

# INTRODUCTION

## UNDEAD NEOLIBERALISMS

*Kenny Cupers, Catharina Gabrielsson, and Helena Mattsson*

IN THE WAKE OF THE 2008 FINANCIAL CRISIS, critics have proclaimed neoliberalism dead. Identified as the originary economic theory of the Reagan-Thatcher revolution and as a widespread ideology that celebrates the logic of the market for governing human affairs, neoliberalism, some critics were quick to declare, was now finally proven defunct.<sup>1</sup> The economic policies invented by a small group of self-proclaimed neoliberal economists—based largely at the University of Chicago in the 1970s and 1980s—and adopted across the globe over the decades since then had ultimately failed to deliver economic growth in any sustainable way, despite their promises. Even the deputy director of the research department at the International Monetary Fund (IMF), long considered one of the bastions of neoliberal ideology, declared in 2016 that “the way we have been thinking can’t be right.”<sup>2</sup> Joseph Stiglitz, former vice president of the World Bank and Nobel Laureate in economics—suggested that today’s students and policy makers are no longer interested in enforcing a neoliberal rationality.<sup>3</sup> And in the wake of the 2016 American presidential election, the philosopher and activist Cornel West went so far as to state that “the neoliberal era in the United States ended with a neofascist bang.”<sup>4</sup>

Despite these claims, however, many of the political-economic processes that scholars have analyzed under the rubric of neoliberalism—the expansion of markets, the undoing of social welfare policies, financial deregulation, the

privatization of collective goods and services, and so on—have not ceased. Instead, the opposite has occurred, as some speak of a “retro-neoliberal turn (back) to revanchism,” manifested in even more aggressive forms of marketization spiraling into extremes of global inequalities.<sup>5</sup> Others, including Philip Mirowski, have suggested that crisis does not constitute the end of neoliberalism but rather has become one of its very motors, because crisis ultimately provides opportunities for even more violent and voracious processes of market expansion.<sup>6</sup> It should not surprise then that the 2017 Nobel Memorial Prize in Economic Sciences was awarded to the Chicago school economist Richard H. Thaler for his contributions to behavioral economics—the study of *Homo economicus* par excellence.<sup>7</sup> Neoliberalism is thus being declared dead precisely at the moment when it seems to become ever more pervasive and all-encompassing.

A similar undeath seems to plague neoliberalism at the conceptual level. “Neoliberalism is everywhere, but at the same time, nowhere,” writes Rajesh Venugopal in a 2015 review of academic literature on the topic.<sup>8</sup> In his assessment of how the term is used and what it means across a range of social science disciplines, he traces not only its increasingly expansive definitions since the 1970s but also its increasing incoherence and contradictory uses. Depending on one’s definition and disciplinary purview, he argues, neoliberalism can be conceptualized as set of economic policies for market expansion, a political agenda of class rule, or a set of technologies of the self. But when neoliberalism is at once macroeconomic and micropolitical, ostensibly democratic and easily combined with authoritarian rule, a specific school of economic policy and the marker of our global era, how useful is it still as an analytical category? Venugopal is hardly the only one to question the viability of the concept, but he has gone so far as to argue that neoliberalism serves primarily “as a rhetorical tool and moral device for critical social scientists outside of economics to conceive of academic economics and a range of economic phenomena that are otherwise beyond their cognitive horizons and which they cannot otherwise grasp or evaluate.”<sup>9</sup> Despite such indictment, the scholarship on neoliberalism has only continued to grow.

Starting from neoliberalism’s refusal to die, both in the world “out there” and as an academic concept, this book proposes to shift the debate toward more a historically and concretely grounded mode of analysis. To analyze neoliberalism both as a specific rationality at work in politics, economics, and government and as a set of concrete political-economic processes and practices that have reshaped our physical and social worlds over the past decades, architectural history offers a particularly fruitful and yet underexplored methodological lens. Building on recent scholarship that has begun to historicize neoliberalism, the book proposes a historical method of inquiry that is atten-

tive to the concrete ways in which politics is made sensible and given sense in the world around us.<sup>10</sup>

