



WHAT IF? WHAT NEXT?

SPECULATIONS ON HISTORY'S FUTURES

SESSION 4B

THE COUNTERFACTUAL

Feedback Loops: Architectural History's Impact on Architecture

TO CITE THIS PAPER | [Gail Pini](#). "Can't one be both? Gathering the divided bodies of Luis Barragán." In *Proceedings of the Society of Architectural Historians Australia and New Zealand: 37, What If? What Next? Speculations on History's Futures*, edited by Kate Hislop and Hannah Lewi, 612-619. Perth: SAHANZ, 2021. Accepted for publication December 11, 2020.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTURAL HISTORIANS AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND (SAHANZ) VOLUME 37

Convened by The University of Western Australia School of Design,
Perth, 18-25 November, 2020

Edited by Kate Hislop and Hannah Lewi

Published in Perth, Western Australia, by SAHANZ, 2021

ISBN: 978-0-646-83725-3

Copyright of this volume belongs to SAHANZ; authors retain the copyright of the content of their individual papers. All efforts have been undertaken to ensure the authors have secured appropriate permissions to reproduce the images illustrating individual contributions. Interested parties may contact the editors.

CAN'T ONE BE BOTH? GATHERING THE DIVIDED BODIES OF LUIS BARRAGAN

Gail Pini | University of Queensland

Using the architectural historian Mark Jarzombek's critical historiography as a theoretical frame, this paper takes The Barragán Archives—a multi-year project by conceptual artist Jill Magid—as an alternative path for thinking about the roles of archives, agency and the canon in the making of architectural histories. In his Prolegomenon to Critical Historiography (2000) Jarzombek enigmatically contends that to fulfill its mission architectural historiography must take up the position of uninvited guest in its own house. In the last decade, contemporary artists have increasingly delved into the architectural archives to pose their own questions. Have these artists become uninvited guests invading the disciplinary bounds of architecture with their own “matters of concern,” or does their work open up new perspectives of interest to architectural historians? By focusing on Magid's response to the life and work of the famous Mexican architect, Luis Barragán, this paper explores how an artistic practice might count as a contribution to architectural historiography. The artist sets out to both reveal and intervene. She makes visible the implications of a corporation's ownership of the architect's professional archive for his artistic legacy. Her engagement with the architectural historian in control of the archive brings into focus the material divisions, proprietary controls, professional standards and conflicting desires involved in the formation of histories and heritage. The climax of this extended investigation is The Proposal (2016) in which she recrafts a portion of the architect's own bodily remains into a diamond engagement ring, which is offered as a gift to the historian in exchange for the return of the archive to public ownership in Mexico. While the artist's work is yet to achieve this desired effect, her intervention has opened up discussion of both the architect's legacy and the broader issues about proprietorial control of cultural heritage. In place of disciplinary enclosure and the purity of the canon, The Barragán Archives points towards a historiography of hospitality and the dynamic unfolding of artistic legacy. Both constrained by and formed through property and intellectual property regimes, artistic legacy is shown to be a contested, hybridising and creative concept that displaces rather than replaces the canon.

Introduction

*'So what, exactly, is the proposal?' Magid turned to Zanco. 'If you accept this ring, you will return the archive to Mexico,' she said. 'I am offering you the body for the body of work.'*¹

In this paper I consider *The Barragán Archives*, a multi-year project by the conceptual artist Jill Magid, as a psychodrama that performs an unexpected historiographic task, revealing certain limits of architectural scholarship to itself. The artist's unusual proposal to the architectural historian, Federica Zanco, was the culmination of their prolonged mis-engagement over the legacy of Luis Barragán. *The Proposal* took place in 2016 when the artist travelled to Switzerland to present the historian with a ring. The diamond set into this ring was made from the cremated remains of the famous Mexican architect. In offering this extraordinary gift, the artist proposes a condition—if the historian, who is also the Director of the Barragan Foundation, accepts the ring, she must return the architect's professional archive to Mexico. My interest in *The Barragán Archives* grew out of a curiosity about what artists were doing in the architectural archives.² In countering disciplinary norms and stirring up sedimented historical and aesthetic clichés, artists' appropriations of architectural history have generated unexpected affects and associations; including questioning taxonomies of modernity and shifting our relations with a reified canon. Represented as art, architecture may become disconcerting to its familiars—the architectural community that claims prior ownership over architecture's story and image—but more open to new interpretations and responses.

