

# The mask of design: Andrea Zittel

**Keywords:** art / design / consumerism / capitalism

## **Abstract**

*Clothing design, for artist Andrea Zittel, is not a commercial enterprise but a means to critically explore the dynamics of the contemporary consumer world. A-Z Administrative Services, Andrea Zittel's commercial façade, is not a design studio so much as an experiment with contemporary life in the consumer realm. Zittel evokes the commercial sphere of fashion only to unsettle it, replacing the individualised fantasies of high design with a complex examination of social control.*

*Each item of her clothing design, I argue, comes to stand as a marker for Andrea Zittel, a subject rendered melancholy through her attempts to escape the constraints of the consumer world.*

*Zittel claims to reduce consumer choice and simplify the lives of her "clients", yet despite her utopian ambitions the work points instead to a desperate attempt to control and manage the immediate environment. Her struggle to find freedom from the contemporary consumer world frames the auratic dimension of her work, complicating its commercial surface. She thus situates herself within both the art world and the commercial world of design. In this complex position, her works create spaces in which to think critically about the contemporary consumer world.*

*This paper will explore Zittel's complex position between the realms of critical artistic practice and the consumer market. On the one hand, she compromises her aesthetic autonomy by declaring and exposing the exchange-value of her work, by claiming to be a commercial designer. Yet at the same time her works create a critical and artistic space within the commercial market. The complexity of this position reflects the complexity of the predicament to which it responds. Zittel's work insists that it is within the systems of production that such issues can be most carefully contemplated, and the dynamics of production renegotiated.*

## **Introduction**

When Andrea Zittel first began her design company A-Z: Administrative Services (A-Z), she idealistically claimed: "I give you a small nucleus of harmony. You are calmer, more relaxed, peaceful." Yet the ricochet effect of encountering her design points not to idealistic solutions, but instead to the alienating effects of late capitalism. Her commercial products unsettle A-Z's

commercial façade, tracing a seemingly impossible struggle to obtain a sense of place, freedom and difference within the systems of the contemporary consumer world. Like modernist predecessors, *A-Z* claims to seek liberation from capitalism through material production, emphasising hand-made, useful designs as a means to overcome the alienating effects of commodification. The idealistic ambitions of *A-Z Administrative Services*, however, cannot be realised. As I argue, each clothing design system that Zittel creates is ultimately reinvented, prompting renewed production. This flawed design process serves to make the consumer aware of the alienating effects of contemporary consumer culture. *A-Z Administrative Services*, Andrea Zittel's commercial façade, is not a design studio so much as an experiment with contemporary life in the consumer realm. Zittel evokes the commercial sphere of fashion only to unsettle it, replacing the individualised fantasies of high design with a complex examination of social control. Products including *A-Z Personal Uniforms* (Figure 1) are not commodities so much as costumes, evoking both the physical body of Andrea Zittel and her movement through the world. This paper examines how Zittel uses clothing design to explore and disrupt the systems of commercial production. As I argue, Zittel's utilitarian production is a mask, and what lurks beneath is the dysfunction of late capitalism.



**Figure 1.** Andrea Zittel, *A-Z Personal Uniforms*, cotton, silk, velvet, 1991-1994, installation view, Sadie Coles HQ, Los Angeles, USA

*A-Z Personal Uniforms* (1991-1994) were promoted as a design solution for the overabundant consumer world. Promising to deliver an easy system of dress, they aimed to eradicate simultaneously the dictates of fashion and the difficulty of consumer choice. As traces of the *A-Z* corporation, however, and designed according to the rules of Zittel's systematic life-regime, they

carried their own set of personal, psychological and social restrictions. The description of *A-Z Personal Uniforms* captures both the officious guise of *A-Z* and its more playful underpinnings:

Starting in 1991 I designed and made one perfect dress for each season, and then wore that dress every day for six months. Although the garments were utilitarian in principle, I often found that there was a strong element of fantasy or emotional need invested in each season's design.<sup>i</sup>

The series of mostly-black, pinafore style dresses were tailored to include particular features for the climate, season, Zittel's daily activities and comfort needs. After several years of living under the regime of *A-Z Personal Uniforms*, Zittel shifted gear and developed *A-Z Personal Panels* (Figure 2). The rules of this clothing system changed in accordance with the failure of each design to achieve its aims. When the personal uniform system failed, it was subjected to reinvention.



