

# architecture institutions and change

---

## Proceedings of the Society of Architectural Historians Australia and New Zealand Vol. 32

Edited by Paul Hogben and Judith O'Callaghan

Published in Sydney, Australia, by SAHANZ, 2015  
ISBN: 978 0 646 94298 8

The bibliographic citation for this paper is:

Steen, Andrew P. "Guerrilla in the Midst: The Universitas Project and a New Type of Institution." In *Proceedings of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand: 32, Architecture, Institutions and Change*, edited by Paul Hogben and Judith O'Callaghan, 640-651. Sydney: SAHANZ, 2015.

## Guerrilla in the Midst: The Universitas Project and a New Type of Institution

*The Universitas Project was the brainchild of Institute of Architecture and Urban Studies co-founder and Museum of Modern Art Curator of Design, Emilio Ambasz. In 1971 Ambasz sent his "Project Working Paper" to an extensive list of intellectuals ranging from Kenneth Frampton to Michel Foucault, Denise Scott Brown to Roland Barthes. Ambasz's document, colloquially named "The Black Book," called for the creation of a "new type of institution" to be built in New York state. The goal was to design the structure and the curriculum of this "Universitas" to help educate architects and designers for what Ambasz defines "a post-technological society." Ambasz solicited "critical essays" from the respondents that addressed "The Black Book" and spoke to his reformist educational and institutional agenda.*

*Italian semiotician Umberto Eco replied with the parodically-titled and -framed "Critical Essay". In this piece, Eco outlines a kind of non-university: a network-based model of education "by the masses" not merely "for" them. In outlining the relation of his "new university" to existing knowledge, Eco inserts a translated extract from Mao Zedong's On Practice: "To acquire knowledge it is necessary to participate in the process which transforms reality. To get to know the taste of a pear it is necessary to transform it by eating it." These sentences help figure Eco's argument. They indirectly capture the system of relation and the spirit of engagement he advocates. But the quotation also exercises the poetic function of language. It opens the "Critical Essay" to readings outside strict referential meaning. The message challenges the basic premises of Ambasz's Universitas.*

*This paper takes Mao's quotation as a lens through which to understand Eco's "Critical Essay". It finds a semantic chain that opens Ambasz's Universitas Project to cultural slippage and ideological contestation. Eco's little "Black Book" response is presented here as non-institutional: a guerrilla incursion into so-called critical architectural discourse.*

This paper concerns an intellectual position made relative to institutions constructed by the Italian semiotician Umberto Eco. While the mechanisms of Eco's position are general and related to mass-mediated society, the focus here is on a text written specifically for an architectural audience, and in relation to architectural pedagogy. Eco's advocacy of a guerrilla engagement with culture leads him to promote a networked non-university. It also leads him to critique the ideology and practice of critique, particularly radical or so-called critical critique.

This paper performs two parallel operations. It gives an account of the arguments mounted in the central Eco text and in related texts. At the same time it supports this historical account with a meta-demonstration of the argument. In other words, the following pages speak of, as well as speak through, Eco's attack on the institutions of architectural education and architectural criticism. A Mao Zedong quotation used by Eco in his "Critical Essay" supplies the device through which to progress these operations.

The dual nature of this paper leads discussion from a specific text, to the lineage of texts preceding it, and from this collection out to a broad cultural network pertaining to critical architectural theory and would-be revolutionary praxis. During the course of this paper, secure structures of information will be broken down, and the relation of institutions to the mass reframed. The study, however, proceeds from the secure grounds of its key text.

## A critical essay

Eco wrote "Critical Essay" in late 1971.<sup>1</sup> The University of Bologna's then-Associated Professor of Semiotics was one of a list of academics and intellectuals who received a publication written by Argentine Emilio Ambasz – the Museum of Modern Art (New York) Curator of Design and Institute of Architecture and Urban Studies co-founder – titled "Project Working Paper" in July 1971.<sup>2</sup> In writing this document, Ambasz had collaborated with Stanford Anderson, Peter Eisenman, Suzanne Keller, Rosalind Kraus, and Joseph Rykwert,<sup>3</sup> and sounded out Kenneth Arrow, Walter Buckley, Karl Deutsch, Ronald Dworkin, Thomas Farer, Gerald Feinberg, Harry Frankfurt, Arnold Kramisch, Robert Nozick, and Alan Trachtenberg.<sup>4</sup> "Project Working Paper" – also known as "The Black Book"<sup>5</sup> – was thus supported by a diverse network of intellectuals, but formally authored by Ambasz of MoMA and the IAUS. The ironic institutionality of Ambasz and his project will be important to the discussion below.

