

**KENNY CUPERS (2014) *THE SOCIAL PROJECT:  
HOUSING POSTWAR FRANCE*. MINNEAPOLIS:  
UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA PRESS. ISBN 978 0  
8166 8964 4.**

Theresa Enright

*Modern life demands, awaits a new plan for the house and for the city.*  
Le Corbusier, *Toward an Architecture* (2007: 86)

In *The Social Project*, Kenny Cupers provides a thorough history of the development of post-World War II mass housing in France. Focusing on large suburban estates as symbolic projections of national aspirations and as material places-in-formation, Cupers locates these ‘projects’ as defining features of postwar French society. Cupers also demonstrates how urban architecture and planning—as situated social practices—were transformed in the later half of the 20<sup>th</sup> century through their engagements with these new residential spaces.

Unlike most treatments of postwar housing provision, which rely on one-dimensional narratives of centralized rational institutions, *The Social Project* reveals the making of the postwar urban fabric to be a multifaceted and experimental endeavour. In particular, the book suggests that the modernism that so prominently defined mass housing was never a complete or closed ideology enforced by a unitary and omniscient *dirigiste* state, but an evolving practice enacted by a broad range of forces and actors. Cupers’ primary insight is that France’s utopian modernization projects of social engineering (and one could potentially extend his argument elsewhere) were shaped by dynamics of contestation, negotiation and hybridity, and by contingent interactions between governing bodies, knowledge producers, markets, civil society organizations and ordinary inhabitants.

*The Social Project* outlines these dynamics during the *trente glorieuses*, or ‘thirty glorious years,’ an era roughly extending from 1947 to 1977. Marked by high levels of industrial production, rapid economic growth and the extension of city frontiers, this golden age of France was built on the twinned processes of Fordist economic development and Keynesian political and spatial management. Piloting these processes, successive governments undertook a vast array of ambitious schemes to create a thoroughly modern capitalist nation. Suburban housing estates (Cupers largely focuses on those around Paris) epitomized these *grands projets* of reconstruction.

As in his previous book, *Use Matters: An Alternative History of Architecture* (2013), in *The Social Project*, Cupers traces the complex relationships between the welfare state and urban architecture with a focus on user participation. Cupers’ central argument is that modern architecture and urbanization coevolved in the postwar period, ‘through a process of continual experimentation centered on everyday life as a target of modernization and an emerging domain of expertise’ (xii). Repudiating the thesis that 20<sup>th</sup> century state planning and architecture were dangerously disembodied and disconnected from inhabitants, Cupers shows that how people relate to one another and their environment was a central concern of housing practices. Indeed a range of stakeholders including residents themselves endlessly discussed the dialectic between social relations and the built form. This framework specifying the regimes of knowledge around ‘use’ structures the interventions of the book and organizes the analysis.

Breaking down the evolution of social housing projects into distinct decades, each with a signature morphology, Cupers usefully disaggregates the construction of three suburban arrangements that are generally grouped together under the politically-loaded term, the *banlieue* (suburb): the *grands ensembles* (large housing estates), the *villes nouvelles* (New Towns) and the *banlieue pavillonnaire* (single-family dwellings). A keen eye allows him to respectively locate these various types of projects within subtly shifting architectural discourses and practices from the 1950s, when mass industrial production and national modernization were predominant, through the multifaceted experiments and critical interventions of the 1960s, and to the increasing privatization of housing and community in the 1970s.

Equally important to the chronological narrative are the images interspersed throughout the book. Although rarely integrated into

the text directly and frequently left unexplained, the hundred or so photographs, plans, sketches, promotional brochures, postcards, media clippings and academic reports trace a complementary history to Cupers' interpretations. These images—taken from various national and municipal archives as well as the author's own collection—emphasize the integrated, though nonlinear relationships between plans, use, representations, research and experience. They also reinforce the central claim that 'the social project' is a composite discursive structure that emerges through multiple, overlapping though often discontinuous articulations.

