Public housing is in a period of major decline. Long-term disinvestment – associated with an ideological shift towards the neo-liberal shibboleths of something called ‘the market’, fetishised as an abstract, uncontrollable, autonomous force – and private property have rendered the construction of new public housing virtually unthinkable at the level of governance. Housing costs are an ever-present concern, yet its socio-political relevance is often overlooked – even as housing costs, as a percentage of median income, have increased exponentially (40). The sub-prime mortgage crisis, and its disastrous repercussions in the global economy, put housing on the map again, but the reaction of neo-liberal repercussions in the global economy, put housing on the map again, but the reaction of neo-liberal.

The Comprehensive Spending Review of October 2010 represented another massive assault on social housing. The government announced a budget cut for the construction of affordable homes for the next four years of nearly 50%, from £8.4 billion to £4.5 billion. Meanwhile, the system for managing council housing financing – the Housing Revenue Account subsidy system – is set to be replaced with an undisclosed ‘self-financing’ arrangement. Funding for promised 150,000 new ‘social’ homes, it is proposed, could be raised by allowing Housing Associations to charge their tenants a new ‘Affordable Rent’ tenancy at 80% of the market rate. The principal of secure tenancies is also under threat. For new tenants, Government policy is to give Housing Associations powers to grant ‘fixed-term tenancies’ with a minimum time period of two years, abolishing the right to existing secure or assured lifetime tenancies. Social polarisation will be exacerbated by allocating the basis of those who are, “the most vulnerable in society and those who need it most”, reinforcing existing policy and further tarnishing the principle of social housing for all (5). Meanwhile, Government proposals to reduce Housing Benefit by 10% for job seekers who have been out of work for more than 12 months. Unemployed people will have to make up the rent shortfall from the £65 they get on Job Seekers Allowance, even as almost half of those on Local Housing Allowance (for those renting privately) are already £100 a month short of what they need to pay the rent (6).

Public and social housing is being attacked like never before, and much of it is justified by a campaign of vilification which judges the people who live in public housing, just as harshly as the public housing itself. Militant Modernism, by Owen Hatherley, and Where the Other Half Lives: Lower Income Housing in a Neoliberal World, edited by Sarah Glynn, however affirm the dogma of ‘no alternative’ is a neo-liberal commonplace – despite signs everywhere of that creed’s decadence – Hatherley’s excavation of ‘Socialist Modernism’ and Glynn et al’s affirmation of collective housing struggle offer primers for a different kind of future. Militant Modernism ranges historically from France, New Zealand, Australia, Canada and the US. For the purposes of this review, I want to concentrate on those elements in each book which consider housing and urban questions in the UK.

Militant Modernism
Owen Hatherley’s Militant Modernism attempts to resuscitate a radical modernism from its ossification within academia, the heritage industry, and the jaded discourses of ‘leftism’. Appearing as part of the Zero Books series, the title makes good on the imprint’s manifesto claim that “another kind of discourse – intellectual without being academic, popular without being populist – is not only possible: it is already flourishing”. A dedication to the memory of the Victorian Architects Department, and a quote from John Ruskin’s A Defence of the Idealists (1853), frames the ecletic, but critical tone of a wide-ranging excavation of Utopia from the “futures ruins” – those architectural relics of modernism still extant in urban life.

Hatherley asks if the modernist impulse to ‘erase the traces’ – to destroy in order to create – can revive a once radical modernism that would certainly reject current attempts to replicate parallel ‘preservation’ aspects of the modernist conservation organisation like DOCOMOMO (7), argues, have granted Modernism more museum status, but in doing so they have surrendered the radical heritage of modernism. As Pawley contends, this tendency mockingly accepts Modernism’s ‘absorption into the art-historical classification system as a style…converting their once proud revolutionary instruments back into monuments for the delectation of the masses alongside the palaces of the ancient regime…” (p.5-6). Hatherley’s argument, however, follows Walter Benjamin, whose “destructive character knows only one watchword: make room. And only one activity: clearing away. His need for fresh air and space is stronger than any hatred” (Cited, p.4). Benjamin’s desire to ‘live without traces’, manifested his desire to suppress the historical accretion of decadent bourgeois culture superimposed in the re-imagined image of Klein’s Angel of History. His “dialectical, double-edged” acumens, aimed to blast open the capitalist dream world, with its proliferation of phantasmagorical commodities, “into an entirely new world; one shaped by the promise of an end to the纪”，≠मिलियंट मोर्ननिज्म (8). For the avant-garde modernisms, as for Benjamin, “erasing the traces” meant “outwring the old world before it has the chance to hit you with you” (p.5). For Hatherley, modernism had no interest in continuity: the shift from 19th century encrustation to the stark, unfinished concrete wall was “brutally sharp”; not merely progression, but “an interruption, a rupture, a break with the continuum altogether…” (p.6).

