



## Domesticity and Leisure: Radical Architectures.

Cano Dominguez Maria<sup>1\*</sup>, Cano Dominguez Minerva<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1\*</sup>University of Newcastle (Australia), [minervacanodom@gmail.com](mailto:minervacanodom@gmail.com)

<sup>2</sup>Independent Researcher, [minervacanodom@gmail.com](mailto:minervacanodom@gmail.com)

**Citation:** Cano Dominguez Maria, Cano Dominguez Minerva, (2024), Domesticity and Leisure: Radical Architectures, *Educational Administration: Theory and Practice*, 30(5), 8486-8493

Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v30i5.4392

### ARTICLE INFO

### ABSTRACT

*Our society's ongoing social, cultural, and climate changes are shifting how people experience domestic and leisure environments. The influence of the counterculture led by the turbulence of various social movements and the climate crisis are among the factors leading to the emergence of new lifestyles, relationships, and activities that are conditioning how we design and build new architectures. Domesticity and leisure are fast and inexorably merging and changing. House is a mental territory that extends into the broader context of the city, with leisure driving these actions. The domestic environment is adapting many of its uses and spaces to new technification of forms where Architecture and its identity are changing, evolving into a hybrid environment difficult to define. This paper follows the works of the Italian Radical Architects "Global Tools" (1973-75), set against the background of discussions in periods of energy crisis, rapid population growth, and climate imbalance; the paper reviews the design of domesticity and leisure through radical lenses. What might be their future, and how could we retool the discipline of Architecture as a kind of echo of a too rapidly forgotten historical moment?*

**Index Terms**— Domesticity, leisure, radical, architecture, landscape, climate crises, Global Tools.

### I. DOMESTICITY AND LEISURE

Domesticity tends to be a messy assemblage that gains traction from centralised political, climatic, and social forces but operates effectively as a form of distributed power—centripetal in some cases and centrifugal in others. The concept of domesticity refers to the evolution of the notion of the home, where human societies have organised themselves into families, with shared living spaces and communal responsibilities. The concept of home was often associated with the family and was a place of shelter and safety. During medieval times, the home became a more important social institution, with the rise of the feudal system and the importance of the family as the basic unit of society. The rise of capitalism and the growth of urbanisation implied that the home became a site of consumption. The home became more private, with the emergence of the nuclear family and the emphasis on privacy and individualism. In the 19th century, the growth of industrialisation and the rise of the middle class led to significant changes in the concept of the home. The home became a site of consumption, with the growth of consumer culture and the emphasis on material possessions.

When we invoke domesticity as a category of analysis, we can and should feel the pull of all the domains of history and inquiry it brings with it: household, family, labour, state and nation, empire, and capital, to name only a few salient ones; and all the spaces it entails plantation field, marriage bed, spinning room, whether well-appointed or ramshackle. Domesticity has been linked inevitably with the role of women in those spaces. Until the 20th century, their role in domesticity was central and essential. Still, the rise of feminism and the growth of the welfare state led to significant changes in the concept of the home and the role of women in domestic life.

There is no isolating the domestic from capitalism, war, environment, race, or politics. The Anglophone modernist version of domesticity, with its attachment to Western notions of public and private and its denial of the materiality of race, class, and colonialism, remains a powerful undercurrent even in nuanced accounts of the subject. [1]

In the years of reconstruction and economic boom that followed the Second World War, under modernism, the

domestic sphere engendered new expectations regarding social behaviour, modes of living, and forms of dwelling. At the time, the domestic sphere had a crucial role as a space of refuge from a plethora of real and perceived threats and the resulting sense of fear and apprehension they created. Domesticity took centre stage; the home was reinvested with a significance intended to keep dissolution and meaninglessness far away. Yet the home was not always an escape, as Christopher Reed has noted: “The domestic remains through the course of modernism a crucial site of anxiety and subversion.” The anxiety of the Cold War era infiltrated the domestic sphere, and various versions of “home” were conjured to ease broader outside political or cultural tensions. [2] With its culture of celebratory consumerism and embrace of modern architecture's new materials and techniques, a different but significantly related narrative can be culled from the domestic interior. Two decades after the WWII, energy and climate themes suddenly emerged again among architects. The world summits on climate, the media coverage of sustainable development, and an environmental crisis.

