Crossing Boundaries.
Rethinking European architecture beyond Europe.

2014 Palermo 13 - 16 April
The International network “European Architecture beyond Europe: Sharing Research and Knowledge on Dissemination Processes, Historical Data and Material Legacy (19th-20th centuries)”, chaired by Mercedes Volait and Johan Lagae, and supported by EC funding through the COST Action IS0904 (2010-2014), is holding its final conference in Palermo (Rettorato dell’Università degli Studi di Palermo, Palazzo Chiaramonte Steri), 13-16 April, 2014.

The conference includes a general session presenting the achievements and future prospects of the network, and 6 panels. The keynote speech will be delivered by Dr. Sibel Zandi-Sayek, The College of William and Mary, Williamsburg, Virginia, USA: Remapping the Geographies of Industrial Enterprise: Ottoman-British Networks and the Architectural Canon.

An invited lecture will be delivered by Dr. Lukasz Stanek, Manchester Architecture Research Centre, School of Environment & Development, University of Manchester, UK: Architects from Socialist Countries in Ghana (1957-1967): Architecture and Mondialization.

The official launch of the new dedicated electronic journal, ABE - European Architecture beyond Europe, will take place at the conference.
Program

Sunday 13.04
Palazzo Chiaramonte Steri

13:30 - 14:00  Registration
14:00 - 17:00  Presentation of collaborative work achieved during the Action:
Mercedes Volait & Johan Lagae, General introduction.
Claudine Piaton, Juliette Hueber, Thierry Lochard, Boussad Aiche, Researching 19th c. Algiers on site and in archives.
Juliette Hueber, Antonio Mendes, Pauline van Roosmalen, Building digital platforms
Rachel Lee, Going digital: a personal view.
Antonio Mendes, Action’s website: statistics and archiving
17:30 - 18:00  Film screening
18:00 - 19:00  Keynote speech by Dr. Sibel Zandi-Sayek:
Remapping the Geographies of Industrial Enterprise: Ottoman-British Networks and the Architectural Canon

Monday 14.04
Palazzo Chiaramonte Steri

08:30 - 09:00  Welcome speeches:
Prof. Roberto Lagalla, Mag-nifico Rettore dell’Università degli Studi di Palermo; Prof. Marcella Aprile, Direttore del Dipartimento di Architettura dell’Università degli Studi di Palermo; Dott.ssa Maria Elena Volpes, Soprintendente dei Beni Culturali e Ambientali di Palermo della Regione Siciliana

09:00 - 12:00  Session 1. Methods and methodologies. Writing the histories of European imperial/colonial architecture

12:00 - 13:00  Lunch
[androne del pianterreno, Palazzina Neoclassica: ex Regio Lotto, Complesso di Palazzo Chiaramonte]

13:00 - 16:00  Session 2. Architectures of exile. Visions and re-Visions of the global modern in the age of the refugee

16:30 - 18:00  Session 3. Looking eastward, building identities. The architecture of European diplomacy beyond the Mediterranean in the age of Empire

18:30 - 19:00  Film screening
19:00 - 20:00  Invited Lecture by Dr. Lukasz Stanek:
Architects from Socialist Countries in Ghana (1957-1967): Architecture and Mondialization
### Tuesday 15.04

**Palazzo Chiaramonte Steri**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>08:00 - 18:00</td>
<td><strong>Architectural visits:</strong> guided by Ettore Sessa, Eliana Mauro, Vincenza Maggiore, Livia Realmuto. Contact : Eliana Mauro (+ 39 334 6476419) [Departure : The bus will depart from Palazzo Chiaramonte, piazza Marina no. 61, at 8:00 am] Sites to be visited : Monreale (including the Dome and the Cloister); the Cuba, the Zisa, the Palazzo dei Normanni, San Giovanni degli Eremiti, Church di San Cataldo, Church di Santa Maria dell’Ammiraglio, Casina Cinese in park of Real Favorita, Oratorio di Santa Cita. [Free entrance to the monuments for the participants in the conference, by courtesy of the Soprintendenza ai Beni Culturali e Ambientali di Palermo della Regione Siciliana]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18:30 - 20:30</td>
<td><strong>Evaluation meeting</strong> [Chiesa di Sant’Antonio Abate - Complesso di Palazzo Chiaramonte, piazza Marina no. 61]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Wednesday 16.04