In terms of the conference agenda, my paper positions itself in relation to the imperative to *counter the canon*: it asks what a project of countering-the-canon might comprise. Is it a process of defacing, displacing, dismantling or supplementing? Should it aim to be more inclusive; or do away with canonisation altogether? How, in particular, do we oppose the Western canon—this metaphor for rule, for measurement, for tradition, for carefully-weighted judgement; which elevates the universal, the beautiful, the true, the sublime, the spirit of the age? Could we do without our canon? How would we dismantle it anyway? For, as the poet Audre Lorde warned in 1979: "the master's tools will never dismantle the master's house. They may allow us temporarily to beat him at his own game, but they will never enable us to bring about genuine change."³ So while rewriting a narrow history of architecture continues to be urgent work, is *countering*—a warlike gesture of meeting head on—still a promising critical tool? Does it wield the "master's tools" and prescribe asymmetrical, negative modes of encounter? *What if*, as the philosopher Bruno Latour suggested some two decades after Lorde, forms of critique that master and debunk have already 'run out of steam'?⁴ And *what if* a collection of ambivalent things (aesthetic idolatry, national heroes, repressed sexuality) were already bundled into a single canonic figure; admittedly a difficult whole,⁵ an already divided figure like Luis Barragán.

This essay brings Magid's *The Barragán Archives* (2013-2018),⁶ which functions here as an exemplary critique of the enclosure of an architect's legacy, into proximity with the "bewilderment" of critical historiography as expressed by the architectural historian Mark Jarzombek.⁷ The purpose is to explore whether, through unexpected engagements and encounters, an architectural legacy can itself become a force in countering forms of historical reduction, closure and stasis implicit in canonisation. In setting out my argument, I first introduce Jarzombek's critical historiography, then outline the story of the Barragán archives and the artist's project of the same name, followed by a discussion about the historiographic aspects of the artist's practice.

What is Critical Historiography?

In his *A Prolegomenon to Critical Historiography* (2000) Mark Jarzombek laments a lack of scholarly inquiry into the conflicted role of modernist architectural historians.⁸ Historians had become double agents; protagonists in avant-garde events *and* authors of influential histories of architecture. Yet historians themselves are strangely absent, Jarzombek observes, from histories of modernity. This is one manifestation of the pervasive effects of what he terms the "psychologized Self". According to Jarzombek, under the influence of psychology—an amorphous

anti-discipline that spreads everywhere but lacks a clear disciplinary centre—modern architecture privileged the speed of subjective agency over the slowness and objectivity of method. Questions of polemics, program and theory⁹ replaced precedence, provenance, connoisseurship and archives. This led historians to align themselves with those *spirits* who would create the *right* history. Without being fully aware of the trap, they became dual-split figures—embracing avant-garde identities *by* repressing the “scholarly-Self”. To reveal these circuitous operations, Jarzombek calls for a “project that is neither the *handmaiden* of a discipline nor an *agent* of the modernist call for the *liberation* of Self ... [that] could develop into a more far-reaching, galloping interdisciplinary *diegesis* dealing with the fundamentals of epistemological construction.”¹⁰