This sudden shift toward ecology, landscape, and climate changed how we design and use materials. Soil, ceramic, and glass came to be tested in different projects around the globe.

Through the introduction of glass architecture in the 50s and the visual opening and exposure of the domestic environment, the interior, rather than a “detective story,” becomes “film noir”, the scenography of nineteenth-century, cinematography. The increasing visibility of the post-war domestic environment, witnessed in both the popular representation and organisation of the interior, intensified gendered binaries of inside and outside.

The pressure to maintain the illusion of a perfect domestic environment— modern, clean, stylish, and efficient—was intense and sustained across various popular media in the post-war period. Many illustrated features and “how to” articles emphasised “the look,” how things “should look,” and how they “look best,” affirming the pervasive visibility of the domestic environment. The anxiety of maintaining appearances within the “to-be-looked-at-ness” of the domestic environment has been associated with the exponential growth of psychoanalysis and increased prescriptions of tranquilisers in the post-war era. The suggestion that psychological comfort could be provided by controlling the aesthetic conditions of the domestic environment seems to be evidence of psychic fissures related to the performativity of these spaces.[3] Empty, aseptic, with no plants or nature. Spaces with non-liveable traces became a trend.



**Table 1: A protozoan with bacterial ectosymbionts.**

More recently, the boundaries between domestic and urban environments are increasingly blurred. The house acted as quite an autonomous microcosm and the city as its receptacle. Many activities, events and rituals usually associated with domestic space today often occur outside, scattering the home throughout the city. Meanwhile, the domestic environment increasingly accommodates certain urban functions, changing its traditional meaning and giving rise to hybrid situations. Domestic and urban environments are merging in a symbiotic way.[4] Architecture and the building environment disciplines are mimicking nature and rethinking

design strategies for our cities—symbiotic relationships to create new typologies in our built environment. Recent social, political, technological, and cultural changes have led to the emergence of new forms of living that rapidly transform domestic and urban life. Domesticity is more and more understood as a field or as a mental territory that goes beyond the material, concrete spatial, and bodily limits of the house: it is a multidimensional domain related to the intimate condition of humans and other species beings and their need for protection, care, rest, recovery, and leisure. New technologies also play a key role in rediscovering domestic spaces and their relationship with the city. All these phenomena have given rise to different uses of spaces, both urban and domestic; people actively interact with the environment with or without a digital layer, resulting in a totally new form of relationship with the city. With the advent of broader, multi-level global connections and virtual communities, the external world enters and permeates the domestic sphere, questioning the bourgeois meaning of home as a purely private place.[5]

Today, the domesticity is often no longer understood as a finished product but as a process in continuous evolution, which depends on the relationship between the house and its inhabitants physical and emotional well-being. Precisely because one of its main influences comes from the outside, the domestic interior extends beyond the limits of the house and expands into the urban. The house tends to the city, and the city turns into a home; they share rooms, spaces, times, and atmospheres. This blurring of traditional dualities gives rise to a new concept of domesticity, replacing the idea of the home as a closed space with fixed uses and a static identity: a concept that allows multiple meanings and that exists in a context that transcends physical boundaries.

Domesticity is evolving, increasingly expanding into the urban field, and thus gaining complexity. For many people, home is no longer a stable and fixed place enclosed within four walls but a series of interconnected fragments scattered throughout the city. Home is migrating to the city, while the city is becoming domestic in all its aspects and all its spaces.

