“A map of the world that does not include utopia is not worth even glancing at, for it leaves out the one country at which humanity is always landing.” Oscar Wilde

COURSE DESCRIPTION
The course examines the rich tradition of utopian thinking in architecture, urban planning and the visual arts. Here, utopia is explored in its modern form: as a call to transform the world through human planning and ingenuity. The purpose of the course is to better understand the role that the utopian imagination has played in the construction of social practices, the development of urban and social planning models, and technologies of power.
LECTURE SUMMARY

1. INTRODUCTION

PART I: UTOPIA
2. ENTER UTOPIA
3. INDUSTRIAL CITIES
4. THE GARDEN IN THE CITY
5. SPEED CITIES
6. THE TOWER IN THE PARK
7. COUNTER-CULTURE AND TRANSIENT CITIES
8. CYBERNETIC AND NETWORKED CITIES
9. Spring Break

PART II: COUNTER-UTOPIA
10. NO-EXIT CITIES
11. AFTER UTOPIA: POST-FUNCTIONAL AND NON-PLANNED CITIES
12. UTOPIA’S RETURN
13. Student Presentations
14. Student Presentations
15. Student Presentations

COURSE REQUIREMENTS

Attendance: Attendance to all course meetings is mandatory. An attendance sheet will be distributed at each meeting. More than two unexcused absences will lead to a reduction of one letter grade. More than four unexcused absences will lead to an automatic failure in the course. If you have a good reason for missing class, please inform the professor by email beforehand.

Readings: There will be approximately 60-80 pages of reading a week. The readings will be posted online. All readings must be completed the night before the relevant seminar.

Writing Center: I strongly recommend that students with even minor difficulties with writing set up an appointment with the Barnard Writing Center before handing in assignments. http://writing.barnard.edu

Course Assessment and Grading:
Participation and Attendance ............................................................................................................ = 10%
Weekly Reading Responses ............................................................................................................. = 10%
Weekly Presentations .................................................................................................................... = 20%
Term Paper Presentation ................................................................................................................ = 20%

Term Paper Midterm Submission (750 words) .............................................................................. = 15%
  • Deadline: Thursday March 10: Emailed as MS Word document.

Term Paper Final Submission (2000 words) ................................................................................... = 25%
  • Deadline: Monday May 9th. Emailed as PDF document with images and image captions.

Discussion Participation
Students are expected to attend all Tuesday seminars, to do all seminar readings, to wisely and consistently contribute to the weekly seminar discussions. Participation during seminars is mandatory.
Weekly Reading Responses
Weekly Reading Responses are due Monday nights at midnight. I will set up online discussion boards for each week on courseworks. You will be able to see your classmates’ responses only once you have added your own response to the forum. Once you have added your response, I recommend that you read some of the other responses on the forum.
For each week of the course, you are asked to:
• write a 200-300 word response (no less, no more) to issues and polemics encountered in the readings for that week. In responding to the readings, you will need to briefly summarize the arguments that you feel are central to the week’s theme.
• End your response with one question. The question should not seek a factual answer (how much..., when did.... etc.) but should address what you see as the main points of debate in the readings.

The purpose of weekly responses is:
• to demonstrate that you’ve read the assigned readings for the week.
• To show that, beyond simply reading the texts, you’ve thought about the central arguments and themes, that you’ve been able to draw connections between that week’s various readings (and possibly, the readings from previous weeks), and finally, that you’ve been able to scale-up your thinking and consider some of the larger social / political / personal … stakes involved.

Your responses don’t need to discuss all of the week’s readings, although they should address most of them. The responses will be graded on a total of 2 points. In order to get a full 2 points, your response needs to demonstrate that you’ve read the readings and been able to focus on the main issues and arguments they present. For summaries that are poorly written, incomplete or do not demonstrate an adequate grasp of the material, students will get an R for the first couple of weeks, meaning that they’ll need to resubmit the response within a week’s time. Late responses cannot be accepted.

Weekly Reading Presentations
Each of you will be required to present once during seminar over the term. Depending on class size, there may be two presenters per seminar. Presenters for a given week will have to meet together and divide up the reading material in an equal and coherent way. You and your co-presenters will prepare a common powerpoint presentation that will integrate all material that might help foster a better class discussion and better dramatize the theories and ideas presented. Presentations shall include a visual slideshow which should include as many of the buildings, urban schemes or visual projects listed on the syllabus for the given week as possible. These projects should be used to illustrate the main themes and questions addressed in the readings. Furthermore, each presenter should choose one building, urban scheme or visual project and present that project more fully. For this project, you should provide comprehensive visual material (sketches, plans, maps, elevations etc...). Presentations should last a total of 20-25 minutes (for all presenters).

