

## Les Immatériaux Research

### Working Paper No. 10

#### The architecture sites of *Les Immatériaux*, curated by Alain Guiheux

Andreas Broeckmann

(version 16 February 2023)

#### Introduction

Among the circa sixty exhibition sites in *Les Immatériaux*, there were three sites dedicated to architectural themes. They were titled *Architecture plane* (Flat Architecture), *Référence inversée* (Inverted Reference), and *Terroir oublié* (Neglected Terrain), and they were curated by the architect and theorist Alain Guiheux, a curator at the Centre de Création Industrielle (CCI), the design department of the Centre Pompidou. Preparing these sites which pertained to contemporary theories and practices in architecture, and fit into the wider conceptual framework of *Les Immatériaux*, Guiheux worked closely with the chief curators Jean-François Lyotard and Thierry Chaput. Yet, as the archival evidence suggests, it was Guiheux who had the original ideas for these particular sites, and he was rather autonomous in their conceptual elaboration.

The architecture sites dealt with the ways in which architecture under its postmodern condition was no longer predicated on the concepts of building and construction, and on the building materials used. According to Guiheux, architecture was a conceptual practice whose primary media were the drawing and the model, rather than the building itself. Whereas the exhibition sites *Architecture plane* and *Référence inversée* explicated this idea, the third site, *Terroir oublié*, offered an historical and retrospective look back at the central role that construction materials had played in modernist architecture.

Guiheux additionally proposed two sites about the significance of photography and text for architecture. Both proposals remained unrealized, suggesting that there was a limit to how broadly Chaput and Lyotard wanted the exhibition to engage with architectural themes. And there was a realized site called *Habitacle* (Compartment), dealing with postmodern forms of habitation, in whose preparation Guiheux was not involved because, presumably, it surpassed his own field of interest at the time.

#### Guiheux's work with the *Immatériaux* team

Alain Guiheux was invited to contribute to the *Immatériaux* project early in 1984, when the curatorial work on the exhibition started after Lyotard's return to Paris from his teaching assignment in the United States. Thierry Chaput and his team had already met with Guiheux on two occasions in 1982 and 1983, before Lyotard joined the project. These were in-house consultations with a colleague at the CCI during which the potential implication of architectural themes on the planned exhibition about "new materials and creation" were explored. Among the staff of the CCI, Guiheux was the most likely candidate for such an assignment, given his strongly philosophical and contemporary interests, in comparison with the more historical and modernist orientation of the chief curator of architecture, Jean Dethier,

and the sociological interests of Vincent Grimaud, head of the CCI department for "social innovation."<sup>1</sup>

Alain Guiheux had trained as an architect at the École nationale supérieure d'architecture in Lille. He started working for the Centre de Création Industrielle in 1982, in the department of Vincent Grimaud, after having done research at the national Institut de l'Habitat, in a workshop directed by the sociologists of urban life, Henri Lefebvre et Henri Raymond.<sup>2</sup> Guiheux's own first exhibition for the CCI would be *Lieux ? de travail* ("Places ? of work", June – October 1986), making the sites he prepared for *Les Immatériaux* his first curatorial project at the Centre Pompidou.

In the period from February till October 1984 there was, according to the calendars of Moinot and Lyotard, a series of thirteen meetings with Guiheux.<sup>3</sup> Given that the CCI offices were right next to each other, we can surmise that there were further informal encounters of Guiheux with Chaput and the project managers. Apparently Lyotard was present only in less than half of the scheduled meetings, namely at the beginning (February, March) and then at the end of the preparation process (July, August, October), suggesting that Guiheux did the actual elaboration of the sites rather independently, after having discussed the plans for the overall project at the beginning, and then presenting the results of his research and the proposals for the exhibits in the summer. The three architecture sites (as well as the site *Habitacle*) are already mentioned with their eventual titles in the concept that Chaput and Lyotard prepared in April 1984, suggesting that the basic parameters were laid out by March. In the following months, Guiheux prepared a 26-page dossier, "L'Architecture dans *Les Immatériaux*," explaining the conceptual guidelines of the sites and suggestions for the exhibits.<sup>4</sup> This dossier formed the basis for the curatorial decisions which were affirmed in the

---

<sup>1</sup> Jean Dethier was busy with a major exhibition project in 1984 (*Images et imaginaires d'architecture*, spring 1984) and did not get involved directly in *Les Immatériaux*, though he helped to establish the contacts to some of the lenders, including Peter Eisenman, Rem Koolhaas, Gallery Van Rooy Amsterdam, and the Museum of Architecture in Frankfurt am Main. (The invoice for the Koolhaas silkscreen print is addressed at Dethier; see 1994033W223\_003.) For the discussion about architecture in the exhibition about "new materials and creation" that Chaput was planning in 1982–1983, prior to Lyotard's arrival, see the archive dossier 1994033W223\_026, which contains a concept, possibly by design historian and CCI staff member, Raymond Guidot, "Quelques remarques sur le projet 'matériaux et création'" (two versions, p. 6–8, and 9–11, with handwritten notes by Martine Moinot in the first, and notes by Guiheux in the second). It places a strong emphasis on the design aspect of materials and takes a perspective on the handling of new materials which Guiheux would eventually critique in the audiovisual installation for the site *Terroir oublié*. What this pre-concept formulated as open questions about the status of materials in postmodern architecture (p. 8, 10), would appear as affirmative contemporary answers in *Architecture plane* and *Référence inversée*. The same dossier (1994033W223\_026, p. 58–67) also contains a report about the research by Sabine Vigoureux in March and April 1983, on different design aspects of the "matériaux et création" theme, with listed suggestions and comments by the various designers and producers who were interviewed by Vigoureux upon suggestion by Daniel Rozensztrach; and on p. 68–72, a concept by Guiheux dated 23 May 1984, for questions to be asked Paul Virilio about his new book, *L'Espace critique* (Paris: Christian Bourgois, 1984).

<sup>2</sup> Personal conversation with Alain Guiheux, Paris, 10 June 2021. In 1984, Guiheux was already working together with the architect, theorist and teacher Dominique Rouillard, with whom he later founded the agency Architecture Action, a project which they co-direct until today. Henri Lefebvre, before his death in 1991, published his last major book in 1981, *Critique de la vie quotidienne, III. De la modernité au modernisme (Pour une métaphilosophie du quotidien)* (Paris, L'Arche, 1981), which includes a critique of modernism, and of postmodernist architecture as it had been featured at the 1980 Venice Biennial. Lefebvre and Raymond worked with the Institut de l'Habitat (renamed Centre de Recherche sur l'Habitat, in 1986), a research unit of the CNRS (Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique). For Henri Raymond, see Jean-Pierre Frey: *Henri Raymond – Paroles d'un sociologue. Vers une histoire architecturale de la société*. Paris l'Harmattan, 2006.