**True leisure** (*epistemic leisure*), as described by Plato, becomes a metaphysical form, of which our *doxic* leisure activities inevitably become a mere reflection; hence, it becomes possible to distinguish hierarchies of good and bad leisure, with rational discourse and ritual sports becoming the noblest. For the Epicureans, anything that helped fulfil the need for happiness and satiation counted as good leisure, so for them, the best leisure forms become those that give some kind of satisfaction. Archaeological, physiological, and psychological evidence, along with comparative work with modern-day primates, suggests that leisure has always had a pivotal place in the lives of humans. Leisure was an essential quality of *Romanitas*, what it meant to be a true Roman man, but this sense of *Romanitas* was, paradoxically, based on an appreciation and appropriation of Greek culture and leisure forms and a rejection of the Roman Empire's popular culture. Christian writers and moralists of the early Byzantine period explore how leisure was restricted and channelled. In the increasingly autocratic eastern Roman Empire, theological debate became an outlet for communicative discourse and agency, to the extent that – especially in the sixth century – it became a form of leisure among the urban population of Constantinople. Byzantine leisure and the Ottomans' leisure lives routinely used leisure in similar instrumental ways to ensure the continuity of political stability, communal identity, and power inequalities. In the European Middle Ages, the rise of the manorial village, with its complex and ritualised culture and calendar, constrained the leisure choices of the peasant and the lord. The prevalence of folk games such as football and the leisure life of the peasantry with the world of feasts and jousts of the feudal princes was limited in its expressive, communicative freedoms. [6]

These changing patterns and significations of leisure consumption through the twentieth century were noticed by American economist and sociologist, Thorstein Veblen. It was only in the period following the Second World War that leisure (in the modern West) started to be associated with constructing cultural identities and activities relating to nature, landscape, and care. Especially from the 60s, the relationship between outdoor recreation and environmental politics is evident. The change in design toward unique strategies and this climate preoccupation is associated to the counter-culture initiatives of the 1960s and the neoliberal reforms of the past 60 years.

**Domesticity and leisure** have been concepts of analysis and redefinition since the Second World War, shaping how architecture is expressed by focussing on creating distinct and innovative spaces for living and occupying. The gender revolution that had evolved during the 60s contributed to a radical change in definitive function represented through topics of leisure and domesticity. The impact of technological revolutions, among other forms of social, political, and economic events, helped to reimagine a singular space into an open, climate-adaptive one with great potential. The developments in technology has played a significant note in the context of urban experiences through climate explorations.

THE RODNEY AND OTAMATEA TIMES,  
WEDNESDAY, AUGUST 14 1912.

### Science Notes and News.

#### COAL CONSUMPTION AFFECT- ING CLIMATE.

The furnaces of the world are now burning about 2,000,000,000 tons of coal a year. When this is burned, uniting with oxygen, it adds about 7,000,000,000 tons of carbon dioxide to the atmosphere yearly. This tends to make the air a more effective blanket for the earth and to raise its temperature. The effect may be considerable in a few centuries.

**Table 2: Anonymous writer in Rodney and Otamatea Times, 2021— with earlier publication date, though quotation was in the March 1912.**

After World War II, a significant growth in suburbanization and consumerism attracted the attention for a change. A few groups of architects and designers, among others, started to point out the worry consequences and the need for a change. [7]

Architecture played a crucial role in exploring new ways of life through designing new structures and dwellings which had incorporated aspects of leisure, such as outdoor spaces and recreational facilities. Not only had post-war changed the design of living conditions but also public leisure spaces too, with the appearance of botanic gardens, spa complexes, and amusement parks changing the predominant domesticated lifestyle into one that promoted recreation and relaxation. Nature has been tethered to that with biomimetic designs, landscape architecture and programs.

Altogether, the post-war period has shown noteworthy changes to how people engrossed themselves in leisure and domesticity, which is clearly emulated in architecture design.