Despite (or perhaps as a result of) the abundant detail, however, the question of *how* the social project is fabricated tends to overshadow the equally important inquiry of *why* it turned out as it did. That is, Cupers positions architecture and urbanism as complex urban assemblages, yet often overlooks the macro political and economic forces in which they are embedded. As a result, causal explanation is sometimes sacrificed to functionalist retrospection. That being said, the intricate description of the making of 'one of the twentieth century's largest, and perhaps least understood social and architectural experiments' is undeniably valuable (xii). Insofar as it reveals the contested nature of urban modernism as a theory and a practice, *The Social Project* thus makes a significant contribution to studies of architectural theory and urban history. It also presents a welcome intervention in studies of French social housing, offering a nuanced perspective on the multifaceted production of the infamous postwar *banlieue*. The book will surely be of interest to architects, planners, policy makers and urban theorists more broadly.

### **The Grand Project**

In Western Europe, the great social project launched in the aftermath of World War II aimed to create a just and prosperous society out of the ashes of catastrophe. Central to this modernizing reconstruction was the task of providing sanitary, technologically equipped, affordable dwelling universally. In France, under the slogan 'Housing for All,' this intervention had a number of goals. In addition to addressing the looming housing crisis and lodging the hundreds of thousands of poor and working class who were living in *bidonvilles* (slums) or other run-down tenements, it also sought to drive industry by bringing labour to peripheral factory locations, and to support a growing middle class population through the construction of community arrangements that were conducive to healthy and happy

living. The strategy to bring about a new world through new ways of living was certainly driven by the norms of rationality and efficiency, but Cupers suggests that the dreams objectified in mass housing projects contained a multitude of hopes for individual and collective well-being. The social project represents a concerted re-imagining of collective life at scales ranging from the family apartment to the neighbourhood to the city and nation.

From the vantage of the present, where the dense, concrete, repetitive highrises that define the *banlieue* are better known as places of exclusion, degradation and lawlessness, there is a glaring discrepancy in what the social project was imagined to be and what it has become. The subtext to *The Social Project* is how these utopian dreams for improved human conditions have failed.<sup>1</sup>

For some time now, the most compelling answer to this question comes from thinkers such as James Scott (1998) who criticize the authoritarian workings of 20<sup>th</sup> century centralized planning and the shortcomings of 'seeing like a state.' For Scott, 'high modernism,' exemplified in the *grand projets* of Le Corbusier, has resulted in some of the worst and most violent planning disasters of the twentieth century. Criticizing the technocratic belief that social problems can be quantified and solved by centralized power and the imperialism of imposed global visions, Scott (1998: 6) argues that '[d]esigned or planned social order is necessarily schematic; it always ignores essential features of any real, functioning social order.' Hence, attempts by architects, planners, officials or bureaucrats to design society according to scientific laws and to impose a predetermined rational order are bound to be inadequate at best and terroristic at worst. This argument is echoed by those who question the presumed objectivity of the all seeing god's eye plan (Jacobs, 1961; de Certeau, 1984), by those who mourn the logical evacuation of desire and Eros from the urban realm (Lefebvre, 1987) and by those who claim that static utopian prescriptions render inhabitants corporeally neutral and subjectively anonymous and are thus antithetical to meaningful agency and change (Jameson, 2004; Grosz, 2001). In seeing like a state, planners create cold spaces more closely resembling isolated architectural maquettes than bustling cities. Modernism's paradoxical myopia prevents it from grasping the flux of public encounters and the collective engagements that define the vitality of quotidian urban existence.

Cupers challenges the conventional wisdom of this critique. While not disagreeing with the spirit of any of these claims, what Cupers

shows is that even at the height of French modernization, such high modernism never existed in practice. Not only did architects involved in state projects not necessarily follow the Bauhaus tradition (many were trained in more conservative Beaux-Arts schools and not an insignificant number ascribed to emerging Communist design practices) but architectural and urban plans were always implemented in complex environments and thus subject to much deviation in the path from plan to implementation. Moreover, from its inception, but especially from the 1960s onward, purportedly modernist social projects were frequently attuned to the ‘street level’ and to the ways in which users inhabited, interacted with and manipulated their environments. Cupers thus goes beyond a simple trial of Le Corbusier and his conspirators, to examine the multiple concepts and ideologies that support French reconstruction and the relationships of various actors—architects, planners, social scientists, state agencies etc.—in the processes of place- and space-making.

