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Zaha in Thatcher’s 1970s Britain

In 1972, Iraqi-born Zaha (Mohammad) Hadid (1950–2016) (Figure 8.1) moved to London to undertake her studies at the Architectural Association (AA).¹ The daughter of the artist Wajiha al-Sabunji and the wealthy industrialist and co-founder of the left-liberal al-Ahari group and National Democratic Party in Iraq, Zaha Mohammed Hadid, came from a socialist-oriented, influential upper-class family. She studied at an Iraqi convent school for Muslims, Jews and Christians in the 1960s, “[when] women were empowered and anything seemed possible,”² and later attended English and Swiss boarding schools before moving to London. After graduation, Hadid worked for her former AA tutors and founders of the early OMA (Office of Metropolitan Architecture), Rem Koolhaas and Elia Zenghelis, until she opened her own architectural firm (Zaha Hadid Architects, or ZHA) in 1980, after becoming a naturalized British citizen.

One year earlier, in May 1979, Margaret Hilda Thatcher (1925–2013) was elected the first female prime minister of the UK. One of two daughters of Beatrice Ethel Stephenson and the English grocer, Methodist preacher, and politician Alfred Roberts, she grew up in provincial Grantham. According to Thatcher, her father, inspired by John Stuart Mill’s *On Liberty*,³ was an “old-fashioned liberal”⁴ who believed strongly in individual responsibility and financial soundness. Having lived through the Great Depression of the 1930s and coming from a frugal but reasonably well-off middle-class family, Thatcher worked her way up the socioeconomic ladder, studying chemistry on a scholarship at the University of Oxford from 1943–1947, then becoming a barrister and a politician. As prime minister, Thatcher and the movement she spawned encouraged women and men in Britain to work hard for personal gain in order to move from depending on state welfare to becoming self-sufficient and prosperous within free, neoliberal markets. Along with US President Ronald Reagan, who was elected in 1980, Thatcher embarked on a campaign to encourage privatization of property and the deregulation of industry to facilitate global free trade and free markets that promoted global competition to restore economic power and superiority to Britain.⁵ It was in the context of Thatcher’s newly competitive Britain, a period coinciding with the rise of feminism, that Hadid initially struggled to build her architectural practice. But through her hard work, persistence, tenacity, and fighting spirit, she finally established an architectural empire and body of work for which she became recognized as the most famous woman architect of her time.⁶

In this chapter, I undertake a reading of Hadid’s professional success through the lens of neoliberalism⁷ and of Hadid herself as both a product and a producer of high-end architecture in neoliberal
global markets. My interest is in reading Hadid through the neoliberal, gender-neutral actor *homo oeconomicus*, or economic man, and as part of a “creative class.” The chapter will position Hadid in relation to the lifestyle and philosophies of her former employer, Rem Koolhaas, including his laissez-faire attitude to globalization, continuous growth, and “bigness” in architectural practice. Hadid is studied here as a successful, independent, and hardworking entrepreneur marketed through extensive publicity as a woman architect and for the unique brand of one-off pieces of high-end designer architecture and products she produced. Hadid’s penthouse apartment in Clerkenwell,
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London (which she did not design but refurbished internally and where she resided for two and a half years from 2006 on), is used to discuss the dominance of professional life on her private sphere. How Hadid mobilizes or enacts her gender within a neoliberal lifeworld leads to a discussion of the physical impact on her own body of her prolific global jet-setting, which I read through Michel Foucault’s concept of “biopolitics” and Jonathan Crary’s 24/7: Late Capitalism and the Ends of Sleep.⁸ The aim of this chapter is to consider the life of this highly acclaimed female architectural practitioner, for whom work is everything, and through doing so to highlight first, how home and work spaces for “the independent woman” can change domestically; second, how corporeal consequences of neoliberalism affect the gendered body of the architectural practitioner; and third, what a successful and fulfilling life in architecture means today.

Neoliberalism, homo oeconomicus, and Feminism

From 1978 to 1979—the eve of the elections of both Thatcher and Reagan—Foucault examined neoliberalism through a series of lectures he delivered in Paris that considered the relationship between governmentality (or “the art of government”) and the exertion of power on the body politic. In the book of the collated lectures titled The Birth of Biopolitics, Foucault notes the changing association between biology and politics (“biopolitics”) and the powerful role that homo oeconomicus plays in neoliberalism.⁹ According to Foucault, economic man (who can be male or female, i.e., they can be economic man or economic woman) is competitive, driven, and singularly focused on his or her work life. Most importantly, she or he is entrepreneurial, using creativity to gain a market edge in the global economy. In her reflection on Foucault’s lectures and theories, political scientist Wendy Brown argues that under neoliberalism’s free market advocacy, economic man “takes its shape as human capital seeking to strengthen its competitive positioning and appreciate its value.”¹⁰ Economic man today ensures that everything is for sale. Economic rationalism demands that education, healthcare, becoming pregnant, the city, architecture, design labor, and the designer are not only commoditized but also co-opted to maximize return on investment through innovation.¹¹

Homo oeconomicus, regardless of her or his gender, is highly employable and productive in their labor because they are “family-free.”¹² Being family-free does not mean economic man or economic woman is without a family. Homo oeconomicus can be married or not, partnered, or have children. If they do have children, their freedom comes from not having primary care responsibilities, thereby giving them more time to work. Economic women and economic men with children can be family-free because their partner, a nanny, an au pair, or a boarding school takes primary care responsibilities from them.