<sup>3</sup> See Chronology 2020.

<sup>4</sup> See 1994033W223\_006, p. 3–31. [The cardboard folder containing this dossier has a sticker "Le bâtiment orphelin / Terroir oublié", presumably printed by Guiheux, but the content is not specific to this site.]

summer, and then put into practice by Guiheux together with one of the project managers on Chaput's team, Sabine Vigoureux.

### **Guiheux's conception of architecture, *L'Ordre de la brique***

The architecture sites must be viewed in a double perspective, first from the point of view of Lyotard's concept for *Les Immatériaux*, and secondly from that of Guiheux's own thinking about architecture. In 1983 and 1984 Guiheux was finishing his doctoral thesis on the role of the brick in architecture, *L'Ordre de la brique*.<sup>5</sup> Guiheux's book is an historical study of the way in which the brick and its materiality have been conceptualized in architectural theories since Vitruvius, whose 1st century BC tract on architecture was highly influential not least for Renaissance and early modern architecture. Guiheux's analysis looks at the way in which architectural theorists conceived of construction, the wall, and the meaning invoked by construction materials. The book takes the brick as the starting point for a more general theoretical investigation of the role that materials played in the conceptualisation of architecture. Its main primary sources are theoretical texts by historical architects, but it also includes analyses of exemplary buildings and of typical ways of using building materials.

The fourth chapters, entitled "Informer" (To Inform), deals with the significance of building materials in the projection of buildings.<sup>6</sup> The historical focus here is on the modernist period and on a number of modern architects for whom the qualities of building materials strongly determined the conception of the building. In an exemplary passage about Louis Kahn, Guiheux writes that

"like Mies, Wright, Aalto, or Le Corbusier, Kahn could say: 'the shapes should not in any way resemble those made with other materials. The way you have used it, the way one sees it, should make it possible to recognize that it is this material and not another that you have treated.'"<sup>7</sup>

This analysis of the modernist approach to building materials forms the backdrop for the fifth and final chapter of the book, "Immatériaux," whose sections directly relate to the different exhibition sites which Guiheux proposed for *Les Immatériaux*.<sup>8</sup> The first of these, "Maternité perdue ou le bâtiment orphelin" (Lost Maternity, or the Orphan Building), would eventually be presented under the title *Terroir oublié* and displayed exemplary building materials used by Alvar Aalto and Frank Lloyd Wright, as well as an audiovisual programme of text quotations and photographs of modernist buildings. And the following sections of the "Immatériaux" chapter outline how since the 1960s the significance of building materials withers, and how the architectural project is increasingly articulated through the drawing ("Architecture plane"), and how the relationship between project and building is inverted, making the project more important than the building ("Référence inversée").

The text of this chapter in Guiheux's doctoral thesis is more or less identical with the conceptual document that Guiheux prepared for the exhibition, "L'Architecture dans *Les*

---

<sup>5</sup> Alain Guiheux: *L'Ordre de la brique*. Bruxelles: Mardaga, 1985.

<sup>6</sup> Guiheux 1985, p. 165–178.

<sup>7</sup> Guiheux 1985, p. 193, qu. Louis Kahn, *La construction moderne*, July–August 1973. (les formes ne doivent en aucune façon rassembler à celles qui sont réalisées avec d'autres matériaux. La façon dont vous l'avez employé, la manière dont on le voit, doit permettre de reconnaître que c'est un matériau et non un autre que vous avez traité.)

<sup>8</sup> Guiheux 1985, p. 207-215.

*Immatériaux*.<sup>9</sup> According to the dating of some sections of this latter document, its parts were drafted between May and the beginning of August 1984.

Guiheux additionally prepared texts to be used for the exhibition soundtrack, including excerpts of texts by some of the architects whose work would be presented in the sites. These texts would eventually not be used, since the soundtrack of *Les Immatériaux* became a project in its own right, for whose zones, comprising several sites each, the editors, Dolorès Rogozinski and Jean-François Lyotard, selected literary and philosophical texts that were less directly related to the themes of individual sites. All in all, Guiheux's preparatory materials preserved in the archive of the Centre Pompidou are much more organised and elaborate than the materials for any other part of *Les Immatériaux*, which may indicate the effusive ambitions of a young curator, but is perhaps also due to the fact that Guiheux was already conceiving these curatorial texts as a thesis chapter.<sup>10</sup>

## The curatorial program of the architecture sites

### *Terroir oublié*

The first site described in Guiheux's concept is called "Maternité perdue ou le bâtiment orphelin" (Lost Maternity or the Orphan Building) and will, in the exhibition, be presented under the title of *Terroir oublié* (Neglected Terrain).<sup>11</sup> Its concept took a deliberately retrospective look at the "museum" of modern architecture, presenting in separate vitrines, a brick from a building by Frank Lloyd Wright and two sculpted architectural elements designed by Alvar Aalto, made of ceramics and of wood respectively. A visual display presented slides with photographs of modernist buildings, juxtaposed with short quotations by various modernist architects. In Guiheux's chronological narrative this site comes first because it revisits and bids farewell to the modernist conception of materiality in architecture. The archival documents show how the text and image program of the audiovisual display were gradually narrowed down from an elaborate discourse to terse, poignant statements, finally arriving at the emblematic formula coined by Guiheux:

"The truth of the material, this maternity, is lost. The material is no longer."<sup>12</sup>

The *Inventaire* catalogue's unbound pages, one dedicated to each of the exhibition sites, contained on their front side, recto, a key visual and a conceptual summary, generally written by Jean-François Lyotard, and, on the verso side, short entries about the exhibits and their

<sup>9</sup> 1994033W223\_006, p. 3–31. In the following, quotations are taken from the version of the text published in *L'Ordre de la brique* (1985), unless stated otherwise.

<sup>10</sup> Besides the two functions of exhibition concept and thesis chapter, Guiheux's text may also have been used for a funding application that Chaput and Lyotard launched in May 1984; see their letter, dated 28 May 1984, to Alain Arvois, Mission d'Étude et de Recherche, of the Ministry of Urbanism and Housing, requesting financial support from the Ministry for the architecture sites, and for the exhibition architecture in general (1994033W223\_026, p. 37–38), with adjoining concept (p. 39–46) about the exhibition as a whole, and the architectural elements; Alain Guiheux is here mentioned as the curator of the sites who had already worked on their realisation. The three-page summary document corresponds to a handwritten, undated, one-page document (1994033W241\_012), probably drafted by Lyotard, which sketches an argument for how the question of the urban can be connected to the concepts of *Les Immatériaux*. The fact that this draft is written on a page with the letterhead of the Ministère de l'Urbanisme et du Logement, Mission des Études et de la Recherche, suggests that these are notes taken in the context of a meeting with Arvois at the Ministry, as instructions on how best to formulate the funding application.