### **Architecture's Historical Agency**

If one were to look for a clear and succinct definition of neoliberalism, David Harvey's might well be the one. Neoliberalism for him is the view that "human well-being can best be advanced by liberating individual entrepreneurial freedoms and skills within an institutional framework characterized by strong private property rights, free markets, and free trade."<sup>11</sup> In other words, neoliberalism is not an economic theory (it is in fact hardly if ever mentioned by mainstream economists, as often remarked) but a political belief in the primacy of the market for governing human affairs. This belief is at the basis of a range of policies aimed at inserting, expanding, or mimicking market-based mechanisms in domains previously understood as lying beyond or set apart from the market. Because of this, neoliberalism carries significance on the level of social organization, human relationships, and the conception of values—rather or perhaps more than in the discipline of economics as such. Approaching neoliberalism as a rationality or a belief, scholars from a range of social science and humanities fields see its manifestation in a variety of market-centric policies and processes, including privatization, financialization, and deregulation, in a historical context in which the state, in many but certainly not all cases, steps back from its former responsibilities of social provision. This does not mean the withdrawal of the state, scholars now agree, but rather a reconfiguration of the relationship between market and state.<sup>12</sup>

As straightforward as such a definition may seem, it readily exposes fundamental problems and problematic assumptions that plague studies of neoliberalism.<sup>13</sup> The crux of these problems is arguably in the relationship between neoliberalism as a specific form of reasoning and the real-world policies and practices that tend to be grouped under the same name. Neoliberalism can refer to a hegemonic abstract idealization of the market, but it can also be used as umbrella term for concrete, market-oriented restructuring policies and practices. In studies of neoliberalism, this distinction is not always made, and, if so, the relationship between idea and practice is more often assumed than it is substantiated. For example, the common assumption that neoliberalism can be identified with specific forms of capitalism, notably finance capitalism, is often dismissed by economic historians who study the longer history of capitalism.<sup>14</sup> That does not mean, however, that recent processes of financialization, including that of housing, cannot be substantively linked to identifiably neoliberal policies.<sup>15</sup> But attempts to capture neoliberalism at its core often end up being all-encompassing and thus run into conflict with other theories. For Aihwa Ong, for instance, neoliberalism is a "mobile technology" that re-

casts governing activities as nonpolitical, which leads to radically decentered and technocratic modes of governance.<sup>16</sup> This interpretation contradicts that of neoliberalism as the political project of a class-based counterrevolution, a perspective adopted by, for example, David Harvey, and it fits uneasily into the longer history of twentieth-century technopolitics, as attempts to govern through seemingly nonpolitical means both exceed and predate the neoliberal turn.<sup>17</sup> Such contradictions are not surprising, however, because neoliberalism is always contradictory, carrying its own negation and resistance, as well as alternative imaginaries, within it. But if neoliberalism is in fact so fundamentally “contradictory” and “polymorphic,” as Jamie Peck and others claim, why should we even assume that these contradictions and forms are all expressions of that same underlying thing we label “neoliberalism”?<sup>18</sup>

It is one thing to avoid perceiving neoliberalism as both essential and ubiquitous by searching for “actually existing neoliberalisms,” but it is quite another to see the same logic at work in so many diverging and contradictory processes.<sup>19</sup> Rather than assume the existence of such a logic and a coherence for which historical proof is lacking, this book focuses on architecture to substantiate specific relationships between ideas and practices. The contributions to this volume do away with grand narratives of a neoliberal turn to instead examine specific examples of how architecture since the 1960s has borne witness to particular political-economic processes and forms of reasoning, some of which can uncontroversially be labeled neoliberal, while many others may test the limits of that label. Rather than to ask what a neoliberal architecture looks like, or how architecture represents neoliberalism, the chapters in this volume examine the role of architecture, urban design, and built environments in processes of economic transformation that can be substantively linked to neoliberal reason.

Going beyond narratives of well-known architects or iconic buildings and projects, this book is based on the premise that everyday built environments can play both passive and active roles: they can not only reflect political-economic change but also, in their very construction, can effectuate or even enable it. To investigate such processes in detail, the book explores historically contingent and geographically specific processes in China, Turkey, South Africa, Argentina, Mexico, the United States, Britain, France, Sweden, and Czechoslovakia. Architecture, as a set of both discourses and practices, can be used to explore the relationship between neoliberal reason (the abstract idealization of the market) and concrete, market-oriented restructuring processes. This means understanding neoliberalism as a *project* that is almost utopian in the sense that it is driven by the belief that “market forces operate according to immutable laws no matter where they are unleashed.”<sup>20</sup> It is the tension between these two registers that allows us to observe more clearly how neoliberal

## INTRODUCTION: UNDEAD NEOLIBERALISMS

processes and projects are implemented and configured in different contexts. Examining the role of architecture in how neoliberalism “hits the ground” is thus to uncover specific historical and geographical processes marked by contingency and seen as dependent on local contexts—their political narratives, organizational conditions, and cultural dynamics. We therefore conceptualize neoliberalization as a contradictory, “uneven” process, replete with affirmations and resistances.