According to Brown, women occupy two roles within the neoliberal world.

Either women align their own conduct with this truth, becoming homo oeconomicus, in which case the world becomes uninhabitable, or women’s activities and bearing as femina domestica remain the unavowed glue for the world whose governing principle cannot hold it together, in which case women occupy their old place as unacknowledged props and supplements to masculinist liberal subjects.¹³

Describing Brown’s economic woman in architecture, Rochelle Martin writes,

Women who have devoted themselves solely to their careers, attaining positions of prestige in their firms, feel that they can afford total commitment only if they are not married. This echoes a belief in the traditional career path that is structured to fit the male pattern—a young man works long hours at the beginning of his career to establish his reputation and gain necessary skills and knowledge.¹⁴
The difference between women choosing to become *homo oeconomicus* (in its most potentially productive form) rather than *femina domestica* occurs because of their decision not to be tied down by a partner or to have children.

It is well known that Hadid chose not to marry or have children. When queried at age 58 about her private life sacrifices, she maintained it was through her free will that she devoted her life to work, not family. “I don’t think one has to get married. Nor are you obliged to have children if you don’t want them.”\(^1\) “You should only have children if you can give them time. If I’d stayed in the Middle East, I could have done it. The family relationships there make it easier to look after children.”\(^1\) Being family-free has allowed Hadid to become economic woman, giving all her time to focus on her career. Conversely, Hadid’s personification of economic man has come at the cost of the loss of certain aspects of her gender/femininity, questioning her typicality as a woman because of independence.

Even today, the “independent woman” is atypical for architects. When Simone de Beauvoir wrote *The Second Sex* in 1949, she set out the conundrums for “the independent woman.”

There are . . . a fairly large number of privileged women who find in their professions a means of economic and social autonomy. [. . .] [As] a minority, they continue to be a subject of debate between feminists and anti-feminists.\(^1\)

While Hadid never claimed to be a feminist and never opposed the institutionalization of architecture through any form of activism, the relationship between capitalism and feminism established in the latter half of the twentieth century is important to understand here because the freedom for women to choose work over family or work and family has implications in the world of economic commerce and power relations.

In *Working the Spaces of Power: Activism, Neoliberalism and Gendered Labour*, Janet Newman discusses the “coincidence between feminism and global capitalism.”\(^1\) She draws out two discourses on the topic in feminist scholarship, first, “how processes of ‘mainstreaming’ served both to acknowledge and depoliticize feminist claims; and second, how neoliberalism appropriated identity politics.”\(^1\) Newman contends that through its ability to commoditize everything and everyone for reasons of increased marketization, “feminist-inflected activism”\(^1\) has been erased. Under neoliberalism, working women become equal players in the marketplace. As additional “human capital,” they become a productive economic market opportunity that can be exploited within the enterprise culture.\(^1\) According to Nancy Fraser,\(^2\) feminist critiques of patriarchy opened up women to new forms of exploitation in which women’s emancipation was tied to the engine of capital accumulation.

The performativity of femininity for market advantage, defined by Goodman as “professional femininity,”\(^\)3 uses women, and in this instance the creative practice and designs by a woman architect, for increased marketization. The construction of femininity as an identity is transformed by neoliberalism into “marketable commodities.”\(^\)4 Feminine skills used by professional women, such as “listening, supporting and facilitating, caring and encouraging, emotional intelligence and intuition,”\(^\)5 can be used to propose “new” modes of business management, enterprise, and products. Hadid was presented to the public as a “nice” “earth mother” who could transform, because of her commitment to the highest quality of production in her office, into a “Queen of Hearts screaming, ‘Off with their heads!’”\(^\)6 In “Zaha: An Image of ‘the Woman Architect,’”\(^\)7 I argue that Hadid performed femininity and masculinity as required to survive and thrive in the working world. Because women architects need to behave in traditional masculinist ways at certain times, some aspects of feminine behavior can be sacrificed, lost, or devalued in the workplace, while other aspects are used in publicity as a unique selling point (USP). Going beyond that previous research, here I contend that the professional image presented by Hadid, her creative practice, and multidisciplinary design outputs are shaped by neoliberal market forces through her participation in the “creative class.”
**Hadid as the “Creative Class”**

