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The East-West Dialogue in Architectural History: A Personal Perspective

Globalization is a buzzword of our times. But what does or can it mean for architectural history? Recent studies on the historiography of the discipline point to a western bias in its discourses. Is then globalization just another way of seeing and interpreting in terms of west and non-west; that is to say a colonizing project by a different name?

My scepticism about the binaries implicit in both the colonial and postcolonial framings of architectural history has been noted elsewhere. And the question of how we both interrogate and reconcile the east-west dialogue in the history and theory of architecture remains an ongoing research interest. Work continues on the collaborative project “Ambivalent Geographies,” currently funded by the British Academy, between Elvan Altan Ergut and Belgin Turan Özkaya of Middle East Technical University and myself that has been active for over five years. Our aim is to open up the perceived boundaries between cultures to reveal the intertwined histories of seemingly distant geographies. To this end the next phase of the project includes participants from across the Middle East so expanding our purview. Instead of colonizing the “non-west” by mapping it using western narrative structures, we suggest it is appreciated for its complexity and diversity, as well as the different sets of values that operate within its various cultural frames. “Ambivalent Geographies” does, then, reposition the west in the theoretical and historical landscape of architectural history. But the ambivalence we seek to interrogate lies as much in the intellectual as in the historiographic geographies of the discipline.

A new research initiative I am involved in with Christine Mengin of Université Paris I (Panthéon-Sorbonne) looking at the architecture of Tianjin (Tientsin) has made me think about what happens when western architecture is culturally and geographically dislocated in a non-colonial context. Tianjin was home to a number of foreign concessions in the late Qing Dynasty and early Kuomintang era (nineteenth-twentieth centuries). These were territories ceded by the Chinese to the European imperial powers where the diplomatic immunity and autonomy they enjoyed facilitated trade and offered physical protection to residents. The architectural history of Tianjin is not then the story of a colonial presence, nor are the issues now faced concerning its preservation part of a postcolonial re-reading of
the past. There by invitation rather than force, the individual concessions express national differences in planning and design spanning c. 1850-1950, which in itself was a period of substantial political turmoil in Europe. The subsequent Cultural Revolution in China brings an additional layer of historical interpretation to this distinctive architectural environment, as does the dynamic expansion of present-day Tianjin fuelled by the embracing of international capitalism. Tianjin recontextualizes western architecture as here it is transposed, deracinated and juxtaposed in an eastern (non-western) environment that is not colonial in origin. And the new dimensions that this brings to the ambivalent geographies of architecture offer fresh opportunities for rethinking architectural history in a globalized context.

Dana Arnold
University of Southampton, UK
http://www.soton.ac.uk/history/profiles/arnold.html
Call for Papers Issued for EAHN First International Meeting

Guimarães, Portugal, 17-20 June 2010

The call for papers for the First International Meeting of the European Architectural History Network, Guimarães, Portugal, 17-20 June 2010 was issued at the end of March.

Papers are sought for the twenty-five sessions and roundtables at the conference which will cover architecture of all periods, from antiquity, medieval, and early modern, up through the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, as well as topics from allied disciplines. This broad historical representation is enriched with a wide range of methodological approaches framing the various sessions.

The conference advisory committee chose twenty-three sessions and roundtables from among the sixty-eight proposals submitted from twenty-three different countries; the EAHN then added two additional roundtables, resulting in a total of twenty sessions and five roundtables.

The call for papers may be viewed on the conference website:
http://www.eahn2010.org
or downloaded at the following URL:
http://www.eahn2010.org/EAHN2010_CPF.pdf

Complete details for submissions are included in the CFP, with proposals and supporting material to be sent directly to the chair(s) of each session or roundtable.

The deadline for paper proposals is 30 October 2009.

Keynote speakers and other conference details will be announced in the next few months: look for regular conference updates in upcoming issues of the EAHN Newsletter and in announcements through the EAHN listserv.
Câmara Municipal de Guimarães, begun in the mid-sixteenth century but profoundly renovated in the eighteenth century. Now the Guimarães Town Hall, this building by an unknown architect was originally the Convent of Santa Clara, located on one of the oldest streets and axes of medieval Guimarães, the Rua de Santa Maria; this connected the upper town with its castle to the lower town, where Our Lady of Oliveira Monastery was founded. Photograph: EAHN

The Museu de Alberto Sampaio, Guimarães, founded as a museum of ecclesiastical art in 1928 and located in portions of the former convent of the Collegiate Church of Nossa Senhora da Oliveira in the heart of the city. Photograph: EAHN
Judicial Architecture Thematic Group Co-Organizes Exhibition in Luxembourg

On the occasion of the inauguration of the new palais designed by French architect Dominique Perrault, the Court of Justice of the European Communities is holding an exhibition entitled The Architecture of the Constitutional and Supreme Courts of the Member States of the European Union. A Photographic Overview.

This photographic exhibition is devoted to the buildings which accommodate the highest jurisdictions of the twenty-seven member states. It displays architecture which, whatever the era in which it was conceived, manifests the need for a symbol expressing both the timeless idea of justice and the legitimacy of the institution which embodies it. Comprising thirty-six panels, the exhibition presents photographs of the buildings housing sixty-five higher national courts.

The EAHN Judicial Architecture Thematic Group assisted the exhibition organizers with arranging the display of the collected visual documentation. For the Court, although it “candidly pointed out the epistemological weakness of this photographic compilation,” it “nonetheless emphasizes one of its great merits: that of opening up the field of research and reflection on the architecture of Europe’s courthouses.” (Catalogue, p. 8.)


The exhibition was inaugurated on 30 March, in presence of the presidents of the constitutional and supreme courts of the member states of the European Union. It will be on display in the Gallerie of the Ancien Palais in Luxembourg until 15 July.

Christine Mengin
Université Paris I (Panthéon-Sorbonne)
View of the Architecture of the Constitutional and Supreme Courts of the European Union exhibition installation in the Ancien Palais of the European Court of Justice in Luxembourg.
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SAHGB-EAHN Annual Symposium Report

London, 16 May 2009

British Architecture Seen from Abroad was the subject of the annual symposium of the Society of Architectural Historians of Great Britain, this year held in conjunction with the European Architectural History Network. The theme is important, yet no book has attempted to discuss it. Chronologically arranged papers covered a remarkable range of interpretations of the theme.

After introductions by the joint chairs, Andrew Ballantyne and Dirk van den Heuvel, Ute Engel, of the University of Mainz, opened with “British Cathedrals Seen from a Continental Perspective.” Twentieth-century German scholars identified English Gothic as eccentric and wilful in accordance with their preconceptions. She believed that Nikolaus Pevsner had “reinforced the view that English art is peripheral,” but acknowledged that English scholars later added depth not by formal analysis, but through social and linguistic parallels.

Susan Klaiber, an independent scholar from Winterthur, Switzerland, examined an encounter of contemporaries, Wren and Guarini. No domes existed in England before Wren, whose design development for St. Paul’s can be related in all its phases to Guarini’s designs, especially those for the unfinished Theatine church of Ste.-Anne, Paris, later demolished.

“Historians love the quest for models,” announced Marcus Becker (Berlin), stripping away simplistic expectations about “Frederick II of Prussia and ‘English’ Neo-Palladianism.” Although certain English Palladian prototypes were reproduced in Potsdam under Frederick’s rule, they were an aspect of a theme-park like set of samples from Europe, and English models were chosen more for reasons of state than for their architectural significance.

Calcutta took the place of Potsdam as Kamalika Bose (Ahmedabad, India) showed how a prosperous Bengali merchant class built versions of English country houses along narrow streets, with massive porticos, while interior courts and plan forms followed local typology. These were the work of British engineers, loose impres-
The lecture hall in the Art Workers Guild, 6 Queen Square, Bloomsbury, London, venue for British Architecture Seen from Abroad

Photograph: EAHN
sions of the originals, with all the trappings of the nouveaux riches. Change the streets, and it could have been Bishop’s Avenue, Hampstead, or any other “millionaire’s row.”

Alex Bremner (Edinburgh) looked less at the buildings than at the people, the Anglican episcopate after 1841 who carried their contacts with architects when posted overseas. In the most methodologically oriented paper of the day, he challenged the neglect of colonial architecture in standard histories of “mother countries.”