The "Project Working Paper" was written "with the intention of identifying and defining critical points of concern."<sup>6</sup> The document contains four essays and four appendices.<sup>7</sup> This mass of information outlines what Ambasz titles "Institutions for a Post-Technological Society – Universitas Project." The project's key aim was to help realise "in New York State ... a pioneering type of institution, dedicated to the evaluation and design of the man-made milieu."<sup>8</sup> The goal, in short, was to design a new university: the Universitas University.

The Universitas Symposium was held on January 8 and 9, 1972, in MoMA's Member's

Penthouse.<sup>9</sup> The full list of symposium participants is Christopher Alexander, Emilio Ambasz, Hannah Arendt, Jean Baudrillard, Manuel Castells, Gillo Dorfles, Arthur Drexler, Ronald Dworkin, Umberto Eco, Hans Magnus Enzensberger, Kenneth Frampton, Percival Goodman, Stuart Hampshire, Erich Jantsch, Suzanne Keller, Gyorgy Kepes, Arnold Kramish, Henri Lefebvre, Edward J. Logue, Richard L. Meier, Hasan Ozbekhan, Martin Pawley, Octavio Paz, Anatol Rapoport, Meyer Schapiro, Carl Schorske, Denise Scott Brown, Thomas A. Sebeok, Jivan Tabibian, Alain Touraine, Rexford Guy Tugwell, and Sheldon S. Wolin.<sup>10</sup>

Responses to the “Project Working Paper” were varied, but often evaded the project’s key ideals and aims. Gillo Dorfles wrote a paper that, “[r]ather than give suggestions for a new university of design, ... make[s] some remarks on the situation of that group of disciplines with which such a university should concern itself.”<sup>11</sup> Jean Baudrillard’s critique asserts “[n]othing is more false than the limits a ‘humanistic’ design would set for itself.”<sup>12</sup> Manuel Castells argues: “[f]or what we lack is not the impossible but those possibilities that we are obliged to ignore so that mediocrity may continue to be profitable.”<sup>13</sup>

It is perhaps unsurprising given such conflicts over core terms and objectives that the Universitas Symposium fell short of reaching a unified position. The project failed to meet its goal of establishing “a new type of institution” in New York State. The Project did, however, realise its goal of publishing a proceedings;<sup>14</sup> and while it took thirty-four years to realise, *The Universitas Project* is a valuable record of the attitudes held at the time.

Eco’s chapter, “Critical Essay,” is a conspicuously literal response to Ambasz’s “Project Working Paper” call for “*Critical Essays*.”<sup>15</sup> Eco’s text can be seen as highly parodical. The title alone suggests an ironic metatextual statement. The first paragraph develops this criticism of Ambasz’s “critical” focus.

It is not clear whether the critical essay should advance proposals on the disciplinary structure of the Universitas, on its organisation, on its philosophy, or whether it should comment on some of the points in the Project Working Paper. In the latter case, I tend to think that it must be very difficult to comment on a text scientifically when its pages are not numbered, and I hope that the future Universitas will supply more precise elements of code for those who will have to send messages from the centre to the periphery and vice versa.<sup>16</sup>

The tone here is scathing. In listing alternative topics, Eco points to a lack of clarity in the “Project Working Paper.” In highlighting its lack of pagination, his challenge verges on absurdism. While the paragraph’s general mode of address is relevant to this current paper, the examination undertaken here will examine a more complex discursive mechanism.

“Critical Essay” is not totally without substantive and admissible argumentation. It sketches a promising response to the Universitas Project’s aim of rethinking the schooling of designers and architects and generating a new university that would be more appropriate to the requirements and aspirations of the contemporary society.<sup>17</sup> This is not surprising. Eco had taught at Florence University’s Faculty of Architecture during the tumultuous years, 1966 to

1969, spawning the experimental group, U.F.O.<sup>18</sup> The student movement of 1968 was also significant to his work: its confrontational politicality led to the ritual “suicide” of his own avant-gardist collective Gruppo 63.<sup>19</sup> Eco was thus professionally and personally exposed to student politics, and well placed to make insightful comment.