The persona of the architect as a creative professional is complex, being conditioned by historic constructions of the architect in the conflicting roles of “artist” and “professional.” As Nancy Levinson has written,

> Central to the mystique of architecture—in life and in the movies—is the idea of the architect as a person of marked creativity, creativity so strong it can seem a primal or religious force, allowing the architect to envision what does not yet exist, and so fundamental to [her or] his identity that others cannot help but acknowledge it, with various degrees of admiration, awe, envy, and fear. 28

For Manuel Shvartberg,

> the popular notion of “creativity” is particularly interesting because it has become a generalized imperative of neoliberal societies: creativity (and its proxies, “innovation” and “disruption”) [is] seen today as an essential component of any “competitive” worker. 29

It is because of the ability of “creativity [to] ma[k]e new worlds out of nothing” and to “measure [. . .] that productivity as a kind of surplus value relative to other inputs” 30 that economists such as Richard Florida 31 have defined the value of the “creative class,” in which avant-garde architectural designers or “starchitects” such as Hadid sit comfortably.

Nowadays the architectural “creative class” commodifies design labor through product innovation and marketing. Design as “immaterial labour gets categorized, spatialized, and monetized,” 32—the extent of which depends on the degree of “innovation” performed by the designer within the market. Market forces allow “the creative class” to operate as gender-neutral entrepreneurs to increase their market share because the USP of their product creates global demand able to increase revenue generation. According to Richard Biernacki, “Economics instrumentalizes creativity as a factor of production.” 33

In *The Image of the Architect*, 34 Andrew Saint studies architectural practices ranging from those based on artisanship to those driven by revenue generation. 35 Starting with the creative genius with a singular artisan-driven practice (Frank Lloyd Wright), Saint moves to the large corporate practice with a business model of creative genius (Louis Sullivan) collaborating with his “salesman” business partner (Dankmar Adler) 36 to the entrepreneur architect (John Poulson) and the developer architect (John Portman). 37 Creative or designer architects are presumed to spend substantial amounts of time designing, while good commercial practices fine-tune the timelines of productivity through delegation of labor, using partners or employees’ skills as efficiently as possible to facilitate fast and efficient production of architecture (ideally large-scale architecture) in a spirit of enterprise. The business-savvy architect is seen to be hardheaded and ruthless in their attitude to staff productivity, setting tight deadlines while friendly to clients to win jobs. Saint writes, “Though the managerial and artistic approaches to architecture continue generally to appear mutually opposed, in many of the biggest and most profitable practices they have happily co-existed.” 38

Even before Thatcher came to power, the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) commissioned a report in 1962, *The Architect and his Office*, 39 to survey small to large private practices in search of “a good starting point for the growth of the managerial and entrepreneurial ideal in British architecture.” 40 The report’s conclusions were centered on economization and rationalization of production, marketization, and an observation that larger firms had the potential to design and build more and be more economically generative so as to be more sustainable in the long term.

Between 1980 and 2013, Hadid went from “being the Architect Who Never Got Anything Built to someone who can’t stop building.” 41 During this period, she employed ZHA Director Patrik Schumacher, who is a strong advocate of neoliberalism. 42 The shift in productivity, however, occurred
mainly because of her using digital technologies to create a marketable, curvaceous architectural brand. “According to [Frank] Gehry, Hadid’s greatest strength was that she created a language that’s unique to her.” 43 She admitted that she was “not so focused on making money,” preferring to “spend time inventing architecture instead of going and getting work.” 44 Architecture critic Herbert Muschamp saw, however, that failing to build the Cardiff Bay Opera House prompted Hadid to change her behavior from being difficult 45 and self-defeating, and that this brought her more supporters and clients. Because of this, she began to build, expand her business, and win prizes and commissions of increasingly large size, thereby taking a share of what was otherwise “a white, male, [starchitect] business.” 46

Recognized as the “Queen of the Curve,” Hadid’s rounded products and architecture were marketed as feminine-inspired curvaceousness. 47 Through inventive business entrepreneurship, Hadid created a market share in architecture, product, fashion, and jewelry design that employed futurist smoothness. In addition to her ZHA business, Zaha Hadid Design (http://zaha-hadid-design.com/) sold and still sells Hadid-designed merchandise including chess sets, candleholders, platters, vases, dinnerware, cup and saucer sets, ties, scarves, placemats, coasters, glasses, mugs, books on her work and her lithographs, a shelving system, chandeliers, and stools. Costing up to £9,999, the designer objects are produced in limited and numbered editions, directed at the collector market. Hadid designed sets for the Pet Shop Boys; collaborated with Karl Lagerfeld to design fashion installations, namely the Mobile Art Chanel Contemporary Art Container; and furniture such as the Iceberg bench (Figure 8.2) for

\[Figure 8.2\] “Zaha Hadid’s Clerkenwell loft,” September 2013
Source: © Mark O’Flaherty.
the *Z-Scape Collection* for Sawaya & Moroni. She designed handbags for Louis Vuitton and collaborated with Brazilian shoe designers to produce the Melissa shoe range, and with Pharrell Williams for Adidas. Between 2005 and 2008, she designed the *Z.Car* with Kenny Schachter/ROVE, a two-person, hydrogen-powered city car with zero emissions. As she grew in notoriety, she supported and commissioned original clothing designs by elite fashion designers. She recognized that her wanting to “wear unconventional clothes” paralleled her “not at all conventional behavior.”