**Palazzo Chiaramonte Steri**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Activity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>09:00 - 12:00</td>
<td><strong>Session 4. Transnational studies and cultural transfers</strong> Lunch [androne del pianterreno, Palazzina Neoclassica: ex Regio Lotto, Complesso di Palazzo Chiaramonte]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:00 - 13:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:00 - 16:00</td>
<td><strong>Session 5. Architecture as development aid.</strong> Actors, networks and mechanisms in the design of institutional buildings in the postcolonial global South <strong>Session 6. Examining Tropical Architecture: in different international contexts.</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30 - 19:00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
This session seeks to explore and debate the ways in which we write (and have written) the history of ‘European architecture abroad’, particularly in the context of European imperial expansion. For some thirty years now the study of European imperial and colonial architecture has largely been refracted through the theoretical lens of post-structuralism —mainly appropriated from philosophy, literary and cultural studies—in the form of the ‘Orientalist’ critique of Edward Said and other forms of Foucauldian discourse analysis, nominally referred to as ‘post-colonial theory’. As powerful and seductive as these modes of analysis may be, and as useful in their opening new ways of seeing and interpreting forms of cultural production such as architecture, they have become formulaic, predictable, and even ortho-
dox. They have also received trenchant and sustained criti-
cism from the wider scholarly community in historical stud-
ies (especially outside art and architecture circles) for their inherent limitations.

This leaves us with the question of where the study of Euro-
pean imperial and colonial architecture might turn next. On
the whole, other scholarly and cognate traditions, such as
early modern and modern European history, have developed
more diverse and wide-ranging approaches to the study of
empire and culture, adapting insights from geography, envi-
ronmental studies, anthropology, and other disciplines; and have devoted significant attention to integral concepts such as networks and agency. Although not necessarily opposed to discourse analysis, these scholarly frameworks—including regional approaches (‘Atlantic’, ‘Pacific’, ‘Indian Ocean’, and ‘World/Global’ histories), network theory, and ‘connected’ histories—provide new and very different insights than those provided by post-colonial theory. However, just as architectural historians have not fully engaged with scholars in these fields, early modern historians have also been somewhat reluctant to engage fully with architecture and the built environment as agents and repositories of social practice and social change.

Can, indeed should, architectural history engage more with these alternative scholarly traditions and modes of analysis? What can we learn from them, and how might we apply them? How might architectural historians interact more productively with colleagues in history and historical social science disciplines to encourage more architecturally-informed analysis in those fields? Or, ought post-colonial theory remain the key concept and frame of reference that underpins our study of the colonial built environment? This session welcomes papers that address any aspects of these key questions, either by dealing specifically with methodological approaches that enhance, progress, and/or transform our understanding of European imperial and colonial architecture, or by exploring case studies that allow for these methodological concerns to be elaborated in specific contexts. Put simply: where are we, where are we going, and where do we want to be as scholars of the colonial built environment.

Alex Bremner & JoAnne Mancini
Analyzing colonial architecture through the lens of creativity research

June Komisar, Ryerson University, Canada.

This paper seeks to explore how using creativity theory from cognitive psychology can broaden the understanding of architectural production in colonial settings when used in tandem with more traditional methods such as post-colonial theory. Creativity theory can help explain stylistic differences, innovations, hybridized forms and adaptations by both colonizer and colonized. It can also tease out how the sharing of knowledge and the cross-pollination of ideas among cultures is a feature of such settings.

The case study used here is the remote colonial town of Ouro Preto, once the capital of the state of Minas Gerais, Brazil, where, in the eighteenth-century, both Portuguese colonizers and African and Afro-Brazilian slaves contributed to architectural production. The city continued to grow in the nineteenth century while Ouro Preto was the region’s capital, although that status was lost in 1897. Complicating the history, in the 1930s, to emphasize the city’s historical importance, the architecture of Ouro Preto was edited and altered by the national cultural heritage group (SPHAN).
to highlight eighteenth century colonial artefacts and de-emphasize nineteenth-century production. In parallel, Brazilian, American and European historians began to write about the city using a variety of approaches.

