, our face pressed up against the glass. Exterior shots

interrupt these scenes: we are on a beach, a shoreline, amongst reeds, flying over a snow-covered fjord. We are on the edge of a cliff looking out to sea. We are in a city, Stockholm, alone at night. While the commercial—it is a Swedish Volvo ad that we are watching—throws us back and forth between warm interiors and various remote landscapes, at the same time it presents us with a series of figures we momentarily inhabit, including the recognizable faces of rapper and musician Jason “Timbuktu” Diakité, athletics star Emma Green, hockey player Börje Salming, artist Oskar Linnros, and fashion designer Carin Rodebjer, as well a wide-eyed and gloomy child and an unidentified couple (two girls, maybe, or perhaps a guy and a girl). Throughout the four-minute ad, these characters are subject to a double positioning—on one hand, they are all placed in close proximity to a source of warmth (a stove in a hut, a woolen blanket, the upturned collar of a thick jacket, a bonfire on a beach, and of course the heated interior of their Volvo cars); on the other, they inhabit broader context that are cold, grey, wet, isolated, and often located on a threshold of sorts (vast bridges, dramatic cliffs, icy shorelines, steep cobbled steps, endless forest roads . . . even the rain-battered streets of Stockholm are depicted as empty). The inhabitants of this world are pensive, reflective, and alone: they hug themselves to ward off the chill as they stare out into the darkness or the sea or the city. The object of their gaze is elsewhere, somewhere far off in the distance. The prevalent mood is one of *vemod*, the Swedish word for melancholy.

The melancholy that is present in this advertisement is built on the possibility of a return to the warmth. It is not a cold and neutral monolith, as in Lars von Trier’s *Melancholia*, which I addressed in the previous chapter in relation to Boris Groys’ comments on theory, that these famous faces contemplate as they stare out into the darkness. It is not even, I think, the darkness itself. Rather, their minds are elsewhere; they are “preoccupied.” They inhabit many spaces at once: built environments like forests and cities, but also an unbuilt environment, made up of images of desire. And in turn, they become bodies for us to inhabit too, Pegman-like, as we gaze with them into the darkness. This is

a preoccupation that might sell a car (the warmth to which we imagine it would be nice to return, that we imagine will take us home, after our confrontation with the cold), but these “ghosts” and their desire for an interior are also becoming important actors in how we design architecture, and in what way we let it hold us, and in what ways we are expected to perform it.

In order to demonstrate this, I need to tell you a second, very short, story from practice. This tale was explored in a conference paper that never became an essay and thus was not included in this thesis, which I presented at the conference “Writing Place” at Delft University in November, 2013. The story is about the figure of Jakob, a figure who has haunted this thesis from its inception. Jakob is 38, works hard, plays hard, holidays in Barcelona, and reads *Monocle* magazine. This was what the concept-architect confidently proclaimed, as if introducing a new boyfriend to a parent, to my friend the architect-architect, who was working on a very expensive apartment building in the best bit of town. The two were sitting in a meeting. The meeting did not, unfortunately involve a show and tell about new lovers, and no parents were present (*per se*); rather, they were there to talk about the fit-out concept for the show apartments and the fictional character who would ensure their personalization.

“Jacob has some vintage items that he’s going to bring with him when he moves in,” at this point images are circulated of a much loved dresser, “but he also really values contemporary design brands, of course.” More images were splashed across the wall via projector beam. The mood board filled the room. Jakob was the moodboard. My friend the architect raised a hand and ventured that the dark shade applied to the four walls of the living room might not be a wise choice given the depth of the room it was to be applied to. Tight plans and deep rooms were mandatory given the cost of the site, which was worth a bomb to begin with, before the demolition and the design and the building of this new palace. “I’m sorry, but Jakob likes petroleum blue,” she was told reprovably. “But *Jakob*,” my friend responded (I think of her screaming in exasperation when I picture this scene now), “doesn’t exist!” The consultant blinked, ignored this, and went back to slide flicking, impatient, apparently, to get to the

“identity-bearing shelf” that would tie the development together from the inside out. This was 5 years ago; I wonder if those walls are still petroleum blue.

Jakob of course doesn’t exist. Jakob has never existed. He is a rhetorical device used to exert dominance in a bargaining situation between two types of architectural competences from competing firms. Jakob is also the product of “hard” information that has been translated into “soft” information through a process of synthesis, a figure of analysis, an evidence base, diagramming the commodity desires of an urban upper class. He has been extracted from an archive somewhere—an image once removed from the consumers who will purchase the apartments, a little bit younger, a little bit more adventurous, a little bit more refined. Jakob is an ideal, a shimmering resonance that acts like an inhabitant but is in fact a container. Like the ubiquitous children with candy-colored balloons that live in architectural visualizations or Pegman from Google Earth, he is one of the many “ghosts” that give us a “body,” that *pre-occupy* us in the present, as we dream of a future.

Containers can be bodies too—and those bodies in turn, like theory, have their own architectures. What I am tentatively trying to suggest is that such architectures are also able to perform many of the “magic” tricks that architecture has developed. Such architectures can precede the subject, frame the subject, and produce the subject; Jakob is an architecture that infiltrates other architectures via the actions of clients and the responses of other architects forced to comply, contractually, with a sub-consultant’s creations. Jakob belongs to the same category as the digital archive in this sense, and as a figure of bad restlessness, overwork, and debt, our task in theorizing him might be to find the ways to exceed him and expose the fragile labor behind his production.⁷⁸

In the Papers...

To talk about architecture in terms of facilitation is to raise many of the issues of scale and also the techniques discussed in the method chapter in relation to the theoretical orientation required to see, work with, and produce an architecture that operates in aggregate.

The essays that address facilitation tend to address techniques of aggregation in a critical register: that is with the aim of negating an architecture that is approaching the scale of the population but in so doing instills a neoliberal “economic space” or a “game of differences” in its wake. In each case, the answer is not straight forward.

Connections

The essay “The Liquid Seam” addresses the city at large. Here, I am interested in the tension between an architecture of containment and enclosure and an architecture of infinite extension. This was a very early essay in this project and a particularly important one, that was significantly reworked in a later phase of the research in order to better speak to the “plunge into real estate” that I was interested in exploring. In tandem with the work that Secretary did in “The Continuous Surface,” the critique offered in this essay also offered up a productive tool that could be repurposed for wholly different purposes, I found (the liquid seam of the title).

In “A City of Bits and Atoms,” the task of “fleshing out” a network is addressed. “How big is Uber?” we ask. Here we attempt to understand how the network itself understands the distribution of bodies that it produces (there is a screen, we found out, and it is called “Heaven”) and how it maps these across space (“bits and atoms” they call it). We close the essay by suggesting that the network here constitute a carefully individualized and thus obscured architecture in fact that “holds” millions.

The other essay in this bracket, “Yes Boss,” addresses the practices of fan photography and the architecture of Bjarke Ingels through the lens of an investigation of the 8 House in Copenhagen. I have already discussed the accompanying video that Fredrik Torisson and I made in Chapter 1 within a discussion of evidence bases; the paper itself addresses the building more fully, as a kind of “after image” that followed the diagrammatic marketing video initially made by its architects, which gained significant dissemination at the time. This is also a form of pre-occupation, we argue, which sets the connective surfaces of the tilted monolith in relation to a future city, but also to the perfection of the initial render.

Projections

The two essays that open this thesis, “Managing the Not-Yet” and “Anticipation,” originally two halves of a longer essay that was split in two for the purposes of publication, address the ways in which the recombinant and fragmentary forms of production described by the semiocapitalism thesis reorganize the labor of the architect. Picking up on a theme that permeates Fredrik’s own doctoral thesis, *Utopology: A Re-Interrogation of the Utopian in Architecture*, in these essays we were interested in the diagrammatic capacities of “the architectural project.”⁷⁹ Deploying theories of performativity drawn from critical theory and gender studies—namely, the explication of interpolation set out by Louis Althusser and the reworking of Austin’s linguistic take on performativity by Judith Butler—we argued that the distinction between “material” and “representation” becomes irrelevant in thinking through the politics of the project. It is rather the capacity of the project to keep itself “in progress” that matters. The longer a building remains unbuilt, the longer it can continue to be worked upon by a range of actors including land speculators, real estate financiers, and architects; at the same time, projects feed the logics of semiocapitalism by facilitating the “capsularization” of work, reinforcing the primacy of the production of signs over the production of commodities, and opening up the future as a site for work and for profit in the now.

“Pop Theory” address the capacity of the image to “pre-occupy” us through a text and a video. The essay responds to a course that Rutger Sjögrim and I were teaching in the Architecture and Gender series at the School of Architecture at KTH, wherein we had decided to tackle the theme of “norm-critical photoshopping” and had called the course “Images of Desire.” The video forms one of the six videos that makes up “Housework” and as such I discuss it in Chapter 1. This essay was developed in parallel and in discussion with Daniel Koch surrounding his work on the logic of the mannequin, a productive exchange that allowed me to formulate first the notion of “ghosts” explained previously in relation to Jakob, but also the story of Pegman.

In support of these papers, I also include a short essay, “Desire for Democracy,” which I wrote for the catalogue of an exhibition

produced by Architects Sweden and MYCKET for the Swedish Institute. Writing to a general audience, I here attempt to summarize many of the thoughts that informed another exhibition by Secretary, “The Continuous Surface of the Welfare State,” which is included as a supporting project in this thesis, and apply them to an even broader territory. I use Nina Power’s “Towards a Feminism of the Void” to reflect on what a critical, public, “gap” might be in spatial terms.⁸⁰

Jakob, Pegman, the mannequin, and the ghost; Heaven, the endless interior; the project. These are all architectures that provide populations with spaces to inhabit, pushing them, generally towards bad restlessness, debt, and overwork. If we were to put all of those children with their balloons—the ones in the shiny renders of beautiful new buildings—to work doing something else, we would have an army of thousands. It is these thoughts that architecture must learn to think if it is to transform the present, I believe. It must learn to think in aggregate again.

The Unbuilt Environment

Through this doctoral research, architecture was examined as a key technology in the neoliberal project. A discipline that is vested in the production of subjects and environments, architecture draws, writes, and dreams of a vast range of “container technologies” that enclose, move, shape, support, and produce us. Through many of the architectures that I attempted to address as objects of critical architectural theory—that I tried, in other words, to unsettle—architects were producing drawing, buildings, mannequins, and stories that would act as the “economic spaces” of neoliberalism. The entrepreneurs of the self that were meant to inhabit these spaces were not only surrounded by an exterior environment, but enclosed by an environment that permeated them all the way through, facilitating certain kinds of lives, and not others, from the interior.

Many of these architectures were, and will never be, built; others were so distributed that they cannot be located without being re-aggregated; some were projected into a future and thus did not take form in the present at all. Many accreted as images in the

instant archives of the popular and professional architectural press, social media, the market, and the regulatory structures of the state, constituting archives which offered a seemingly impossible glimpse into an architecture in the making, at a city and a discipline under construction.

This architectural present builds up around us, project by project, forming a geological mass that actively waits, anticipating its materialization, circulation, or sale, but also its theorization. In aggregate, this architecture is neither material nor representation: it is not drawing or building, but both. This is why we need a term like “the unbuilt environment,” to start to try to talk about this alloy that confronts us.

In the architecture of the “unbuilt environment,” the day after tomorrow is active, and anticipation, plausibility, and projection are reinforced as powerful architectural operations. Whether it is through the curated real estate interior, the convenient and movable containers delivered by ride-sharing apps, the children with balloons who populate architectural visualizations, or the unbearable closeness of the co-living cell—all things you will meet in reading the papers that make up this thesis—in inhabiting such architectures we occupy neoliberal logics, and in turn we allow such logics to occupy us. The unbuilt environment that I describe overtly encourages us to draw upon ourselves as a material and our future as a resource in ways that leave us, as embodied biopolitical subjects, withdrawn, vulnerable, and deeply “preoccupied.” Further, in confronting the high-gloss conviviality of the enterprising architectures of semicapitalism, we encounter a mode of architectural practice that, in privileging the production of the (neoliberal) entrepreneurial subject, forecloses the possibility of an architecture able to support us all, whoever we are. It is here that we must start again, for the architectural objects that I examined and tried to “face” with the tools of critical architectural theory are not those that will come next.

At the particular present that closes this period of doctoral research and thus this *kappa*, the state of things in Sweden has again shifted ground. The real estate market appears to be cooling down as the buildings that were drawn have now largely been drawn

forth. The horizon is still ringed with cranes, and the possibility seems open for a renewed building effort with respect to affordable (rental) housing for all Swedes. A range of industry associations and government departments have dedicated recent branding efforts to promoting “democratic architecture”; and on February 23, 2018, the Swedish Government released its long awaited architecture proposition, “A Politics for the Designed Living Environment,” whereby it has committed to the central role that architecture can play in drawing forth a “sustainable designed living environment.”⁸¹ Planners and architects will soon turn up for work at the Swedish National Board of Housing, Building, and Planning, which is to open a new office in the southern city of Malmö. The biopolitical reorientation within architecture that many of the articles that make up this thesis advocated for as a new alliance between architecture and life seems possible. It was, looking back upon the work, indeed possible to write critique through all of these shifts, within a fog that we have been calling neoliberalism for over 40 years now.

Architecture must today be understood in terms of a production of “designed living environments” made up of both built and unbuilt architectures. These accidental megastructures, made up of seemingly unrelated pieces, can in fact act as powerfully cohesive, choratic “container technologies.” We simply need to learn how to see them and how to work with them *in aggregate*. These environments enclose us and move us, actively facilitating specific ways of life and of living and life itself. Through this *kappa* I have argued that critical architectural theory provides us with ways to make this aggregate appear. I’ve also argued for the importance of critical theories not only in unsettling the present, but in negating the moments of disciplinary withdrawal that capitalism elicits, in the background. In this, theory can move architecture, helping architecture to hold us, in our waking life and in our dreams of a future. This is the role that the unbuilt environment could play, if we choose to care about it as a disciplinary object for architecture: it might give us more room to move, to plan, to think, and to live a life that we consider worth living. All of us.

