



EUROPEAN ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY NETWORK
PALAIS DES ACADEMIES

EAHN

SECOND INTERNATIONAL MEETING
BRUSSELS, BELGIUM 31 MAY - 3 JUNE 2012

Abstracts are invited for the sessions and round tables listed below by September 30, 2011. Abstracts of no more than 300 words should be sent directly to the appropriate session or round table chair(s); abstracts are to be headed with the applicant's name, professional affiliation [graduate students in brackets], and title of paper or position. Submit with the abstract a short curriculum vitae, home and work addresses, email addresses, telephone and fax numbers.

Sessions will consist of either five papers or four papers and a respondent, with time for dialogue and questions at the end. Each paper should be limited to a 20 minute presentation. Abstracts for session presentations should define the subject and summarise the argument to be presented in the proposed paper. The content of that paper should be the product of well-documented original research that is primarily analytical and interpretative rather than descriptive in nature.

Round tables will consist of five participants and an extended time for dialogue, debate and discussion among chair(s) and public. Each discussant will have 10 minutes to present a position. Abstracts for round table debates should summarize the position to be taken in the discussion.

Papers may not have been previously published, nor presented in public. Only one submission per author will be accepted. All abstracts will be held in confidence during the selection process. In addition to the 23 thematic sessions and 4 round tables listed below, open sessions may be announced. With the author's approval, thematic session chairs may choose to recommend for inclusion in an open session an abstract that was submitted to, but does not fit into, a thematic session.

Session and round table chairs will notify all persons submitting abstracts of the acceptance or rejection of their proposals and comment on them by October 31, 2011. Authors of accepted paper proposals must submit the complete text of their papers (for a 20 minute presentation) to their session chair or complete draft of discussion position (for a 10 minute presentation) to their round table chair by March 15, 2012. Chairs may suggest editorial revisions to a paper or discussion position in order to make it satisfy session or round table guidelines and will return it with comments to the speaker by April 15, 2012. Speakers must complete any revisions and distribute copies of their paper or discussion position to the chair and the other speakers or discussants by April 30, 2012. Chairs reserve the right to withhold a paper or a discussion position from the program if the author has refused to comply with these guidelines. It is the responsibility of the chair(s) to inform speakers of these guidelines, as well as of the general expectations for both a session and participation in this meeting. Each speaker is expected to fund his or her own registration, travel and expenses to Brussels, Belgium.

CONFERENCE CHAIR

Hilde Heynen

SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE

Jorge Correia, University of Minho
Krista De Jonge, K.U.Leuven
Adrian Forty, UCLondon
Hilde Heynen, K.U.Leuven
Mari Hvattum, AHO Oslo
Susan Klaiber, independent scholar
Dietrich Neumann, Brown University
Edoardo Piccoli, Politecnico di Torino
Belgin Turan, METU Ankara
David Vanderburgh, UCLouvain

ORGANIZING COMMITTEE

Thomas Coomans, K.U.Leuven
Dirk De Meyer, UGent
Els De Vos, Artesis Hogeschool Antwerpen
Rika Devos, UGent
Jean-Louis Genard, ULB, Faculté
d'architecture La Cambre-Horta
Janina Gosseye, K.U.Leuven
Hilde Heynen, K.U.Leuven
Ruth Hommelen, St. Lucas
Bernard Kormoss, Université de Liège
Judith le Maire, ULB, Faculté d'architecture
La Cambre-Horta
Piet Lombaerde, Universiteit Antwerpen
Anne-Françoise Morel, UGent
Sven Sterken, St. Lucas
Francis Strauven, UGent
Koenraad Van Cleempoel, UHasselt
Jean-Louis Vanden Eynde, UCL

IMPORTANT DATES

September 30, 2011:
submission of abstract to session chairs

October 31, 2011:
notification of acceptance

March 15, 2012:
submission of full papers

May 31- June 3, 2012:
2nd EAHN international conference in
Brussels

This Call for Papers and Discussion Positions can also be read at the meeting website: www.eahn2012.org — or at EAHN website: www.eahn.org.

Session Proposals

THE CLASSICAL URBAN PLAN: MONUMENTALITY, CONTINUITY AND CHANGE

Greek and Roman monuments have been disappearing from the collective psyche for millennia; as soon as a new Roman emperor assumed power, for example, the architectural landscape was reshaped and adapted to suit the new rule. More recently, the rapid acceleration in the loss of collective memory through the obliteration of monuments has made clear that ancient architecture as we have come to know it is moving away from the physical realm, to the imaginary psyche. One aspect of it, however, remains: the urban grid. Even where ancient architecture has been decimated to make room for new urban and at times, rural spaces, substantial portions of an earlier ancient grid can be retraced and the wider plan can, to varying extents, be recovered. This session will shed light on these “lost” urban and rural plans.

We know that individual monuments as well as monumental architectural ensembles can today be harnessed in the service of memory scripting, just as it was – as Paul Zanker so brilliantly showed – in Roman Republican times. Can the same approach be extended to the planning grid? Does meaning change as the plan is altered? Does memory change? Can an ancient plan reflect a new cultural, political or social order?

Whether intentional or not, each Classical plan has the capacity to embody specific messages linked to such notions as “heritage” and “identity”. While this is arguably most significant when considering the formal orthogonal grid, the weight that this infrastructure can bear in terms of cultural meaning has been underappreciated by current scholia. As such, this session invites papers focusing on Greek and Roman grid traces – both literal and figurative. Proposals are particularly welcome which consider ways through which the collective memory of cities and smaller settlements is altered, if at all, with the introduction of newly constructed monuments within an ancient plan. Participants might also address the reciprocity between the institutional and architectural order of cities; or explore how an entire city can be monumentalised by virtue of “inheriting” a Classical plan. Overall, this session will inform theoretical frameworks, thereby broadening as well as reassessing the existing discourse on ancient urban plans.

SESSION CHAIRS:

Daniel Millette, School of Architecture and Landscape
Architecture, University of British Columbia
E: millette.daniel@yahoo.com

Samantha Martin-McAuliffe, School of Architecture,
University College Dublin
E: samantha.martinmcauliffe@ucd.ie

Scholars of medieval European architecture have traditionally focused on the monuments of major metropolitan centres, especially cathedrals, palatial complexes and fortifications. This tendency has dominated the field since its origins and, unfortunately, has fostered a myopic and sometimes anachronistic view of medieval building practices. In particular, it has distorted our understanding of the architectural patronage of political regimes, which not only commissioned impressive structures in cities, but also erected numerous rural edifices throughout the territories under their control, including bridges, gates, fountains, hospitals and mills.

Although much of this vast production was strictly utilitarian in nature, many buildings in the countryside or in small population centres were designed and executed with strategic objectives in mind. Tuscan communes, for example, typically commissioned architecture within their subject territories that adhered to an official typology and/or iconography, which often determined the choice of materials and the design of arches, windows, cornices and battlements; thus, they unified their territories visually, delimited their borders with neighbouring states, and projected the political unity and social cohesion of their citizen residents.