Buildings, housing, and projects of urban transformation are often taken as symbols of the political doctrine of late capitalism, which proposes market exchange as both a remedy for social problems and a universal form of social organization. If cities have been acknowledged as sites of primary importance for neoliberal experimentation—places where the techniques of neoliberalism are forged, played out, and actively contested—architecture’s role in these processes has been relatively neglected. Little has been said on how architectural practice and design—with its accompanying discourses and modes of representation—confer with neoliberal regimes and how questions of aesthetics and spatial experience come into play in shaping the new biopolitical subject of neoliberalism.<sup>21</sup> The relative lack of scholarship on architecture and neoliberalism might be due to a common misunderstanding that architecture (unlike the city) is a phenomenon set apart from policy, regulations, and processes of governance. The various analyses undertaken in this book make it clear, however, that architecture must be understood in a broader sense, and yet it carries a distinction both in relation to “the city” and “the built environment.” When referring to “architecture,” the contributions to this volume are not limiting our understanding to physical objects created by architects nor do they consider it solely as a discursive “truth game” that serves as an instrument of control in contemporary processes of neoliberalization. Instead, the contributors understand architecture as simultaneously practice, inhabited space, aesthetic discourse, and material culture in ways that are involved, in different registers and scales, in the complex processes of societal transformation that neoliberalization entails.

In adopting such a broad understanding of architecture, the authors of this book aim to demonstrate the many ways in which the concrete everyday is connected to some of the abstract economic theories and policies that have reshaped the world in myriad ways since the 1970s. Addressing the built environment as complex assemblies with the capacity to shape, structure, and condition human action rather than just frame it, this book collectively investigates the agency of architecture in confirming, resisting, or even preceding neoliberal restructuring forces. Architecture is not simply a mirror of politics and social conditions but an active agent that shapes individuals, institutions, and policy. Simultaneously immaterial and material in form, architecture op-

erates across the registers of production processes, cultural objects, and biopolitical tools.

This book is a history of architecture as discipline and agency; a history of materializations, representations, and symbolic values; an analysis of social ordering and experimentation. From different standpoints and concrete situations, the various chapters of this book combine to produce a nuanced but also contradictory account of the historical agency of architecture in political-economic change. The increasing dominance of market-centric rule since the 1970s prompts us to understand how architecture, as a discipline and as a profession, itself undergoes historic transformations, which range from theoretical shifts to new technologies that radically alter how architecture is conceived, mediated, and produced. In showing how the advent of new ideals, metaphors, and concepts alters professional roles and sets off new entrepreneurial actors, this book also targets the role of discourse in and for social transformation. In Reinhold Martin's estimation, as certain things are rendered unthinkable and unspeakable, there is a change in the self-perception of the profession that is linked to larger epistemic shifts.<sup>22</sup> To capture these varied and multifaceted transformations, architecture operates as a conceptual lens. It allows us to trace and discern the complex interplay among policies, economics, and everyday lives through a set of practices, tools, and disciplinary mind-sets that simultaneously produce and mirror specific processes of neoliberalization.

### **The Temporality of Neoliberalization**

The history outlined in this book confers with a broader trajectory of architectural historiography. Mary McLeod, in her path-breaking text "Architecture and Politics in the Reagan Era" (1989), proposed two distinct interpretations of architecture, the first relating to processes of production that involve architecture's material role in the economy, and the second addressing architecture's production as cultural objects, including the reception of architecture.<sup>23</sup> Contributing to a new take on historiography, McLeod's article put forward an understanding of architecture as embedded in temporalities, materialities (built), and immaterialities (unbuilt), going beyond perspectives conditioned by the architect as the "author." Instead, she or he becomes one agent among others in a network of things, protocols, decisions, interests, agendas, regulations, and power relations. Some of the contributors to this volume build on this approach, as they explore the situated agency of the architect, engineer, and planner in heterogeneous discourses and practices. The book thus brings a historical perspective to studies on neoliberalism and architecture by shifting the focus from contemporary discourse to historical analysis of specific economic or political policies and their implementation.

Inherent to the conceptualization of such "actually existing neoliberal-

ism” is the distinction between the utopian idealism of neoliberalism and the uneven and variegated realism of processes of neoliberalization. To historicize the relationship between neoliberalism and architecture therefore not only calls for producing situated and detailed case studies but also for articulating the connections and bringing out the relations among them. Spanning a range of phenomena, from objects to landscapes, from the rural to the urban and processes of urbanization, the chapters of this book combine to show how architecture performs in interconnected and multiscale processes of political-economic transformation over time. In this way, the individual chapters come together, not only as situated in their time and place but also as expressive of larger structures—articulating “methods of decipherment,” as it were, by adopting different perspectives of the same complex.<sup>24</sup> Rather than assume the existence of such structures prior to investigation, however, the historian must substantiate how their specific evidence suggests this existence.