While the lack of historiographic enquiry Jarzombek identified two decades ago has partly been addressed,¹¹ Jarzombek points not just to gaps in research but to “unresolvable paradoxes” that entrap all historical speculation,¹² and to a *crisis* characterised by the speed of the avant-garde against the “proverbial slowness of bourgeois academic history.”¹³ Both practices, he asserts, lack a critique of their respective disciplinary aesthetics—a critically informed objectivity in the case of the scholar and a critically informed subjectivity in the case of the avant-garde; both “obscure the historiographic problematic that lies at the heart of everything modern.”¹⁴ This absence of self-critique becomes compounded when one practice (history) is used to unravel the other (art). In confronting these paradoxes, Jarzombek concludes that historiography can fulfill its mission “only by taking up the uncomfortable position of uninvited guest in its own house.”¹⁵ By starting from the position of art rather than history, my paper tracks an inverted version of Jarzombek’s problem. What happens when an artist makes herself the “uninvited guest” and art begins to unravel the “scholarly-Self”?

The Story of the Archives

The architect: *I am only a symbol for all those who have been touched by Beauty.*¹⁶

The historian: *I’m a self-doubting person by nature. I’m not a genius. I am a working horse.*¹⁷

The artist: *I believe the most radical tool of pragmatism is poetry.*¹⁸

Born in 1902 to a land-owning family, Luis Barragán trained as an engineer and was an autodidactic architect. A developer who was often his own client, he mostly designed private houses in Mexico City. He also famously designed for horses. A relatively marginal figure on the global scene until the 1970s, Barragán was awarded the Pritzker Prize in 1980 “for his commitment to architecture as a sublime act of the poetic imagination.”¹⁹ A gay man and devout Catholic in a conservative society, the celebrated architect necessarily led a divided public and private life.²⁰ When he died in 1988 this division was formalised. His will split his patrimony into two estates creating two archives: the personal and the professional. In 1993, following the suicide of the architect’s business partner, the professional archive was offered for sale by Rosario Uranga, the widow who inherited the fatal inheritance. When unable to find a buyer in Mexico, she consigned the archive to Max Protetch, a specialist art and architecture dealer in New York. Delivered to his office in 1995, Protetch reported there was so much paper he worried his floor might collapse. Given the fairly boutique scope of Barragán’s practice, his professional archive consists of a surprising amount of material.²¹

Luckily, a buyer soon emerged: Rolf Fehlbaum, Chairman of Vitra, the Swiss design company. Consequently, the heavy burden of a life’s work was again relocated. This time to a concrete basement under a Frank Gehry building at the Vitra campus near Basel, where it came under the control of the newly established Foundation Barragan. The Director of the Foundation is the architectural historian, Federica Zanco. She is also the wife of Rolf Fehlbaum. Having acquired copyright to the architect’s work and trademarked his name (without the accent), the Foundation Barragan, also purchased the archive and copyrights of the architect’s favourite photographer, Armando Salas Portugal. Since acquiring this bundle of rights, the not-for-profit Foundation has vigorously asserted a strong form of copyright protection, akin some say to bullying.²² This reported refusal to grant permissions has, at least to some extent, stymied research into the architect’s work.²³

In 2012 when the artist visited Casa Barragán, the architect's former home and studio, she was told "a gothic love story ... with a copyright-and-intellectual-property-rights subplot"²⁴ of how after the architect's death in 1988 his professional archive ended up in the jealous possession of a historian who stores it in an underground bunker in Switzerland, while only the small personal archive in Casa Barragán remains open to scholars. According to the story, the historian had visited Casa Barragán with her betrothed and subsequently asked for the gift of the professional archive *in lieu* of an engagement ring.²⁵ After hearing this story and becoming captivated by the architect's work, in 2013 the artist wrote to Zanco and asked for permission to visit the archive in preparation for an exhibition in Basel. In retrospect, the historian sees her blunt refusal as the catalyst that triggered the unfolding of the art projects, collectively known as *The Barragán Archives*.