Speaking to the goal of the “new” university, Eco’s “Critical Essay” suggests replacing the conventional hierarchical didactic configuration with a networked educational model. He asserts this prospective model would be “by the masses” rather than merely “for” them.<sup>20</sup> He stipulates that “[t]he aim of the Universitas should be to transform the inhabitants of the environment ... from guinea pigs to advisors and from advisors to collaborators,”<sup>21</sup> foretelling the now ubiquitous social networks. And in making reference to “the Storage of Cultural Information files,”<sup>22</sup> Eco can be seen to presage the internet, databases, Wikipedia, and search engines.

The proposition of “Critical Essay,” however, is not well developed. Eco’s essay does not contain a thorough elaboration of his hypothetical institutional model. This should not be taken as an oversight. As a piece of cultural communication, “Critical Essay” does not rely on refined reasoning. The shadow of Gruppo 66’s “ritual suicide” is evident: the essay is more polemical than scientific.

The rhetorical focus and thus centrepiece of “Critical Essay” is a capitalised quotation. Eco claims

the project for a new university ... could be synthesized by a sentence written by Mao Tse-tung: “To acquire knowledge it is necessary to participate in the process which transforms reality. TO GET TO KNOW THE TASTE OF A PEAR IT IS NECESSARY TO TRANSFORM IT BY EATING IT.”<sup>23</sup>

This excerpt brings a rich syrupy image into the text. But it is not the sensuousness of the quotation that is pertinent. It is rather its contextual aspect that offers insight into the textual condition underwriting the intellectual history of what Felicity Scott deems “architectural theory proper.” Mao’s quote reveals the poetic functioning of language within architectural discourse by positioning Eco’s work in relation to the underlying networked web of information. Part of this network was laid down by Eco himself.

## A semiological guerrilla

Less than five years before Universitas, Eco attended another conference in New York. “Vision ’67 – Survival and Growth” was held at the Loeb Student Center, New York University, from the 19 to 21 October 1967.<sup>25</sup> At the time, Eco was Professor of Visual Communications at Florence University. He was one year from publishing *La struttura assente*.<sup>26</sup> He was yet to establish his position within the semiotic landscape, but he was forging a position in relation to structuralist discourse.

For “Vision ’67,” Eco wrote “Towards a Semiological Guerrilla Warfare.” This paper takes as

its general object the most significant aspect of power relations of the post-industrial world: the communication industry.<sup>27</sup> To develop his thesis, Eco refers to a book he published in 1964, *Apocalittici e integrati*.<sup>28</sup> Here he presents two types of intellectual. As the title implies, these two types are the “apocalyptic” and the “integrated.”

Intellectuals of the apocalyptic type focus on the ideological aspect of the mass media.<sup>29</sup> Apocalyptics propose “[i]t doesn’t matter what you say via the channels of mass communication ... The important thing is the gradual, uniform bombardment of information, where the different contents ... lose their differences.”<sup>30</sup> They present a powerful mass media; and passive addressees: a mass audience absorbing the hegemonic message through their plug-in-drug of choice. The link to institutions is clear. The mass media is demonised by apocalyptics. They argue either for its abolition, or for major reform aimed at improving its content. Such an improvement has an implicit ideological loading.

Integrated intellectuals, on the other hand, see mass media as the positive product of the democratic rule of Western civilisation. They believe it presents the popular culture of its viewers. For integrates, the position and role of the mass media is not ideologically suspect, and its liberally developed forms are inherently suitable for integration into the existing worldview of the population. Under an integrated perspective, addressees are not drugged but are rather positively sedate within the warm, encompassing society in which they live.

While the apocalyptic and integrated intellectuals present opposing positions, they share a basic structural premise. Both types assume a standard “Message” is broadcast by the media and absorbed in a fixed manner by an acritical viewer. This is a model at which Eco takes aim. He sketches out these two contrasting but complementary positions to propose a third that acts to subvert the model.