Presentations will be graded qualitatively according to this set of criteria:
• Clarity of thought: how well you can describe some of the more difficult and nuanced ideas and arguments in the readings. It is absolutely essential to gain a good grasp of the main themes elaborated in the readings. You’ll probably need to read some essays twice and do additional research in order to get a proper handle on the material. Please take a look at the list of additional readings at the end of the syllabus. You may want to read some of them before your presentation.
• Visual presentation: Your presentation needs to be organized in a coherent way. You’ll be marked on how well you can connect the ideas elaborated in the readings with the projects you choose to present.
• Originality and Unity of Thought: Your presentation should not follow the pace and narrative of the readings too strictly. In other words, you should identify the main themes and arguments (thesis) of each reading and state them at the onset of your presentation rather than tediously going through every element of the author’s argument. A great presentation will have clearly
stated the main themes, arguments and will have identified the stakes of such arguments (Why is this important? What is the context? How does this argument/idea differ from other possible interpretations?).

Term Paper and Term Paper Presentations
Each student will prepare an 8 page term paper (approx. 2000 words) based on one utopian scheme of the student's choice. The goal of the paper is to connect the utopian scheme to the real-world context out of which they emerged. What real-world social problem, concern or malaise does your chosen utopian scheme seeks to address or react to? What cultural/social/political tensions does it seek to resolve or reconcile?

You must use footnotes following the Chicago Manual of Style, 16th edition.
You must all set up an individual appointment with me to discuss your paper topic ideas before Feb 25.

Some common writing problems to avoid:
1. Use of Quotations: The most common issue has to do with the use of quotations. Students often use quotations in order to avoid explaining a point or making an argument themselves. They often will insert a quotation directly into a paragraph without context and without mentioning the source. Many students will use quotations that are two to three sentences long without any analysis. As a general rule, quotations should be used sparingly and need to be explained and discussed by the student. It is often preferable to paraphrase a quotation in the student’s own words and add a footnote citing the source.
2. Thesis Statement: All final papers must have a clearly articulated thesis statement (1-2 sentences long). Your thesis statement should focus on the larger stakes (why is this important? How does it add to or dispel some of our assumptions about subject X) and connect it to an existing discourse (this can be a discourse that we've examined in class or not...). A strong thesis statement will help structure your essay and give the reader a better sense of the purpose of each paragraph in the overall argument.
3. Run-On Sentences: Often, students will try and cram too many ideas into one sentence. This tends to lead to grammatical problems. Good writing often alternates between a short, declarative sentence, and longer descriptive sentences.

GRADING SCALE

| 97.5 - 10 = A+  | 87.5 - 89.9 = B+  | 77.5 - 79.9 = C+  | 67.5 - 69.9 = D+  |
| 92.5 - 97.4 = A | 82.5 - 87.4 = B  | 72.5 - 77.4 = C  | 62.5 - 67.4 = D  |
| 90.0 - 92.4 = A-| 80 - 82.4 = B-   | 70 - 72.4 = C-   | 60 - 62.4 = D-   |

Below 60 = F

LEARNING OBJECTIVES
Upon successful completion of this reading and writing intensive course, the student will be able to:
1. Develop a critical understanding and awareness of some of the decisive ideas, theories and debates relating to utopian discourse over the past two centuries.
2. Understand the role that territorial and urban organization play in the construction of social practices, human subjectivities and political awareness.
3. Understand the way that discourses traditionally seen as external to the discipline of architecture inform and elucidate its practice and production.
4. Demonstrate the ability to read texts critically and to relate issues encountered in these texts to contemporary architectural discourse and practice.
5. Develop research, writing, and critical thinking skills through the research and writing of a series of reading summaries and a term paper that use textual and visual evidence to state a meaningful thesis.
**CLASS SCHEDULE**

**WEEK 1**

Tues. 01/19  
INTRODUCTION

**WEEK 2**

Tues. 01/26  
**ENTER UTOPIA**


**additional readings:**
- Anthony Vidler, "Cities of Tomorrow," *Artforum International* (Sep 2012).

**WEEK 3**

Tues. 02/02  
**INDUSTRIAL CITIES**


**additional readings:**
WEEK 4

Tues. 02/09


additional readings

Tues. 02/16

[Haussmann’s Paris; Soria y Mata, Cuidad Lineal; Edgar Chambless, Roadtown; Sant’ Elia, Città Nuova; N.A. Milyutin, Magnitogorsk; Leonidov and OSA Team, Competition for Magnitogorsk; F.T. Marinetti, Angiolo Mazzoni, Mino Somenzi, Aero-Architecture Linear City Project; R. Neutra, Rush City Reformed; Le Corbusier, Plan Obus and Plans for South America; N. B. Geddes, Futurama; G.A. Jellicoe, Motopia; P. Eisenman and M. Graves, Jersey Corridor Project; A. Boutwell and M. Mitchell, Continuous City for 1,000,000 Human Beings; Paul Rudolph, Lower Manhattan Expressway; Diller and Scolfidio, Slow House]