Everything started because I said no the first time Jill asked for access to the archive. How do you react to a no? I think it has to do with your relationship to authority. I would just say, 'All right, never mind,' but Jill makes art.²⁶

According to Magid her artistic project commenced not with the refusal but with the question: "What does it mean for a corporation to own an artist's legacy?"²⁷ In the years following the refusal, the artist engaged incessantly with the problematic posed by the inaccessible archive: producing nine exhibitions and a film,²⁸ as well being involved in numerous public talks, catalogues and a book of essays. The individual artworks are diverse and provocative—some directly targeting Vitra and the historian's own body of work. For example, the artist produced *Der Trog* (2013), a model of the Vitra campus which proposes the construction of a copy of the architect's famous fountain *Fuente del Bebedero* (1959). She purchased copies of the historian's monograph, *Luis Barragán: The Quiet Revolution* (2001), inserting frames around the very images she was not given permission to display. She copied furniture from the architect's house²⁹ and made a neon sign that shifts between Barragán with and without the accent.³⁰ These artworks make visible the implications of intellectual property laws that control artistic legacies. But despite her outpouring of art, the professional archive remained closed. Following the immanent logic of her practice, the artist decided a more intense poetic affect was needed to release the architect's body of work from confinement—an uncanny exchange, a body for a body.

In 2015, after consultation with the architect's family and negotiations with the State authorities, Magid was allowed to open the architect's tomb and take a precise measure of his remains—525 grams of ashes—the minimum required to make an Algordanza memorial diamond.³¹ This shocking appropriation of the architect's body did indeed excite public interest in Barragán's legacy, as well as anger and disgust, but not at first. First the artificial diamond, made by a process exposing pure carbon to very high heat and pressure, needed time to quietly grow—six months in this case. On completion, the diamond was formally presented by the artist to the family, prior to being set into an engagement ring in Mexico City. All of these steps involved scrupulous documentation and carefully drafted legal agreements. The ring is jointly owned by the artist and the family and according to their signed agreement may never be sold. It may only be given, and only to one person, and only in exchange for the return of the architect's body of work. The climax, therefore, was when in 2016 the artist travelled to Switzerland to make the proposal to the historian: "If you accept this ring, you will return the archive to Mexico. I am offering you the body for the body of work."³²

To date, the historian has not accepted the artist's proposal which remains open. It seems unlikely that she will. Since 1995 in a condition of almost solitary confinement, she has dedicated herself to cataloguing the architect's archive. After the artist began to write strange letters to her in 2013 and her correspondence ended up in exhibitions, the historian and the archive were no longer hidden from the public eye. While the historian has remained civil and composed under pressure, she does feel she is the subject of an ill-founded critique.³³ The archive was bought to prevent it from being scattered, the material is being properly conserved, and there is in fact no clear proposal for where the archive could be returned to. However, the historian admits that she "grossly underestimated the timeline" for the preparation of the *catalogue raisonné*: "after all

these years, I have so little to show. It's demoralizing to be confronted with such criticism and aggressions. Am I doing something wrong? I have asked myself that many times."³⁴ The scarcity of her output is in vivid contrast to the flood of work generated by the artist, who has opened Barragán's legacy to a wider audience and exposed complex ethical questions—not only about control of artistic legacies but also about the desecration of tombs.

The Artist as Uninvited Guest

Can we count the artist's harassment of the historian as a contribution to projects envisaged by Jarzombek? Behaving much like an uninvited ethnologist visiting the architectural field—careful in her relations, faithful to her method, following the logic of her project—Magid examines relations between searching subjects and their research objects. She moves unnervingly between the differential speeds of the scholar and the avant-garde. She persistently draws attention to ubiquitous but hidden structures—always within the rules, often to the point of absurdity. In the following paragraphs, I briefly consider some examples of her practice against the type of projects suggested by Jarzombek.