The lens, methodology or perspective chosen to examine the past affects our understanding of a condition. Looking at the variety of interpretations of Ouro Preto – from art historians to cultural heritage groups – with different vantage points and theoretical or political approaches, can provide insight into Ouro Preto’s architecture and culture, but can also enrich our understanding of the nature of cultural production and the creative process in the field of architecture as a whole.

Rethinking the ‘colonial modern’

Tim Livsey, Birkbeck College, University of London, UK.

This paper draws on research into Nigerian buildings to reassess the ‘colonial modern’ literature on architecture in colonial settings, with its roots in Said’s Orientalism. It argues that ‘colonial modern’ scholarship has added a great deal to our understanding of the relationship between buildings and colonialism, but often overlooks two key areas.

First, ‘colonial modern’ analysis has often overlooked the way colonialism worked in different ways in different times and places, despite buildings providing important evidence of this very phenomenon. For example, in Nigeria the colonial state built halls for chiefly meetings in the 1920s, but hospitals and universities in the 1950s. Multinational companies’ office buildings built in 1960s offer evidence of neocolonial networks after independence, while buildings for the 1977 Second World Festival of Black Arts and Culture held formed part of post-colonial Nigeria’s attempt to position itself as a regional power. Buildings thus form evidence of changing ideologies and practices of colonialism that ‘colonial modern’ analyses can miss.

Second, ‘colonial modern’ analysis has overlooked the agency of colonial subjects in colonial-era building projects, particularly through a scholarly focus buildings’ planning and construction that neglects what came before and after. Colonial-era university buildings, for example, have been presented as intrusions into African societies that upheld colonial power but can also be seen as co-produced by African agendas and agency. Southern Nigerians had campaigned for improved educational facilities since the nineteenth century, and the chiefs of Ibadan welcomed the selection of their city as the home of a new university, actively cooperating in the procure-
ment of a site. Equally, the buildings constructed were widely welcomed by Nigerians as evidence of modernisation, and the press and politicians called for more such projects, not less. Buildings’ contexts, reception and use thus offer important evidence to historians.

**Picturesque modernities:**
*a transcultural enquiry into the formation of the “colonial style” in architecture between Europe and Asia. Methodological considerations*

*Michael Falser*, Chair of Global Art History, Heidelberg University, Germany.

The above mentioned project is embedded in the Chair of Global Art History at the Cluster of Excellence ‘Asia and Europe in a Global Context’ with its specific methodological approach of ‘transculturality’. The research project itself is in its earliest phase (starting in January 2014) and the proposed paper intends to discuss its methodological preliminaries in front of a wider scientific audience in the above mentioned section. This project as a whole aims to overcome the territorial determinants of nation-states and evolve a multi-polar concept of space in global art history. It recognises colonies not as containers for European style imports and transformations but as highly innovative laboratories for architectural ‘neo-

**A Profusion of Moorish Remains:**
*Victorian encounters with Islamic architecture in the West*

*Lara Eggleton*, University of Manchester and University of Leeds, UK.

As the nineteenth century in Britain spurned a new generation of middle-class sightseers, the remains of Islamic monuments in Western Europe increasingly represented an accessible and exotic frontier, whilst colonial inroads to the Indian Subcontinent and its rich Mughal heritage were well established. The volumes of testimonies, texts, illustrations and photographs that captured the experience of these very different regions also helped to shape an early historical conception
of Islamic architecture in accordance with value-laden definitions of the decorative and the ornamental. While the views of British architects, designers and antiquarians have been extensively explored within studies of Victorian Orientalism, an anthropological reading of tourists’ and sightseers’ first-hand accounts (such as through the lens of transculturation) offers a fresh perspective on Western architectural historiography and the non-specialist encounters that helped to shape it.

This paper examines how Victorian encounters with remains of Islamic architecture and ornament in former Muslim occupied regions in Spain and Portugal, as well as those of Mughal India, impacted upon perceptions of cultural difference throughout the nineteenth century. Journals, handbooks and visual materials produced by men and women travellers reveal a diversity of perspectives that informed readings of Islamic architecture in relation to commercial and internationalising forces in Britain. But rather than a purely Orientalist or postcolonial discussion of these texts, this paper is concerned with their anthropological dimension, critically examining the precise nature of the encounter between traveller and monument. A series of examples will reveal a range of individual experiences of Islamic buildings and ruins, and their importance to an emerging global history of architecture.

