call for papers
Abstracts are invited for the sessions and round tables listed below between April 15 and September 30, 2013. Abstracts of no more than 300 words should be submitted through the Conference website, along with applicant’s name, professional affiliation, title of paper or position, a short curriculum vitae, home and work addresses, e-mail addresses and telephone 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 six to eight 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 24 thematic sessions and 3 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, 2013. 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, 2014. 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, 2014. 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, 2014. 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 Turin, Italy.

The complete Call for Papers and Discussion Positions can be downloaded from the meeting website: www.eahn2014.polito.it and from the EAHN website: www.eahn.org
AFTERLIFE OF BYZANTINE ARCHITECTURE IN THE NINETEENTH AND TWENTIETH CENTURY

The nineteenth and twentieth centuries witnessed a continuous, controversial and unexpectedly complex revival of Byzantine architecture. This process left its mark in Europe, USA and beyond, where a significant number of buildings associated with the Byzantine style altered the appearance of many urban landscapes, including Sainte-Marie-Majeure in Marseilles (1852-93), San Spiridione in Trieste (1858-69), Westminster Cathedral in London (1893-1903), Notre Dame d’Afrique in Algiers (1858-72), the National Shrine in Washington (1919-61), the Cathedral of Christ the Saviour in Moscow (1883, 2000), Saint-Espirit in Paris (1828-35) and the Australian War Memorial in Canberra (1927-41). Yet there is no clear overview of this rich tradition of neo-Byzantine architecture, which remains marginal and largely incomprehensible due to rigid national or regional patterns of interpretation, scholarly disinterest and historiographical reluctance.

This session considers the discrepancy between the plenitude, diversity and importance of re-imagined and re-used Byzantine architecture and its persistently peripheral status in historiography. This paradox is especially apparent in the context of Byzantine and neo-Byzantine architecture, frequently perceived as both a model for, and a precursor of, architectural modernism. A link between Byzantine and modern architecture, based on the ideas of structural rationalism, tectonics, truthfulness and anti-naturalism, as represented in neo-Byzantine architecture and elaborated by various historians and theoreticians — from John Ruskin and Henri Labrouste to Henry-Russell Hitchcock and Philip Johnson, Roger Fry and Clement Greenberg — seems to be, however, only part of an unexplored kaleidoscopic picture. The question of the origins, importance and roles of architecture associated with the Byzantine style in different contexts throughout the nineteenth and twentieth century remains obscure and elusive. Nevertheless, this architectural tradition has been developed under different social, ideological and political circumstances associated with concepts as diverse as nationalism and modern imperialism; clericalism and religious messianism; authoritarianism, monarchism and conservatism; spiritual regeneration and the re-interpretation of classical antiquity.

This session invites participants to investigate the complex and still largely unacknowledged architectural and ideological legacy of neo-Byzantine architecture, which has appeared across the globe in a dizzying array of building types: from Roman Catholic cathedrals to Protestant churches; from congregational temples for the Eastern Orthodox Christians to Synagogues; from war memorials to exhibition pavilions and other secular buildings.

SESSION CHAIR
Aleksandar Ignjatovic, Faculty of Architecture, University of Belgrade

The complete Call for Papers and Discussion Positions can be downloaded from the meeting website: www.eahn2014.polito.it and from the EAHN website: www.eahn.org
IN-BETWEEN AVANT-GARDE DISCOURSE AND DAILY BUILDING PRACTICES: THE DEVELOPMENT OF THE SHOPPING CENTRE IN POST-WAR EUROPE

This session will focus on a new urban figure that emerged in western Europe in the post-war period: the shopping centre. Following the apparent demise of pre-war modernism, post-war architectural culture was concerned that people’s sense of responsibility to their local communities was eroding and expected architecture and urban design – by allowing people to identify with their immediate locale – to help buttress people’s sense of belonging. The notion of a ‘core’ that could engender community interaction therefore became an important theme in the avant-garde discourse on modern architecture and urbanism, and found a fertile breeding ground in the (often) highbrow building programmes of the western European welfare states. These building programmes not only targeted housing, health care and education, but also gave rise to the development of community infrastructure, which was to cater to all strata of the population equally: leisure parks, community centres, school buildings, cultural centres, and so on.

Parallel to these novel community-oriented infrastructures, another new (commercially inspired) spatial figure became popular in western Europe: the shopping centre. A fully-fledged architectural expression of the new logics of mass distribution and mass consumption, the post-war shopping centre gradually settled on the European territory. Even though it was most commonly developed by private bodies, from a social point of view it had much in common with the newly constructed welfare state centres, offering spatial centrality, public focus and human density.

For this session, we invite papers that explore this parallel between government-funded community infrastructure and privately developed shopping centres in post-war Europe. We want to discuss whether the multiple parallels between community infrastructure and shopping mall were a mere coincidence or, in fact, the result of the strong influence of contemporary avant-garde discourse about architecture and urbanism on daily building practice.

SESSION CHAIRS
Tom Avermaete, Department of Architecture, Delft University of Technology
Janina Gosseye, School of Architecture, University of Queensland

The complete Call for Papers and Discussion Positions can be downloaded from the meeting website: www.eahn2014.polito.it and from the EAHN website: www.eahn.org
BUILDING BY THE BOOK? THEORY AS PRACTICE IN RENAISSANCE ARCHITECTURE

The rise of theory is one of the distinguishing traits of Renaissance architecture. Taking different formats – manuscript and printed, and ranging in genre from the instruction manual addressing the specific needs of the practitioner to the learned dissertation feeding the interests of the intellectual elite – architectural treatises flourished across fifteen- and sixteenth-century Europe, becoming the primary means for the dissemination of architectural knowledge past and present. Furthermore, Renaissance treatises shaped generations of professionals, informed the choices of their patrons, defined the contours of the profession and established models for the organization of field-specific information.

Renaissance theoreticians were also practitioners. Their understanding of the classical past was based as much on the reading of ancient texts as it was on the excavation and surveying of the physical remains of Antiquity. Antiquity itself was both the object of their humanistic curiosities and a repository of ideas and models for their design practices. And writings provided broad historical narratives on architecture, its origins and its developments as well as recipes, technical solutions, and practical prescriptions. This integrated approach, bringing together theory and practice, was the very basis of the success of Renaissance architectural treatises and their impact the cultural and built environment. Yet, scholarship typically analyses Renaissance theory of architecture as a field of its own, independent from practice. Such separation prevents, rather than promotes, our understanding of how architectural knowledge was produced, disseminated and received in the Renaissance.

This session seeks to bridge the current epistemological divide by focusing on the connections between the theory and the practice of architecture in fifteenth- and sixteenth-century Europe. It welcomes papers dealing with the variety of ways in which the practice and theory of architecture informed each other; with the ways in which theoretical texts were conceived, produced, and illustrated to facilitate comprehension; and how architects and humanists read, understood, or misunderstood theoretical texts. A case-study approach is preferred.