<sup>11</sup> See Guiheux 1985, p. 207–208, 1994033W223\_006, p. 4–13. "Maternité perdue" was used as the title of the audiovisual programme in *Terroir oublié*.

<sup>12</sup> 1994033W223\_008 (*La vérité de la matière, cette maternité, est perdue. Le matériau n'est plus.*)

individual significance prepared by Guiheux. In his own short texts, Lyotard sought to relate the themes of the individual site to the overall concept of *Les Immatériaux*, and to the *Mât* path in which each site was presented – in the case of *Terroir oublié*, it was the fifth path, of *Maternité*, maternity. Lyotard writes:

"A building is no longer shaped by its site and the materials of the terrain where it is built. One no longer builds, one implants. In constructing, one built in accordance with the glory or modesty of the correspondence of a culture with a mother nature. What mother is honoured in large-scale architectural projects?"<sup>13</sup>

It is remarkable that a site which was so explicitly retrospective of a modernist conception of materials in architecture, was placed here at all, in this postmodern setting, between the questioning of biological motherhood (*Les trois mères*), of economic value (*Monnaie de temps*, *Négoce peint*), and of authorship (*Tous les auteurs*).<sup>14</sup> If we look at the rest of the show from the position of *Terroir oublié*, we realize that nowhere else *Les Immatériaux* is as affirmatively nostalgic, even if this nostalgia is presented in a detached and resigned tone – its resignation resonating with the absence of the human body, theatrically staged in the *Théâtre du non-corps*, and with the opening affirmation of the ephemeral gift of life, in the Egyptian bas-relief of the *Vestibule d'entrée*.

This constellation of different readings – between modernist architecture, motherhood, and the meaning conveyed by construction materials – is suggestive of the dialogical way in which Lyotard and Guiheux worked together. Guiheux developed a curatorial programme that was translated and adapted to the broader context of the exhibition by Lyotard. At times, this translation might stretch the reading of the site beyond Guiheux's intention, here indicated by Lyotard's introduction of the notion of "mother nature" (*mère-nature*).

### *Architecture plane*

An impression of the dialogical dynamics between Guiheux, Lyotard and the rest of the *Immatériaux* team can be gleaned from the archival materials related to the site *Architecture plane* (Flat Architecture).<sup>15</sup> They include text drafts from various stages of the preparation, photocopies of potential exhibits, as well as lists and handwritten notes which indicate the gradual development of the site's curatorial programme.

The site with the working title *Architecture tableau* (Panel Architecture) elaborated the notion of an architecture whose essence lies not in the finished building, but in the concept and in the media of conceptualisation, especially drawing and model. In the exhibition the site showed large concept drawings by the contemporary architects Rem Koolhaas and Zaha Hadid,

<sup>13</sup> Lyotard, *Inventaire catalogue* (1985/2022), page *Neglected Terrain*, recto, n.p.

<sup>14</sup> On the question of materiality and value, Guiheux, in *L'Ordre de la brique* (1985, p. 40), quotes an anecdote about Frank Lloyd Wright, related by Alvar Aalto. Aalto remembers that Wright asked his audience during a lecture: "Do you know, ladies and gentlemen, what a brick is? It is a trifle, it costs 11 cents, it is a commonplace and worthless thing, but it has a special property. Give me this brick and it will be immediately transmuted into the value of its weight in gold." (A. Aalto, cit. in *Architecture d'Aujourd'hui*, No. 191, June 1977, p. 69.) (*Savez-vous mesdames et messieurs, ce qu'est un brique? C'est une bagatelle, elle coûte 11 cents, c'est une chose banale et sans valeur, mais qui possède une propriété particulière. Donnez-moi cette brique et elle sera immédiatement transmuée en la valeur de son poids en or.*) Guiheux used a paraphrased version of this quotation as a motto on the title page of his book. ("L'architecture, c'est la transmutation d'une brique sans valeur en un brique en or.")

<sup>15</sup> See the dossier of preparatory research materials, 1994033W223\_003. For the concept, see Guiheux 1985, p. 210–211; 1994033W223\_006, p. 20–21.

accompanied by a drawing by the Dutch avantgarde designer Piet Zwart, and two sculptures from the *Architecton* series of the Russian artist Kasimir Malevich.

The handwritten notes by Sabine Vigoureux, partly jotted down on draft copies of Guiheux's concept text, record fragments of a discussion between Guiheux and Lyotard about the conceptual framing and its narrative presentation in the site:

"finish with: Zaha [Hadid] and Koolhaas – because archi[itecture] is painting, CAD [computer aided design], pure object

in the middle: Architectons by Malevich, and Mondrian (something from De Stijl is necessary)

we omit Mathieu

+ drawing by Malevich."<sup>16</sup>

In an earlier version, on the preceding page in the archived dossier, the attempt at building a narrative structure read like this:

"from painting to archi[itecture]", Aalto → Hadid

Le Corbu[sier] + Mathieu → Koolhaas

Aalto (and Mondrian) → Hadid, Mondrian at the entrance.<sup>17</sup>

We can imagine how Vigoureux was following the conversation, taking notes in order to keep track of the different constellations of works under discussion. Each potential exhibit was discussed with respect to the way in which it would relate to the others, and how it might contribute to the overall narrative and the meaning of the site. Among the first proposals, for instance, were abstract paintings by Alvar Aalto. Guiheux described them as counter-examples to the role of drawing in the work of Koolhaas and Hadid. The latter represented a new "reappearance of the pictorial in architecture in a form which neither Le Corbusier nor A. Aalto, who were both painters and sculptors after all, could have imagined."<sup>18</sup> Given the negation, which would have been hard and unintuitive to convey to the audience, it is not surprising to find that Aalto's paintings were soon deselected, in favour of exhibits that would convey the site's concept in a more affirmative and more directly architecture-related manner. About Zaha Hadid's drawing, "The Three Towers" (1985), Guiheux writes in the catalogue text:

"The bias toward the graphic is innovative not so much in its technique as in terms of its status: the architect and her colleagues agree in regarding this type of

<sup>16</sup> 1994033W223\_003, p. 9 (*finir par: Zaha [Hadid] et Koolhaas – car l'archi[itecture] est peinture, C.S.D. [computer system design], pur objet / au milieu: des Architectons de Malevitch et Mondrian (il faut qqe [quelque] chose de De Stijl) / on supprime Mathieu / + dessin de Malevitch*).

<sup>17</sup> 1994033W223\_003, p. 8 (*"de la peinture vers l'archi[itecture]", Aalto -> Hadid / Le Corbu[sier] + Mathieu -> Koolhaas / Aalto (et Mondrian) -> Hadid / Mondrian à l'entrée*). The reference here is presumably to the French abstract expressionist Georges Mathieu. A work by De Stijl artist Cesar Domela appears in the form of a constructivist assemblage (*Construction*, 1929) on the recto page in the *Inventaire* catalogue.