The example of Sarcelles—the first *grand ensemble*, and the metonym for French mass housing—exemplifies the fact that projects were ‘more than the product of a single utopian blueprint gone awry’ (xv). Built between 1955 and 1976 on a lot 15 km north of Paris, Sarcelles consists of a number of high-density buildings which by 1974 housed some 12 000 units and 60 000 people. In the first few years of its operation, growth greatly outpaced amenities and the neighborhood revealed the challenges of purpose-built, isolated, compact living. Referred to at the time as ‘Europe’s largest construction site,’ a ‘concentration camp universe’ consisting of ‘silos for people,’ Sarcelles became a potent symbol for the inauthentic, alienated and degraded environment for which postwar housing is known (139-140). So much did this space appear pathological that the degenerative effects of mass housing were grouped under the name of *sarcellite* (‘sarcellitis’).

Yet Sarcelles is not the result of an abstract Master-plan. While the central state saw Sarcelles as a flagship territory for future residence and industry, there was no comprehensive plan for the area at the outset. Rather, the neighborhood took shape incrementally. The state’s development agenda was frequently slowed, blocked or altered by difficulties in land acquisition, shifting demands for more profitable growth in public services, the ongoing housing shortage which demanded continued expansion, and resistance from the local municipal government that was inadequately prepared to manage the influx of inhabitants. For Cupers, Sarcelles demonstrates that the

‘strictures of private property and messiness of expropriation got in the way of even the most ambitious government projects’ (143).

Moreover, he posits residents’ associations and tenant unions as instrumental to development once inhabitation began (in this sense he extends Castells’ famous study of the *grands ensembles* in *The City and the Grassroots* [1983]). Despite the fact that the state agency, the Central Real Estate Company of the Deposits and Consignments Fund (SCIC), was the owner, developer and landlord of the social housing estates, voluntary organizations such as the Association Sarcelloise, and later the Residents’ Council mobilized for better facilities (including reliable heating) and services (such as transit, daycare, and libraries), and even instituted rent strikes against the state-landlord. These campaigns were often successful and the practical needs of inhabitants were incorporated into planning based on knowledge from the ground: from the streets, kitchens, hallways and playgrounds of the ensembles. Grassroots tenants organizations were even given a formal role in planning and running the housing operations and through this, birthed a new praxis of substantive democratic citizenship. The situation in Sarcelles was far from unique, and similar patterns were visible in projects across France, where the participation of residents was a crucial element of both design and management. Cupers shows that the everyday life of leisure, home, neighborhood and family was thus not just the product of disengaged architects and modernist ideologues who imposed lifeless spaces onto populations. Rather, the ‘organized passivity’ of the suburbs (Lefebvre, 1971) was merely one part of a larger picture that also included the suburbs as a site of active communication and struggle.<sup>2</sup>

### **Participation**

Key to Cupers’ contribution to postwar housing studies is his focus on this polyvalent participation in the production of space and the vicissitudes of inhabitation. Indeed, Cupers shows how ‘use’ ‘participation’ and ‘everyday life’ become central technical and philosophical concepts through architectural and sociological discourse focusing on housing projects. *The Social Project* thus locates the suburban habitat as a central site of postwar theorization— where dwelling in all its complexity gives rise to new ways of understanding, formulating and disciplining communal social relations. A focus on the interface of participation and everyday life through urban

discourse demonstrates the social project as an important terrain of both grassroots contestation and state power.