A critique of a Historian's Practice

The artist frames an historian at work: her passions, her products, her affiliations, her modes of operation, her handling of texts, her matters of concern. Under pressure from this unwanted public portrait, the historian has in turn challenged the “magical realism” of stories; crafting her own historical figure through her comportment, replies and refusals. By inviting the historian to collaborate, the artist reveals a glimpse of the historian's practice—proprietary control, slowness and exclusivity, a narrow view of quality. Standards of care, limited space, archival conditions, production of a *catalogue raisonné* become reasons to justify a failure to share research materials. The artist, by contrast, uses a poverty of resources and a surfeit of restrictions to shape her engagement with the architect's legacy; making visible the rigid constraints underlying regimes that are also essential to the production of an artistic legacy.³⁵

A Disciplinary Ideological Critique

The artist's engagement with the architect's personal possessions and home highlights the split life marking disciplinary histories. Neglect of the personal and the political and the valorisation of the professional puts historians in an ambiguous position when ethical problems emerge from the study of a person's life.³⁶ In the case of Barragán, the enclosure of his professional archive intensifies scholarly and aesthetic engagement with personal photographs, documents, objects, spaces and networks of friends. Through her use of the epistolary method, the artist attends to forms of desire that underpin objective research. For example, she plays with questions of who is talking to whom, when she copies a letter Barragán wrote to a woman friend, addressing it to the historian and signing it from herself. She sends the historian a gift—a marked copy of *Climates*, a book by André Maurois, that Barragán gave to a woman he admired—which leads to a lovely reply, which engenders a further artwork³⁷. This delicate attention to possessiveness and seduction prompts us to reconsider extraordinary things which have been said about the architect's home by architects and historians. “His house was not merely a house but House itself.”³⁸ “I remember having this feeling of really wanting to spend the night there—not just to sleep in the house but to sleep with the house.”³⁹ “It was, as the French say, *coup de foudre*, instant love.”⁴⁰

Interdisciplinary Diegesis Dealing with the Fundamentals of Epistemological Construction

The transformation of the architect into a diamond was the artist's most intense and provocative act. A scholarly companion to this artwork—also called *The Proposal*—includes essays from writers of architecture, law, history, anthropology, and art. The book generates exchange about themes of possession, gifts, artistic legacy and the conditions of its production and draws attention to diverse methods of research. For example, the unpublished dissertation of architectural scholar Leonardo Diaz-Borioli, which brings together network analysis, textual analysis and psycho-spatial interpretation. Living in a homophobic society, Barragán was perhaps obscure when he referred to his architecture as “autobiographical.”⁴¹ Careful readings of annotated books in his library,

such as Proust's novels and biography, point towards inaccessible realms of the architect's innermost thoughts and feelings about art and love, but they also provide Diaz-Borioli with clues to decoding descriptions of his architecture.⁴² This type of hybrid research attempts to place the psychological up front rather than allowing it to operate as a hidden contamination.

A more negative response to Magid's project was evident in a panel discussion at the opening of artist's 2017 exhibition in Mexico City.⁴³ Described as "a political and ethical debate on the current and future conditions of the transfer of cultural heritage from a model of the nation-state to one of corporate institutions," the event vastly overflowed its terms.⁴⁴ The New Yorker journalist, Alice Gregory, who had followed the unfolding saga for several years, wrote of a tense event watched by a packed house and streamed to more than 70,000 people. "For almost two hours, the audience looked on as epic and often metaphysical questions—of faith, language, taste, value, ownership, legacy—were debated with ferocious intensity. The subject of the discussion was a diamond."⁴⁵ The artist's transformation of the canonic architect had become a national controversy. Gregory reports insults, requests for the investigation of local government, demands for the diamond to be pulverised, and an open letter from a "prominent architect" asking for the artist's show to be cancelled. But despite evident hostility and calls for censorship, the artist feels the artwork has succeeded in bringing about important discussions.⁴⁶

