

The *Fotoromanzi* were fictionalized chronicles with real actors ... The second one was titled *Utopia*, the first was *Lotta per la Casa (Struggle for Housing)*. We thought, we architects also want to change the world. In pages you see me explaining what utopia is. We talk about urban transformation, about the problem of communication, about the relations with unions ... We had this intuition: *Lotta per la Casa* is a struggle of the workers and *Utopia* a struggle of the architects; then there was the problem of mediation, and this was the intermediate struggle.

Piero Derossi, Interview by Olympia Kazi, Turin, 01.18.2006

GLOBAL TOOLS

I was part of Global Tools and I have actually printed the bulletins with my hands. It was not a magazine; it was a collective publication. The base of Global Tools was Milan in via Brera, in the gallery of Castelli. He had given us a space and even a small stipend. What happened was that at the end the group of Global Tools eventually broke up because of those hundred thousand lire. The Florentines wanted to have that money because they had to commute from Florence. The sad story with money, which always happens.

Ugo La Pietra, Contributor. Interview by Olympia Kazi, Milan, 06.30.2005

MEGASCOPE

The first magazine I did was called *The Parish Magazine*. It was just two sheets of what was then Roneo, you know Roneo? You typed it into an onion-skin, you type it onto that, and any corrections you could actually paint them out. Anyway we produced that. That was very much a protest magazine about the conflicts between the new students and the older students ... At the time we wrote, we thought that everything was terribly boring, as a lot of it was really, because this was before Kings Road and swinging London got going. (BC, MW)

I was quite active in the British Architectural Students Association called BASA, and so I guess there was a need for something, a space for a magazine that linked us all up, and we had seen *Archigram* of course. We'd been aware of *Archigram* largely through Cedric Price, who came down to Bristol to give a talk and I think his appearance in Bristol changed a lot of people's lives really ... So I think [*Megascope*] was partly sort of a protest of what we thought was grey and dull in the architecture of the older generation, and partly a protest against the school as we saw it in Bristol, and partly an interest with what Archigram had produced and in doing something of our own, which was very different, but that again used the same sort of technology, put together very easily. (IS)

Peter Murray, Editor 1964–1965. Interviews by Beatriz Colomina and Mark Wigley, London, 10.14.2005 and Irene Sunwoo, London, 11.03.2005.

ON SITE

I chose this format specifically because when opened up it was about the horizon, it was about the site, it was about vista, it was not about the object, the thing. It has very playful juxtapositions. My intention always was that these publications be read on several levels. They can be read by the headings – you can get a message by just reading through the large headings; they can be read visually and you don't have to read the text; or you can read the text.

We produced it ourselves. I can't remember how many we [first] produced – somehow 5000 sticks in my mind. I came up with the theme, then did the research, found the images, did the layouts, took it to a printer and had it printed. I set the type, well actually, the original publications were set with hot type, the old leaded type – before they went to computer type, and then sent them out. We sent them to everyone, from every category, arts, architecture, libraries. We got a lot of response. It succeeded in generating this dialogue.

Actually we had much more enthusiastic response to the publications than to the projects we were trying to build ... Because they were less threatening in a certain way and also everybody loves to be published. So suddenly you became everybody's best friend because you were publishing things.

Alison Sky, Editor 1972–1974, Interview by Anthony Fontenot, New York, 10.20.2006

OPPOSITIONS

I went to England and I met Ken [Frampton] through Colin [Rowe]. Ken had just become the editor of *Architectural Design* at the end of 1961 or 1962. Kenneth and I used to meet and talk and I said, I am going back to Princeton and we are going to start a group and I am going to get you come over and be the editor of our magazine. It was called Re:Form, that was the name of the journal, and then it was called Case. There were a lot of names for this journal.*

Well let me tell you what happened. We paid for Ken to come over for this meeting. And we flew him over, and Emilio [Ambasz] picked him up in a limousine, dressed as a chauffeur! It's a true story. So we have this meeting and we elect Ken to be the editor of this magazine. Ken says, alright, I want to choose my editorial board: he chooses three people, but not me. And we didn't talk for two years. He chose Stan Anderson and Hank Millon.

I believe that the only source of true material were *prima facie* magazines, the magazines of 1910, 1920, the magazines of 1930 were the record of what was happening. And for us the whole idea of *Oppositions* was to record that moment in the seventies in America, and the relationship between America and Europe. We were trying to set up a theoretical framework for thinking in the United States. And we were dealing with *Arquitecturas Bis*, and dealing with *Lotus*, and *AMC [Architecture Mouvement Continuité]*, we were all in the same mode.

I designed the first issue of *Oppositions*, I still have it. It had a grey cover and it was "O" "positions" with the "p" dropped out, and it had serif type and it was really awful. So we took it to Massimo [Vignelli] and I said, I want it to have a grey cover and Massimo said, absolutely not, it has to be orange because that will stand out on the bookshelf.