## II. THE 70S AND GLOBAL TOOLS

**Radical architecture** describes designs that challenge the conventional standards of traditional architecture. The term was popularized throughout the 1960s and 70s to suggest extremes of shape, structure, or, more often, the political position of its designers.[7] Modern architecture had become too commercialised, focused on aesthetic concerns over social and environmental issues, and failed to adequately address the needs of the people who use buildings. Radical architecture sought to challenge these limitations by exploring new design concepts, materials, and technologies and prioritising social and environmental concerns in their designs. This often led to unconventional and experimental designs, exhibitions and theoretical approaches that aimed to create social criticism and provocation.

The MoMA's ground-breaking 1972 exhibition, *Italy: The New Domestic Landscape*, is crucial to explain this relationship and the different approaches. This exhibition emphasises both the dynamic context of radical Italian design and architecture in the 70s and the innovative series of experimental domestic "environments" as an analytical project that attempts to reassess the visionary possibilities of architecture and design.

From here, groups of individuals tested different skills and abilities in a collaborative design process. These media-savvy groups remained role models for their robust utopian image-making and multidisciplinary approach and working structure, particularly "Global Tools", which began in the 70s as a functioning collective claiming different architectures for the current political and climatic crisis. [8]

In the field of Design and Architecture, an awareness started to suggest the level of criticality we were facing. The famous Aspen Design Conference (1970) was dedicated entirely to the subjects of the environment, and both architects and intellectuals, such as Buckminster Fuller, met to rethink the connections between ecological concerns and political matters. 1972 was a turning point and an awake call for our climate mindset with a paper authored by John Sawyer and published in the journal *Nature*. It reveals how much climate scientists knew about the fundamental workings of the global climate over 40 years ago and predicted impacts



resulting from a continued rise in atmospheric carbon dioxide. This year in Rome, we saw published “The Limits to Growth”, where a clear statement is made: the Earth’s interlocking resources – the global system of nature in which we all live – probably cannot support present rates of economic and population growth much beyond the year 2100, if that long, even with advanced technology.

With climate awareness and the emergence of new actions, the delicate geopolitical context rising during the oil crisis (Yom Kippur War, 1973), and the burnout of capitalist society, society was placed in a critical position. That prompted the creation of radical groups that retool the design strategies for a global redefinition of our profession.



**Table 3: Global Tools at Casabella Magazine, 1973.**

**Global Tools** was founded on 12 January 1973 at the editorial office of Casabella by the members who participated in the 1972 MoMa exhibition. It was created as a system of workshops that started in Florence and later migrated to other places around Italy. Originally defined as a “School of Popular Arts and Techniques,” it was organised around five themes that avoided the disciplinary classifications of traditional educational institutions: “body”, “communication”, “construction”, “survival”, and “theory”. [8] The laboratories were devised to function on several levels: as living labs open to students, professionals, and citizens interested and, as systems for the use of natural materials according to their biological characteristics—as a programme of research and education outside an institutional framework, aiming to combine the utopic aspirations of radical architecture with open design systems accessible environments. The labs also served as a provisional private network of interconnected experimental spaces seeking sustainable and speculative design alternatives.

They tested domestic and leisure strategies conceived as an alternative to the current obsolete living conditions and ‘re-tooled’ the design discipline in an era of globalisation, a complex historical period characterised by heterogeneous intellectual exchange smoothly moving across the realms of politics and education.[9]

Global Tools explored and formed a discussion on the evolution of domestic and leisure spaces tethered to the “tools” as the locus where a hidden political and climate potential awaited further exploration.

They tested the viability of architecture's potential survival or disappearance, away from its objecthood and into an environment of perceptual relations, behavioural configurations, and “domestic rituals.” Where leisure is related to body, land, community, and nature.

In 1975, at the end of the Global Tools experience, more architects were engaged in transformative designs, and key professionals emerged with a different approach to regulative designs. Global Tools influence the current architectures, but also in the way of thinking and designing a different future, closely engaged with climate, country, and people.

Global Tools shared through their mouthpiece Casabella, workshop publications, and photography, leisure nodes and opportunities that are incubating something new from the old. Those articles, images and advertisements have the potential to contribute significantly to a study of domesticity and leisure toward a climate-adaptable design strategy. These contributions are relevant nowadays to an audience beyond those who are interested in the Italian Radical Architects of the 70s.