Chapter 3

The Metadata

This section of thesis provides information on the contexts of production and publication that made the inclusion of the fourteen papers, and three supporting projects, possible. It also demonstrates the links between various contexts, and aims to provide the reader with the names and dates required to trace the development of the research over the past six and a half years (January 2012—March 2018).

Contexts of Production

Critical Studies in Architecture

Critical Studies in Architecture is a specialization within the subject architecture, and a research group at the KTH School of Architecture which “examines the history, theories, and discourses of architecture. Architecture is considered here as a profession, a discipline, and a cultural expression. Important issues treated are architectural meaning and representation, the influence of different ideologies and power structures on architecture, and in reverse how it may reproduce ideological systems and power structures. Research methods are interdisciplinary and relate to broad humanist fields such as critical studies of culture as well as artistic methods of representation. Current research in this area combines advanced history and theory with experimental artistic methods and the development of feminist architectural criticism for practice and education.”¹ Critical Studies includes the work of FATALE, but also is much larger than

this, taking in, at various points, the doctoral research of Katarina Bonnevier, Jan Hietala, Jenny Wiklund, Maria Ärlemo, and Brady Burroughs, amongst others; as well as the research of Katja Grillner and H el ene Frichot.

It was within the context of teaching within the Architecture and Gender series of courses that many productive exchanges of thoughts with Jennifer Mack, Rutger Sj ogrim, and Janek Ozmin occurred. My written collaborations with H el ene occur within this context.

Svensk Standard

Svensk Standard was founded in order to talk about, research, draw, write, and build architecture, in a social setting. Svensk Standard began in Stockholm in 2008. Its members include: Fredrik Andersson, Mattias Beckman, Anders Berensson, Caroline Ektander, Kristin Gausdal, Jo el Jouannet, Daniel Johansson, Ola Keijer, Sara Liberg, Martin  oso , Karin Matz, Andreas Nordstr om, Rutger Sj ogrim, Kristina Sundin, and Markus Wagner. The common denominator in Svensk Standard’s projects are the social conditions of their production, which take place outside of work hours and outside of commercial efficiencies and sociabilities. Svensk Standard’s projects are messy, socially awkward, inefficient, and unprofitable. Past projects have been exhibited at the No+Ch Festival in Beijing (2009); the Nordic Pavilion at the International Architecture Biennale in Venice (2010); in the “V ara drommars stad” exhibition (City of Stockholm) at Kulturhuset (2011); at the “Teachers Exhibition” at the KTH School of Architecture (2013); and at the Royal Academy of Fine Arts (2015).

Secretary

Secretary is an office for architecture, founded by architects Karin Matz and Rutger Sj ogrim, and myself in 2017. The practice is built on a shared interest in the capacity of architecture to facilitate a dignified life at the scale of the population. Secretary work with buildings, exhibitions, research studies, and megastructures that give form to the late welfare state in the twenty-first century. In

2018, Secretary won the Ung Svensk Form 2018 (Young Swedish Designer of the Year) Folkhem Prize. We all work part-time at the KTH School of Architecture at present.

ResArc

ResArc is a network encompassing the four largest Schools of Architecture in Sweden (KTH in Stockholm, LTH in Lund, Chalmers in Gotheburg, and Umeå University in Umeå) that was made possible by a considerable government investment in architectural education by the Swedish research funding agency, FORMAS, in 2011, in a total effort that also included the two strong research environments Architecture in Effect and Architecture in the Making. Through this network, Sweden was able to support a national cohort of PhD students within architecture, who met, discussed, and learned together, over the entire period of this research, across the four schools of architecture. It was through this network that Erik Sigge, Fredrik Torisson, and myself were able to produce the first issue of LO-RES, a journal for architectural theory. This was my first point of encounter with the work of Janek Ozmin, Sepideh Karami, Hannes Frykholm, Katja Hogenboom, amongst others; and it was in this context that a conversation first begun with Fredrik Torisson, who also figures prominently as a co-author in the essays that make up this thesis.

Contexts of Dissemination

Conferences

The majority of the essays that comprise this thesis were first presented at conferences, occasions that are worth enumerating in order to trace the broader conversations that the essays engage with, which affected the specific cuts made through specific architectural presents within the 5-year period of the research. Conferences provide spaces capable of bestowing legitimacy on a practice in training, but also of providing access to the theory of other theorists. For these purposes, the Architectural and Humanities Research Association (AHRA), a network that

“promotes, supports, develops and disseminates high-quality research in the areas of architectural history, theory, culture, design, and urbanism,”² was particularly important, and it is for this reason that such a large proportion of the peer-reviewed material included in the thesis is published in the journal *Architecture and Culture*, a publication associated with this annual conference series and the figures who have populated it, and the *Critiques* series of anthologies, one of which I co-edited, which are also linked to these conferences. As such, the thesis is a product and contribution to a series of conversations that occurred at: the 9th AHRA Conference *Architecture and the Paradox of Dissidence*, organized by Ines Weisman and colleagues and hosted by London Metropolitan University, on November 15–17, 2012, which introduced me in particular to the work of Tahl Kaminer, Keller Easterling, and Isabelle Doucet, who all commented on this dissertation as seminar opponents at various stages in the development of the work; the 11th AHRA Conference *Industries of Architecture*, organized by Katie Lloyd Thomas, Nick Beech, Tilo Amhoff, and Adam Sharr, and hosted by Newcastle University, on November 13–15, 2014, where Marxist analyses of the labor of the architect re-oriented my own work significantly and Tijana Stevanovic emerged as an important peer and friend in this process; to the 12th AHRA Conference *This Thing Called Theory*, organized by Teresa Stoppani and colleagues, and hosted by Leeds Beckett University, November 19–21, 2015, where in particular my colleague and co-conspirator H el ene Frichot’s critical meditation on the uncritical adoption of “affect” initiated a dialogue with Doug Spencer’s work that has remained important to this day.

Closer to home, in Stockholm, where sites of production and reception overlap each other, other important events included the 13th AHRA Conference *Architecture and Feminisms: Ecologies, Technologies, Economies*, organized by H el ene Frichot, Catharina Gabrielsson, Helena Mattsson, Karin Reisinger, and Meike Schalk, and hosted by my own institution, KTH, on November 17–19, 2016, an event that enabled important feedback on the dissertation from Peg Rawes; and *The Architecture of Deregulations*, organized by

Helena Mattsson and Catharina Gabrielsson at my own institution, KTH, March 10–12, 2016. To these, I include the conferences *Emptiness and Plenitude: A Symposium on Architectural Research By Design* organized by Konstantinos Avramidis, Chris French, Piotr Leśniak, and Maria Mitsoula at the University of Edinburgh, October 4–6, 2013; *Writingplace: Literary Methods in Architectural Research and Design*, organized by Klaske Havik and colleagues and hosted by Delft University of Technology, on November 25–27, 2013; and the 13th International Bauhaus Colloquium *Dust and Data* organized by Ines Weisman and hosted by the Bauhaus University in Weimar October 26–29, 2016. On many of these occasions, I received comments that were so critical to the reorientation of the material that the concept of “sole authorship” seems inaccurate and a conceit.

Journals

Three of the peer-reviewed journal articles included in this thesis were published in special issues of *Architecture and Culture*. As such, these papers responded to three targeted editorial lenses, each of which was linked to a conference: namely, that offered by Katie Lloyd Thomas, Nick Beech and Adam Sharr in their emphasis on architecture as labor and industry in “Into the Hidden Abode: Architecture and Production” (Volume 3, Issue 3, 2015); Catharina Gabrielsson and Helena Mattsson’s editorial interest in the architecture of deregulations through “Solids and Flows: Architecture and Capitalism” (Volume 5, Issue 2, 2017); and that of Karin Reisinger and Meike Shalk in “Styles of Queer Feminist Practices and Objects in Architecture” (Volume 5, Issue 3, 2017).

The fourth peer-reviewed article was published in *Drawing On*, an online journal edited by Konstantinos Avramidis, Chris French, Piotr Leśniak, Maria Mitsoula, and Dorian Wiszniewski, and started at Edinburgh University. *Drawing On* encourages architectural and design research that works with artistic and practice-based research strategies.

The Avery Review is a respected online journal based in the United States. *The Real Review* was initiated as crowd-funded initiative, and is a printed journal that publishes critical essays

that “review” the present moment, based in London. Both represent publications produced by emerging scholars, researchers, editors, and curators themselves and provide a much-needed context for emerging scholars, amongst other established writers, theorists, and critics, to publish work that reaches a wide international audience.

LO-RES is “an international architectural theory journal that is “in favor of the tangential, the speculative, and the fuzzy,” and “essays on architecture that resonate at lower resolutions.” I founded LO-RES in 2014 with Fredrik Torisson and Erik Sigge and thus acknowledge that I have a double role, as author and editor, in the case of the text “Vertigo,” which is included in this dissertation.

Books

Three papers are published in books, two of which are forthcoming and will thus not be discussed here. One paper is published within *Architecture and Feminisms: Ecologies Economies, Technologies*, an anthology that H  l  ne Frichot, Catharina Gabrielsson and myself edited in 2017. This book was linked to the Architectural Humanities Research Association (AHRA) conference “Architecture and Feminisms: Ecologies, Technologies, Economies,” at the KTH School of Architecture, Stockholm, in 2016. The paper “In Captivity” was written specifically for the book, and was not presented at the conference.

Exhibitions

The three projects that are included in the thesis in support of the papers were each shown within the context of an exhibition, rather than a print or online publication. This constitutes a fourth mode of dissemination, and also introduces the role of the curator as an important figure for theoretical production.

Svensk Standard’s *Byggloupsboken* was exhibited in the exhibition “EVA” at the Royal Swedish Academy of Fine Arts in Stockholm, between October 8 and 29, 2015. The exhibition was curated by members of the Board of Eva Bonniers donationsn  mnd, the organization that ran the initial competition that led to our development of the project, including the organisation’s Chairperson, Ann Magnusson, and Tor Lindstrand and Eva Arnqvist, and our

participation was predicated on winning the preceding public art and architecture competition of the same name, which included 30,000 SEK in prize money to develop the work. Part of the work included two panel discussions with Jack Self, H el ene Frichot, Erik Bengtsson, Jennifer Mack, Petra Petersson, Erik Stenberg, and Bj orn Wiklander.

Secretary’s video work “Housework” was exhibited within the exhibition “NormForm” at ArkDes (Sweden’s national center for architecture and design) between October 6, 2017, and February 11, 2018. This exhibition was curated by Camilla Andersson, Maja Gunn, and Karin Ehrnberger. We took part on the basis of an invitation from the curators; this work was not commissioned and was thus unwaged with respect to its development, although we drew heavily upon earlier work undertaken for the article Pop Theory, which was initially presented at the Architecture and Feminisms conference in Stockholm in November, 2016.

Secretary’s installation *The Continuous Surface of the Welfare State* was developed in relation to an initial idea for a group exhibition put forward by the ambulating art institution Zimm Hall. The resulting exhibition, “V alf arndsstatens gr anssnitt” (“the Welfare State’s interface” in English) took place at Allkonstrummet at Mossutst allningar in V artahamnen, Stockholm, on January 12–22, 2017, and besides our own installation, work by Klas Eriksson, Kanslibyr an, and Mattias B acklin and NUG was also shown. The exhibition was curated by Malin Zimm and Mattias B acklin, who run Zimm Hall. Our work was largely self-funded, with assistance from Zimm Hall for printing and partial lighting costs. Part of our contribution included a panel discussion with Ulrika Karlsson, Erik Sigge, Josefin H agglund, Anna Montgomery, and Daniel Koch; and a continuous lunch with invited guests Joanna Zawieja and Hannes Frykholm, as well as members of the public. This work was re-hung for the touring exhibition Ung Svensk Form 2018, which was produced by the association Svensk Form, ArkDes, IKEA, and the City of Malm o stad, and led by Karin Wiberg. This exhibition was first shown at ArkDes between February 8 and March 18, 2018.

List of Appended Papers

Projections

Paper 1: Managing the Not-Yet **Helen Runting and Fredrik Torisson**

Helen Runting and Fredrik Torisson, “Managing the Not-Yet: The Architectural Project Under Semicapitalism,” in “Solids and Flows,” eds. Catharina Gabrielsson and Helena Mattsson, special issue, *Architecture and Culture* 5, no. 2 (2017): 213–220.

First presented as one half of the paper: Helen Runting and Fredrik Torisson, “Managing the Not-Yet,” at the Architectural Humanities Research Association (AHRA) conference “This Thing Called Theory,” at Leeds Beckett University, Leeds, November 19–21, 2015.

Paper 2: Anticipation **Helen Runting and Fredrik Torisson**

Helen Runting and Fredrik Torisson, “Anticipation and Other Affective Productions: Theorizing the Architectural Project in Action,” in *After Effects: Theories and Methodologies in Architectural Research*, eds. Hélène Frichot with Gunnar Sandin and Bettina Schwalm (New York and Barcelona: Actar, forthcoming 2018).

First presented as one half of the paper: Helen Runting and Fredrik Torisson, “Managing the Not-Yet,” at the Architectural Humanities Research Association (AHRA) conference “This Thing Called Theory,” at Leeds Beckett University, Leeds, November

19–21, 2015, organized by Teresa Stoppani, Girogio Ponzio, and George Themistokleous.

Paper 3: Pop Theory

Helen Runting, Rutger Sjögrim, and Fredrik Torisson

Helen Runting, Rutger Sjögrim, and Fredrik Torisson, “Pop Theory: The Architecture of Late Night Shopping,” in “Styles of Queer Feminist Practices and Objects in Architecture, eds. Meike Schalk and Karin Reisinger, special issue, *Architecture and Culture* 5, no. 3 (2017): 513–524.