And of course we did a tricky thing you know, in *Oppositions*, we mislabeled: we'd get a Tafuri article that was written in 1975 and we would say that this came out in 1974. We always misdated so we will always be the first bibliographically.

Peter Eisenman, Editor 1973–1982. Interview by Beatriz Colomina and Urtzi Grau, New York, 10.18.2006.

*Re:Form and Case were never published.

[Peter] Eisenman for a long time had this idea in his head that there had never been a modern movement in the United States. I came to the States because of Eisenman, basically. He had met me in London when I was editing *Architectural Design* – in fact I was responsible for publishing an extract from his Ph.D. thesis at Cambridge – and he had invited me to Princeton to teach, and part of his project at that moment was to actually start a magazine, in Princeton. There was this notion of trying to develop a polemical modern movement in the United States, which in his opinion had never existed as it had existed in Europe. So *Oppositions* had this aim, and Peter had this aim, that it should be polemical, the organ, hypothetically, of an avant-garde movement in the United States.

Kenneth Frampton, Editor 1973–1982. Interview by Urtzi Grau, Daniel Lopez-Perez, and Irene Sunwoo, New York, 10.10.2006

"Oppositions" was the place in which current work would be, [it was] where Peter did his piece on the Smithsons and where we published [James] Stirling, but no project would be published without critique. It wasn't a vanity magazine in that sense for our friends. "Theory" was obviously that which we wanted to bring to America and was largely European-based, bringing a lot of the questions that had already been around in England and in Spain and in Italy in particular. I brought the French in, but in a historical way. In general the axis was Anglo-Italian-Spanish, and I think that was because of Peter's total affection for Italy, and Mario [Gandelonas'] sense of where Spain was, and later Peter, because of *Arquitecturas Bis*, was in touch with Rafael Moneo and [Oriol] Bohigas. We wanted to do "History" in such a way that it contributed to people's understanding of the roots of different kinds of thinking, and different kinds of production. Basically it was to counter post-modernism and the style wars that were going on. And "Documents" was definitely an inheritance from *Form*. We found some good documents, but it was always difficult to get good translations.

Anthony Vidler, Editor 1976–1984. Interview by Beatriz Colomina and Daniel Lopez-Perez, New York, 10.22.2006

TRANSPARENT: Manuscript für Architektur, Theorie, Kritik, Polemic, Ummaum

The new architecture with glass and with new room dispositions is a transparent architecture, and we architects sketch on transparent paper, and this was also used for the cover, and so had a double sense. And also transparency in society, political transparency was very important.

Günther Feuerstein, Editor 1970–1988. Interview by Craig Buckley, Vienna, 08.16.2006

VH 101

I was not involved with the almost legendary Russian issue of *VH-101*, but I know something about its origin. This theoretically quarterly magazine had been created in 1970 by Françoise Karshan-Essellier, and was edited by her and Otto Hahn until 1972 ... Françoise Essellier had met with Francesco Dal Co, the key figure in the making of the Soviet issue of *VH-101*, who proposed her to make a special issue putting together all of the scholars who had been involved in working on the Russian Avant-garde at the Venice Institute of Architecture.

Jean-Louis Cohen, New York. Interview by Alicia Imperiale, New York, 09.07.2006

CLIP/STAMP/FOLD: THE RADICAL ARCHITECTURE OF LITTLE MAGAZINES 196X – 197X

NOVEMBER 14, 2006 – JANUARY 31, 2007 OPENING RECEPTION: TUESDAY NOVEMBER 14, 6 – 8PM

CURATED BY BEATRIZ COLOMINA, CRAIG BUCKLEY, ANTHONY FONTENOT, URTZI GRAU, LISA HSIEH, ALICIA IMPERIALE, LYDIA KALLIPOLITI, OLYMPIA KAZI, DANIEL LOPEZ-PEREZ, AND IRENE SUNWOO AT PRINCETON UNIVERSITY

WWW.CLIPSTAMPFOLD.COM



Storefront for Art and Architecture

97 KENMARE STREET NEW YORK NY 10012 TEL 212 431 5795
www.storefrontnews.org

Clip/Stamp/Fold

THE RADICAL ARCHITECTURE OF LITTLE MAGAZINES 196X – 197X NOVEMBER 14, 2006 – JANUARY 31, 2007 STOREFRONT FOR ART AND ARCHITECTURE WWW.CLIPSTAMPFOLD.COM

INTERVIEWS & FIRST-PERSON ACCOUNTS

ACTIONS COMMUNICATIONS CENTRE AND SYMBOLS

We knew that all the different schools had these different programs going on, and we never knew until it was too late, who was lecturing where ... Basically what we did was we got our friends in the other architecture schools to tell us what was happening and to make a kind of *Time Out* for architecture. And the guy who started *Time Out* was actually an architecture student who saw this thing and started *Time Out*. We made this little newsheet, which was this four-page thing, and it was a list of all the different lectures at all the different schools.