They were the incubators of a new path of experimentation, creativity and retooling of an obsolete discipline. They paved the way for us to understand architecture currently and how we embrace and face new challenges

in the built environment. Speculative Architecture is a political tool that goes beyond the simplistic design but reconfigures cities, nature, and domestic rituals.

### III. RETOOLING THE DISCIPLINE

Ecology is an alternative to modernisation: a new way to handle all the objects of human and non-human collective life. Isabelle Stengers and Bruno Latour explore the overcoming of modernity and positivism, which opens the field to exploring destroyed practices that must be thought of beyond science and philosophy, which is a way of thinking. The late modernist capitalist dissident practice of Global Tools acknowledges the cosmopolitics of architecture, understanding the capitalist project (and its dependency on unbridled economic growth and climate changes) as a ruin with the reality of a finite and burned-out planet. The climatic crisis has positioned humankind on the verge of an existential threat that demands radical political action, along with new imaginaries and aesthetics. A ruin that must be vandalised with alternative social and political contracts of the domestic and leisure rituals.



**Table 4: Rambla Climate-House by Andrés Jaque / Office for Political Innovation + Miguel Mesa del Castillo. Photograph by José Hevia**

The last 20 years have been crucial in new tools and strategies with new dissidents continuing the way of the 60s as Andrés Jaque - conversation with Jack Murphy (AN Magazine), January 19, 2023- “We understand that our world is a little bit more complex, it’s a bit more about gaining a voice, we are constructing a network of actors that are engaging with reality in a very responsible way. If I had to define our practice, I would say it is how to articulate design with research and activism. How to design for inter-scalarity, how do we do things that can operate at different scales simultaneously. I think this is crucial because that is how conflicts are happening. They are happening in how the design of a kitchen affects the whole city’s economy or the way resources are used. So that is one challenge because now, in our discipline, things are separated by scales - from industrial design to architectural design to urban design to urban planning to territorial planning. The question of how to develop design practices that could cross and connect things that are happening in different domains is a crucial question of our generation”. Retooling the discipline from education, as academia plays a crucial part in our next generation of architects and designers. Devising alternative modes of practice for today’s context where we provoke and explore, test and play, engaging with ephemeral constructions, borderless spaces, and multispecies relationships that allow us to immerse, surrender, undo, and camouflage. By investigating scenarios for the future and creating narratives around different forms of agency that shape space and culture, we can test speculative architectures. It relates to, overlaps with, or is synonym with several other concepts from architecture fiction and design futures to radical architecture. Little by little, it has been gaining relevance in educational research, but often uncritically or linked to increased productivity and technological innovation. But speculative is not neutral. From there, we can be resilient and subvert political discussion to adopt more sustainable systems and different ideologies toward the preconceived old-fashioned “Architecture”.

### REFERENCES

1. 9999, Superstudio and. *Global Tools: Survival Group*. Global Tools, 1974.
2. Abalos, Iñaki. *The Good Life : A Guided Visit to the Houses of Modernity*. New, revised and updated edition. ed. Zurich, Switzerland: Park Books, 2017.