**Figure 2.** Andrea Zittel, *A-Z Personal Panels*, installation view, Andrea Rosen Gallery, New York, 1998

Struggling with the constant task of designing a new and ideal garment every six months, Zittel decided to employ panels of fabric that could be modified, mixed and matched at will. In her words, "I decided to create some guidelines to make the decision a little easier."<sup>ii</sup> Where the *Personal Uniforms* were single, fully designed items of clothing, the panels were less designed and thereby more versatile. Inspired by the Russian Constructivists, who suggested that design should complement the natural state of fabric, *A-Z* decided to use nothing but rectangular

pieces of fabric, tied in place over the body. In their 'Program of the First Working Group of Constructivists,' for example, Alexander Rodchenko and Varvara Stepanova described a practice of construction where design material is changed as little as possible, calling it *Faktura*. They wrote, "Faktura is the organic state of the worked material or the resulting new state of its organism."<sup>iii</sup> Working from this logic, Zittel decided to use geometric patterns to complement the rectangular weave of her fabric. She describes, "As a way of pushing this rule to its absurd yet logical conclusion, I decided to take the position that all dresses should only be made from rectangles."<sup>iv</sup> Like all of A-Z's experiments, the clothing used the rules of a prevailing system and extended them to their limit. The resulting costumes resembled colourful aprons of seemingly endless variety. This apron/pinafore aesthetic emphasised the disciplinarian, totalitarian nature of A-Z, reinforcing the importance of work and efficiency, regulation and order in Zittel's life.

In addition to functioning as uniforms, relieving Zittel of the difficulties of both consumer choice and design, they also metamorphosed into other forms – the fabrics could be hung on the wall or positioned in a room as sculpture. The designs themselves were presented as artworks in the form of painting, and with their repetition of geometric patterns in simple colour schemes they recalled modernist abstraction. This was more than an appropriation of Constructivist aesthetics, for Zittel was not simply advocating socialist ideology. The design of the *A-Z Personal Panels* (1995-98) exposes the concept of use-value as a false means to find freedom from the reified clutter of contemporary consumerism.

A-Z claims to focus on the utilitarian value of commodities as a means to resist the abstraction inherent to the process of exchange, with its homogenising effects.<sup>v</sup> As soon as an object is produced in order for it to be exchanged, Marx suggests, it attains an exchange-value that is based on an abstraction of its intrinsic use-value. In this process of reification, the material basis of the commodity diminishes and its inherent qualities and differences are lost. Marx writes that commodities "don't contain an atom of use-value."<sup>vi</sup> Like modernist predecessors, A-Z claims to seek liberation from capitalism through material production, emphasising use-value as a means to overcome the alienating effects of commodification. Yet Zittel's 'alternative' production is framed in suffocating, totalitarian terms.

With fabrics that metamorphose from clothing into furniture, systematically structuring material life, works such as the *Personal Panels* design a life-regime. This process occurs in seemingly

rational steps, yet is presented in exaggeratedly systematic terms, lending a certain absurdity to the project. From the *Personal Panels*, for example, Zittel developed panels of carpet to be used as versatile flooring. This was then developed into carpet furniture. While the furniture consisted of nothing but panels of carpet, and could not comfortably be used for sleeping, eating or working, it was marketed as a utilitarian product: “The *A-Z Carpet Furniture* is luxurious, easy to store and versatile. One room can serve several functions and the furniture can be hung on the wall when not in use.”<sup>vii</sup> While the driving motivation behind this production is an attempt to find freedom from the systems of late capitalism, its exaggerated logic defeats this purpose.