In fact, polities throughout medieval Europe used architecture to demarcate territory and consolidate authority. Robert Branner famously argued that King Louis IX of France promoted the spread of Gothic architecture to the south and west of Paris in order to proclaim his rule over his newly expanded kingdom. Caroline Bruzelius asserted that the Angevins adopted a similar architectural strategy in Southern Italy. In the twelfth century, the many regional styles of Romanesque architecture (Norman, Burgundian, Aquitanian, Rhenish, Lombard, Roman, etc.) corresponded geographically to areas of political control or influence. Even castles, the most practical of edifices, were often designed according to certain criteria or adorned with esoteric iconographic motifs that advertised the authority of a particular government.

This session invites participants to investigate the architecture of territoriality in Europe during the Middle Ages. Papers addressing questions of patronage (seignorial, communal, ecclesiastical or private), historiography, iconography or ideology are especially welcome.

SESSION CHAIR:

Max Grossman, Department of Art, University of Texas
E: megrossman@utep.edu

This session examines the depictions of cities under siege in the period 1450-1700. Siege warfare was omnipresent in early modern Europe. Nearly all important cities were fortified, and many of them were besieged at least once. Accordingly, images of cities at war compose a large part of the visual culture of the time. Countless siege views were produced in all kinds of media (drawings, prints, paintings, tapestries, etc.), displaying a rich variety of forms (frontal views, aerial perspectives, iconographic plans, etc.), formats (book illustrations, broadsheets, mural maps, etc.), and functions (reconnaissance, news reporting, commemoration, etc.). Some siege images were genuine masterpieces of graphic art and urban cartography.

Notably, siege views pose problems of topographical as well as narrative accuracy: their development is connected to that of cityscapes and mapmaking as well as to that of news prints and graphic journalism. Traditionally, depictions of sieges were memorial works: posterior fabrications devoid of any documentary verisimilitude. But after 1500, they frequently purported to be "true portraits": accurate, eyewitness records of the actual events. At the same time, representations of cities became more accurate due to improvements in perspective drawing and surveying techniques. Siege warfare was certainly an important motor for innovations in urban cartography. For many cities, the earliest accurate representations to have survived are siege scenes. Yet even when made from first-hand observation on site and despite their claims to veracity, depictions of sieges always mixed historical fact with artistic fiction. Thus the abundant imagery of cities under siege offers an enormous potential for urban and architectural historians, but there are many pitfalls awaiting those who want to use such images not merely as illustrations, but as sources in their own right.

This session explores the variety of uses for the testimony of siege views. Papers may consider images in all media of specific sieges or cities, from the whole of Europe (including the borderlands of the Ottoman Empire in eastern Europe and northern Africa). They could also address thematic issues, such as the use of different representational modes, iconographic conventions and genre clichés; the dissemination of siege prints and of innovations in city planning; the commissioning of siege pictures as a form of self-representation; or ensembles of siege scenes and their display in princely palaces or public buildings.

SESSION CHAIR:

Pieter Martens, Department of Architecture, Urbanism and
Planning, Leuven University
E: pieter.martens@asro.kuleuven.be

In the sixteenth century, political and economic engagements between Renaissance Europe and the Islamic world opened new pathways for cultural exchange. Trade, diplomacy and tourism vastly enhanced Europeans' knowledge of Ottoman, Safavid and Mughal urban design and architectural practice. As travel narratives from the period attest, Europeans reported on the cities, gardens, and buildings with which they came into contact, often characterizing them as sites of social interaction. Some of the accounts even included drawings and sketches of Islamic cities and gardens, which captured the attention of European cultural elites. Intellectual and artistic exchanges facilitated by merchants, tourists, and missionaries also added to the reciprocal flow of architectural ideas and concepts.

During this period, some simultaneous changes occurred in garden design in Europe and Persia. The role of gardens in cities grew in prominence, with a gradual shift in emphasis from gardens for the private sphere to an increasingly public function. As a natural consequence of this shift, gardens began to serve as the core of new urban plans and designs. This phenomenon not only established a new relationship between the garden and city, but also emphasized the garden pavilion or villa as the focal point. Are such concurrent developments in European and Islamic gardens the result of universal political and social changes in both regions or could these garden design traditions mutually have influenced one another? The papers in this panel can study such potential influences by comparing the meanings and forms of gardens in the Islamic world to those in Europe or by exploring historical documents to validate mutual influence in garden design. The papers can also compare and contrast between the function of the palace or pavilions in relation to the garden in Islamic cultures and the villa in relation to the garden in European cultures.

SESSION CHAIRS:

Mohammad Gharipour, School of Architecture and Planning,
Morgan State University
E: mohammad@gatech.edu

Stephen Caffey, Department of Architecture,
Texas A&M University
E: scaffey@arch.tamu.edu

Over the past several decades, there has been a growing interest, in many fields of history, in “de-centering,” “re-framing,” and/or “re-orienting” the Renaissance which aims to “re-place” it within a more global context. Parallel to the attempts to make architectural history less Europe-centered and more cross-cultural, this interest has been voiced in some recent studies on the history of Renaissance architecture as well. Accordingly, these studies seek to shift the geographical boundaries of Renaissance architecture by expanding them beyond “Europe” and by including especially the “Islamic East” and the “New World.”

With the hope of contributing to this emerging literature, this session aims to open it up to new directions of research by exploring how this shift can be mapped out without essentializing these geographical distances in such terms; how it can be traced out architecturally by means of travelling forms, images, ideas, texts, and people; and how cross-cultural approaches in architectural historiography can show us crossing not only geographical, but also disciplinary boundaries, and furthermore, the boundaries of the “Renaissance” as a paradigm.

In line with these questions, this session invites papers that present fresh insights into architectural encounters, contacts, interactions, and/or exchanges across geographies in various ways as case studies of the shift of boundaries in Renaissance historiography. It also encourages papers of theoretical discussion that look for alternative frameworks within which such encounters/contacts/interactions/exchanges can be interpreted.

SESSION CHAIR:

Sevil Enginsoy Ekinci, Faculty of Architecture, Middle East
Technical University
E: enginsoy@metu.edu.tr

COURT RESIDENCES IN EARLY MODERN EUROPE
(1400-1700). ARCHITECTURE, CEREMONY, AND
INTERNATIONAL RELATIONS

This session focuses on the architecture of the court residence in the period 1400-1700. It aims more specifically at examining the interaction between palace architecture and the “ceremonial” – the set of rules which regulates and codifies human interaction in this space. To the informed observer, a palace’s architecture carries multiple connotations, representing power, lineage, and tradition versus innovation. Patterns of court ceremonial are perceived by the palace’s owners, inhabitants, and visitors alike in many different ways and expressed in many different sources. The ceremonial influences the material form of the palace, from its *disposition* (spatial organization) to its decoration. Conversely, the palace’s architecture, its space and form, serves as a barometer for the major evolutionary steps of the court ceremonial, and thus of the structure and composition of the court in general. A particular issue is the growth of public versus private spaces, and the nature of privacy.