SESSION CHAIRS
Francesco Benelli, Department of Art History and Archaeology, Columbia University
Sara Galletti, Art, Art History & Visual Studies, Duke University

The complete Call for Papers and Discussion Positions can be downloaded from the meeting website: www.eahn2014.polito.it and from the EAHN website: www.eahn.org
THE HISTORIOGRAPHY OF THE PRESENT

In her concluding comments on the Second International Meeting of the EAHN in Brussels, Mary McLeod noted a tendency among more recently minted scholars and PhD students to be preoccupied (and perhaps problematically so) with the recent past. Evidenced either as the historiography or critical appraisal of the architecture since the 1970s or as the study of architectural history’s earlier moments and trajectories through attention to their historians, this work actively addresses the patrimony of the present. It further looks to the task of understanding those moments in the recent past in which the form and structures of contemporary architectural thought, practice, education and criticism were introduced or confirmed. What do the tools and disciplinary perspectives of the architectural historian offer this problem? Is this a proper subject for architectural history scholarship? Can we reverse the implications habitually drawn from Tafuri’s maxim ‘non c’è critica, solo storia’ to argue that subjects of criticism can, indeed, be subjects of history? That the passage of time is not the only means by which to foster critical distance? When does it stop being too soon to start writing architectural history?

This session invites speakers to reflect on the broader issues at stake in this pull to the present: to historicize this development, to contextualize it institutionally and intellectually. What is at stake in the perceived growth of attention to the recent past? What is the nature of this work? What objectives underpin its momentum? Does it speak to the history and fates of architectural theory among the architectural humanities? Or the role of cultural studies in positioning architectural matters in hitherto unconsidered territories? And what are the implications of attending to the present and the recent past rather than other historical moments? Is there an impact upon resources, students and opportunities that can reshape architectural history and undermine traditionally strong fields of historical study (antiquities of various stripes, the medieval epoch, and so forth)? How does it affect architectural history’s geography, or the parallel pull to consider the global?

Papers in this session will address these broad-ranging questions through focused reflections on the current shape of architectural history as a field of study. Contributions may offer cross sections through a series of cases, through treatment of a defined moment (such as postmodernism, or deconstructivism) or present examples symptomatic of broader problems or positions within the questions sketched out here. Papers will ultimately contribute to the broader historiography of ideas in architectural culture, and contributions may also reflect on the role and valency of this disciplinary agenda on architectural history writ large.

SESSION CHAIR
Andrew Leach, School of Environment, Griffith University
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IMPORTANT DATES
April 15 - September 30, 2013: submission of abstract
October 31, 2013: notification of acceptance
March 15, 2014: submission of full papers
June 19 - 21, 2014: 3rd EAHN International Conference in Turin
Contemporary environmental strategies in architecture are usually framed as responses to recent concerns with ozone depletion, global warming, or energy shortages. But environmental concerns have a much more complex relationship with the history and politics of modern architecture and urbanism. This session enlarges the historical and theoretical context of environmental awareness, debate and praxis in architecture, with the aim to historicize sustainability and enlarge the historical perspective on current debates – and as such it can be perceived as an extension of the SAH 2010 session Counter Histories of Sustainability (also chaired by P. Pyla). The session invites papers that investigate the relationship between environmental concerns and architectural culture in the mid-twentieth century, before the popularization of environmentalism in the 1970s. The topic of this session does not pertain to concepts of Nature or biological analogies that influenced architecture through time, but rather it focuses specifically on post-World War II strategies that emphasized the prevention of environmental destruction on a local, regional or global level. Some such practical or theoretical strategies in architecture focused on low technologies of building and appropriations of particular knowledge systems, materials and techniques. Others forged partnerships with industrial production and advanced technologies. Others still put their emphasis on large-scale managerial control of natural resources, becoming entangled with the politics of colonial or post-colonial modernization. And others concentrated on small-scale experiments with single buildings, becoming entangled with other sets of politics. Taken together, all these approaches – and their contradictions – constitute an important history of environmental consciousness in architecture.

Papers that present critical analyses of particular case studies (such as low or high tech utopias, discourses on appropriate technologies, or versions of ‘green’ architecture) are most welcome. Papers should analyze the social, cultural, and environmental repercussions of the cases presented. Also welcome are papers that cut across geographical locales to offer broader reflections on environmentalism, historicizing terms like Ecology, Nature, Environment, and related concepts of ‘environmental balance’, ‘natural resources’, and so on. In what ways did social reformist visions in architecture become aligned with arguments for curbing industrial pollution or for preserving environmental ‘quality’? How did particular strategies for urban amelioration or mass housing, become intertwined with environmental fears?

SESSION CHAIR
Panayiota Pyla, Department of Architecture, University of Cyprus
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'BREAD & BUTTER AND ARCHITECTURE': ACCOMMODATING THE EVERYDAY

This session takes its title and theme from a 1942 article by English architectural historian John Summerson, who called on practicing architects to face 'the real-life adventures which are looming ahead' instead of trying 'to fly level with the poet-innovator Le Corbusier.' To render architecture 'effective in English life,' Summerson argued, would be the role of qualified teams of 'salaried architects' working for local and central authorities or commercial undertakings. Their 'departmental architecture' would be responsible for lifting the average quality of everyday building practice for the benefit of all, while providing a profession constantly seeking to secure its place in society with 'those three essential things for any born architect – bread, butter, and the opportunity to build.' Coincidentally, the following year saw the publication of Ayn Rand's novel The Fountainhead, whose architect protagonist epitomised the 'prime mover', the individualistic creative hero who singlehandedly conquered his place in history. Seemingly following Rand's drive, the canon of western contemporary architecture has overlooked Summerson's everyday 'salaried' architecture, however dominant it may have turned out to be in our built environment, praising instead the solo designer and his groundbreaking work. It seems to have been in 'departmental architecture' that the social role of the architect – both in terms of social hierarchies and contribution to social betterment – was primarily tested and consolidated in the aftermath of World War I. Yet the work of county, city and ministerial architects, and heads of department in welfare commissions, guilds and cooperatives is seldom discussed as such. The specific character of this work as the product of institutional initiatives and agents, as the outcome of negotiation between individual and collective agendas, remains little explored, even when celebrating the few public-designed projects that are part of the canon.

What is, then, the specificity of this 'Bread & Butter' architecture? What is its place in architectural history studies, and how should we approach it? What does it tell us about the dissemination and hampering of architectural trends, or the architectural culture within institutions and agencies? Is it relevant in today's context of swift downplaying of institutional agency in the spatial accommodation of everyday needs? Are we prepared to bypass the still prevalent notion of the architect-artist, the prime mover, and look at the circumstances of those who played their part in inconspicuous offices and unexciting departments? We welcome papers that address these and other questions prompted by the theme, focusing on the period after World War I, when many public initiatives were put in place, until the late 1960s, when established hierarchies were challenged and the architect's place in society again changed.

SESSION CHAIRS
Ricardo Agarez, Bartlett School of Architecture, University College London
Nelson Mota, Department of Architecture, Delft University of Technology
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FORTIFIED PALACES IN EARLY MODERN EUROPE 1400–1700

From the fifteenth century onwards the spread of firearms profoundly affected the medieval castle. Residential and defensive elements that were once united in a single structure now evolved into separate architectural entities. The château fort gradually developed into a residential palace surrounded by a fortified perimeter. In addition, the shift from vertical to horizontal defence meant that the main trait of a stronghold was no longer its profile but its plan. As the plan became dictated by firing lines, angular shapes took the place of round and square ones, and the overall geometry became regularized. Efforts to reconcile the often contradictory demands of residence and defence inspired a wide variety of architectural designs across Europe, many of which have received little scholarly attention.