The idealistic ambitions of both the *A-Z Personal Uniforms* and the *A-Z Personal Panels* cannot be realised. Zittel’s life-long clothing requirements aren’t solved in a single design. Each system of clothing is ultimately unsatisfactory, prompting renewed production. Simply ‘replacing’ capitalism with another form of production, this flawed process reveals, ends up perpetuating its very conditions.<sup>viii</sup> And so Zittel’s various clothing systems do not liberate her from the cycle of consumption. Premised on ‘need’ and thereby on lack, each design only fuels her cycle of production. Instead of creating a neo-Constructivist revolution, Zittel enacts its failed idealism, revealing the mechanisms of capitalist production that easily bend to accommodate ‘oppositional’ forms of production. This stance is not as programmatic as *A-Z* wants consumers to believe. As Zittel states, “Now people attempt to free themselves from social conventions or governmental restrictions by shrinking down to fit in between the cracks of larger systems – or by turning inward to some sort of private or personal realm.”<sup>ix</sup> The futile products of *A-Z* thus lead consumers to consider the personal, subjective and psychological mechanisms of capitalist production.

In this sense, *A-Z: Administrative Services*, is an experimental playground. It unites a rational game, determined by specific design ‘rules,’ with a play of critical artistic practice, where irrationality and subversion undermine its serious façade. The concept of ‘play’ has been an ongoing preoccupation of philosophy since Socratic times. In early philosophical writings it was considered an ethical issue, posed in opposition to ‘seriousness.’ In modern times, it was an aesthetic concern, considered as a counterpoint to ‘work.’ For post-structuralist thinkers, playfulness has been used in a disruptive sense, to question signification and undermine structural thinking.<sup>x</sup> ‘Play’ is often been divided into ‘rational’ and ‘irrational’ counterparts, not unlike Zittel’s studio. The rational side of play falls within the spheres of anthropology, sociology and science. Games, for example, are means through which subjects are socially conditioned.

Children learn how to socialise through play, while organised sport institutionalises playful behaviour. Yet 'play' also encompasses cheekiness, subversion and the disruption of social order. This more irrational sense of the concept abounds in artistic, literary and philosophical discourses – it has been embraced by philosophers from Nietzsche to Derrida, and accords with recent post-structural theory.

In both its institutionalised and subversive forms, play provides a unique means through which to reveal the functioning of society. As Mechthild Nagel writes "Play may have its own realm of truth (Gadamer), but nevertheless it can shed light on philosophical 'noble' lies."<sup>xi</sup> This is the underlying function of Zittel's design. In its 'seriousness,' it positions her practice within the commercial design world. Simultaneously, it acts as a playful mask, unleashing a critical artistic practice into consumer culture that exposes some of the 'noble lies' of capitalist production. The products of A-Z enact the failure of design to satisfy human need and through this dysfunction they shed light on the alienating effects of late capitalism.

Zittel's reorganises her personal environment through design to create a more satisfying existence. Each object of design, in this context, manifests Zittel's psychological wishes. In "The relation of the poet to day-dreaming," Sigmund Freud examines children's play as a means to understanding adult fantasy and repressed desire. Freud describes children's play as a serious, rather than frivolous, undertaking. Children at play, he suggests, are serious about it. What they do not take seriously, however, is reality. Instead, they create their own version of reality by rearranging objects from the real world. The child, he writes, "creates a world of his own or, more truly, he rearranges the things of his world and orders it in a new way that pleases him better."<sup>xii</sup> It is this use of real objects that separates play from mere fantasy, and it is this attempt to create a fantastic reality that shapes Zittel's work.

In an exhibit of *A-Z Personal Uniforms* at Andrea Rosen gallery in New York in 2004, rows of dresses, nearly identical, were lined up like soldiers, with barely enough room between each mannequin for the viewer to walk through. Walking through the space became a game, involving delicate action, ducking, dodging and sidling in order to view all of the pieces. This process forces the viewer to encounter the works in close proximity. Each dress represents a period in Zittel's life, and each mannequin presents a silent Zittel. The repetition of slightly different dresses documents a changing self. Walking through Zittel's uniforms, in this sense, is to retrospectively witness Zittel evolving over time. In their complex critique of late capitalism, A