Constructions of creative genius and authorship mean that Hadid needed to establish and perform her difference, her (literal) exceptionalness, as a kind of personal brand. Since 2006, Hadid wore for special events the “one-of-a-kind” designs by Elke Walter. Mostly black, Walter’s garments created a designerly, sculptural form around Hadid’s body, paralleling Hadid’s curvaceous sculptural architecture. Prada and Yohji Yamamoto also designed one-off pieces worn by Hadid, “and her closet was packed with Miyake, Gigli and Miu Miu.” Hadid’s dress image as a “creative professional” was bold, playful, entirely original, and exclusive, just like Hadid’s one-off designs. It is in the very nature of starchitects that they grow from a mythological narrative and are obliged to (or rewarded for) reinforcing that myth. In the spirit of true neoliberal marketing genius, Hadid’s bodily image and the image of her private penthouse become ideal subjects for publicity.

### Hadid’s Clerkenwell Penthouse

The penthouse, as an apartment type, has mostly been analyzed in architectural literature from the standpoint of masculinity and bachelorhood as a space of play for the unmarried, family-free man. “Playboy's Penthouse Apartment,” an article first published in *Playboy* magazine, for instance, was republished in *Stud: Architectures of Masculinity.* It sets out how the penthouse, with its extraordinary views and its planning focused on a large seating area, bedroom, and bathroom, allowed the playboy to accentuate his independence, masculinity, and sexual performativity. *Playboy’s* penthouse was marketed as a lair to court and bed women. Domestic labors such as cooking were devalued through the inclusion of a bare-minimum kitchen with only a microwave oven. The penthouse has evolved since but remains a space for singles or family-free couples that are metropolitan wealthy (to afford the views).

In 2006, one year after having completed the BMW Central Building in Leipzig, a project Douglas Spencer describes as advertising “the world view of neoliberalism in phantasmagorical form,” Hadid purchased the top-floor open warehouse of a five-story loft building and converted it into her penthouse through an uncompromising vision of whiteness. Journalist Simon Hattenstone described the space as “The whitest whiteness everywhere—white floors, white walls, white ceilings, white fibreglass sculptures that double up as white sofas”—even “the AstroTurf that carpeted her roof terrace” was white.

In *White Walls, Designer Dresses*, Mark Wigley writes that “The identity of modern architecture seems inseparable from the whiteness of its surfaces.” Analyzed at length by Wigley is the French modernist architect Le Corbusier’s argument, set out in *The Decorative Art of Today,* for uncluttered, white-walled, well-lit, open interior spaces that allow free movement for the demands of modern life. In “A coat of whitewash, the Law of Ripolin,” Le Corbusier explains that whitewashing allows people to live healthily because whiteness demands continual cleaning to remove dirt. These two explanations for “whiteness” set off an aesthetic trajectory in contemporary architecture that continues today in the work of ZHA and remains exemplified in her penthouse.

The main living room or “studio” space in Hadid’s penthouse (Figure 8.3) is an unconventional, blindingly white room, often used as a gallery stage to showcase Hadid’s designs and her personal collections of designer objects. Acting more as a clutter free showroom for photo shoots of her, her paintings, furniture designs, or clothing collection, “light plays an important role, courtesy of an enormous skylight that permeates the central seating area, and a wall of windows leading to the back terrace.”

Decorated by Kazimir Malevich–inspired ZHA digital drawings, and with her Aqua table taking
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center stage (sometimes photographed with or without the Rifatta Bella chairs designed by William Sawaya around it), the “studio” is undomesticated and operates more as an office foyer. “There were no books, no CDs and perilously little sign of human occupation.”

Another small room in the penthouse was devoted to showing her “collection of Murano glass, vases, plates [. . .] consisting of different forms and colours.” Designer furniture, the Marshmallow sofa by George Nelson, and Tongue chair by Pierre Paulin, were positioned around the Murano glass as a perfectly controlled complement.

On another floor was Hadid’s bedroom (Figure 8.4), also starkly white, with white blinds and an adjoining bathroom. Unlike the other hard-surfaced rooms that show “perilously little sign of human occupation,” Hadid’s bedroom contained a large double bed with cushions and cover (which she designed for the Hotel Puerta de America, 2003–2005), a flat-screen television, and a “dressing
It also included a small black and red work desk. Following the typical penthouse for a bachelor with reduced kitchen, Hadid’s Clerkenwell apartment was kitchenless. Hadid chose to have the existing kitchen removed because “it was ‘ugly.’”