This session focuses on the building typology of the palazzo in fortezza in its broadest sense. Besides fortified palaces that were planned as a whole, it will also consider instances where new fortifications were built around an older palace or, vice versa, where a new residence was erected within a pre-existing citadel. The aim is to explore the conjunction of palatial residence and military defence. Papers may discuss the architectural connection (or lack thereof) between the palace and its fortifications. How was the building’s defensive role combined with residential comforts and ceremonial requirements? What happened to weak elements such as entrances, windows, forecourts and gardens? Did its decorative programme reflect its martial component? Was the fortified perimeter truly functional or merely symbolic? Did its military features answer to the demands of full-scale warfare or only to limited security needs? Conversely, could a fortified palace really operate as a fully-fledged princely residence, or were there limitations to the extent of its court life? Relevant events such as an attack on a fortified palace or a courtly ceremony held within its confines may also be examined.

Of particular interest are issues of cultural interchange, considering that fortification was an ‘international style’, whilst palatial architecture was firmly tied to local and dynastic traditions. We welcome cases from the whole of Europe (including its overseas colonies) and especially from less studied regions such as Central and Eastern Europe. We explicitly seek analytical papers that enable transnational comparison.

NB: The session fits within the framework of the ESF Research Networking Programme ‘PALATIUM. Court Residences as Places of Exchange in Late Medieval and Early Modern Europe (1400-1700)’ (www.courtresidences.eu).

SESSION CHAIRS
Pieter Martens, Research Foundation Flanders (FWO)
Konrad Ottenheym, Department of History and At History, Utrecht University
Nuno Senos, Faculdade de Ciências Sociais e Humanas, Universidade Nova de Lisboa
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EUROPEAN ARCHITECTURE AND THE TROPICS

Europeans have a long history of social, cultural and economic contacts and exchanges with the people of the Tropics. Although this history can be traced to an earlier time, it intensified in the past few centuries, with extensive formal and informal colonization of tropical territories by Europeans. The circulation and translation of architectural knowledge and practices between Europe and the Tropics is an inextricable part of this long and rich history.

By choosing the Tropics over other geographic categories, this session foregrounds the environmental and climatic dimensions of this history of exchange. This session will focus on how European architectural knowledge and practices were ‘acclimatized’ to the ecologies, heat and humidity of the Tropics. However, tropicalization entailed more than just environmental and climatic adaptations. Scholars in various interdisciplinary fields, particularly environmental and medical history, have shown that the tropicalization of European knowledge and practices involved social, cultural and political transformations too. David Arnold developed the concept of tropicality to suggest that tropical nature – of which climate is an important component – could be understood along the lines of Saidian Orientalism as an environmental ‘other’, deeply entwined with social, cultural, political, racial and gender alterities in contrast to the normality of the temperate zone. Tropicality is, however, not a monolithic category. Not only have the constructions of the Tropics varied with the changing social, cultural and political conditions of European colonization in the past few decades, they have also changed based on the shifting medical, environmental and other scientific paradigms of understanding the Tropics. How this climatic ‘other’ has been addressed architecturally by various actors at different historical moments has likewise been characterized by multifarious approaches.

This session invites papers that examine in a situated manner how European architecture has been tropicalized in any historical period at any tropical site. Tropicalization is of course not a one-way diffusionist process. Just as this session explores European architecture in the Tropics, the very notion of European architecture is neither immune to outside influence nor necessarily produced solely by Europeans. This session also, therefore, invites papers that explore how European architecture outside the Tropics was transformed by tropicalization and how European architecture might have been a hybrid entity co-produced by non-Europeans.

SESSION CHAIR
Jiat-Hwee Chang, School of Design and Environment, National University of Singapore
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ARCHITECTURE AND CONFLICT, C. 300–C. 1600

In conflict and war architecture is often damaged or destroyed, but many situations of conflict have, on the other hand, also led to the creation of new buildings. In the Middle Ages and the Renaissance, when high-ranking individuals or large groups of people had to be convinced of power, authority or friendship for instance, various strategies could be employed. Visibility was (and still is) of course an enormous advantage of buildings, leading those who held power to turn to architecture in instances where no other means were available to convince people of their authority. This pattern continued throughout the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Power might of course be expressed, but not all rival parties would necessarily accept such expressions of superiority, and techniques of persuasion were called for. Architectural concepts and forms could be incorporated in the building project to avoid alienating those to be won over, and to facilitate their allegiance in situations of changed personal and institutional relations. In many cases the inclusion of particular groups and individuals was closely connected to policies of exploiting, rather than erasing, their identities.

This session will explore the various architectural means employed by participants in situations of conflict or rivalry during the Middle Ages and the Renaissance. Cases may be at local or regional level, but may include architecture that was aimed at a larger audience, as in a national or international theatre of operations. We invite papers considering questions of the following kinds: the aims of patrons with their architecture; how the element of time could be used to their advantage or would turn against them; if the architectural choices made in such situations would support either new or more traditional architectural features; whether or not patrons favored specific architects for various projects to ensure that the intended message would be expressed in the right way. Both individual buildings and groups of buildings can be discussed in papers. In some cases buildings may be the starting point in a paper, whereas other papers may investigate the position and ambitions of patrons.

SESSION CHAIR
Lex Bosman, Institute for Art History, Universiteit van Amsterdam Herengracht

The complete Call for Papers and Discussion Positions can be downloaded from the meeting website: www.eahn2014.polito.it and from the EAHN website: www.eahn.org
HOW IT ALL BEGAN: PRIMITIVISM AND THE LEGITIMACY OF ARCHITECTURE IN THE EIGHTEENTH AND NINETEENTH CENTURIES

By the turn of the eighteenth century, architects and writers questioned many of the foundations of renaissance design theory and its later developments: the role of Roman antiquity as the primary provider of architectural references; the authority of Vitruvius’ *De architectura* and its many editions, translations and re-workings; and also some of the very concepts that shaped this design theory, such as the idea that architecture emerged as the imitation of primitive forms of building. Challenging these authorities was not merely a matter of rejecting or reinterpreting the design principles espoused by Vitruvius or retrieved from ancient monuments. It also entailed redefining the foundations of architecture as a culturally and socially embedded artistic discipline. After all, traditional models – and primitive origins in particular – explained how architecture was enmeshed with the very fabric of society. If these authorities were challenged, new arguments had to be found explaining how architecture found its place at the centre of human culture.

In this session, we will examine one particular strain of arguments that addressed this problem: new ideas about the origins of architecture. In particular, we are interested in how the increasingly vivid debates about primitivism – the idea that any human action, institution or custom is at its purest at the moment of inception – informed new ways of thinking about architecture, its origins, and its role in society and culture. Hitherto primitivism has been considered mainly in relation to Modernism, but it emerged in the early eighteenth century as a mode of thought about the origins, meaning and legitimacy of society and cultural practices. As such, it offers a unique perspective on the still current problem of how to endow architectural forms with cultural meaning. By advocating a return to first origins, primitivism offers an alternative to history as the storehouse of architectural form and meaning. We invite papers that address the role of the quest for origins in general, and ideas on primitivism in particular, in architectural thought and practice in the eighteenth and nineteenth century. We welcome case studies about texts, buildings or oeuvres that open up wider intellectual, social and institutional contexts. We are particularly interested in how questions about origins and primitivism introduced new ideas into architectural discourse – such as the religious and symbolical, rather than the practical and tectonic origins of architecture – and configured the relation of architecture with other artistic and scientific disciplines, such as archaeology and different kinds of historiography, natural history, linguistics and ethnology. Finally, we are curious to see how the preoccupation with primitivism translated into building practice.