*Thousand Plateaus: Capitalism and Schizophrenia* (1987), French philosophers Gilles Deleuze and Felix Guattari refer to evolutionary processes in describing social transformation, in their terms, 'becoming.' 'Becoming,' for Deleuze and Guattari, involves transformation. It is the result of the productive and positive movements of desire, and is revolutionary because it enables radical shifts in perspective. It provides the ability for people to change and to see the world through other eyes. Revolutionary movement is composed of exactly this, "the connection of flows, the composition of nondenumerable aggregates, the becoming-minoritarian of everybody/everything."<sup>xiii</sup> The main motivation of all art, they suggest, is to unleash such moments, which involves entering into the proximity of something else, of participating in the activities that constitute it.<sup>xiv</sup>

In this sense, it is in wearing Zittel's dress and in moving through her furniture that viewers can approximate her experiences. To purchase an *A-Z Personal Uniform* is to transport oneself into Zittel's world, to live her life, to 'become' Zittel. This is ensured by a contractual requirement that the consumer of *A-Z Customised Uniforms* discard all other items of clothing. The *A-Z* requirement is that "the client must agree to wear the garment exclusively and to store or discard all other garments of like type."<sup>xv</sup> A similar effect occurs in simply viewing the work. Walking through garments that signify her body, the viewer enters into Zittel's physical world. Each *A-Z Personal Uniform* represents six months of a person's life, providing a sense of transformation over time. Viewers do not imitate Zittel by walking through her installation, or by wearing her clothing. Instead, they differentiate from their pre-existing identity by communicating with this 'other.'

The *A-Z* identity is one that tries to evade the domination of exchange. In this sense, Zittel's rigid structure for living is a means to think 'other' than fetishised consumerism, to undo the subject's identification with the systems of late capitalism, a system that seems to have no outside. The disruption of capitalist systems, for Deleuze and Guattari, involves this process. It is a means of internal transformation, rather than external 'opposition,' provoked by a shift in perception.<sup>xvi</sup> In this sense, Zittel disrupts capitalist systems by transporting her viewers and consumers into her own world of production, where the dysfunction of capitalism is laid bare, and a space is opened to consider the possibility of its otherness. This is not to propose an alternative, but rather to initiate change. Such transformation is evident in *A-Z's* gradual move away from the singular, systematic design of the *A-Z Personal Uniforms* toward garments that have more of an accordance with their environment.

The system of *A-Z Personal Uniforms* gave way, in one step, to the slightly more flexible system of *A-Z Personal Panels*, which offered a multiplicity of fabric and colour variations. This led, in turn, to the development of *A-Z Raugh Garments* (1998), where the concept of the *A-Z Personal Panels* went a step further. Rather than cutting out pieces of fabric and sewing them into geometric patterns, Zittel simply tore off rectangles from a roll of fabric and fastened them onto her body using safety pins.<sup>xvii</sup> These subtle changes in production reflect Zittel's ongoing attempt to think 'other' than a producer of exchange-values, to make objects that draw attention to the personal and psychological nature of production. Most recently, in her *A-Z Fibre Forms* (Figure 3), she has abandoned 'systems' of dress altogether, focusing on the fabric itself. The *Fibre Form* garments are made by directly felting wool into a shirt or dress, constructing garments in whole pieces and without seams. The resulting material is full of holes of various sizes and shapes, and its naturally haphazard surface evokes the desert environment from which it has emerged. Soft ochre tones, varying across the fabric, and irregular edges summon the rocky and expansive surface of the landscape of Joshua Tree, California, where Zittel's interest in natural forms found fruition. It expresses desire in both an abstract sense – in its flowing form and organic production – and in a more literal sense – the fabric opens to the space of the body through actual holes that reveal flesh. *A-Z Fibre Forms* appear as scarred tissue, bearing in the fabric a sense of Zittel's stretched and ever-failing attempt to negotiate personal freedom in the contemporary consumer world.