The methodological question of the relationship between specific case studies and larger political-economic transformations should thus be understood from a temporal perspective. This question can be interpreted first of all as a question of periodization. In the vast literature on neoliberalism, periodization is often contested, and it ranges from Michel Foucault’s study of ordoliberalism between the 1930s and the 1960s as the theoretical foundation for neoliberal reason, to David Harvey’s analysis of neoliberalism as a global shift in government and economic affairs starting in the late 1970s.<sup>25</sup> Architectural history does not resolve these divergent interpretations, and neither does it suggest one over the other. Its strength lies instead in connecting discursive timelines with political-economic ones in specific historical contexts. As such, it conveys how the construction of neoliberal reason might be mapped, albeit in a fragmentary way, onto concrete spaces and processes and, vice versa, how concrete events have consequences in intellectual production.

The question of periodization is nevertheless but one entry into the complex relationship between the temporality and materiality of architecture. Buildings persist in time, even when the forces that gave rise to them have changed. Exemplary here is the built heritage of the welfare state and in particular social housing. This temporal perspective centers on understanding processes of neoliberalization as occurring in waves and phases: an initial “roll-back” phase, which entails the dismantling of state welfare provision, and a second “rollout” phase, which establishes new relationships between state and market. The Fordist-Keynesian juridical framework governing architecture (and also governed by architecture) is destroyed (often in relation to economic crises), while the underlying relations between state, market, and social life are reconfigured in a different manner. Aspects of this regulatory shift in housing include the changing relationship between public and private space (see the

chapter by Kenny Cupers), the growing disjunction between finance and material practices (Anne Kockelkorn's chapter), and the global transformation, with the help of governments, of the housing sector into an absolutely central component of finance capitalism.<sup>26</sup> Beyond housing production, regulatory shifts include the growing emphasis on "flexibility" in specific building types. When Margaret Thatcher deregulated the British financial service sector in the 1980s, it gave rise to a new typology of flexible office buildings with interior atria, catering to a new kind of open plan office space (see the chapter by Amy Thomas), which in turn brought about deregulations in fire-safety design (and that of Liam Ross). Similar shifts in regulatory systems, involving flexibility and performance-based thinking, also occurred in the Swedish housing norms in the 1980s (Helena Mattsson's chapter) and can be seen in the introduction of discretionary zoning laws in New York City in 1967 (see Deepa Ramaswamy's contribution). Related to such re- and deregulations is the reorganization of professional labor and the emergence of new professional roles, such as the fire-safety consultant and the interior designer integrating design and management in London or the urban designer in New York City. If the aftermath of the 2008 crisis has shown that neoliberalism becomes further entrenched through a crisis of its own making, this tendency may be traced back to the early neoliberal policies in the almost bankrupt city that was New York in the 1970s.

### Neoliberalism and Postmodernism

Focusing on architecture and spatial production allows us to understand neoliberalism not so much as an umbrella term for any kind of political-economic change since the 1960s but as the material and cultural embodiment of a specific political-economic rationality. The chapters of this book evoke a *visual* and aesthetic perspective of how neoliberal reason is made sensible and, at the same time, how the political-economic processes that take place in its name contradict its idealizations. In this respect, the book also contributes to the ongoing reframing of postmodernism in architectural history today, in much the same way that recent historical scholarship on the postwar decades has helped revise dominant narratives about high modernism.<sup>27</sup> Implicitly or explicitly positing the 1970s as a historical break, dually marked by economic restructuring and the advent of a new cultural condition, recent historical scholarship on this period furnishes concrete agents of this shift without recourse to "postmodernism" as a black-boxed term. Examining historical relationships between postmodernism in architecture and the advent of neoliberalism necessarily involves an analysis of architecture's role in political-economic systems. Fredric Jameson's understanding of postmodern architecture as the cultural *expression* of late capitalism, to which it holds a "virtually unmediated relationship," foregrounds a new "hybrid" spatiality generated by reorganizations in capital that

are tied into technology and globalization.<sup>28</sup> This postmodern “hyperspace” suppresses distance in both time and space and submerges the subject in the immediate present without “sheltering layers and intervening mediations.”<sup>29</sup> By defining postmodernism as a “cultural dominant” rather than a specific style, Jameson makes allowances for the contradictions and differences in how postmodernism appears in various cultural fields. But this also serves to underline a view on postmodern architecture as the *outcome* of capitalism. For Jameson, architecture is identified with buildings procured by capital investors, framed in terms of property and real estate. The broader conceptualization of architecture from which this book operates, however, destabilizes the hierarchical and causal logic that characterizes Jameson’s approach.