3. Arra, Guido, Ugo La Pietra, Gianni Pettena, and Franco Vaccari. *Global Tools: Communication Group*. Global Tools, 1974.
4. Belyaev, D. K. "Destabilizing Selection as a Factor in Domestication." *Journal of Heredity* 70, no. 5 (1979): 301-08. <https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jhered.a109263>.  
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jhered.a109263>.
5. Bidwell, Duane R. "'Let's Get into Character': A Narrative/Constructionist Psychology of Conversion in Quentin Tarantino's Pulp Fiction." Article. *Pastoral Psychology* 49, no. 5 (05// 2001): 327-40. <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1010355426729>.  
<http://ezproxy.newcastle.edu.au/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=pbh&AN=5404539&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
6. Binazzi, Lapo. *Global Tools: Theory Group*. Global Tools, 1974.
7. Borasi, Giovanna, ed. *The Other Architect: Another Way of Building Architecture*. Edited by Canadian Centre for Architecture. Montreal: Spector Books, 2015.
8. Borgonuovo, Valerio, and Silvia Franceschini, eds. *Global Tools: 1973-1975*. Istanbul: SALT, 2015.
9. Branzi, Andrea. *Global Tools: Construction Group*. Global Tools, 1974.
10. Branzi, Andrea, Gaetano Pesce, Alessandro Mendini, Franco Raggi, and Ettore Sottsass Jr. *Global Tools: Body Group*. Global Tools, 1974.
11. Burton, Antoinette. "Toward Unsettling Histories of Domesticity." *The American Historical Review* 124, no. 4 (2019): 1332-36. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ahr/rhz643>. <https://doi.org/10.1093/ahr/rhz643>.
12. Butcher, Matthew, and Luke Caspar Pearson. "Enduring Experiments: How the Architectural Avant-Garde Lives On." Article. *Architectural Design* 89, no. 4 (07// 2019): 6-13. <https://doi.org/10.1002/ad.2451>.  
<http://ezproxy.newcastle.edu.au/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asu&AN=137266930&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
13. Campbell, Colen. "Vitruvius Britannicus, or the British Architect." (1725).
14. Casens, Philippe, and Nathalie Bruyère. "'Seizing the Real: From Global Tools to Design 3.0'". *Cubic Journal* 3, no. No. 3: DESIGN MAKING: Practice . Making . Praxis (2020). <https://doi.org/10.31182/cubic.2020.3.026>.
15. Catenacci, Sara. "Dalla Distruzione Dell'oggetto All'”Ambiente Come Sociale”." PhD, Sapienza Università di Roma, 2017.
16. Catenacci, Sara, and Jacopo Galimberti. "Deschooling, Manual Labour, and Emancipation: The Architecture and Design of Global Tools, 1973-1975." 99-121, 2017.
17. Coleman, Nathaniel. *Utopias and Architecture*. Florence, UNITED STATES: Taylor & Francis Group, 2005. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/newcastle/detail.action?docID=308714>.
18. Coles, Alex, and Catharine Rossi, eds. *The Italian Avant-Garde, 1968-1976*. Edited by EP Vol. 1. Berlin: Sternberg Press, 2013.
19. Colomina, Beatriz. *Are We Humans?*
20. ———. *Sexuality & Space*. Princeton Papers on Architecture ; 1. New York, N.Y: Princeton Architectural Press, 1992.
21. "Archigram's Cook on Superstudio's Natalini." 1982, accessed 21 March, 2023, <https://www.architectural-review.com/archive/archigrams-cook-on-superstudios-natalini>.
22. *The Oxford Dictionary of Architecture*. 3 rev. ed. Oxford University Press, 2021.
23. Deamer, Peggy. *Architecture and Capitalism : 1845 to the Present*. London, UNITED KINGDOM: Taylor & Francis Group, 2013. <http://ebookcentral.proquest.com/lib/newcastle/detail.action?docID=1318977>.
24. Didero, Maria Cristina, Evan Snyderman, Catharine Rossi, and Deyan Sudjic. *Superdesign: Italian Radical Design 1965-75*. New York, N.Y: Monacelli Press, 2017.
25. Enia, M., and F. Martella. "The Domestic City. Expansion of the Domesticity in the Contemporary City." 2020.
26. Formia, Elena. "Mediating an Ecological Awareness in Italy: Shared Visions of Sustainability between the Environmental Movement and Radical Design Cultures (1970-1976)." Article. *Journal of Design History* 30, no. 2 (05// 2017): 192-211. <https://doi.org/10.1093/jdh/epw051>.  
<http://ezproxy.newcastle.edu.au/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=asu&AN=123057086&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
27. Franceschini, Silvia. "Global Tools of Learning." *Volume* 45, no. 3 (2015): 92-98.
28. Gold, John R. "A World of Organized Ease: The Role of Leisure in Le Corbusier's La Ville Radieuse." *Leisure Studies* 4, no. 1 (1985/01/01 1985): 101-10. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02614368500390071>.  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02614368500390071>.
29. Harrison, Ariane Lourie. *Architectural Theories of the Environment : Posthuman Territory*. New York: Routledge, 2013. doi:10.4324/9780203084274.
30. Isenstadt, Sandy. "Atomic Dwelling: Anxiety, Domesticity, and Postwar Architecture." *Journal of Architectural Education* 67, no. 1 (2013/03/07 2013): 138-39. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10464883.2013.767136>. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10464883.2013.767136>.
31. Kalimtzis, Kostas. *An Inquiry into the Philosophical Concept of Scholé: Leisure as a Political End*. 1 ed. London: Bloomsbury Academic, 2017. doi:10.5040/9781474237963.