British colonial architecture with or without architects? A methodological challenge

Robert Home, Anglia Ruskin University.

The term ‘colonial’ carries these days negative associations, especially for the colonized: an unequal or asymmetric power relationship during the period of European expansionism. In architectural or planning history the colonial period is seen as expressing itself through grand designs for showcasing the imperial project and the controlling gaze of empire, and the architects and planners worked for the ruling power and its wealthy agents. To be relevant today, however, for the rapidly growing cities of the tropical or ‘global South’ requires an approach that interprets the forces, especially imposed power relationships, that shaped urban landscapes.

Colonial architectural history has usually focused on grand public buildings (secretariats, customs houses, legislatures, law-courts, post offices, railway termini etc.) and commercial buildings such as banks and hotels, with their architectural styles imported by architects from the metropolis, often in an explicitly ‘imperial’ style as formulated by Baker, Lutyens and others, sometimes absorbing local influences (as with the Indo-Saracen style). Numerous examples have been presented in the current RIBA
An alternative approach approaches colonial architecture and planning as experienced from below, drawing upon theories of postcolonialism and subaltern studies to explore perspectives of urban space framed by the colonialists’ ‘gaze of power’ and negotiated from below. For this a rather different methodology is required, which this paper explores in relation to British colonial urban planning history.

Foucault’s genealogical method offers one approach, through the evolution of practices, discourses and institutions, complex processes that need to be understood in their ‘mundane and inglorious origins’. The origins of building types rather than design styles of individual architects. Such a genealogy of the rules of colonial urban management can deconstruct the various influences at work: the rules devised over the preceding three centuries to control workers in the Caribbean slave plantation system; the place of Benthamite Utilitarianism in developing local government laws and institutions for both England and the colonies; the military and health imperatives behind the cantonment regulations in British India that were applied in parts of Africa; concepts of trusteeship and indirect rule derived from Burke and promoted by Lugard; and legal approaches to land tenure facilitated colonial land-grabbing in the name of the crown. This paper examines the mundane aspects of building forms, with emphasis upon the control and exclusion of indigenous populations.

Another approach is through detailed local urban historical geography, addressing the complex particularities of ownership, occupation, and use of land. This recognizes the local effects of racial segregation, and the space and site coverage standards applied to buildings, especially worker housing. Such local histories of places and communities can also provide a platform for the ‘voices of the poor’ who experienced colonial urban planning from below, and especially women, who were closely involved in the practical realities of home life and families’ survival struggles.

While architects (some of them RIBA members) may have designed the grand public buildings and master plans of the colonial project, it was more usually engineers, both civil and military, who, trained in ‘practical architecture’, usually provided standard designs for common military and civil buildings, e.g. barracks, hospitals, or housing, typically controlled by public works departments or the railways.
The emergence of what is today known as international architecture is to a large extent related to the global impact of exiled European architects, who, scattered throughout the world, contributed decisively to its theoretical debates, institutional formations and built manifestations from the early 1920s onwards.

The historiography of exiled modern architecture has long focused on cases of purportedly successful and unidirectional cultural transfer as represented in the master narratives of prominent US immigrants such as Walter Gropius and Mies van der Rohe. The dominant focus on individual biographies and histories of linear stylistic innovations has all too often overlooked the importance of discrepant discursive contexts (material and non-material alike), marginal geographical destinations, the effects of critical self-reflection, as well as the numerous tragedies of loss, disruption and failure under the conditions of forced dislocation. In the last two decades, however, several important studies that have contributed to a much more complex understanding and significantly extended knowledge (temporal as well as geographical) of the fragmented dynamics of architects’ and urban planners’ exilic dislocations (including re-migrations and transmigrations) and modern architecture and planning. In addition, new approaches have emerged,
informed by the fields of history as well as by scholars from related fields such as literary studies, anthropology, human geography and political history. Papers can address the many individual lives and works of 19th and 20th century exiled European architects with a view to their role in the transformation of international architecture, trace (discursive) modes of production and reception (including non-European resistance to Western cultural hegemony), test specific (historical) experiences for links with and relevance to current, or possibly earlier, exilic modes of planning and building, or investigate the research field’s historiographical overlaps and collusions with related interpretive paradigms like diasporic, (trans-)migrant, (post-)colonial, transnational, cosmopolitan, global, or international architecture. We are particularly interested in comparative perspectives and theoretical-methodological approaches that consider temporal/geographical variants, discrepant political-ideological conditions, and institutional and personal networks. We also invite papers that explore exilic careers of non-European architects within Europe or analyse the architecture produced, commissioned or inhabited by exiles who were not architects.