First presented as: Helen Runting, Fredrik Torisson, and Rutger Sjögrim, “A Guide to ‘Shopping,’” at the Architectural Humanities Research Association (AHRA) conference “Architecture and Feminisms: Ecologies, Technologies, Economies,” at the KTH School of Architecture, Stockholm, November 17–19, 2016.

Paper 4: Desire for Democracy

Helen Runting

Helen Runting, “Desire for Democracy,” *Aiming for Democratic Architecture*, Tove Dumon Wallsten, ed. [exhibition catalogue] (Stockholm: Architects Sweden, Svenska Institutet, and MYCKET, 2018), 6–8.

The text was commissioned by Tove Wallsten and Julia Hertzman of Architects Sweden (SA); Tove acted as chief editor of the publication, and the Swedish Institute (SI) and the queer, feminist artistic research practice MYCKET (Mariana Alves Silva, Katarina Bonnevier, and Thérèse Kristiansson) together formed the editorial committee. The travelling exhibition that the catalogue accompanies was designed by MYCKET; it was first shown at the Stockholm Furniture & Light Fair in Älvsjö in Stockholm on February 6, 2018.

Connections

Paper 5: The Liquid Seam

Helen Runting

This was first presented as “The Liquid Seam,” at “Aesthetics: The Uneasy Dimension in Architecture,” the Annual Symposium of the Nordic Association for Architectural Research in Trondheim, Norway, April 25–27, 2013.

It was subsequently revised, taking the form published here, and presented as: Helen Runting, “The Long Nineties: Reassessing ‘A Complex Order’ in Semiocapitalism,” at the conference “Architecture of Deregulations: Postmodernism, Politics, and the Built Environment in Europe, 1975–1995,” at the KTH School of Architecture and Moderna museet, Stockholm, March 10–12, 2016, organized by Helena Mattsson and Catharina Gabrielsson.

Paper 6: A City of Bits and Atoms
Helen Runting and Arthur Röing Baer

First presented as: Helen Runting and Arthur Röing Baer, “A City of Bits and Atoms,” at the Young Bauhaus Research Colloquium, part of the 13th International Bauhaus Colloquium, “Dust and Data,” at the Bauhaus Universität, Weimar, October 26–19, 2016, organized by Ines Weizman.

The excerpt was submitted to *The Real Review* following communication with Jack Self, co-editor of the publication. Excerpt subsequently published as Helen Runting and Arthur Röing Baer, “Uber as Megastructure,” *The Real Review* 2 (2016): 91–98. The version included in this dissertation is the longer, conference paper.

Paper 7: Yes Boss
Helen Runting and Fredrik Torisson

Helen Runting and Fredrik Torisson, “Yes Boss! Towards a Projective Critique of BIG’s 8 House,” *Drawing On* 1 (2015): 127–138.

First presented as: Helen Runting and Fredrik Torisson, “Yes Boss: This Is A Crime for Playing and Rewinding,” at the conference “Plenitude and Emptiness: A Symposium on Architectural Research by Design” at the University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, October 4–6, 2013.

This paper was submitted for publication within *Drawing On* following communication with Konstantinos Avramidis, Chris

French, and Maria Mitsoula, after the “Plenitude and Emptiness” conference, to which this issue was linked.

Deregulations

Paper 8: Welcome to the Promenade City

Helen Runting and H  l  ne Frichot

Helen Runting and H  l  ne Frichot, “Welcome to the Promenade City: Gentrifictional Images of Thought in the Post-Industrial Age,” in “Into the Hidden Abode: Architecture and Production,” eds. Katie Lloyd Thomas, Nick Beech, and Adam Sharr, special issue, *Architecture and Culture* 3, no. 3 (2015): 397–411.

In part first presented as: Helen Runting, “Visions of Grandeur: A (Disciplinary) Reading of Stockholm’s Architecture Policy,” at the Architectural Humanities Research Association (AHRA) conference “Industries of Architecture,” at Newcastle University, November 22–24, 2014.

This paper was the result of a “mash-up” of my paper and that presented by H  l  ne Frichot (Post-Industries of Architecture: The Immaterial Labor of the Image of Thought”) upon the request of the editors of the publication, Katie Lloyd Thomas, Nick Beech, and Adam Sharr.

Paper 9: Vertigo

Helen Runting

Helen Runting, “Vertigo,” *LO-RES* 1 (2015): 57–62.

This paper was written for LO-RES, which I edited with Fredrik Torisson and Erik Sigge.

Paper 10: Let The Right One In

Helen Runting

Presented as: Helen Runting, “Let The Right One In,” at the Architectural Humanities Research Association (AHRA) conference, “Architecture and the Paradox of Dissidence,” at the London Metropolitan University, November 15–17, 2012, organized by Ines Weizman.

Enclosures

Paper 11: The Promise of a Lack

Hélène Frichot and Helen Runting

Hélène Frichot and Helen Runting, “The Promise of a Lack: Responding to (Her) Real-Estate Career,” *The Avery Review* 13 (2015).

This essay was submitted to *The Avery Review*, and accepted by editors James Graham, Caitlin Blanchfield, Jordan H. Carver, and Jacob B. Moore.

Paper 12: White, Wide, and Scattered

Helen Runting and Hélène Frichot

Helen Runting and Hélène Frichot, “White, Wide, and Scattered: Picturing Her Housing Career,” *This Thing Called Theory*, Teresa Stoppani, Girogio Ponzio, and George Themistokleous (eds.) (London: Routledge, 2017), 231–241.

First presented as the conference paper: Helen Runting and Hélène Frichot, “White, Wide, and Scattered,” at the Architectural Humanities Research Association (AHRA) conference *This Thing Called Theory* at Leeds Beckett University, November, 2015, organized by Teresa Stoppani, Girogio Ponzio, and George Themistokleous.

This book was produced in association with the conference, and we were invited to submit by Teresa Stoppani, editor (with Girogio Ponzio, and George Themistokleous) for this reason.

Paper 13: The Pastel Cell

Helen Runting and Hélène Frichot

Helen Runting and Hélène Frichot, “The Illusory Autonomy of the Real Estate Interior,” *Rethinking the Social—Making Effects*, eds. Sten Gromark, Jennifer Mack, and Roemer van Toorn (Barcelona: Actar, forthcoming 2018).

This publication has been produced in association with the two strong research environments Architecture in Effect and Architecture in the Making.

Paper 14: In Captivity
Hélène Frichot and Helen Runting

Hélène Frichot and Helen Runting, “In Captivity: The Real Estate of Co-Living,” in *Architecture and Feminisms: Ecologies Economies, Technologies*, eds. Hélène Frichot, Catharina Gabrielsson, and Helen Runting (London: Routledge, 2017): 140–149.

This paper was written for the book, which I edited with Hélène Frichot and Catharina Gabrielsson.

Svensk sammanfattning

Denna avhandling är en exkursion i arkitekturteori som avsiktligt begränsar sig till ytan. Det är, hävdar jag, i det till synes ytliga vi kan urskilja hur tecken på spänning, upplösning och sammanhållning formas, och identifiera de ögonblick då arkitektur börjar bli *obyggd*. Linsöverstrålning i Photoshopfiler. Bilder klistrade på plank. Det tunna lager av Stockholmsvit (NCS-kod S0502Y) som täcker väggarna i tiotusentals innerstadslägenheter i Sveriges huvudstad. Eftermiddagssolen som reflekteras i en metallklädd fasad i Ørestad, Köpenhamn. Den mapp i obehandlat, brunt papper innehållande policydokument som visades på en utställning på Kulturhuset i Stockholm en sommar för redan ganska många år sedan ... I dessa scener formar arkitekturen livet självt, och den gör det på en skala som överskrider den individuella byggnaden. Här, på ytan, finner vi en politik, mer specifikt en *biopolitik*, som förtjänar spekulativ utforskning och kritik.

I arbetet med denna avhandling har jag genomgående strävat efter att kritiskt och teoretiskt förstå arkitekturens skiftande inställning till de liv den oundvikligen formar och modellerar. Jag har därför valt att betrakta arkitekturdisciplinen som en handling som utvecklas på nivån av omgivning och miljö: en arkitektur som är verksam på befolkningens skala. Beträktade tillsammans pekar de förändringar som behandlas i var och en av avhandlingens fjorton essäer mot ett genomgripande skifte i arkitekturdisciplinens landskap under 2000-talets andra årtionde, där faser av *undandragande* (manifesterat i *avregleringar* och *inhägnanden*) och *underlättande* (genom *projektering* och

sammankoppling), leder fram mot ett tillstånd som jag hänvisar till som *den obbyggda miljön*, i vilken projektet ersätter byggnaden som arkitekturens primära resultat.

Om teori

Arkitekturteori kan förstås som en verksamhet som syftar till att få arkitekturens nu att framträda, med alla dess sprickor och ofullständigheter. Arkitekturteorins mål är att leda arkitekturdisciplinen till handling. För att göra det måste teorin ibland framställa nya, oroliga ting i de sprickor den identifierar; ibland måste den istället negera de ting den beskriver, för att skapa de tomrum i och med vilka en framtida praktik kan arbeta.

En kritisk teori kan syfta till att åstadkomma förändring, men den kan också forma sitt objekt, om nuet – med dess frustrationer, dess vändor, dess föreställningar om “det goda livet” – befinner sig i ett tillstånd av förvandling. När vi ställs inför en ny situation kan vi bli tvungna att söka nya orienteringspunkter eller källor för en *rastlöshet* som kan rubba en framträdande status quo. Inom ramen för denna forskning har detta inneburit att jag varit tvungen att börja om varje gång ett nytt nu inrättat sig i det rådande *sakläget*. De fjorton essäer som utgör denna avhandling riktar sig främst till arkitekter, och ibland till stadsplanerare, invånare och andra teoretiker. Var och en av essäerna försöker behandla och föreslå förändring, genom att arbeta på och *i bakgrunden till, längs med och utöver* de arkitektoniska processer, praktiker, arkiv och produkter de diskuterar. Teori, menar jag – för att låna en formulering av Joan Didion – utförs i “klippningsrummet”. Det handlar antingen om att koppla tillbaka en skiktad arkitekturdisciplin till det samhälle och de befolkningar den formar och möjliggör; eller om att avslöja de varaktigheter, de *kontinuerliga ytor*, som redan finns där.

Om den obbyggda miljön

Denna avhandling undersöker arkitekturen som en central teknologi i det nyliberala projektet. Som en disciplin engagerad i produktionen av subjekt och miljöer, ritar, skriver och drömmer arkitekturen om en bred uppsättning “behållarteknologier”, som innesluter, förflyttar,

formar, stöder och framställer oss. Många av de ritningar, byggnader och "spöken" som jag diskuterar fungerade i själva verket inte bara som arkitektur men också som nyliberalismens "ekonomiska rum". De "självetvets entreprenörer" som var tänkta att befolka dessa rum var inte bara omgivna av en yttre miljö, utan inneslutna i en miljö som helt genomträngde dem, och som inifrån dem riktade dem mot vissa typer av liv snarare än andra.

En stor del av denna arkitektur blev aldrig, och kommer aldrig att bli, byggd; andra delar var så skingrade att de inte ens kunde lokaliseras utan medveten ansträngning att *aggregera* dem; vissa projicerades in i framtiden och fick alltså ingen som helst samtida form. Många ackumulerades som bilder i de "ögonblickliga arkiv" som upprättas i arkitekturtidsskrifter, fackpublikationer, sociala medier, marknaden och statens reglerande strukturer. Dessa arkiv erbjuder, hävdar jag, en till synes omöjlig inblick i en arkitektur i tillblivelse. De visar en stad och en disciplin under konstruktion. Denna arkitektoniska samtid byggs upp omkring oss, projekt för projekt, och formar en geologisk massa som aktivt inväntar att materialiseras, cirkuleras eller säljas – men också att teoretiseras. Sammantaget är denna arkitektur varken material eller representation: den är varken ritning eller byggnad, utan båda delar. Detta är anledningen till att vi behöver ett begrepp som "den obbyggda miljön" för att börja försöka tala om denna infrastrukturella legering.

I den obbyggda miljöns arkitektur är i övermorgon redan en aktiv dag, och *föregripande*, *plausibilitet* och *projektering* är upphöjda till kraftfulla arkitektoniska operationer. Vare sig det rör sig om en fastighets curaterade interiör, om de bekväma och rörliga behållare som samkörningsapparna tillhandahåller, om de ballongförsedda barn som befolkar bilderna i arkitekturfirmornas presentationsblad eller om den outhärdliga intimiteten i en samboende-cell – saker som samtliga förekommer i de texter som tillsammans bildar denna avhandling – så intar vi, när vi befolkar sådan arkitektur, en nyliberal logik, samtidigt som vi låter en sådan logik inta oss. Teori kan ge rörelse åt arkitekturen, hjälpa arkitekturen att bära oss, i vår vakna tillvaro såväl som i våra drömmar om framtiden. Detta är den

roll den obbyggda miljön skulle kunna spela, om vi väljer att göra den till ett objekt för arkitekturdisciplinens teori och praktik: den kan ge oss större rum att röra oss i, att planera, att tänka, och att leva ett liv vi tycker förtjänar att levas. Vi alla.

Helen Runting
Stockholm, mars 2018

Svensk översättning: Kim West

Endnotes

PREFACE

- 1 Pablo Miranda Carranza, “Program Matters: From Drawing to Code” (doctoral thesis, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 2018), 2–3.
- 2 The term “organisartorial” is described in the paper “White, Wide, and Scattered,” wherein we draw upon Jean Baudrillard’s *The System of Objects* in order to describe the emergence of an “organizational-sartorial” regime of control through dressing the residential interior. See: Jean Baudrillard, *The System of Objects* (London: Verso, 1996).
- 3 Karin Ehrnberger also makes the connection between the *kappa* and “dressing” in her doctoral thesis, which addresses the format of the thesis by publication as itself an object for norm-critical design. Karin Ehrnberger, “Tillblivelser: En trasslig berättelse om design som normkritisk praktik” [Creations: An Entangled Story of Design as Norm-critical Practice] (doctoral thesis, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 2017), 1.
- 4 *The Chicago Manual of Style*, 16th ed. (Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2010), 363.