Stefan Muthesius (University of East Anglia) compared two texts, the famous Das Englische Haus of 1904, and the little-known Die städtische Bodenparzellierung by Rudolf Eberstadt. The first was concerned with the historical causes of the model English lifestyle, the second with methods of land division and speculative development in England, although the real intention of Eberstadt’s views was disputed in discussion.

Two afternoon papers took us to Singapore, where Oscar Wilson organized the architectural profession in the 1920s (Raymond Quek, Nottingham), and Turkey, where two British Council exhibitions of architecture and planning were shown in the later stages of World War II, offering a modernism that was not in the “cubist” style, by then out of favor (Elvan Altan Ergut, Ankara).

The two final papers had been selected from a large number of offerings on New Brutalism, which is evidently a hotter topic abroad than at home, where there is widespread reluctance to engage with its complex meaning. Christoph Grafe (TU Delft) examined the Queen Elizabeth Hall and Hayward Gallery, confessing himself baffled by the intention of the designers and their apparent ambivalence towards the welfare state. M. Christine Boyer (Princeton) closed with a study of the Smithsons, largely composed of readings from unpublished writings by Alison Smithson, rich as plumcake but risking indigestion at the end of a rewarding day, not lacking in the eccentric and wilful.

Alan Powers
University of Greenwich

A fuller account of the symposium will be published in the Autumn 2009 issue of the SAHGB newsletter, which will be available for download at http://www.sahgb.org.uk/index.cfm/display_page/Publications.
British Architecture Symposium

The elaborate ceiling of the Art Workers Guild lecture hall
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Some of the SAHGB-EAHN symposium participants chatting during a break in the proceedings.
Photograph: Kamalika Bose
EAHN at the SAH Annual Meeting:
Affiliation with SAH and Lunchtime Information Session

The 2009 annual meeting of the Society of Architectural Historians (SAH) took place in Pasadena, California from 1-5 April. The SAH Board, at its meeting immediately prior to the conference, voted unanimously to recognize the EAHN as an affiliate organization. The affiliate status is granted to organizations whose educational missions parallel those of the SAH and it allows them to sponsor sessions at the Society’s annual meeting. SAH Board members also expressed a desire to build a strong working relationship with the EAHN.

This year, in what has now become a regular event, the EAHN hosted a lunchtime brown-bag meeting on Thursday, 2 April in order to further publicize its activities and recruit new members. The meeting was chaired by Nancy Stieber, and other EAHN committee members including Andrew Ballantyne, Carmen Popescu, and Zeynep Kezer were present. SAH President Dietrich Neumann, who is also an EAHN committee member, was able to make a brief appearance. Jorge Correia, EAHN’s second vice-president and general chair of the 2010 conference in Guimarães, presented an overview of the conference and invited those present to participate and spread the word. Andrew Ballantyne drew attention to the upcoming EAHN-SAHGB joint symposium, which takes place in London in May, and noted that a publication based on the papers presented at the conference was very likely to follow. Carmen Popescu reported on the EAHN’s recent study tours in eastern Europe and attendees were advised about the projected tour to Scotland next year. EAHN brochures and the call for papers for the Guimarães conference were also distributed at the meeting in Pasadena.

Zeynep Kezer
Newcastle University

Summary of Proceedings, EAHN Annual Business Meeting 2009

The Fourth Annual Business Meeting of the EAHN took place at the Middle East Technical University, Ankara, on Saturday, 14 February 2009. President Christine Mengin began the meeting with a review of the organization’s activities and
Bakewell & Brown, Pasadena City Hall, 1927
Photograph: Carmen Popescu

Greene & Greene, Charles S. Greene House, Pasadena, 1902-1915
Photograph: Carmen Popescu
achievements in 2008 and early 2009 which included the Transfer and Metamorphosis conference in Zurich in June 2008, the tour to Romania in July 2008, the publication of four newsletter issues, the launch of the new website, and the continuing progress in preparations for the EAHN First International Meeting in Guimarães in June 2010.

The financial report for 2008 details many transactions for the EAHN treasury, both income (such as a small surplus from the Romania tour, and various contributions from the STAG foundation, general members and committee members), as well as expenditures (chiefly payments for the new website). The EAHN has established a Paypal account which will assist in collecting donations from members, fees from tour participants, and annual contributions from committee members. An appeal to the membership for donations in January 2009 yielded a small number of generous contributions: most of this sum was applied to pay for programming of the new website, and the balance of the website costs were covered by donations from EAHN committee members.

Developing a comprehensive fundraising strategy has become more important than ever for the organization, and a subcommittee was formed to investigate possibilities such as donations from members, institutional contributions (both monetary and in-kind contributions), and grant proposals targeted for specific projects. The structuring and amount of a future individual membership fee was discussed again, as well as the development of a consortium of supporting institutions. For the moment, the EAHN will continue to collect a modest donation from tour and conference participants as included in the registration fees. Finally, the EAHN Treasurer Carmen Popescu will resign her post after the Guimarães conference and the search for a replacement should begin now.

A major change in the EAHN mailing list was made in September 2008, when the list moved from INHA in Paris to the Delft office where it is administered with the commercial mailing list service Constant Contact. The Constant Contact monthly fee is paid by an individual committee member. The committee discussed striking the correct balance between freely disseminating information regarding architectural history throughout Europe and filling members’ in-boxes with too many messages, perceived by some as spam.
Ankara Bağ Evi, a traditional Ankara orchard house, restored by the Vehbi Koç Foundation and opened to the public in 2007. Members of the EAHN committee toured the Orchard House the day after the EAHN annual business meeting.
Photograph: Rob Dettingmeijer

A restored interior in the Ankara Orchard House with period furnishings.
Photograph: Rob Dettingmeijer
Most encouraging for all present, EAHN membership continues to grow dramatically. During the 2008 Annual Meeting in Leuven, the EAHN counted approximately 250 members; one year later during the 2009 Annual Meeting, the organization has approximately 670 members. (Note: as of May 2009, membership has passed the mark of 750).

Carmen Popescu reported on EAHN tours: the Romanian tour to Bucharest and Bucovina in July 2008 was a success, with ten participants in addition to the tour leaders. To repeat this success we must identify appealing new tour destinations, with appropriate local contacts to assist in developing the itineraries, all with the continuing goals for EAHN tours of discovering new geographical locations, exploring new sites, developing a historiographic approach to the architecture of a region, and broadening the horizon of the EAHN members. Such tours should be realized with low prices and high impact for networking between tour members, local scholars, and with local organizations. Areas under consideration for future tours include Poland, Finland, Serbia and Scotland; a Scottish tour will definitely be developed for 2010, as well as a tour in Portugal in conjunction with the Guimarães conference.

Nancy Stieber reported on EAHN publications. The launch of the new website in February 2009 and the continuing production of the quarterly newsletter were the major accomplishments of the publications committee during the past year. Both the newsletter and website need to recruit additional personnel to ensure smooth production processes and reduce the work load for individual members of the editorial team.

Progress on developing the journal has been delayed because of the work involved in the website and newsletter. A draft mission statement for a journal has been developed by Alona Nitzan-Shiftan and Carmen Popescu, to be reviewed by the publications committee in Ankara. The format of the future journal was again discussed (digital or print); we agree that a convincing concept for journal content is of utmost importance, before any decisions on format.

Nancy Stieber also discussed the EAHN’s relations with other similar organizations: the EAHN is currently a candidate for becoming a CAA affiliated society, and affiliate
The headquarters of VEKAM, the Vehbi Koç and Ankara Research Center, which maintains the Ankara Orchard House. The EAHN committee enjoyed a lunch hosted by VEKAM after visiting the Orchard House. Photograph: Rob Dettingmeijer

EAHN committee members with Turkish colleagues at the VEKAM Research Center in Ankara
Photograph: EAHN
status with the SAH has also been mentioned (Note: affiliate status with both the CAA and SAH has since been granted.) We continue to have close contacts with the SAHGB and Docomomo International, and should pursue similar cooperation with other related organizations.

The EAHN thematic groups continue to grow and develop their own active projects. The judicial architecture group (Christine Mengin) is pursuing projects with the Court of Justice of the European Communities in Luxembourg, and hopes to apply for EU funding for its activities. The eastern Europe and Balkan group (Carmen Popescu) is working particularly on Balkan cities, with a meeting on this topic organized by Greek colleagues. The group on colonial architecture is not represented in Ankara, but they have presented their activities on the new EAHN website, as have the other two groups.