Regina Göckede & Rachel Lee
Rudolf Wittkower and His “Architectural Principles”: An Exiled Humanist Scholar in an Age of Anti-Humanism

Ron Fuchs, Art History Department, University of Haifa, Israel.

Rudolf Wittkower’s Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism (1949) is an extraordinary monument of architectural historiography. Although being a learned and seemingly esoteric discussion of Renaissance architectural theory, the book now holds for some a place among the constitutive architectural texts of the 20th century. Not only has it “remained a fundamental evaluation of Renaissance architectural aesthetics” for more than half a century, it also had an “unprecedented impact upon architectural production” (Payne, 1994) in Europe and the US in the second half of the century.

The discussion of Wittkower’s work remained strictly in the abstract sphere of architectural form, architectural theory and historiography. This was, no doubt, thanks to Wittkower’s purely academic discourse. However, part of the significance of Wittkower’s book lies in the fact that it was written in exile from his home in Germany, with the Blitz at the background.
The theme of Reason vs. the Irrational is perhaps the ultimate theme of Wittkower’s book. Wittkower is far from constructing the rationalist, “scientistic” portrait of the Renaissance with which he is often credited. The ultimate inspiration for his historic construction - this paper suggests - is found primarily in the thought of Aby Warburg and in his preoccupation with the persistence of the irrational. Wittkower was using Warburg’s library (itself an “exile” from Hamburg, Germany) for writing his book in London during WW2. The tragic narrative on the demise of Renaissance thinking that Wittkower draws in the last chapter of the book can be read as a lament for the Kantian humanism and enlightenment rationality that Jewish scholars such as Ernst Cassirer (another user of Warburg Library in Hamburg, and later an exile) tried to promote in their work. In the post-war climate of disillusionment with enlightenment, Wittkower’s narrative preserved its relevance perhaps better than that of his exiled colleagues.

Whereas the perspective of an exile in the work of contemporary refugee Jewish art historians such as Panoksky, Kristeller, Auerbach and Edger Wind, has received scholarly attention, Wittkower strangely escaped such a treatment.

The paper will explore the way Wittkower’s position as a refugee and exile could have shaped his interpretation of the renaissance. It will point out its sources in pre-war Germany, and the enduring relevance of his construction for the post-war treatment of the subject.

The national and the foreigner in Brazilian architecture historiography

Anat Falbel, University of Campinas, Institute of Philosophy and Humanities (UNICAMP/IFCH), Brazil.

In 1971 George Steiner formulated modernity as the strategy of the permanent exile, defining its linguistic homelessness and erratic feature as extraterritoriality. In this context where each gesture of communication between human beings was understood as translation gesture, the studies on the contribution of the European émigrés to the development of an American urban culture, were benefited by a new approach emerged from humanities infiltrated by the French post modernist elaborations which considered the specificity of their production.

In Latin America, these studies are identified mainly from the 1980s onwards. In Brazil, the new theoretical apparatus endorsed the deconstruction of the modern architecture historiographical discourse until then sustained by the figural relation between colonial past
and architectural modernity, hence opening the path for the recognition of the role played by immigrant professionals in the forging of a modern cultural landscape. Without pursuing individual trajectories but using some particular biographical paths as narrative expedients to enlighten specific cultural dynamics, I propose a methodological discussion concerning the analysis of the exiles’ production in Brazil through three main perspectives:

1. Simmel’s elaborations concerning the place and the “objectivity” of the stranger, as well as Emmanuel Levinas’ concept of alterity, both used as instruments in the analysis of the language of forms and contents resulting from the immigrant awareness of its own otherness, as well as the dialogue forged between the national and the foreigner.

2. Steiner’s formulation of extraterritoriality, implying the understanding of the immigrant professionals as intermediaries between cultures. In this sense, their cultural achievements and enduring dialogues with the old continent disclose the dynamics of the cultural transferences processes between Europe and America.