Furthermore, the palace was a prominent place of cultural exchange in early modern Europe. Due to the numerous, convoluted dynastic relationships between them, the world of the courts 1400-1700 constituted a network of international character on a truly European scale, long before the age of Versailles. These international relationships pervaded all aspects of court life; the architecture of the courts cannot be adequately understood without studying these exchanges and influences. Thus the scope of this session is deliberately pan-European. It similarly transcends the common boundaries of styles and stylistic periods, and encourages an international, comparative, transdisciplinary perspective.

This session invites papers that consider specific instances of court architecture as means of expression, representation, and communication with subjects, or outsiders, of court society. It particularly welcomes papers that focus on the international connections which give meaning to the palace’s architecture. Papers may deal with court residences from the realms of the dominant monarchies (Burgundy/Habsburg, Valois/Bourbon, Tudor/Stuart, etc.), but we are also looking for examples coming from other parts of Europe.

NB: The ESF International Research Networking Programme “PALATIUM. Court Residences as Places of Exchange in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe (1400-1700)” offers mobility grants for young researchers from abroad (non-Belgian) to participate in this session (see www.courtresidences.eu).

SESSION CHAIRS:

Konrad Ottenheim, Universiteit Utrecht, The Netherlands
E: k.a.ottenheim@uu.nl

Stephan Hoppe, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München,
Germany
E: email@stephan-hoppe.de

TRAVEL OF MEN AND MODELS: INTERPRETING, COLLECTING
AND ADAPTING FRENCH ART AND ARCHITECTURE IN
EUROPE DURING THE 17TH AND 18TH CENTURIES

With the French “grand siècle,” Paris became a centre of art and culture, and as such it attracted artists, agents and administrators from many European courts to study architecture and art, collect models and recruit artists. This movement is exemplified with the rebuilding of the royal palace in Stockholm from the 1690s and with Peter the Great’s Saint Petersburg in the beginning of the eighteenth century, where French artists were recruited and the architectural and artistic production and administration was structured according to French principles, but also adapted to Northern building traditions and environmental requirements. The art life at the courts of Prussia, Dresden and Spain, to mention some, experienced similar developments.

In this session we would like to gather active researchers working upon this topic, to map recent and ongoing studies and to collect examples of foreign architects, craftsmen and artists in Paris, and French artists working for foreign courts in Europe. The aim is to obtain a better comprehension of travel and mobility of men and architectural models during the early modern period, but also to gain new insight in how French models and patterns of building organization and administration were reinterpreted outside the French borders. Not only were the foreign artists and agents interested in the art market and the ongoing building sites (private and public), but also in the French administration surrounding the academies, the manufactures and the superintendency of royal building projects. This resulted in national interpretations of French building administration and art academies in other European countries. How do the examples of collecting and interpreting French art at European courts during the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries differ from each other? How were the French models adapted to various European traditions and climates? Of great interest are also European “agents” responsible to choose and buy models in Paris. We would like to discuss and compare detailed examples of how these agents worked: how they competed to obtain the best prices during sales of drawings and models, and how they created and used their personal network to recruit French architects and artists to the courts that they served.

SESSION CHAIRS:

Linnéa Rollenhagen Tilly, CDHTE, Paris
E: linneatilly@gmail.com

Linda Hinners, curator Nationalmuseum, Stockholm
E: LHS@nationalmuseum.se

Church architecture is the outcome of an encounter between different tensions: the self-representation of a community and its ecclesiology; the society's theological culture; the architectural culture of the patrons, the designers and the builders; the relationships between the figurative arts and the arts of celebration; and the relationship between the community and its institutional, economic, and landscape contexts.

In recent histories of church architecture, the history of forms and techniques has been increasingly accompanied by a focus on the history of liturgy and religiosity: the performance of the rites, with their functional and symbolic implications, is currently regarded as a decisive factor in modelling architectural space. "Liturgical space," with its history of celebration, has gained an interdisciplinary place in the reconstruction of the circumstances surrounding ecclesiastical architecture.

This session aims to draw up a balance of the relationships between the history of architecture and the history of western Christian liturgies (and of Catholic and Reformed liturgies in particular), with a diachronic and interdisciplinary approach. The session's focus will be the liturgical reforms seen as driving, or accelerating, "reforms" in architectural space. Obviously, the liturgical aspect does not resolve the interpretation of church architecture: contributors are asked to investigate the sources that can help gain an understanding of the actual role of rites and the liturgy in establishing the churches' architectural program, and the mutual interaction with other factors.

Scholars are invited to address such focal points as the liturgical reforms of the second millennium of Western Christianity: the Gregorian Reform (eleventh century), the Lutheran, Calvinist and Anglican Reforms in north-central Europe, the Catholic Reform (or Counter Reformation) in Mediterranean Europe, the Liturgical Movement in the Christian churches of the twentieth century, the Second Vatican Council, and the current "Reform of Reforms" proposed in certain quarters of the ecclesiastical world.

Contributors are asked to concentrate on analyzing specific sources relevant to the topic (such as ecclesiastical archives, technical archives, or correspondence), and on a wide-ranging comparison of the available historiography, where possible suggesting new interdisciplinary routes to achieving a wider understanding of church architecture as a complex cultural phenomenon.

SESSION CHAIRS:

Andrea Longhi, Politecnico di Torino, Department of
Housing and City
E: andrea.longhi@polito.it

Esteban Fernández Cobián, Universidad de La Coruña,
Departamento de Construcciones Arquitectónicas
E: efcobian@udc.es

The first EAHN International Meeting in Guimarães (2010) hosted a Roundtable session entitled "Setting a Research Agenda for Colonial Architecture and Urban Planning: Current and Emerging Themes and Tools." One of the key points to emerge from this session was the need to investigate further notions of agency and networking in relation to architectural production in European empires. It was acknowledged that the tendency of post-colonial theory had been to homogenise and/or essentialise the "coloniser," leaving little if any indication of the precise motivations, agendas, and allegiances (even nationalities) of those involved in the European colonial project. However, there were many different and oftentimes conflicting agencies bound up in the imperial enterprise, including missionaries, merchants, soldiers, administrators, educators, and explorers. Although these agencies had overlapping interests, they did not necessarily view empire or colonisation in the same way. This often led to conflict and division within the colonising power itself. A more complex and nuanced understanding of these agencies (and actors) vis-à-vis architecture is now required.

Among the more prominent if understudied of these agencies was Christianity in the guise of missionaries. Operating at what was considered to be the frontier of European civilisation, missionaries worked to transform the non-European world in very specific and identifiable ways. Architecture was nearly always instrumental in this process. Such men often relied upon local and extended ecclesiastical networks as conduits through which to exchange architectural knowledge. For example, the networks through which Anglican clergymen communicated ideas about architecture during the nineteenth century were global in extent, giving their buildings a remarkable degree of consistency wherever they were found. The transmission and maintenance of this knowledge then became crucial to how the colonial Church of England as an organisation signalled its purpose and intent.

This session seeks contributions dealing specifically with networking and its effects within colonial church and missionary organisations in European imperial contexts—i.e., how networking was fundamental to the spread and consolidation of particular architectural forms and spaces. Submissions from all periods and places in European missionary and colonial church history are invited. Applicants are asked to consider how global and missionary Christianity acted as a form of agency in its own right, thereby both complicating and stratifying our understanding of the "coloniser" and colonial society through built form.