Grahame Shane, Editor 1964–1965. Interview by Irene Sunwoo, New York, 10.24.2005

ADVERTISEMENTS FOR ARCHITECTURE

The first time I started to do the advertisements was in 1976 in New York, and they came simultaneously in the context of magazines. In other words, *Oppositions* had asked me to publish an article, and I said yes, but I wanted to put in one of the advertisements for architecture, which I was already thinking about. And, then in the context of other magazine articles—in *Architectural Design*, then it was a Japanese magazine—every time I did an article, I would at the same time have a number of pages interspersed with the article, which would show these advertisements for architecture. So, in other words, I was trying to simultaneously reinforce the argument that was made in the text, but at the same time to have something that could function totally independently from the text, and so independently that they were made as a series of postcards, which were sold at the time at a place down in SoHo in New York.

I was very close to Antoine Grumbach, [Christian] Portzamparc, and a couple of other people who were very much involved in the making of these magazines. It was only later, actually, in 1971, when I began work for the *AD* issue [*Beaux Arts since '68*, September 1971] that I met other people, like Hubert Tonka, who had been already involved with the major magazine *Utopie*, and that's also when I met [Jean] Baudrillard and all these people, but I was not directly involved in their production. It's quite amusing that for the longest time I had next to one another on my shelf one of the little magazines produced by Superstudio covered with artificial fur, then another one published by Utopie at almost the same time, covered with sand paper. And I tell you, the touch of sand paper is an absolutely horrible touch, and those two together were brilliant.

Bernard Tschumi, Interview by Beatriz Colomina and Craig Buckley, New York, 10.22.2006.

ANGELUS NOVUS

It is in this climate in the middle of the sixties that myself and Massimo Cacciari began *Angelus Novus*. It was a strange magazine, in the sense that it was a magazine that was very much in line with [Franco] Fortini and [Walter] Benjamin. Our points of reference were explicit: Benjamin, Adorno and Frankfurt. In 1964, I think, or in 1963, the first book of Benjamin was translated into Italian. It was entitled *Angelus Novus*.

Cesare De Michelis, Editor 1964–1974. Interview by Alicia Imperiale, Venice, 06.29.2006

There was a first step: there were these two guys. [Massimo] Cacciari and Cesare de Michelis were *enfants terribles*. They already started in 1959 or 1960 as high school students to publish a magazine named *Il Volto*, the "Face." *Il Volto* was really a high school magazine, but very ambitious, and in 1964 *Il Volto* became *Angelus Novus* ... If you look at *Angelus Novus*, I think the same year, 1968 or perhaps 1967, there was a text about De Stijl written by a group with Massimo Cacciari and Francesco Dal Co and some other students. It was the result of a seminar held at the university in 1965 to 1966 and then re-elaborated. And the criticism against [Giulio Carlo] Argan and against Argan's interpretation of the Bauhaus was very heavy.

Marco De Michelis, Contributor 1968–1971. Interview by Alicia Imperiale, Venice 06.27.2006

ARCHIGRAM

We in theory met at each other's apartments, and somehow we hung onto the idea of doing the paper, and the "gram" aspect was very important. It should not be a magazine; it should be a "gram" – like an aerogram or a telegram. The key thing was that it was not a mag; it was a "gram." And so it was very important that it should not be in a format like a magazine. I can very simply give you the economics. There was a size that went on a printing machine, which was something like fifteen by nine [inches]. It was all made upon an offset litho economic print-size. For very few pounds you could get this thing run off on that size. Therefore if you analyze the first issue of *Archigram*, it was whatever that size was not for aesthetic reasons, but because it was cheap. And then we printed the front sheet, the one that has the potato print on it, in the basement of [Taylor Woodrow]. David and I worked in the same office and we convinced the secretary to help us print the front sheet, which was just an ordinary foolscap sheet of paper. So it was all cheap, cheap, cheap. And funnily enough, the printer, which was around the corner from our office, was next door to Cedric Price's office. He was in the basement next to the printer. It was incredibly local. The whole of London, our office, the place who printed it and Cedric Price were all within one block.

Peter Cook, Editor 1961–1970. Interview by curatorial group, Princeton, 11.16.2004

The one thing that's very important in publishing or whatever it might be is the technology that's available. Now what's happening in this boundary between the fifties and sixties is that offset litho printing became available as a general high speed facility, as opposed to letter-press, which requires professional, industrial equipment, because in letter-press all the characters are set with individual slides of metal – whether its cold metal or hot metal or sliding type, or whatever system –whereas offset litho enables you to take either typewriting or handwriting or sketches or drawings or whatever, and to reproduce them. So small magazines only became possible when the printing technology became possible as well.

