Bataille's Writings
(Un-)framing the transgression of architecture's limits

Julien Merle

Delft University of Technology (Netherlands)

Abstract

Georges Bataille's writings are often perceived as a discourse against architecture which is seen either as a physical construct whose aim is to order, limit and control or as a textual structure whose function is to ensure meaning. Nowadays the boundaries of architecture, either the ones that define it as a discipline or the ones that it produces as an organ of control, seem to be put into question. This paper aims to expound the relevance of Georges Bataille's writings for critically assessing the shifts of boundaries that the discipline has recently experienced.

Introduction

> 'Perhaps one day [transgression] will seem as decisive for our culture, as much a part of its soil, as the experience of contradiction was at an earlier time for dialectical thought. But in spite of so many scattered signs, the language in which transgression will find its space and the illumination of its being lies almost entirely in the future. It is surely possible, however, to find in Bataille its calcinated roots, its promising ashes'.[1]

More than 70 years ago, the French writer Georges Bataille set up a practice of critical writing as the transgression of architecture's boundaries and limits. Architecture, for Bataille, allows for a metaphorical apparatus to be built on itself: some forms and features of architecture are often used for social and linguistic ordering or limiting. But also, on the literal level, it represents an encoding of the political and social hierarchies and boundaries of society. Architecture is not only a discipline with specific boundaries but also an authority itself setting up limits. Bataille, as the theorist of transgression, constantly trying to overturn the defined norms, limits and hierarchies, was opposed to whatever could create and transpose these rules and boundaries. Consequently, Bataille's writings are often seen as a transgression of architecture's limits in either metaphorical or literal fashion.

Nowadays, architecture's boundaries seem to be shifting or are literally transgressed by new practices informing themselves through interdisciplinary exchanges. In a similar fashion, the discipline's capability for ordering the city and society is put into questions by notions such as relevance, effectiveness, sustainability and late capitalism's development, but also by transformations within the cultural sphere in terms of imagery, symbolism and collective values. Unexpectedly, Bataille's wish to tear down architecture's authority and limitations seems to have been realised through rather different means than he had thought of.

The novelty of the current situation is the transformation of the architectural territory and its edges into a realm of transgressions and shifts, or to put it in other words, the discipline seems (and perhaps *only* seems) to have become more 'Bataillan' than Bataille could have imagined. Consequently, instead of being seen simply as an attack on architecture, Bataille's writings might rather be perceived as a conceptual framework allowing a critical assessment of the present transgression of architecture's limits and boundaries. What is at stake here can be resumed in the following question: How far are the present shifts of architecture's boundaries a real transgression of the architectural dominion, the figure of the authoritarian limiting and ordering? In order to critically assess the shifting boundaries that the discipline is enduring it is necessary to return to the relationship that Bataille's writings have with architecture. This will necessitate expounding a few essential notions that Bataille considered as operations transgressing architecture's domination: the Formless, the Base Materialism and the Notion of Expenditure. These operations, in turn, will aid in identifying and discussing the transgression at work within a few recent architectural practices partaking in the present disciplinary shifts of boundaries.

Bataille Against Architecture

One of the first articles Bataille published in the dictionary of the review *Documents* was devoted to architecture. It came out in May 1929 in the second issue and consists only of a few paragraphs. In the first, Bataille asserts that:

'Architecture is the expression of the very soul of societies, just as human physiognomy is the expression of the individuals' souls. It is, however, particularly to the physiognomies of official personages (prelates, magistrates, admirals) that this comparison pertains. In fact it is only the ideal soul of society, that which has the authority to command and prohibit, that is expressed in architectural compositions properly speaking'.[2]