SESSION CHAIR:

Alex Bremner, School of Arts, Culture and Environment,
University of Edinburgh
E: alex.bremner@ed.ac.uk

Scholarship on the representation of urban space has explored the ways in which visual images of cities project meaning onto the built environment. One aspect of this phenomenon is temporal. Indeed, images of unbuilt architectural projects and utopic urban plans may imply an orientation to future time, while exaggerated representations of historical landmarks look to the past. Other images purport to show the phases of development of a city and thus imply a progressive view of time. Still others may emphasize the relationship between the modern and the ancient and imply cyclical time. This session explores the wide range of temporal dynamics in urban representation. To that end, we invite papers that examine temporality in images of cities from the fifteenth to the nineteenth centuries. We will particularly favour papers that focus on the historiographical implications of visual representation: how is the image conveying, supporting, arguing for a particular historiographical position and in service of what interests? The urban representations may be in any medium, including but not limited to prints, paintings, and photographs; not excluding maps, iconic images, touristic guides, or popular ephemera. We hope to foster a comparative discussion about the myriad ways that the representation of time has been embedded in the visualization of the city.

SESSION CHAIRS:

Michael Schreffler, Department of Art History, Virginia Commonwealth University
E: mschreff@vcu.edu

Nancy Stieber, Art Department, University of Massachusetts
E: nancy.stieber@umb.edu

Although the study of architecture magazines and periodicals has sparked renewed scholarly interest during the last decades, the wide range of “training documents” published for educational purposes by institutions educating architects, civil and military engineers in Europe has never been subject to scrutiny.

In addition to royal and private academies in the eighteenth century and the wide adoption the Beaux-Arts school’s ateliers system in the nineteenth century, architecture was also taught in other institutions such as engineering schools, regional schools of architecture, schools for applied arts as well as other professional institutes. All of them prepared their students to design various types of projects according to the professions to which they designated themselves. Within this frame, a large range of manuscript and printed material among which school manuals, teaching handbooks, graphic models sheets, exercise handouts and three-dimensional models, was used to frame and to shape a common body of references to the various building trades.

While recent historiography reveals a multiplication of studies in the field of architecture publications, no study has ever been undertaken at large on this grey educational production which often remained uncatalogued in schools’ archives when not scattered away with the closure of the institutions. This lack of research can be partly explained by the short-lived nature of this material, either manuscript or modestly lithographed in the own schools’ print shops, which was often updated and reprinted according to changes in the educational programs. Nevertheless, the study of this mere “body of knowledge” and common references seems pivotal to us. Its recording and analysis will enable to envision the full realm of architectural training as a global and collective process associated with scholarly knowledge such as geometry, sciences of engineering or art history. It will also replace the training process at the heart of the act of architectural teaching and educating.

The purpose of this session is thus to share about the still marginal place of training publications produced in Europe (including the ones issued by small or local institutions). We invite papers that will discuss the state of research and the methodological challenges regarding this complex and manifold material such as: how to tackle the corpus of educational publications in order to create a “global listing of teaching material”? How to analyse these tools (drawings, scrapbooks, models) and methods (principles, examples, demonstrations...)? How architectural and technical design and invention were taught?

SESSION CHAIR:

Valérie Nègre, School of architecture Paris La-Villette
E: valerie-negre@wanadoo.fr

While architectural drawings have always been at the centre of attention of architectural historians, the role of textual documents produced in the construction of buildings and their interrelationships with drawings remains under-investigated. This may well be because drawings and accompanying construction documents are often preserved separately in the archives and because architectural history has tended to focus on design while questions of the building process are dealt with by construction history.

The development of drawings, specifications, building contracts, bills of quantities and other construction documents depends on local building practices and law and their histories differ across Europe, but these documents can be considered to share some common characteristics. They describe and define the building prior to its realization. They are, to varying extents, instructions to workmen but also serve as legal documents. They are not the sole preserve of the architectural profession, but are the product of complex co-operation, conflict and negotiation between a wide range of actors and institutions. As such they may formally act as limitations but also have a constitutive role in the production of architecture.

We think that historical research of legal and regulatory documents in architecture has implications beyond procurement and construction history. In this session we would like to bring together a range of researchers to open up a discussion about the different meanings and values these documents hold and how they might be interpreted, critiqued, or used in architectural history and theory. We are particularly interested in what kinds of histories are made available through their exploration and how these documents might offer openings for questions in architectural history and theory that might otherwise remain under-explored. These questions might include:

How has architecture been encoded in the building process, either in individual documents or through their interrelationships?; *How* might we read these documents not merely for themselves or for their technical contents, but as historical accounts of specific processes and relationships involved in the making of architecture?; *What* are the interrelationships between text and drawing, and is it possible to discern a developing notation system between them that is typical of architecture and building?; *What* functions have these texts and drawings served during the building process, is there any continuity in their development, and can we speak of a specific form of architectural discourse that might emerge from this kind of study?

SESSION CHAIRS:

Tilo Amhoff, University of Brighton, The Bartlett School of
Architecture
E: t.amhoff@ucl.ac.uk

Merlijn Hurx, Utrecht University, Department of History and
Art History
E: m.hurx@uu.nl

Since the 1930s, the middle class has played a central role in the expansion of mass consumption in most advanced societies. The increased access to consumer goods has affected many aspects of life and, as Pierre Bourdieu famously argued in *Distinction*, strategies of consumption have influenced the way social statuses are perceived, communicated and transmitted. These phenomena have also made an impact on how space and built form are considered and used.

Architecture can be viewed as a salient component of this process of social transformation, one based on the recognition, on the part of specific social groups, of the symbolic values assigned to material consumption. With its capacity to define the symbolic barriers that separate social classes, architecture has contributed to the shaping of many contemporary societal hierarchies: targeted by designers, contractors, real estate investors as well as by public policies, the middle class has built part of its cultural identity on precise models of life and aesthetic preferences.

This session intends to investigate how architecture, by proposing ways of living and lifestyles that came to be considered characteristically *bourgeois*, has contributed to a process of middle class self-identification. Papers are invited to examine the architectural models that, since the 1930s, were developed and advanced in an effort to address and shape the residential needs of the middle class. Among the questions the session wants to address are: how did designers, developers or real estate operators imagine the middle class and its internal articulation? Did specific buildings serve as reference points for the diffusion of peculiar solutions, related for example to spatial organization, technological equipment or use of materials? Did specific middle class groups develop forms of social identification with elements or practices related to architecture? And how were residential spaces transformed by the people who inhabited them?

The session's goal is to promote a debate on methodology applied to the architectural history of everyday life. We especially encourage the presentation of "stories of houses" -- namely, historical analyses that concentrate on selected buildings, images of "modern life" and the experiences of those involved in the creation of a middle class model of life.

SESSION CHAIRS:

Filippo De Pieri, Politecnico di Torino, Dipartimento di
Progettazione Architettonica e di Disegno Industriale
E: filippo.depieri@polito.it

Paolo Scrivano, Boston University, Department of History of
Art and Architecture
E: scrivano@bu.edu

Nothing might seem further removed than the world of high-tech engineering and the back-to-the-land movement of the 1960s. But it can be argued that just as the military applications which stimulated the development of light-weight transportable structures provided the inspiration for the domes and the inflatable structures used for pop festivals and the alternative communities of the 1960s and 1970s, the world of engineering was also stimulated by the ecological ideals and traditions of networking of the Counterculture.