The chapters collected here build on but also go beyond Jameson’s important argument about architecture being an expression of contemporary capitalism. Since the time of Jameson’s writings, that relationship has only become more entrenched and complicated. If, as Nancy Fraser has recently argued, capitalism has now reached a point where it saturates society as an “institutionalized order,” neoliberal reason is arguably one of the primary means by which such institutionalization has come about.<sup>30</sup> The chapters collected here examine how a political ideology driven by an almost fundamentalist faith in the virtues of the market for the provision of justice and the distribution of wealth is manifested in architecture and spatial production.<sup>31</sup> Viewed from this perspective, the ideals of democracy, progress, and the utopian in modernity are perhaps not so much abandoned in the wake of postmodernity but rather are dislocated, projected, or made integral to the promises of the market.<sup>32</sup>

The contributions to this volume—only some of which explicitly take on the discourse of “postmodernism”—suggest that an identification of postmodern architecture with the neoliberal turn is a simplification of both. While postmodernism is a notoriously vague concept, varying with the contexts onto which it is projected, scholars such as Reinhold Martin have suggested that its so-called apolitical apparition in architecture—whether involving a historical turn, an embrace of popular culture, or the repression of the utopian—is a symptom of neoliberalism. The chapters herein build on this argument, but they also further complicate relationships between cultural expressions, material form, politics, and economics. They show, for instance, how it was not the embrace of postmodernism but rather the *resistance* against its adoption that was affiliated with a neoliberal critique of the welfare state (Catharina Gabrielson) and how the “re-creation” of the historic inner city and the “rediscovery” of public space came in a postmodern cladding, as enforced by planning rather than the outcome of commercial interests (Helena Mattsson). Conversely, the heated engagement with postmodern discourse and forms of expression were active components in the restructuring of a former European socialist culture

(Maroš Krivý). At the same time, projects such as Rem Koolhaas's design of Euralille (Valéry Didelon) uncomfortably straddle these categories; Euralille is unmistakably "neoliberal" in its celebration of flexibility and capital flows but as an expression is very different from the urban schemes commonly associated with postmodernism.

### Structure of the Book

The structure of the book proposes four different approaches to architecture's historical role in the construction of neoliberal reason and in concrete processes of neoliberal reform. The built environment makes abstract rationality sensible, just as architecture serves political-economic processes of neoliberalization. But architecture can also resist such processes, by its very material presence or its symbolic power, and as such it can afford certain possibilities while foreclosing others. The book's four sections reflect the varied roles, both active and passive, that architecture plays in neoliberal thought and activity.

The first section, "Shifting Objects and Representations," analyzes not only how architectural objects and representations register political-economic change but also how material artifacts and representational frameworks produce new cultural meanings in the process of social change. This section centers on the ways in which architecture and urban design partake in creating, reinforcing, and transforming the complex web of meanings that, following the philosophy of Cornelius Castoriadis, provide the foundation for society. Encompassing notions of collective life as much as individual personhood, social imaginaries are transmitted through customs, habits, language. These imaginaries are embedded in space and in social institutions, and they constitute the slowly sliding ground over which societies change.<sup>33</sup> The speed of accelerated real estate transactions has allowed the commodity aspect of architecture to dominate aesthetic practice or use value. Anne Kockelkorn shows in her analyses of Ricardo Bofill's *Les Espaces d'Abbraxas* how the decisive property of housing production under the regime of the market is the disjunction of its representations. Different representations of housing drift further and further apart, projecting the ghostly attributes of the commodity onto an urban landscape whose properties and functions evade the mechanisms of bodily perceptions. Ana María León examines the delayed construction of Argentina's national library as an inverted ruin that attests to the political and economic instability that accompanied neoliberalization in Argentina. She shows how the materiality and anachronistic temporality of architecture illuminate the contradictions of the region's late capitalist modernity. Catharina Gabrielsson focuses on the resistance to and rejection of postmodernism reduced to "style" in Swedish architectural culture. These forces were motivated paradoxically by arguments typically employed in the promotion of postmodern ideas:

opposition to late modernist standardization, a newfound attention to detail and craft, safeguarding the ethos of place, and preserving historic values. The contradictions inherent to “style” are central in Gabrielsson’s chapter, echoing contradictions in neoliberalism itself: signifying both rupture and continuity with the welfare state. Maroš Krivý explores the reception of postmodernism in socialist Czechoslovakia, spurring a vivid production of “paper architecture” in which mass housing estates became objects of playful and ironic critique. This turn in discourse, Krivý claims, helped pave the way and institute the postsocialist adaptation of architecture to market-centric rule.