A Multiplication of Divisions

This sampling of *The Barragán Archives* is intended to show its wide-ranging historiographic impulse as well as the range of engagements it fosters with an architect's legacy. But where does this leave the canonic figure at the centre of it all? When asked to give a lecture in the early 1980s, shortly after he won his Pritzker Prize, Luis Barragán wrote back that sadly he was not able to come: "I am not well, but I am preparing to die well."⁴⁷ It seems Barragán may not have planned to leave his legacy so restless.⁴⁸ To date, the artist has not succeeded in reuniting his body of work. She has rather multiplied divisions by dividing his bodily remains: part of which remains in his tomb and part of which is now entombed in a diamond. But perhaps some divisions are unavoidable. The architectural theorist, Ines Weizman, tells us that the artistic legacy has three lives: when it is created; the copyright period after the artist's death; and after copyright expires.⁴⁹ It is the second life—the current phase of Barragán's legacy—that is thought to be the most critical to long-term flourishing. But not only are legacies already divided, archives also multiply. The philosopher Jacques Derrida speaking of archives says the archive is always doubled by the event that is archived and the event of archiving.⁵⁰ And indeed Magid, who carefully archives all media generated by her art practice, has also created a doubled archive; as well as a kind of feedback loop between her artworks and their documentation.

If the artist has failed to restore material unity, can we conclude that she has occupied the position of "uninvited guest"? For a time, the artist lived in the architect's home, became a host, gathered his family, scholars and guests in many places. She offered the hospitality needed to care for an architect's legacy—to grow new things out of old. While agency in architectural history remains dependent on gaining access to copyright, architecture, archives and audiences; the artist's project demonstrates that conformity with rules can still interrogate the mechanism of its own exclusion. In the place of the purity of the canon the artist gives us the dynamic unfolding of artistic legacy, emphasising living connections over a posthumous singularity. Her historiographic and artistic practices evoke intensity rather than iconicity, promiscuity rather than patrilineality, complexity rather than reduction. So perhaps we might say the architect as diamond gives us a likeness of his place in the canon, while his remaining ashes point to the fertile metamorphosis of his legacy. In this way, artistic legacy becomes revealed as a hybridising creative force that occupies a bustling no man's land between objective and the subjective, between scholar and avant-garde, between personal and professional—displacing rather than replacing the canon. Meanwhile, the historian's labour is far from complete and, to paraphrase the artist, we *await her publication with affection and gratitude*.⁵¹