Why did the ingenious structural solutions of the engineers – geodesic domes, zomes, inflatable structures – appeal to the young generation of the counterculture? Through campus lectures, magazine articles and other publications, the engineers seemed to offer new possibilities, free from the limitations and discipline of the International Style. The mesmerizing effect of engineer-inventor Buckminster Fuller's long lectures on many campuses inspired many hand-built geodesic domes. It was the students who invited the engineer-architect David Georges Emmerich (1925-1996) to teach at the Beaux Arts School of Architecture in Paris in 1965. Students experimented with pleated surfaces, stackable units and tensegrity structures. This research led to constructive systems using cheap, industrialised components, with wide scope for self-help housing as well as a broad range of architectural structures. Studying the structure of microorganisms seemed more stimulating than calculating reinforced concrete or steel trabeated systems, and architect and structural engineer Frei Otto demonstrated how to use these experiments in the design of tensile structures.

By contrast, the countercultural obsession with ecological principles had a delayed action impact on engineers and architects, stimulated by the 1973 oil crisis. And the countercultural habits of networking and collectivisation prepared the ground for the personal computer revolution and the connectivity of the World Wide Web.

Papers will be welcomed which uncover the paradoxical interaction between sophisticated structures and what the younger generation, influenced by the counterculture, explored in student work or built projects in the 1970s. Similarly, papers which trace the influence of the counterculture on engineering or computing applications will also be welcomed. The focus should mainly be on Europe and its relations with North America.

SESSION CHAIR:

Caroline Maniaque, Ecole Nationale Supérieure d'Architecture Paris-Malaquais
E: caroline.maniaque@wanadoo.fr

Regionalism has had an intense if unbalanced existence in architectural history. Eclectic, romantic, nationalist, historicist, critical, resistant – numerous titles have been used to position design practices that engage with local and regional elements, originated in both formal and informal custom. Among these categories, critical regionalism (CR) had widespread impact and, thirty years on, still influences architectural debate. Although critiqued and questioned, it has become an umbrella-term and a benchmark against which complex and diverse local practices are hastily asserted.

CR helped set the ground for a moralism of *good* and *bad*, *avant-garde* and *populist* use of regional features in design work – according to which *critical* is progressive, worthy of study and praise, while *uncritical* (eclectic, romantic, literal) is retrograde, and not equally relevant. This moral distinction and its insistence in binary oppositions bring about the ambivalent character of CR both as a “revisionary form of imperialist nostalgia” (Jacobs 1996), “often imposed from outside, from positions of authority” (Eggener 2002), and as a theory reverent towards attitudes of peripheral challenge to central hegemonic power.

Notions of *negotiation*, *interchange*, *assimilation*, *hybridity*, and *contamination* linking modernism and regionalism have recently been introduced to complement the established view of *antagonism* between the two. More and more investigations show evidence of *conciliation* and blur conventional readings of *opposition*. The aims and ambitions of regions and local communities, however, remain hidden in generally centralized accounts. How were these formulated, and transferred to building practice? How were the cultural frames of metropolitan practitioners projected onto peripheral contexts? To what extent were local actors permeable to central agents?

We welcome papers that bring about discussion on the multiple facets of regionalism in Europe, and extend its boundaries. Regionalism studied in local sources or seen from the local standpoint, as well as constructed and issued from the centre. Regionalism observed in objects of the everyday built by locals, as much as in acknowledged works by central designers and agencies. Regionalism incorporating pastiche and nostalgia, familiar imagery and popular self-interpretation, discussed at the same level as cosmopolitan regionalism employing abstraction and exclusive references. Regionalism explored in its shades of grey, beyond the conventional black-and-white reading it has generally had from architectural history.

SESSION CHAIRS:

Ricardo Agarez, The Bartlett School of Architecture, UCL
E: ricardo.agarez@gmail.com

Nelson Mota, Delft University of Technology/ University of Coimbra
E: n.j.a.mota@tudelft.nl

The session builds on the one held at the first EAHN conference 2010, and aims to address the multifarious relations between architecture and the vast subject of the Western European welfare state, which by now is generally considered a historical phenomenon.

While the welfare state involved a wide array of social policies and programmes, including health care, unemployment benefits and old age pensions, at its heart were initiatives – from new towns to hospitals and from schools to housing – that required new architectural solutions. This placed the architect on the front line of the welfare state project. Initially, architects received wide-scale praise for their innovative work but, when political consensus over the welfare state came under strain or collapsed – as notably during the crisis of the 1970s – architects and the work they produced came under sustained attack. Today, as we look back to the historical phenomenon of the welfare state, we can start to re-assess both how architects positioned themselves within the politics of building production and, crucially, the nature and characteristics of the work that they produced.

To understand the production of the period roughly demarcated by the years 1945-1985, we would like to investigate the positions, roles and agencies that architects have articulated vis-à-vis the welfare state. The Western European welfare state adopted large parts of the aesthetic agendas of the pre-war avant-gardes, and acted as a generous patron to modern architects and artists alike. Yet, at the same time, the welfare state system was under consistent attack, sometimes literally through terrorism or the street riots of 1968, sometimes more playfully in the case of so-called happenings and Dutch Provo. Main criticism as also vented by architects, concerned so-called “repressive tolerance” pointing to totalitarian aspects of the welfare state systems and their bureaucracies in particular.

We would like to bring together presentations that re-investigate the specific positions of architects as envisaged and allowed for by the welfare state project and vice versa. We want to address questions such as: What positions were given to architects in the post-WWII period and what critical roles did avant-garde architects claim for themselves? What was the real span of their agency? How did architects deal with the tension between the oppressive aspects of the welfare state project on the one hand and its emancipatory ambitions on the other? And most important of all, what productive moments, roles and projects emerged from this?

SESSION CHAIRS:

Tom Avermaete
E: t.l.p.avermaete@tudelft.nl

Dirk van den Heuvel
E: d.vandenheuvel@tudelft.nl

Mark Swenarton
E: m.swenarton@liverpool.ac.uk

Who is the global architect? Is he or she a single, dominant designer or a multi-layered collaboration between teams and partners? Is the archistar phenomenon the effect of a new professional practice, or just a fashionable attempt to regain glamour for a design world whose boundaries are more and more blurred by the current flows of multi-media propositions that underpin building politics and that architecture is asked to reproduce? The position of the session's proponents is to challenge the claims of the “master” designer as sole creator, branding his/her own name as a precocious achievement of modernist culture. The session proposes a redefinition of the position of the designer within his/her professional environment and a better understanding of how collaborative design has worked in the past. The focus is on the web of relationships that constitute the work of architecture and planning.

