At each biennial conference, the EAHN interest groups are given the opportunity to hold meetings which can range from brainstorming sessions or business meetings to more planned workshops. They are open to all conference participants and meant to carry forward the EAHN’s mission to be an open, non-hierarchical and welcoming network. Below are short reports of the group events held in Tallinn at EAHN2018 on 13 June 2018.
Architectural publishing is today under threat as never before. In the urge to address this complex situation, we invited scholars and practitioners working in or with architectural publishing to an object-based roundtable. Each invited participant brought to the table a publication that they considered as paradigmatic on a disciplinary or a personal level as well as pertinent for its geographical and historical context. From a seventeenth-century fundraising booklet, an architectural history handbook and a magazine of the nineteenth century to three twentieth-century magazines, and a book, a magazine and a scholarly journal from this century, objects covered a wide range of practices within architectural publishing.

Reflecting upon this variety of samples, one of the most pertinent questions raised by the panel regarded the implications of digital versus print, both in terms of digital-born media as well as of the digitisation of historical material, and the freedoms and specific values within both. Two other sets of questions were incited by publications on the table. The first one: the relationship between publication and audience, and how one shapes the other. Though initially prompted by a 19th-century history handbook, it proved to be relevant to all publications on the table regarding the links between different groups – professional to lay, academic to practitioner, etc., and institutions and their communities – academia and scholars, professional bodies and practitioners, etc. While the requirements of academia are, and have been, a driving force of publishing, the panel advocated for forms of ‘hybrid’ publications as an alternative to the constraints placed by academia, that can reach broader audiences and allow to experiment with writing modes and formats. The second set of questions related to the economics of publishing. Models of patronage and sponsorship, past and present, prompted a discussion
around structures of production – including gender-based structures – as well as the visible and invisible labour involved.

The roundtable ended with many open questions around publishing practices, audiences, and materials and the panel agreed that further debate is crucial for architectural publishing to remain critical. We thank everyone who attended, but particularly the invited contributors: Petra Brouwer, Maarten Delbeke, Francisco Díaz, Rute Figueiredo, Charles Rice, Mika Savela, André Tavares, and Erik Wegerhoff.

**Gender Group**

**Women and Gender in Architecture and Urban Design**

Convened by Anooradha Iyer Siddiqi (Harvard University) and Rachel Lee, in collaboration with Katia Frey (ETH Zurich) and Eliana Perotti (ETH Zurich)

Our aim for this meeting was to discuss our (Anooradha Iyer Siddiqi and Rachel Lee’s) call for papers ‘On Margins: Feminist Architectural Histories of Migration’ for a special issue of *ABE* journal in relation to a selection of readings we had previously circulated among group members (see list below). However, as we were sharing the allotted time with the Architecture and Environment Special Interest Group, this plan proved too ambitious and we spent the hour working through questions related to the CfP alone.

Having introduced the CfP as the current iteration of an ongoing conversation that has been developing between us over several years, we focused on two claims made in the first paragraph: first, that the dynamic of a situated and re-situated perspective is foundational to feminist histories of architecture, and second, that feminist historiographical approaches destabilize presumptions of fixity at the heart of the discipline. This provoked a discussion about the notion of fixity in
terms of presumed structures of architectural historical discourse and ‘the canon’, as well as in relation to subjects and objects of research. Points were raised about expanding the geographical field of research away from European centres, the potential of architectural history as a field that supports diverse methods, the emerging significance of the ‘activist academic’, and what it might mean to study figures who have moved through colonial and postcolonial spaces. Points were also made about the absence of archives of women architects and builders and the implications this has on research: How do we find evidence? How do we trace professional interactions that were based on un-transcribed conversations?

Criticisms were expressed about the lack of definition and implied interchangeability of terms such as migration and mobility, and the focus on ‘women’s work’ in the CfP: is it productive to explore architecture produced by women, particularly in relation to regionalism and vernacular architecture? By studying women architects and mobility it may be possible to open up larger historical narratives of capitalism, beyond the nation-state construct: women found proving grounds and were able to inhabit spaces outside of typical professional networks, as Jane Drew did in Chandigarh or Ghana. While our research has shown that studying women leads to different kinds of private archives, explorations, and narratives, we admitted to a potential lack of commensurability between the proposed combination of feminist methods and feminine subjects. For some participants the CfP was an attempt to align two oppositional ideas: contributing to an expanded and more inclusive canon (a recuperative project that can also be interpreted as regressive) versus a feminist defamiliarization of architectural history that questions the presuppositions of the canon. Should these be distinct projects, or, as we have intimated, is there a gain to be made in suspending, juxtaposing and layering them together? For others the migrant subjects are places where methodology and object intersect. How this potential dichotomy resolves itself remains to be seen in the submissions we receive to the CfP.

**Readings**


**Histories in Conflict Group Open Meeting**

Convened by Panayiota Pyla (University of Cyprus) and Alona Nitzan-Shiftan (Israel Institute of Technology)

The engaged group that met in Tallinn included some attendees of the Jerusalem Conference and some new members. We were happy to hear that the Jerusalem conference has been a springboard to new initiative and future conferences in the field.