The second section, “Policies and Spatial Production,” examines how economic policies materialize in architecture and built space. This focus allows the contributions to reveal the ways in which architecture has helped reshape relationships between the market and the state, in particular through architecture’s role in regulatory systems of production and planning. The aim here is not to show how architecture participates in certain forms of capitalism, such as finance capitalism, but rather to reveal how it operates in political projects and policies that transform market-state relations. Focusing on the transformation of corporate offices in the City of London in conjunction with the changing political economy of finance, Amy Thomas argues that architectural flexibility became instrumental to the rise of a user-centered regime of work environments. Cole Roskam’s chapter excavates the architectural and technological roots of economic liberalization in China before the official reforms of Deng Xiaoping, in order to demonstrate how prefabrication programs contributed to China’s unique transition toward market-centric rule. Focusing on an urban development project that is iconic of Swedish postmodernism, Helena Mattsson frames neoliberalization in relation to the discourse of “deregulation”: a shift from housing norms to aesthetic forms, and from the regulation of the apartment interior to that of the urban exterior. This shift in the regulatory regimes of architecture articulates spatial and material shifts that herald the rise of new approaches to public management. Sharóne Tomer illustrates how the intersection of neoliberalization and postapartheid emancipatory aspiration in South Africa has given rise to an “architecture of austerity.” Such an architecture is shaped by an ideology of scarcity that reproduces the worldview of market-based rule.

The third section, “Professional Practices in Transformation,” explores the intricate relationship between professional practices and social and economic change. The contributions in this section demonstrate how design professions transform processes of neoliberalization and are in turn reshaped by those processes. They examine how architecture and urbanism serve in the configuration of new, presumably more dynamic systems—whether in terms of technology, management, cybernetics, or capitalism at large. Architecture symbolically and materially contributes to that “new spirit of capitalism” that

Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello located in 1990s management practices but that can be traced in architectural and planning practices from the 1960s onward.<sup>34</sup> Deepa Ramaswamy focuses on the shift from regulatory planning to discretionary zoning laws in 1960s New York in order to demonstrate how the neoliberal turn entailed a new regime of public management, public-private negotiation, and urban design. Mary Louise Lobsinger examines the British architect Cedric Price's engagement with government policies in the late 1960s to show how the novel paradigm of "systems thinking" transformed planning into the production of spatiotemporal flexibility. Valéry Didelon provides a microhistory of Euralille in northern France, a project planned and constructed at breakneck speed and aimed at resurrecting a postindustrial region in decline by turning the center of Lille into a hub for the European Common Market. Rem Koolhaas's role in the construction of Euralille demonstrates the changing agency of the architect: no longer the maker of master plans based on architectural ideals but rather a "surfer," moving on the waves of opportunity. Liam Ross focuses on fire-safety engineering to demonstrate how deregulation gave rise to a new, "liberated" regime of creativity and performativity in large construction projects. This shift from governing by standards to governing by uncertainty is a process in which private actors significantly shape public interest.

The final section, "Subjectivities in Formation," focuses on the ways in which architectural practice and built form articulate new forms of subjectivity. The focus in this section is thus on architecture's role in biopolitics, foregrounding the production of subjectivity but in relation to the transformation of the state. Sarah Lopez shows how remittance architecture is instrumental in the construction of neoliberal subjectivity. Focusing on the transnational migration of Mexicans to and from the United States, she shows how the resulting residential and public architecture in rural Mexico bears witness to migrants shaping themselves as calculating, entrepreneurial, and risk-absorbing subjects vis-à-vis both the Mexican state and the US state. Janina Gosseye analyzes the entanglements between Prime Minister Margaret Thatcher's buy-to-let program and the hybrid character of the new Milton Keynes city center, a project that encompassed what was then the largest shopping center in Europe. Focusing on the conflation of civic and commercial space in the making of a British new town during the 1960s and 1970s, this chapter demonstrates how "consumer-citizens" were constructed through a commodification of urban life. It shows how left-leaning architects worked against but at the same time engaged with some of the ideas that would come to constitute the core of Thatcherite neoliberalization. Kenny Cupers examines theories of human territoriality and their role in the demise of public housing in Western

Europe and North America between the 1960s and the 1980s. He argues that the neoliberalization of mass housing constituted an epistemological turn: a naturalization of the human subject's primary needs of privacy and territorial control. And finally, Esra Akcan focuses on recent urban developments in Istanbul to show how megaprojects are forming the modern *Homo economicus* of the "New Turkey." She demonstrates how an autocratic state in a corrupt political regime uses the built environment in a way that could be termed crony capitalism as well as neoliberalism.