Andrew Ballantyne discussed plans for the SAHGB-EAHN annual symposium scheduled to take place in London this May (Note: see the symposium report elsewhere in this newsletter).

Jorge Correia discussed the preparations for the Guimarães conference. The conference committee will finalize the selection of the twenty sessions and five roundtables in Ankara, and also discuss keynote speakers for the three evening events planned. The CFP will be launched just before the SAH meeting in early April. The committee discussed the amount of the conference registration fee, how much of a donation to the EAHN should be included in this fee, and which reduction to offer to students, as well as to scholars from economically weaker countries. Registration fees will also include abstracts and dinners on three evenings. The total conference budget is €40,000, with half of this covered by sponsors: the city of Guimarães, the Universidade do Minho, and others.

The project of a comprehensive bibliography of European monographs in architectural history remains a goal of the EAHN, but the project has made little progress this year due to a lack of funding and personnel.

Hilde Heynen is organizing a project to develop a ranked list of periodicals in the discipline, to be used by scholars and universities to help assess research output.
A subcommittee was formed to work on this project over the coming sixteen months, with a final draft to be presented for discussion at the Guimarães conference.

Marc Visser reported that @MIT at the TU Delft will no longer be able to fund the EAHN secretariat after 1 September 2009, because of drastic budget cuts to the entire department. The committee thanked Visser and @MIT for the generous support given to the EAHN to date, which has been crucial in the development of the organization. The fundraising committee will explore possibilities to raise money elsewhere to keep the EAHN office in Delft at least through the Guimarães meeting; other departments in Delft might contribute, as well as other institutions, with the goal of developing a funding consortium.

The situation in Delft raises the issue of long-range planning for the organization, and the committee considered the following questions: when will the EAHN incorporate as a permanent organization? How should this permanent organization function? And how can we professionalize the organization for the long term (hiring an executive director, for instance)?

Finally, the committee elected four new members, Elvan Altan Ergut, Zeynep Kezer, Cana Bilsel, and Ilknur Kolay, while the previous committee members and officers were all reconfirmed in their positions. Furthermore, Jorge Correia was elected second vice president of the EAHN in recognition of his outstanding efforts in organizing the EAHN First International Meeting.

The next EAHN business meeting will take place in Bologna in late January 2010; further details will be announced in the December 2009 EAHN Newsletter.

The full minutes of the Ankara meeting may be consulted on the EAHN website: http://www.eahn.org/site/en/annualmeetings.php.
On the Calendar


Deadline for paper proposals, EAHN First International Meeting, Guimarães, June 2010: 30 October 2009

EAHN First International Meeting, Guimarães: 17-20 June 2010
Paço dos Duques de Bragança (palace of the Dukes of Bragança), Guimarães, begun in the early fifteenth century
Photograph: EAHN
Architectural History in Turkey

Architectural history as an autonomous discipline is relatively new in Turkey. The emergence and development of the field as a whole parallels the genesis of the relevant educational and research institutions in the country, and we thus trace the history and practice of the discipline within this institutional framework.

Educational Institutions

Architectural history is studied in Turkey in departments as diverse as architecture, history, art history, and archaeology, but there are only four programs that offer graduate education specifically focusing on architectural history.* An overview of these programs provides a general understanding of the teaching of architectural history as an independent field in the country.

All of the graduate programs in architectural history are located within departments of architecture. Three of them are at universities in Istanbul, namely Mimar Sinan University (MSU), Istanbul Technical University (ITU) and Yıldız Technical University (YTU). The fourth is the program at Middle East Technical University (METU) in Ankara. Mimar Sinan University is the oldest in Turkey, opened as the School of Fine Arts (Mekteb-i Sanayi-i Nefise-i Şahane) in the late nineteenth century during the Ottoman period. The school remained the only one providing architectural education until the 1940s when Istanbul Technical University and Yıldız Technical University were established, both offering education in architecture. Middle East Technical University, on the other hand, was founded in the 1950s as the country’s first university outside Istanbul; it was followed by many others, and today almost every city in the country has a university, while the number of departments of architecture now exceeds thirty.

Courses in architectural history were included in the curricula of undergraduate architecture education in these schools, taught by people with diverse backgrounds. But it was not until the 1960s that an appropriate context existed for the institutionalization of architectural history as an academic discipline with the development of graduate programs. In this, the graduate program in architectural history at ITU arguably played a pioneering role. The studies by its faculty, particularly those of the then-head of the program, Doğan Kuban, helped develop its major field of expertise in the discipline, namely “Turkish architectural history,” with a specific...

focus on the Ottoman era. Modern architecture, too, emerged as an area of study in this period. Not only the studies at ITU, but especially Bülent Özer, the head of the MSU graduate program in architectural history during the same period, adapted the historiography of modern architecture to nineteenth- and twentieth-century architectural production in Turkey.*

Graduate study in architectural history was undertaken at ITU and MSU together with restoration until the 1980s, when the fields were separated. New programs also opened during this period at other universities, one of which was METU. Here, the architectural historian Abdullah Kuran had been one of the earliest deans of the Faculty of Architecture in the 1960s, and he laid the foundation for study of architectural history at the university, although the METU graduate program in architectural history did not officially open until the 1980s.** Its founding head was İnci Aslanoğlu, Kuran’s earlier assistant and Kuban’s student. Representing the changing approaches in architectural historiography in recent decades, the METU graduate program has emphasized a cross-cultural and interdisciplinary approach, defining its field of interest within a broader geographical and historical perspective. Similarly, the graduate program at YTU, opened in the late 1990s, has presented a critical approach with the aim of re-evaluating conventional historical narratives through new modes of thought and new historiographical concepts. The different educational objectives and outcomes of these four graduate programs have provided varied planks in the national platform for architectural history, which has grown increasingly strong and autonomous as an academic discipline in recent decades.

Research Institutions
Despite the existence of specialized graduate programs specifically focusing on architectural history, general research in the field in Turkey is pursued only within institutions in related disciplines.

Following the approach and organization in educational programs, research affiliated with graduate programs in architectural history in the universities was originally undertaken mainly in conjunction with architecture and restoration, as exemplified by the foundation of the ITU Architectural History and Restoration Institute in 1974, the MSU Institute of Research on Turkish Architecture and Restoration in 1977, and the Architectural History Unit of the METU Faculty of Architecture Research


** At METU, the Department of Restoration had opened already in 1966.
Typical Ottoman house in Safranbolu.
Photograph: Nancy Stieber

Main hall (sofa) of a typical Ottoman house in Beypazarı.
Photograph: Nancy Stieber
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Education and Research in Turkey

View of Safranbolu, a UNESCO World Heritage site, with the Köprülü Mosque built by Köprülü Mehmet Pasha in 1661.
Photograph: Nancy Stieber
and Implementation Center in 2004. Other fields of study in which research in architectural history is pursued are history and archaeology. The METU Center for Research and Assessment of the Historic Environment, founded in 1966, exemplifies a focus on archaeological sites. The Koç University Research Center for Anatolian Civilizations, on the other hand, is exemplary of institutions which study history in general, functioning as a center which also supports researchers in the field of architectural history.

Considering institutions other than universities, the ones with a general focus on historical studies seem to be the most fruitful for architectural history research. This holds for both public and private research institutions. The Turkish Historical Association, as a public institution founded in 1930, should be emphasized with its vast library and archives containing documents of the late Ottoman and the Republican periods. The History Foundation of Turkey, founded in 1991 as a non-governmental organization, is similarly significant as a center of research that houses one of the richest archives on economic and social history, as well as on daily life in Turkey. In recent decades, the number of centers for historical research has increased, paralleling a general rise of interest in history, including local histories. In this context, the research centers on the histories of Ankara, Istanbul or wider geographies, such as the Vehbi Koç and Ankara Research Center, the Ankara Institute Foundation, the Istanbul Research Institute, and the Mediterranean Civilizations Research Institute, are pioneering and important examples. Research centers on historical studies are proliferating because of the increasing role of private initiatives in the field, and the Ottoman Bank Museum, Archive and Research Center in Istanbul should also be mentioned here as the first private archive opened to researchers.