<sup>18</sup> Guiheux 1985, p. 210–211 (*une réapparition du pictorial dans l'architecture, sous une forme que ni Le Corbusier, ni A. Aalto, tous deux pourtant peintres et plasticiens, n'auraient pu concevoir*). The two paintings by Alvar Aalto of which there are photocopies in the research dossier, are "32,5 x 39,5 cm, 1946–47, oil" [p. 73], and "63 x 79 cm, 1964, oil" [p. 145], in *Alvar Aalto, Synopsis, Painting, Architecture, Sculpture* (Basel, Stuttgart: Birkhäuser, 1970). The copies in the research dossier were taken from another book publication, giving slightly different dates and sizes.

representation as a project, so that these 'graphical intermediaries' further designate the lack of interest in architecture as finished object or result."<sup>19</sup>

The text entry about Koolhaas' triptych reiterates the core idea of Guiheux's curatorial concept:

"The axonometric triptych for Rotterdam is the real site of architecture. The built version would only be a representation of it using materials which, as such, disappear, a fatally inadequate and perhaps unnecessary reproduction. Taking the form of a panel [*tableau*], the architect's drawing imposes its presence as a thing itself, negating its status as a representation."<sup>20</sup>

The critique of representation expressed in Guiheux's texts is also taken up by Lyotard in his short introductory text in the catalogue. Lyotard broadens the perspective, away from architecture, towards the more general question of pictorial representation:

"It seems that there is no distinction between an architect's drawing and a painter's drawing."<sup>21</sup>

There is a small, significant difference in the ways in which Guiheux and Lyotard were looking at the same exhibits. While Guiheux emphasized the architectural drawing, capturing the resulting picture by the term *tableau* (panel), Lyotard saw the shift from the material and constructed building to pictorial representation in the context of his own critique of representation which he had first formulated in his book of 1971, *Discours, figure*. Lyotard therefore employed the term *peinture*, in the sense of a non-instrumental and non-representational form of making pictures:

"Construction materials can be produced on demand – that is to say, for a particular project. The projection of a building on paper is now the essential component of the architectural message. The architect's drawing frees itself of the constraints of 'building' and approaches those of 'painting' [*peindre*]. A slippage of one code toward another which renders uncertain the distinction between the two messages, architectural and pictorial."<sup>22</sup>

Guiheux himself would not have made this allusion to painting. It is a reference which appears only in Lyotard's texts, while all potential 'painting' exhibits – by Mondrian, Aalto or Mathieu – had been omitted in favour of a more straightforward 'architectural' selection.<sup>23</sup>

### ***Référence inversée***

The theme of the third site curated by Guiheux is encapsulated in its title which pinpoints the "inverted reference" between the architectural drawing and the building.<sup>24</sup> The drawing is not a representation standing in for the 'architecture proper' of the building, but instead the

<sup>19</sup> Guiheux, *Inventaire catalogue* (1985/2022), page *Flat Architecture*, verso, n.p.

<sup>20</sup> Guiheux, *Inventaire catalogue* (1985/2022), page *Flat Architecture*, verso, n.p. (translation modified, A.B.).

<sup>21</sup> Lyotard, *Inventaire catalogue* (1985/2022), page *Flat Architecture*, recto, n.p.

<sup>22</sup> Lyotard, *Inventaire catalogue* (1985/2022), page *Flat Architecture*, recto, n.p.

<sup>23</sup> In Guiheux, *L'Ordre de la brique* (1985, p. 200), the chapter focusing on the modernist appraisal of the brick and other building materials, ends with a short section about two instances where this appraisal was "buried" and matter was overcome, namely in the neo-plasticist theory of Piet Mondrian, and in futurism.

<sup>24</sup> See Guiheux 1985, p. 208–210, 1994033W223\_006, p. 14–18.

building is conceived as a possible representation of the drawing which itself is understood as the primary site of architectural thinking. In a draft text, Guiheux puts it like this:

The activity of conception does not consist in going, in one's head, through all the corners of a future building which the drawings would prefigure. The latter lose their representative function and become pure architecture that the constructions simulate. In order to understand this inversion, we can say that ink, pencil or watercolor, photography, the balsa wood of the model, are the real materials, when the brick and the hollow block are only their representation.<sup>25</sup>

It is noteworthy that this idea was already encapsulated in a text, entitled "Buildings of Ink" (1984), which Guiheux wrote before getting involved in *Les Immatériaux*.<sup>26</sup> The text has the form of a dialogue between a student of architecture and a teacher who discuss about the status of writing, design and construction in architecture. The text argues that "architecture is a discourse" and that the architect is like a philosopher. Moreover, it announces the end of matter in a formulation that points forward to the formula about the end of the material in architecture, which concluded *Terroir oublié*. Earlier in 1984, Guiheux had written: "The material no longer exists for an architect, only the meaning, the message remains."<sup>27</sup>

Like the concept development of the other architecture sites, the first curatorial sketches for *Référence inversée* considered an historical and narrative approach, starting with a slideshow of historical and contemporary buildings, models, and drawings by different architects. However, this idea was replaced in the process by the decision to show only work by the American architect Peter Eisenman, because of, as Guiheux put it, his "extreme doctrinal awareness."<sup>28</sup> The site presented three of Eisenman's architectural models, as well as three axonometric drawings of *House II* (1969-1970). In the catalogue, Guiheux quotes Eisenman:

*House II* was deliberately coded to extract it from reality. It was constructed to look like a model. In fact, in many published photos of the real building the caption says 'Photo of the maquette of *House II*.' The house looks like a model...<sup>29</sup>

Eisenman's discourse provided the blueprint for Guiheux's core argument of the inverted reference between concept and building:

"When I turn to the making of maquettes and drawings taken as objects in themselves, or when I consider the real building as a maquette and therefore as a

<sup>25</sup> A. Guiheux, concept sketch, spring 1984, 1994033W223\_002, p. 3. (*L'activité de conception ne consiste pas à parcourir en sa tête l'ensemble des recoins d'un édifice à venir que les dessins préfigureraient. Ceux-ci perdent leur fonction représentative et deviennent pure architecture que les constructions simulent. Pour donner à comprendre cette inversion on dira que l'encre, le crayon ou l'aquarelle, la photographie, le balsa de la maquette, sont des matériaux réels, quand la brique et le parpaing n'en sont que la représentation.*)

<sup>26</sup> Guiheux, "Bâtiments d'encres," published in Jean Dethier (ed.): *Images et imaginaires d'architecture*. (Exhibition catalogue) Paris: Centre Pompidou, 1984, p. 57–61. The archive dossier related to the architecture sites (1994033W223\_026) contains photocopies of two undated typescripts of this text, version 1, p. 27–35, and version 2, p. 16–26, with handwritten additions by Guiheux in the margins. Dethier's exhibition opened on 8 March 1984, so the text must have been completed by January.