To aid in this process, “Towards a Semiological Guerrilla Warfare” gives a detailed description of the “mechanics of communication” of the mass media.<sup>31</sup> The Code – described by Eco as “an established system of probabilities”<sup>32</sup> that allows information to become in some way meaningful – is key for apocalyptics and integrates alike. The model of communication both types use relies on the Source (or mass media broadcaster) and the Addressee (or viewer) using the same Code. This is what allows a Signal to be received as a Message.

Framing communication around a shared code has implications for those engaged in coding. Such a functional concern does not suit the agenda Eco had at this point in time. “Toward a Semiological Guerrilla Warfare” focuses instead on the process of decoding. For Eco, the message the Addressee extracts from the initial Signal is entirely dependent upon the Code they apply.<sup>33</sup> The Signal does not automatically translate into the received Message. Mass media audiences control the messages they accept. When this process is multiplied across the broad spectrum of a mass audience, “discordant interpretations” are inevitable, to the point where, according to Eco, “variability of interpretation is the constant law of mass communications.”<sup>34</sup>

Eco aims to amplify this inherent discordance. He demands active participation in mass

media decoding. Channelling radical political sloganeers, Eco calls for the occupation of “the first chair in front of every TV set.”<sup>35</sup> He invokes a contest with the mass media by “all of us” – the chairmen and chairwomen, his new “*proletariat*.”<sup>36</sup> According to Eco, “[t]he battle for the survival of man is not to be won where the communication originates, but where it arrives.”<sup>37</sup>

“Towards a Semiological Guerrilla Warfare” is a call-to-arms “urg[ing] the audience to control the message and its multiple possibilities of interpretation.”<sup>38</sup> Eco’s invitation to small-scale mass media resistance carries into “Critical Essay.” It is tempting to judge his use of “Chairman” Mao simply as a metaphor, borrowing the authority of this real-world guerrilla. But such a reading assumes a simplistic transmission of a clean Message – the kind favoured by the very apocalyptic and integrated intellectuals Eco resists. An alternate reading is available, with the assistance of a third Eco text.

## A devil’s advocate

During 1971 Eco also published *Le forme del contenuto*.<sup>39</sup> This publication contained “Semioitica della metaphora” – “The Semantics of Metaphor.”<sup>40</sup> This essay is a close exposition into the workings of language.

The basic point stressed by Eco is the plurivocality of the codes of human communication. This is a consistent motif in Eco’s work since 1962’s *Opera aperta*.<sup>41</sup> If codes transmitted information in a simple binary system, communication would be a simple, denotative process. Within a Message of Morse Code, for example, all “enunciations” are entirely “determined by the system’s conventions”; and as a consequence, “each and every utterance ... [is] tautological” – i.e., presents the contents of the Message with no remainder.<sup>42</sup>

But linguistic communication is not so straightforward. It uses semiotic codes that are inherently insecure. This “allow[s users] to enunciate events that the code did not anticipate as well as metasemiotic judgments.”<sup>43</sup> Users are “able to generate both factual messages ... and ... messages which place in doubt the very structure of the code itself.”<sup>44</sup> Enunciations do not merely transmit literal denotations through established codes; they also offer forms that reveal those codes.

According to Eco, “Language” is a “system of semantic systems.”<sup>45</sup> He terms this “never completely structurable” object the “Global Semantic System.”<sup>46</sup> The fields of this Global Semantic System are continually made and unmade depending on message transmission and reception. The degree of fluxing depends on the amount of non-literal message content within the system, whether arising at the Source or at the Addressee. Eco contends that the uncentred Global Semantic System is expressive of the deep structure of communication and understanding.<sup>47</sup>

Eco attempts to support his Global Semantic System concept by investigating language uses that exercise the system’s structure – uses commonly framed as metaphor. “The Semantics of Metaphor” reconceptualises metaphor: Eco’s goal is to take an ostensibly

creative communicative act and demonstrate its reliance on an underlying web of semantic connections. For Eco, metaphors obscure the structure of the Global Semantic System, as they seem to associate two previously unconnected lexemes.<sup>48</sup> He wants “to show that each metaphor can be traced back to a subjacent chain of metonymic connections which constitute the framework of the code.”<sup>49</sup>

To make his case, Eco turns to James Joyce's *Finnegan's Wake*, a work of literature he deems “produces sufficiently violent metaphors without interruption or reservation” to make a strong demonstration.<sup>50</sup> The focus of Eco's exposition is one particular Joyce construction: the name Minucius Mandrake.