Architectural magazines – whether it's American or English or European – still depends a great deal on the advertisers. They don't sell enough magazines to pay for the production of the magazines. They rely on advertising almost universally. So what they show in these magazines is what the advertisers have contributed to building. So they tend to show buildings. At that time, they never showed anything other than built work. (G)

Dennis Crompton, Editor 1963–1970. Interview by curatorial group, Princeton, 11.10.2005

ARCHITECTURAL ASSOCIATION QUARTERLY

The first major publication that really set out the Architectural Association students' position in the pre-war current period was called *Focus* [1938–1939]. There were four issues of that ... and that was followed by another magazine, also edited at the AA, which was called *Plan* [1943–1951]. Without *Focus* and *Plan* I don't think *Architectural Association Quarterly* would have been what it was. I knew the editors quite well.

I came January the first 1969 back to the AA. And then we had a short period where they ran out of money for [the AA's journal] *Arena* and it became *Arena/Interbuild*, a dreadful magazine ... And so I said, we can't go on like this. *Arena* seems to be obscured by meaningless technological articles, articles which really didn't make any sense for the AA membership, so I said, let's try and create a new magazine. But, I said, I want an academic magazine, but one that opens up the debate on architecture internationally. And the creation of *Architectural Association Quarterly* started January 1969. (IS)

Dennis Sharp, Editor 1969–1982. Interview by Irene Sunwoo, London, 11.02.2005

ARCHITECTURAL DESIGN

I made a certain effort to create special issues, or anyway, issues which gave a definite emphasis to certain buildings and to certain manifestations in Europe ... In a way I had tried to push the magazine more towards the character that Ernesto Rogers' *Casabella* had had. That wasn't really Monica [Pidgion, editor of *AD*]s way of working, but she didn't resist it particularly. I would say that was my primary role in shaping the magazine over that short period of time ... I know that in the thirties magazines like *Wendigen* would devote from time to time a complete issue to one building. It still seems to me that that is a missing element in architectural publishing even now.

Kenneth Frampton, Technical Editor 1962–1965. Interview by Urtzi Grau, Daniel Lopez-Perez, and Irene Sunwoo, New York, 10.10.2006

Well, we used to have [Cosmorama], this little bit in the front where you say what the magazines are saying, and you do summaries of them. And people became more and more interested in that than the contents of the magazine itself. And so we expanded it, and tried to make it more lively. In fact that became the bit that I was interested in, and, well you can see that it was why people bought the magazine at that time.

AD wasn't influenced in any way by little magazines, but when I first moved to the office I knew all the Archigram people, and we did an issue on Archigram soon after that. And other people – Antfarm, all those little groups around the world – started sending stuff to us. As I said, at the beginning we were publishing what was sent in. Everybody, every sort of freak sent in stuff. And that included most of the little magazines – all the Austrian ones. Hans Hollein had a little magazine, then he became editor of *Bau*, the Austrian magazine. And there was Haus Rucker, too. They did a little thing. They used to send us all this stuff; sometimes it was related to magazines, sometimes not. And then *Melpomène* in France, that little one, they sent us stuff. They used to send us stuff because they wanted us to publicize it, or publish something from it. So we did both, always in Cosmorama.

Robin Middleton, Technical Editor 1965–1972. Interview by Craig Buckley and Irene Sunwoo, New York, 10.23.2006

I was scanning through international magazines for things that we could pick up [for Cosmorama]. The first one we opened was *Times* magazine. They used to have a section in the front of *Times* magazine on “new products.” They would invariably pick up some new NASA based or interesting material, something that they could see for more general use, but we could see uses related to the building industry. That technological transfer partly came about because you couldn’t find the right materials in things like the *Standard Catalogue*. You just couldn’t find them. (LK)

The company who owned *AD* wanted to get rid of it but Monica came up with a new sort of economic model. Because the standard model of magazines is that you get a bit of money from subscriptions and you get quite a lot of money from advertising, but the advertising for some reason was moving away from *AD* so she set it up in what we called then the book economy, i.e. all your income comes from subscriptions. (BC, MW)

Peter Murray, Art Director 1969–1973, Technical Editor 1973–74. Interviews by Lydia Kallipoliti, London, 11.25.2005; and Beatriz Colomina and Mark Wigley, London, 10.14.2005.