When she did have a kitchen, she had “someone to cook” for her, but because she went “out all the time” with clients or work colleagues, she felt no need for a kitchen in her flat.

Dagmar Holub notes that

Hadid never had her own office; she would sit right in the middle of her studio for many years. Arriving late in the morning, she would sketch for an hour or so, and then begin asking to see projects, and her employees would feed her plans and renderings.
As Hadid’s practice grew, she gave Schumacher more autonomy to manage the Clerkenwell office. Then she would work or have meetings at her home, which was within walking distance. Her penthouse was both inside and outside the space of the office. As ZHA grew, Hadid’s penthouse became a place for working, publicity, exhibition, sleeping, and bathing, when she was not traveling overseas for work.

**Globalization, “Bigness,” and Big Business**

Architects have always been globe-trotters, “designing structures for distant lands, getting the designs approved, and overseeing construction.”²⁶³ Michael Davis notes, however, that there are key differences between architectural globe-trotting in times past and architects engaging with globalization today. Previously, architects operated mostly within a few empires, not worldwide, and this meant that while they might have been importing one empire’s architecture to another country, they “did not worry about ‘globalization.’”²⁶⁴ In order to generate income and create new international markets, many modern architectural firms seek out architectural and city design opportunities in the global economy.

The problem of the city was integral to teaching at the AA during the 1960s and 1970s, the period when Koolhaas studied and taught Hadid. While Koolhaas was a professor at the AA, Thatcher abolished student grants, which meant that “many English students could no longer go there” and the school opened up to internationalization “with an involuntary invasion . . . by foreign students.”²⁶⁵
The debate about reverence to the historical, European city (Leon Krier) versus the modern, international city (Koolhaas/Zenghelis) that began during that time has been drawn out in the work of OMA through Koolhaas’s fetishism with the modern American city. In the 1990s, this grew into an uncritical fascination with the “irrational exuberance,” or heightened speculative fervor, for quickly generated new cities such as those OMA worked on in Asia.

As Ellen Dunham-Jones notes, “Equating capitalism with modernization and change, Koolhaas identified early on how global capitalism created dynamic, highly speculative urban conditions that were transforming the contemporary city.” For Koolhaas, new global markets provided architects with both destabilization and liberation. In his book *Architecture, Ethics and Globalization*, Graham Owen quotes Koolhaas, who at the time explained, “It seems clear that somehow we [architects] should be able, when given the impossibly difficult problem of designing in two weeks a city for three million people, to respond with vigor and skill.” Being non-judgmental of neoliberalism has allowed Koolhaas to only see the good in its doctrine, which asserts that “free markets [...] result in the most efficient and socially optimal allocation of resources,” and that “economic globalization [...] spurs competition, increases economic efficiency and growth, and is generally beneficial to everyone.”

Some corporate and commercial architectural practices—whether starchitect or not—aspire to continuous growth in numbers of employees and offices throughout the world through building bigger projects for, ideally, bigger profits. Koolhaas argues for this desire to take on as many commissions as possible through his explanation of the “interesting topic, the economics of architecture.” As Koolhaas notes, “you can never say no, because there is someone behind you who will say yes.” Koolhaas’s writings on architects engaging with big business and its virtues are a logical next step because “bigness” is the requirement of global architectural practice. “In globalized practice,” starchitects have the market advantage of using “the phenomena of celebrity—capitalized upon by architectural media and the profession alike—to assign identity to the work as commodity of cultural capital, as branded talent.” So while the revenue and cost of the labor of starchitects and their designs becomes more expensive and valuable in the marketplace, exploitation of low-income labor becomes accentuated. As Brown points out, the freedom of neoliberalism accentuates social inequality rather than equality, contrary to what it falsely claims.

Participating in the global economy involves architects, and the construction industry in which they operate, sometimes taking commissions from authoritarian clients, or employing workers at low rates of pay. Like many other large practices that billowed in size (OMA, Norman Foster, Steven Holl, Kisho Kurokawa, etc.), conquering more and more countries with more and more projects, ZHA came under ethical criticism because of Hadid’s “apparent indifference to the suffering of workers and low-income residents [affected by her projects].” Hadid’s “indifference” brought into question the profession’s obligation towards social justice under unfettered entrepreneurship, and with it the architect’s agency. Some critics, including Guy Mannes-Abbott of the group Gulf Labor have stated that “Starchitects have acted with breathtaking contempt for the lives and wellbeing of the migrant workers building their spectacular culture shops, from which they profit so handsomely.” But neoliberalism takes its toll on both the poorly paid and the well paid through the Foucauldian concept of “biopolitics” because neoliberalism depletes (human) resources in order to capitalize upon them.