For Bataille, architecture is not only the representation of the ideal social norm but also an instrument to dictate good social behaviour. Architecture is perhaps a discipline with definite boundaries but it has also a more practical aim: precisely, to define the boundaries of society, to represent its ideal norm. Bataille isn't the first to connect the human form with architecture. Vitruvius did so, when he discovered the proportions of contemporary types of humanity in the different orders of Greek architecture. But Vitruvius (as well as most of classical architects after him), used the metaphor to give life to the stone. Bataille uses the analogy to demonstrate the reverse, a petrifaction of the living flesh that is reduced to a mere structure or a proportioned skeleton. Architecture is seen as the final stage of a natural progression leading from the ape to the ideal man and finally finding completion with the monument. But all that disappears with the passage from man to monument is what is perishable: the flesh that rots through time. And all that remains is the skeleton, the structure. Architecture preserves of man only what death has no hold on. This Hegelian-dialectical move, that is to face consciously death and to supersede it, by becoming what death cannot impact, by killing the mortal animal within man, by transforming man into pure spirit, is what Bataille would criticize all his life. Man reproduces himself as ideal, as immortal, as pure spirit, by killing the mortal-animal that he is, through the mirror-trap that architecture holds out to him. Man is confined, conformed and limited within his ideal, non-animal reflection. Finally, Bataille concludes this rather short entry on architecture by identifying the consequences and possibilities of an onslaught on architecture and its limitative or normative process:

'And if one attacks architecture, whose monumental productions are at present the real masters of the world, grouping servile multitudes in their shadows, imposing admiration and astonishment, order and constraint, one is, as it were, attacking man'.[3]

With this passage, Bataille formulates the battle plan of his project and the aim of his thought: the ideal man and its adjunct set of norms and hierarchies directly inherited from the Enlightenment's discourse, can be overturned and transgressed through the attack of its representation: architecture.

However, Bataille's criticism of idealism is not limited to the representative or reflective function of architecture. He also investigated the question of materiality. In the third issue of Document, he wrote:

'The time has come, when employing the word materialism, to assign to it the meaning of a direct interpretation, excluding all idealism, of raw phenomena, and not of a system founded on the fragmentary elements of an ideological analysis elaborated under the sign of religious ties'.[4]

Bataille restlessly opposed the classical conception of philosophical materialism that was for him nothing but idealism in disguise. He sought to vanquish the "ontologizing" of matter, which is what he believed materialist thinkers did.

'Most materialists, despite wanting to eliminate all spiritual entities, ended up describing an order of things whose hierarchical relations mark it as specifically idealist. They have situated dead matter at the summit of a conventional hierarchy of diverse types of facts, without realizing that in this way they have submitted to an obsession with an ideal form of matter, with a form which approaches closer than any other to that which matter should be'.[5]

This 'should be', for Bataille, is a form of homogeneous appropriation: it presupposes the existence of a standard or a normative frame; a frame rejecting outside of itself its most heterogeneous content. Applied to architecture, this leads to the questions of the 'true' use of materials and the 'purity' of construction, means that are so dear to numerous classical and modern architects. Thus, materialism is also a form of ordering, setting up limits and hierarchies; often a subject of discussion but most of the time an authoritarian boundary for architectural practices, marking the territory between what is a proper or true architecture and what should simply be discarded as such.

The question of the temporal and the decay in architecture, or of its economy, is also tackled by Bataille. He saw within the mirroring of the ideal man in architecture a form of repetition; a repetition allowing architecture to extend its domination this time on the field of the temporal and the economic. Man is asked to recognize himself in architecture, and then in its turn architecture reflects what the ideal man is. Doing as such architecture constantly reproduces itself, through man and within itself. And reproduction is the way out of the process of entropy which is, through time, threatening every system and being. Architecture tries to stand outside of time,

refusing decay and somehow its own death, by embodying the concept of harmony.

> 'Harmony, like the project, refuses the notion of time: its principle is the repetition through which everything becomes eternal. The ideal is architecture, or sculpture, immobilizing the harmony, guaranteeing the duration of motivations of which essence is the annihilation of time'.[6]

Architecture, on those questions of the temporal, decay and economy, is seen as a self-securing investment whose benefits are literally eternal. Architecture can't show signs of tiredness or crumbliness (only badly conceived architecture can, and the blame is always put on the architect). It has to mirror man's overcoming of death, eternally. Architecture should sustain time, annihilate decay, represent harmony and finally stand outside of economy as the symbol of it, its general equivalent. And everything that does not comply with the architectural will (but which is nevertheless constantly appearing on the surface of architecture) should be rejected on the other side of the boundary (set up by the architectural authority), as non-architecture, as an entropic failure, as disharmonious, as an economic loss.