In the first section of the book '1950s: Projects in the Making' participation is largely defined by the emergent notion of a *usager* or 'user.' Combining commodity and welfare logics—and at once an inhabitant, citizen, consumer, and client—the user is one who is entitled to and partakes in state services. Anticipating the qualities of the user and the dynamics of use 'allowed French architects and planners to address—but not necessarily access—this universe beyond the controllable process of design' (322-3). While initially conceived as that which is beyond the control of the state, Cupers shows how use then became incorporated into planning itself. Both concepts (users and use) were central to the rise of social science expertise on everyday life that then constituted the vast 'epistemological machineries of the postwar state' (79).

A burgeoning sector of semipublic firms (the most famous among them being the Center for Economic and Social Research, or CERES) began to study dwelling in order to predict the needs of populations and to optimize design principles. At the intersection of design and use, researchers claimed that '[s]ociology would simply provide the 'user data' for a better adjusted architecture' (79). If the housing projects were experimental endeavours, life-sized laboratories for renewed human life, then the user was their basic unit of analysis. The state, patron and recipient of this research, according to Cupers, was thus a 'knowledge producing institution as much as an interventionist one' (xxii). Aiming to improve upon the original Athens Charter (which outlined principles of modern design according to a universal schema of human needs), the French government continually revisited the best practices of urbanism and the best way of organizing space through feedback loops in the form of mass questionnaires, interviews and qualitative studies of everyday life.

The second section of the book '1960s: Architecture Meets Social Science' traces the effort to integrate new user data through the *grille Dupont*—a enumerated grid of catalogued needs—into better neighborhood facilities and improved principles of design. With the *grille Dupont*, the organizing concept of theory and practice shifted from the user to the 'participant,' one actively involved in the making of physical territory and social community. 'Participatory centers' or *poles d'animation* were built in social housing neighbourhoods alongside retail, commercial, and social services in an effort to create

mixed-use spaces. These centres infused bedroom suburbs with much needed urban infill, but they also had more grandiose aspirations to catalyze modern *agoras* or hubs of public life. Cupers writes that,

‘In many ways, urbanism of the *grand ensembles* during the 1960s thus revolved around the intention to *animate* them...under the banner of *animation*, inhabitants were increasingly conceptualized not only as passive beneficiaries of dwelling units, but as active subjects of the urban environments provided for them.’ (135)

Yet he is quick to point out the dual nature of this participatory ethos and its ambivalent relationship to substantive democracy. On the one hand, these poles were controlled by state planners and market interests, who translated real needs into the existing logics of the dominant technocracy. Yet, on the other hand, through their engagements with space and one another, inhabitants were able to genuinely influence their surroundings and the future of their neighbourhoods.

State power was expressed in the knowledge it produced about the housing estates and the forms of governmentality it gave rise to. Yet this was not without internal tension and immanent critique. Cupers points out that as state-sponsored sociological analysis grew in importance and degree, spaces also opened up for non-hegemonic knowledges and practices to flourish. In the revolutionary fervor of the early 1960s, many of the most influential critical voices in France—including Henri Lefebvre, but also Michel Foucault, Felix Guattari and Jean Baudrillard—used state funding to conduct research on the suburbs with decidedly anti-statist and anti-capitalist agendas. Combined with grassroots demands for autonomy and self-management (what was known in left circles as *autogestion*) this counter knowledge posed challenges to the status quo. Armed with sharp critiques of everyday life and strategies for resistance, community centres, residents’ groups and other associations vied for democratic power over the conditions of their lives and over collective consumption needs.

The encouragement of participation was thus an ambiguous mediator between grassroots struggles and the *dirigiste* state. For Cupers,



This mind-set was neither the sign of a decidedly emancipatory transfer of power to the inhabitant nor the disingenuous mirage of a user who was in reality nothing more than an alienated automaton of state capitalism. Instead it was part of a complex power dynamic in which the freedom of inhabitants and state-led orchestration were not necessarily antithetical, but in fact part and parcel of the same project: logical expertise in urban planning, but also the importance of more diverse approaches to architectural design, and thus, the gradual transformation of modernist doctrine as it was embodied by the first generation of *grands ensembles*. (135)

Modernism thus took effect through the perspective of the master-planner *and* the user.