Militant Modernism was written with the coda that “the Left Modernisms of the 20th century
continue to be useful: a potential index of ideas, such masses failed, tried, tripped or broken on the wheel of the market or the state” (p.13). Even in their ruinous state, suggests Hatherley, they offer “spectral blueprints” (p.126) alternative to the neoliberal dogma that ‘there is no alternative’. Hatherley’s “nostalgia for the future” resides in his reflection on modernist architecture as the radical challenge to the more prosaic aspects of social democracy: the once futuristic walkways, precincts and high-rises of modernism, even in their dilapidation, engender a critique of the conservatism, and inelegance reproduced through contemporary planning and architecture. What remains of Council Housing and the NIS are the vestiges of a ‘Ridofide for the Working Class’ envisioned by Aneurin Bevan and others. For Hatherley, these contested remains of modernism represent an epochal moment when the working-class got ideas above their station. The worth of his untimely thesis lies in its unashamed determination to consider the more radical moments of modernism dialectically. With a nod to Brecht and Eisler, he points us ‘Forwards! Not Forgetting’.

When the Situationist Internationale (SI), developed the theory of the dérive (“a mode of experimental behavior linked to the conditions of ‘futurism’: a technique of rapid passage through varied ambiances”), they updated techniques from the Surrealists, and cultivated an urban critical praxis as a means to critique the “Haussanisation of Paris and the ideology of urbanism”. They thus sought out the labyrinthian alleyways of old Paris where Hausmann’s hand had no dominion; where odd corners, the working-class and worn surfaces could still afford to exist. But, for Hatherley, the SI were prone to nostalgia, and for him the modern dérive, in a UK context, would have to take place among the concrete walkways of the 1960s (p.11), rather than the quaint streets of Victoriana, which might be the perverse analogue to those Precariat zones investigated by the SI. The contention is debatable: the dérive is a mode of experimental critical enquiry, and the point is surely that everything must come under critique in a society dominated by capitalist relations. However, Hatherley’s argument generates a stimulating eulogy to the Neo Brutalism – a harsh architectural interlude within modernism – that presents a hypothesis which is original and provocative.

Brutalist architecture took its name from the French term Atroon brut: raw reinforced concrete, cast in rough, unfinished form; while the term The New Brutalism derives from a Reyner Banham book on the architectural movement. The buildings of New Brutalism fetishised “hardness, dynamism, scale and rough edges” (p.17), and were informed by the advanced urban industrial landscapes of the UK, the most developed post-industrial society in the 19th century. The return to pre-industrial arcadia, evoked in the phrase ‘An Englishman’s Home is his Castle’ is both patriarchal absurdity, and retro-feudal myth. As Hatherley notes, a ‘castle’ intimates a functionalist fortress, not a Mock-Tudor home in suburbia. A closer analogue is a high-rise modernist housing estate like Robin Hood Gardens in Poplar, London. Hatherley is at pains to stress that there is no pristine return. Britain’s Gardens in Poplar, London. Hatherley is at pains to stress that there is no pristine return. Britain’s erstwhile linden avenues were as mysterious and attractive as a machine for producing numbers!” (p.19). Of course, there was a context for this ‘no-holds-barred’ productivity. The post-war housing crisis risked causing major social unrest, and the “numbers game” was fought out by both major parties in electoral competition. As well as easing working-class housing deficit, a period of near full employment, investment in public housing (reproduction) eased upward pressure on wage-bargaining at the level of production. These arguments shouldn’t detract from some of the gains that were made in eradicating the worst of tenement slum housing and preventing the working-class antagonism in securing public housing. Nevertheless, the undefended defence of socialist modernism born from its most avant-garde tendencies fails to account for the rather more banal condition of most post-war public housing. Meanwhile, only latterly does Hatherley mention the working-class people who live in the kind of blocks he laments. He is right to note that tenants frequently want to stay in council flats, despite virulent campaigns of defamation waged on public housing. But his argument that tenants like the “views and the open space” (p.42) is insufficient even if it does express a sentiment that truth that detractors rarely acknowledge. One flat in a block may be suffused with light, and benefit from fantastic views; another flat on the same block might lie in the shadow of the building, be prone to damp, and have a less than glorious perspective. Depending on what is being allocated, in a vastly reduced market, it’s a bit of a lottery. Another explanation might be that those people who want to remain in public housing are often being offered an even worse option in ‘stock transfer’ regeneration packages. Above all, public housing remains the cheapest option, and wanting to remain in council housing is a thoroughly pragmatic and common-sense decision.