Transgression

But Bataille did not only criticize the authoritarian figure, limiting and ordering society, that is architecture. He also practised through his writing or *écriture* the transgression of all forms of limit. However, the transgression operating within Bataille's writing should not be understood as working beside or outside the limit, the order or the boundary. Rather it operates within this limit, to the point that the transgression as well as its trajectory and perhaps also its origin exist only within this border. As Michel Foucault one day said in one of his eulogies to Bataille:

> 'Transgression, then, is not related to the limit as black to white, the prohibited to the lawful, the outside to the inside, or as the open area of a building to its enclosed spaces. Rather, their relationship takes the form of a spiral which no simple infraction can exhaust. Perhaps it is like a flash of lightning in the night which, from the beginning of time, gives a dense and black intensity to the night it denies, which lights up the night from the inside, from top to bottom, and yet owes to the dark the stark clarity of its manifestation, its harrowing and poised singularity; the flash loses itself in this space it marks with its sovereignty, and becomes silent now that it has given a name to obscurity.'[7]

Thus, Bataille's practice put at work an arsenal formed of carefully identified notions that transgress architecture's limits and its boundaries from within. These notions, which he liked to call operations, are consequently not formed of a simple and naive dialectical opposition to the architectural dominion,

rather they are working from within it, bringing to the fore what undoes the architectural order and will: the formless as the transgression of ideal representation, base materialism as the subversion of the idealist materialism, and the notion of expenditure as the inversion and broadening of the conventional economy.

The Formless

Bataille was neither an architect nor an architectural critic. He was a writer whose aim regarding architecture was double: first to unveil the function of architecture within the discourse, which is to secure meaning, to define and limit communication, while, in the same move, to transgress it. The Formless or *Informe* is the central notion he employed through his life long enterprise. It originates from the 'critical dictionary' that Bataille published from 1929 to 1931 in *Documents*:

> 'Formless: A dictionary would start from the moment in which it no longer gives the meaning but the impact of the words, their job. Formless is thus not merely an adjective having a given meaning but a term for lowering status with its implied requirement that everything has a form. Whatever it designates lacks entitlement in every sense and is crushed on the spot, like a spider or an earthworm. For academics to be content, the universe would have to assume a form. All of philosophy has no other goal: it is a matter of fitting what is there into a formal coat, a mathematical overcoat. On the other hand to assert that the universe resembles nothing else and is only formless comes down to stating that the universe is something like a spider or a spit.'[8]

Bataille's dictionary performs in two different but linked modes: it shows the materiality under the face of allegory, it points out the libidinal content of the words, and in the same movement, it appoints all the terms which haven't an allegoric dimension like the 'spittle'. But, as the dictionary is itself part of the architecture of the discourse (it is what defines words), Bataille had to transgress it. He did so by operating a double transgression of this academic norm and authority: First, by focusing on the Formless, which is what every dictionary rejects (a dictionary's aim is to give the definition and thus the 'form' of the words) but which is nevertheless present within the words, exceeding their conventional meaning. Then, the second fold of the transgression appears by giving the definition of 'his' dictionary in the article on Formless, assaulting as such the usual relationship between signifier and signified, the true architecture of the dictionary, its form. Consequently, the formless can't be defined and is better described through

what it does or operates: a lowering of the boundaries, a loss of classification or hierarchy, and through the reactions it provokes: 'what it designates (...) gets squashed everywhere'. The formless is not a concept, a theme or a given quality; it is a 'performative', an operation bringing down the architecture which secures the meaning of the discourse. It is what resembles nothing, but it is not simply the negative (dialectical) double of architecture which only represents the ideal man. It is more of a black hole that architecture cannot reflect, order or control, a sort of abyss that is hidden within architecture and in which the mirroring gaze of architecture gets trapped in its turn. The formless is not a term that has a stabilized meaning; rather it does a 'job'. It does not oppose architecture, it undoes (transgresses) it from within. The formless is an operation.