AMC: Architecture Mouvement Continuité

AMC remains a really interesting magazine and was central in the action of my generation ... This is when I come into picture, around 1976, entering the board and writing on the adventures of André Lurçat in Russia ... If you look at the core series of the magazine in between the years 1975, 1974 and 1980 you have an absolutely fundamental locus, for instance with excellent interviews that still are important documents. I remember an interview with Peter Eisenman, done by Françoise Very, who was a former alumna of Tafari at the Venice School. There were very important essays allowing for the rediscovery of the architecture of the social democratic garden cities built in the 1930s, a useful piece on Adolf Loos’ work in Paris, and very significant revisions in the analysis of Le Corbusier’s work that led to the 1987 exhibition at the Pompidou. It must be also said that the magazine was closely connected with the work being done in at least two schools of architecture, the one in Belleville – at that time called the Unité Pédagogique numéro 8 – and the one in Versailles. Two groups were involved: the one of Bernard Huet and the one of [Jean] Castex, [Phillipe] Panerai and [Jean-Charles] Depaule on the other. In short, this has been a very refined magazine, which also had a very broad international spectrum looking at Italy, at Spain, at the U.S. At that time, it coincided with the editorship of Bernard Huet at *l’Architecture d’aujourd’hui*, and this could be considered as a sort of golden age lasting from 1973/1974 and the late 1970s, in which the 1968 generation dropped politics in order to start working on more theoretical, historical or design-related issues.

Jean-Louis Cohen, Editor 1977–1983. Interview by Alicia Imperiale, New York, 09.07.2006

ARCHITEXT

At the time, when we started, there already were such things as Archizoom and *Archigram*. So we said, let’s do something with “archi-”. And we knew “architect” wouldn’t do, so we crossed it out. The cross, in fact, became an X! Secondly, it was just a play on words: “architect” and “text.” I think that was how we came to it.

Takefumi Aida, Editor 1970–1972. Interview by Lisa Hsieh, Tokyo, 09.08.2006.

ARSe

It’s a bit to feed our parody, so we tried to cross out the spelling of “architect” on top of the “c.” So it has a dual meaning: denying the idea of a conventional architect ... And my idea was that we use a regular format, but we make it square. There was already in circulation among mathematicians *Le Carré Bleu* from France. “Blue square.”

The reason is mostly cost saving, I think, because it is easy to mail it, and cheap to print it. It’s connected – one, two, three, four, five – so it becomes a slip. When we sent it, we folded it to make it twenty-one by twenty-one [centimeters].

>>

You see, the book distribution system in Japan is very, very strange, because it’s sort of a monopoly. We tried to avoid that. So first we tried to send each of them separately to our friends. It’s a limited circulation. We tried to make it very loose looking; we avoided having a big statement, a manifesto kind of thing, which Metabolism did. We tried not to get into that kind of serious manner, but a more loose one. That’s the main reason why we circulated it for free.

In order to decide the theme, we got together within this vicinity, and sharing lunch, and [Mayumi] Miyawaki used to drink a lot! And by the end of dinner, or lunch, we decided what’s next. Well we enjoyed meeting, all of us, rather than putting efforts into a publication. In my memory, yes.

Minoru Takeyama, Editor 1970 – 1972. Interview by Lisa Hsieh, Tokyo, 09.08.2006

ARQUITECTURAS BIS

Discussion was at the forefront in the small universe of the magazine. The magazine worked well in the sense of attending almost weekly or biweekly lunch at Rosa [Regas]’s house, or at a restaurant, and it was there where the material available was seen and discussed. In reality it was a very genuine discussion. There could have been differences of opinion, important differences between some [of the participants].

Our magazine has a literary character linked to a current culture of reflection. Today this is more rare. The format was already a different format than other magazines, which relied more on the image, as in the Italian magazines, as it had always been with *Domus* or *Lotus* in those years.

Our magazine had the spontaneity that *Oppositions* never had. Peter [Eisenman] has always been conscious of his work as a document for the future, and this turns the format of *Oppositions* into a more academic [magazine]. It varnishes it with the graphics of [Massimo] Vignelli, and in the end it has more the format of a collage magazine. It published important articles but never does one relate to another, never does a single theme constitute the heart of the magazine and force everyone to think about one issue.

Rafael Moneo, Editor 1974–1985. Interview by Joaquim Moreno, Madrid, 01.11.2006

ARSe

What was interesting for us was the making of a clearly intellectual magazine, but within a technical realm of architecture, and not a gossip column, and also not to show built work for the sake of built work, for one would end up with a critical discussion of a professional line of work.

I remember a meeting in Italy, and a second meeting in Barcelona and Cadaqués. There were three or four magazines that had the same intentions – *Oppositions*, also *Lotus*, *Controspazio*, and *Arquitecturas-bis* – and it was great because one could speak about the magazines themselves and afterwards one could write an article. It was a very canonical yet efficient way to obtain information that was very aleatory, periodically emerging from people and magazines. It was a way to be closer to an international beat.