24/7 Architectural Work Life: Wellbeing and the Self

While Margaret Thatcher was married with twin children (born in 1953, 26 years before she became prime minister), she was devoted entirely to her political working life and practiced the neoliberal long work hours, minimal sleep culture that capitalism thrives upon in order to increase productivity.
Those who worked with her claim she only slept four hours per night during weekdays. Very little sleep allowed her to put into practice her belief that disciplined long hours of hard work with little rest was the avenue to personal and economic independence and freedom.

Jonathan Crary notes that “in relation to labor, [a 24/7 work life] renders plausible, even normal, the idea of working without pause, without limits. It is aligned with what is inanimate, inert, or unaging.” Crary claims the “features that distinguish living beings from machines” are the need for pause or rest. But “24/7 markets and a global infrastructure for continuous work and consumption” undermine this. Globalized architectural practice (where a firm creates architecture across multiple time zones in multiple countries, so that a job never stops being worked on) is not questioned in architecture. On the contrary, for many practitioners it is seen as a sign of a successful, “healthy” business. But just as the bodies of construction workers are exploited under neoliberalism, I argue here that a neoliberal, 24/7 architectural work-life is corporeally detrimental to the body and wellbeing of its star-designers, including Koolhaas and Hadid.

Koolhaas’s jet-setting lifestyle of flying around the world for architectural commissions was compounded by the fact he lived between two families—one based in London with his partner and original OMA founder, the painter Madelon Vriesendorp with whom he has two children, the other in Amsterdam where he lived with his current partner, the interior and garden designer Petra Blaisse. When he was not moving between England and the Netherlands, Koolhaas lived in hotels. But his need to travel to market and expand his practice had a profound personal and physical effect on Koolhaas’s life, because he almost died from injections he was required to have to undertake work in Lagos, Africa. After recovering from this near-death experience, Koolhaas changed his lifestyle, swimming daily to balance his body and mind.

In Hadid’s case, not having a partner, children, or care commitments allowed her to devote herself entirely to her working life, leading to her being labeled by Stuart Jeffries as a “workaholic and single . . . destined to have only one longtime companion—galloping influenza” as the price of her global travels and success. Jeffries claims that at the time of his interview with a flu-ridden Hadid in 2004, after she had won the Pritzker Prize, she hadn’t stopped traveling, a pattern of continuous work she sustained from the age of 53 until her sudden death at 65.

She’s just back from Vienna, where she teaches, and will be jetting off again soon to oversee her many projects. To Rome, perhaps, where her extraordinary National Centre of Contemporary Arts is under construction. Or to Leipzig, where her offices and technical spaces for BMW’s HQ will mingle white and blue collars in a hearteningly egalitarian manner. Or to Wolfsburg, also in Germany, where she’s building a science centre. Or to Italy, where her Salerno ferry terminal is being thrown up.

Hadid claimed her ill-health was due to all the flying she did. She explained to Jeffries, “I don’t know what they put in the air on those planes, but it is really affecting my health.” Continuous work becomes a recurring theme in interviews with Hadid. In his 2010 interview with Hadid, Hattenstone states that when he asked what she did to relax, Hadid seemed to have “not quite understood the question. [Hadid replying,] ‘Relax? Nothing.’ But with buildings on site in France and Britain and Milan and Azerbaijan and Spain and China, there’s not much time for relaxing.” Hadid explained the problem with women nowadays was that now they’re liberated; they look after the home, they look after the children, they look after the work and with architecture I think it’s important to have continuity. It’s not like nine to five, you can’t just switch on and off.
While Hadid designed architecture that aimed at improving wellbeing, she modeled many of her staff, female and male (and as most large starchitect and commercial firms do), into a continuous pattern of long work hours. This is a work life pattern that students from “good” architecture schools are encouraged to pursue. The life pattern develops in corporate practices into working in the office well beyond the hours of nine to five, sometimes (or often) seven days a week, and with years of work without vacation, so staff are rarely at home and able to have only limited sleep.

Rather than a site of sanctuary and rest, Hadid’s bedroom doubled as a place for work. Hadid would sometimes lie awake in her white-painted apartment. However, what was going through her head wasn’t the usual insomniac’s litany of anxiety and regrets. “No, no, I lie awake thinking about buildings. I dream about buildings quite often and I’ve even trained myself to work out plans in my head, not just on paper, on a computer screen.” Limited or no sleep allowed Hadid to achieve maximum architectural productivity.