<sup>27</sup> Guiheux 1984, p. 60 (*La matière n'existe plus pour un architecte, il ne reste que de la signification, du message.*). The reference to "architecture as discourse" on p. 58.

<sup>28</sup> 1994033W223\_002, p. 5. See the copy of a page from the concept document of April 1984 (1994033W223\_002, p. 2), on which the first, alternative proposals for exhibits are vigorously crossed out, now underlining only Eisenman's name.

<sup>29</sup> *Inventaire* catalogue (1985/2022), page *Inverted Reference*, verso, n.p., quoting P. Eisenman, "Le rappresentazioni del dubbio: nel segno del segno," in: *Rassegna*, March 1982.

mere extension and not as a result, I attempt to reverse the traditional role of architecture in relation to its own process."<sup>30</sup>

The argument that Guiheux had developed in his historical investigation into the role of matter and construction in architecture, and whose epitome Guiheux found in Eisenman's "doctrine," was taken up and reiterated in Lyotard's catalogue entry:

"It's not the 'concrete' building that serves as a reference for the architectural drawing, but also, or better, the architect's plan, the elevation, the cross section that is to be 'seen' in the construction. The reference to the hardware [*matière*] of architecture is inverted. The building represents its representation on paper."<sup>31</sup>

The chain of references comes full circle when Guiheux, in a remark that is not in the exhibition concept but that was later added to the text for the book publication of *L'Ordre de la brique*, speaks about the relationship of architecture and discourse, pointing out the significance of Lyotard's book about Marcel Duchamp, *Duchamp's TRANS/formers* (1977/1990), for Peter Eisenman:

... any statement is already potentially architecture, whether its origin is external (see the importance of *Les Transformateurs Duchamp* for P. Eisenman) or internal (a text aiming to analyze architectural post-modernity).<sup>32</sup>

The triangle formed by Duchamp's conception of art, Eisenman's conception of architecture, and Lyotard's conception of postmodern (im)materiality, is, for Guiheux, an inheritance, a prize and a toolbox.

Guiheux proposed two further exhibition sites, both of which were not realized. The first of these was called *Bâtiment parlé* (Spoken Building), which would have pushed further on the idea of architecture as discourse, and the architectural significance of the medium of text.<sup>33</sup> The second was a site that would, under the title *Matériel Architecture* (Material Architecture), have shown architectural photographs.<sup>34</sup> The conceptual argument was analogue to those of the sites *Architecture plane* and *Bâtiment parlé*, this time adapted to photography. The claim was that photography wouldn't just represent architecture, but that it

<sup>30</sup> *Inventaire catalogue* (1985/2022), page *Inverted Reference*, verso, n.p., quoting P. Eisenman, "A Poetus of the Model—Eisenman's Doubt," in: *Idea as Model*, Rezzoli, 1981.

<sup>31</sup> Lyotard, *Inventaire catalogue* (1985/2022), page *Inverted Reference*, recto, n.p.

<sup>32</sup> Guiheux 1985, 210 (... *tout énoncé est déjà potentiellement de l'architecture, que son origine soit externe (voir l'importance des Transformateurs Duchamp pour P. Eisenman) ou interne (un texte visant à analyser la post-modernité architecturale).*)

<sup>33</sup> See Guiheux 1985, p. 211–212, 1994033W223\_006, p. 15, 19. Guiheux and Dominique Rouillard had also made this argument for the architectural discourses of the 17th century, in a report written for the École d'architecture de Lille and submitted in June 1984, A. Guiheux, D. Rouillard: *Si on peut dire en architecture. Les mots, les ordres dans la seconde moitié du XVIIe siècle*. [Rapport de recherche] 224/84, Ministère de l'urbanisme et du logement / Secrétariat de la recherche architecturale (SRA); Ecole nationale supérieure d'architecture de Lille et Régions Nord, 1984, online at hal-01888429. See also the shorter treatment of the same historical argument in A. Guiheux, D. Rouillard: "L'Architecture parlante. Une autre crise." In *Cahiers du CCI*, special issue, "Mesure pour mesure: architecture et philosophie," edited by Claude Eveno, in collaboration with Collège International de Philosophie. Paris: Centre de Création Industrielle, 1987, p. 19–24.

<sup>34</sup> See Guiheux 1985, p. 212, 1994033W223\_006, p. 22. Guiheux's suggestion was to show photographs of the US-American architecture photographer Julius Schulmann.

became the predominant form in which architecture existed, a photography that "corrects" the flaws of construction, recreating and "restoring a truth buried in the drawings."<sup>35</sup>

We can only speculate why these two proposals were not taken up. The short concept texts suggest that perhaps even Guiheux himself was not fully convinced of their pertinence, his indications for how to exhibit them remaining rather tentative. Moreover, whereas in the cases of *Architecture plane* and *Référence inversée* it was possible for Lyotard to draw out a conceptual argument about representation and materiality that was not limited to architecture, *Bâtiment parlé* and *Matériel Architecture* appeared to be making architectural arguments which couldn't as easily be translated into general phenomena of postmodernity, and which perhaps made more sense in Guiheux's book than in the exhibition.

The same is true of a section in Guiheux's concept dedicated to urbanism.<sup>36</sup> The general argument here is that city planning was no longer dependent on specific technologies, and that there was therefore a new freedom in urban planning concerning construction, communication and infrastructure, one that was analogous to the freedom from specific materials in architecture. Guiheux placed this section at the end of his conceptual text and left it without suggestions for exhibits. Since the question of urbanism features prominently in the correspondence with the Ministry of Urbanism and Housing, about raising funds for the exhibition, it may be a theme that was brought up by representatives of the Ministry, and that then Lyotard, Chaput and Guiheux were struggling to integrate, in order to justify the funding request.<sup>37</sup> – Eventually, there was no site in the exhibition that addresses questions of urbanism.

Another exception in Guiheux's treatment is a section on the theme of the *Habitat*. Initially left empty in the draft document, there is a text dated 29 May which was presumably supposed to fill that gap.<sup>38</sup> In this short statement, Guiheux underscores the contemporary detachment of humans from their living environment, and claims that the habitation loses the metonymic relation to its inhabitants and their memories. Guiheux again makes no suggestion for an exhibit, and he does not seem to have been involved in the preparations of the exhibition site called *Habitacle* (Compartment) which displayed a sleeping cell from a modular hotel, provided by a Japanese outfitter. Lyotard, in his catalogue text, picked up on the notion of detachment, but unlike Guiheux's more sociological argument, Lyotard went on to focus on the prosthetic quality of the capsule:

"Decline of the living space as a site of identification and enjoyment, emergence of environments calculated to provide the requisite organic functions? A prosthetic habitat for a body with no dimensions other than the purely functional?"<sup>39</sup>

---

<sup>35</sup> Guiheux 1985, p. 212.