The grassroots side of this dialectic reached its peak in May '68, events which were in part inspired by contrasting the grim housing estates in Nanterre to the vibrant city center of Paris. After the break of 1968, however, criticism was once again appropriated and channeled in the service of quelling restive populations and strengthening statist and capitalist control (see also Stanek, 2011). Cupers considers this dynamic in the third section of the book, '1970s: Consuming Contradictions.' As active uses of space and practices of mobilization became increasingly harnessed by the corporatist state and liberal market principles, the language of participation came to mirror that of now-privatized developers. Participatory centres, which had previously served as meeting grounds, play structures and organizational incubators, became nothing more than glorified shopping malls.

Under the rubric of 'integration' various social groups and knowledge producers were included in participatory centres, but in constrained ways. 'Participation from above' meant the involvement of a team of experts who mediated ambitious state plans and private developments (178). Thus, writes Cupers, '[d]espite its brief success in infusing new architectural experiments, the advent of participation in planning ultimately strengthened the legitimacy of sociological expertise and the increased mediation between design and use' (182). As the welfare state responded to the recession of 1974, its role in urban knowledge and design was not weakened, but its ambition was transformed. No longer aimed at the collective good of universal freedom and equality, the social project became ever more firmly

equated with the economic project. The state's ultimate aim from the 1970s onward was to establish the conditions for private accumulation first and collective prosperity second.

Cupers' careful analysis of participation and use in the housing estates blurs the distinction between authoritarianism and autonomy and questions the insidious nature of inclusive design. Cupers' claims about participation in social housing, for example, add to Jonathan Hill's (2003) more general criticism of the related notion of 'flexibility' and user-oriented discourses of modernist design. For Hill, flexibility is actually a pervasive selling point in modernist architecture that increases the power of the planner as well as the exchange value of architects and their designs. Hill (2003: 32) advises that '[i]n any example of flexibility, it is important to recognize who has the authority and knowledge to change a space.' Noting the flexible, participatory, and self-reflexive aspects of modernism is important insofar as it shows a more complex reality, but attention to the imbalances in capacities to produce space and to mechanisms of hierarchization inherent in building practices are crucial. While the asymmetries between the inhabitant and the state and developer are clear, an explicit focus on unequal power relations is regrettably deemphasized in Cupers' account.

### **The Social Compromise**

A central thread through *The Social Project* is how postwar housing projects are thoroughly imbued with power yet remarkably depoliticized. As the planning and production of postwar housing was seen as being simultaneously technical and broadly participatory, it was viewed as being outside of and transcending conflict. This Saint-Simonian neutrality was enforced by the panoply of rational experts and administrators who could 'place the relationship between people and place outside the realm of politics' (10). Drawing on Paul Rabinow's Foucauldian analysis of the construction of French modernity, Cupers refers to the construction of mass housing as being based on a non-partisan 'politics beyond ideology' (xxiv). The very notion of 'the social' in the productivist state was divorced from the realm of political contest and indeed, was '*ni gauche, ni droite*' (neither left, nor right), but a central concern to Socialists and Communists as well as Gaullist and free market reformers. Paradoxically, the social project thus became the work of both ends of the political spectrum and yet the provenance of neither.

'Modern urbanism in France was politically eclectic' (xxiv), writes Cupers. Irreducible to a single platform, modernism was a negotiated, path-dependent set of reforms and transformations that *nevertheless* had implications for relations of domination, exploitation and revolutionary possibilities. If Cupers is effective at demonstrating modernism exceeded the direction of the centralized state and how the social project operates beyond any particular partisan position, he is less clear on how power circulates in such a way so as to give some greater capacities to influence this process than others. That is, while he carefully explores the small-scale workings of institutional power within particular housing estates, the structural forces in which the collective social project is embedded are rarely addressed. In particular, the lack of a framework to analyze class and race as spatial processes is a significant drawback to this otherwise impressive text.