Fig 1: *Fashion Architecture Taste (FAT). The Anti-Oedipal House.*

If an architecture operating the formless is to be found – that is, an architecture attempting to transgress its functions of control and representation, and thus itself – it can't be a device, due to its operative character, simply representing something and certainly not man, the ideal man. Thus, the shameless formalisms of the deconstructivists' club or of the flow-and-blob-shapers that are always explained through some discursive and carefully enounced notes as representing, embodying or framing either the turmoil of our past and present condition or the fantastic potential of today's technological discoveries, are definitely not formless but hyper-representative and as such non-transgressive and ultra-conforming. On the contrary, an architecture operating the formless is not holding to man a mirror in which he has to recognize himself, through which he is reproduced as ideal. An architecture operating the formless transgresses itself by refusing to reproduce man. It does not ask man to recognize itself in himself. It is the transgression of the Hegelian-dialectical move: it brings back the animal-man into play; it does not show how man should be

and should function but, proudly allows man to be as he is and, facing his ideal, to simply dysfunction.

Such an aim, to allow a place for dysfunction, is precisely what the architects calling themselves FAT are pursuing with their project for an Anti-Oedipal House. The house is designed to accommodate a married couple wishing to be able to fulfil their shallow lifestyle aspirations by holding dinner parties in their modernistic-pedant glass house, while their teenage son is free to indulge in his adolescent obsessions away from his parents' repressive gaze in the voluptuous and adequately named 'Mastabatorium'. With the Anti-Oedipal House, man's flesh is back on the skeleton of architecture. The ideal man is dead and man's animality has a place to exist. This architecture operating the formless transgresses literally architecture's authority and its boundaries that are framing as well as conforming man to its ideal.

BASE MATERIALISM

Bataille's base materialism is the pre-figuration of what he would later call 'heterology'. The type of matter he wants to speak about is what we have no idea of, what makes no sense. This matter is literally shit or laughter or an obscene word or madness. It is whatever cuts all discussion short, whatever does not lend itself to any metaphorical displacement; whatever does not allow itself to be in-formed. According to Bataille, this matter is a seductive waste appealing to what is most infantile in us; it is a regressive low blow. Hence base materialism has the 'job' of de-classing matter. In a manner similar to the formless (which declassifies what has a form), base materialism is an operation. It is simultaneously lowering matter and liberating it from its ontological prison, from what it *should be*, from its position of role model.

Yet, the question remains as to where to find a support on which to construct such base materialism: a materialism not implying ontology, not implying that matter is the thing-in-itself? Certainly not from dialectical materialism, which had, according to Bataille, as starting point (and as much as ontological materialism), absolute idealism in its Hegelian form. Bataille found some help within his idiosyncratic reading of fetishism in Freud. For Freud, fetishism is a perverse form of symbolic transposition and the fetish is an imaginary substitute for the absent object of desire (often the maternal phallus). For example, within Freud's writings, excrement

is the symbolic transposition of gold or jewels. But, within the mechanism of fetishism there is still a form of sublimation, precisely a transposition. Consequently, Bataille had to imagine base materialism as fetishism without transposition. Base materialism is somehow this raw matter that brings disgust, this mud that belongs to the realm of dirt. A dirt that is rejected outside of the clean edifice of society (delimited by the conventional architectural boundaries), but nevertheless constantly reappearing within it for de-classing every material pretensions.

Where to find among architecture's productions an attempt at operating such a base materialism, that is, a fetishism without transposition? Certainly not within the recent architectural productions of Swiss architects, either affiliated with the strain of phenomenology and transposing their 'fetishistic' materialism through some reductive reading of Heidegger, or implementing their design on the territory of the dialectically-materialist state that is China. There is no room here to rehearse the history of ontological materialism within the discipline leading from the classical view of Carlo Lodoli's *function* of material (its inner resistance to mechanical force should determine its agency),[9] to the position of Frank Lloyd Wright seeking the *logic* of materials that he theorised in his 'Five New resources' (a fidelity to the *nature* of materials),[10] or that of Adolf Loos, with his famous critique of ornament, (defining each materials as possessing their own *language*),[11] and finding its conclusion in the more contemporary material experiments supported by new technological developments.