**Figure 3.** Andrea Zittel, *AZ Fibre Forms*, 2002-2003, installation view, Andrea Rosen Gallery, 2005



*A-Z: Administrative Services* engages imaginatively with production, like a child at play, to make the consumer aware of the false promise of desire proffered in capitalist production. Simultaneously, the products of this experimentation provide a means for consumers to 'become-Zittel,' to experience her psychological oppression through design and to conceive of escape through her idealistic eyes. Each object of Zittel's design is an example of mis-design. The products diverge from and disrupt their conceptual plan, which in turn highlights the psychological nature of social production. The psychological nature of Zittel's practice is crucial to appreciating the necessary 'failures' of her design.

Zittel has described her design as "the cure for a life out of control."<sup>xviii</sup> It provides her with a feeling of control over her body and her material life. As an exercise in self-control, Zittel's game provides little more than temporary comfort. In other words, "It is consolatory rather than transformative."<sup>xix</sup> The repeated failure of these designs, however, subverts this consolatory effect, eliciting frustration and critique over complacency and comfort. Design, in this context, frames an anxious subject struggling to find freedom from the systems of late capitalism. This subject is unable to satisfy her needs and is desperate for a system that will relieve her sense of alienation. This dysfunctional production reveals a contradiction at the heart of consumer culture; amid a landscape saturated with promises of satisfaction, consumers are estranged from themselves and in particular, from their desires. Zittel reveals Marx's argument that the products of capitalism feed "imaginary" desires.<sup>xx</sup> Her products enact this aspect of capitalism in various guises.

The disconcerting effect of Zittel's designed environment points to the creation of a closed and personal imaginative world, one at odds with reality. A confused identity is at the core of the very title, *A-Z*, both an acronym for Andrea Zittel and a corporate title for her production company. At times Zittel promotes her work in the first person, at others in an officious corporate tone, and yet at others she encompasses ambiguous others under the term 'we.' Because the division between Andrea Zittel and *A-Z: Administrative Services* has been lost, her identity is alienated twice over; first through capitalist exchange, and secondly through her response to this in the form of controlling designs. For Marx, alienation is an inherent effect of capitalist production. For the capitalist worker, he argues, alienation occurs several times over; through the product of labour, which is "an alien object exercising power over him" and through labour itself, which "belongs to another; it is the loss of his self."<sup>xxi</sup> These estrangements then shape capitalist society at large.

Zittel performs this subject through her design – despite numerous attempts to return production to use-value, which in Marx's terms is “the satisfaction of wants,” the objects of her production only disconnect her from her body and her sense of self. Meanwhile, her personal identity is lost within the capitalist identity of *A-Z*, which becomes indistinguishable from the worker employed in its service. Both capitalist and labourer, experimenter and subject, Zittel is lost in the terms of her production. Marx describes this as a fundamental aspect of capitalist production, wherein “The capitalist robs his own self.”<sup>xxii</sup> The alienation expressed by *A-Z: Administrative Services* extends into people's homes, into gallery spaces, and into the commercial marketplace.

The inherent psychological dysfunction of *A-Z*'s production plays with the idea of madness. Her alienated identity as *A-Z* commodifies its attempts to escape commodification. This madness forms the commercial premise and function of her design, leading to the revelation that in capitalist systems, desire is unconsciously repressed on both a social and individual level. As Deleuze and Guattari write, capitalism is “a machine that is not only technical but social, and through which desire desires its own repression.”<sup>xxiii</sup> Zittel's hopeless idealism demonstrates this complex situation, where her utopian production implicitly represses her body, her needs and her wishes, even in spite of itself.