Oriol Bohigas, Editor 1974–1985. Interview by Joaquim Moreno, Barcelona, 01.16.2006

ARse

It was “ARse” because the whole idea was the *Architectural Review*, and the *Architectural Review* was the “AR” and that’s their lettering exactly, so it was like graffiti on a poster. That was a big thing at the time, anti-advertising; that still goes on today where people graffiti on a really good slogan that turns an advertisement on its head, and that was the idea.

I and Stuart [Knight] and the other sort of “bolshy” guys were just so appalled that Archigram were not only so distanced from the radicalism that was going on everywhere in the student world that we started looking at what they were proposing, and of course their success now shows that we were absolutely right, because everything that they were proposing was a rip-off of Russian Constructivism without the politics. Instead of “workers of the world unite” it was “come on down and get groovy,” and the collages were all of dolly-birds and enviable people ... But the attack on Archigram – it was a polemic, not a personal thing at all.

David Wild, Editor 1969–1972. Interview by Irenee Sunwoo, London, 10.07.2006

BAU: Schrift für Architektur und Städtebau

“Alles ist Architektur,” well many people know it. This is not to be understood for a present generation, this piece of cheese. Because now they think it is very good and could be a building by Herzog and De Meuron, or something. This is Emmmenthaler cheese – it was sort of a derogatory remark for a bad building. “This looks like an Emmmenthaler,” like a piece of cheese with some holes in it. So everybody understood that additional pun here in this cover.

We did not get paid anything. It was completely voluntary work. The publisher took care of the printing and things like that, but we did not get paid anything. It was all the time voluntary, all the years. We only had the use of the secretary of the Zentralvereinigung der Architekten Österreichs [Central Union of Austrian Architects] for work, and she was of course paid by the Zentralvereinigung. The president, who had a small studio in the center of the city which he did not use – he had a bigger office somewhere else – he let us use this as the editorial office, free of charge. We were just interested in communicating our ideas, the ideas of others, and getting in touch with others.

Hans Hollein, Editor 1965–1970. Interview by Craig Buckley, Vienna, 08.18.2006

ARSe

I wrote a letter to Zentralvereinigung, and I wrote *Der Bau*: “it is a very traditional and conservative publication, you must change it into a modern publication.” Then Hans Hollein reads the letter, and then he calls me up and said “Hello Günther, you wrote a letter to Zentralvereinigung. I am feeling like you, we have to change this publication. Come in, we talk together how to make it.” ... We came together and said okay, we have to change, we have to make a total other publication. So, who can help us? Yes, we were friends with Gustav Peichl and especially Hollein was a very old friend of Walter Pichler.

Günther Feuerstein, Editor 1965–1967. Interview by Craig Buckley, Vienna 08.16.2006

ARSe

And so, at one point [*Bau*] stopped. Unfortunately, anyway, we had just been in Moscow to prepare a [Konstantin] Melnikov issue. This was a very difficult thing because he was *persona non grata* and he had to smuggle out the material. He gave us the films, because he could not develop them or print them in Moscow; that would have been very dangerous. We brought it to Vienna by ways that we knew, and we made the prints for him, the enlargements and the smaller prints. We brought it back to him and he wrote down the description and texts and everything. It was a very difficult time in Moscow. At the passport control they looked to see if you had magazines – *Time*, *Newsweek*, *Der Spiegel*, and so on – and they would confiscate them. They confiscated *Playboy* and so on, but this they probably kept for themselves. So, it was a very strange situation

Hans Hollein, Editor 1965–1970. Interview by Craig Buckley, Vienna 08.18.2006.

CARRER DE LA CIUTAT

We were already organized as a group, a heterogeneous group, as you said, of students and young professors, but a group that have been consistently fighting the Franco dictatorship. My memory of it is that [*Carrer de la Ciutat*] came immediately after the death of Franco when there was this attempt to reorganize It was an amazing moment because his death in November of 1975 left a whole generation of people like myself, that have gone through the university thinking that political activism was part of the curriculum with a lot of free time in their hands. ... [Josep] Quetglas was really the leader of our group. He was one of the most charismatic teachers in the School of Barcelona when I arrived as a student and it was also him who introduced us to the school of Venice and the whole world of theory and politics.

>>

Das Andere was one of our models. The interest with [Adolf] Loos definitely came to us from the Venice School, but this idea of thinking about *Das Andere* came from us directly. Not only that, but way before we did our issue on Loos, which was not until issue 9–10 in January 1980, we took the typeface [from *Das Andere*] for the title *Carrer de la Ciutat*. Of course, then the rest of the journal is done with a typewriter. Basically we would type these strips with this kind of Olivetti typewriter, that was very heavy, not an electrical one, so every time you made a mistake it was hilarious because you had to redo it completely and type the whole thing again. It is ragged on the right. We did not have hyphens; if it did not fit, you moved it to the next line. That also led to a lot of mistakes, because you never knew exactly whether it was going to fit or not. But this kind of naïveté was something that was very characteristic.