Fig 2: *Atelier Bow-Wow, Vegetable Kiosk in rural-scape, Japan.*

I would rather use the space that is allowed to me, to present a singular project among the different realisations of the Japanese Atelier Bow-Wow: the so-called

vegetable kiosk in the rural landscape. This is not presented to point at an 'architecture of base materialism' and thus propose, in my turn, an ontology of some kind. But, with regard to base materialism, to show how it might operate in the undoing of architecture's pretensions at ordering matter; in other words, to look at an architecture *operating* base materialism against itself and consequently transgressing itself as architecture. In their project for a vegetable kiosk, the architects of Atelier Bow-Wow are not trying to express anything with their use of mud and wood: matter is neither the thing-in-itself nor what it 'should be'. This architecture undoes itself from within: the matter is organized in order to secure the function of the edifice (that is to preserve grown vegetables) but it does not let itself be transposed. You can smell the dirt's odour mixing with the one of vegetables, then this produces a feeling of fascination and disgust, a return to infantile memories where the pleasure of playing with mud is forbidden by the adults' disapprobation. You experience the transgression of the parental authority as well as the rupture of the boundaries of ontological materialism: mud is *just* mud and that's what makes it desirable.

The Notion of Expenditure

By the mid thirties, Bataille, in his search for a base materialism, finally modified the usual psychoanalytical interpretation of jewels. The relation between gold and excrement is no more seen as a simple displacement. Jewels and shit are no more associated through contrast, they share a condition of pure loss (the jewels are economic waste by definition). They are, with the fetish, considered as sumptuous expenditure. This led him to redact his seminal essay *The Notion of Expenditure* that he finally improved into the first volume of *The Accursed Share: Consumption* in 1949. There, Bataille reverses the normal understanding of economy: while it is always based on scarcity in order to focus on the phenomenon of production, Bataille, inspired by the *Essay on the Gift* of the French anthropologist Marcel Mauss, argues the opposite and proposes a 'general' economy. In his view, because the sun is in a state of superfluity, we are facing an excess of energy, the accursed share, which cannot be always reinvested in the circuit of production, but should be consumed, expended in pure loss:

'I will begin with a basic fact: The living organism, in a situation determined by the play of energy on the surface of the globe,

ordinarily receives more energy than necessary for maintaining life; the excess of energy can be used for the growth of a system; if the system can no longer grow, or if the excess cannot be completely absorbed in its growth, it must necessarily be lost without profit; it must be spent, willingly or not, gloriously or catastrophically'.[12]

For Bataille, this accursed share is destined to one of two modes of economic and social expenditure. It must be spent, either luxuriously and knowingly in every form of potlatch, or, outrageously and catastrophically at war. Refusing the latter for obvious reasons, Bataille co-opts the potlatch as the only mode of total expenditure. The individual practicing the potlatch, the destruction of its own riches, a form of gift, is the sovereign being per excellence, the one expending in pure loss. Yet, the potlatch is problematic: it allows the individual practicing it to gain a reward. He gains a status or rank within society. Hence, the potlatch is not a real form of total expenditure. The ideal would be, according to Bataille, for the potlatch of not being returned, and for the individual, practicing it, of getting nothing in return. The individual should not receive anything material or symbolic (like status) as compensation. Furthermore, the sovereign being cannot be aware of his newly found status of sovereignty: that would make the potlatch useful, and thus, the sovereign would lose his sovereignty. Consequently, sovereignty is only accessible in not knowing it; it is a state of unknowingness. Of course, Bataille is at great pains to find in our time a true sovereign individual, practicing a true potlatch or some expenditure in pure loss and gaining unknowingly its access to sovereignty. The only example he is able to propose is the miserably poor, the homeless:

> *'The true luxury and the real potlatch of our times fall to the poverty-stricken, that is, to the individual who lies down and scoffs. A genuine luxury requires the complete contempt for riches, the sombre indifference of the individual who refuses work and makes his life on the one hand an infinitely ruined splendour and on the other, a silent insult to the laborious lie of the rich'.*[13]

If the notion of expenditure is a transgression of the boundaries of common economy, proposing a passage from a 'restrictive' economy towards a 'general' one (in Bataille's own words), then the question for architecture remains: How might the economy of architecture, its will at resisting time, decay and entropy, and its necessary usefulness, be transgressed by the practice of expenditure? Or in other words: Can architectural production partake in an expenditure in pure loss? Can architecture, itself, be sovereign?