The failed utopian premise of *A-Z* clearly references modernist predecessors whose idealism is the inspiration behind her design facade. Her failure to achieve her aims reenacts the idealism of earlier movements such as Constructivism and the Bauhaus. Importantly, it illustrates the paradox of this Marxist tradition. Based on utilitarian production, it was impossible to escape capitalist systems without disrupting the logic of production itself. As Baudrillard writes: “Comprehending itself as a form of the rationality of production superior to that of bourgeois political economy, the weapon Marx created turns against him and turns his theory into the dialectical apotheosis of political economy.”<sup>xxiv</sup> Zittel's production captures this paradox again and again; using the logic of use-value and ‘design’ to attempt to find freedom, she instead finds herself locked in a vicious cycle. By reproducing capitalism's systematic control of desire in such an obviously neurotic personal manner, the dysfunctional design of *A-Z* thereby makes consumers consider production as a psychological process. As Deleuze and Guattari argue in *Anti-Oedipus*, capitalism attempts to disguise this psychological function and survives by unconsciously controlling desire. Making this function conscious, in Deleuze and Guattari's terms, schizoanalyses social production. As tools in a social experiment, Zittel's products

exaggerate capitalism's irrational logic. From this position 'internal' to commercial design, she interjects a critique into its cycle and provides a critical shift in perspective. In her words, "I often tend to embody ideas as a form of critique."<sup>xxv</sup> The potential for this to change the consumer's perspective is captured in the evolution of A-Z garments.

Zittel has used design critically to make the consumer aware of the psychological and subjective nature of commercial production. In Zittel's words, "looking at the issues that are in design and starting to use art to explore those issues."<sup>xxvi</sup> The basis of Zittel's design is not the production of commodities. Instead, she has designed an elaborate domain of critical play that she takes very seriously. Through her products, viewers experience Zittel's constructed life and are encouraged to consider the effects of contemporary design on the subjects of late capitalist society. Zittel's failed design endeavours revisit avant-garde idealism and expose remnants of historical failure. Even her attempts to create 'new' materials involve the recycling of the past in the form of waste. For Slavoj Žižek, it is balance and history that threaten the continued expansion of late capitalism. He writes, "capitalism, which can survive only by incessantly revolutionising its own material conditions, ceases to exist if it 'stays the same,' if it achieves an internal balance."<sup>xxvii</sup> Zittel pushes the internal imbalance of capitalism to its limits, creating an unhappy universe of production within. She adopts an internal position, producing commodities that expose the mechanisms of late capitalism by enacting its failed promises. Struggling to satisfy her needs, Zittel exposes capitalism's masquerade – under the alluring façade of fetishised desire, it instead produces lack.

*A-Z Administrative Services'* products are circulated in the commercial market, imparting their critique within its systems. Through this experiment, Zittel creates a critical space within production and encourages a change in perspective. For Zittel, freedom emerges in the failure of her design and in the failure of her systems. Zittel's performance indicates that within false hope resides the elusive and productive force of freedom. The complexity of this position reflects the complexity of the predicament to which it responds. Zittel's work insists that it is within the systems of production that such issues can be most carefully contemplated, and the dynamics of production renegotiated.