Endnotes

- ¹ Alice Gregory, "Body of Work," *The New Yorker*, Aug 01, 2016, 32.
- ² For example: Peter Friedl's *Rehousing* (2012-), Pierre Huyghe's *This is not a time for Dreaming* (2004), Sam Cranstoun *To Speak of Cities* (2020). For more examples see <https://framingark.blogspot.com>.
- ³ Audre Lorde, *Sister outsider: Essays and speeches* (Penguin Classics, 2020), 112. A Black feminist and civil rights activist, Lorde spoke these much quoted words at the Second Sex Conference in 1979
- ⁴ Bruno Latour, "Why Has Critique Run out of Steam? From Matters of Fact to Matters of Concern," *Critical Inquiry* 30, no. 2 (2004), <https://doi.org/10.1086/421123>. For Latour, critique has at least in some forms become counter-productive. Latour's famous analysis of modernity is a key influence on my thinking in this essay.
- ⁵ Aaron Betsky referencing Venturi, calls Barragán's architecture an "architecture of the difficult whole". Aaron Betsky, "No Architect Today is Capable of Buildings like Luis Barragán's", *Dezeen*, 3 Nov 2020, <https://www.dezeen.com/2018/04/30/opinion-aaron-betsky-luis-barragan-casa-barragan/>.
- ⁶ See the artist's website for more information about the project: <http://www.jillmagid.com/projects>.
- ⁷ Mark Jarzombek, *The psychologizing of modernity: art, architecture, and history* (Cambridge, U.K. New York: Cambridge University Press, 2000), 218. See footnote 49
- ⁸ "A Prolegomenon to Critical Historiography" is the first section of Jarzombek, *The Psychologizing of Modernity*, 1-15. An earlier version was published as "A Prolegomena to Critical Historiography." *Journal of Architectural Education*, 52, no. 4 (1999): 197-206.
- ⁹ Although he focusses on the influence of psychology, Jarzombek also points towards the impact on art and architecture theory of interdisciplinary exchanges with philosophy, psychoanalysis, poststructuralism and phenomenology. *The Psychologizing of Modernity*, 1.
- ¹⁰ Jarzombek, *The Psychologizing of Modernity*, 11.
- ¹¹ Some examples by Australian scholars include, Andrew Leach, *What Is Architectural History?* Cambridge: Polity, 2010.; John Macarthur, "Movement and Tactility: Benjamin and Wölfflin on Imitation in Architecture." *The Journal of Architecture* 12, no. 5 (2007): 477-87; Macarena De La Vega De León. "Modern to Contemporary: A Historiography of Global in Architecture." *Cuaderno De Notas*, no. 20 (2019): 43-52.
- ¹² Jarzombek, *The Psychologizing of Modernity*, 2.
- ¹³ Jarzombek, *The Psychologizing of Modernity*, 8.
- ¹⁴ Jarzombek, *The Psychologizing of Modernity*, 9.
- ¹⁵ Jarzombek, *The Psychologizing of Modernity*, 15.
- ¹⁶ Luis Barragán, 1980 Laureate, Acceptance Speech, Pritzker Prize, 3 Nov 2020, https://www.pritzkerprize.com/sites/default/files/inline-files/1980_Acceptance_Speech.pdf.
- ¹⁷ Zanco quoted in Gregory, "Body of Work," 32. Gregory has written several articles about The Barragán Archives. Her *The New Yorker* articles provide a compelling overview of the project.
- ¹⁸ Nikolaus Hirsch, Carin Kuon, Hesse McGraw, Markus Miessen, ed., *The Proposal Jill Magid*, vol. 8, Critical Spatial Practices (Berlin, Sternberg Press, 2016), 15.
- ¹⁹ Pritzker Prize Jury Citation is an uncredited quote from Emilio Ambasz, *The Architecture of Luis Barragán*, (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1976). On the canonisation of Barragan's work see Federica Zanco, "Inward, Outward: Barragán in Transition." *The Journal of Decorative and Propaganda Arts* 26 (2010): 180-205.
- ²⁰ For a discussion of homophobic attitudes of artists such as Diego Rivera see Fernando Quesada, "The reality of fiction: the ECO by Mathias Goeritz." *Cuadernos de Proyectos Arquitectónicos* 6 (2016), 154-157. The title of this essay is a riff on a comment by the Mexican artist Pedro Friedeberg. When asked about his memories of Barragán he replied he was a very devout catholic. The interviewer said that he thought Barragán was gay. Friedeberg replied "Can't you be both?"
- ²¹ 13,500 drawings, 7500 photographic prints, 82 photographic panels, 7800 slides, 344 publications, 7 files of clippings, 7 architectural models, files of manuscripts, notes, lists, and correspondence, pieces of furniture and other objects. Gregory, "Body of Work," 29.
- ²² Gregory, "Body of Work," 31.
- ²³ Inez Weizman "2900 Fahrenheit" in Hirsch, *The Proposal Jill Magid*, 93.
- ²⁴ Gregory, "Body of Work," 30.
- ²⁵ The artist has stated that story was neither confirmed nor fully denied by Zanco or Rolf Fehlbaum. Zanco says this story is 'magical realism'. Gregory, "Body of Work," 33.
- ²⁶ Gregory, "Body of Work," 33.
- ²⁷ <http://www.jillmagid.com/exhibitions/woman-with-sombrero>.
- ²⁸ The film, *The Proposal* (2018) was shown at ACMI's *Non Fiction Documentary Festival* in 2019.