The main periods focused on by these institutions of historical studies are the Ottoman and Republican eras. The ancient period, on the other hand, became a subject of research beginning already with nineteenth-century excavations, studied and promoted mostly by international institutions working in Turkey, such as the American Research Institute in Turkey, the British Institute at Ankara, the German Archaeological Institute, and the Japanese Institute of Anatolian Archaeology. Only a few of these institutions focus on subjects other than archaeology, such as the French Institute of Anatolian Studies that chiefly
supports the study of Ottoman history, and the IRCICA Research Center for Islamic History, Art, and Culture, or ICOMOS and DOCOMOMO that have national branches in Turkey to pursue studies in the field of conservation.

For these different disciplines related to architectural history—from art history, archaeology, conservation and restoration, as well as architecture—there are also professional and disciplinary organizations, such as the Chamber of Architects and societies of architects, art historians, archaeologists, and conservation professionals, which all contribute to the study of architectural history, even if it is not their primary focus.

Some of the organizations in these related disciplines are significant for their documentation activities, for which the current digital platforms “Arkiv” and “Architectural Museum” should be mentioned.* These collect archival information on architects, buildings, and related topics from all periods in Turkey. Despite the lack of a research institute that exclusively focuses on architectural history, all the aforementioned national and international institutions as a whole promote and support research in the field in many different ways, not only by providing funding but also by organizing activities such as lectures, conferences, tours, exhibitions, and by publishing works in architectural history.

Elvan Altan Ergut and Belgin Turan Özkaya
Middle East Technical University

* "Arkiv" (http://arkiv.arkitera.com) is the virtual archive of Arkitera Architecture Center, and "Architectural Museum" (http://www.archmuseum.org) is the virtual museum of Building and Information Center.
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TURKISH INSTITUTIONS IN ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY*

EDUCATION

Middle East Technical University
Graduate Program in Architectural History
Suna Güven
harch@arch.metu.edu.tr
http://www.archweb.metu.edu.tr/programs/graduate/archist/index.htm
Address: İnönü Bulvarı 06531 Ankara
(tel) +90 312 210 22 03 (Dept. of Architecture)
(fax) +90 312 210 7966

Istanbul Technical University
Graduate Program in Architectural History
İlknur Kolay
http://mimarlik.itu.edu.tr/
http://160.75.51.35/en/academic/faculty/architectural-history-division
Address: Taşkısla Taksim 34437 İstanbul
(tel) +90 212 2452753 (Dean’ s Office)

Mimar Sinan Fine Arts University
Graduate Program in Architectural History
Ela Güngören
http://www.msgsu.edu.tr/
Address: Meclis-i Mebusan Caddesi No: 24
Fındıklı 34349 Yıldız- İstanbul
(tel) +90 212 252 16 00

Yıldız Technical University
Graduate Program in Architectural History
Alev Erkmen
http://www.mim.yildiz.edu.tr/
Address: Barbaros Bulvari 34349 Yıldız- İstanbul
(tel) +90 212 383 70 70

MATPUM - METU Faculty of Architecture
Research Center
Ali Uzay Peker
info@matpum.com,
http://matpum.metu.edu.tr/
Address: İnönü Bulvarı 06531 METU/Ankara
(tel) +90 312 210 72 50

VEKAM - Vehbi Koç and Ankara Research Center
Zeyneponen@vekam.org.tr
http://www.vekam.org.tr
Address: Pınarbaşı Mahallesi Şehit Hakan Turan Sokak No: 9 Keçiören – Ankara
(tel) +90 312 355 20 27

Docomomo_tr - Documentation and Conservation of Modern Movement Working Group in Turkey
Elvan Altan Ergut
docomomo_tr@yahoo.com
http://www.docomomotr.itu.edu.tr
Address: ITU Faculty of Architecture
Taşkısla 34467 İstanbul

Arkiv - Arkitera Architecture Center Archive
Aslı Canbal
http://arkiv.arkitera.com/
Address: Cemil Topuzlu Cad. İş Bankası Blokları A Blok D.8 Dalyan 34726 İstanbul
(tel) +90 (216) 355 07 22
(fax) +90 (216) 386 94 30

Chamber of Architects, Ankara Branch
Yeşim Uysal
info@mimarlarodasiankara.org
http://www.mimarlarodasiankara.org/
Address: Konur Sokak No: 4/3
06650 Yenisehir– Ankara
(tel) +90 312 417 8665
(fax) +90 312 417 1804

History Foundation
İlhan Tekeli
tarihvakfi@tarihvakfi.org.tr
http://www.tarihvakfi.org.tr/
Address: Zindankapı Değirmen Sokak No: 15
Eminönü – İstanbul
(tel) +90 212 522 02 02

* The forum on “Architectural History in Turkey” organized during the EAHN Fourth Annual Business Meeting in Ankara, 13-15 February 2009, forms the basis of this list. The contact names given for institutions in the list are those of the representatives who attended the forum or supplied us with relevant information. We would like to thank all representatives for the information they provided about their institutions.

The Museum of Architecture database also contains a selection of buildings located outside Turkey: here, St. Olaf Church in Tyrvää, Vammala, Finland. Screenshot: By permission of the Building and Information Center.
Architecture and Modernity in Cyprus

Situated at the southeastern edge of the Mediterranean, Cyprus has a rich architectural history which can be traced back to the Khirokitia Neolithic settlement (approximately 7,000 BC), through the fascinating remnants of the Chalcolithic, Bronze and Iron ages, and to traces of Phoenician, Assyrian, Egyptian, or Persian rulers. In Cyprus one encounters significant Classical, Hellenistic and Roman monuments, as well as remnants of a rich medieval past that includes Byzantine churches (many of which are listed as UNESCO World Heritage sites), Gothic and Venetian monuments, Ottoman mosques, hans and mansions. Testimonies to the turbulent history of Cyprus, all these compose a multilayered mosaic of architectural histories. Lesser-known and largely understudied is the architectural history of modern Cyprus, which is entangled with the histories of colonialism and decolonization, nation-building, socioeconomic modernization, and identity politics - the latter usually being framed in terms of tensions and anxieties about the coexistence of the Greek-Cypriot and Turkish-Cypriot communities on the island.

Modern architecture in Cyprus was initially intertwined with the island’s experience of colonialism. Cyprus came into British hands in 1878 when the British rented it from the Ottomans, hoping for military and economic gains from the island’s strategic position (notably its proximity to Suez and the Silk Road). Consistent with colonial practices, the British implemented a full topographical survey followed by a population census, with the ultimate goal of commanding knowledge and producing tools for control. When it came to managing the occasional bi-communal tensions between the Greeks (the majority on the island) and the Turks (the last ruling community), the colonial power opted for keeping its distance, to avoid interfering. This state of affairs changed after the full annexation of Cyprus in 1914, the grant of colony status in 1925, and the uprising of the local population due to economic hardship in 1931. At that point, the British rulers introduced a series of reformist projects in the areas of law and infrastructure, launching a process of economic modernization and urbanization.

The ideas and practices of architectural modernism began to be introduced to Cyprus in the 1930s, when an increasing number of professional European-educated architects established their practices on the island. Institutional and residential architecture began to echo a rational aesthetic, which often also sought
to establish ties with the local vernacular preferences. After the Second World War, stronger urbanization trends also introduced the aesthetic of “corporate modernism,” frequently manifested in the Cypriot landscape through concrete-frame apartment buildings and office blocks that began to spread out of historic city centers. After Cyprus gained its independence in 1960, modern architecture became more important as a symbol and an instrument of both decolonization and modernization. The new building boom came not only as a result of the transition to Cypriot statehood but also as a result of the booming tourist industry. The construction of new schools, office buildings, markets, banks, factories as well as hotel complexes and tourist kiosks reflected an awareness of the postwar rethinking of modernism, by contemplating architecture’s non-functionalist and expressive dimensions through the use of exposed concrete, brise-soleil, broken volumes, and sculptural overhangs. Postcolonial Cyprus—having emerged in the midst of the cold-war period—was not without political tensions. Bi-communal conflicts of the 1960s led to the violent division of the two main communities in 1974 that has until today left Cyprus with an unresolved political conflict and an open wound that is vividly reflected in the built environment, despite the rapid
modernization of many aspects of life.

Here we present a series of vignettes from Cyprus’s twentieth-century architectural history, ranging from British colonial rule to the construction of a post-independence nationhood in the 1960s. Far from pretending to give a comprehensive overview, the images and short descriptions below offer a flavor of the complexities of the history of modern architecture in Cyprus, which has been intertwined with changing national goals, transforming socioeconomic realities, cultural anxieties, political debates, and other factors.