Eco credits James Atherton as providing a referent for the first part to the name. Historical figure Minucius Felix was an advocate of the Church, whose words in the second or third century ad were aimed “to convince the Gentiles of the truth of the Christian faith.”<sup>51</sup> Due to Joyce's grounding in Catholicism and his “insatiable” reading habits, Eco deems him likely familiar with the name Minucius Felix.<sup>52</sup> It would thus have had an established position in Joyce's General Semantic System.

Atherton does not provide his reader an explanation for Mandrake. It would appear the violence of the metaphoric conjunction was, for him, too great. His Global Semantic System network did not allow this coupling. The encyclopaedia of Eco supplies a connection.

Atherton had not thought of the world of comic strips (a world which Joyce ... knew very well through the daily comics in the newspapers of the time); otherwise, he would have realized that Mandrake could be Mandrake the Magician, the famous character of Lee Falk and Phil Davis.<sup>53</sup>

It is Eco's contention that Joyce knew Mandrake the Magician.<sup>54</sup> On this basis, the mechanics of the portmanteau becomes clear. Eco describes Mandrake the Magician as “an illusionist,” able to make his adversary “mistake the pistol in his hand for a banana, [and] hear objects talking.”<sup>55</sup> Mandrake is “a master of persuasion” and “a ‘devil's advocate’.”<sup>56</sup> A logical semantic connection becomes evident: both Minucius and Mandrake can be positioned as advocates. The previously separate and dissimilar lexemes become associated.

Yet for Eco, this semantic match does not, on its own, explain why Joyce joined Minucius and Mandrake. Even allowing for a shared role as advocate, Minucius Mandrake lacks an identifiable chain. Eco finds the missing link in Pat Sullivan's comic strip, Felix the Cat. This semantic entity establishes a relationship “by contiguity” between both halves of this conjunction: the Cat possesses the same name as Minucius, Felix; and is from “the same universe of comic strips” as the Magician, Mandrake.<sup>57</sup> For Eco, both of these relationships are simple and unimpressive in themselves. The power of Joyce's construction comes when “the middle term has fallen” and the text is left with what is taken as a “metaphor.”

So-called creative language use such as metaphor thus obscures structure by omitting words. They short-circuit existent connections; but the connections are still in place, lying

beneath the surface of language in the General Semantic System. This is all relevant to discussion here as a similar semantic association can be seen to sit below “Critical Essay.” The chain reveals some important aspects of the Global Semantic System that underwrites the rhetoricality of the text, the discourse in which it is found, and the argument it launches. The grounds on which knowledge can be institutionalised shifts dramatically with this theory.

## A Beginner’s Guide

Mao Zedong founded the People’s Republic of China on 1 October 1949, and controlled that authoritarian state until his death on 2 September 2 1976. He is responsible for the death of 40 to 70 million people, and/or the birth of a new popularly led culture. The details of Chairman Mao’s rule are not pertinent to this discussion. What is pertinent is the uptake of Mao as a cultural symbol and a discursive object.

In the mid-1960s, the capitalist system dominating the Western world was under popular challenge. By that time, McCarthyism was consigned to history books; but the Cold War continued, both militarily, and culturally. In a paper delivered to “Vision ’65”,<sup>58</sup> Marshall McLuhan claimed that society had entered into a “new and potent environment,” the uncertainties of which were causing confusion and insecurity.<sup>59</sup> And McLuhan was not alone: the “Vision ’65” conference was filled with similarly concerned individuals.<sup>60</sup>

In Europe at the time, Marxism was a well-established ideology with which to critique the capitalist system. The work of many continental philosophers – among them, Universitas attendees Baudrillard, Castells, Henri Lefebvre, and non-attending invitee Louis Althusser – was based on Marxist apparatuses. But by the end of the 1960s, the paradigm was becoming contentious. The Vietnam War brought a new accent to debates. Cultural and political machinations encouraged intellectuals and cultural producers to search for an alternative model, and, perhaps more importantly, an alternative object on which to focus cultural critique. Marx was compromised; Mao became a key figure.