INTRODUCTION

- 1 Gilles Deleuze, “Postscript on the Societies of Control,” *October*, 59 (1992): 3–7.

CHAPTER 1: METHOD

- 1 Although a common term, I am grateful to a small book made by the Office for Contemporary Art for alerting me to how powerful it looked on a page. See Marta Kuzma, Pablo Lafuente, and Peter Osborne, eds., *The State of Things* (Oslo: Office for Contemporary Art, 2012).
- 2 Here, I use the definition of critical theory advanced by Raymond Geuss who I refer to extensively throughout this chapter. His text functions as a particularly useful summary, I think, and I am grateful to Jane Rendell for her reference to this text in *Critical Architecture*, which was how I, and many of my colleagues, first discovered it. See: Raymond Geuss, *The Idea of a Critical Theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1981).

- 3 For a comprehensive review of the American “post-critical” debate, see: William S. Saunders, ed. *The New Architectural Pragmatism* (Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 2007).
- 4 Fredric Jameson, *Postmodernism: Or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (London: Verso, 1991), xi.
- 5 Jameson, *Postmodernism*, 39–44.
- 6 Joan Didion, *The White Album* (New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1979).
- 7 *Ibid.*, 13 (emphasis added).
- 8 Sara Ahmed, “Orientations: Towards a Queer Phenomenology,” *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 12, no. 4 (2006): 543–574.
- 9 *Ibid.*, “Orientations,” 553.
- 10 *Ibid.*
- 11 *Ibid.*, 549.
- 12 Silvia Federici, “Wages against Housework” [1979], *Revolution At Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle* (Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2012), 15–22.; Katrine Marçal, *Who Cooked Adam Smith’s Dinner?: A Story About Women and Economics* (London, 2016 [2015]).
- 13 Judith Butler, *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity* (New York: Routledge, 2006 [1999]); Judith Butler, *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative* (New York: Routledge, 1997).
- 14 Geuss, *The Idea of a Critical Theory*, 55.
- 15 *Ibid.*, 2.
- 16 Michel Foucault, “So Is It Important to Think,” *Power*, ed. James D. Faubion (New York: The New Press, 1994), 457.
- 17 Luc Boltanski and Ève Chiapello, *The New Spirit of Capitalism* (London: Verso, 2005).
- 18 Dolores Hayden, *The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Design for American Homes, Neighborhoods, and Cities* (Cambridge, Mass.: The MIT Press, 1981).
- 19 “Co-Laborations - Sharing Authorship and Space in Architectural and Urban Research” was a symposium held for the ResArc network on February 11–12, 2016, at LTH, Lund University, Lund.
- 20 See Christopher Hight’s comments on the practice servo in his 2005 essay “Preface to the Multitude – The Return to Network Practice in Architecture,” the first chapter in the ambitiously named *Experimental Research in Architecture and Design: Beginnings*, an anthology produced by the research group AKAD (Academy for Art- and Practice-based Research in Architecture and Design).
- 21 Katja Grillner, “Ramble, Linger and Gaze: Dialogues from the Landscape Garden,” (doctoral thesis, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 2000). Brady Burroughs’ dissertation can be referred both as Brady Burroughs, “Architectural Flirtations: A Love Storey” (doctoral thesis, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 2016); or Beda Ring, Brady Burroughs, and Henri T. Beall, *Architectural Flirtations: A Love Storey* (Stockholm: Arkitektur- och

- designcentrum, 2016). I will provide both here and in the bibliography, in support of the notion of the multiple.
- 22 Maurizio Lazzarato, *The Making of the Indebted Man* (Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e), 2012).
 - 23 Geuss, *The Idea of a Critical Theory*, 63.
 - 24 Michel Foucault, “Intellectuals and Power,” in *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1977), 208.
 - 25 Judith Butler, “Bodily Vulnerability, Coalitions, and Street Politics,” *The State of Things*, Marta Kuzma, Pablo Lafuente, and Peter Osborne, eds. (Oslo: Office for Contemporary Art, 2012); Judith Butler, “Rethinking Vulnerability and Resistance,” *Vulnerability in Resistance*, Judith Butler, Zeynep Gambetti, and Leticia Sabsay, eds. (Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2016), 13–27.
 - 26 Franco Berardi (Bifo), *Felix Guattari: Thought, Friendship and Visionary Cartography* (Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008), 9.
 - 27 Jane Rendell, “Between Two: Theory and Practice,” Jonathan Hill, ed., “Opposites Attract,” special issue of the *Journal of Architecture* 8 (Summer 2003): 222.
 - 28 Jameson, *Postmodernism*, 117.
 - 29 Tor Lindstrand, “Glitch Architecture,” *LO-RES* 1 (2014): cover gatefold.
 - 30 Daniel Koch, A Cortege of Ghostly Bodies: Abstraction, *Prothesis*, and the Logig of the Mannequin, in *Architecture and Feminisms: Ecologies, Economies, Technologies*, Hélène Frichot, Catharina Gabriellsson, and Helen Runting, eds. (London: Routledge, 2017), 99–105.
 - 31 OMA, “Norra Tornen,” accessed March 10, 2018, <http://oma.eu/projects/norra-tornen>.
 - 32 See Fredric Jameson’s “Is Space Political” for a discussion of the problems with this. Fredric Jameson, “Is Space Political?” *Anywhere*, Cynthia C. Davidson, ed. (New York: Anyone Corporation, 1995), 193–205.
 - 33 Architects Sweden, *Sveriges Arkitekters Branschrappport 2017: På väg mot nya marknader*, Charlotta Holm Hildebrand (ed.) (Architects Sweden: Stockholm, 2017).
 - 34 The Swedish Association of Architects, *Sveriges Arkitekters Branschrappport 2015: En unik chans att flytta fram positionerna*, Charlotta Holm Hildebrand and Jacob Sahlqvist (eds.) (The Swedish Association of Architects: Stockholm, 2015); The Swedish Association of Architects, *Sveriges Arkitekters Branschrappport 2016: Arkitekter har blivit bristvara*, Charlotta Holm Hildebrand (ed.) (The Swedish Association of Architects: Stockholm, 2016); Architects Sweden, *Sveriges Arkitekters Branschrappport 2017: På väg mot nya marknader*, Charlotta Holm Hildebrand (ed.) (Architects Sweden: Stockholm, 2017).
 - 35 Jameson, *Postmodernism*, 43.
 - 36 Franco “Bifo” Berardi, *After the Future*, Gary Genosko and Nicholas Thoburn, eds. (Edinburgh: AK Press, 2011): 91.
 - 37 Deleuze, “Postscript,” 5.

- 38 Maurizio, Lazzarato, “Immaterial Labour,” In *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics*, Paolo Virno and Michael Hardt, eds. (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 133–150.
- 39 Josef Vogl, *The Specter of Capital* (Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2015). 99.
- 40 Franco “Bifo” Berardi, *And: Phenomenology of the End* (South Pasadena: semiotext(e), 2015).
- 41 Sven-Olov Wallenstein, “Noopolitics, Life, and Architecture,” *Cognitive Architecture. From Biopolitics to Noopolitics in the Age of Communication and Information*, Deborah Hauptmann and Warren Neidlich, eds. (Rotterdam: 101 Publishers, 2010), 46–60.
- 42 Catharina Gabrielsson, “The Critical Potential of Housework,” *Architecture and Feminisms: Ecologies, Economies, Technologies*, Hélène Frichot, Catharina Gabrielsson, and Helen Runting, eds. (London: Routledge, 2017), 246–255.
- 43 Berardi, *After the Future*, 68.
- 44 Douglas Spencer, *The Architecture of Neoliberalism: How Contemporary Architecture Became an Instrument of Control and Compliance* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016).
- 45 *Ibid.*, 157.
- 46 Mark Fisher “Time-Wars: Towards an Alternative for the Neo-Capitalist Era,” *Gonzo Circus* (n.d.), accessed March 1, 2018, at <http://www.gonzocircus.com/exclusive-essay-time-wars-towards-an-alternative-for-the-neo-capitalist-era/>. See also Mark Fisher, *Capitalist realism: is there no alternative?* (Winchester: Zero Books, 2009).
- 47 Wendy Brown, *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism’s Stealth Revolution* (Zone Books, New York, 2015), 37.
- 48 Translation author’s own. Original text: “På de privata arkitektföretagen har den genomsnittliga debiteringsgraden ökat till strax under 80 procent. Oförmågan att förändra affärsmodellen eller höja timarvodena innebär en press på de anställda att bokföra all tid på projekten. Det finns inte utrymme för interna möten eller pauser i arbetet. Det leder till överbelastning och frånvaro, i värsta fall utbrändhet och långtidssjukskrivningar med stora kostnader för företagen och lidande för de anställda.” Ulrik Östling, “För många akademiker har för mycket att göra” [Too many academics have too much to do], *Sveriges Arkitekter* (June 15, 2016), <https://www.arkitekt.se/for-manga-akademiker-har-for-mycket-att-gora/>.
- 49 Jennifer Mack, *The Construction of Equality: Syriac Immigration and the Swedish City* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017).
- 50 Helen Runting, “Material Conversations: Autonomy, Performativity and Being Between in Urban Planning” (master’s thesis, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 2009).
- 51 Fisher, “Time-Wars,” n.p.

- 52 Berardi, *After the Future*, 55.
- 53 Ibid., 61.
- 54 Foucault, “So Is It Important to Think,” 457.
- 55 Don DeLillo, *Cosmopolis* (London: Picador, 2013 [2003]), 79.
- 56 Ibid.
- 57 Vogl, *The Specter of Capital*.
- 58 DeLillo, *Cosmopolis*, 79; Don DeLillo, *Zero K* (New York: Picador, 2016).
- 59 David Cronenberg, *Cosmopolis*. Film. Directed by David Cronenberg (Canal+ et al., 2012).
- 60 DeLillo, *Cosmopolis*, 103.
- 61 Ibid.
- 62 Ibid.
- 63 Boris Groys, *In the Flow* (London: Verso, 2016), 33.
- 64 Donna Haraway, “Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective,” *Feminist Studies* 14, no. 3 (1988): 275–299.
- 65 K. Michael Hays and Alicia Kennedy (2000) as quoted in A. Krista Sykes, “Introduction,” *Constructing a New Agenda: Architectural Theory 1993–2009* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2010), 19.
- 66 Berardi, *After the Future*, 35.
- 67 Lazzarato, “Immaterial Labour.”
- 68 “Om Hemnet,” accessed October 10, 2017, <https://www.hemnet.se/om>.
- 69 Robert Venturi, Denise Scott Brown, and Steven Izenour, *Learning from Las Vegas: The Forgotten Symbolism of Architectural Form*, rev. ed. (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1977), 8.
- 70 “How Machine Learning Helps Uber Keep the Disruptions Coming,” *Structure Data* (2016), accessed May 25, 2016, at <https://vimeo.com/album/3867562/video/159939786>.
- 71 Gillian Rose, *Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to the Interpretation of Visual Materials*, 2. ed. (London: Sage, 2007).
- 72 Arindum Dutta, during a seminar at KTH in 2017, gave the excellent advice that “each cut is the construction of the archive,” encouraging an approach that would “explode the automechanical aspects of the mode of explanation” in the material. I found this sentence enormously helpful, and have returned to it several times within the research.
- 73 Svensk Standard, *Byggloboken: Flerbostadshus 2014* (Stockholm: Svensk Standard, 2015).
- 74 Aggregate, “About,” accessed March 10, 2018, <http://we-aggregate.org/about/group>.
- 75 Aggregate. *Governing by Design: Architecture, Economy, and Politics in the Twentieth Century* (Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2005).
- 76 Eyal Weizman, *Forensic Architecture: Violence at the Threshold of Detectability*

- (New York, Zone Books, 2017).
- 77 Weizman, *Forensic Architecture*, 193.
- 78 Walter Benjamin, *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction* (London: Penguin, 2008 [1935]).
- 79 For instance: Rirkrit Teravanija, *Untitled (Free)*, performance at 303 Gallery in New York (1992).
- 80 Groys, *Into the Flow*, 4. Emph. added.
- 81 Hal Foster, *Bad New Days* (London and New York: Verso, 2017[2015]), 78.
- 82 *Ibid.*, 4.
- 83 *Ibid.*, 92.
- 84 Bonnevier, *Behind Straight Curtains*; Burroughs, *Architectural Flirtations*.
- 85 *Ibid.*; *ibid.*
- 86 Jane Rendell, “Between Two,” 231.
- 87 Jane Rendell, “Tendencies and Trajectories: Feminist Approaches in Architecture,” *The SAGE Handbook of Architectural Theory*, C. Greig Crysler, Stephen Cairns, and Hilde Heynan (London: Sage, 2013), 96.
- 88 Eyal Wiezman, “Lethal Theory,” *Log 7* (Winter/Spring 2006): 53–77.
- 89 Here I borrow Audre Lorde’s critical advice to white, middle-class, heterosexual feminists regarding their poor selection of tools in destroying the master’s house. Audre Lorde, “The Master’s Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master’s House,” *The Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*, Cherríe Moraga and Gloria Anzaldúa, eds. (New York, The Kitchen Table Press, 1983).
- 90 Deleuze, “Postscript,” 5.
- 91 Malin Zimm, “Slow Watch: A Sci-Fi Novel About the Ecology of Time in the Society of Fear,” *Architecture and Feminisms: Ecologies, Economies, Technologies*, Hélène Frichot, Catharina Gabrielsson, and Helen Runting, eds. (London: Routledge, 2017), 163–169.
- 92 Hélène Frichot, *Creative Ecologies: Theorizing the Practice of Architecture* (London: Bloomsbury, forthcoming 2018), n.p.
- 93 *Ibid.*
- 94 “Environmentality” is a term that builds on a footnote in *The Birth of Biopolitics*. Foucault postulates that neoliberal governmentality doesn’t directly produce subjectivities as much as environments, thereby ushering in a new field of power wherein: On the horizon of this analysis we see . . . the image, idea, or theme-program of a society in which . . . action is brought to bear on the rules of the game rather than on the players, and finally in which there is an environmental type of intervention instead of the internal subjugation of individuals.” Michel Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the College de France 1978–1979* (New York: Picador, 2004), 116.
- 95 Butler, “Bodily Vulnerability, Coalitions, and Street Politics.”
- 96 For an analysis of Superstudio’s work, see Peter Lang and William Menking, *Superstudio: Life Without Objects* (Milan: Skira, 2003).