ARCHAEOLOGICAL MUSEUM, NICOSIA

One of the earliest architectural projects of the British colonial power was the archaeological museum in Nicosia (1908-24). The construction of the museum went along with the implementation of a legal framework to control excavations and the trade of archaeological artifacts. The museum was to become the main place for showcasing and storing the numerous archaeological findings that had no home up to that point. The British architect and “Curator of Ancient Monuments” George Jeffery designed the museum as a series of galleries organized around a central open courtyard. Understood literally and metaphorically as “containers” of history, the museum’s galleries were experienced in a linear sequence, as though to establish a continuity on the island’s otherwise “fragmented” cultural history. As a symbolic gesture, a Pentelikon-marble portico was designed, cut into pieces and shipped from Athens to Nicosia where it was assembled on the spot and literally attached to the building. The portico was in direct contrast with the colonial style of the rest of the building. From a colonial point of view the neoclassical portico provided a symbolic reference to the island’s historic origin that justified colonialism as a cultural project and as a return to the country’s classical past.

FANEROMENI HIGH SCHOOL, NICOSIA

The British attempt to maintain a distance from local politics was exemplified in their educational policy, which left issues of education, heritage and identity in the hands of the local communities. Close ties with Greece and Turkey, and the economic and cultural support of the wealthy and powerful religious institutions, placed schools at the heart of nationalist discourse of the time. Especially in the case of the Greek-Cypriot community which saw British rule as an opportunity for
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Andreas Fotiades, Faneromeni High School, Nicosia, c.1920, front elevation
Photograph: Petros Phokaides, 2008
the de-ottomanization of the island and union with the newly formed Greek state, school buildings—from urban high schools to rural elementary schools—became a privileged site for experimentation with neoclassicism, which codified and projected a nationalist imagery onto public space.

Faneromeni High School, designed by Andreas Fotiades in the early 1920s, is named after the Christian Orthodox Church that stands in front of it. Its façade, constructed out of local sandstone, echoed European rationalism while it simultaneously alluded to contemporary state schools and other public buildings in Greece. Within the dense urban fabric of Nicosia, and not far from the Archaeological Museum, the Faneromeni School introduced neoclassicism with a different meaning attached to it: it turned the colonial space at the city center into an arena of ambivalent identity projections and formations.

ENGLISH SCHOOL, NICOSIA

In contrast to the ethnic schools of the two communities that were spatially integrated into the urban fabric, the so-called “English School” (1936-39) was constructed on an empty site, outside Nicosia’s walls and just opposite the Governor’s House. A sizable area around the school was confiscated and used for sport facilities, while it also served as a buffer zone, separating the school and the Governor’s House from the city and the surrounding suburbs. At the same time, the building program introduced a new concept of spatial organization in educational institutions that combined classrooms and the library with a public hall, dormitories and sport facilities.

The project architect was the Greek-Cypriot Odysseas Tsangarides, while the colonial Public Works Department (PWD) was in charge of the construction and the supervision. The form and decoration of the main building of the complex, in particular the tower-like entrances and the classroom typology, referred to traditional British schools and colleges; at the same time, it adopted elements from local colonial architecture, such as the arched porticos and certain building materials such as the yellow sandstone. The English School expressed a somewhat neutral stance towards ethnic and religious dichotomies, while it also proclaimed a persistent commitment to the colonial center and the British government.
O. Tsangarides, English School, Nicosia, 1936-39, front elevation
Photograph: © Public Information Office

O. Tsangarides, English School, Nicosia, 1936-39, view from first floor
Photograph: © Public Information Office
In 1939, a series of ceremonies celebrating the opening of new public buildings took place. In these ceremonies architecture was a backdrop for military parades and public speeches, thus transferring colonial discourse into public space. Along with the English School, the government inaugurated the General Hospital of Nicosia (1936-39) and a sanatorium in the Troodos mountains (1936-40). Both buildings were designed by the Greek-Cypriot architectural firm Michaelides Bros and were constructed by the colonial Public Works Department. In these cases, the colonial government was assuming the role of a modernizing agent that imported innovation from the West into the colonies. The government’s decision to construct a new hospital building and replace the old and outdated medical facilities was accompanied by particular debates on technological progress and innovation, as well as healthy, clean and functional hospital spaces. These kinds of debates became the focus for the General Hospital—rather than the identity politics mentioned above. The hospital, a two-story building standing on pilotis, echoed interwar modernism’s universalist aesthetic and its valorization of scientific progress.

The period after the Second World War was characterized by an intensified urbanization process, creating the need for a large number of school buildings which were constructed under the auspices of district educational councils. These schools were placed on the periphery of the urban core, inside residential areas. Independently, such schools continued to be the primary social and urban elements for each community.

One of the first modernist school buildings is Demetris Thymopoulos’s elementary school in Lykavytos, Nicosia, constructed between 1955-57. The architect distributed the building program in distinct volumes in a “form follows function” manner, and also introduced expressive elements, such as brise-soleil, and local materials, such as local sandstone. Other schools at the time—many of them by Thymopoulos, like his Pallouriotissa High
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Michaelides Bros, Sanatorium in Kyperounda, Troodos, 1936-40
Photograph: Petros Phokaidis, 2008
School for Girls, Nicosia (1962)—were designed in a similar manner; these established a new building type, which was reproduced extensively after the island’s independence in 1960—although in the postcolonial period, the same vocabulary carried different social meanings.

SULEYMAN ONAN HOUSE, NICOSIA
NEOPTOLEMOS MICHAELIDES HOUSE, NICOSIA
ALEXANDROS DEMETRIOU APARTMENT BLOCK, NICOSIA
GRECIAN PARK HOTEL, FAMAGUSTA

After independence in 1960, new political and social conditions produced a totally different context for architectural production, which became a key tool for addressing the local society’s aspirations for decolonization and economic development. In 1961-63 Ahmet Vural Bahaeddin designed the house of Turkish-Cypriot lawyer Suleyman Onan. The Turkish-Cypriot architect designed mainly private residences for the elite, who typically played important political and social roles in the postcolonial period. Bahaeddin’s use of modernist vocabularies, materials and furniture attempted to introduce a cosmopolitan note in domestic life. Moving in the same direction, the work of Neoptolemos Michaelides has interesting similarities and differences. His work for private residences is
Neoptolemos Michaelides, Neoptolemos Michaelides House, Nicosia, 1965
Photograph: Petros Phokaides, 2008

Ahmet Bahaeddin, Suleyman Onan House, Nicosia, 1961-62
Photograph: from T. U. Uraz, H. Pulhan, P. Uluçay, H. Toprakçı, and Ö. Özbekeoğlu,
Houses for the Others Between 1955-1993 by the Architect Ahmet Vural Bahaeddin,
explicitly modernist but has particular vernacular references. Both in terms of the typology and in terms of the transitional spaces he introduced, Michaelides formulated a creative architectural response to local climatic conditions. The architect’s formal exercises through the use of reinforced concrete are illustrated in the design of his own house in 1965 as well as in larger structures, such as the Alexandros Demetriou apartment building (1963-65) and Grecian Park Hotel (c. 1965) constructed in Nicosia and Famagusta, respectively. In the creative attitude of N. Michaelides and of the other unmentioned architects of the postcolonial period one can witness an undercurrent of 1970s brutalism.

Cyprus changed drastically yet again in 1974, when a series of dramatic political changes including a coup d’état by the Greek Junta of the time and a military invasion by Turkey led to a violent division of the island and the uprooting of its people according to rather artificial ethnic lines. The built environment of Cyprus bears testimony to the open wounds of the country—through refugee settlements, military buffer zones, and borders that slice through the capital city and the entire island. Even if grand architectural projects of more recent years—such as Zaha Hadid’s design for the central Eleftheria Square in Nicosia, Hopkins Architects’ proposal for a Cultural Center, and Jean Nouvel’s project for a university library—might aspire to a hopeful future, the military checkpoints and other scars on the physical environment are a constant reminder of an unresolved political conflict that shapes today’s Cyprus and its architecture.