How do architects work with their partners, associates and studio assistants? How do ideas pass around the studio, between the word and the pencil? In many cases, we have no way of tracking the flow of ideas between collaborators, but occasionally history has left us with clues to this process, in the form of plentiful drawings and documentary or verbal accounts. The session encourages examples from different geographical areas, based on solid evidence coming from documentation that assesses roles, gender frames, family or group exchanges on a transnational dimension. Examples may include models of equal or unequal partnership; teamwork related to specific professional occasions such as competitions; spousal teams; renewed practices after interruptions. Cases where architects' collaborators changed, and the effect this may have had on the practice would be particularly insightful. Also welcomed are papers that redefine how partnership modified professional practice with the invention of shared attitudes, new modes of expression and a different representation of roles. There is an interesting strand of master/assistant typologies in collaboration, some related to the genetic process (for example, hand/idea, rough sketch/measured drawing, plan/perspective), some determined by skills and specialization in different fields, some more in the world of construction such as client/builder/craftsman. More than to determine an inventory of practices, the session seeks to give an account of the diversity of professional practice in twentieth-century architecture and planning and to bring to light those individuals that have remained very much overshadowed by the course of their own history and the narrative of architectural historians.

SESSION CHAIRS:

Tim Benton, the Open University, Walton Hall
E: t.j.benton@open.ac.uk

Maristella Casciato, School of Architecture “Aldo Rossi”,
University of Bologna
E: maristella.casciato@unibo.it

NEW IDEAS, NEW MODELS?

ARCHITECTURAL REPRESENTATION AND ITS OBJECTS IN THE TWENTIETH CENTURY

The architectural model represents a particular mode of reflection. Oscillating between the abstract and the concrete, the model is a working tool for conceiving, developing, and communicating form and space, as well as an exhibition object in its own right. Representing a tradition as real and influential as built architecture, the history of the architectural model spans from prophesy to documentation; invoking the possible, the unachievable, the typical, the utopian, the rejected, the permanent and the past.

Recently, models have attracted much attention in the context of twenty-first-century design approaches that rely on computer technologies as well as in research on Renaissance and nineteenth-century themes. Our question is: what happened to models in the twentieth century? Did they change character during the period identified with modernism and its legacy, when plaster signified a return to the past and the computer had not fully emerged as a design medium?

We welcome papers that look at models in the context of the design process or the subsequent representation, explanation or exhibition of new architectural designs and ideas in this period. Models were used to introduce new ideas to the public throughout the century: earlier, at MoMA's "Modern Architecture – International Style" exhibition and later in the 1981 "Idea as Model" produced by New York's IAUS. Were their uses of the model new or derivative of earlier practices? At a time when structure and materials were viewed as generators of architectural form, did architects adapt the engineer's empirical approach to the model as a design tool? What role did models play in the identification of space and transparency as a constituent element of architecture? Did they address changing social practices? Other topics to consider are the materiality of models, particular architects' changing use of models; or the role of models in the conceptualization of architecture. We are interested in papers that address the issue thematically or with case studies.

SESSION CHAIRS:

Mari Lending, The Oslo School of Architecture and Design
E: mari.lending@aho.no

Wallis Miller, College of Design, Pence Hall, University of Kentucky
E: wmiller@uky.edu

THE WAY BACK TO AN ALTERED HOMELAND:

REMIGRATION AND REEMPLOYMENT OF ARCHITECTS IN EUROPE, 1935-1970

Twentieth-century Europe was marked by (forced) migrations, ranging from the expulsion of minorities during World War I to the ethnic cleansing during the Yugoslav Wars. The emigration of architects has become a major research area in art history in the last decades where the focus has been laid on the dictatorships of the 1930s and 1940s particularly on Germany, Austria and the USSR due to National Socialism and Stalinism.

In contrast, the topic of remigration and reemployment of expelled or emigrated architects has rarely been examined for the period 1935-1970. Even though only a small number of the emigrated architects had managed to build up successful new careers in their exiles, the number of re-emigrants was few. While some, regarded as foreign planners, had been forced to return from the Stalinist USSR in the mid-1930s (e.g. Gustav Hassenpflug, Hannes Meyer, Mart Stam) others returned willingly to their native countries like the German-speaking architects after 1945 to the FRG (e.g. Ernst May), the GDR (e.g. Richard Paulick) or Austria (e.g. Clemens Holzmeister).

The session aims to investigate this phenomenon on a European scale; papers are invited covering remigrations during the period 1935-1970. In addition to the examples given, papers may also refer to the situation in (post-) fascist Italy and Spain, in the countries liberated from Nazi-occupation, in the socialist states of Eastern Europe after 1945 or in France and Italy after losing their colonies in the 1950s and 60s. Furthermore papers investigating the reemployment of architects who stayed in their new homelands but were again entrusted with projects in their native countries (e.g. Walter Gropius, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe) are also welcome.

Topics may include, but are not limited to the following questions: Which circumstances and premises bring/force/prevent an émigré/expatriate architect to return to or build in his native country? Which former contacts are re-established, which strategies are pursued to build up a new career? How does the architectural work alter after remigration? Which preconditions exist in different countries for the reintegration or reemployment of architects? Do cultural policies take re-emigrants into consideration? How do their colleagues react to their return?

SESSION CHAIRS:

Andreas Zeese, Department for Art History, TU Vienna
E: andreas.zeese@tuwien.ac.at

Georg Geml, Department for Art History, TU Vienna
E: georg.geml@tuwien.ac.at

Since the end of the nineteenth century the baroque has undergone a series of critical and historical re-evaluations in view of its chronology, actors, and characteristics. Each successive moment of appraisal has clarified not only the content indicated by the term baroque but also the tools and objectives of the historians who address the problems it poses in any given moment. Papers in this session will address the study of baroque architecture from the 1940s to the 1970s with a view towards understanding its instrumentalization within the context of postwar modernism and postmodernism.

Scholarship on the history of architectural historiography has demonstrated that history assumed a new importance to the work and thinking of architects in these decades. Art historians able to distil architectural history into lessons, overt and subtle, found a willing readership among practicing architects. The figure of the architect-historian also emerged as a force at this time: committed to the academic study of architectural history but with an audience of practicing architects and students very clearly in mind. The “operative histories” famously attacked by Manfredo Tafuri had allowed for the reinstatement of history as part of the mainstream concerns of modernism. The instrumental historian returned to the architectural discourse of these decades a sense of historical debt, but shaping history as he or she did so. Among the vehicles for working through the complexities of such themes as space, form, context, type, materiality, historicity, perception, significance, and (urban) scale, the architectural baroque proved useful.

Consider Norberg-Schulz’s studies of urban scale and type in *Baroque Architecture*; Wittkower’s and Zevi’s influential portrayals of Borromini as the model (modern) architect; the importance of the baroque for Giedion’s conception of the history of architecture as the history of space (extending Wölfflin’s and Schmarsow’s premises); or Dorfles’s or Scharoun’s comparative readings of the baroque against modern expressionism. How does Portoghesi’s *Roma barocca* (1966) contribute to modern (indeed, postmodern) architecture as it adds to the library on baroque architecture? Papers will explore instances in which the mechanisms, premises and consequences of postwar historiography of the baroque have sustained a translation from historiography to architecture that has proven productive for the thinking and practice of architects.