Again, I have not the space or time to exhaustively present the different attempts from architects and artists at discussing architecture's entropic side and its obligation of sustainability: from Robert Smithson's Partially Buried Woodshed and Gordon Matta-Clark's Anarchitecture showing entropy at work, to Bernard Tschumi's advertisement of the Villa Savoye's decay, till the more recent debate on 'green building' and sustainable design. I would rather like to point out the work of the New York-based artist Michael Rakowitz who distributes free of charge inflatable shelters, that he calls Parasites, to the community of homeless in his hometown. Made of plastic bags and tape, costing approximately 5 dollars per units, they constitute a visible protest against the status of homeless while helping at the prolongation of their lives. In a manner similar to biological parasites, these shelters are hooked onto the ventilation outtake ducts of public building.

Fig 3: *Michael Rakowitz, Parasites.*

One might not perceive the Parasites as an expenditure in pure loss or simply refuse the mere possibility of a sovereign architecture (an architecture as non-useful expenditure), for the very simple reason that architecture, which is more than the act of mere building or hosting a function, always preserves at its roots this useful function. An architecture refusing to be useful, would not be architecture, not even a building, but, at best, a sculpture. However, a way out of this paradox resides in the differentiation that Bataille made between a 'restrictive' economy and a 'general' one. Indeed, within the restrictive economy of the individual the Parasites seem to be anti-entropic, against expenditure but also useful.[14] But at the level of a 'general' economy, the Parasites are in my view a sovereign architecture, an architecture for the sovereign being, that is an architecture allowing for expenditure in pure loss as a way of life (the homeless' way of life) and, in such a way, transgressing the architectural limits and boundaries that only secure a harmonious, out of time, economically safe and homogeneous society to exist. This

architecture has a purpose or function on the 'restricted' level of an individual's economy but this purpose becomes precisely, on a 'general' economic level, non-useful, a pure expenditure.

In New York City, one Parasite was redesigned in direct response to then Mayor-Rudolph Giuliani's anti-homeless laws. Under Giuliani's mandate, any structure higher than three and a half feet was considered to be a tent and therefore an act of illegal camping. The new shelter circumvented Giuliani's ordinance by being lower to the ground like a sleeping bag. The case went to the court and the jury threw away the charges, agreeing with the argument that the structure was a body extension.15 Obviously Giuliani's laws were a dissimulated action for throwing out of New York the homeless community. The sovereign mayor -- sovereign in its archaic meaning -- of New York could not accept the mere vision of those that society rejects as different or other, of those who choose to live a really sovereign life refusing the accumulation and the production of energy, goods and riches; of those who transgress the law and boundaries of economy, of those ones who would spend their life in the unproductive expenditure of every form of energy. The Parasites are an example of a sovereign architecture for the sovereign being of our time: the miserably poor, the homeless. However, these Parasites are only ephemerally preserving their sovereign status. These structures are fighting against the mechanisms of discrimination and ordering by assuring that those choosing unproductive expenditure as a model of life are seen. And to be seen is to be on the way to being acknowledged, and that is an end as much as the end for the sovereign.