Panayiota Pyla
University of Cyprus

Petros Phokaides
[National Technical University of Athens]
Virtual Tour
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Neoptolemos Michaelides, Alexandros Demetriou apartment building, Nicosia, 1963-65
Photograph: Petros Phokaides

Neoptolemos Michaelides, Grecian Park Hotel, Famagusta, 1965
Photograph: authors, from the Greek architectural magazine Arhitektoviki 58 (1966): 69.
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LINKS FOR ARCHITECTURE AND CULTURE IN CYPRUS

General information on Nicosia and Cyprus

Municipality of Nicosia: http://www.nicosia.org.cy/
Cyprus Tourism Organization: http://www.visitcyprus.com/wps/portal

Museums and Cultural Centers

Marfin Laiki Group Cultural Centre: http://www.laiki.com/web/w3cy.nsf/WebContentDocsByID/ID-23821A6B963FE50FC2256B7A006CFA3F

Architectural Organizations and Institutions in Cyprus

Docomomo Cyprus Working Party, contact address: docomomo.cyprus@gmail.com
Cyprus Architects Association: http://www.architecture.org.cy
Department of Architecture, University of Cyprus: http://www.eng.ucy.ac.cy/ARCH

Books and Periodicals on Cypriot Architecture


Bookstore with a large selection of books on Cyprus, including architecture, art and archaeology.
BOOK REVIEW

Murray Fraser with Joe Kerr

*Architecture and the “Special Relationship”: the American Influence on Post-War British Architecture*

Abingdon: Routledge, 2007, 591 pp., 50 line illus., 230 b & w photos and 16 pp. color section, £55


Looking across at the USA during the Bush years, European intellectuals had to try hard not to be anti-American. Many, indeed, did not even try – perhaps too complacently sharing Baudrillard’s perception of the USA as “the only remaining primitive society” (p. 14). *Architecture and the “Special Relationship”* sets out explicitly to attack this lazy hostility, starting from the premise that “British architecture became modernized and globalized primarily through the emulation and absorption of Americanized ideas and values” (p. 5). Murray Fraser and Joe Kerr make an overwhelming case for this, drawing upon evidence from finance, industry, commerce, architecture, planning and popular culture.

After a wide-ranging introduction, the first chapter provides a pre-history of the subject from the Declaration of Independence through a century and a half to the Second World War. It identifies manifestations of growing US influence on the architectural, urban, industrial and commercial development of Britain. Larger case studies of nineteenth- and early twentieth-century American influence on Glasgow, Liverpool, Manchester and particularly London are punctuated with relevant and engaging cameos of influential Americans in Britain: these include the “pathological polygamist” Isaac Singer (of sewing machine fame) and William Waldorf Astor who “improved” Hever Castle – Anne Boleyn’s childhood home – with a new moat and new Tudor village to satisfy his contorted snobbery (pp. 64-5 and 84-5).

Another chapter discusses town planning, unpicking the complex interactions between Britain and America in the theory of Geddes, Unwin and Mumford; in the
Architecture and the ‘Special Relationship’
The American Influence on Post-War British Architecture

Murray Fraser with Joe Kerr
influence of the car; in the American ideas behind British New Towns; and in the development of prefabricated housing. A substantial part of the book is devoted to commercial architecture. Office blocks, shopping centers, and suburban industrial and commercial campuses, too often passed over by an academic world more interested in socially progressive or artistically expressive buildings and types, are here given their full weight.

What might be seen as the core of the book covers the ground one would expect: Banham, Price, Archigram, Foster and Rogers are examined over two chapters, tracing the history and effects of their interactions with US architecture, theory and technology. Drawing their material overwhelmingly from published sources and conference papers, the authors (who express doubts about the value of interviewing architects – p. 6) situate architectural developments in the wider cultural contexts of Cold War politics, popular culture and scientific progress.

If the technophiles of British postwar architecture receive sensitive analysis so do their opponents, classified here under the banner of “monumentality.” From Kahn and the Smithsons the argument moves urbanely on to Venturi and postmodernism, making a convincing case for American influences on James Stirling, an architect who is more routinely discussed in terms of his influence on America. A particular pleasure of the chapter is a more detailed examination of Eero Saarinen’s disappointing US Chancellery in London; here architectural, symbolic and cultural readings are supported by analysis of the hotly-worded attacks on the building by British critics.

The final chapter brings the story up to date with unashamedly Americanized supermarkets, airports, “loft apartments” and spec houses – a vindication of the book’s argument that modernity and globalization in Britain have been driven most importantly by the influence of the USA. The discussion concludes elegantly with some observations on a recent spate of American commissions for prominent British architects.
Architecture and the “Special Relationship” is a model cultural history, doubtless profiting from the decade-long collaboration from which it arose. Where it engages explicitly with critical theory it does so to a clear purpose, and its great breadth of reference never comes at the cost of clarity. It is not only consistently informative and authoritative, it is also a great pleasure to read. Fraser and Kerr introduce each new idea and topic in such a way that no one could feel excluded by lack of prior knowledge, but then pursue it with an originality of approach which guarantees new ideas and insights for the specialist.

For all the apparent specificity of its subject matter, the authors trace US influence into so many areas of British architectural life that the resulting book provides an authoritative and compelling history of postwar British architecture, wide-ranging in its coverage and original in its approach.

Barnabas Calder
Department of Architecture, University of Strathclyde
BOOK REVIEW

Michael Asgaard Andersen, editor

Nordic Architects Write: A Documentary Anthology
Abingdon and New York: Routledge, 2008, 418 pp., many black and white illus., $53.95 (paperback), $149.95 (hardcover)

The publication of a broad range of Scandinavian architectural texts in English is an event to be welcomed wholeheartedly. Few are determined enough to spend the time learning these “minority” languages and Scandinavian mastery of English—the “new Latin”—is so impressive that the struggle is not even rewarded with friendship; the relationships have already been built in English. Non-Scandinavians, therefore, have tended to study Scandinavian architects and architecture as through a long lens: related only in the most general way to social and political events and barely linked to the complex internal Scandinavian architectural discourse. Will the appearance of thirty-six texts written over the twentieth century translated into English have an influence on the way Scandinavian architecture is studied? One would hope. Certainly translations of writings by Poul Henningsen, Henning Larsen, Nils Ahrbom, Leif Reinius, Peter Celsing, Knut Knutsen, Håkon Vigsnaes, Marku Komonen, and Reimo Pietäla can only help.

But now the problems begin. Thirty-six texts divided equally between four countries means nine texts per country—not quite the same thing as thirty-six (or even twenty) per country. And which texts? The recent translation of the central Swedish texts of modern architecture by Ellen Key, Gregor Paulsson, and the collective treatise, acceptera in Modern Swedish Design: Three Founding Texts (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2008) rather rips the heart out of the Swedish section; there is no point in duplicating material published elsewhere in English, one might think. But in the case of the Finnish section, almost everything of importance by Alvar Aalto has already been published in English (including the text the editor has
Nordic Architects Write

A documentary anthology
Edited by Michael Asgaard Andersen

Introductions by Steven Holl, Michael Asgaard Andersen, Christoffer Harlang, Anni Vartola, Elisabeth Tostrup, Johan Mårtelius and Wilfried Wang
decided to publish). Could one contemplate a volume dedicated to Nordic architects without Aalto? Probably not. But in fact, of the thirty-six texts published here, fully one-quarter have already been published in English, and some have no Scandinavian language original.

Additionally, texts have been silently edited, footnotes or marginal notes removed and illustrations suppressed. A reader coming fresh to this book would not know that the texts had once been illustrated. Take something as basic as Gunnar Asplund’s professorial installation lecture of 1931, “Vår Arkitektoniska Rumsuppfattning,” (freshly translated here as “Our Architectonic Perception of Space”). As originally published in Byggmästaren the first illustration of almost a dozen was of a Japanese villa: in this book the only illustration is from the Stockholm Exhibition. Indeed, the possibility that Asplund’s illustrations and those of Peter Celsing, for his installation lecture of 1960 “Om Rummet,” published here as “About Space” could form a critical intergenerational dialogue is not something a reader of this book could speculate about. I apologize for singling out the Swedish section—the lack of illustrations veils an interesting historical parallel—but the same editorial rule applies throughout. The bitter truth is that a note buried on p. 412 should be on the title page: “The texts have been edited for clarity and length.” To revert to the old Latin: Caveat lector!