Taken together, these chapters go beyond critiques of the neoliberal dogma in order to develop new analytical and methodological approaches to recent history. Yet they make no allusions to the possibility of offering a "complete" architectural representation of such processes of transformation. Instead, they offer new frameworks for interpretation. By bringing to light little-known material from the centers as well as the peripheries of neoliberal reason and reform, they contribute to the opportunity to gain a more nuanced understanding of both neoliberalism and architecture. Analyzing how buildings, projects, and other matters of architecture since the 1960s have played a role in the implementation of concrete policies of market expansion, privatization, and financial deregulation, the chapters in this book reveal how architecture has participated in some of the most sweeping transformations of recent times.

## Notes

1. Stuart Hall, Doreen Massey, and Michael Rustin, eds., *After Neoliberalism? The Kilburn Manifesto* (London: Soundings, 2013).
2. Shawn Donnan, "IMF Economists Put 'Neoliberalism' under the Spotlight," *Financial Times*, May 27, 2016. See also Jonathan D. Ostry, Prakash Loungani, and Davide Furceri, "Neoliberalism: Oversold?," *Finance & Development* 53, no. 2 (June 2016): 38–41.
3. Will Martin, "Nobel Prize–Winning Economist Joseph Stiglitz Tells Us Why 'Neoliberalism Is Dead,'" *Business Insider*, August 19, 2016.
4. Cornel West, "Goodbye, American Neoliberalism: A New Era Is Here," *The Guardian*, November 17, 2016.
5. Jamie Peck, Neil Brenner, and Nik Theodore, "Actually Existing Neoliberalism," in *The SAGE Handbook of Neoliberalism*, ed. Damian Cahill et al. (London: SAGE, 2018), 9, accessed August 25, 2019, <http://www.su.se/biblioteket/>.
6. Philip Mirowski, *Never Let a Serious Crisis Go to Waste: How Neoliberalism Survived the Financial Meltdown* (London: Verso, 2014). Mirowski's book follows a comparable argument by Naomi Klein about capitalism; see Naomi Klein, *Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism* (Toronto: Random House, 2007).
7. Richard Thaler, *Misbehaving: The Making of Behavioral Economics* (New York: Norton, 2015).
8. Rajesh Venugopal, "Neoliberalism as Concept," *Economy and Society* 44, no. 2 (2015): 165–87.

9. See Venugopal, "Neoliberalism as Concept," 165.

10. Two publications from the 2010s explore the historical origins of neoliberalism: Johanna Brockmann, *Markets in the Name of Socialism: The Left-Wing Origins of Neoliberalism* (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2011); and Daniel Stedman Jones, *Masters of the Universe: Hayek, Friedman, and the Birth of Neoliberal Politics* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2012).

11. David Harvey, *A Brief History of Neoliberalism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2005), 2.

12. Jamie Peck and colleagues emphasize the strong interventions carried out by the state as market rules are *imposed* on local institutions and conditions. Similarly, Foucault's concept of the biopolitical and his readings of the neoliberal are not identified with *laissez-faire* but rather with permanent vigilance, activity, and intervention on behalf of the liberal state.

13. For an overview of neoliberalism studies, see Simon Springer, Kean Birch, and Julie MacLeavy, *The Handbook of Neoliberalism* (London: Routledge, 2016).

14. On the longer history of finance capitalism, see Giovanni Arrighi, *The Long Twentieth Century: Money, Power, and the Origins of Our Times* (London: Verso, 2010). Economic histories of capitalism, including Thomas Piketty's, do not tend to employ the concept of neoliberalism analytically. See Thomas Piketty, *Capital in the Twenty-First Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2014).

15. On financialization and neoliberalism, see the chapter titled "What Is Neoliberalism?" in David M. Kotz, *The Rise and Fall of Neoliberal Capitalism* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2015).

16. See Aihwa Ong, *Neoliberalism as Exception: Mutations in Citizenship and Sovereignty* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006): 3; and Aihwa Ong, "Neoliberalism as a Mobile Technology," *Transactions of the Institute of British Geographers* 31, no. 1 (2007): 3–8.