## Endnotes

- <sup>i</sup> Zittel, A 2002, *diary #01*, Tema Celeste Editions, Milan, p. 76
- <sup>ii</sup> Zittel, A 2002, p. 78
- <sup>iii</sup> Rodchenko, A and Stepanova, V 2003, "Programme of the First Working Group of Constructivists," in *Art in Theory, 1900-2000: An Anthology of Changing Ideas*, (Harrison and Wood, eds), Blackwell, Oxford; Cambridge, p. 342
- <sup>iv</sup> Sadie Coles HQ 1998, "Press release," *A-Z Personal Panels 1993-1998*, New York.
- <sup>v</sup> See Marx, K 1974, *Capital: a critique of political economy*, vol. I, ed. Engels, trans. Moore and Aveling, Lawrence and Wishart, London.
- <sup>vi</sup> Marx, K 1974, p. 45
- <sup>vii</sup> Zittel, cited in Schumacher, R 2003, "How do I get inside a Trojan Horse?" in *Andrea Zittel, 18 May - 8 November*, ex. cat., Ingvild Goetz, Sammlung Goetz, Munchen, p. 65
- <sup>viii</sup> This points to Baudrillard's argument that "Marx made a radical critique of political economy, but still in the form of political economy." (Baudrillard, J 1975, *The Mirror of Production*, Telos Press, St. Louis, p. 50)
- <sup>ix</sup> Zittel A 2002, p.11. More explicitly, she states, "We are now of an era that is so well versed in critical thinking (or critical nonthinking) that we know better than to have any grand hopes or to start up any collective movements." (Zittel, A 2004, "Shabby clique," *Artforum*, 42, no. 10, p. 211)
- <sup>x</sup> Generally, it has been configured as the 'Other' to reason. See Nagel, M 2002, *Masking the object: a genealogy of play*, Lexington Books, Maryland; Oxford.
- <sup>xi</sup> Nagel, M 2002, p. 109
- <sup>xii</sup> Freud, S 1934, "The relation of the poet to day-dreaming," in *Collected papers*, ed. Riviere, *The International Psycho-analytical Library*; no. 10, Hogarth Press and the Institute of Psycho-Analysis, London, p.174
- <sup>xiii</sup> Deleuze G and Guattari, F 2004a, *A thousand plateaus*, Continuum, London; New York, p. 522
- <sup>xiv</sup> This involves a move away from mimicry, allowing for variations on the original identity, rather than reproducing a stereotype. They describe becoming-woman as "emitting particles that enter the relation of movement and rest, or the zone of proximity, of a microfemininity, in other words, that produce in us a molecular woman, create the molecular woman." (Deleuze and Guattari, 2004a, p. 304)
- <sup>xv</sup> Zittel, cited in Zelevansky, L 1994, *Sense and sensibility: women artists and minimalism in the nineties*, ex. cat., Museum of Modern Art, New York, p. 32
- <sup>xvi</sup> Putting oneself in the place of another involves taking on a radically different perspective, and in this way becoming transforms established perspectives. It enables the formation of communities because it involves finding accordances with others. (See "Becoming-Intense, Becoming-Animal, Becoming-Imperceptible," in Deleuze and Guattari 2004a, pp. 256 - 341)
- <sup>xvii</sup> The term *Raugh* is Zittel's amalgamation of the terms "raw", and "rough." As a design strategy, it attempts to accommodate the inevitable messiness of life by creating furnishings that disguise dirt and hold things as they accumulate most naturally. This signifies a shift from her obsessive control of environment.

---

<sup>xviii</sup> Zittel, A 1995, "Auto interview by Andrea Zittel," *Transcript*, vol. 1, no. 2

<sup>xix</sup> Verhagen, M 2003-2004, "Micro-utopianism," *Art Monthly*, no. 272, p. 2

<sup>xx</sup> In Marx's words, "the extension of products and needs becomes a *contriving* and ever-*calculating* subservience to inhuman, sophisticated, unnatural and *imaginary* appetites." Marx, K 1961, *Economic and philosophic manuscripts of 1844*, Foreign Languages Publishing House, Moscow, p. 109

<sup>xxi</sup> Marx, K 1961, p. 71. He writes, "An immediate consequence of the fact that man is estranged from the product of labour, from his life activity, from his species-being is the *estrangement of man* from *man*." (p. 75). This leads to alienation from the social realm and the world at large, which comes to be "an alien world inimically opposed to him." (p. 71)

<sup>xxii</sup> Marx, K 1974, p. 597

<sup>xxiii</sup> Deleuze, G and Guattari, F 2004b, *Anti-Oedipus: capitalism and schizophrenia*, Continuum, New York; London, p. 379

<sup>xxiv</sup> Baudrillard, J 1975, p. 50. In Baudrillard's account, Marx's materialism avoided the issue of symbolic exchange – the concept at the core of his own examination of late capitalism.

<sup>xxv</sup> Zittel, A 2001, p. 118

<sup>xxvi</sup> Zittel, A 2000, cited in Louisa Buck, "Home, sweet unit: Artist's interview, London," *Art Newspaper*, November 2000, part II, p. 24. It is important to note that design is a conceptual process, and its dictionary definition is "mental plan." (Fowler and Fowler, eds, 1974, *The concise Oxford dictionary of current English*, Oxford University Press, London, p. 330)

<sup>xxvii</sup> Žižek, S 1989, *The sublime object of ideology*, Verso, London; New York, p. 52