SESSION CHAIR:

Andrew Leach, Griffith University, Australia
E: a.leach@griffith.edu.au

The focus of this panel is the planning history of holiday resorts in Socialist countries and their physical and economic transformations after the fall of the Iron Curtain. After World War II, mass tourism started to be perceived as a driving force for the economic development of landscapes that had been marginalized before not only in Western but also in Eastern Europe. Segregation of urban space into zones for production and reproduction was expanded to a much larger scale: in Socialist countries too, spaces of leisure were planned and built at the peripheries of cities, on the mountains and at seashores, e.g. at the shores of the Bulgarian, Rumanian and then-USSR Black Sea or at the shores of the Mediterranean Sea of the then-non-aligned Yugoslavia. Socialist countries, however, needed more serious ideological argumentation than their Western counterparts before starting their effort: therefore they first introduced a so-called “social tourism”, subsidized holidays in cheap and therefore simple accommodations, built and run by workers’ unions, youth organisations, the army, and big companies for their own employees. Although first facilities were already developed in the 1930s in fascist Italy (*Dopolavoro*) and Germany (*Kraft durch Freude*), during the Popular Front government in France, in Great Britain (Billy Butlin’s Holiday Camps), in Sweden and in communist USSR, their success was limited due to the overall economic crisis and the beginning war. The most important preconditions for mass tourism, growth of economy and paid holidays for workers were only realized after World War II. The liberation after Stalin’s death enabled several Socialist countries to heavily invest in the design and construction of tourist resorts – and many of those were opened to foreign tourists as well.

Papers therefore should emphasize the planning history of Socialist holiday resorts on all scales, from traffic infrastructure (hubs, harbours, stations, airports), to spatial, urban and landscape design, to building typologies and interiors. Papers might also deal with the ideological arguments and the shift from collective experience to individual hedonistic encounters. Papers may also emphasize the process of post-Socialist transformation of their physical status (abandonment, restoration, refurbishment, or rebuilding) and their economic status (private, semi-private, public) including problems such as restitution of land expropriated during communist revolutions, unclear building regulations and corruption, as well as their adaption to the demands of a much more differentiated tourism and a very powerful real estate market.

SESSION CHAIR:

Michael Zinganel
E: zinganel@mur.at

“DEVELOPMENT” FROM THE PERIPHERY.

ARCHITECTURAL KNOWLEDGE EXCHANGE BEYOND US/ SOVIET BIPOLARITY, 1950S-1980S

This session aims to put into question the concept of “development” by focusing on the post-WWII exchanges of architectural knowledge between the “peripheries” struggling for alternative scenarios of modernization rather than subscribing to one model promoted by the centres: the United States or the Soviet Union. Even if this period cannot be understood without accounting for the Cold War polarities, this session challenges the reduction of postwar architecture and planning practices to the US or Soviet political domination and postulates a more differentiated view on alliances among professionals from modernizing countries away from central hubs.

Focused on post-colonial modernization and nation-building processes, this session will review global knowledge exchange from the 1950s to the 1980s in order to unpack and expand the concept of “development.” With possible case studies including Yugoslav architects working in Nigeria, Israeli architects delivering projects in Iran and Tanzania, or Polish planners designing cities in Iraq, this session will address networks of professional knowledge transfer in order to offer a differentiated view on the agency of experts serving their countries as much as their own professional and personal goals.

How and on what institutional bases have professional networks been set? How did they mediate local nuances of geopolitical contexts within the postwar global division of architectural labour and the flows of “development aid”? What were the interactions between such networks and governmental organizations, educational systems, and local communities? How did competition and cooperation between professionals affect the production of new architectural knowledge? In what ways did global knowledge transfer influence and challenge architecture practices and discourses of post-WWII modernisms?

The focus on global knowledge exchange draws attention to the role of architecture and architects in world affairs: while this session challenges the historically entrenched vision of architecture knowledge flow from “developed” to “developing” countries, it also affirms a very contemporary call for contextual cosmopolitanism and rooted universalism.

SESSION CHAIRS:

Rachel Kallus, Technion, Israel Institute of Technology
E: arkalus@tx.technion.ac.il

Łukasz Stanek, Institute of History and Theory of Architecture,
Swiss Federal Institute of Technology
E: ls@henrilefebvre.org

POSTMODERNISM - THEORY AND HISTORY

Postmodernism has been extensively theorized, minimally historicized. The architectural trend, or more broadly, the cultural phenomenon, has been around now for some thirty years, and now has enough historical distance to warrant a retrospective analysis, especially one international in scope.

We invite papers on either or both the theory and practice of postmodernism in architecture, their interaction or the lack thereof, and the long-term impact of each on architectural discourse. Was postmodernism as it emerged in architecture but a brief historical interlude, titillating at the time, but without much lasting import? To what extent was practice, in the hands of Hans Hollein, Charles Moore, Robert Stern, James Stirling and others supported by or engaged in theory? What role did literary critics and cultural theorists – Martin Heidegger, Walter Benjamin, Henri Lefebvre, Noam Chomsky, Colin Rowe, Jacques Derrida, Fredric Jameson – play in practice and more broadly in architectural discourse, collectively or individually? Was the pursuit of postmodern theory largely an academic endeavour independent of design practice, as Otero-Pailos has suggested? As a formal trend, postmodernism appears passé; as a body of thought, less so. What is the legacy, both of the theory and of postmodernist practice, did either exert a substantial, sustained influence on architectural thinking?

We are looking for papers addressing either or both, or (as Otero-Pailos might put it), a more theorized history or historicized theory, but in any case, a better understanding of the two and their relationship. Proposals focusing on national differences would be welcomed – Postmodernism as it emerged in Italy, for example, which was decidedly different from that of the United States. Or regional differences: why were some areas more interested in the theoretical discourse, others in the architecture? Papers might address the work either theoretical or built, of a single individual (e.g. Aldo Rossi, Philip Johnson, James Stirling, Charles Moore); a particular building or project (Hollein's Austrian Travel Bureau; Piazza d'Italia); a particular theorist, essayist, or critic (Bachelard, Baudrillard, Tafuri and the Venice School, K. Michael Hays), a body of thought (phenomenology); a specific aspect (critical regionalism) or a specific historian (Frampton, Jencks).

SESSION CHAIR:

Meredith L. Clausen, University of Washington
E: mlc@u.washington.edu

Roundtable Proposals

NEITHER “MODERNISM” NOR “AVANT-GARDE”:
A ROUNDTABLE DISCUSSION IN HONOUR OF THE
NINETIETH BIRTHDAY OF ALAN COLQUHOUN

In his introduction to *Modern Architecture*, Alan Colquhoun summarizes a paradox of the Modern Movement: it is characterized by resistance to industrial capitalism and nostalgia for a pre-industrial community and by a simultaneous belief that the architect as “seer” can predict and create the forms of an industrial age, an “architecture conscious of its own modernity.” Colquhoun notes Peter Bürger’s distinction between an “avant-garde” (which sought to change the status of art within bourgeois capitalism) and “modernism” (which attempted to change art’s forms), but he finds the boundary between them difficult to draw in architecture, for Europe’s most polemically avant-garde architects combined utopia and aestheticism. That “modernism” and “avant-garde” can be used interchangeably in architecture suggests a disciplinary opening for architectural history.