<sup>36</sup> See Guiheux 1985, p. 212–214, 1994033W223\_006, p. 25–27. For a treatment of the topic of urbanism by Lyotard, see his essay "*Domus* and the Megalopolis" (lecture originally held in 1987) in *The Inhuman* [1988] Cambridge (UK): Polity, 1991, 191–204.

<sup>37</sup> See footnote 10, above.

<sup>38</sup> In the document 1994033W223\_006, p. 28, before the final three-page section on "Urbanisme", there is an empty page inserted which has only the handwritten word "Habitat" on it and a page number that places it in the sequence of the overall document. The typed document 1994033W223\_026, p. 15, is entitled "Habitat" and signed by Guiheux. In the date "29 mai 94 16 h 25", the "94" appears to be erroneous, since the text clearly fits in the 1984 context of the exhibition preparations, and parts of it were actually used by Guiheux in the "Urbanism" section of the "Immatériaux" chapter in *L'Ordre de la brique*, 1985, p. 213–214.

<sup>39</sup> Lyotard, *Inventaire catalogue* (1985/2022), page *Compartment*, recto, n.p. More than ten years later, Guiheux was the author of a book and exhibition catalogue, *Kisho Kurokawa, architecte. Le Métabolisme, 1960–1975* (Centre Pompidou, MNAM-CCI, 1997), which included an extensive treatment of Kurokawa's modular

It would be difficult and perhaps counterproductive to try and disentangle the respective contributions, by Guiheux and Lyotard, to the conceptualisation of the architecture sites. Guiheux clearly brought to the conversation his own ideas about the status of construction materials in architectural theory, while Lyotard tested the conceptual framing of the *Immatériaux* project on the architectural ideas and potential exhibits proposed by Guiheux.<sup>40</sup> Guiheux acknowledged the debt that the "Immatériaux" chapter of his thesis, *L'Ordre de la brique*, owed to Jean-François Lyotard, and it is likely that the invitation to contribute to *Les Immatériaux* gave Guiheux the chance to develop his own thinking about postmodern architecture in a way that might not have been possible otherwise.<sup>41</sup> Moreover, for a young architectural critic, it must have been exciting to be given a first chance to exhibit work by contemporary architects like Zaha Hadid, Rem Koolhaas, and Peter Eisenman, at a moment when the concept of "deconstruction" was becoming an important topic in contemporary architecture – spurred not least by the competition entry by Jacques Derrida and Peter Eisenman for the architectural design of the Parc de la Villette, in 1985.<sup>42</sup> But Guiheux's text "Bâtiments d'encre," written before the first conversations with Lyotard took place, shows how his core ideas for the sites were already in place:

"If drawing is nowadays architecture, then architecture is drawing, and to make a project is to construct a real building; to construct a building is to draw it."<sup>43</sup>

Like for the museum curator Bernard Blistène who worked on the visual arts sites, for Alain Guiheux the collaboration with a senior philosopher like Jean-François Lyotard was a unique early-career opportunity. Blistène and Guiheux brought their specialist knowledge of modern and contemporary art and of architecture into the dialogue and helped Lyotard to articulate his ideas around postmodernity through the selection and presentation of certain exhibits.

---

architecture designs from around 1970. The publication coincided with the donation by Kurokawa of a number of drawings to the collection of the Centre Pompidou in 1997 (see p. 64–65). In 1979, Kurokawa had made a mentioned but not selected proposal for the Beaubourg site (see p. 58).

<sup>40</sup> Martine Moinot's meeting notes of 20 and 21 March 1984 (1994033W223\_026), eight and four pages long respectively, suggest a very animated and extensive discussion between Guiheux and Lyotard of the themes to be addressed in the architecture sites. The conversation appears to have meandered quite considerably, but there are indications that many of the ideas that would form the core of the three realized sites were already mentioned, as well as the ideas for the unrealized sites *Bâtiment parlé*, and *Matériel architecture*. Chapat's brief notes of a meeting with Guiheux on 25 April mention four sites (*référence inversée*, *terroir*, *bâtiment parlé*, *archi plane*), with hints at the programme for these sites evolving, but not yet completed.

<sup>41</sup> Guiheux 1985, p. 8, acknowledgement for the final chapter: "Ce dernier chapitre doit beaucoup à J.-F. Lyotard alors Commissaire général de l'exposition "Les Immatériaux" au Centre Pompidou, et qui nous a permis que nous y réalisons les "sites" architecture."

<sup>42</sup> See Jacques Derrida and Peter Eisenman (1997). *Chora L Works*. New York City, Monacelli Press, and the exhibition catalogue *Deconstructivist Architecture*, edited by Philip Johnson and Mark Wigley, Museum of Modern Art, New York City, 1988. Another instance where a similar architectural programme is presented, is the Ars Electronica Festival of 1994, which ran under the title of "Intelligente Ambiente – Intelligent Environment" and included a thematic focus on "Architecture and Electronic Media" (Vol. 1, ed. Karl Gerbel, Peter Weibel. Wien: PSV, 1994) which featured contributions by Peter Eisenman, COOP Himmelblau ("The Medium as Construction Material"), Zaha Hadid, and Toyo Ito, as well as Paul Virilio's text "The Overexposed City [La ville surexposée]" which had crucially influenced Lyotard's thinking about *Les Immatériaux* in the winter and spring of 1984 (see Lyotard, "After Six Months..." in Hui/Broeckmann 2015).

<sup>43</sup> Guiheux 1984, 61 ("Si le dessin est aujourd'hui l'architecture, alors l'architecture est le dessin, et faire un projet, c'est construire un bâtiment réel; construire un bâtiment, c'est le dessiner.")

### Guiheux's review of *Les Immatériaux*

By way of conclusion, it is noteworthy that as part of the concept for the architecture sites, and as the final section of the "Immatériaux" chapter in his thesis, Guiheux formulated a critique of the exhibition architecture developed for *Les Immatériaux*. Under the section title "Ne pas mettre en scène" (Don't stage), Guiheux wrote that the scenographic solution chosen by Philippe Délis and Lyotard sought to convey a sentiment of vagueness and insecurity.<sup>44</sup> Guiheux denounced the representational mode of this architecture which displayed its function, and which looked like what it was supposed to mean, as a residue of the modernism that Guiheux was trying to get away from. He pleaded for freeing the appearance of architecture from a specific meaning, and argued for a completely generic scenography that would refute any form of representation.