SESSION CHAIRS
Maarten Delbeke, Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, Ghent University
Sigrid De Jong, Centre for the Arts in Society, Leiden University
Linda Belijenberg, Centre for the Arts in Society, Leiden University
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THE ARCHITECTURE OF STATE BUREAUCRACY: REASSESSING
THE BUILT PRODUCTION OF (COLONIAL) GOVERNMENTS

The cultural, material and spatial turns in political historiography have brought about a cross-fertilization between political and architectural history in the last two decades. The spaces in which politics take place and the political implications of architecture have become a focus of interest both for political and architectural historians. However, this encounter has strengthened the tendency to view politics primarily as a representational activity, rather than an act of governance. Hence, historians have privileged the study of what Walter Bagehot, when writing on the English constitution in 1873, called the ‘dignified parts’ of the State – the Houses of Parliament, museums, embassies, and national world’s fair pavilions. Buildings which house the ‘efficient parts’ of the State – the ministries, the public administrations, and so on – have hitherto remained largely neglected in academic research.

In this session, we are interested in investigating this second, more mundane built production of the State, aligning us with the argument of Henry Russell-Hitchcock’s 1947 article that the ‘architecture of Bureaucracy’ is worthy of (scholarly) attention as much as is the ‘architecture of genius’. In particular, we want to address the norms and forms that have influenced such governmental buildings as well as the actors involved in their design and construction. We invite papers that tackle questions via a case-study-based discussion. For example, how was the organization of the State (centralized vs. decentralized) reflected in its built apparatus? How does the (urban) site, the scale, the architectural language and the interior spatial distribution of State buildings illustrate the ways in which the State mediated its position vis-à-vis the citizen? To what extent did government develop particular building types, and what do these tell us about the desire of the State to improve its efficiency? Was their design underscored with notions of Taylorism? What constituted the technocratic building apparatus of the State? What were the networks of power and knowledge implied in official bodies like Public Work Departments that constituted what Peter Scriver has referred to in the British colonial context as the ‘Scaffolding of Empire’?

Papers should be interpretative rather than descriptive in nature, and can present case studies within the time frame 1918-1970. We do not set limitations in terms of geographical scope but request that when the focus is on the architecture of state bureaucracy in colonial territories, the authors also draw comparison with the situation ‘at home’.

SESSION CHAIRS
Rika Devos, Service BATir, Building, Architecture & Town Planning, Université libre de Bruxelles
Johan Lagae, Faculty of Engineering and Architecture, Ghent University
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IDEOLOGICAL EQUALITY: WOMEN ARCHITECTS IN SOCIALIST EUROPE

Emerging in the 1970s, the feminist approach to architectural history in the West and in the United States explored beginnings: from investigations of women who created spaces via exhibitions and who were influential as patrons and architects around 1900, to a focus on women in the shadows of modernist masters or who laboured in adjunct positions throughout the twentieth century. As women architects slowly gained ground in the 1980s and 1990s, research turned to new themes focusing on gender, space, and architecture.

In the former socialist countries of Eastern Europe, however, the emergence of the woman architect and a gendered approach to history followed a starkly different trajectory. Before 1945, most architectural faculties limited the number of women architecture students but, after World War II, women’s integration into the profession was quick and radical. Because the new socialist states desperately needed engineers and architects, restrictions were abolished and the number of female architecture students increased extensively. The sudden integration of women into architecture served more than a practical demand. Because the ideal Socialist Woman should seek self-fulfillment in work and social-political commitment, the influx of women into architecture and engineering reinforced the prevailing political ideology. Abundant state commissions provided work for all who were willing, and, in principle, the new generation of women architects entering the profession in the 1950s and early 1960s were offered the same opportunities as their male colleagues.

While the bulk of gender research in architectural history concentrates on difference, this situation of conscious (forced) equality may help to explore other aspects of the feminine. Therefore we hope to generate a new consideration of gender and architecture inspired by the situation in Socialist Europe, and we seek papers that address this special situation. For example, did state-promoted, ideological equality contradict everyday gender practices? How did it impact on the situation for women in architectural design offices? Did women play an adjunct role or did they supervise large commissions? Were they confined to the usual ‘feminine’ fields, like residential architecture, interior design, or monument preservation? How did the media treat them and their work? Did they embrace Socialist ideology, did they attempt a more critical position, or did they exploit their position as women for other ends?

SESSION CHAIRS
Mary Pepchinski, Department of Architecture, Hochschule für Technik und Wirtschaft Dresden
Mariann Simon, Faculty of Architecture, Budapest University of Technology and Economics
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ARCHITECTURE, ART, AND DESIGN IN ITALIAN MODERNISM:
STRATEGIES OF SYNTHESIS 1925-1960

Whether one is considering Gio Ponti’s insertion of a miniature architectural scene on a Richard Ginori vase in the early 1920s, Fausto Melotti’s imposing ceramic caryatids for the luxury liner Conte Grande designed by Ponti in 1949, or Lucio Fontana’s construction of total ‘spatialist’ environments – such as the one presented in the Milanese gallery Il Naviglio in 1949 featuring a large sculpture suspended from the ceiling illuminated by black light – it is clear that Italian architecture was inextricably associated with a dense network of interactions with art and design in the inter-war and post-war periods. The session will examine this phenomenon as a ‘red thread’ running through Italian architectural culture and as a fertile terrain of exchange with wider currents of international modernism.

As far as the post-war period is concerned, the integration of craft traditions with industrial production recalls the social and economic premises of the argument Tafuri put forward in the article ‘Design and Technological Utopia’ (1972), regarding Italy’s disjunctive transition from an agrarian society to an industrialized one. The session will examine the links between distinct stylistic codes in light of Tafuri’s hypothesis. Although these links operate in multiple ways, they become most effective at the level of the articulation of strategies relating architecture to the other arts, while bestowing on it the status of primus inter pares. From this viewpoint the history of Italian modern architecture becomes a history of the ways that companion arts enter into its orbit and become part of its spatial, formal and material logic.

The session will explore different modes of synthesis associated with a wide spectrum of architect/designers and artists who contributed to architectural and design ensembles. By pursuing their own paths, these protagonists ensured the specificity of the Italian contribution to European Modernism. Far from reflecting any unified set of artistic choices or rigid theoretical assumptions, the Italian experiments with aesthetic synthesis describe a field of competing valorizations. These experiments will be situated historically and critically by examining the various strategies – formal, structural, symbolic, and spatial – through which the intra-aesthetic dialogue was continually reinvented. Finally, the session will explore the possibility that this dialogue paved the way for theses of architecture’s relative autonomy formulated from the late 1960s to the early 1980s by Rossi and Tafuri, insofar as architecture’s links to the other arts could dialectically reveal the limits of its disciplinary foundations and its role within the wider aesthetic sphere.