- ²⁹ Including *Facistol* (2013), *Refractory Cross inspired by Luis Barragán* (2013) and the 'Butaca' chair adapted by designer Clara Porset, and subsequently reproduced by Barragán, and Josef Albers.
- ³⁰ *Barragan@* (Neon, three transformers, 2016).
- ³¹ Memorial diamonds are manufactured by companies specialising in the process of creating artificial diamonds from pure carbon through heat and pressure. Prior to *The Proposal* (2016) is the artist's project *Autoportrait Pending* (2015), in which she arranges in advance for her own remains to become a diamond after her death.
- ³² Gregory, "Body of Work," 32.
- ³³ The historian's gracious manner is in contrast to hostile critiques of some commentators who claim to care about her interests. For example: Pamela Ballesteros, "Interview with Daniel Garza-Usabiaga, La Implicación Del Archivo Barragá," 3 Nov 2020, <http://gastv.mx/entrevista-daniel-garza-usabiaga-la-implicacion-del-archivo-barragan/>.
- ³⁴ Zanco quoted in Gregory, "Body of Work," 33.
- ³⁵ In an interview Magid notes that "copyright serves to construct legacy" Hirsch, *The Proposal*, 8.
- ³⁶ See for example the various debates about Le Corbusier's involvement with the fascist Vichy regime <https://www.nytimes.com/2015/07/13/arts/design/le-corbusiers-architecture-and-his-politics-are-revisited.html>.
- ³⁷ *Quartet*, 2014, a teleplay for four characters: Architect, Artist, Author and Archivist, inspired by Samuel Beckett's *Quad* 1981.
- ³⁸ Louis Kahn. "Silence and Light" in *Louis Kahn Essential Texts* (Boston: W. W. Norton & Company, 2003), 235.
- ³⁹ Barragan scholar Keith Eggener quoted in Gregory, "Body of Work," 28.
- ⁴⁰ This is the opinion of Juan Palomar, former Director of Casa Barragán about how Zanco and Fehlbaum responded on their first visit. Gregory, "Body of Work," 29.
- ⁴¹ Emilio Ambasz, *The Architecture of Luis Barragan*. (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1976), 108.
- ⁴² See Leonardo Diaz-Borioli, "Collective Autobiography: Building Luis Barragan" (PhD diss., Princeton University, 2015). A related comment about the historical value of marginalia and markings appears in the preface of a work translated by Mark Jarzombek. Neumeyer, Fritz. *The Artless Word: Mies van der Rohe on the Building Art*. (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1991). "This attempt to reconstruct Mies's conceptual edifice draws on another, so far unevaluated but authentic source, namely the markings left behind in his books in the form of under linings. They afford insight into the spiritual dimension of his philosophy."
- ⁴³ "A Letter Always Arrives at Its Destination", exhibition, 2017 at Museo Universitario Arte Contemporáneo (MUAC)
- ⁴⁴ Artist's website
- ⁴⁵ Alice Gregory, "What Happened after Mexico's greatest architect was turned into a diamond," *The New Yorker*, May 21, 2017. 9 Nov 2020, <https://www.newyorker.com/culture/culture-desk/what-happened-after-mexicos-greatest-architect-was-turned-into-a-diamond>. Other than the artist, the panel was all male and comprised two lawyers, a cultural promoter, a professor of aesthetics, the curator and a moderator.
- ⁴⁶ Gregory, "What Happened after Mexico's greatest architect was turned into a diamond."
- ⁴⁷ Alberto Campo Baeza. "Beauty Itself: On Luis Barragán." 97. https://www.campobaeza.com/wp-content/uploads/1996/11/2008_PENSAR-CON-LAS-MANOS_BEAUTY-ITSELF.pdf.
- ⁴⁸ Daniel Garza-Usabiaga, a critic of Magid who sees himself as a supporter of Zanco, is of the opinion that Barragán attached his artistic copyright to the professional archive to avoid their division. See interview previously cited.
- ⁴⁹ Weizman, "2900 Fahrenheit," *The Proposal*, 94.
- ⁵⁰ For a discussion of archives and hospitality see Mireille Calle-Gruber, "Event of the Archive" in *Heidegger, Philosophy, and Politics: The Heidelberg Conference*, ed. Mireille Calle-Gruber (New York, NY: Fordham University Press, 2016) xiii–xxii.
- ⁵¹ The artist signed her letter (dated 31 May 2016) to Zanco about the proposal: "I await your response. With affection and gratitude, Jill"