Cupers acknowledges for example, that housing conditions for poor, working class and middle class residents vary. Yet he stops short of explaining why such discrepancies exist and how class relations are reproduced through architecture and urban practices. Similarly, while he notes the existence of critiques of planning as class struggle (he cites Hubert Tonka who claims that urbanism is 'a direct instrument of class power,' [205]), his own analysis falls short of engaging this line of critique. Indeed, Cupers adopts a social scientific tone of objectivity which itself perpetuates the false objectivity of spatial knowledge.

On the question race and colonial relations, Cupers is no better. He briefly mentions the phenomenon of ethnic enclaves and the stigma of North African populations in housing estates, but does not analyze in any detail how immigrants and visible minorities were systematically denied access to housing and services at rates far higher than native French populations. At various moments, he points out the similarities between colonial planning techniques abroad and those of the *banlieue*, but does not press this line of analysis to its logical end: that as an attempt to impose order onto urban space through racial divisions, and as a quest to civilize unruly populations through parochial norms of European progress, the social project was a colonial one. As Kipfer and Goonewardena (2014) recently claim, in France the 'colonization of everyday life' of the postwar period is not merely metaphorical, but a material practice of managing relations of domination and actively creating centers and peripheries, exploiters and exploited. Focusing on the uneven development of the suburbs, they argue that 'the reorganisation of everyday life in postwar France is both a response to geopolitical decolonisation and

an aspect of neo-colonial arrangements' (101). Cupers does cite Kirsten Ross' (2004) seminal study on French modernization as being inextricable from decolonization, yet shies away from engaging her claims in any detail. Without this perspective we are left with an inadequate understanding of the discriminatory nature of modernization and everyday life and the effects of the social project for differently positioned subjects. In order to have greater diagnostic traction, Cupers' analysis would benefit from a better developed critical method.

Furthermore, without attention being paid to the regimes of exploitation bound up in the social project and how race, class and nation are imbricated in the French national imaginary, the question underpinning the text (how do we go from utopian dream to nightmare?) is left unanswered. If the modernist project was always attuned to the vicissitudes of everyday life, and critical sociological theory institutionalized into state logics, what then accounts for the demise of the *banlieue* into a site of poverty, racism and marginality? How does the social project—a product of a seemingly benevolent state—generate pervasive social polarization, hierarchization of populations and neighbourhoods and an apartheid order of segregated housing and living? Why does state intervention continue to fail to achieve its goals—never merely rhetorical—for inclusion, conviviality, equality and a rich quality of life for all urban inhabitants? Why do places designed for intense collective engagement still give rise to alienating environments?

The virtue of *The Social Project* is to display the extremely ambivalent nature of utopian projects and the inherent contradictions of the French housing estates. The postwar suburbs were at once sites of despair, despondency, misery and malaise; and sites of hope, promise, freedom and happiness. They were global yet specific, technocratic yet participatory, highly regulated yet experimental, functional yet flexible, humanist yet anti-humanist, urban yet anti-urban. A shortcoming of the book is that it leaves the reader in search of a framework to contextualize and reconcile these contradictions and their disparate effects.<sup>3</sup>

### **Rethinking The Social Project Today**

For Cupers the stakes of understanding the social project lie in the need for a more robust theory of how space is produced. Understanding the promises and failures of this unique historical

venture is urgent as ‘the products of the welfare state’s golden age are disappearing even before their making has been properly understood’ (xiv). While he may not have adequate tools to unpack the demise of the *banlieue*, his work is invaluable for comprehending the way architecture, urbanism, the state, market and bureaucracy are imbricated in complex configurations.