This roundtable invites participants to explore the space between “avant-garde” and “modernism” as interpretive categories, and asks if these terms, as canonically defined in architecture, have continued relevance to the discipline. Participants may explore a range of questions raised by Colquhoun’s analysis, engage the dialectic of the European avant-garde as defined by Manfredo Tafuri, Francesco dal Co and others, or reflect on the applications of ideology critique to a geographically expanded field. Given the diverse conditions of the production of “modernism” globally, does the concept of the “avant-garde” have application outside Western Europe? What does the binary of traditional/modern mean in colonial contexts where nostalgia for tradition may refer to indigenous and/or metropolitan culture? Why does the discipline find it impossible to give up the myth of the master architect who intuits the architecture of his time, revealing a near “Oedipal relation” (in Benjamin Buchloh’s words) with “the parental avant-garde” and the pioneers of modern design? What terms have been most productive in expanding the geographic, discursive, and disciplinary frameworks of recent modern architectural history?

ROUNDTABLE CHAIRS:

Patricia Morton, History of Art Department, University of California

E: patricia.morton@ucr.edu

Can Bilsel, Department of Art, Architecture + Art History, University of San Diego

E: cbilsel@sandiego.edu

Analysis of the intersection between architecture and politics is central to the interdisciplinary project of current architectural history. Yet the ways in which we define the "political" and the aspects of politics with which we engage vary widely. For some, especially historians of modern architecture, a political analysis means the dissection of discourses of knowledge/power, or the spectacle, as instantiated in buildings, and architectural or urbanistic culture more generally. Others investigate the ways postcolonial theory might illuminate not only the emergence of "hybrid" architectures, but those same architectures' (paradoxical) alignment in the service of the hard polarities of party politics, too. Studies of earlier periods have considered architecture's mobilization in the service of the state, the city, and other claimants to authority, and have examined the ways in which the "jurisdiction", that form of property which is at once a territory and a power, or a privilege, was affirmed and secured through architectural means. Others engage with politics as an arena of conflict between ideologies (or less coherent bundles of ideas and aims) within which architecture and its destruction are used as tools or weapons; or with the fine grain of legislation around property ownership, planning and infrastructure in which the state and the built environment are inseparably implicated. The importance of specificity and care in the delineation of the particular geopolitical conditions is widely accepted, but less attention is perhaps paid to the fluidity of these conditions and their internal contestation.

Close attention to what, exactly, we are doing when we engage with architecture in political context, or with a politics of architecture, can reinvigorate the discussion. We invite abstracts for a roundtable consisting of brief (circa ten-minute) position papers presenting a methodological approach to the analysis of architecture, design, landscapes or cityscapes in political context, illustrated by one or two examples. (Paired papers will each be followed by open discussion, with the chairs providing a summary analysis at the end of the session.) Because the aim is to enable fruitful dialogues, papers originating in work on any period, ancient to modern, and any part of the world are welcomed.

ROUNDTABLE CHAIRS:

Leslie Topp, Department of History of Art & Screen Media,
Birkbeck College, University of London
E: l.topp@bbk.ac.uk

Christine Stevenson, Courtauld Institute of Art, University of
London
E: christine.stevenson@courtauld.ac.uk.

The present roundtable seeks to reflect upon the collection and selection of architectural historical records and their impact on the writing of architectural history.

With *Die Methode der Kunstgeschichte* (1913), Hans Tietze made an impressive status quaestionis of the emerging art and architectural historical method in his time. Art history, and largely parallel with it, architectural history, were only beginning to assert themselves as scientific disciplines in their own right and were starting a development that as yet awaits completion. Tietze distinguished between "direct" sources (the building itself) and "indirect" sources (recordings of architectural artefacts or processes). Intentionality was a central concept in his classification of the latter: was the source at its inception meant as a conscious record of architecture, or is it rather "accidentally" informative for the later architectural historian? Starting from this classification, architectural historians' (hidden) agendas can be culled from their preference for one or the other type of source. The variety of architectural historical writings can thus be more precisely qualified according to the approach to source material.

Recently, architectural history's essential multidisciplinary nature has been reasserted (e.g. Stieber, *JSAH* 64:4 (2005)), referring to the wide range of disciplines and sources from which architectural historians derive their methods and information. Gender perspectives or a focus on the history of dwelling, for instance, move away from the "intentional sources" engendered by architects or policy makers, to learn from more unintentional sources (interviews with "users"/ dwellers, women's magazines etc.). How do architectural histories deriving from architectural-internal sources such as architects' (auto)biographies and treatises, differ from such histories based on extra-architectural data? How can the status of evidence shift over time and move from being interpreted as "indirect" to "direct" or vice versa? And, related to this, how does the relation between sources and histories influence archival collection policies and vice versa?

ROUNDTABLE CHAIRS:

Sofie De Caigny, Centrum Vlaamse Architectuurarchieven
Ellen Van Impe, Centrum Vlaamse Architectuurarchieven
E: cvaa@vai.be

FUSION ARCHITECTURE FROM THE MIDDLE AGES TO THE
PRESENT DAY: INCORPORATION, CONFRONTATION OR
INTEGRATION?

Most histories of architecture tend to portray neatly-defined, self-contained examples of buildings from different eras. The built reality is, however, often very different. This is not only true of fittings and furnishings from later periods (i.e. a Gothic church equipped with Baroque altars) but also of the incorporation of almost whole, pre-existing buildings which are (re)framed and re-interpreted as a consequence. Renaissance Italy provides a number of examples, like the new outer shells added by Alberti and Palladio to some medieval buildings, not least Vasari's Uffizi in Florence which integrated both the medieval Zecca and a Romanesque church to create a new visual, spatial and architectural concept; or the Capitol in Rome which swallowed its medieval and ancient predecessors. Nonetheless, this phenomenon is not limited to any single period. Indeed, it continued well into the nineteenth and twentieth centuries and even continues today – one need only think of the Smithsons' Upper Lawn Pavillion at Fonthill or, more recently, Nieto Sobejano's bold creation, in the German town of Halle, of a new art gallery from the bishop's medieval palace.

This roundtable session addresses issues of architectural incorporation and metamorphosis from the Middle Ages to the present day. Its focus lies not on the pragmatic appropriation of pre-existing structures, but on their purposeful integration as part of intentionally planned new wholes. Why embed an existing building in a new structure? What formal, visual and spatial solutions are found? Do we go too far if we think of this action as actually venerating a pre-existing building? To what extent was the previous structure preserved, controlled or regulated? We welcome contributions (of about ten minutes) that explore examples of architectural fusion and use these as keys to a broader theoretical and/or systematic perspective on the phenomenon.

Our aim will also be to critically reflect upon a phenomenon which has received considerable interest in postmodernist practise and discourse, but which has barely been systematically or theoretically discussed since.

ROUNDTABLE CHAIRS:

Brigitte Sölch, Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florenz –
Max-Planck-Institut
E: soelch@khi.fi.it

Erik Wegerhoff, Lehrstuhl für Theorie und Geschichte
von Architektur, Kunst und Design, TU München
E: wegerhoff@tum.de