17. Most notably Harvey, *Brief History of Neoliberalism*.

18. Jamie Peck, "Explaining (with) Neoliberalism," *Territory, Politics, Governance* 1, no. 2 (2013): 132–57.

19. Helga Leitner, Jamie Peck, and Eric S. Sheppard, *Contesting Neoliberalism: Urban Frontiers* (New York: Guilford Press, 2007).

20. Jamie Peck, Nik Theodore, and Neil Brenner, "Neoliberal Urbanism: Models, Moments, Mutations," *SAIS Review* 29, no. 1 (2009): 49.

21. Three notable exceptions are Douglas Spencer, *The Architecture of Neoliberalism* (London: Bloomsbury, 2016); Ana Jeinc and Anselm Wagner, eds., *Is There (Anti-)Neoliberal Architecture?* (Berlin: Jovis, 2013); and, to a certain extent, Peggy Deamer, ed., *Architecture and Capitalism: 1845 to the Present* (London: Routledge, 2013). While the first two adopt a contemporary and discursive approach and Deamer includes a historical dimension in her study on capitalism, none looks at neoliberalism and architecture specifically as enfolded and at times mutually enforcing socio-historic processes of transformation.

22. Reinhold Martin, *Utopia's Ghost: Architecture and Postmodernism, Again* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2010), xvii.

23. Mary McLeod, "Architecture and Politics in the Reagan Era: From Post-Modernism to Deconstruction," *Assemblage* 8 (1989): 22–59.

24. Foucault talks about micro powers in relation to biopolitics in Michel Foucault and Michel Senellart, *The Birth of Biopolitics: Lectures at the Collège de France, 1978–1979* (New York: Picador, 2010), 166.

## INTRODUCTION: UNDEAD NEOLIBERALISMS

25. Harvey, *Brief History of Neoliberalism*; Michel Foucault, *Naissance de la biopolitique: Cours au Collège de France (1978–1979)* (Paris: Editions Gallimard et des Editions du Seuil, 2004).
26. See important scholarship on the financialization of housing, including works by Manuel Aalbers, such as *The Financialization of Housing: A Political Economy Approach* (London: Routledge, 2016).
27. For instance, Sarah Williams Goldhagen and Réjean Legault, *Anxious Modernism: Experimentation in Postwar Architectural Culture* (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2000); Dana Arnold, Elvan Altan Ergut, and Belgin Turan Ozkaya, *Rethinking Architectural Historiography* (London: Routledge, 2008); Mark Crinson and Claire Zimmerman, *Neo-avant-garde and Postmodern: Postwar Architecture in Britain and Beyond* (New Haven: Yale Center for British Art, 2010); Helena Mattsson and Sven-Olov Wallenstein, *Swedish Modernism: Architecture, Consumption, and the Welfare State* (London: Black Dog, 2010); and Kenny Cupers, *The Social Project: Housing Postwar France* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014).
28. Fredric Jameson, “The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism,” in *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*, ed. Neil Leach (London: Routledge, 1997), 240.
29. Fredric Jameson, “Cognitive Mapping,” in *Critical Theory: A Reader for Literary and Cultural Studies*, ed. Robert Dale Parker (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), 470–71.
30. Nancy Fraser, “Behind Marx’s Hidden Abode: For an Expanded Conception of Capitalism,” *New Left Review* 86 (March–April 2014).
31. A vivid illustration of this complexity is Stuart Sim’s comment that “market fundamentalism runs counter to the postmodern skepticism towards authority, although some postmodernist thinkers would see the market as a way of undermining traditional social and political values.” Stuart Sim, ed., *The Routledge Companion to Postmodernism*, 3rd ed. (London: Routledge, 2011), 272.
32. For a discussion on neoliberalism (or the free market) as inherently and essentially utopian, see Karl Polanyi, “The Self-Regulating Market and the Fictitious Commodities; Land, Labour, and Money,” in *Primitive, Archaic and Modern Economies: Essays by Karl Polanyi*, ed. George Dalton (Garden City, NY: Anchor Books, 1968).
33. Cornelius Castoriadis, “The Imaginary: Creation in the Socio-historical Domain,” in *World in Fragments: Writings on Politics, Society, Psychoanalysis, and the Imagination*, ed. and trans. David Ames Curtis (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1997), 6–8.
34. Luc Boltanski and Eve Chiapello, *The New Spirit of Capitalism* (London: Verso, 2007).