SESSION CHAIR
Daniel Sherer, Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation, Columbia University

The complete Call for Papers and Discussion Positions can be downloaded from the meeting website: www.eahn2014.polito.it and from the EAHN website: www.eahn.org
ARCHITECTS, CRAFTSMEN AND INTERIOR ORNAMENT, 1400–1800

Is the study of interior ornament an integral part of architectural history? To date, the literature on architectural history has largely neglected the relationship between spatial form and interior ornament, resulting in the development of a sub-genre focused on interior design and decoration. Given the scale of ornament in early modern architecture across Europe, this separation of the building from its decoration militates against a holistic understanding of architecture and divides the Vitruvian triad that lay at the centre of architectural education and practice: firmitas, utilitas and venustas. For example, in the large literature on Palladianism there has been little and discrete coverage of the interior. Perhaps the multifaceted and complex nature of interiors, mediated as they were by patron, architect and craftsman, complicates overarching historical narratives? But this separation of architecture from ornament does not reflect the real experience of buildings. Is it time to reunite these realms? Given the rehabilitation of craft in contemporary discourse, might interior ornament reclaim its place in architectural history? Appropriately, pioneering research on Filippo Juvarra’s work in Turin provides an exemplar for broader study of the relationship between architects and craftsmen in early modern Europe.

This session aims to explore the evidence for communication and creative collaboration between architects and craftsmen, including plasterers, carvers and painters. While detailed written instructions are relatively rare, a range of other materials – such as drawings, models and building accounts – illuminates the process. To what extent were architects equipped to design ornament, and to what extent did they rely on craftsmen for ornamental design? Papers are invited that consider these issues in broad or specific terms.

SESSION CHAIRS
Christine Casey, Department of History of Art and Architecture, Trinity College Dublin
Conor Lucey, School of Art History and Cultural Policy, University College Dublin

The complete Call for Papers and Discussion Positions can be downloaded from the meeting website: www.eahn2014.polito.it and from the EAHN website: www.eahn.org
PUBLIC OPINION, CENSORSHIP AND ARCHITECTURE IN THE EIGHTEENTH CENTURY

Among the general transformations of the eighteenth century, there arose a new relationship between the press and architecture. For the first time, a space was born for the emergence of public opinion regarding architectural projects of varying scale and relevance. In those countries where the press was under direct censorship, public opinion found other outlets, such as pamphlets and anonymous letters; in all cases, though, there was evidence of a new and more critical response to changes in the built environment, replacing unrestrained praise. The aim of this session is to collect and discuss published, and unpublished, examples of the interaction between architecture and public opinion during the eighteenth century.

Architecture in the periodical press, in private correspondence and in pamphlets

Increasingly, the periodical press becomes a commercial enterprise, with direct competition between different journals and newspapers. How far was architecture - as well as other transformations of the built environment - among the themes that formed part of this process?

A periodical press also develops in nations where censorship is in place. In these conditions, how exactly was architectural criticism/debate affected? And what do other sources tell us about positions that could not be expressed in the official press?

Patronage and building type: major transformations in architecture.

For works commissioned by rulers, whether kings, princes or popes, what room for criticism/opinion was there in the Eighteenth century press? What were the restrictions of censorship, either of the state, or self-imposed? What role did official Academies play in facilitating criticism? The Assembly Rooms in Great Britain, the seats of the Accademie scientifiche di dilettanti in Italy, and theatres in every nation were commissioned by collective bodies, such as the Società dei cavalieri, or similar groups of patrons. What kind of discussion developed through the projects for these buildings, and how far was that discussion open in character, involving wider public opinion?

And finally, with the growth of cities, the design of open spaces and of urban-scale projects, and the emergence of competitions the European landscape changes. As new public buildings, city squares, bridges and port facilities started to appear, how were contrasting opinions on these transformations expressed? By what means, and where, did a public debate around these objects develop?

SESSION CHAIRS

Carlo Mambriani, Dipartimento di Ingegneria Civile, dell’Ambiente del Territorio e Architettura, Università di Parma
Susanna Pasquali, Dipartimento di Architettura, Università di Ferrara

The complete Call for Papers and Discussion Positions can be downloaded from the meeting website: www.eahn2014.polito.it and from the EAHN website: www.eahn.org

IMPORTANT DATES

April 15 - September 30, 2013: submission of abstract
October 31, 2013: notification of acceptance
March 15, 2014: submission of full papers
June 19 - 21, 2014: 3rd EAHN International Conference in Turin
The Medium is the Message: The Role of Exhibitions and Periodicals in Critically Shaping Postmodern Architecture

As recent scholarship has pointed out ‘the history of the architectural media is much more than a footnote to the history of architecture’ (Colomina 1988). Ever since the late eighteenth century, architectural exhibitions and periodicals have played an essential role in the dissemination of architectural culture. Emphasizing the work of certain architects and belittling that of others, they introduced movements and constructed new tendencies while theoretically and critically shaping urban and architectural discourse. While a number of scholars have recently reconsidered the role of these media in the modern era, their significance for the postmodern decades has only recently opened up as an important field of research.

Relying heavily on the circulation of images and on so-called ‘paper architecture’, postmodernism has always been intertwined with the media. In their critique of the Modern Movement and exploration of a new spatial and visual culture, architectural exhibitions and periodicals played an essential role as sites of production. The examples are telling: from the 1976 Idea as Model exhibition, the 1978 Roma Interrota project and the 1980 Strada Novissima, to periodicals such as Architecture Mouvement Continuité, Controspazio and Oppositions. As hypothetical spaces these media contributed to the development of new architectural approaches, providing an alternative to the built project. As discursive platforms they enhanced cultural transfers, transatlantic or paneuropean encounters. As critical practices they extended the role of the architect beyond its traditional boundaries, functioning as vehicles for research based design. In short, exhibitions and periodicals acted as critical projects that shaped postmodern architecture and urban design.

In this session we will bring together presentations that focus specifically on the role of postmodern architectural exhibitions and periodicals as sites of critical production. We are particularly interested in papers that discuss thematically or through case studies one or more of the following questions. What was the role of the postmodern media in proposing a new spatial and visual culture? To what extent are these projects a response to the end of the ‘grand narrative’? How did the exhibition design or the editorial apparatus enable an unorthodox approach to the built project? What was the influence of paper projects as they were elaborated for these media? And how did exhibitions and periodicals function as laboratories for alternative architectural practice?

Session Chairs
Veronique Patteeuw, École Nationale Supérieure d’Architecture Lille
Léa Catherine Szacka, École Nationale Supérieure d’Architecture Paris-LaVillette – Centre Pompidou

The complete Call for Papers and Discussion Positions can be downloaded from the meeting website: www.eahn2014.polito.it and from the EAHN website: www.eahn.org
MISSING HISTORIES: ARTISTIC DISLOCATIONS OF ARCHITECTURE IN SOCIALIST REGIMES

In both heavy and less rigid socialist regimes, architectural discourses were often the object of orchestrated tight control. Much design and comment on architectural thinking and production at the time followed a narrative that was approved – if not scripted – by the bureaucrats of ideology. However, in order to avoid control over architectural language in socialist regimes, the practice of architecture frequently found a new voice through semantics that veered away from the usual course of the discipline. A parallel approach that specifically addressed politics employed the appropriation of artistic mediums. Art confronted unwritten rules in architectural discourse in a different way, filling in the blanks with meaningful interpretations. Various forms of visual arts – from videos, photography and performances, to fictionalized narratives used in movies and novels – allowed an introspection of crucial architectural issues which would have been difficult otherwise. Even works which were considered at the time to be purely a reflection of propagandistic rhetoric (Shostakovich’s Cheriomushky, for example) raised questions about the limitations of the role that architecture could assume in socialist society. Resituated in a different semantic realm by the artistic gaze, architectural discourse was not only distorted but also dislocated. This process of deconstruction revealed architectural problems, allowing them to step into the public domain. Art, therefore, not only questioned the nature and role of architecture in those times, and the constraints shaping it, but also provided a space of (perhaps limited) freedom for debate.