3. The concept of landmannschaftn developed under contemporary spatial social representations, in particular Lyotard’s formulation of language spaces revealing the chain of associations and the articulation of the foreigners in the spatial and cultural context of the city.

Henry Kulka and the tradition of Adolf Loos in the South Pacific

Bryleigh Morsink, University of Applied Arts Vienna, Austria.

In recent decades, studies within Austrian scholarship have highlighted the omission of exiled cultural figures within the rewriting of historical narratives after the end of the Second World War, as part of a broader critique of Austria’s ‘victim thesis’. The Austrian trend of reclaiming architectural figures through publications, exhibitions and archives has generally worked within the modernist master narratives. These studies look at cultural figures exiled in North America, who received recognition and relative success in their adopted homes. This paper will examine the work of Henry Kulka (1900–1971) who was a student and then later partner of Adolf Loos. Working with Loos for over a decade, Kulka was arguably Loos’s closest student and the most loyal follower of his architectural principles.

In 1938, Kulka escaped Nazi Austria by securing safe passage to New Zealand. He settled in Auckland with his family and remained in his adopted home until his death in 1971.

However, to this point mainstream Loos scholarship has marginalised Kulka’s role in the development of Loosian architectural practice. By
critically examining this historiography, I seek to explore the historical connections, exchanges and confrontations that have been overlooked by master narratives through looking at Kulka’s practice in the South Pacific as a pluralistic and heterogeneous development of the Loosian modernist tradition in the Small Island nation.

**Emigré Experiences: Frederick Romberg and German Modernism in Australia**

Veronica Bremer, Jacobs University, Bremen, Germany.

I will examine the architecture of émigré artist Frederick Romberg (1913-1992) through the lens of émigré photographer, Wolfgang Sievers (1913-2007). Romberg and Sievers fled the rise of Nazism in Germany and arrived in Australia in 1938; having brought with them the influence of the Bauhaus and German modernist traditions. The professional relationship between architect and photographer resulted in a multitude of photographs whose documentary nature of architectural form communicates not just the physical characteristics of buildings, but also the experience of exile; the constant artistic interaction, collaboration, and active promotion of similar modernist aesthetics. Romberg’s deliberate use and dependence of Sievers’ Bauhaus-trained photographic practice to capture his architecture, and likewise, Sievers’ selective photographic captures of Romberg’s heavily Bauhaus architectural forms, provide insight as to what/whom the artist in exile depends on, engages with, and seeks once in a foreign landscape.

Focusing on Siever’s photographs of Romberg’s designs for Stanhill Flats, Newburn Flats, and Glenuga Flats, the paper contends that documentary photographs further provide a historical reality of the past and architectural practice. The photographs put us, the viewers, in the setting Romberg found himself in at around the time his buildings were executed; they illuminate the emerging phenomenon of German modernism in Australia during the 1950s. These photographs, providing flat, almost 360-degree views of architectural forms throughout Romberg’s artistic career, allow for an analysis of the modernist traditions that Romberg employed in his designs. This multidisciplinary approach of analyzing Romberg’s architecture through the photographs of Wolfgang Sievers serves to better understand Australian migrant art and just as well, the migrant experience and migrant identity.
Eugenio Giacomo Faludi (Buda-
pest 1896- Toronto 1981),
Architect in Italy, Planner in Can-
ada.

Stefano Poli, Politecnico di Milano,
Department of Architecture and
Urban Studies, Italy.

Faludi, of Jewish origin, was born in Budapest in 1891. In 1919 he moved first to Vienna and then to Fiume. In 1925 he moved to Rome and he enrolled at the Scuola Superiore di Architettura, where he graduated in architecture in 1927.

In Rome, during the Twenties, Faludi participated in the debate on planning on a regional scale as a member of the GUR (Gruppo Urbanisti Romani). Then, in Milan in the Thirties, he founded an eminent architectural studio which actively contributed to the dissemination of an innovative architectural language and non-traditional patterns of urban development.