The widespread rejection of ‘stock transfer’ from Council Housing to Housing Associations across the UK has shown that tenants have a natural distrust of hyperbolic ‘regeneration’ rhetoric. Hatherley’s tribute to militant modernism provides a stirring counter-discourse to stigmatizing discourses, but at times his argument founders on an outlook that privileges the aesthetic over a deeper analysis of the role of working-class antagonism in securing public housing, and the constitutive role of economics in determining outcomes in the built environment. As Frederic Jameson once observed, “We’ve had machines in England for donkey’s years, they’re no novelty to us” (p.24).

While Vorticism failed to stamp its presence on everyday life, effectively wrapping up with the onset of World War I, the New Brutalism was a product of a Social Democratic institution (London’s metropolitan government in its changing guises: LCC, GLC,) and had a chance to influence the quotidian through (limited) architectural commissions. New Brutalism regarded itself as the real fulfiment of modernism’s initial radical impulses, and in tracts like ‘Criteria for Mass Housing’ opposed itself to the established practice of the ‘classical’ modernists of the International Congresses of Modern Architecture (CIAM). ‘Angry young London architects’, like Alison and Peter Smithson, were immersed in the problem of producing architecture of everyday use-value for the proletariat, and saw themselves as, “building for the socialist dream, which is something different from complying with a programme written by the socialist state” (p.53). For Hatherley, Brutalism was defined in some relation to the pop, sex, and glamour of its times. In one memorable passage, Hatherley pays homage to Pulp’s ‘ten minute fantasies’, ‘Shelley’s Secret’. Not only did the concrete lines and walkways of Park Hill are imbued with a sense of mesmeric eroticism, finally climaxing in a collective orgasm on Park Hill at 4.13 am (p.37). The Barbian complex, meanwhile, is “as mysterious and attractive as a JJ Ballard heroine!” (p.34), while Eros House is noted as a reminder of the ‘strangely intimate’ (p.36) tone that creeps into the aesthetic of Brutalism. JJ Ballard’s Artyfacts Exhibition, Crash, and Concrete Island have covered similar terrain before, but Hatherley’s account adds a particularly architectural slant to the popular, everyday conjuncture of flesh and concrete, adding a cultural and aesthetic dimension largely absent from accounts of public housing. For Hatherley, the remaing ‘cities in the sky’ are persistent vestiges of socialist modernism, a modernism now being dismantled at frightening speed through urban development projects that routinely mask the real class conflict or gentrification through the utilitarian euphemism of ‘regeneration’. Strangely, for a polemic so firmly wedded to notions of radical rupture (slightly shifting the traces) the concept of creative destruction, the Schumpetarian mantra for neoliberal modes of deregulation and ‘renewal’, appears only lately. Even when this rhetoric was so firmly wedded to municipal socialism, as with Glasgow in the 1960s (the ‘shock city’ of the modernist housing revolution), the process and rhetoric was amenable to say the least. When David Gibson, Glasgow’s post-war ‘housing crusader’ (“arguably the most remarkable of Western Europe’s post-war municipal housing leaders”19), who trained as a civil engineer Lewis Cross to develop a programme of house building in Glasgow, their “extreme concern for output” was driven by the maximisation of ‘productivity’. They eagerly embraced ‘package-deal’ housing contracts in a process of ever diminishing respect for the ‘art of quality’. In the 1960s, under their leadership, high-rise flats made up nearly 75% of all completions compared to less than 10% in all other post-war years: this period marked “the most concentrated multi-storey drive experienced by any city in the UK”20. Cross’s crude utility was notorious. One planner said of him: “He had no conscience, no soul, no heart – just a machine for producing numbers”21. Of course, there was a context for this ‘no-holds-barred’ productivity. The post-war housing crisis risked causing major social unrest, and the “numbers game” was fought out by both major parties in electoral competition. As well as easing working-class housing deficit, a period of near full employment, investment in public housing (reproduction) eased upward pressure on wage-bargaining at the level of production. These arguments shouldn’t detract from some of the gains that were made in eradicating the worst of tenement slum housing and preventing the working-class antagonism in securing public housing. Nevertheless, the undefended defence of socialist modernism born from its most avant-garde tendencies fails to account for the rather more banal condition of most post-war public housing. Meanwhile, only latterly does Hatherley mention the working-class people who live in the kind of blocks he laments. He is right to note that tenants frequently want to stay in council flats, despite virulent campaigns of defamation waged on public housing. But his argument that tenants like the “views and the open space” (p.42) is insufficient even if it does express a sentiment that truth that detractors rarely acknowledge. One flat in a block may be suffused with light, and benefit from fantastic views; another flat on the same block might lie in the shadow of the building, be prone to damp, and have a less than glorious perspective. Depending on what is being allocated, in a vastly reduced market, it’s a bit of a lottery. Another explanation might be that those people who want to remain in public housing are often being offered an even worse option in ‘stock transfer’ regeneration packages. Above all, public housing remains the cheapest option, and wanting to remain in council housing is a thoroughly pragmatic and common-sense decision. The widespread rejection of ‘stock transfer’ from Council Housing to Housing Associations across the UK has shown that tenants have a natural distrust of hyperbolic ‘regeneration’ rhetoric. Hatherley’s tribute to militant modernism provides a stirring counter-discourse to stigmatizing discourses, but at times his argument founders on an outlook that privileges the aesthetic over a deeper analysis of the role of working-class antagonism in securing public housing, and the constitutive role of economics in determining outcomes in the built environment. As Frederic Jameson once observed, “We’ve had machines in England for donkey’s years, they’re no novelty to us” (p.24).
Sarah Glynn et al’s substantive and empirical account of public housing in *Where The Other Half Lives* helps fill in some of those parts in his account. *Where The Other Half Lives* can’t match the imaginative vigour of *Militant Modernism*, but it does offer fresh insights into the very much from within the perspective of collective class struggle in housing.