We invite papers on art forms that challenged issues in architecture under socialist regimes. We intend to extend the traditional limits of Eastern European regimes and include countries like China and Cuba. We propose, at the same time, to extend the chronological frame and go beyond the fundamental moment of 1989, requesting papers that explore how the remains of socialist ideas of architecture are reciprocated by contemporary art practices engaged in recent history. How have art works, created before and after 1989 by both architects and artists, shaped a critical discourse on the architecture of the socialist regimes? What means were employed in this critical process?

SESSION CHAIRS
Srdjan Jovanovic Weiss, Centre Research Architecture, Goldsmiths University of London
Carmen Popescu, Université de Paris IV Sorbonne

The complete Call for Papers and Discussion Positions can be downloaded from the meeting website: www.eahn2014.polito.it and from the EAHN website: www.eahn.org
PRODUCING NON-SIMULTANEITY: CONSTRUCTION SITES AS PLACES OF PROGRESSIVENESS AND CONTINUITY

Ever since Ernst Bloch coined the term Ungleichzeitigkeit – non-simultaneity – the concept has been widely accepted, particularly in German-speaking historiography. A place where progress and tradition markedly co-exist is the construction site. Especially since the Industrial Age, new technologies and the ever larger scale of sites and numbers of workers on one hand were accompanied by continuity and custom on the other. However, Ungleichzeitigkeit is a relatively new theme in the study of construction sites. The grand narrative of construction history for the nineteenth century customarily focuses on the technological innovations of buildings such as London’s Crystal Palace, while social history has concentrated mainly on the craft character of the building sector. And architectural history for the first part of the twentieth century repeatedly ignored the ambiguity of construction sites and interpreted them as mere symbols of modernity. Only recently has research started to engage with the complexity of construction sites more fully. On construction sites, progressiveness and tradition do not simply co-exist, they are places that represent non-simultaneity. These spaces offer the symbolic resources to demonstrate and stage both progressiveness and, at the same time, continuity and custom.

The session invites discussion of the nineteenth- and twentieth-century construction site as places of production within this broad perspective, as locations of progressive and traditional practices as well as sites representative of an ambivalent modernity. Papers are invited from all academic fields concerned with construction, including the history of architecture, the history of technology, and the history of knowledge or social history. Papers that address the issue either conceptually or through case studies will be considered equally.

SESSION CHAIRS
Eike-Christian Heine, Department of History, University of Stuttgart
Christoph Rauhut, Institute of Historic Building Research and Conservation, ETH Zurich

The complete Call for Papers and Discussion Positions can be downloaded from the meeting website: www.eahn2014.polito.it and from the EAHN website: www.eahn.org
THE PUBLISHED BUILDING IN WORD AND IMAGE

What are the common grounds, or the points of divergence, between word and image in the dissemination of architecture? The study of word-image relations is one of the most innovative and cross-disciplinary fields to have emerged in the humanities over the last decades. Following on from what has been labelled the ‘visual turn’ in the 1990s, it attracts scholars from disciplines as diverse as art history, linguistics, anthropology, philosophy, or literature. This session aims to open up this field to architectural history by exploring the effect of the coexistence of the graphic and the written in the dissemination of architecture. We invite papers that challenge the relationship between descriptions and illustrations of buildings in printed and publicly disseminated media such as newspapers, journals, pamphlets, books, or catalogues. While recent scholarship has increasingly turned to investigate 1960s and 1970s architectural journalism, we are particularly interested in the nineteenth and early twentieth century. This period – which saw the discovery of the daguerreotype, the eclipse of the engraving by the photograph, as well as the rise of the architectural magazine – has been largely overlooked by research on architectural publication.

We encourage papers on subjects within this time frame, but also welcome work on word-image relations in other periods. Particularly welcome will be papers that focus on a close analysis of specific publications, genres, or published events, as well as detailed analyses of particular aspects such as captions, layout, content, use of colour and literary devices. Questions discussed could include, but are not limited to: what roles do words and images, and the relationship between both, play in the dissemination of architecture? What does the image illustrate, what does the text describe? What is the effect of treating word as image, or image as text? How are hierarchies between text and graphics expressed, also in terms of content? What is the effect of new reproductive and illustrative technologies on the style of writing? How does a new medium, such as photography, change the form and content of the text? By probing the visual and the written at the same time, the session intends to expand current methods of architectural historiography. In the face of an ever-growing corpus of published representations of architecture, we see an urgency to explore the historical implications and the development of the relationship between word, image, and building.

SESSION CHAIRS
Anne Hultzsch, Bartlett School of Architecture, University College London
Catalina Mejia Moreno, Newcastle University

The complete Call for Papers and Discussion Positions can be downloaded from the meeting website: www.eahn2014.polito.it and from the EAHN website: www.eahn.org
Walking is key to the acquisition of spatial knowledge. It is the most fundamental means by which we make sense of architecture and space, and it is embedded in the practice of historians who only feel secure in their understanding of a structure once they have visited it in person, poking their heads through doorways, sensing the narrowness of corridors with their bodies, and negotiating physical shifts in elevation as they ascend or descend from one level to another. But while the measuring of space with the body may be rendered concrete in traditional dimensions – labeling distances the length of arms and feet – the act of walking remains so taken for granted that its consequences often seem invisible. As Francesco Careri observes, however, walking represents a transformative practice and, for anthropologist Tim Ingold, circumambulation offers a way of knowing. This most pedestrian mode of transport is in fact capable of bringing about radical shifts in meaning affecting not only the occupant but even the space itself (as in Alfred Kazin’s experience of New York). Martin Heidegger lamented ‘the loss of nearness’ in modern culture where, he suggested, the triumph of modern technology in overcoming great distances had also rendered human experience more uniform or generic, and where increased accessibility and familiarity tended to impoverish the most intimate lived human experiences. And yet perhaps within the most basic mode of human locomotion lies the seeds of transformation and renewal. Through walking we come into contact with the object, engaging both the distant and proximal senses. Through walking we begin to recover a sensual experience too casually glossed over in the conventional academic study of architecture as a static object projected onto a pixellated screen. We measure buildings by paces and construct narratives as we negotiate the natural and human world.

This session seeks to investigate the implications of such observations. In what ways does the act of walking open up the traditional history of architecture and urban spaces to new kinds of interpretation? How does walking challenge the dominant praxis and modes of understanding that currently dominate architectural history? How does walking provide a means to interrogate and even redefine the experience and understanding of buildings and spaces? Topics might include historically specific questions surrounding medieval pilgrimage or the modern drifter in the city. We also welcome broader topics on human locomotion, space and the built world.