The discussion evolved around the outcome of the recent thematic conference of the EAHN, ‘Histories in Conflict: Cities, Buildings, Landscapes’ that was held in Jerusalem in June 2017, and that cast the spotlight on past and current realities in cities as diverse as Mostar, Famagusta, Dublin and Jerusalem. We reported on the Jerusalem conference’s three workshops:

1. urban citizenship | violence | historiography
2. data | space | conflict
3. heritage | preservation | urban renewal

The vivid roundtable discussion focused on the methodological challenges of writing histories in conflict: on the tension between activism and scholarship, and on archival challenges posed to those of us who research fields of conflict. Participants reflected on the kind of intervention to which we are committed when we engage such conflicted sites—how can we contribute to the critical understanding of these sites and to advancement of the public good through research in our own domain?
A draft matrix with key concepts from the thematic conference, projected on the screen helped generate a brainstorming session on the different modalities of intellectual labor that come to a sharper relief in areas of conflict: designers, activists and scholars. The participants wished to examine how and should criticism turn into operative criticism, and what is gained and lost in the mobility between the different modalities of intellectual labor. Issues of rights vs. citizenship and the danger of the former overriding the latter were connected to the larger discussion of the scope we aim to cover. Should the various manifestations—national, civic, gender, ethnic, religious, economic etc.—be all discussed under our primary historiographical focus i.e., how should we re-conceptualize our disciplinary tools vis-à-vis the predicament of conflict?

Housing Group
Housing Histories as a Methodological Frontier: A Workshop and a Manifesto

Convened by Gaia Caramellino (Politecnico di Milano) and Filippo De Pieri (Politecnico di Torino)

The third encounter of the Interest Group on Housing held in Tallinn was conceived as a shared discussion on the specific ways in which housing history, as currently practiced by architectural historians, can contribute to current debates concerning the methodology, the goals and the public relevance of architectural history. The meeting was intended as the first step of a collective writing exercise that will result in a ‘manifesto’, co-authored by the participants.

The aim was to understand how recent research, teaching and public communication experiences in the field of housing history can play a role in exploring/encouraging innovative research approaches to architectural history. The workshop was organized as a round-table discussion on four proposed topics that allowed to address the question adopting different methodological perspectives.

The first issue discussed was ‘cross-disciplinarit’ and the way it is currently practiced by housing history research, questioning the role of housing histories in encouraging forms of exchange and contamination between different fields of knowledge. A second moment of the conversation was dedicated to the understanding of the role of housing histories in opening the field of architectural history to the practice of cross-cultural and long-term comparison and on the relevance of transnational perspectives. The third part of the debate focused on the new forms of interaction between phenomenological and abstract approaches, as mirrored by recent housing histories. Finally, the group’s attention focused on the growing interest for micro levels observations and its connection with the microhistorical debate, as well as on its role in the re-shaping of macro-narratives. A last part of the meeting was dedicated to the organization of the writing of the position paper on methodological concerns and to the definition of the future activities of the Interest group, its role and aims, opening up to the possibility to conceive it as a permanent research table on specific topics.
LATIN AMERICA GROUP
CULTURAL TRANSFERS AND CONNECTIONS BETWEEN LATIN AMERICA AND EUROPE SINCE THE 19TH CENTURY

Convened by Ana Esteban Maluenda (Universidad Politécnica de Madrid), Horacio Torrent (Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile), Ruth Verde Zein, (Mackenzie University, São Paulo) and Anat Falbel (São Paulo)

The aim of the First Meeting of the ‘Latin America-Europe Connections’ EAHN Interest Group was to define the future of the group and its possibilities of development.

The coordinators of the group had suggested a discussion pointed on the cultural encounters between Latin America and Europe since the 19th century. The moderator of the meeting, Ana Esteban Maluenda, began with a brief reflection on the concept of cultural connections between continents. Then, a round table with eight speakers was formed. After a brief presentation of each of them around a research topic underway, a debate began in which, rather than talking about the papers that were presented, the interest and the future of the group were discussed. We had four participants from Brazil, one from Mexico, one from USA, one from Portugal and one from Spain, that is to say, 6 from the Americas and only 2 from Europe. This was pointed out as one of the group’s objectives: to help non-European researchers to join the EAHN conferences and, in this way, the network. However, it was considered to try to level the geographical origin of the works, since of the eight works presented, six were dedicated to Brazil. Each assistant committed to divulge the existence of the group in search of interested researchers of diverse Latin American nationalities, with the aim of levelling the origins for future meetings.

The diffusion and growth of the group was considered as one of the priorities at this time. One of the attendees, Helena Bender, promoted the use of social networks to disseminate the group’s news and provide information. Ana Esteban Maluenda committed to activate communications with group members through the website.