• Norman Bel Geddes, Ch. 1 “Towards Design,” and Ch. 2 “Speed To-morrow,” in Horizons (Boston: Little, Brown and Company, 1932), 1-43. (Online)

additional readings
• Molly Wright Steenson, “Interfacing with the Subterranean: Paris’s Pneumatic Post” Cabinet 41 (Spring 2011), 82-86.
[ Fritz Lang, Metropolis; L. Hilberseimer, High Rise City; M.v.d. Rohe, Skyscraper for Friedrichstrasse; Kazimir Malevich, The Suprematist City; Le Corbusier, Ville Contemporaine, Plan Voisin and Ville Radieuse; Lucio Costa and Oscar Niemeyer, Brasilia; Mario Pani, Cuidad Tlatelolco Housing Project, Mexico City; Emile Aillaud, Housing Complex, Pantin-les-Courtillières, France; Candilis, Josic and Woods, Toulouse le Mirail; Minoru Yamasaki, Pruitt-Igoe, St-Louis Wallace Harrison, Empire State Plaza; Louis Kahn, Philadelphia Plan; Friedrich St.Florian, Vertical City; R.B. Fuller and S. Sadao, Cylinder towers of Slum redevelopment in Harlem; R.B. Fuller, Triton City for San Francisco ]

- Le Corbusier, Panels of The Radiant City.

additional readings

- Rem Koolhaas, “La Ville Radieuse,” in In the Footsteps of Le Corbusier.
- FILM: Chad Freidrichs, The Pruitt-Igoe Myth (2011)
- FILM: Jean-Luc Godard, Two or Three Things I know about Her (1967).
COUNTER-CULTURE AND TRANSIENT CITIES

Tues. 03/01

[ Bruno Taut, Alpine Architecture and The City Crown; Situationists, The Naked City, Constant, New Babylon; Cedric Price, Fun Palace; Archigram, Plug-In City and Instant City, Paul Virilio and Claude Parent, Oblique Architecture; Haus Rucker Co., Pneumacosm in the City, Superstudio, Holiday Machine; Lebbeus Woods, The New City, Jean Prouvé, Nomadic Structures; F. Otto, Suspended City and Pneumatic Lunar Station; P. Maymont, Suspended City of Paris; Kisho Kurokawa, Nakagin Capsule Hotel, W. Döring, The City of PVC cells; Reyner Banham and François Dallegret, Environment-Bubble; M. Safdie, Habitat ’67 and Habitat Puerto Rico; Ron Herron, Walking City, J.-P. Jungmann, Dyodon; L. Woods, Quake City; Vincent Callebaut, floating islands]

• Peter Cook and Warren Chalk, Editorial from Archigram 3, 1963.

additional readings

• Cedric Price, Joan Littlewood, “Fun Palace,” The Drama Review 12, no. 3 (Spring, 1968), 127-134.
• Mike Davis and Daniel Bertrand Monk, “Floating Utopias: Freedom and Unfreedom of the Seas,” in Evil Paradises: Dreamworlds of Neoliberalism
WEEK 8

Tues. 03/08 [ Louis Kahn, Philadelphia Plan; Candilis, Josic, Woods, Toulouse le Mirail, Bochum University, Frankfurt Competition; H. Kobayashi, The Submarine City; T. Zenetos, Electronic Urbanism; Archigram, Computer City; N. Schöffer, The Cybernetic City; Christopher Alexander, Houses Generated by Patterns, Stelarc; Nigel Coates and D. Branson, Ecstacity; MVRDV, Meta-City, Data-Town; Greg Lynn, New City; Reiser and Umemoto, West Side NYC Competition, C. Ratti, SENSEable City Laboratory; K. Matsuda, Augmented City; The Sims ]


additional readings

- Cedric Price, Joan Littlewood, “Fun Palace,” The Drama Review 12, no. 3 (Spring, 1968),127-134.

Thurs. 03/10 DUE: Term Paper Midterm Submission (750 words): Emailed as MS Word document.

WEEK 9

Spring Break
**WEEK 10**  
**Tues. 03/22**  


**additional readings**


**WEEK 11**  
**Tues. 03/29**  

[Reyner Banham et al., *Non-Plan*; Disneyland, Anaheim CA; EPCOT, Disneyworld, Orlando FL; Seaside, Florida; Leon Krier, *Reconstruction of Stuttgart*; Leon Krier, *Poundsbury*, UK; The Truman Show]

- David Harvey, “The Figure of the City,” in *Spaces of Hope* (University of California Press, 2000).

**additional readings**

WEEK 12  
Tues. 04/05
[ Contemporary Projects at a utopian scale ... ]

• Reinhold Martin, “Critical of What?” Harvard Design Magazine 21

additional readings

WEEK 13  
Tues. 04/12  TERM PAPER PRESENTATIONS

WEEK 14  
Tues. 04/19  TERM PAPER PRESENTATIONS

WEEK 15  
Tues. 04/26  TERM PAPER PRESENTATIONS
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