SESSION CHAIRS
David Karmon, Department of Visual Arts, College of the Holy Cross Worcester
Christie Anderson, Art Department, University of Toronto

The complete Call for Papers and Discussion Positions can be downloaded from the meeting website: www.eahn2014.polito.it and from the EAHN website: www.eahn.org
Every since the publication of Reyner Banham’s famous 1955 essay ‘The New Brutalism’, the idea that a modern building could display a ‘brutalist’ expression has flourished internationally. Notwithstanding the many possible origins of this design approach – the usual suspect being Le Corbusier’s béton brut at Marseille’s Unité d’habitation – it was Banham who launched this memorable phrase. During the following decades, words like brutalist and brutalism have been freely employed by critics and historians alike to describe diverse architectural works realized between the mid1950s and the mid1970s. From his British standpoint, Banham wrote as a propagandist assisting the birth of an architectural movement. Yet by the early 1970s, American historians – among others – were struggling to qualify buildings that had often received a lukewarm reception, not least because of the negative connotation associated with adjectives like brutal and brutality.

From Banham’s ‘New Brutalism’ to the historian’s brutalism, something was unquestionably lost in translation. However, as in all translations, something new was also created. It is this process of transference that forms the focus of this session. For if Brutalism has been widely accepted as the key notion to characterize a certain genre of work produced during the post-war period, the way this idea – and this expression – have penetrated into most national architectural cultures is still in need of closer examination. Though Banham himself touched upon the international dissemination of Brutalism in his 1966 survey, this issue has not yet been thoroughly investigated. When and how did the notion of Brutalism enter (or re-enter) French architectural culture? When and how did it enter other countries in continental Europe, the Middle East, South America, Australia? Was the original Brutalist impetus acculturated within specific national or regional building traditions? What are we to make of the substantial differences in terms of planning, spatiality, and materiaility between works that have been confidently enshrined as Brutalist, like Vittoriano Vigano’s Istituto Marchiondi in Italy (1954-58) and Paul Rudolph’s Art & Architecture Building in the United States (1959-63)?

I seek papers that explore the penetration, adaptation, acculturation or reconceptualization of Brutalism within various national contexts. Contributions may address this topic from a broad perspective or through the study of specific buildings, architects, writers or publications. While the session aims to concentrate on the investigation of particular national situations, papers that study the translation from one context to another are also welcome.

SESSION CHAIR
Réjean Legault, École de design Université du Québec à Montréal

The complete Call for Papers and Discussion Positions can be downloaded from the meeting website: www.eahn2014.polito.it and from the EAHN website: www.eahn.org
SOUTHERN CROSSINGS: IBERIA AND LATIN AMERICA IN ARCHITECTURAL TRANSLATION

Architects, buildings, and ideas about the built environment have intensely constructed the various historic routes linking the Iberian Peninsula and Latin America during the twentieth century, routes that remain peripheral to an architectural history field still dictated by a north-western discourse. Since Cuban independence in 1898, the southern transatlantic throughway has been a prime stage of postcolonialism and a persistent geopolitical and cultural force. The final severing of colonial bonds between Iberia and the American continent gave way to a mirror effect in the ongoing redefinition of Spain and Portugal on the one hand, and of the various Latin American states on the other. From diplomatic efforts and ideological allegiances, to institutional initiatives and economic investments, the consolidation of the southern transatlantic axis invariably comprised an architectural front. Through its various iterations, these crossings represented resistance to an imperialist past and the possibility of an alternative model of progress, while maintaining privileged connections between the Iberian and Latin countries.

This panel invites papers that examine the ways in which architecture, urban planning, and their related disciplines have inscribed and symbolized this bi-directional route, how architecture travelled through it, and how architectural knowledge emerged from these southern exchanges. Emphasis will be placed on the complex dynamics through which architects engaged with the social, economic, and geographical dissonances implied in these transfers, whilst claiming cultural accord on the basis of language, religion, and history. Papers may address the construction of Latin-Luso crossed imaginaries through exhibitions, histories, buildings, or journals – whether promoted by state agencies, cultural institutions, private enterprise, or individuals, and whether designed by political exiles, economic émigrés or cultural jet-setters. We look for scholarship that emphasizes both the poetic and the political dimensions of these crossings, addressing stylistic, technological, and theoretical developments positioned within post-colonial tensions, such as: Hispanism, Lusophony, and their counter-ideologies; processes of syncretism, mestizajes, exile, and migration; or challenging prevailing narratives of modernism and modernization. Spain and Portugal are as marginal to Europe as Latin America is to America, at least in terms of historiography. This session seeks to understand these architectural southern crossings as leading to paradigms and discourses of modern and postmodern culture substantially different from, but also structural to, those launched from the globalizing north.

SESSION CHAIRS
Marta Caldeira, Yale School of Architecture
Maria González Pendás, Columbia University

The complete Call for Papers and Discussion Positions can be downloaded from the meeting website: www.eahn2014.polito.it and from the EAHN website: www.eahn.org
If postmodernism is, as Fredric Jameson famously claimed, indeed ‘the cultural logic of late capitalism’, what do we make of the fact that in the 1970s and 1980s similar phenomena also flourished throughout Eastern Europe? Does it mean that late capitalism and late socialism shared some as yet unacknowledged commonality? Or that ‘socialist postmodernism’ was merely a western import? Was it a cultural signal of the imminent collapse of socialism? Or was socialist postmodernism an entirely different beast from its capitalist counterpart, thus opening up the possibility of ‘other postmodernisms’, similar to the existence of ‘other modernisms’ that architectural history started acknowledging around the turn of the millennium?

While art historians have long engaged with postmodernism in socialist states, architectural historians have only just started such inquiry. This session questions the definition of architectural postmodernism from the perspective of the (former) socialist world. It invites case studies of buildings, paper projects, and theoretical positions that will cast new light on how we label postmodern architecture, namely the practical and discursive critiques of modernism and modern rationality; the return of historicism, rhetoric, and representation; reliance on surface effects, fragmentation, and pastiche; linguistic and theoretical turns; populist orientation, and so on. The session ultimately aims to problematize the relationship between architecture and socialist societies in the two decades before the collapse of the Berlin Wall.

Was architectural postmodernism necessarily a cultural form of political dissidence under state socialism? How was such subversion possible, if most architectural commissions were socially/state controlled? If postmodernism was imported from the West, how did such transfer occur and how were the western models appropriated and transformed? Did the legacy of Socialist Realism somehow affect the emergence of socialist postmodernism? Finally, is postmodernism even possible without postmodernity? Does its existence indicate that, after all, there was a form of socialist postmodernity, even though it is often assumed that the former socialist states failed to transform into postmodern flexible post-Fordist economies and new epistemological regimes? Or was it just a statement of intent rather than an expression of the existing social conditions, something akin to what Marshall Berman called ‘modernism of underdevelopment’?

Starting from the premise that the socialist world was not a homogeneous entity, this session aims to acknowledge the historical and cultural specificities which existed. Especially welcome are the proposals that posit alternative genealogies of architectural postmodernism, thus questioning the entrenched canons established in the West.