CHAPTER 2: FINDINGS

- 1 See, for instance, Helena Mattsson and Sven-Olov Wallenstein, eds., *Swedish Modernism: Architecture, Consumption, and the Welfare State* (London: Black Dog Publishing, 2010).
- 2 To quote scholars Karin Grundström and Irene Molina, “Although originally constructed for ‘everyone and everybody’, working-class neighbourhoods came to consist almost entirely of (CBC-owned) high-rise, multi-storey rental apartment buildings. Middle-class neighbourhoods consisted of row houses, detached houses, and smaller apartment buildings, mainly organised as cooperatives. Finally, upper middle class neighbourhoods consisted of privately owned villas. This organisation of almost homogeneous clusters of tenure form related to building type still, to some extent, prevails.” Karin Grundström & Irene Molina, “From Folkhem to lifestyle housing in Sweden: segregation and urban form, 1930s–2010s,” *International Journal of Housing Policy* 16, no. 3 (2016): 323.
- 3 See Guy Baeten, Sara Westin, Emil Pull, and Irene Molina, “Pressure and Violence: Housing Renovation and Displacement in Sweden,” *Environment and Planning A* 49, no. 3 (2016): 1.
- 4 Sebastian Parkkila, “Hornstull blir “gaffel- och knivsöder,” *Dagens Media* (April 26, 2013), accessed September 20, 2017, <https://www.dagensmedia.se/marknadsforing/kampanjer/hornstull-blir-gaffel-och-knivsoder-6113493>.
- 5 Take the example of the Prada store, where “AMO’s research into identity, in-store technology, and new possibilities of content-production in fashion helped generate OMA’s architectural designs for new Prada epicenter stores in New York and Los Angeles.” OMA, Office, accessed March 18, 2018, <http://oma.eu/office>.
- 6 City of Stockholm, *Promenadstaden: Översiktsplan för Stockholm* [Policy Document, Swedish Version] (Stockholm: City of Stockholm, 2010).
- 7 City of Stockholm, *Översiktsplan för Stockholm* [Policy Document, Swedish Version] (Stockholm: City of Stockholm, 2018).
- 8 Richard Burdett and Deyan Sudjic, eds., *The Endless City: The Urban Age Project by the London School of Economics and Deutsche Bank’s Alfred Herrhausen Society* (Phaidon, London, 2007).
- 9 Boverket [Swedish National Board of Housing, Building, and Planning], *Reviderad prognos över behovet av nya bostäder till 2025, 2016:18* [Revised Prognosis, Number of New Dwellings Required] (June 2016) (Karlskrona: Boverket, 2016), 1.
- 10 Helena Mattsson and Sven-Olov Wallenstein, “Introduction,” in Helena Mattsson and Sven-Olov Wallenstein, eds., *Swedish Modernism: Architecture, Consumption, and the Welfare State* (Black Dog Publishing: London, 2010), 8.
- 11 Erik Sigge, “Architecture’s Red Tape: Government Building Construction in Sweden, 1963–173” (doctoral thesis, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 2017).
- 12 In Swedish, “en omfattande avreglering av byggandet.” Boverket, *Bostadspolitik: Svensk politik för boende, planering och byggande under 130 år* (Karlskrona: Boverket, 2007), 107.

- 13 David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2005), 114.
- 14 Boverket, *Bostadspolitiken*.
- 15 Eva Hedman, *A History of the Swedish System of Non-Profit Municipal Housing* (Karlskrona: Boverket [Swedish National Board of Housing, Building, and Planning], 2008), 19.
- 16 Thomas Berglund, “Allmännyttan får inte sätta hyrestak” [Municipal Housing Company’s No Longer to Set Rent Ceiling], *Svenska Dagbladet* (November 13, 2009).
- 17 Johan Hellekant och Sebastian Orre, “Stockholms stad sålde ut 26000 bostäder” [The City of Stockholm Sold 26,000 Dwellings], *Svenska Dagbladet* (May 27, 2015), accessed March 18, 2018, <https://www.svd.se/ett-paradigmskifte-pa-stockholms-bostadsmarknad>.
- 18 Hedman, *A History of the Swedish System of Non-Profit Municipal Housing*.
- 19 Peter van Santen och Dilan Ölcer, “Svenska hushållens skuldsä ning – uppdatering för 2016,” *Ekonomiska kommentarer 5* (November 22, 2016) (Stockholm: Riksbanken, 2016), accessed June 12, 2017, http://www.riksbank.se/Documents/Rapporter/Ekonomiska_kommentarer/2016/rap_ek_kom_nr5_161122_sve.pdf
- 20 Svensk Mäklarstatistik, accessed April 18, 2018, <https://www.maklarstatistik.se/omrade/riket/#/bostadsratter/arshistorik>; and Svensk Mäklarstatistik, accessed April 18, 2018, <https://www.maklarstatistik.se/omrade/riket/stockholms-lan/stockholm/#/bostadsratter/arshistorik>.
- 21 The website “Svensk mäklarstatistik” (Swedish Real-Estate Statistics) reports an average per square meter price of SEK73,358 for the period September– November 2014; “Centrala Stockholm,” last updated December 16, 2014, accessed December 25, 2014, <http://www.maklarstatistik.se/maeklarstatistik/kommun.aspx?Main=Centrala%20Stockholm&LK=3,003&Months=12&Extra1=8,888&Extra2=8,888&Typ=Boratter&Ant=1,473/>.
- 22 Michel Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics*.
- 23 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics*, 95.
- 24 Foucault, *Birth of Biopolitics*, 116.
- 25 Wendy Brown, *Undoing the Demos*, 21.
- 26 As David Harvey notes, “Joining the EU in 1993–4 deprived the [Swedish] state of many of the tools it had previously maintained to fight unemployment and advance the social wage.” Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, 114.
- 27 Ibid.
- 28 These spectral structures can be seen throughout the Swedish city; in Stockholm, we might look to Garnisonen, the enormous government complex on the inner city’s northern edge built between 1964 and 1972, the project of a State institution that was re-reprogramming itself in line with what can be read as an early neoliberal logic and precursor to New Public Management. See: Sigge, “Architecture’s Red Tape.”

- 29 Wendy Brown, “Neoliberalism and the End of Liberal Democracy,” *Edgework: Critical Essays on Knowledge and Politics* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2005), 46.
- 30 Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 144.
- 31 Jamie Peck, Nik Theodore, and Neil Brenner, “Neoliberal Urbanism: Models, Moments, Mutations,” *SAIS Review* XXIX, n. 1 (Spring-Winter 2009), 53.
- 32 Foucault, *The Birth of Biopolitics*, 144.
- 33 See, for instance, Brown, “Neoliberalism and the End of Liberal Democracy.”
- 34 Maurizio Lazzarato, *Signs and Machines: Capitalism and the Production of Subjectivity* (Los Angeles, 2014), 9.
- 35 Gilles Deleuze & Felix Guattari, *Anti-Oedipus: capitalism and schizophrenia* (London: Continuum, 2004), 269.
- 36 *Ibid.*, 254.
- 37 *Ibid.*, 264.
- 38 This also needs to be inserted into the bibliography: “Lazzarato, Maurizio. “Strategies of the Political Entrepreneur,” *SubStance* 112, vol. 36, no. 1 (2007): 87–97.
- 39 Lazzarato, *Signs and Machines*, 9.
- 40 Felicity Scott, *Architecture or Techno-Utopia: Politics After Modernism*, (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2007).
- 41 Reinhold Martin, *Utopia’s Ghost: Architecture and Postmodernism, Again* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010).
- 42 Tahl Kaminer, *Architecture, Crisis and Resuscitation: The Reproduction of Post-Fordism in Late-Twentieth-Century Architecture* (London: Routledge, 2011).
- 43 Roemer van Toorn, “Fresh Conservatism: Landscapes of normality,” accessed April 18, 2018, <http://www.roemervantoor.nl/Resources/Fresh%20Conservatism.pdf>, 11.
- 44 Claudia Dutson, “The Entrepreneurial Self,” *Architecture and Feminisms: Ecologies Economies, Technologies*, Hélène Frichot, Helen Runting, and Catharina Gabrielsson, eds. (London: Routledge, 2017), 292.
- 45 BuzzFeed Video, “We Lived With Zero Privacy With Total Strangers,” YouTube [11 mins 51 secs], <https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=2heLd3z6Gz4>.
- 46 William Gibson, *Distrust That Particular Flavor* (Penguin Books Ltd., 2012), 45.
- 47 “Economic development is so highly valued that by elected officials that planners, even if they were not to share this ideology of growth, would find it difficult, if not impossible, to oppose the state’s complicity. The result has been a peculiar form of nonplanning in which planners participate in individual projects, often attempting to temper the most egregious negative externalities, while failing to place these projects into any broader framework of urban development, a basic tenet of modernist planning ...” Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*, 115.
- 48 Martin, *Utopia’s Ghost*, 106.

- 49 Ibid., 154.
- 50 Kaminer, *Architecture, Crisis and Resuscitation*, 157.
- 51 Foucault, *The History of Sexuality Volume 1* (London: Penguin Books, 1978), 139.
- 52 Ibid., 138.
- 53 Ibid., 142.
- 54 Roberto Esposito, *Bíos: Biopolitics and Philosophy* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008), 10; Miguel Vatter, *The Republic of the Living: Biopolitics and the Critique of Civil Society*, first edition (New York: Fordham University Press, 2014).
- 55 Sven-Olov Wallenstein, *Bio-Politics and the Emergence of Modern Architecture* (New Yor: The Temple Hoyne Buell Center and Princeton Architectural Press, 2009).
- 56 Ibid., 42.
- 57 Ibid., 48.
- 58 Michel Foucault, *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison* (London: Penguin Books, 1991).
- 59 Michel Foucault, *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences* (London: Routledge, 2002 [1970]).
- 60 Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 205.
- 61 Beatriz Colomina, “The Split Wall: Domestic Voyeurism,” *Sexuality and Space* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1992), 250.
- 62 Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*.
- 63 Ibid., 202.
- 64 Cormac McCarthy, *The Road* (London: Picador; 2006).
- 65 Foucault, *Discipline and Punish*, 219.
- 66 Wallenstein, *Biopolitics*, 5.
- 67 Lazzarato, *Signs and Machines*, 12–13.
- 68 Ibid., 16.
- 69 Ibid., 18.
- 70 Zoë Sofia, “Container technologies,” *Hypatia* 15, no. 2 (2000): 181–200.
- 71 Ibid., 194.
- 72 Ibid., 184.
- 73 Butler, “Vulnerability and Resistance,” 14.
- 74 Ibid., 15.
- 75 Luce Irigaray, *An Ethics of Sexual Difference* (Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993).
- 76 Ibid., 127.
- 77 Ibid., 52.
- 78 My friend and colleague Fredrik Torisson retrieves the debunked theory of “hopeful monsters” from biology in order to offer us one way forward. Hopeful

monsters, according to Torisson, are produced by minor alterations in the DNA of an individual that lead to a new species. Such creatures might help us, he argues, to think the unthinkable. The Hopeful Monster is less creature than simply the unseen—it is both network and utopia and place and chimera—and it prompts us to wonder why, if Jakob could like any color, even those that don't exist, he chooses the one from the Marc Jacobs handbag that was popular some five years ago. Jakob is simply neither hopeful nor monstrous enough, despite his infinite scalability. Fredrik Torisson, "Utopology: A Re-Interrogation of the Utopian in Architecture" (doctoral thesis, LTH, Lund University, 2017).

- 79 Ibid.
- 80 Nina Power, "Towards a Feminism of the Void," accessed January 17, 2018, <https://ninapower.net/2017/11/09/191/>.
- 81 With this term I riff of a current policy discussion. This was the title of a 2015 governmental investigation and a current Swedish government policy proposition. See: Government of Sweden, Regeringens proposition 2017/18:110: Politik för en gestaltade livsmiljö [Politics for a Designed Living Environment] (Stockholm: Government of Sweden, 2018), accessed March 18, 2018, <http://www.regeringen.se/492796/contentassets/8ecb8b5973924e6b9e93627c041d27a6/politik-for-gestaltad-livsmiljo-prop.-201718110.pdf>.

CHAPTER 3: THE METADATA

- 1 KTH Royal Institute of Technology, "Architecture: Study Plan for Third-Cycle Subject, 2010," accessed March 18, 2018, <https://www.kth.se/student/kurser/dr/subj-ARKITEKT-en.pdf>.
- 2 AHRA, accessed February 13, 2018, <http://www.ahra-architecture.org>.