**Everyday Modernism**

“Public ownership allowed for a municipal form of collective control, took both the land and housing out of the property market, boosted the role of elected local councils and provided a decent home at affordable rents to far more than a third of the population by the late 1970s, dramatically reducing the social power of capital and the disciplinary role of rents and mortgages in the labour market.” — Stuart Hodgkinson

Hodkinson’s appraisal of public housing as part of a great account of housing privatisation in *Where The Other Half Lives* does a good job of summing up his positive role in countering the tyranny of private rent, even if ambivalence remains, for this author at least, over “the role of elected local councils” in the ownership and management of public housing. As well as a bulwark against rent hikes, municipal housing has also provided “an expedient service”, obfuscating the failings of the private market. Glynn cites Peter Malpass who has argued that state intervention in council housing has played a significant supporting role for the private sector by supplying needs not met by the market, securing government contracts for the construction industry, and withdrawing when housing construction becomes more profitable for the private sector (p.23-24). Nevertheless, Hodkinson’s summary of the social benefits of public housing provides an important reminder to a dominant narrative of stigmatisation. As Glynn observes, an emphasis on the continuity of capitalist control of the housing market obscures, by “socialising class struggle” in secure housing. She cites a Community Development Project report in 1976 which contrasted “the political struggle of the working class to establish a socialised form of housing which recognised the right of everyone to a decent home at a reasonable cost”, to the political ‘Right’ who “have always tried to contain development of council housing by narrowly defining the purposes for which it is to be provided, and creating an alternative to it more closely aligned to their interests” (p.24).

While Hatherley’s version of militant modernism tends to reify the ‘roles’ of specialists in housing (architects, planners, artists, film-makers, etc), *Where The Other Half Lives* emphasises the role of collective working-class agency in obtaining decent, affordable housing. This support for the direct action of the community from necessity. In 19th century laissez-faire capitalism, the ruling classes believed it was neither right nor necessary to intervene in housing markets. Until after World War I, nine out of ten households rented their home from private landlords, and rack-renting and slum conditions were endemic. By 1917, as the Scottish Royal Commission acknowledged, there was more than enough pre-war evidence to show “the inability of private enterprise to provide housing for the working-class”. All of this is widely known, and the slum conditions of the period have been detailed extensively. More important is the attempt by this report to respond to the working-class to these conditions, and the reaction elicited from government. The Industrial Unrest Commission of 1917, for instance, recorded that slum housing had become a “great public menace” and an important source of social tension; while the Royal Commission on the Housing of the Industrial Population of Scotland conceded that, “Beneath the facade of prosperity, housing had become artful...; to-day, after three years of war, it is too inexcusable to be disregarded any longer” (p.15-17).