In that sense we felt ourselves very much like architects. I remember when people tried to describe Quetglas as a historian he always reacted very strongly. And he used to say something that I still subscribe to: ‘I am not a historian, I am an architect who writes.’

The thing I remember is that *Arquitecturas Bis* was like this journal of the older people. Of course we read it, and of course we were very interested, but we had our own identity, and this identity was well established. I don’t know why, but the moment *Carrer de la Ciutat* came out we were incredibly recognized by the school, and before that we were a group that existed. We did not want to be like them [*Arquitecturas Bis*]. It is like if you ask me if I want to be like my parents. Forget it! You want to be exactly the opposite, and that’s how it was, so, if anything, there would be a generational break.

I think we shared [as a group] the idea of the forgotten figure and recovering something from history that everybody overlooked ... again, suspicious of official histories, suspicious of the authoritative view; the attempt to try to come with something that will dislocate the traditional narratives or the accepted narratives. But it is also a little bit of a fetish, a little bit of the antiquarian, I mean, where did we find these figures?

Beatriz Colomina, Editor 1977–1980. Interview by Urtzi Grau, New York, 10.18.2006

ARSe

CASABELLA

We argued violently with Superstudio in the Radical period. In my texts in *Casabella* [1972] I signal that Superstudio was going towards the rediscovery of architecture: the City without architecture, which is how they were working, would eventually bring them to the rediscovery of architectural composition. That is exactly what happened, but Superstudio does not represent Radical architecture. Superstudio represents a very coherent case of strategic research born in that context and later developed into those disasters that they are building now. This means nothing about the Radicals as a whole. If somebody knows how to look, already at that time they had an attitude that was basically reactionary and academic.

Andrea Branzi, Contributor. Interview by Olympia Kazi, Milan, 01.13. 2006.

ARSe

The gorilla with the nimbus was conceived when we were traveling in New York. We went to the museum at Central Park, the Museum of Natural History. There were dioramas, and one had this gorilla. I bought a postcard of it because I thought it was funny, and this image came from that. We then used it for the cover of *Casabella*, for the cover of Paola Navone’s book [*Architettura Radicale*, 1974], and also on the cover of the catalogue of the last exhibition that Gianni Pettena just did [*Archipelago: architettura sperimentale, 1959–1999*, 1999].

Alessandro Mendini, Editor 1970–1976. Interview by Olympia Kazi, Milan 02.27.2006.

CLIP-KIT

It was just myself and a chap called Geoffrey Smythe. And Cedric Price was one of our mentors, really. He was always incredibly generous with his time with students. I think as long as he liked them, and as long as they made an appointment to see him. If you dropped in you really got an earful. He had a few very formal characteristics like that. You had to do the right thing. He was always enormously helpful. He and Archigram were our hero figures really, and Cedric perhaps slightly more than Archigram. I think the drier look of *Clip–Kit* is very much more of a Cedric influence; Bucky [Fuller] and Cedric, absolutely were where we were at, I think, and Reyner Banham was the muse.

So the clip is related to the thought of the architecture that is within the *Clip–Kit* as well. And what was quite new at the time was this high tech binding, these things which had just been produced. We were given them free by the people who manufactured them. It was plastic binding. So that’s the “clip” and this is the “kit.” For your first issue, basically, you got half a dozen pages, and then each month you got another pack. You bought your “clip.” You paid six shillings for your “clip” with your first issue and then we sent the rest.

We did 500 copies of *Clip–Kit*. By that time I had a good network of contacts around schools so I got individuals within the schools to actually sell them. We just sent a bundle to the schools and they would send them out. The Architectural Association gave us a pigeonhole for everything so it all came here to Bedford Square.

Peter Murray, Editor 1966. Interview by Beatriz Colomina and Mark Wigley, London, 10.14.2005

CONTROPIANO

The critique of ideology meant the discussion about the form or the expression of the political power at the moment. So if you look at the first issues of *Contropiano* you have essays concerning directly questions of Marxist sociology, of the working class, texts about literature – Thomas Mann for example – and more theoretical texts addressing the question of the critique of ideology. Architecture did not play from the beginning such a classic function.

Manfredo [Tafuri] was the guy who was able to introduce very peculiar architectural questions inside of this discussion with his famous essay “Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology.” One very peculiar aspect was that the group of *Contropiano* was not so acquainted with architecture. Tafari was already a cult figure for young students of architecture, but not for Alberto Asor Rosa or Mario Tronti. So when we asked Manfredo to join the group, they read *Theories and History of Architecture*, and they were totally critical of him. No for late-Adornianism...So the birth of “Toward a Critique of Architectural Ideology” was not an easy one. It was not that Manfredo published a text and everyone was happy with it. There were very long but very structured discussions inside of the different groups about publishing the text.