PAPER 1: MANAGING THE NOT-YET

- 1 Fredric Jameson, *Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991), 124.
- 2 Luc Boltanski and Ève Chiapello, *The New Spirit of Capitalism* (London: Verso, 2005), 104.
- 3 Maurizio Lazzarato, "Immaterial Labour," in *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics*, ed. Paolo Virno and Michael Hardt (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996), 137.
- 4 For a longer discussion of anticipation in relation to the project, see Helen Runting, "The Waiting Room," in *Feminist Futures of Spatial Practice: Materialisms, Activisms, Dialogues, Pedagogies, Projections* (Baunach: Spurbuchverlag, 2017); and Helen Runting and Fredrik Torisson, "Anticipation and Other Affective Productions: Theorizing the Architectural Project in Action," in *After Effects* (Barcelona: Actar, forthcoming).
- 5 Gregory Seigworth and Melissa Gregg, "An Inventory of Shimmers," in *The Affect Theory Reader* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010), 1.
- 6 Gilles Deleuze, "Postscript on the Societies of Control," *October* 59 (1992): 5.

Bibliography

- “Bifo” Berardi, Franco. “The Century that Trusted in the Future.” In *After the Future*, edited by Gary Genosko and Nicholas Thoburn, 15–68. Edinburgh: AK, 2014.
- . *And: Phenomenology of the End*. South Pasadena: semiotext(e), 2015.
- Aggregate. *Governing by Design: Architecture, Economy, and Politics in the Twentieth Century*. Pittsburgh: University of Pittsburgh Press, 2012.
- Agrawal, Arun. *Environmentality: Technologies of Government and the Making of Subjectivities*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2005.
- Ahmed, Sara. “Orientations: Towards a Queer Phenomenology.” *GLQ: A Journal of Lesbian and Gay Studies* 12, no. 4 (2006): 543–574.
- . *The Promise of Happiness*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.
- Alaimo, Stacy, and Susan Hekman, eds. *Material Feminisms*. Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 2008.
- Althusser, Louis. “Ideology and Ideological State Apparatuses: Notes Toward an Investigation.” In *Lenin and Philosophy and Other Essays*. New York: Monthly Review Press, 1971.
- Ashton, Matt. “Vi måste prata om Venedigbiennalen” [We need to talk about Venice]. *Arkitekten* (March 15, 2016): accessed October 21, 2016, <http://arkitekten.se/debatt/vi-maste-prata-om-venedigbiennalen/>.
- Aureli, Pier Vittorio. *The Possibility of an Absolute Architecture*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2011.
- Awan, Nishat, Tatjana Schneider, and Jeremy Till. *Spatial Agency: Other Ways of Doing Architecture*. Oxon: Routledge, 2011.
- Baeten, Guy, Sara Westin, Emil Pull, and Irene Molina. “Pressure and Violence: Housing Renovation and Displacement in Sweden.” *Environment and Planning A* 49, no. 3 (2016): 631–651.
- Ballard, J.G. *High-Rise*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1975.
- Banham, Reyner. *Los Angeles: The Architecture of the Four Ecologies*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2001 [1971].

- Barr, Philippa Nicola. "The Urban Age: 10 Years On." *Domus* (December 28, 2015): accessed April 1, 2018, https://www.domusweb.it/en/architecture/2015/12/28/urban_age_10.html.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *Selected Writings*, translated by Mark Poster. Cambridge: Polity, 2001.
- . *The System of Objects*. London: Verso, 1996.
- Beauregard, Robert. "Between Modernity and Postmodernity: The Ambiguous Position of US Planning." In *Readings in Planning Theory*, 2nd edition, edited by Scott Campbell and Susan Fainstein (Oxford: Blackwell, 2003).
- Bengtsson, Bo. "Housing and Housing Policy in Sweden." In *Planning and Sustainable Urban Development in Sweden*, edited by Mats Johan Lundström, Charlotta Fredriksson, and Jakob Witzell. Stockholm: Föreningen för Samhällsplanering, 2013.
- Benjamin, Walter. *The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction*. London: Penguin, 2008 [1935].
- Berardi, Franco (Bifo). *Félix Guattari: Thought, Friendship and Visionary Cartography*. Hampshire: Palgrave MacMillan, 2008.
- Berglund, Thomas. "Allmännyttan får inte sätta hyrestak" [Municipal Housing Company's No Longer to Set Rent Ceiling]. *Svenska Dagbladet* (November 13, 2009): accessed April 2, 2018, <https://www.svd.se/allmannyttan-far-inte-satta-hyrestak>.
- Bishop, Claire. "Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics." *October* 110 (2004): 51–80.
- . "Introduction." *Participation*, edited by Claire Bishop, 10–17. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2006.
- . *Artificial Hells: Participatory Art and the Politics of Spectatorship*. London: Verso, 2012.
- Bloch, Ernst. *The Principle of Hope. Vol. 1*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1995.
- Blücher, Gösta. "Planning Legislation in Sweden—A History of Power Over Land-Use." In *Planning and Sustainable Development in Sweden*, edited by Mats Johan Lundström, Charlotta Fredriksson, and Jacob Witzell, 47–58. Stockholm: Föreningen för Samhällsplanering, 2013.
- Boeri, Stefano, Francine Fort, Michel Jacques, and Armelle Lavalou, eds. *Mutations: Rem Koolhaas Harvard Project on the City*. Barcelona: Actar, 2000.
- Boltanski, Luc, and Ève Chiapello. *The New Spirit of Capitalism*. London: Verso, 2005.
- Bourriaud, Nicolas. *Relational Aesthetics*. Dijon: Presses du reel, 1998.
- Boverket. *Bostadspolitiken: Svensk politik för boende, planering och byggande under 130 år* [Housing Politics: Swedish Politics for Dwellings, Planning, and Construction Over 130 Years]. Karlskrona: Boverket, 2007.

- . *Rapport 2015:8, Behov av bostadsbyggande: Teori och metod samt en analys av behovet av bostäder till 2025* [Report 2015:8, The Housing Deficit: Theory, Method, and Analysis of the Housing Deficit to 2015]. Karlskrona: Boverket, 2015.
- . *Reviderad prognos över behovet av nya bostäder till 2025, 2016:18* [Revised Prognosis, Number of New Dwellings Required]. Karlskrona: Boverket, 2016.
- Boyd, Robin. *The Australian Ugliness*. Melbourne: Penguin, 1960.
- Bradley, Karin, Anna Hult, and Göran Cars. "From Eco-modernizing to Political Ecologizing." In *Sustainable Stockholm: Exploring Urban Sustainability in Europe's Greenest City*, editors Jonathan Metzger and Amy Rader Olsson, 168–194. London: Routledge, 2012.
- Bratton, Benjamin H. *The Stack: On Software and Sovereignty*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2015.
- Brenner, Neil, and Christian Schmid. "The 'Urban Age' in Question." *International Journal of Urban and Regional Research* 38, no. 3 (2014): 731–755.
- Brown, Wendy. "Neoliberalism and the End of Liberal Democracy." *Edgework: Critical Essays on Knowledge and Politics*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2005.
- . *Undoing the Demos: Neoliberalism's Stealth Revolution*. New York: Zone Books, 2015.
- Bryant, Ross. "The Addition of Real-World Imperfections is Taking Architectural Visualization to the Next Level." *Dezeen* (August 12, 2013): accessed March 6, 2017 <https://www.dezeen.com/2013/08/12/henry-goss-on-architectural-visualizations/>.
- Bulgakov, Mikhail. *The Master and Margarita*. London: Vintage, 2004.
- Bunschoten, Raol, Takuro Hoshino, Petra Marguk, et al. "CHORA Manifesto." *Daidalos* 72 (1999): 42–51.
- Burdett, Richard, and Deyan Sudjic, eds. *The Endless City: The Urban Age Project by the London School of Economics and Deutsche Bank's Alfred Herrhausen Society*. Phaidon, London, 2007.
- Burroughs, Brady. "Architectural Flirtations: A Love Storey." Doctoral thesis, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 2016.
- Butler, Judith, Zeynep Gambetti, and Leticia Sabsay. "Introduction." In *Vulnerability in Resistance*, edited by eds. Judith Butler, Zeynep Gambetti, and Leticia Sabsay, 121–11. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016.
- Butler, Judith. "Rethinking Vulnerability and Resistance." In *Vulnerability in Resistance*, edited by eds. Judith Butler, Zeynep Gambetti, and Leticia Sabsay, 12–27. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2016.
- . "Bodily Vulnerability, Coalitions, and Street Politics." In *The State of Things*, edited by Marta Kuzma, Pablo Lafuente, and Peter Osborne, 161–197. Oslo: Office for Contemporary Art, 2012.

- . *Excitable Speech: A Politics of the Performative*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- . *Gender Trouble: Feminism and the Subversion of Identity*. New York: Routledge, 2006 [1999].
- Calvino, Italo. "A Plunge into Real Estate." In *Difficult Loves: Smog and a Plunge into Real Estate*, translated by D.S. Crane-Ross, 148–246. London: Vintage Books, 1999.
- Castells, Manuel. "European Cities, The Informational Society, and the Global Economy." *New Left Review* 204 (1994).
- Hildebrand, Charlotta Holm, and Jacob Sahlqvist, eds. *Sveriges Arkitekters Branschrapport 2015: En unik chans att flytta fram positionerna*. Stockholm: Sveriges Arkitekter [The Swedish Association of Architects] 2015.
- Hildebrand, Charlotta Holm, ed. *Sveriges Arkitekters Branschrapport 2016: Arkitekter har blivit bristvara*. Stockholm: Sveriges Arkitekter [The Swedish Association of Architects], 2016.
- City of Stockholm. *Arkitektur Stockholm: Strategier för stadens gestaltning* [Architecture Stockholm: Strategies for the Design of the City]. Stockholm: City of Stockholm, 2014.
- . *Översiktsplan för Stockholm* [Comprehensive Plan for Stockholm]. Stockholm: City of Stockholm, 2018.
- . *Promenadstaden: Översiktsplan för Stockholm* [The Walkable City: The Comprehensive Plan for Stockholm]. Stockholm: City of Stockholm, 2010.
- . *Vision 2030: Framtidsguiden* [Vision 2030: A Guide to the Future]. Stockholm: City of Stockholm, 2007.
- Clark, Liat. "Uber's Real Time Car Map Is Fake." *WIRED* (July 28, 2015): accessed May 25, 2016, <http://www.wired.co.uk/article/uber-algorithm-fake>.
- Colomina, Beatriz. "The Split Wall: Domestic Voyeurism." In *Sexuality and Space*, 73–128. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1992.
- Coole, Diane, and Samantha Frost, eds. *New Materialisms: Ontology, Agency, and Politics*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.
- Corner, James. "Terra Fluxus." In *The Landscape Urbanism Reader*, edited by Charles Waldheim, 22–33. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2006.
- Cotton, Wade, and Isabelle Kirkham-Lewitt. "Model Wombs." *The Avery Review* 22 (March 2017).
- De Cauter, Lieven. *The Capsular Civilization: On the City in the Age of Fear*. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 2004.
- de Certeau, Michel. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1984.
- de la Bellacasa, Maria. "Nothing Comes Without Its World: Thinking With Care." *The Sociological Review* 60, no. 2 (2012): 197–216.

- Degen, Monica, Claire Melhuish, and Gillian Rose. "Producing Place Atmospheres Digitally: Architecture, Digital Visualization Practices and the Experience Economy." *Journal of Consumer Culture* 17, no. 1 (2017): 3–24.
- Deleuze, Gilles, and Felix Guattari. *Anti-Oedipus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia*. London: Continuum, 2004.
- Deleuze, Gilles. "Postscript on the Societies of Control." *October*, 59 (1992): 3–7.
- . *The Fold: Leibniz and the Baroque*. London: Athlone Press, 1993.
- DeLillo, Don. *Cosmopolis*. London: Picador, 2013 [2003].
- . *White Noise*. New York: Penguin, 2009 [1984].
- . *Zero K*. New York: Picador, 2016.
- Deutsche, Rosalyn. "Boys Town." *Environment and Planning D* 9 (1991): 5–30.
- . *Evictions: Art and Spatial Politics*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1996.
- Didion, Joan. *The White Album*. New York: Farrar, Straus, and Giroux, 1979.
- Dogma and Black Square. "MONTHS: A House without Housework." In *Home Economics: Five New Models for Domestic Life*, edited by Jack Self, Shumi Bose, and Finn Williams. London: The Spaces with Real, 2016.
- Dorrian, Mark. *Writing on the Image: Architecture, the City and the Politics of Representation*. London: I.B. Taurus, 2015.
- Dutson, Claudia. "The Entrepreneurial Self." In *Architecture and Feminisms: Ecologies Economies, Technologies*, edited by H el ene Frichot, Helen Runting, and Catharina Gabri elsson, 292–302. London: Routledge, 2017.
- Easterling, Keller. *Enduring Innocence: Global Architecture and Its Political Masquerades*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2005.
- . *Extrastatecraft: The Power of Infrastructure Space*. London: Verso, 2014.
- Ehrnberger, Karin. "Tillblivelser: En trasslig ber ttelse om design som normkritisk praktik" [Creations: An Entangled Story of Design as Norm-critical Practice]. Doctoral thesis, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 2017.
- Eisenman, Peter. "Editor's Introduction." In Also Rossi, *The Architecture of the City*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1982.
- Engstr m, Carl-Johan, and G oran Cars. "Planning in a New Reality—New Conditions, Demands, and Discourses." In *Planning and Sustainable Urban Development in Sweden*, edited by Mats J. Lundstr m, Charlotta Fredriksson, and Jacob Witzell, 11–21. Stockholm: F oreningen f or Samh allsplanering, 2013.
- Esposito, Roberto. *B ios: Biopolitics and Philosophy*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2008.
- Evans, Robin. *Translations from Drawing to Building and Other Essays*. London: Architectural Association, 1986.