While the reasons why women leave architecture are multifarious, as Despina Stratigakos contends, women (and men) architects made in the extreme image of *homo oeconomicus* can be so driven by neoliberal and corporate values of careerism that the physical body (not only the economic body) suffers. After suffering from and being treated for bronchitis at a Miami hospital, Hadid died of a heart attack in 2016. (Three years earlier, aged 87, Thatcher died at the Ritz Hotel in London of a stroke.) Survived by her brother Haytham (whom she left £500,000), Hadid’s total fortune worth £67,249,458 was also bequeathed to Schumacher (£500,000), her four nieces and nephews (£1.7 million), “past, current and future employees and office holders of the companies,” and the Zaha Hadid Foundation, which was set up to promote architectural education and exhibitions of Hadid’s work, and other charities. Her architecture practice, ZHA, of which she was sole owner, was left in trust. “In the [fiscal year ending] April 2015, Zaha Hadid Ltd turned over £48m and employed 372 people.” ZHA continues its global enterprise today.

**Beyond Hadid’s Penthouse: Modernity, Gender, and Space After Neoliberalism**

While they could not be more different in their political beliefs, Hadid and Thatcher both forged extraordinary career success for modern women in their respective fields of work. The purpose of my occasional interlacing of the two women’s biographies is for comparison and to position Hadid in a context not created by her but by the governance beyond, in this instance Thatcherism. Thatcher set the scene for change in Britain for women and men to become economically “independent” workers under neoliberalism. While we imagine we are in control and free to create our own identity in the modern world through the “the ideal of individualism,” it is clear that “the art of governmentality” (to return to Foucault) creates a limited set of lifeworld possibilities and trajectories, most of which perpetuate class differences inculcated in us through our merging of “cultural and parental influences, normative social orders and other ingredients.”

The structuralization of neoliberal corporatism creates rules and limits to the spaces (private and public) and lifestyles architectural practitioners are able to occupy and enact respectively. Hadid was a product of neoliberalism and a participant producer of neoliberal production in architecture. Her “professional femininity” was co-opted by neoliberalism for purposes of marketization, creating new markets in architecture.

Hadid’s model of architectural labor reaffirms women and men architects transforming into *homo oeconomicus*, family-free, 24/7 workers. Through their “not at all conventional behavior,” Hadid and Koolhaas were able to redefine definitions of gender performativity through their decisions to have no partner, or more than one partner, and to juggle their unconventional, highly demanding personal lives between their offices and homes.
Hadid’s penthouse is a spatial construct of her reaffirmation of the spaces to support *homo oeconomicus* with a large, hard-surfaced, totally white “studio” space, bedroom, and bathroom but no kitchen. The “studio” and bedroom are no longer domestic spaces for socialization and relaxation but become a site of creative architectural labor and the socialization that supports it, including meetings, the exhibition of Hadid’s design artifacts, and designer branding of her and her work as product and image. Her atypical behavior translates into a kitchenless apartment. The only signs of stereotypical femininity in Hadid’s penthouse are her bedside table of perfumes and her large wardrobe. Much of her apartment appears gender neutral.

The implications of Hadid’s pursuit of futuristic, hygienic, sterile “whiteness” in her penthouse conceals the labor of the unseen cleaners who maintain the penthouse’s whiteness and the obsessiveness that requires its maintenance as a showroom. Hadid’s penthouse doubles as the white space of the gallery that is a constant exhibition of the art and architectural designs Hadid made and collected. Like Le Corbusier’s white studio spaces, Hadid’s choice of white walls shows the primary and close relationship between artists and architects. It highlights the deep overlap between neoliberal work and home through the occupant/designer’s aesthetic control.

Neoliberalism makes some people “see their individual lives as the project to which they largely devote themselves. A project emblematic of modern freedom.” But a study of interior domestic spaces “affirm[s] the centrality of relationships to modern life, and the centrality of material culture to relationships.” A focus on “household material culture” shows an intertwining of historic and current social, parental, and outside influences. The household objects we select and furnish our domestic interiors with, and from which we gain comfort beyond the workplace, visually allude to our aspirations and engagement with the outside world.

According to Aristotle, the ultimate purpose of human existence or life is the pursuit of “eudaimonia,” loosely translated as happiness. In *The Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle argues that eudaimonia is not about short-term pleasurable sensations but is the possible outcome of the totality of one’s life, how we participate in our life and play it out. There is no doubt that Hadid’s total devotion to a work-centered life was her choice and that she gained great satisfaction and motivation from her work, which I would contend is not driven merely by materialist ambition. But in this chapter I have shown that while Hadid’s lifestyle, a lifestyle typical of most starchitects, is seen to define a successful modern woman architect’s lifestyle, it can be unsustainable. A life revolving around never-ending 24/7 work, perpetual travel, living like a “gypsy, of no fixed abode,” staying in the “twilight architecture of airport terminals and distant hotel rooms” (which Koolhaas describes as “junkspace”) more often than your home exhausts and exploits the body of the architect. Such a singularly focused lifestyle relies on a narrow view of success, depleting us of having a fulfilling total life. So while architects might like to think that architectural production is exceptional in the area of work-life balance (that our work is our life), this chapter shows that many of the neoliberal mechanisms that exploit workers in general also apply to architectural firms and their lead architects (and the subsequent construction process), perpetuating a pattern of economic inequality, oppression, and abuse of human capital.