This intervention is especially timely insofar as Cupers’ book emerges at a moment when the French suburbs are once again being radically rethought. Both the central state and municipal governments have announced schemes to renew and redefine the blighted suburban landscapes of mass housing estates. The ambitious Grand Paris initiative launched in 2007 by Nicolas Sarkozy best exemplifies this gesture. Continuing in the tradition of using large infrastructural improvements to solve social ills, Grand Paris aims to radically overhaul suburban space through utopian spatial renovations. Questions of use, everyday life, inclusivity, participation, and peripherality continue to underwrite contemporary planning debates, with Grand Paris’ social project continuing the ideational, institutional and political contests of the postwar era. Grand Paris also confirms that architecture is uniquely though ambivalently positioned to lead these transformations (Enright, 2014).

With the increasing imbrication of real estate and finance capital, a climate of national austerity and a more complete subsumption of governing principles within market ideals, the social project in the neoliberal era is especially fraught. Perhaps Cupers’ principal lesson for the present is that utopias failed not because of the myopic perspective of the state, but because of problems inherent to the process of building. The social project is, as Lefebvre might say, not sufficiently an urban *oeuvre*. *The Social Project* is a good place to begin interrogating the perilous passage from plans and representations to reality and the political agency of architecture today. It is a provocative call to consider how to produce more equitable and convivial urban worlds and the appropriate knowledges and practices required to sustain them.

### Endnotes

<sup>1</sup> Cupers claims to not to be concerned with the ‘success or failure’ of the *banlieue* and aims instead to analyze it ‘on it’s own terms’ (xv). Yet at the same time, he bookends this analysis with segments which describe the decline of the suburban housing estates, their ‘otherness’

compared to central cities, and the insurrectionary events of 2005. It is clearly the unfulfilled promise of the social project that makes his intervention remarkable today.

<sup>2</sup> Of course, Lefebvre too, while focusing on the banality of the quotidian, also presents everyday life as dialectical, indeed the only space where subversion is possible.

<sup>3</sup> Cupers is in conversation with recent publications that aim to draw out the complex and conflictual relationships between the French state, planners, architects and academic social scientists in the postwar era. It can productively be read, for example, alongside Stuart Elden's collection of Henri Lefebvre's writing, *State, Space World* and Łukasz Stanek's, *Henri Lefebvre on Space: Architecture, Urban Research and the Production of Theory* (2011). Cupers' book is not as rich theoretically as either of these. It would benefit from engaging more closely, for example, with Lefebvre's notion of the 'state mode of production,' a socialist and capitalist imperative for growth which sees the state produce hierarchy and fragmentation through growth, and with Stanek's account of the mechanisms through which urban and sociological critique are appropriated by state apparatuses.

### References

Castells, M. (1983) *The City and the Grassroots: A Cross-Cultural Theory of Urban Social Movements*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cupers, K. (ed.) (2013) *Use Matters: An Alternative History of Architecture*. New York: Routledge.

De Certeau, M. (1998) *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Enright, T. (2014) 'Illuminating the Path to Grand Pari(s): Architecture and Urban Transformation in an Era of Neoliberalization,' *Antipode*, 46 (2): 382–403.

Grosz, E. (2001) *Architecture from the Outside*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press.

Hill, J. (2003) *Actions of Architecture: Architects and Creative Users*. London: Routledge.

Jacobs, J. (1961) *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Random House.

Jameson, F. (2004) 'The Politics of Utopia,' *New Left Review*, 25.

Kipfer, S., & Goonewardena, K. (2013) 'Urban Marxism and the Post-colonial Question: Henri Lefebvre and 'Colonisation,'" *Historical Materialism* 21(2): 76-117.

Le Corbusier. (2007) *Toward an Architecture*. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute.

Lefebvre, H. (2009) *State, Space, World: Selected Essays*. Edited by N. Brenner. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Lefebvre, H. (1987) 'The Everyday and Everydayness,' in *Yale French Studies*, 73: 7-11.

Ross, K. (1996) *Fast Cars, Clean Bodies: Decolonization and the Reordering of French Culture*. Cambridge: MIT Press.

Scott, J. C. (1998) *Seeing Like a State: How Certain Schemes to Improve the Human Condition Have Failed*. New Haven: Yale University Press.