- Federici, Silvia. "Wages against Housework" [1979]. *Revolution at Point Zero: Housework, Reproduction, and Feminist Struggle*, edited by Silvia Federici, 15–22. Oakland, CA: PM Press, 2012.
- Fisher, Mark. "Time-Wars: Towards an Alternative for the Neo-Capitalist Era." *Gonzo Circus* (n.d.): accessed March 1, 2018, at <http://www.gonzocircus.com/exclusive-essay-time-wars-towards-an-alternative-for-the-neo-capitalist-era/>.
- . *Capitalist Realism: Is There No Alternative?* Winchester: Zero Books, 2009.
- Fishwick, Samuel. "The Collective: Inside London's Most Luxurious Commune." *The Evening Standard* (September 11, 2016): accessed April 12, 2017, <http://www.standard.co.uk/lifestyle/esmagazine/the-collective-inside-london-smost-luxurious-commune-a3333526.html>.
- Flyvbjerg, Bent. *Rationality and Power: Democracy in Practice*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Forester, John. *Planning in The Face of Power* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1989).
- Foster, Hal. *Bad New Days*. London and New York: Verso, 2017 [2015].
- Foucault, Michel, and Gilles Deleuze, "Intellectuals and Power." In *Language, Counter-Memory, Practice: Selected Essays and Interviews*, edited by D. F. Bouchard, 205–217. Ithaca: Cornell University Press, 1977.
- Foucault, Michel. "So Is It Important to Think." In *Power*, edited by James D. Faubion, 454–458. New York: The New Press, 1994.
- . "What Is Critique?" In *The Politics of Truth*, edited by Sylvère Lotringer. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2007 [1978].
- . *Discipline and Punish: The Birth of the Prison*. London: Penguin Books, 1991.
- . *Security, Territory, Population: Lectures at the Collège de France 1977–1978*. New York: Picador, 2007.
- . *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the College de France 1978–1979*. New York: Picador, 2004.
- . *The Order of Things: An Archaeology of the Human Sciences*. London: Routledge, 2002 [1970].
- Fraser, Nancy. "Feminism, Capitalism and the Cunning of History." *New Left Review* 56 (2009): 97–117.
- Frichot, Hélène. "Gentri-Fiction and Our (E)States of Reality: On the Exhaustion of the Image of Thought and the Fatigued Image of Architecture." In *The Missed Encounter of Radical Philosophy with Architecture*, edited by Nadir Lahiji, 113–132. London: Bloomsbury, 2014.
- . "Söder Pops Island: My Own Personal Gentri-Fiction." *Candide: Journal for Architectural Knowledge* 9 (2015): 74–96.

- . *Creative Ecologies: Theorizing the Practice of Architecture*. London: Bloomsbury, forthcoming 2018.
- Friedman, Alice. “Architecture, Authority, and the Female Gaze: Planning and Representation in the Early Modern Countryhouse.” *Assemblage* 18 (August 1992): 40–61.
- . “Girl Talk: Marion Mahony Griffin, Frank Lloyd Wright and the Oak Park Studio.” *Places Journal* (June 2011). Accessed March 6, 2017, <https://placesjournal.org/article/marion-mahony-griffin/>.
- Fulcrum. *Real Estates: Life without Debt*. London: Bedford Press, 2014.
- Gabrielsson, Catharina. “The Critical Potential of Housework.” In *Architecture and Feminisms: Ecologies, Economies, Technologies*, edited by H el ene Frichot, Catharina Gabrielsson, and Helen Runting, 246–255. London: Routledge, 2017.
- Galloway, Alexander R. *Protocol: How Control Exists after Decentralization*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2004.
- Geuss, Raymond. *The Idea of a Critical Theory: Habermas and the Frankfurt School*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 1981.
- Gibson, William. *Distrust That Particular Flavor*. Penguin Books Ltd., 2012.
- Giedion, Sigfried. *Mechanization Takes Command: A Contribution to Anonymous History*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1970 [1948].
- Gillick, Liam. “Contingent Factors: A Response to Claire Bishop’s ‘Antagonism and Relational Aesthetics’.” *October* 115 (Winter 2006): 95–107.
- Government of Sweden. *Fler nya hem* [More New Homes]. Stockholm: Regeringskansliet, 2015.
- . *Regeringens proposition 2017/18:110: Politik f or en gestaltade livsmilj o* [Government Proposition 2017/18:110: Politics for a Designed Living Environment]. Stockholm: Government of Sweden, 2018. Accessed March 18, 2018, <http://www.regeringen.se/492796/contentassets/8ecb8b5973924e6b9e93627c041d27a6/politik-for-gestaltad-livsmiljo-prop.-201718110.pdf>.
- Gregg, Melissa, and Gregory J. Seigworth. “An Inventory of Shimmers.” In *The Affect Theory Reader*, edited by Melissa Gregg and Gregory J. Seigworth, 1–25. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.
- Grillner, Katja. “Ramble, Linger and Gaze: Dialogues from the Landscape Garden.” Doctoral thesis, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 2000.
- Griswold, Alison. “Uber Has Pinpointed the Moment You’re Most Likely to Pay for Surge Pricing.” *Quartz* (20 May 2016). Accessed May 25, 2016, <http://qz.com/689060/uber-has-pinpointed-the-moment-youre-most-likely-to-pay-for-surge-pricing/>
- Grosz, Elizabeth. “Deleuze’s Bergson: Duration, the Virtual and a Politics of the Future.” In *Deleuze and Feminist Theory*, edited by Claire Colebrook. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 2000.

- . *Architecture from the Outside: Essays on Virtual and Real Space*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2001.
- Groys, Boris. “The Loneliness of the Project.” *New York Magazine of Contemporary Art and Theory* 2002): accessed May 19, 2017, https://thomas-hersey.wiki.uml.edu/file/view/The_Lonliness_of_the+_Project.pdf.
- . *In the Flow*. London: Verso, 2016.
- Grundström, Karin, and Irene Molina. “From Folkhem to lifestyle housing in Sweden: segregation and urban form, 1930s–2010s.” *International Journal of Housing Policy* 16, no. 3 (2016): 316–336.
- Haraway, Donna. “A Cyborg Manifesto: Science, Technology, and Socialist-Feminism in the Late Twentieth Century.” In *Simians, Cyborgs, and Women: The Reinvention of Nature*. New York: Routledge, 1991.
- . “Situated Knowledges: The Science Question in Feminism and the Privilege of Partial Perspective.” *Feminist Studies* 14, no. 3 (1988): 275–299.
- . *Modest_Witness@Second_Millennium. FemaleMan©_Meets_OncoMouse™: Feminism and Technoscience*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- . *Staying with the Trouble: Making Kin in the Chthulucence*. Durham and London: Duke University Press, 2016.
- Harris, Mark. “Uber: Why the World’s Biggest Ride-Sharing Company Has No Drivers.” *The Guardian* (November 16, 2015): accessed June 13, 2016, <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2015/nov/16/uber-worlds-biggest-ride-sharing-company-no-drivers>.
- Harvey, David. *A Brief History of Neoliberalism*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Hauptman, Deborah. “Introduction: Architecture and Mind in the Age of Communication and Information.” In *Cognitive Architecture. From Biopolitics to Noopolitics. Architecture & Mind in the Age of Communication and Information*, edited by Deborah Hauptman and Warren Neidich, 11–43. Rotterdam: 010, 2010.
- Hayden, Dolores. *The Grand Domestic Revolution: A History of Feminist Design for American Homes, Neighborhoods, and Cities*. Cambridge, Mass., 1982.
- Healey, Patsy. “Planning Through Debate: The Communicative Turn in Planning Theory.” *The Town Planning Review* 63, no. 2 (April, 1992): 143–162.
- Hedman, Eva. *A History of the Swedish System of Non-Profit Municipal Housing*. Karlskrona: Boverket [Swedish National Board of Housing, Building, and Planning], 2008.
- Heidegger, Martin. “The Thing” [1964]. In *Poetry, Language, Thought*, translated and edited by Albert Hofstadter, 161–184. New York: Harper & Row, 1971.
- Hellekant, Johan, and Sebastian Orre. “Stockholms stad sålde ut 26000 bostäder” [The City of Stockholm Sold 26,000 Dwellings]. *Svenska Dagbladet* (May 27, 2015): accessed March 18, 2018, <https://www.svd.se/ett-paradigmskifte-pa-stockholms-bostadsmarknad>.

- Helliwell, John, Richard Layard, and Jeffrey Sachs, eds. *The World Happiness Report*. New York: Columbia University, 2011. Accessed December 9, 2013, <http://www.earthinstitute.columbia.edu/sites/files/files/Sachs%20Writing/2012/World%20Happiness%20Report.pdf>.
- Higgie, Jennifer. "One Take: Human Mask." *Frieze* (December 17, 2014): accessed October 23, 2016, <http://www.frieze.com/article/one-take-human-mask/>.
- Hight, Christopher. "Preface to the Multitude—The Return to Network Practice in Architecture." In *Experimental Research in Architecture and Design: Beginnings*. Stockholm: AKAD through Axl Books, 2005.
- Hill, Jonathan. "Drawing Research." *Journal of Architecture* 11, no. 3 (2006): 329–333.
- Holder, Andrew. "The Stories Bricks Tell Themselves." *Pidgin* 16 (2013).
- Huxley, Margo. "The Limits to Communicative Planning." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 19 (2000): 77–86.
- Innes, Judith. "Planning Theory's Emerging Paradigm: Communicative Action and Interactive Practice." *Journal of Planning Education and Research* 14, no. 3 (1995): 183–189.
- Irigaray, Luce. *An Ethics of Sexual Difference*. Ithaca, N.Y.: Cornell University Press, 1993.
- Jameson, Fredric. "Is Space Political?" *Anywhere*, edited by Cynthia C. Davidson, 193–205. New York: Anyone Corporation, 1995.
- . *Postmodernism or the Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 1991.
- Kaminer, Tahl. *Architecture, Crisis and Resuscitation: The Reproduction of Post-Fordism in Late-Twentieth-Century Architecture*. Oxford, UK: Routledge, 2011.
- Kapp, Silke. "Construction Sites of Utopia." Paper presented at the 11th International AHRA Conference, "Industries of Architecture: Relations, Process, Production," Newcastle, UK, November 13–15, 2014.
- Keen, Andrew. *The Internet Is Not the Answer*. London: Atlantic Books, 2015.
- Klingmann, Anna. *Brandscapes: Architecture in the Experience Economy*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007.
- Knight, Sam. "How Uber Conquered London," *The Guardian* (April 27, 2016): accessed May 25, 2016, <https://www.theguardian.com/technology/2016/apr/27/how-uber-conquered-london>.
- Koch, Daniel. "A Cortege of Ghostly Bodies: Abstraction, Prothesis, and the Logic of the Mannequin." In *Architecture and Feminisms: Ecologies, Economies, Technologies*, edited by Hélène Frichot, Catharina Gabriellsson, and Helen Runting, 99–105. London: Routledge, 2017.
- Kokalitcheva, Kia. "Uber Completes 1 Billion Rides." *Fortune* (December 30, 2015): accessed June 13, 2016, <http://fortune.com/2015/12/30/uber-completes-1-billion-rides/>.

- Koolhaas, Rem. *Delirious New York: A Retroactive Manifesto for Manhattan*. New York: The Monacelli Press, 1994 [1978].
- Kristeva, Julia. "Institutional Interdisciplinarity in Theory and Practice: An Interview." In *The Anxiety of Interdisciplinarity, De-, Dis-, Ex-, Vol. 2*, edited by Alex Coles and Alexia Defert, 3–21. London: Blackdog Publishing, 1998.
- KTH Royal Institute of Technology, "Architecture: Study Plan for Third-Cycle Subject, 2010." Stockholm: KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 2010. Accessed March 18, 2018, <https://www.kth.se/student/kurser/dr/subj-ARKITEKT-en.pdf>.
- Kuzma, Marta, Pablo Lafuente, and Peter Osborne, eds. *The State of Things*. Oslo: Office for Contemporary Art, 2012.
- Kwon, Miwon. *One Place After Another: Site-Specific Art and Locational Identity*. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2002.
- Lacy, Suzanne. *Mapping the Terrain: New Genre Public Art*. Seattle, Wash.: Bay Press, 1995.
- Lang, Peter, and William Menking. *Superstudio: Life Without Objects*. Milan: Skira, 2003.
- Larsen, Lars Bang. "The Long Nineties." *Frieze* 144 (January-February 2012): accessed March 31, 2018, <https://frieze.com/article/long-nineties>.
- Larsson, Christer. *Gestaltade Livsmiljö—en ny politik för arkitektur, form och design* (SOU 2015:88). Stockholm: Statens offentliga utredningar, 2015.
- Latour, Bruno. "Why Has Critique Run Out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern." *Critical Inquiry* 30, no. 2 (2004): 225–248.
- . *Reassembling the Social: An Introduction to Actor-Network-Theory*. Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 2005.
- Lavin, Sylvia. *Kissing Architecture*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 2011.
- Lazzarato, Maurizio. "Immaterial Labour." In *Radical Thought in Italy: A Potential Politics*, edited by Paolo Virno and Michael Hardt, 133–150. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1996.
- . "Strategies of the Political Entrepreneur." *SubStance* 36, no.1, issue 112 (2009): 86–97.
- . *Governing by Debt*. Los Angeles: Semiotext(e), 2015.
- . *Signs and Machines: Capitalism and the Production of Subjectivity*. Los Angeles, 2014.
- . *The Making of the Indebted Man*. Los Angeles, CA: Semiotext(e), 2012.
- Le Corbusier. *Towards a New Architecture*. New York: Dover Publications, 1986[1931].
- Lind, Hans. "Price Bubbles in Housing Markets: Concept Theory and Indicators." *International Journal of Housing Markets and Analysis* 2, no. 1 (2009): 78–90.