SESSION CHAIR
Vladimir Kulic, College for Design and Social Inquiry, Florida Atlantic University

The complete Call for Papers and Discussion Positions can be downloaded from the meeting website: www.eahn2014.polito.it and from the EAHN website: www.eahn.org
HISTORIES AND THEORIES OF ANARCHIST URBANISM

Anarchist thought has had a profound impact on discussions about the city and city planning since the Enlightenment. Still, the influence of anarchism on the history of urbanism has not been sufficiently documented to date, and the aim of this panel is to rectify this gap in the literature. First and foremost, what do we mean by anarchism and what are some of the different ways in which it has shaped the face of urban planning and design? More specifically, how have anarchist thinkers influenced debates about decentralized planning since the nineteenth century? In what ways might the study of anarchism enrich our understanding of democratic or participatory planning more generally? Case studies that explore the links between urbanism and anarchism in journals (such as Architectural Design) and books (e.g. News from Nowhere) are most welcome. Explorations of the influence of anarchist thought on the ideas of seminal urban thinkers (Ebenezer Howard, Lewis Mumford, Patrick Geddes, Bruno Taut, Le Corbusier, Otto Neurath, Frank Lloyd Wright, Constant Nieuwenhuys, Fred Turner, Jane Jacobs, Hakim Bey, Rem Koolhaas, et. al.) will be appreciated as well.

Collectively, our goal is to use this session as an opportunity for rethinking the historiography of urban planning and design from the nineteenth to twenty-first century. We also want to use it as a vehicle through which to reframe contemporary discussions about the informal city.

SESSION CHAIR
Nader Vossoughian, School of Architecture and Design, New York Institute of Technology

The complete Call for Papers and Discussion Positions can be downloaded from the meeting website: www.eahn2014.polito.it and from the EAHN website: www.eahn.org
REVOLUTIONIZING FAMILIAR TERRAIN: THE CUTTING EDGE OF RESEARCH IN CLASSICAL ARCHITECTURE AND TOWN-PLANNING

During the past decade, while a significant amount of literature has been generated regarding new readings of classical monuments and ancient town plans, much less attention has been paid to disseminating and sharing advances in research methods and new techniques for documenting classical architecture and urbanism. The objective of this roundtable is to begin a collaborative discussion on the way architectural historians have harnessed pioneering strategies in the field, laboratory or within library and archival contexts. This roundtable invites panelists who situate innovative techniques and cutting edge practices at the core of their architectural research. For example, studies that address the application of remote sensing in the development of excavation strategies would be especially welcome. Likewise, digital modeling, mapping and virtual reality (VR) have the capacity to revolutionize the way we represent and visualize ancient architecture, but how can we successfully deploy these tools as pedagogical aids? An equally significant topic for discussion is how traditional archival material has, over the past decade, been morphed into 'new' sets of data that can reveal information otherwise invisible to researchers in ancient architectural history.

ROUND TABLE CHAIRS
Daniel Millette, School of Architecture and Landscape Architecture, University of British Columbia
Samantha Martin-McAuliffe, School of Architecture, University College Dublin
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THE THIRD LIFE OF CITIES: REDISCOVERING THE POST-INDUSTRIAL CITY CENTRE

For many western cities the end of the industrial era brought about a significant rediscovery of the centre. This phenomenon is most pronounced in those cities which experienced pre-industrial growth, such as small and mid-size capital cities, centres of an ancien régime society. Turin epitomizes this three-step evolution: pre-industrial, industrial and post-industrial. From the late sixteenth century Turin was the capital of a small European state and its baroque city centre was an artistic expression of political power and cultural traditions. The climax of this pre-industrial life came in the mid-nineteenth century, when the history of the city and that of the emerging Italian nation became intertwined and the city centre gained importance as the setting for the Risorgimento (Italian Unification). Turin remained the capital city of Italy for only four years, from 1861 to 1865.

The second life of the historic centre of Turin was characterized by a decline in status, signalled by the departure of crucial urban activities and functions. At the end of the nineteenth century new settlements around the old centre became production hubs, mixing workers’ dwellings and workshops. Nevertheless, it was not until the 1900s that industrial production took off on a large scale, shifting the urban balance over the course of the next century.

The third life of the city centre of Turin began very slowly at the end of the 1970s, in parallel with the industrial crisis. The last thirty years have seen a search for alternative urban identities and changes in the emphasis given to particular periods of the city’s development. Public redevelopment programs have focused on the roman and medieval core; through a broad policy of ‘big events’ the municipality has tried to recover the old baroque center, with its growing tourist appeal. The idea of the city centre itself has changed, as the celebrations for the 150th anniversary of the Unification (2011) have underlined by focusing not only on the old town, but also on the surrounding industrial areas, with their empty factories ripe for reinvention.

This round table aims to explore the relationships, shared issues and main differences between the case of Turin and other cities. Which actors have led the rediscovery of the centre? What qualities of the city centre have been prioritized: Historic value? Tourist appeal? Real estate potential? How has the social and demographic structure changed? How does architecture and urban planning react to these issues? What is the role played by industrial heritage in this process?

ROUND TABLE CHAIRS
Davide Cutolo, independent scholar
Sergio Pace, Department of Architecture and Design, Politecnico di Torino

The complete Call for Papers and Discussion Positions can be downloaded from the meeting website: www.eahn2014.polito.it and from the EAHN website: www.eahn.org
The current decade marks the fiftieth anniversary of the great flowering of studies on Piedmontese Baroque architecture during the 1960s. Proceeding from pioneering works of the 1950s such as Rudolf Wittkower's chapter "Architecture in Piedmont" in his Art and Architecture in Italy 1600-1750 (1958), or Paolo Portoghesi's series of articles and brief monograph on Guarini (1956), international and local scholars like Henry Millon, Werner Oechslin, Mario Passanti, and Nino Carboneri produced an impressive array of publications on the period. Some of the milestones of this scholarly output include the architecture section of the exhibition Mostra del Barocco Piemontese (1963), Andreina Griseri’s Metamorfosi del Barocco (1967), and Richard Pommer’s Eighteenth-Century Architecture in Piedmont (1967). This scholarship culminated in major international conferences on Guarini (1968) and Vittone (1970), as well as the initiation of the Corpus Juvarriano in 1979.

This roundtable aims to commemorate the golden age of studies on Piedmontese Baroque architecture through a critical assessment of the heritage of the 1960s. Have Griseri’s and Pommer’s ‘challenging’ (Wittkower) concepts proven robust? Does a traditional geographic-stylistic designation remain fruitful for investigating a region whose two major architects built throughout Europe and whose ruling dynasty entered supraregional marriage alliances? Do recent interdisciplinary methodologies – drawing from fields like geography, sociology, or history of science – reframe the roles of agents like civic authorities, construction workers, or military engineers? Has new material evidence altered long-held assumptions?

Discussion positions may directly address historiography or methodology of the 1960s, or present alternative approaches in the form of case studies or new research projects that critically engage with this historic body of scholarship on Piedmontese Baroque architecture, urbanism, and landscape. At its previous conferences, the EAHN did not highlight the architecture of the host region in dedicated panels. Turin, however, arguably presents an ideal venue for an international roundtable with regional focus: then as now, Piedmont is a major European crossroad for cultural influences from the Italian peninsula, France and Spain, northern Europe, and the former Hapsburg empire. Piedmontese Baroque architecture continues to occupy both local and international scholars, as demonstrated by the recent series of monographic conferences in Turin on architects like Alfieri, Garove, and Juvarra organized by the Bibliotheca Hertziana together with the Venaria Reale consortium. Breaking out of these monographic constraints, this roundtable will provide an opportunity to reflect on where the field has been during the past half century, as well as where it might go in the next fifty years.

ROUND TABLE CHAIR
Susan Klaiber, independent scholar
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