This critique would later be echoed in a remark about the scenography for Guiheux's own first exhibition at the Centre Pompidou, *Lieux ? de travail* (1986):

There is no connection between the architecture and the theme of the exhibition, but the factory space in the modern definition and the visits to robotic workshops were important, as was the impact of cybernetics and computer science.<sup>45</sup>

In this exhibition, realised in the year after *Les Immatériaux*, Guiheux appears to have tried to avoid the mistake that he thought had been made by Lyotard, Délis and Chaput. In his own exhibition, Guiheux also drew the consequences from other, more positive lessons he had learned from *Les Immatériaux*: the exhibition *Lieux ? de travail* had no fixed route for the audience to follow, but offered an open space in which any sense of spatial distinction was negated. Moreover, Guiheux sought to avoid representation by using multiple TV monitors and video projections, which are generic scenographic elements *per se*.<sup>46</sup>

The work on *Les Immatériaux* remained an important point of reference for Alain Guiheux throughout his career as an architect, theorist, and curator. The concept text he had written for the architecture sites, which became the final chapter of his doctoral thesis, was republished again over twenty-five years later in Guiheux's programmatic book, *Architecture dispositif* (2012), where it appears as the first chapter in a volume that collects texts which formed part of the architectural, curatorial and conceptual practice that Guiheux and Dominique Rouillard developed under the label of "Architecture Action" since the 1990s. The work for *Les Immatériaux* appears here as a starting point of Guiheux's theoretical trajectory, and as a project which left its traces in the scenography of several of his future exhibitions. The text is now illustrated with images not from *Les Immatériaux*, but from other, later exhibition projects by Guiheux, suggesting that Guiheux perhaps felt a stronger sense of authorship for these exhibitions, but also that the ideas expressed in this early text resonated with the later projects.<sup>47</sup>

<sup>44</sup> Guiheux 1985, p. 214, 1994033W223\_006, p. 27.

<sup>45</sup> "L'Architecture est une exposition," in *Architecture dispositif* (2012), p. 61–66, qu. p. 66. (*Il n'y a pas de rapport entre l'architecture et le thème de l'exposition, mais l'espace usinier dans la définition de la modernité et les visites des ateliers de robots étaient importants, tout comme l'impact de la cybernétique et de l'informatique.*)

<sup>46</sup> Personal conversation with Alain Guiheux, Paris, 10 June 2021.

<sup>47</sup> *Les Immatériaux* is not mentioned in a text about the relationship of architecture and exhibition ("L'Architecture est une exposition", in *Architecture dispositif* (2012), p. 61–66, first published in *Archithèse*, March 1996) which refers to Guiheux's exhibition projects *Lieux ? de travail* (Centre Pompidou, 1986), *L'Invention du temps* (Cité des Sciences et de l'Industrie de la Villette, 1989), *Pierre Chareau* (Centre Pompidou, 1994), *La ville: Art et architecture en Europe* (with Jean Dethier, Centre Pompidou, 1994), *Archigram* (Centre Pompidou, 1994), and *L'Art de l'ingénieur* (Centre Pompidou, 1997). A text by Ignasi de Solà-Morales Rubió, "Architecture des immatériaux", published in a small book edited by Guiheux about recent acquisitions for the

In the introduction to *Architecture dispositif*, Guiheux emphasizes the aspect of architecture turning away from construction and the physical building, and towards the project, the idea. He concludes with a set of references to the postmodernist theories that have influenced his practice:

"To 'make project' consists in deciding on its rules of engendering, on its system of project, when the beliefs and the discourses of truth have vanished. Jean-François Lyotard had perceived at the same time the end of the great narratives and the pursuit of the quest of the new, of the invention, but had not seen that postmodernity was the cultural logic imposed by late capitalism, which has been shown by Frederic Jameson and David Harvey. The analyses of Gilles Lipovetsky and Alain Ehrenberg have described the transformations of the subject. Postmodernity has taught us that we must invent our questions."<sup>48</sup>

Retrospectively, Guiheux embraces a sociological perspective of postmodernity that he saw lacking in Lyotard, and that rather connects to Guiheux's earlier association with Henri Lefebvre and Henri Raymond. But at the same time, Guiheux embraces the conceptual programme of *Les Immatériaux* for his own *curriculum vitae*. He prefaces the "Immatériaux" chapter by a short editorial note:

Published in *L'ordre de la brique* (Liège, Mardaga, 1985), the text presents the 'Architecture' section of Jean-François Lyotard's exhibition 'Les Immatériaux' held in 1985 at the Centre Georges Pompidou. There, French philosophy replaces linguistics – the model of the Sixties to the Seventies – as source of projects. The exhibition announces the development of reflexive architecture in a period where the architect's drawing has become autonomous from the production.<sup>49</sup>

Guiheux took the three architecture sites as a pivotal point in the development of – at least his own – thinking about architecture. A similar combination of biographical and architecture-historical aspects is also present in a passage of Guiheux's introduction for the catalogue of the architecture collection whose constitution he had organised since the early 1990s. In this text of 1998, Guiheux disguises his own understanding of postmodern architecture from that promoted by Charles Jencks and other Anglo-American critics, highlighting his own work on *Les Immatériaux* and the conceptual work that had followed it in the form of a seminar and a symposium at the Centre International de Philosophie, for which Lyotard had invited him.<sup>50</sup>

---

architecture collection, *Architecture instantanée. Nouvelles acquisitions* (Paris, Centre Pompidou, 2000, p. 71–77), deals with the postmodern dematerialisation of architecture with regard to transparency and informatization; there is a short section about the exhibition *Les Immatériaux* (p. 73–74), but the exhibition is referenced only in very general terms, and the focus is then placed on the artworks of Marcel Duchamp and on the discourse of virtuality as it emerged in the 1990s.