The “stigmatised, just as private home ownership was both subsidised and eulogised through right-to-own schemes and poor management has, since resulted in council housing that has come to be seen as a residual second choice for those unable to afford their own home” (p.29). As Glynn notes, such systemic inequalities are crudely ignored in the resultant false choice between degenerated council housing and regenerated ‘social’ housing.

Glynn’s purview suggests other histories unrealised. In the post World War II reconstruction, Aneurin Bevan, as Health Minister in charge of Housing, offered a “glimpse of a socialist vision” – housing as a universal public service, just like the National Health Service (p.20-21). Bevan’s redefinition of the *Working Class*, for the “Working Classes” from the Act’s title, and his conception of housing, located firmly within Laburist Keynesian principles of equitable redistribution, was one where good quality homes in mixed communities would be built by local authorities for people of all backgrounds. Bevan failed to nationalise housing, but he did ensure that four-fifths of the country’s new homes were provided by Local Authorities at a quality standard still recognised today, and that the scale of economic restraints, the prioritisation of foreign policy and defence, and the scale of damage done to Britain’s housing stock during World War II, meant that the post-war housing and the universal public housing provision were quashed by the realpolitik of the ‘numbers game’. But the scale of ambition in his proposals are a powerful argument for the contemporary demands for the ‘Fourth Option’ in housing (direct investment as an alternative to the three options of ‘stock transfer’ of council housing to Housing Associations, PFI schemes, and control by Arms Length Management Organisations).

In fairness, the less than inspiring demand for a ‘Fourth Option’ in the current state of the status of Council Housing amongst a raft of public-private options – signified, in the parlance of ‘regeneration’, by a lack of will to build “regeneration” – and the threat that threatens to engulf public housing in a wave of privatisation. These institutional co-ordinates are, of course, as much a heritage of ‘the Left’ as they are of ‘the Right’, as witnessed by the catalytic role the Labour Party have played in prosecuting neoliberalism. In this context, Glynn’s criticism of neoliberalism, central to her overall argument, is in certain respects flawed. For instance, she argues that, “Neoliberalism, as the name implies, is based on a return to the ideas of free-market liberalism that predominated in the 19th century, where the welfare state and the Keynesian mixed economy” (p.9). Further, she asserts that neoliberalism, “dislodging the previous social structures of the Keynesian mixed economy” (p.38), is diametrically opposed to anything that interferes with capital accumulation. However, on the question of redistribution, it is profoundly assisted by the state, which under neoliberal conditions pro-actively regulates the planning and institutional landscape on behalf of neoliberal accumulation strategies.