- <http://www.bloomsburycollections.com/book/an-inquiry-into-the-philosophical-concept-of-scholar-leisure-as-a-political-end/>.
32. King, Anthony D. "A Time for Space and a Space for Time: The Social Production of the Vacation House." 193-227, 1980.
  33. Lewis, Simon & Maslin, Mark. "Defining the Anthropocene." 171-80 *Nature*, 2015.
  34. Mallett, Shelley. "Understanding Home: A Critical Review of the Literature." *Sociological review* 52, no. 1 (2004): 62-89.  
<http://ezproxy.newcastle.edu.au/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ant&AN=XRAI2000s-45230&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
  35. Moreno, Anna. "Global Tools: Dancing Alone, Clubbing Together." (2020).
  36. Natalini, Adolfo, Cristiano Toraldo di Francia, Gian Piero Frassinelli, and Gabriele Mastrigli. *CCA La Vie Secrète De Superstudio*. Paris: éditions B2, 2020.
  37. Navone, Paola, and Bruno Orlandoni. *Architettura "Radicale"*. Edited by Alessandro Mendini. Casabella, 1974.
  38. Neuman, Fran. "Little Radicalism: Clip, Stamp, Fold: The Radical Architecture of Little Magazines, 196x-197x." [In English]. *Journal of Architectural Education* 61, no. 3 (2008): 69-70.  
<https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1531-314X.2007.00176.x>.  
[http://newcastle.summon.serialssolutions.com/2.0.o/link/o/eLvHCXMwnV3JTsmwEB21cGCTWCvWyh\\_QQGOntML6kKEEFxQEVxQ5diOVNQNwqR-PmOnKQGJC6ccElmJZzyZoXvzBoDRy7r3KyYESSQUYwqzYyoxKZciUlh8GVOXOhBp4siF\\_O5BPHdprwQib42xLEtHE3SgPuZLydBcBa4PWtSvp--eHR9lYdbllIoylAXLJPR7q4DMAzdFoKKZHvor-onoQSfEQBS85HKGfsitDIKRnej-NfEuqPy1cpKJG\\_Jh4dhi2863lON\\_vmAPtmyXA8mggXoomfEBbLcKqMlhvN4PrMAxeZQOyxMRk3SGQ6mNYIZ6ggv8WSomwQdLX-EFBcgk5QsV8hVrGc1gkdx4flRuDiCp\\_im17n1ltMYvDefibnHIxEyi9kow1lgGKMhD43xfcWpFMygXX3NFNUyEtIoLBSl5YnB-lT5NMVSuAI7orL2x3PX3aePgaBxjEwaghuBlZMQEY-U5mnoJ5pzTRsnUHF7159mohv9fONO\\_7pxBpsZo8MSTs5hbf7xaS5gY2WoKqy32t12XHUu8gXr8MQv](http://newcastle.summon.serialssolutions.com/2.0.o/link/o/eLvHCXMwnV3JTsmwEB21cGCTWCvWyh_QQGOntML6kKEEFxQEVxQ5diOVNQNwqR-PmOnKQGJC6ccElmJZzyZoXvzBoDRy7r3KyYESSQUYwqzYyoxKZciUlh8GVOXOhBp4siF_O5BPHdprwQib42xLEtHE3SgPuZLydBcBa4PWtSvp--eHR9lYdbllIoylAXLJPR7q4DMAzdFoKKZHvor-onoQSfEQBS85HKGfsitDIKRnej-NfEuqPy1cpKJG_Jh4dhi2863lON_vmAPtmyXA8mggXoomfEBbLcKqMlhvN4PrMAxeZQOyxMRk3SGQ6mNYIZ6ggv8WSomwQdLX-EFBcgk5QsV8hVrGc1gkdx4flRuDiCp_im17n1ltMYvDefibnHIxEyi9kow1lgGKMhD43xfcWpFMygXX3NFNUyEtIoLBSl5YnB-lT5NMVSuAI7orL2x3PX3aePgaBxjEwaghuBlZMQEY-U5mnoJ5pzTRsnUHF7159mohv9fONO_7pxBpsZo8MSTs5hbf7xaS5gY2WoKqy32t12XHUu8gXr8MQv).