Each national section is preceded by an excellent introduction that orients readers to the texts setting them within the country’s own tradition of theoretical debate. Inevitably internal links are subtle and hard to explain. Parachuting in on one text, how much, for example, should a reader be told about Aulis Blomstedt’s Canon 60 system (no part of which is reproduced) and his role in Finland during the discussions of the 1960s? Anni Vartola in her introduction links Blomstedt to Pallasmaa and debates around Pietäla and the organic, so a careful reader can catch the references another time. Johan Mårtelius provides a multi-layered context for the Swedish section, filling in readers on gaps in the book’s documentary record, notably on the major missing text (acceptera) but he also includes essential thumbnail descriptions of events in the 1960s and 1970s. Christoffer Harlang (introducing the Danish section) and Elisabeth Tostrup (introducing the Norwegian
section) make similarly heroic efforts. An epilogue by Wilfried Wang summarizes the history of Nordic writing stressing the continuities between the countries and nicely emphasizing their "subtle rebellious positions" and the many other virtues of Nordic architecture.

Nicholas Adams
Vassar College, Poughkeepsie, NY
BOOK REVIEW

John Shannon Hendrix

_Architecture and Psychoanalysis: Peter Eisenman and Jacques Lacan_

New York and Bern: Peter Lang, 2006, 252 pp., 26 figs., £23.30


This book is about interpreting Peter Eisenman’s practice, both his texts and design projects, in the light of psychoanalytic theory. Architecture and psychoanalysis are both about structuring experience and situating the subject of perception in a world that makes sense to the subject. Presumably, therefore, a psychoanalytic approach may open up questions that are important for architecture. The reason for writing a book such as this one is to show that Eisenman’s practice is a reflection of something deeply human and a reflection of a certain period of twentieth-century thought, in order to attribute to it a certain form of humanism (or anti-humanism) and a place in the edifice of intellectual history.

_Architecture and Psychoanalysis: Peter Eisenman and Jacques Lacan_ draws parallels between key concepts in the writings of Eisenman and Lacan, in the way that Eisenman and Derrida drew parallels in the late 1980s and early 1990s between their own writings. Because Eisenman rarely refers directly to Lacan, the book has two strategies. It either builds bridges indirectly via other thinkers such as Chomsky or Derrida, to whom Eisenman refers, or directly between Lacan’s concepts and Eisenman’s formal design strategies such as displacement or scaling. For instance, parallels are drawn between Lacan’s objet petit a, Derrida’s différence (with an “a”), and Eisenman’s “absence of presence”; and between the unconscious (of Freud or Lacan; they are different but not enough to matter in this text), Chomsky’s deep grammar and Eisenman’s syntax. To do so, Hendrix goes directly to Lacan’s most difficult papers (chapeau), including “The function and field of speech...,” “The agency of the letter...,” and “The subversion of the subject...,” which constitute Lacan at his most linguistic; and avoids the more accessible Seminars.
ARCHITECTURE AND PSYCHOANALYSIS

Peter Eisenman and Jacques Lacan

John Shannon Hendrix
So how do we read John Shannon Hendrix? He is incredibly well-read across the history of western philosophy from the pre-Socratics to Hegel, to structuralism, to deconstruction. He sees glittering resemblances wherever he looks. His imagination seems to be captivated by the Same and the Different. But instead of a great cross-disciplinary expedition, we are too often left with simple statements of equivalence. First Hendrix identifies oppositions: Chomsky’s surface vs. deep grammar; Lacan’s Symbolic vs. Imaginary ego (not an opposition Lacan uses); Freud’s conscious vs. unconscious; Cusanus’s sensible vs. intelligible worlds; Saussure’s signifier vs. signified; and Hegel’s particular vs. universal. Then he stacks these oppositions as if deep structure in linguistics corresponds to the unconscious in psychoanalysis. There may be lines of thought that link them, but these have to be argued, not simply stated. Whether the unconscious is like deep structure depends upon how Hendrix works though the unconscious and deep structure. Interdisciplinary arguments are constructed, not natural. These arguments are not like draining the Zuyder Zee and seeing what turns up in the sediment; rather, the relations between the unconscious and deep structure have to be constructed by the author. When you explain an idea by relating it to another, you should extend its reach. Instead, too often we are left with correspondences that are not properly introduced and contextualized; that are hastily stated, often repeated, never explained or illustrated. It is never made clear why they are important either to architecture or psychoanalysis.

Lacan supports his theses on desire, identity, and signification by diagrams that are not mentioned in the text, let alone illustrated. Nor do we learn much about Eisenman’s practice. Eisenman’s diagrams are referred to but not included. Although the interior of Eisenman’s Aronoff Center is illustrated and referred to repeatedly, it is never described; and it is never explained how it invokes the Lacanian gaze or split subject, or even how it instantiates the claims that Eisenman makes of it. Because Hendrix worked in Eisenman’s office, we could expect some insight into particular projects. Instead we are told about scaling, displacement, revision, and other recursive design processes as complete abstractions (and informed that these are analogous to dream work, without explaining how dream work works).
These continually repeated equivalences between concepts have the effect of producing a text encrusted with presence, as if Hendrix were trying to render fully present the whole history of western philosophy in the mind of the reader. There is no progression in the text. Nothing is left behind, elided, lost; and nothing new is encountered. When a text is oriented between Derrida (the absence of meaning) and Lacan (the vanishing of the subject), it seems paradoxical that it seems to share with logocentric philosophies the aspirations for full presence.

Lacan insisted that you had to read Freud’s text (and presumably Lacan’s) as if he were writing about himself. Thus Lacan turned an oft-heard criticism of Freud on its head. Far from reducing its relevance – so Lacan claimed—this subjective reading was the basis for its authenticity and hence the truth and universality of analysis. Only then did a text on subjectivity cease to present the contradiction that it treats its subject matter objectively. All texts are subjective; some mask it better than others. We are never outside our subjectivity, even those who repudiate analysis. We can always ask about a text (or art or architecture, or science stripped bare, even) wherein lies the desire of its subject, the author, or – what is essentially the same question – how it situates its author in the field of the Other. Architectural research into psychoanalysis is still in its early days and has arguably not yet found its grounds as a discourse within which it can speak with confidence. We need to support each other. We have to regard this text as expeditionary.

Lorens Holm
School of Architecture, University of Dundee
EXHIBITION REVIEW

L’Accademia Nazionale di San Luca per una collezione del disegno contemporaneo
Curator: Francesco Moschini

Accademia di San Luca, Roma
20 December 2008 – 30 June 2009

Officially founded in 1593 to highlight the important role of drawing in painting, sculpture and architecture, the National Academy of Saint Luke exhibits a new collection of contemporary drawings, on view through June 2009, after which it will travel elsewhere in Europe. First housed in the small church of San Luca on the Esquiline Hill before moving to Pietro da Cortona’s Santi Luca e Martina in the Roman Forum, the prestigious Academy has occupied its current location in the Palazzo Carpegna near the Trevi Fountain since 1934.

Reviving an earlier tradition in which every member newly admitted to the Academy gave an example of his art to the institute (a “pièce de réception”), the Academy has asked current members to contribute two drawings each from different periods of their careers. Expanding on the rich collection of about 5,500 historical drawings, which date primarily from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries, the exhibition celebrates these new contemporary drawings, the works of eighty members.

The exhibition is mounted in four ground-floor rooms at the Palazzo Carpegna, the galleries visually connected with a uniform light blue color. The entrance room displays drawings from all disciplines within the Academy (painting, sculpture, and architecture), while the three remaining spaces each feature one of the disciplines alone. In each room, vertical panels set on a diagonal identify the artists on display. In addition to the work of painters and sculptors, the show includes work by thirty architects.*

Most of the architectural drawings date from 1980 to the present. Employing a range of graphic media, the majority of the architects have used ink or pencil on cardboard or tracing paper, but also pastel on brown paper (Cellini), crayon or

View of the entrance to the exhibition in the Palazzo Carpegna
Photograph: Accademia Nazionale di San Luca
colored pen on tracing paper (Anselmi, Fuksas), watercolour (Isola, Zacchiroliti),
and collage (Monestiroli). The types of drawings chosen by the architects also vary
widely: some are construction documents (Aulenti) or freehand full-scale con-
struction details (Guerri). Others, such as those by Botta, Canella, Fuksas, Purini,
and Zermani are sketches or concept drawings. Most, however, are fully developed
presentation drawings, such as black and white perspectival renderings.