*Tel Quel* is symptomatic of this cultural trajectory. Keen to distance itself from the French Communist Party and its Marxist base, the journal went through a “Maoist period” from 1965 to 1971.<sup>61</sup> In its Spring 1971 issue, Philippe Sollers translated some poems from Mao’s *On Contradiction*; and in Autumn of the same year, Julia Kristeva praised Mao’s focus on the ideological aspect of language in literature.<sup>62</sup>

The uptake and dissemination of Mao by the leftwing French intelligentsia was linked to a broader popularism. In December 1967, *Esquire* published an article titled “The Beginner’s Guide to Mao Tse-tung.” Ostensibly, the article promotes the newly released film *The Valley of the Dolls*. It couples Mao quotations with photographs of the film’s star, Sharon Tate. One of the quotations in the *Esquire* article foreshadows Eco:

Whoever wants to know a thing has no way of doing so except by coming into contact with it, that is, by living (practicing) in its environment. ... If you want knowledge, you must take part in the practice of changing reality. If you want

to know the taste of a pear, you must change the pear by eating it yourself.

“On Practice” (July, 1937)<sup>63</sup>

A close-up photograph of Tate accompanies the quotation.<sup>64</sup> Her right hand is visible. In it she loosely holds a pear of which two generous bites have been taken. Her mouth is held open and slightly askew. A piece of the pear and a generous amount of its juice are apparent below her bottom lip, the latter close to dripping off her chin. Tate’s hair is loosely tousled, and her blouse open at the chest. Despite this informality, her eyes are augmented by false lashes and framed by a thick application of eyeliner and mascara. The image is highly sexual. Indeed, the set of images are all of a sexualised nature: open zippers, wet t-shirts, and fur rugs all feature. In one photograph, on the floor next to Tate’s black-leather-boot-clad left foot, lays Mao’s “little red book,” apparently loaded with cathexis.

The quotations of great significance to the People’s Republic are thus established in subjacent chains with two journals: the scholarly, French, consciously post-Marxist *Tel Quel*; and the popular, American, arguably misogynist *Esquire*. In the latter magazine, the “little red book” is linked to the camp Hollywood film *The Valley of the Dolls* and its star Sharon Tate. The Global Semantic System accepts all these connections within its network.

The message received by an Addressee might key into or overlook such semantic links. “Towards a Semiological Guerrilla Warfare” overtly encourages such aberrant readings. But “Critical Essay” is not another presentation of guerrilla decoding. Nor is it a naive promotion of Maoist ideology. Eco uses the Global Semantic System in another way. He subverts the dominant paradigm by an ironic encoding of cliché. He overcodes his text; and by doing so, he forms his critical position.

## Critical institutions

The significance of the Mao quotation to “Critical Essay” is both gratuitous and all-important. Eco focuses his reader on the lines: as stated above, he claims that the project for a new university can be synthesised in its form; and he incorrectly nominates the quote as “a sentence” rather than two, thus making its textuality more palpable. These are not empty acts.

By including Mao’s quotation in “Critical Essay,” Eco forges links between Mao’s Global Semantic System location, and that of the Universitas Project. “The Black Book” and the “little red book” are connected. But Eco’s inclusion of Mao is not a fresh metaphor. The Chairman of the People’s Republic has no direct significance to architectural intellection, and his quotation offers little more than advocacy for process and practice. His place within the Global Semantic System, however, was already established.

Thanks to previous so-called critical productions, Mao was already significant to architectural discourse. He was an established figure of a self-conscious revolutionary agenda. Rather than being metaphoric, then, Eco’s Mao quotation is ironic. It is a critique of existent contiguities within architectural discourse forged by radical leftwing politics within

structuralist-backed intellectualisation.

In using Mao's quotation, and appropriating the cultural significance of Mao, Eco is using the networks of the Global Semantic System to corrode the integrity of established hierarchies and ideologies. The revolutionary zeal of Ambasz's Universitas Project is caricatured as apocalyptic authoritarianism. The Mao quotation is a metalinguistic challenge to architectural theory discourse and institutionalisation.