And the main contributors of *Contropiano* continued to work on *Angelus Novus*. But the true difference was that *Contropiano* was a very consciously political magazine. It was a part of a political struggle. And as you know Toni Negri did not abandon *Contropiano* after the first issue because of Thomas Mann, but because of heavy strategical differences. Almost all the group of *Contropiano*, with a few tactical exceptions, became members of the Communist party in 1968. And Toni Negri started the adventure of what was named “Autonomia.” So the clash was a very heavy one. It was not an easy problem.

Anyway Negri was in Padova, [Massimo] Cacciari, Francesco Dal Co, and myself were in Venice. Asor Rosa, Tronti, and [Rita] di Leo were in Rome, and Manfredo was commuting between. Most of the editorial meetings happened in Rome, normally at the home of Rita di Leo, who was the sister of a not famous B-movie director, who had some tendencies for erotic movies. And there was a movie that everybody had seen. There was a protagonist at the beginning of the movie who buys newspapers and asks for *L’Unità*, *Corriere*, and *Contropiano*.

Marco De Michelis, Contributor 1968–1971. Interview by Alicia Imperiale, Venice, 06.27.2006

DOMUS

I must say that *Domus*, as long as I was there with my father [Gio Ponti] and for a while with [Alessandro] Mendini, had been a very irregular and absolutely happy experience that could not happen again easily. Also maybe because the founder/editor Gio Ponti had been there for forty years and had passed his ideas and thoughts to those that were working with him. He did not control everything; we knew the method. There were no magazines other than *Casabella*. *Domus* was entirely produced by us: we would do the layout, the photographers were our friends, and there were no correspondents. The architects themselves would sometimes come to our offices and lay out the pages themselves.

Lisa Ponti, Assistant Editor 1965–87. Interview by Olympia Kazi, Milan, 06.29.2006

FORM

It is interesting to know that you have been led to *Form*, by way of *Oppositions*. Of course this is partly explained by the strong connections between Cambridge and Princeton at that point. Tony Vidler and Philip Steadman were both at Cambridge with me in the early sixties and Americans like Peter Eisenman were working at Cambridge. We thought of *Form* as a kind of neo-modernist publication, I suppose, devoted to the early avant-garde as well as to the classic American avant-garde deriving from it (Black Mountain [College], etc). I was especially keen on work by contemporary literary figures – people like Thomas Bernhard, Robert Pinget and Ian Hamilton Finlay – who have now achieved a great reputation. I also included probably the first English translation of an essay by Roland Barthes in issue No. 1. The idea of indexing Great Little Magazines came from Mike Weaver (until recently editor of the journal History of Photography) and enabled us to meet and get contributions from the survivors of that generation. (I contacted [Pierre] Albert-Birot [editor of *Sic*] in Paris and arranged for publication of one of his poemprints, and Hans Richter, editor of *G* [Material zur elementaren Gestaltung], also wrote for us on the death of Duchamp). In the sense that we were doing this – long before systematic attention was being given to Little Mags, we rank – I suppose – as a Meta Little Mag.

Stephen Bann, Co-Editor 1966–1969, Letter to Joaquim Moreno, Spring 2003.

ARSe

The first little magazine that I was involved in was *Form*, in Cambridge, I was very close friends with Phillip Steadman who worked with Steven Bann on *Form*. And also we were involved in discussions on what texts should go in there from the Modern Movement. We got my friend Nick Bullet, who was a student of mine, and he translated the Mies’ texts [from the magazine *G: Material zur elementaren Gestaltung*], and then we found someone to do the Black Mountain College issue. I was not an editor but was part of the group. I got lots of ideas from Sandy Wilson who was at that time very connected to the Dutch scene, to the new Neo-Plasticists in Holland, and was also very involved in bringing and translating pieces from various Dutch magazines at the time of Mondrian and Rietveld.

Anthony Vidler, Interview by Beatriz Colomina and Daniel Lopez-Perez, New York, 10.22.2006

FOTOROMANZI

Turin was different. The Florentines had political relations, too, but they were not as violent and strong as those in Turin, which was a continuous explosion of workshops, occupations, etc. Here is how the group Strum was born. Through Emilio Ambasz I received an invitation to be in the MoMA show “Italy: the New Domestic Landscape.” I thought it was quite contradictory to do such a thing: here we were fighting with the workers to transform the world, justice, and society, and I was going to take my funny little objects and show them in New York. I said no, it wasn’t right. But we said we had to take this opportunity to have such an important museum in New York talk about what goes on in our city. The idea of doing the *Fotoromanzi* came after this.

>>