As Foucault insisted, power is productive. Cuts in state budgets are also opportunities for capitalist growth in former state sectors. It would be better to theorise the neoliberal state, along with Hardt and Negri, “as not really a regime of unregulated capitalism, but rather a regime of accumulation that best facilitates the global movements and profits of capital” (p.22). Neil Smith usefully elaborates on this point, framing the working-class as a form of capital, thus illuminating the role of the 18th century liberal axioms of Locke and Smith – e.g. the free exercise of individual self interest leads to the optimal collective social good, private property is a self interest, free market exchange is its ideal vehicle. Twentieth century US liberalism (Woodrow Wilson, Franklin Roosevelt) for better or worse, redistributed social security to counter the excesses of capitalism, was not so much a misnomer as a re-appropriation of liberal terms in an attempt to rebrand their strategy of redistribution of their original axioms. Contemporary neoliberalism “represents a significant return to the original axioms of liberalism” but this time galvanised by 20th century liberalism, resulting in “an
unprecedented mobilisation not just of national state power but of state power organised and exercised at different geographical scales.” Henri Lefebvre’s conception of the State of Production (SMP) is also useful here. For Lefebvre, the SMP is intimately bound up with state power and in this way its objective will become the point if we simply say that neoliberalism is But as Benjamin Noys recently wrote, we miss the point simply say that neoliberalism as statist as other governmental forms. Writing on Foucault, he argues that, “the necessity is to analyse how neoliberalism creates a new form of governmentality in which the state performs a different function: permeating society to subject it to the economic.” In the words of Foucault, Neoliberalism intervenes on society so that competitive mechanisms “play a regulatory role at every moment and every point in society and by intersecting in this way its objective will become the possible, that is to say, a general regulation of the society by the market”. Thus we move from “a state under the supervision of the market rather than the market supervised by the state.” The state thus needs to be conceptualised as a denoted but active partner in neoliberal accumulation strategies, and this necessitates a more critical position to social democracy than Glynn allows. This has serious consequences for the way change is conceptualised. As Glynn acknowledges, one of the main reasons for the atrophying condition of council housing in the UK has been grass-roots reliance on the Labour Party, with an emphasis on parliamentary socialising. This adherence to the Labour Party and the state is in contrast to many European socialists who have been more wary of state involvement, setting up independent councils and organisations to advance their claims (p.29). The current situation in the UK, where tenants sit on Housing Association committees with the landlords, is indicative of a situation where tenants have been fully incorporated into the management structures of private companies, surrendering whatever independence they had into the bargain. While Glynn is deeply critical of these developments, an inadequate theorisation of the complicity of private companies, surrendering whatever independence they had into the bargain, which constitutes the material underpinning for all the facets of this project. Urbanism – ‘city planning’ – is capitalism’s method for taking over the natural and human environment. Even if a “certain utopian irresolution” (McDonough p.16) hung over the SI project of unitary urbanism, it is the requirements of functionalist planning as a concrete expression of the hierarchical organisation of advanced late capitalism casts a long shadow over the housing question as a discrete and specialist mode of inquiry. Hatherley, in a positive review of Glynn’s book, hints at a possible resolution when he asks if we can ever regard council housing as our architecture, or rather, “an architecture we defend as best we can for want of something better” 27. Defending council housing, just defending all those other state institutions currently being attacked by ‘The Cuts’, risks obscuring all the cuts that have preceded the current ones, and hiding the incorporation of social democracy into Fordist/ Keynesian modes of state productivism on behalf of capital. What we defend has already been cut, and this history, and those who sanctioned it, must be recognised. However, Hatherley’s point leads us to certain unavoidable realities. We defend Council housing, education (“the sausage factory”)28, the NHS, welfare provision, transport services, etc, because of solidarity, and because if we don’t the options are even worse. But in doing so we risk delimiting the parameters of struggle – only talking about what the telly tells us about these ‘minimum’ demands are necessary, and Glynn’s book lags some of them out very well, but without ‘maximum’ demands (the radical construction of a new world) the claims of the present risk being defined by the limited parameters of a circumscribed past. The SI have received sustained critique over the years29, but their refusal of utopian project building, following Marx’s aversion to formulating abstract schemes of a capitalist relations, led them to a position where they were viewed as the most exemplary critique of human geography, and thus a subject of the most refined critique of urbanism (p.28-29). If that sounds implausible in these austere times, it’s worth remembering – as Glynn’s history of council housing shows – that many of the problems we have emerged from the existence, or threat, of revolutionary activity backed by sizeable working-class movements.

Summary

In the recent introduction to a collection of writings by the Situationist International (SI) – The Situationalists and the City – Tom McDonough argues that what is important about the SI is not the plans they produced in their ‘architectural interlude’ (1957-62), but their critique of urbanism and its challenges to its very premises and ways of thinking. Resisting the viewpoint that the SI are simply a critique of urbanism, or rather, “an architecture we defend as best we can for want of something better” 30, McDonough suggests that the most compelling moments of SI theory are precisely those ideas which express a radical resistance to incorporation and assimilation into the material histories of the 20th century and the historical neo-avant-gardes. Borrowing heavily from Henri Lefebvre, the SI set about a radical critique of functionalism and modernisation in planning and architecture. Urbanism was seen as the very technology of separation, and modernist architecture, for them, lay somewhere between the barricades of the Working Class and the barricades of the City. As Guy Debord wrote in 1967, “The society that reshapes its entire surroundings has evolved its own special technique for moulding its own territory, which constitutes the material underpinning for all the facets of this project. Urbanism – ‘city planning’ – is capitalism’s method for taking over the natural and human environment.”
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