The "Project Working Paper" asked Eco to critique the concept of the university. In repositioning hierarchies and power relations, he fulfils this task. But at the same time, he critiques the critiquers of the university concept. Eco's framing of the relation of the periphery to centre becomes particularly meaningful here: Ambasz is a synecdoche, both for MoMA and the IAUS specifically, and for the empowered centre more generally.

"Critical Essay" breaks down the educational model of knowledge holder – knowledge receiver. It also breaks down the educational model of geographic containment, the model supporting universities and MoMA. Exploiting the poetic function of language, Eco uses contiguity as a weapon to send a loaded message.

While its attack is focused on Ambasz, the challenge presented by "Critical Essay" is not merely directed at him. Nor is it limited to the prospective institution of Universitas. Eco's essay contests institutionality in general: the power and supposed centrality of New York's MoMA; and the cultural position of architectural theorisation, particularly its arm aligned to structuralism. Eco advocates for a non-university, but also for a collapsing of the so-called critical authority of architectural theory.

The poetic use of Mao Zedong in a piece of architectural theory articulates non-institutional cultural slippage. Associations of radicalism with MoMA and with many eminent universities may be secured within the history of the twentieth century; but the significance of museums and universities in the twenty-first is less than assured. The progression of the Cultural Information file-store, institutionalised as the world wide web, continues to threaten centres of knowledge, making everyone architectural proletariat and potential guerrillas.

- 
- 1 Umberto Eco, "Critical Essay," in *The Universitas Project: Solutions for a Post-Technological Society*, ed. Emilio Ambasz and Harriet Schoenholz Bee (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2006), 95-104.
  - 2 Felicity D. Scott, "On the Counter-Design of Institutions: Emilio Ambasz's Universitas Project at MoMA," *Grey Room 14* (Winter 2004): 50.
  - 3 Scott, "On the Counter-Design of Institutions," 50.
  - 4 Emilio Ambasz, "Acknowledgments," in *The Universitas Project*, 10.
  - 5 According to Ambasz, this is what it was called by Project participants – Emilio Ambasz, "Introduction: Looking back to see ahead," in *The Universitas Project*, 13.
  - 6 Emilio Ambasz, "Project Working Paper," in *The Universitas Project*, 44.
  - 7 The essays recycle "I. The University of Design and Development; II. Manhattan: Capital of the Twentieth Century; III. The Designs of Freedom," *Perspecta 13/14* (1971): 359-365.