  39. Petit, Victor. *CCA Global Tools (1973-1975): Éco-Design: Dé-Projet & Low-Tech*. Translated by Mariussia Pennacchio-Bruyère. Edited by Nathalie Bruyère. Toulouse: IsdaT éditions, 2023.
  40. Pietra, Ugo La. *Viaggio Sul Reno 1974*. Translated by Ben Bazalgette. Lugano: Artphilein Editions, 1974. Photo book. <https://choisi.info/products/viaggio-sul-reno-1974>.
  41. Schrijver, Lara. "Oswald Mathias Ungers and Rem Koolhaas : Recalibrating Architecture in the 1970s (Volume 63, Edition 1)." 63 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783839457597>.  
[https://newcastle.primo.exlibrisgroup.com/discovery/fulldisplay?docid=alma991016314172907966&context=L&vid=61UON\\_INST:61UON&lang=en&search\\_scope=MyInst\\_and\\_CI&adaptor=Local%20Search%20Engine&tab=Everything&query=any,contains,archipelago%20architecture&offset=0](https://newcastle.primo.exlibrisgroup.com/discovery/fulldisplay?docid=alma991016314172907966&context=L&vid=61UON_INST:61UON&lang=en&search_scope=MyInst_and_CI&adaptor=Local%20Search%20Engine&tab=Everything&query=any,contains,archipelago%20architecture&offset=0).
  42. Spracklen, Karl. "Philosophy of Leisure." In *Constructing Leisure: Historical and Philosophical Debates*, edited by Karl Spracklen, 14-32. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2011.
  43. Verzier, M.O., and N. Axel. *Work, Body, Leisure*. Hatje Cantz, 2018.  
[https://books.google.com.au/books?id=-8h\\_tAEACAAJ](https://books.google.com.au/books?id=-8h_tAEACAAJ).
  44. Wright, Gwendolyn. "Desire and Domesticity." Book review. *Design Book Review (0737-5344)*, no. 37/38 (//Winter96/97
  45. Winter96/97 (1996): 32-34.  
<http://ezproxy.newcastle.edu.au/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=su&AN=34621048&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
  46. ———. "Domestic Architecture and the Cultures of Domesticity." Article. *Design Quarterly*, no. 138 (12//1987): 12-19. <https://doi.org/10.2307/4091194>.  
<http://ezproxy.newcastle.edu.au/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=su&AN=505470510&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.
  47. Zuddas, Francesco. "Radical Notes: Archizoom Re-Viewed Via Ivan Illich." Article. *Architecture & Culture* 8, no. 1 (03//2020): 119-42. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20507828.2020.1773695>.  
<http://ezproxy.newcastle.edu.au/login?url=https://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=su&AN=147549363&site=ehost-live&scope=site>.