We also discussed the possibility of new formats for next meetings, considering the organization of an encounter in a few months to work on the group progress.
Postgraduate Group
Open Meeting
Convened by Miranda Critchley (Bartlett, UCL)

In the postgraduate group, we discussed the situation for PhD students in our respective countries of study and the current issues facing researchers in the humanities. We identified common experiences but also those that were particular to our locations and topics of study - the challenge, for example, of writing history in Hong Kong and feeling the effects of colonialism: when key archives are located in Europe, travel for research becomes expensive and time-consuming. We considered different ways of making conferences more accessible and wondered what resources we’d like from the EAHN, but we also thought about format: in what form would a postgraduate group work best? This was our first meeting; now we’ve got lots to think about for next time!

Postmodernism Group
Drawing Architecture, 1968-1988
Convened by Véronique Patteeuw (ENSA-Lille) and Léa-Catherine Szacka (University of Manchester)

The EAHN round table ‘Drawing Architecture’ organised in the framework of the 2018 EAHN conference in Tallinn gathered scholars, collectors and institutional voices discussing issues of presentation and representation, real and unreal, object and subject with a closer look at architectural drawings produced in the two decades spanning between the year 1968 and the year 1988. Each speaker presented a pair of architectural drawings dating from the period under scrutiny. Tina di Carlo, editor at Drawing Matter, presented a series of drawings by Rem Koolhaas that were recently acquired by the Drawing Matter Trust (Somerset) from the personal archives of Luce van Rooij, Koolhaas’ gallery in Amsterdam. Amongst them: the 1978 Medusa and Welfare Palace Hotel, the 1983 Boompjes silk screen and
a 1982 colour pencil drawing of the same project. Jordan Kauffman, architectural historian affiliated with the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and lecturer in architecture at Boston University could unfortunately not attend the conference but send notes and images that were presented during the round table. Kauffman compared two drawings: a 1978 facade drawing by Michael Graves and the Chamber Works by Daniel Libeskind. Stefaan Vervoort, lecturer in modern and contemporary art at LUCA School of Arts in Brussels proposed a reading of both Peter Eisenman’s 1975 axonometric model of House X and Dan Graham’s 1979 Alteration to a Suburban House. Christian Parreno, Assistant Professor of History and Theory of Architecture at Universidade San Francisco de Quito analysed the 1978 and 1989 Quito Biennale posters. A challenging discussion followed, addressing, amongst others, the following topics: How did the drawing contribute to a postmodern understanding of architecture? What was the afterlife of the drawing and how did this afterlife influence our contemporary understanding of those drawings? What were the techniques used? What role did the drawing play within the architect’s practice? What do we understand by drawing? When talking about drawings, can we include other forms of two-dimension representation such as collage and etchings? What is the status of the original if copies can be made? How to interpret the aesthetics and identity of the drawing? How can we analyse the production of architect as draftsman versus the architect as artist? Could we use the term artwork to talk about architectural drawings? The discussion was recorded, and we hope to continue working on this very rich topic with members of the group.

**Urban Representations Group Curated Urban Visions Workshop**

Convened by Miriam Paeslack (University of Buffalo), Anat Falbel (São Paulo) and Jeffrey Cohen (Bryn Mawr College)

The EAHN Urban Representations Workshop this year set out to discuss urban and architectural representations as ‘Curated Urban Visions’. More specifically, the organizers asked participants to prepare seven-minute presentations paying particular attention to the “pointed filtering or focus” of urban representations.

Through eleven presentations the workshop offered provocations for the discussion of ‘curatorial’ measures across media, geography and historical eras. Three presentation clusters were followed by brief Q&A sessions. The workshop continued for about an hour beyond its official discussion time of 2.5 hours with a general discussion that revealed certain recurring thematic cross-currents.

The first four presentations were grouped under the rubric ‘Purposeful Representations’. Minke Walda’s investigated the omission of visualizing urban decline and demolition in 18th-century Dutch cities; Min Kyung Lee’s traced the affirmative political motives behind maps of late 19th century Paris; Angelo Maggi offered an analysis of G. E. Kidder Smith’s *Italy Builds* (1955), and its almost
cinematic image language; and Giulia Scotto discussed the motives and meanings embodied in urban postcards of Zambia’s capital, Lusaka, from the 1960s.

The second set of presentations was grouped around issues of representation of ‘The Part and the Whole’. John Montague pointed out the circumstances and evidence of ‘contingent city image making’ in John Rocque’s 18th-century map of Dublin; Rosa Tamborrino discussed representations of the city from two-dimensional depictions to models, to Patrick Geddes’s Edinburgh city museum, and to virtual recreations of the city; Nancy Stieber presented an analysis of patterns among views of sites within the city of Amsterdam from the 16th through 19th centuries; and Jeffrey Cohen showed 18th and 19th century panoramic street-elevation series aligned digitally with coeval cadastral maps as records of historic morphologies in European cities.

The final session was titled ‘Urban Experience and Imagination’. In it, Davide Deriu explored the contemporaneous notion of vertigo in photographs of modern buildings taken from the 1920s to the 50s; Miriam Paeslack discussed the spatialities of meaning in the design for an exhibition of contemporary photography of Italian rationalist architecture; and Laura Martinez de Guerenu offered an analysis of Constant Nieuwenhuys’s collage titled Symbolic Representation of New Babylon (1969).