- 8 Ambasz, "Project Working Paper," 46.
- 9 Scott, "On the Counter-Design of Institutions," 49.
- 10 Ambasz, "Project Working Paper," 46. Louis Althusser, Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, Roman Jakobson, Tomàs Maldonado and Susan Sontag were invited but declined the invitation.
- 11 Gillo Dorfles, "The Proairetic Factor and the Concept of Asymmetry in Design," in *The Universitas Project*, 79.
- 12 Jean Baudrillard, "Design and Environment: Or, The Inflationary Curve of Political Economy," in *The Universitas Project*, 62.
- 13 Manuel Castells, "Urban Symbolism and Social Movements: On a New Institution for the Study of the Urban Environment," in *The Universitas Project*, 78.
- 14 Emilio Ambasz and Harriet Schoenholz Bee, eds., *The Universitas Project: Solutions for a Post-Technological Society* (New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2006).
- 15 Ambasz, "Project Working Paper," 44.
- 16 Eco, "Critical Essay," 95. Italics removed.
- 17 Glenn D. Lowry, "Foreword," in *The Universitas Project*, 8.
- 18 Amit Wolf, "Superurbefimero n.7: Umberto Eco's Semiologia and the Architectural Rituals of the U.F.O.," *Californian Italian Studies* 2, no. 2 (2011), <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/8q61n35f>.
- 19 David Robey, "Introduction," in *The Open Work* (Cambridge, US: Harvard University Press, 1989), xx. Indeed, "Critical Essay" may be cast in relation to his article, "The Death of Gruppo 63" (in *The Open Work*, 236-250), written in 1972.
- 20 Eco, "Critical Essay," 104.
- 21 Eco, "Critical Essay," 104.
- 22 Eco, "Critical Essay," 104.
- 23 Eco, "Critical Essay," 95-96.
- 24 Scott, "On the Counter-Design of Institutions," 49.
- 25 [http://siuedesign.org/vision\\_67.htm](http://siuedesign.org/vision_67.htm) (accessed May 2, 2015).
- 26 Umberto Eco, *La struttura assente: introduzione alla ricerca semiologica* (Milan: Bompiani, 1968).
- 27 Umberto Eco, "Towards a Semiological Guerrilla Warfare," in *Travels in Hyperreality*, trans. William Weaver (San Diego: Harcourt Brace & Company, 1990), 135.
- 28 Umberto Eco, *Apocalittici e integrati: comunicazioni di massa e teorie della cultura di media* (Milan: Bompiani, 1964); Umberto Eco, "Apocalyptic and Integrated Intellectuals: Mass Communication and Theories of Mass Culture," in *Apocalypse Postponed Umberto Eco*, ed. Robert Lumley (Bloomington: Indiana University Press, 1994), 17-35.
- 29 Eco, "Towards a Semiological Guerrilla Warfare," 136.
- 30 Eco, "Towards a Semiological Guerrilla Warfare," 136.
- 31 Eco, "Towards a Semiological Guerrilla Warfare," 138.
- 32 Eco, "Towards a Semiological Guerrilla Warfare," 138.
- 33 Eco, "Towards a Semiological Guerrilla Warfare," 139-40.
- 34 Eco, "Towards a Semiological Guerrilla Warfare," 141.
- 35 Eco, "Towards a Semiological Guerrilla Warfare," 142.
- 36 Eco, "Towards a Semiological Guerrilla Warfare," 141. This formulation has obvious unsaid links to "Chairman" Mao.
- 37 Eco, "Towards a Semiological Guerrilla Warfare," 142.
- 38 Eco, "Towards a Semiological Guerrilla Warfare," 143.
- 39 Umberto Eco, *Le forme del contenuto* (Milan: Bompiani, 1971).
- 40 Umberto Eco, "The Semantics of Metaphor," in *The Role of the Reader: Explorations in the Semiotics of Texts* (London: Hutchinson, 1981), 67-89.
- 41 Umberto Eco, *Opera aperta* (Milan: Bompiani, 1962); Umberto Eco, *The Open Work* (Cambridge US: Harvard University Press, 1989).
- 42 Eco, "The Semantics of Metaphor," 67.
- 43 Eco, "The Semantics of Metaphor," 67, italics removed.
- 44 Eco, "The Semantics of Metaphor," 67.
- 45 Eco, "The Semantics of Metaphor," 67.
- 46 Eco, "The Semantics of Metaphor," 82.
- 47 Eco, "The Semantics of Metaphor," 69.

- 48 Eco, "The Semantics of Metaphor," 69.
- 49 Eco, "The Semantics of Metaphor," 68.
- 50 Eco, "The Semantics of Metaphor," 69.
- 51 Eco, "The Semantics of Metaphor," 70.
- 52 Eco, "The Semantics of Metaphor," 88.
- 53 Eco, "The Semantics of Metaphor," 70.
- 54 Eco, "The Semantics of Metaphor," 70.
- 55 Eco, "The Semantics of Metaphor," 70.
- 56 Eco, "The Semantics of Metaphor," 70.
- 57 Eco, "The Semantics of Metaphor," 70.
- 58 "Vision '65: New Challenges for Human Communications" preceded Vision '67.
- 59 R. Roger Remington and Robert S.P. Fripp, *Design and Science: The Life and Work of Will Burtin* (Aldershot: Lund Humphries, 2007), 122.
- 60 Remington and Fripp, *Design and Science*, 122.
- 61 Niilo Kauppi, *The Making of an Avant-garde: Tel Quel* (Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter, 1994), 322.
- 62 Phillipe Sollers, "Sur la Contradiction," *Tel Quel* 45 (1971): 3-22; Julia Kristeva, "Comment parler à la littérature?" *Tel Quel* 47 (1971): 3-18.
- 63 "A Beginner's Guide to Mao Tse-Tung," *Esquire* (December 1967): 213.
- 64 The photograph was taken by William Helburn and is readily available on the internet.