Among the wide selection, the project for the San Pio da Pietrelcina church in San
Giovanni Rotondo by Alessandro Anselmi (2007) is particularly striking for its
power and expressiveness. The project by Francesco Cellini for the former Jung-
hans area on the Giudecca island in Venice (1995) depicts an evocative atmosphere
and refined technique. Curiously, Massimiliano Fuksas’s 2003 drawing of the Fiera
Milano displays a style remarkably unchanged from the quick impression he used
in 1976 to depict his well-known Sport Complex in Paliano.

The meaning of the architects’ drawings is much debated and they can be read in
many ways. The Academy has chosen to feature drawing because it is understood
as “the crucial moment of every visual art, when an idea, portrayed more freely
and directly, more clearly expresses an author’s hand,” as the introductory text to
the exhibition explains. Among those on display, nevertheless, only a few could
be viewed as a medium for immediate expression of the architects’ ideas, while
the vast majority are in fact presentation drawings, which require a long working
process before completion. Therefore, the exhibition seems to imply a notion of
drawing as autonomous work, a theoretical elaboration; furthermore, as a self-
contained architecture that does not necessarily need to be built, that is not sim-
ply a step in the process that transforms an idea into its realization. This notion
was widespread and much debated in Italy in the 1980s, and usually labelled “ar-
chitettura disegnata.” The architectural fantasy by Carlo Aymonino, “Il Colosso,
il Colosseo, l’Arco di Costantino” (2001), and those entitled “La città compatta”
(1966) and “La città uguale” (2000) by Franco Purini illustrate this approach.

Since the mid-1990s the widespread use of CAAD and digital design has deeply
changed the way of making architectural drawings. Perhaps certain drawings,
such as some of the very elaborate presentation drawings on show, have now liter-
ally become a sort of “academic exercise,” but the first approach to a project with
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Carlo Aymonino, project for covering the Giardino Romano on the Capitoline Hill, with museum installation, Rome, 2008
Photograph: Accademia Nazionale di San Luca

Alessandro Anselmi, project for the church of San Pio da Pietrelcina, San Giovanni Rotondo, 2007
Photograph: Accademia Nazionale di San Luca
sketches or summary concept drawings will probably always remain a fundamental and inevitable step in architectural creation.

Curator Francesco Moschini is Professor of the History of Architecture at the Politecnico di Bari and a member of the scholars’ section of the Accademia di San Luca. In his work he has frequently referred to authors including Aldo Rossi and to concepts such as the so-called “progetto di crisi.” In 1978 he founded the Architettura Arte Moderna Gallery in Rome (AAM), dedicated to promoting the “culture of the project” and to “defining the theoretical dimension of the project.” The gallery examines the relationship between theory, history and design in architecture and the visual arts, and this exhibition seems closely related to the AAM program. Given that the exhibition displays only one or two drawings by each of the members, yet shown all together, it is intrinsically heterogeneous, fragmentary, and to some extent “casual.” This coincides very well, therefore, with Moschini’s interests in “contemporaneity” as marked by “crossing sights,” “intersections,” “trespassing” and “contaminations among diverse entities.”

Giulia Ceriani Sebregondi
Sapienza, Università di Roma

Publication related to the exhibition:


** For the information here on Francesco Moschini and the AAM Gallery, see http://www.aamgalleria.it/la-galleria.php?id=3700-Profili-e-nota-biografica-di-Francesco-Moschini and http://www.aamgalleria.it/cfm-home.php.
Vittorio Gregotti, view of pedestrian plaza with surrounding buildings, competition for transformation of the Pirelli zone in Bicocca, Milan, 1988
Photograph: Accademia Nazionale di San Luca
EXHIBITION REVIEW

Las Vegas Studio. Bilder aus dem Archiv von Robert Venturi und Denise Scott Brown
Curators: Hilar Stadler and Martino Stierli

Museum im Bellpark, Kriens
23 November 2008 to 8 March 2009

Deutsches Architekturmuseum, Frankfurt am Main
27 March to 5 May 2009

Seen in Kriens, November 2008

This may well be the right moment for a fresh look at *Learning from Las Vegas*, the urban research from the 1960s by Robert Venturi, Denise Scott Brown and Steven Izenour into an environment that was typically “popular” and “non-designed,” developed almost solely for commercial reasons. This reassessment is timely not only because we seem to find ourselves in the midst of a general reorientation towards the conceptual legacy of this era, but also because of the enduring—and enduringly touchy—relationship our society seems to have with mass culture. Such a reevaluation was first undertaken by Martino Stierli in his dissertation *Ins Bild gerückt* (Zurich: ETH, 2007) about *Learning from Las Vegas*; the investigation has now been continued in the exhibition *Las Vegas Studio: Images from the Archives of Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown*, curated by Stierli (an art historian at the Universität Basel) and Hilar Stadler (director of the Museum im Bellpark, Kriens).

The *Las Vegas Studio* exhibition displayed original material from the architects’ research in Las Vegas. Exceptionally, it presented almost one hundred photographs, along with various films and some astonishing mock-ups of pages for the original book, from the Venturi and Scott Brown archives that—in 1972—were not selected for publication. The selection of photographs chosen for this exhibition by Peter Fischli and the curators, however, does not deal so much with the misses, but instead gives an interesting insight backstage into the creation of this seminal document of late twentieth-century architecture. Thus the exhibition can be understood as a kind of “Making of... *Learning from Las Vegas*.”
The Strip seen from the desert, with Robert Venturi’s silhouette, 1966

One photograph from a sequence documenting the upper Strip, driving north, Las Vegas, 1968
What comes to the fore is, first, the specific working method of the researchers and second the (in the book) less explicit, but at least as interesting, “other” aspirations the authors had towards their research object. The apparent pleasure in studying Las Vegas becomes visible in the snapshots of the researchers themselves at work, and also in the lively and almost physical way in which the Las Vegas artifacts of mass culture are represented here. At the same time this physicality reveals the real focus of these photographs: the sign as a material thing. This is best conveyed, for instance, in the photographs of a cemetery of billboards, in which the (now-“dead”) billboards become vividly alive once again as constructions of communication. Some images feature the atelier of a Las Vegas billboard designer: here we see a young Bob Venturi contemplating in awe some beautiful models of a “Flamingo” sign and, in another photo, studying a precise model of the Frontier hotel and casino with a “Frontier” billboard next to it. Most interesting are those photographs that show the signs as design itself: compositions of lines and colors, as well as technical constructions. A beautiful example is the view of the brightly pink “Flamingo” sign taken from above so as to show the construction of the different layers of flower petals and the depth between these.

The exhibition presented this overwhelming body of photographs as works of art, beautifully displayed in poster-size prints, glazed and framed. Yet more than works of art meant for a broad public, these images are the result of very serious and sensitive investigation by architect-scholars, who appreciated these artifacts as study material for their craft: the making of an architecture of signs and communication for a modern mass society. Whoever is interested in this craft—arguably a major factor in today’s appreciation of the architectural legacy of the mid-twentieth century—should have seen this exhibition.

A fine book accompanies the exhibition, which not only includes excellent reproductions of the photographs, but also features a well-written and well-documented essay about the Las Vegas studio by Martino Stierli, a rich essay by Stanislaus von Moos, a leading scholar of the work of Venturi, Rauch and Scott Brown, and last but not least an entertaining conversation between Peter Fischli, Hans Ulrich Obrist and Rem Koolhaas regarding the photographs. This conversation between the Swiss artist, the Swiss art historian and the Dutch architect touches upon
Studies of billboards, office of Young Electric Sign Company, Las Vegas, 1968
some interesting and sensitive points. Why were Venturi and Scott Brown interested in commercial culture? What are we to think of that choice? And what to think of this all in today’s context? Koolhaas argues that “commercial American Pop culture” was then a “completely plausible” source, because, he claims, “back then, it was the most coherent, consistent and creative bubble you could possibly imagine.”

Karin Theunissen
Technische Universiteit Delft

Publication related to the exhibition:

Riviera Hotel and Casino sign, Las Vegas, 1968
“Ongoing and Upcoming” events listings are now available in an online database on the EAHN website. The database contains events listings from the current issue of the EAHN Newsletter, as well as those from all previous issues. Events may be searched by country, type of event, date, keyword, or combinations of these parameters at the section “Ongoing and Upcoming” at www.eahn.org.

EAHN members and others are encouraged to submit notices of their own events for inclusion in the database through the “Add a Listing” page on the website.

For all current listings in the various events categories, click on the shortcut links below.
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