<sup>48</sup> Guiheux, *Architecture dispositif* (2012), p. 9 (*'Faire projet' consiste à décider de ses règles d'engendrement, de son système de projet, quand les croyances et les discours de vérité se sont évanouis. Jean-François Lyotard avait perçu à la fois la fin des grands récits et la poursuite de la quête du nouveau, de l'invention, mais n'avait pas vu que la postmodernité était la logique culturelle imposée par le capitalisme tardif, ce qui a été la démonstration de Frédéric Jameson et David Harvey. Les analyses de Gilles Lipovetsky et Alain Ehrenberg ont décrit les transformations qui ont été celles du sujet. La postmodernité nous a appris que nous devons inventer nos questions.*)

<sup>49</sup> Guiheux, *Architecture dispositif* (2012), p. 11 (*Publié dans L'ordre de la brique (Liège, Mardaga, 1985), le texte présente la section 'Architecture' de l'exposition de Jean-François Lyotard 'Les Immatériaux' tenue en 1985 au Centre Georges Pompidou. La philosophie française y remplace la linguistique – le modèle des années soixante à soixante-quinze – comme source des projets. L'exposition annonce le développement de l'architecture réflexive dans une période où le dessin d'architecte s'est autonomisé de la production.*)

<sup>50</sup> See *Collection d'architecture du Centre Georges Pompidou*. Paris, Centre Pompidou, 1998, p. 15, fn. 1. There were two seminars on architecture and philosophy held by philosopher Sylviane Agacinski and Alain Guiheux at

Finally, Lyotard is also an important reference in a text that Guiheux wrote in 2017, on the occasion of the 40th anniversary of the opening of the Centre Pompidou, a text which is a critical appraisal of both the CCI and of the Centre Pompidou in general. In this essay entitled "De Pompidou à Georges" (2017), Guiheux argues that the Centre Pompidou failed to live up to its promises of a communal art centre, and that – at least in the period since the 1990s – it sold out to the art market, fostering the social divide that it was originally meant to bridge.

"There was indeed a cultural recovery that took place with Beaubourg, perhaps a brief modern fervor, in any case an interlude where an open society would slip in for a few more months. In the short time between the opening of the Center in 1977 and the publication of *The Postmodern Condition* in 1979, which Jean-François Lyotard transformed into an exhibition, *Les Immatériaux* (1985), we like to confuse the prodigious attendance figures of Beaubourg with the effect of the tourist flagship that is being set up, a super-sign at the heart of the distractive itinerary of tour operators."<sup>51</sup>

Guiheux suggests that the CCI had the greatest potential for forming a cultural interface, but that its rather tame treatment of design, architecture and media disappointed the hopes for what one of its departments called "social innovation."

But apart from *Les Immatériaux*, it is perhaps an exhibition at the National Museum of Modern Art (MNAM), *Hors limites: l'art et la vie, 1952-1994* [Out of Bounds: Art and Life, 1952-1994], which, while remaining in the register of art history, will refer to the way in which the era transforms itself and us, where the change of era and the change of our perceptions meet.<sup>52</sup>

In Guiheux's perception, *Les Immatériaux* was one of the main achievements of the CCI, and a landmark in the development of the Centre Pompidou. In 2017, of all the exhibitions presented by the Centre over a forty-year period, Guiheux highlighted only two: *Magiciens de la terre* (1989) for having drawn the attention to the imminent globalisation of the art world, and *Les Immatériaux*:

The exhibition *Les Immatériaux* by Jean-François Lyotard was an opportunity to deploy a reflection on postmodernity, but can we say that the experience of the exhibition was a determining factor, if not through its homogenizing scenography and the distribution of sound through headphones, which was being used for the first time? The reflective exhibition has therefore nothing obvious... except perhaps always through the "experience", this word so dear to the marketing

---

the Centre International de Philosophie in 1984–1986, as well as a symposium, "L'Architecture en question," in October 1985, whose proceedings were published as a special issue of the *Cahiers du CCI* in 1987 under the title, "Mesure pour mesure. Architecture et philosophie."

<sup>51</sup> Guiheux, "De Pompidou à Georges", 2017, p. 99. (*Il y a bien eu un rattrapage culturel qui s'est joué avec Beaubourg, peut-être une brève ferveur moderne, en tous cas un intermède où se glissera encore pour quelques mois une société ouverte. Dans ce temps court entre l'ouverture du Centre en 1977 et la publication de La Condition postmoderne en 1979, que Jean-François Lyotard transformera en exposition, Les Immatériaux (1985), on se plaît à confondre les prodigieux chiffres de fréquentation de Beaubourg et l'effet du flagship touristique qui se met en place, un super-signe au sein du parcours distractif des tours opérateurs.*) See also the references to Lyotard's *Les Transformateurs Duchamp* (1977), and *La condition postmoderne* (1979), in Guiheux, *Le Grand espace commun*, 2017, p. 19.

<sup>52</sup> Guiheux, "De Pompidou à Georges", 2017, p. 101. (*Mais en dehors des Immatériaux, c'est peut-être une exposition du Musée national d'art moderne (MNAM), Hors limites: l'art et la vie, 1952-1994, qui tout en demeurant sur le registre de l'histoire de l'art, renverra à la manière dont l'époque se transforme et nous transforme, où ce rencontre le changement d'époque et le changement des nos perceptions.*)

people, which takes place there? But who would be interested today in the redevelopment of a reflection on the future of the exhibition?<sup>53</sup>

Guiheux has remained consistent in his critical evaluation of *Les Immatériaux* as an important exhibition project, which did however have its conceptual flaws and which did not resist the problems of its time. For Guiheux himself it was both starting point and touch-stone of his career as architect and exhibition curator.

## Bibliography

Broeckmann, Andreas; Vicet, Marie (eds.): "Chronology of *Les Immatériaux*" (version 2), *Les Immatériaux Research*, Working Paper, No. 1, July 2020.

Alain Guiheux: "Bâtiments d'encre," in Jean Dethier (ed.): *Images et imaginaires d'architecture*. (Exhibition catalogue) Paris: Centre Pompidou, 1984, p. 57–61.

Alain Guiheux: *L'Ordre de la brique*. Bruxelles: Mardaga, 1985.

Alain Guiheux (ed.): *Architecture instantanée. Nouvelles acquisitions*. Paris, Centre Pompidou, 2000.

Alain Guiheux, *Architecture dispositif*. Marseille: Parenthèses, 2012.

Alain Guiheux, "De Pompidou à Georges", in Anne Rey e.a. (eds.): *De Beaubourg à Pompidou. III. La Machine (1977–2017)*. Paris: Editions B2, 2017, p. 97–125.

*Les Immatériaux*, Volume 2: *Album et Inventaire*. Paris: Centre Georges Pompidou 1985.

Jean-François Lyotard: *Duchamp's TRANS/formers*. [1977] Venice, CA: The Lapis Press, 1990.

Jean-François Lyotard: *The Inhuman: Reflections on Time*. [1988] Redwood, CA: Stanford University Press, 1991.

---

<sup>53</sup> Guiheux, "De Pompidou à Georges", 2017, p. 115. (*L'exposition Les Immatériaux de Jean-François Lyotard a été une occasion de déployer une réflexion sur la post-modernité, mais peut-on dire que l'expérience de l'exposition en fut déterminante, si ce n'est au travers de sa scénographie homogénéisante et de la distribution du son au travers de casques dont c'était la première utilisation? L'exposition réflexive n'a donc rien d'une évidence... sauf peut-être toujours au travers de "l'expérience", ce mot si cher aux marketeurs, qui s'y déroule? Mais qui aurait intérêt aujourd'hui à ce que se redéveloppe une réflexion sur le devenir de l'exposition?*)