HPA Issue 3 will be on Megastructures.

This issue is edited by Dominique Rouillard, Anna Rosellini with Lorenzo Ciccarelli, Beatrice Lampariello.

CALL FOR PAPERS
In 1964 the Japanese architect Fumihiko Maki defined Megastructure as “a large frame in which all the functions of a city or part of a city are housed” (Investigations in Collective Form, 1964). In the following years and decades, the term Megastructure expanded widely and it now includes architectures of different forms, functions and urban ambitions. Metabolism, Frei Otto, Constant A. Nieuwenhuys, Yona Friedman, Cedric J. Price, Archigram, Richard Buckminster Fuller are only a few of the protagonists who have developed a personal vision of the Megastructure and contributed to its evolutions. This issue of “Histories of Postwar Architecture” aims to collect several contributions in order to better define the theoretical implications, the architectural and urban declinations that the Megastructure assumed worldwide in the second half of the twentieth century. Moreover, the call aims to evaluate the topicality of Megastructure in relation to the present times.
Topics and questions of interest include, but are not limited to, the following:

- The definition of Megastructure was given at the beginning of the Sixties. Yet already before the war its ancestors existed. In what do the relationships, analogies and differences between the Megastructure and its forefathers consist?
- The definition of Megastructure, as it is given by Fumihiko Maki, Kenzo Tange or Ralph Wilcoxon, is based on series of opposites: big-small, collective-individual, artificial-spontaneous, permanent-temporary, structure-filling. Which are the Megastructure arrangements set up to guarantee the existence of these opposites?
- Which are the architectural complexes, the buildings, the structures and their details that contributed to the definition of the term Megastructure?
- Which technologies and technological imaginaries did allow the conception and the realization of Megastructures? Which is the role of the technological evolutions in its invention?
- Which relationship is between the Megastructure and the city? What scale does exist between them?
- In which way did the Megastructure succeed in producing a social change in the architectural conception and in the displays of both the collective and the private life of human beings?
- Which were the political dimensions of the Megastructure?
- Photomontages, graphic schemes, screenplays and models are only some of the different supports chosen to describe and tell the new kinds of life allowed by the Megastructure. In what way was the Megastructure represented and told?
- What was the role of Megastructure in the architectural teaching?
- What is the legacy of Megastructure in today's architecture and urban theories and planning?
- In what way could it be possible to operate on Megastructures nowadays? Which were the conservative operations, restorations, museification the Megastructures were subjected to in the past?
- How the opposition to Megastructure, and even the detestation of the Megastructure inspired during the time of its development can be explained?
- How to understand the come back of Megastructure, as a name, as an icon, as a possible solution for the future, and for example the unpredictable rehabilitation of Yona Friedman’ visions?
- How Megastructure, in its previous and full definition, could be reinvested by our present environmental challenge?
- Megastructure and smart city: how does this association sound?
Authors must submit directly full papers by September 1, 2018

Accepted authors will be notified by October 15, 2018

Publication is expected to be in December, 2018.

Papers should be submitted using www.hpa.unibo.it

The guidelines for paper submission are available at https://hpa.unibo.it/about/submissions#authorGuidelines

Please, fill in the author's profile with all the informations required as:
- Applicant's name
- Professional affiliation
- Title of paper
- Abstract
- 5 keywords
- A brief CV (max 2,000 characters)

Please submit the proposal in the form of MS Word (length between 20,000 and 80,000 characters). The submitted paper must be anonymous. Please delete from the text and file's properties all informations about name, administrator etc. Papers should clearly define the argument in relation to the available literature and indicate the sources which the paper is based on. All papers received will go through a process of double-blind peer review before publication.

HPA also looks for contributions for the review section. https://hpa.unibo.it/about/editorialPolicies#sectionPolicies