This chapter has shown the need to facilitate improved work-life balance in architectural practice, focused on the “enterprise of [an architect’s] self” rather than the “self for [architectural] enterprise.” It is important to be suspicious of the motives driving neoliberal practice in architecture because it can lead to the commodification and consumption of its practitioners. Neoliberalism not only co-opts its designers into making maximum profit, but can also consume them in its 24/7 work mentality. Through this study of Hadid’s penthouse I have provided a reading of the modern economic woman architect (although it can also apply to an economic man architect) and her spaces through a focus on gender, creativity, and neoliberal entrepreneurship. Hadid’s extraordinary successes...
and failures allow reflection on the cost to the architectural “body politic” for future generations of practitioners. As David Morris explains in “Free Trade: The Great Destroyer,”

There is no question that we have converted more and more human relationships into commercial transactions, but there is a great deal to question as to whether this was a necessary or beneficial development. [. . .] We must decide which values we hold most dear and then design an economic system that reinforces those values.104

Notes

1. Hadid completed her studies at the AA in 1977.
5. While Thatcher’s personality contributed a long-term commitment to “the triumph of ‘free-market’ economics and . . . an aggressive emphasis on the individual as opposed to community . . . the ideology which prevailed was essentially the product of . . . other actors and factors.” See Gould 2013.
6. This came through her receipt of the Pritzker Architecture Prize (2014), the Stirling Prize (2010 and 2011), and her being the first woman to be awarded the Royal Gold Medal from the Royal Institute of British Architects (2015).
7. I refer to neoliberalism here as a class-based political project aimed at new capital accumulation, as defined by Harvey 2007.
22. Fraser 2009, 97–117.
32. Deamer 2015, xxxiii.
33. Biernacki 2015, 40.
34. Saint 1983.
35. While homo oeconomicus is a phrase that is not gender specific, the word entreprendre meaning “to do something” comes from the thirteenth-century French masculine entrepreneur. Because of its use in John Stuart Mill’s Principles of Political Economy, the term became popular and was used to describe an entrepreneur as both a risk-taker and business manager. See Mill 2009 [1884].
36. Adler was a key player in moving the American Institute of Architects towards stronger business models. See Saint 1983, 172, footnote 55.
37. “In the early days Burnham was content to leave much of the designing to the talented Root, himself acting as ‘the salesman.’” Saint 1983, 87.
40. Saint 1983, 142.
42. Hadid employed Patrik Schumacher as a student in 1988. He returned to work for Hadid in 1990 and became her long-term business partner. Today he is the principal of ZHA. See Wainwright 2016.
44. Hadid quoted in Hadid and Duncan 2016.
47. Some of Hadid’s buildings have been openly compared to the shape of a vagina. See Wainwright 2013.
50. Sanders 1996.
51. See Spencer 2016, 84–94.
52. Hattenstone 2010.
55. Le Corbusier 1987 [1925].
60. Hadid quoted in Hattenstone 2010.
63. Davis 2009, 122.
64. Davis 2009.
67. Dunham-Jones 2014, 150.
71. Mander 1996, 315–21 defines the “Eleven rules of corporate behavior” as (1) The Profit Imperative; (2) The Growth Imperative; (3) Competition and Aggression; (4) Amorality; (5) Hierarchy; (6) Qualifications, Linearity, and Segmentation; (7) Dehumanization; (8) Exploitation; (9) Ephemerality and Mobility; (10) Opposition to Nature; and (11) Homogenization.
73. Owen 2016, 62.
74. Hadid’s buildings were recognized for being costly designer objects/products, targeting the high end of the architectural market.
76. Owen 2016, 50.
78. Sir Bernard Ingham, Thatcher’s Downing Street press secretary, quoted in de Castella 2013: “She slept four hours a night on weekdays. I wasn’t with her at weekends. I guess she got a bit more then.”
82. See Lubow 2000, “Last year, he [Koolhaas] was forced to ‘go completely nothing’ after he underwent 15 vaccinations in preparation for a visit to Lagos. ‘The 14th injection went wrong and I developed meningitis and almost died,’ he says.”
85. Jeffries 2004. Hadid also traveled to teach in the Graduate School of Design at Harvard University, the University of Illinois, Columbia University, and Yale University.
88. Hadid designed the Maggie Centre in Fife, opened 2006, around ideals of calmness for wellbeing.
89. Hadid quoted in Holub 2016.
90. This model is seen to be the way towards acquiring reputational capital.
91. Hegde 2016.
92. Hadid’s brother, Foulath Hadid, died in London in 2012.
95. Miller 2011, 286. Miller’s research was done in collaboration with his Ph.D. student in anthropology, Fiona Parrott.
96. Miller 2011, 295.
101. Holub 2016, “Zaha described herself as a gypsy, of no fixed abode with memories in her childhood home.”
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