Conclusion: The Worthiness of the Unworthy

But, one can wonder, on the overall, where a 'Bataillan' architecture leaves us? How worthy is it, exactly? As usual this question might seem to have only a very ambiguous answer. On the one hand, if a true 'Bataillan' architecture is an architecture operating a transgression of every feature that is proper to a conventional architecture (that is a transgression of its formal order, material idealism and economic worth) then its worthiness and value seem to be null. But on the other hand, if a 'Bataillan' architecture becomes suddenly acknowledged by thought as worthy of anything, it will lose its transgressive nature. However, it is perhaps here, within this paradox, that its *role* lies: the transgression of the usual dichotomy of the worthy/unworthy polarisation imposed by Cartesian thinking. This transgression, the transgression of the either/or limit, that a 'Bataillan' architecture operates, opens up a breach or rather a distance in the architectural boundaries separating the formed and the non-formed, the ideal and the material, the useful from the non-useful. There, within this breach or distance, caused by transgression, architecture is allowed to reformulate itself, or rather to find itself in what it had excluded. Only then, architecture might be able, again, to seize the totality of the real.

Notes

1. Michel Foucault, 'A Preface to Transgression,' in Critique, 195-6, (1963): 751-770. Trans. Donald Bouchard (ed), Language, Counter Memory, Practice, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977, pp. 29-52.
2. Georges Bataille, 'Architecture,' Documents, 2, (1929): 117. Trans. Betsy Wing & Denis Hollier, Against Architecture, Cambridge: MIT press, 1989, pp. 46-47.
3. Ibid. p. 53.
4. Georges Bataille, 'Materialism,' Documents 3 (1929): 170. Trans. John Harman, Encyclopedia Acephalica, London: Atlas Press, 1995, p. 58.
5. Ibid.
6. Georges Bataille, The Inner Experience, NY: State University of New York press, 1988, p. 56.
7. Michel Foucault, 'A Preface to Transgression,' in Critique, 195-6, (1963): 751-770. Trans. Donald Bouchard (ed), Language, Counter Memory, Practice, Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 1977, pp. 29-52.
8. Georges Bataille, 'Informe,' Documents 7 (1929): 117. Trans. Betsy Wing & Denis Hollier, Against Architecture, Cambridge: MIT press, 1989, p. 30.
9. Francesco Algarotti, 'Saggio Sopra l´Architettura,' (1756), in Algaroti, Saggi, Bari: Laterza e Figli, 1963, p. 35.
10. Frank Lloyd Wright, 'In the Nature of Materials: A philosophy,' in Frank Lloyd Wright, An Autobiography, New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1943, pp. 337-49.
11. Adolf Loos, 'The Principle of Cladding,' in Adolf Loos, Spoken Into the Void Collected Essays 1897-1900, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1982, pp. 66-69.
12. Georges Bataille, The Accursed Share, volume 1, Consumption, NY: Zone books, 1988, p. 21.
13. Georges Bataille, The Accursed Share, volume 1, Consumption, NY: Zone books, 1988, p. 76.
14. The Parasites are made of cheap recycled materials, that one might call trash; they get inflated by consuming the warm-air pulsed out of a public building, thus reducing, perhaps insignificantly, the unproductive expenditure of the usual functioning of public interiors; and finally they serve an individual in his day to day fight for surviving.
15. Courtney Smith & Stephen Topham, 'Parasites,' in Xtreme Houses, New York: Prestel, 2002, p. 70.

Bibliography

Francesco Algarotti, Saggi, Bari: Laterza e Figli, 1963.

Georges Bataille, The Accursed Share, volume 1, Consumption, NY: Zone books, 1988.

Georges Bataille, The Inner Experience, NY: State University of New York press, 1988.

Georges Bataille, Documents 2 (1929).

Georges Bataille, Documents 7 (1929).

Georges Bataille, Documents 3 (1929).

Michel Foucault, 'A Preface to Transgression,' in Critique, 195-6, 1963.

John Harman (ed), Encyclopedia Acephalica, London: Atlas Press, 1995.

Denis Hollier, Against Architecture, Cambridge: MIT press, 1989.

Adolf Loos, Spoken Into the Void Collected Essays 1897-1900, Cambridge: MIT Press, 1982.

Courtney Smith & Stephen Topham (eds), Xtreme Houses, New York: Prestel, 2002.

Frank Lloyd Wright, An Autobiography, New York: Duell, Sloan and Pearce, 1943.