- Lindstrand, Tor. "Glitch Architecture." *LO-RES 1* (2014): cover gatefold.
- Lorde, Audre. "The Master's Tools Will Never Dismantle the Master's House." In *The Bridge Called My Back: Writings by Radical Women of Color*, edited by Cherríe Moraga and Gloria Anzaldúa. New York, The Kitchen Table Press, 1983.
- Mack, Jennifer. *The Construction of Equality: Syriac Immigration and the Swedish City*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2017.
- Marçal, Katrine. *Who Cooked Adam Smith's Dinner? A Story About Women and Economics*. London, 2016 [2015].
- Markusen, Ann. "Sticky Places in Slippery Space: A Typology of Industrial Districts." *Economic Geography* 72, no. 3 (1996): 293–313.
- Martin, Reinhold, Jacob Moore, and Susanne Schindler, eds. *The Art of Inequality: Architecture, Housing, and Real Estate: A Provisional Report*. New York: Temple Hoyne Buell Center for the Study of American Architecture, Columbia University, 2015.
- Martin, Reinhold. *Utopia's Ghost: Architecture and Postmodernism, Again*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010.
- Massey, Doreen. *For Space*. London: SAGE, 2005.
- Mattsson, Helena, and Sven-Olov Wallenstein. "Introduction." In *Swedish Modernism: Architecture, Consumption, and the Welfare State*, edited by Helena Mattsson and Sven-Olov Wallenstein. Black Dog Publishing: London, 2010.
- McCarthy, Cormac. *The Road*. London: Picador, 2006.
- McLuhan, Marshall. "The Invisible Environment." *Perspecta* 11 (1967): 163–167.
- Metzger, Jonathan. "Strange Spaces: A Rationale for Bringing Art into the Planning Process." *Planning Theory* 10, no. 3 (2011): 213–238.
- Miranda Carranza, Pablo. "Program Matters: From Drawing to Code." Doctoral thesis, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 2018.
- Mouffe, Chantal. *On the Political*. London: Routledge, 2005.
- Mulvey, Laura. "Visual Pleasure and Narrative Cinema" [1973]. In *Film Theory and Criticism: Introductory Readings*, edited by Leo Braudy and Marshall Cohen, 833–844. New York: Oxford University Press, 1999).
- Mumford, Lewis. *Technics and Civilization*. New York: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich, 1962.
- Murakami, Haruki. *Dance Dance Dance*. New York: Vintage Books, 1994 [1988], 86.
- O'Keefe, Brian, and Marty Jones. "How Uber Plays the Tax Shell Game." *Fortune* (October 22, 2015): accessed online June 13, 2016, <http://fortune.com/2015/10/22/uber-tax-shell/>.
- Parkkila, Sebastian. "Hornstull blir "gaffel- och knivsöder" [Hornstull Becomes Knife and Fork Söder]. *Dagens Media* (April 26, 2013): accessed September

- 20, 2017, <https://www.dagensmedia.se/marknadsforing/kampanjer/hornstull-blir-gaffel-och-knivsoder-6113493>.
- Peck, Jamie, Nik Theodore, and Neil Brenner. "Neoliberal Urbanism: Models, Moments, Mutations." *SAIS Review* XXIX, no. 1 (Spring–Winter 2009): 49–66.
- Pine, B. Joseph and James H. Gilmore. "Welcome to the Experience Economy." *Harvard Business Review* (July–August 1998): 100.
- . *The Experience Economy: Work is Theatre and Every Business a Stage*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard Business School Press, 1999.
- . "Welcome to the Experience Economy." *Harvard Business Review* (July–August 1998): 97–105.
- Power, Nina. "Towards a Feminism of the Void" (November 9, 2017): accessed January 17, 2018, <https://ninapower.net/2017/11/09/191/>.
- Purcell, Mark. "Resisting Neoliberalization: Communicative Planning or Counter-Hegemonic Movements?" *Planning Theory* 8, no. 2 (2009): 140–165.
- Quaintance, Morgan. "Claire Bishop: Artificial Hells" [book review]. *Art Monthly* 359 (September 2012): accessed March 31, 2018, <https://morganquaintance.com/2012/09/03/claire-bishop-artificial-hells/>.
- Rajan, Sudhir Chella. "Automobility and the Liberal Disposition." In *Against Automobility*, edited by Steffen Böhm, Campbell Jones, Chris Land, and Matthew Paterson. Malden, MA: Blackwell Publishing, 2006.
- Remsen, Nick. "Global Street Style Report: Mapping Out the 15 Coolest Neighborhoods in the World," *Vogue* /September 5, 2014): <http://www.vogue.com/slideshow/1080625/fifteen-coolest-street-style-neighborhoods/>.
- Rendell, Jane. "Between Two: Theory and Practice." *Journal of Architecture* 8 (Summer 2003): 221–238.
- . "Tendencies and Trajectories: Feminist Approaches in Architecture." In *The SAGE Handbook of Architectural Theory*, edited by Crysler, C. Greig, Stephen Cairns, and Hilde Heynen, 85–97. London: Sage, 2013.
- . *Art and Architecture: A Space Between*. London: I.B. Tauris, 2006.
- Ricchi, Daria. "There's No Fantasy Without Reality: Calvino's Architectural Fictions." *Pidgin* 16 (2013).
- Dolphijn, Rick, and Iris van der Tuin, eds. *New Materialism: Interviews and Cartographies*. Ann Arbor, MI: Open Humanities Press, 2012.
- Ring, Beda, Brady Burroughs, and Henri T. Beall. *Architectural Flirtations: A Love Storey*. Stockholm: Arkitektur- och designcentrum, 2016.
- Rose, Gillian. *Visual Methodologies: An Introduction to the Interpretation of Visual Materials*, 2. ed. London: Sage, 2007.
- Rosenblad, Alex, and Luke Stark. "DRAFT: Uber's Drivers: Information Asymmetries and Control in Dynamic Work" [Workshop Paper prepared for the

- Winter School “Labour in the on-demand economy” at the Centre for European Policy Studies (CEPS) in Brussels, Belgium November 23-25, 2015]. Accessed June 13, 2016, http://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=2686227.
- Runting, Helen. “Material Conversations: Autonomy, Performativity and Being Between in Urban Planning.” Master’s thesis, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 2009.
- . “The Waiting Room.” In *Feminist Futures of Spatial Practice: Materialism, Activism, Dialogues, Pedagogies, Projections*, edited by Meike Schalk, Thérèse Kristiansson, and Ramia Mazé, 253–257. Baunach: AADR, 2017.
- Sadler, Simon. “Open Ends: The Social Visions of 1960s Non-Planning.” *Non-Plan: Essays on Freedom Participation and Change in Modern Architecture and Urbanism*, edited by Jonathan Hughes and Simon Sadler. Oxford: Architectural Press Sadler, 2000.
- SAS. “Söder Pops.” *Scanorama* (November 2013). Stockholm: DG Communications AB, 2013.
- Saunders, William S., ed. *The New Architectural Pragmatism*. Minneapolis, University of Minnesota Press, 2007.
- Scott, Felicity. *Architecture and Techno-Utopia: Politics After Modernism*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2007. “Bifo” Berardi, Franco. “The Zero Zero Decade.” In *After the Future*, edited by Gary Genosko and Nicholas Thoburn, 67–96. Edinburgh: AK, 2014.
- Seigworth, Gregory, and Melissa Gregg. “An Inventory of Shimmers.” In *The Affect Theory Reader*, edited by Gregory Seigworth and Melissa Gregg, 1–25. Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2010.
- Sigge, Erik. “Architecture’s Red Tape: Government Building Construction in Sweden, 1963–173.” Doctoral thesis, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 2017.
- Simondon, Gilbert. “The Genesis of the Individual.” In *Incorporations*, edited by Jonathan Crary and Sanford Kwinter, 297–319. New York: Zone Books, 1992.
- Sloterdijk, Peter. *Foams: Spheres III*, translated by Wieland Hoban. New York: Semiotext(e), 2016.
- Sofia, Zoë. “Container Technologies.” *Hypatia* 15, no. 2 (2000): 181–200.
- Somol, Robert, and Sarah Whiting. “Notes Around the Doppler Effect and Other Moods of Modernism.” Special issue, *Perspecta* 33 (2002): 72–77.
- Somol, Robert. “Indifferent Urbanism: Graphic Standards and Urban Norms” [workshop paper presented at Holcim Forum] (2007). Accessed April 3, 2009, <http://www.holcimfoundation.org/Portals/1/docs/F07/wK-norm/F07-wK-norm-somol02.pdf>.
- Sontag, Susan. “Letter from Sweden.” *Ramparts* (July, 1969): 23–38.
- Spencer, Douglas. *The Architecture of Neoliberalism: How Contemporary Architecture Became an Instrument of Control and Compliance*. London: Bloomsbury, 2016.

- Stengers, Isabelle. *In Catastrophic Times: Resisting the Coming Barbarism*. Open Humanities Press, 2015. Accessed April 12, 2017, http://openhumanitiespress.org/books/download/Stengers_2015_In-Catastrophic-Times.pdf.
- . “Introductory Notes on an Ecology of Practices,” *Cultural Studies Review* 11, no. 1 (March 2005): 183–196.
- Svensk Standard. *Bygglovsboken: Flerbostadshus 2014*. Stockholm: Svensk Standard, 2015.
- Sveriges Arkitekter [Architects Sweden]. *Sveriges Arkitekters Branschrapport 2017: På väg mot nya marknader*. Edited by Charlotta Hildebrand (Sveriges Arkitekter: Stockholm, 2017).
- SVT. “I Väsby bygger man nya centrum - med klossar” [news item] [In Väsby, They Are Building A New Center—With Blocks]. *ABC Nytt* (September 13, 2012): viewed September 14, 2012, <http://www.svt.se/nyheter/regionalt/abc/i-vasby-bygger-man-nya-centrum-med-klossar>.
- . “Stadsplanering som performance: en lyckad idé?” [news item] [Urban Planning as a Performance: A Successful Idea?]. *ABC Nytt* (September 5, 2012): viewed September 14, 2012, at <http://www.svtplay.se/klipp/275956/stadsplanering-som-performance-en-lyckad-ide->.
- Sykes, A. Krista. “Introduction.” In *Constructing a New Agenda: Architectural Theory 1993–2009*, edited by A. Krista Sykes, 14–29. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2010.
- Tag-Eldeen, Zeinab. “Cross-Cultural Knowledge Development—The Case of Collaborative Urban Planning in Egypt.” Doctoral thesis, KTH Royal Institute of Technology, 2012.
- Teixeira Pinto, Ana. “Three New Publications on Socially Engaged Art by Claire Bishop, Creative Time, and Pablo Helguera” [book review]. *Frieze* 149 (September 1, 2012). Accessed April 1, 2018, <https://frieze.com/article/books-20?language=de>.
- The Chicago Manual of Style*, 16th ed. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 2010.
- Thrift, Nigel. *Non-Representational Theory: Space, Politics, Affect*. Oxon: Routledge, 2008.
- Till, Jeremy. *Architecture Depends*. Cambridge, Massachusetts: MIT Press, 2009.
- Torisson, Fredrik. “An Article about Nothing.” *Lo-Res* 1 (2015): 47–55.
- . “Utopology: A Re-Interrogation of the Utopian in Architecture.” Doctoral thesis, LTH, Lund University, 2017.
- UN-Habitat. *An Urbanizing World: Global Report on Human Settlements 1996*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1996.
- van Santen, Peter och Dilan Ölcer. “Svenska hushållens skuldsättsning – uppdatering för 2016” [Swedish Household Debt—Update for 2016]. *Ekonomiska kommentarer* 5 (November 22, 2016)(Stockholm: Riksbanken, 2016): accessed June 12, 2017, http://www.riksbank.se/Documents/Rapporter/Ekonomiska_kommentarer/2016/rap_ek_kom_nr5_161122_sve.pdf.

- van Toorn, Roemer. “Fresh Conservatism: Landscapes of Normality.” Accessed April 18, 2018, <http://www.roemervantoorn.nl/Resources/Fresh%20Conservatism.pdf>.
- Vatter, Miguel. *The Republic of the Living: Biopolitics and the Critique of Civil Society*. New York: Fordham University Press, 2014.
- Venturi, Robert, Denise Scott Brown, and Steven Izenour. *Learning from Las Vegas: The Forgotten Symbolism of Architectural Form*, rev. ed. Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1977.
- Venturi, Robert. *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*. London: The Architectural Press, 1977.
- Vogl, Josef. *The Specter of Capital*. Stanford, California: Stanford University Press, 2015.
- . *The Specter of Capital*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 2015.
- Wagenaar, Cor. *Happy: Cities and Public Happiness in Post-War Europe*. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 2004.
- Wajcman, Judy. “Technocapitalism Meets Technofeminism: Women and Technology in a Wireless World.” *Labor and Industry: Journal of the Social and Economic Relations of Work* 16, no. 3 (2006): 7–20.
- Wallenstein, Sven-Olov. “Noopolitics, Life, and Architecture.” In *Cognitive Architecture. From Biopolitics to Noopolitics in the Age of Communication and Information*, edited by Deborah Hauptmann and Warren Neidlich, 46–60. Rotterdam: 101 Publishers, 2010.
- Wallenstein, Sven-Olov. *Bio-Politics and the Emergence of Modern Architecture*. New York: The Temple Hoyne Buell Center and Princeton Architectural Press, 2009.
- Weizman, Eyal. *Forensic Architecture: Violence at the Threshold of Detectability*. New York, Zone Books, 2017.
- . “Lethal Theory.” *Log 7* (Winter/Spring 2006): 53–77.
- Williams, James. “Deleuze’s Ontology and Creativity: Becoming in Architecture.” *Le Pli* 9 (2000): 200–219.
- Yiftachel, Oren. “Planning and Social Control: Exploring the Dark Side.” *Journal of Planning Literature* 12, no. 2 (1994): 395–406.
- Zimm, Malin. “Slow Watch: A Sci-Fi Novel About the Ecology of Time in the Society of Fear.” In *Architecture and Feminisms: Ecologies, Economies, Technologies*, edited by H el ene Frichot, Catharina Gabrielsson, and Helen Runting, 163–169. London: Routledge, 2017.