Faludi was into contact with the most active architects and engineers of that time, until he was forced to flee to London in 1938 to escape the fascist regime and its racial laws. In London he devoted himself mainly to the publication of a series of studies on rapid manufacturing technologies and prefabrication. His studies on timber prefabrication drew him to Canada where he initially attempted to establish himself as an architect. This met with no success, but he did, however, manage to secure a position as a town planner. In this role he contributed to the first Master Plan of the City of Toronto, and produced numerous plans for small and medium-sized Canadian cities. During the Fifties, he became a leading figure in urban planning in Canada. He held various conferences, and wrote a number of noteworthy articles.

This contribution will provide an examination of the relationship between Faludi’s Canadian writings and projects, European and North American theories of regional and urban planning, and the master plans drawn up by Faludi in Italy during the Forties. It further aims to identify the background, inspiration, and originality of Faludi’s work in Canada.

Walter Gropius and China

Eduard Kögel, Berlin, Germany.

Walter Gropius is well known as the director of the Bauhaus in Dessau, as an architect in Berlin and, after his emigration in 1938, as a teacher and architect in the USA. One of the heroes of the Modern Movement in the interwar period in Germany, in 1937 he emigrated from Berlin via London to teach at Harvard University in the USA.

Walter Gropius never visited China nor did he write any significant
texts about Chinese architecture or urban development. However, from the late 1930s he educated Chinese students at Harvard and in the late 1940s won a commission to design a campus-university in Shanghai. The Chinese students he taught at Harvard include Henry Huang, I.M. Pei, Wang Dahong, Chen Chi-Kwan and Chang Chao-Kang. All of them transferred knowledge from this modern master to China and Taiwan.

Henry Huang was the first to receive his master’s degree and returned to his hometown Shanghai in 1941, where he founded a department for architectural education at St. John’s University. As the basis for the curriculum he used the blueprint of Gropius’ Harvard institute and some elements of Bauhaus education he had learned there. I.M. Pei remained in the USA after his graduation, becoming a project partner for Gropius’ campus-university project in Shanghai. The project was stopped due to the civil war between Nationalist and Communist forces in China around 1949. The abovementioned university project came to Taiwan in the 1950s, by then under the supervision of the former Gropius-students I.M. Pei, Chen Chi-Kwan and Chang Chao-Kang.

My paper will focus on Gropius’ influence on the young Chinese architects he educated and will examine how ideas of architectural modern-ism emigrated to China and Taiwan. The focus on Gropius and his Chinese students will allow to reveal the transfer of ideas from one of the most influential figures in twentieth century architectural education into the Chinese architectural discourse of the post war years.
Looking eastward, building identities.

The architecture of European diplomacy beyond the Mediterranean in the age of Empire

Embassies are, by definition, representative institutions, but the share of their architectural shelters in this signifying function is a complex and still under studied issue. By transferring a fragment of the nation beyond its frontiers, embassies, consulates and other officially “foreign” architectures engage in a complex cultural dynamic of encounter, estrangement or integration. Symbolic, identitarian and political meanings may be variously inscribed in their architectural fabric; balances in social topography may be altered – all the more when such buildings were constructed or adapted by European powers in countries with a remarkable degree of geographical/cultural distance. The stylistic heterogeneity resulting from the interactions and constraints inherent to diplomacy is all the more bewildering in such cases.

This session is meant to develop a critical and comparative reflection on a rather neglected aspect of architectural and urban history that informs the global spread of European forms and aesthetics through an unusual lens. It proposes to do so by concentrating on the geography that lies East of the Mediterranean and on places and structures located outside the direct colonial confrontation. We are interested in contributions looking at buildings related not only to the main Western European players, but indeed to Eastern and Central European agency. Empirical as well as conceptual and
theoretical research on European diplomatic structures in the Ottoman, Persian and non-colonial Asian geography, as well as in peripheral cities of the Russian empire, can be presented and discussed in this session.

We invite papers assessing the ways in which European diplomacy, international relations, and changing power balances shaped important parts of the built environment outside Europe, in a space/time framework characterized by expanding European penetration eastward and corresponding roughly to the long 19th century and beyond. We are particularly interested in contributions that address the architectural embodiment of encounters and representational strategies within innovative frameworks, exploring new ground beyond the conventional critique of Orientalism. Preeminence will be given to proposals reflecting on the appropriate methods and sources for this kind of transnational investigation, and addressing the history of diplomatic buildings as a constant reworking of images, styles, spaces and political messages, affecting each other in unpredictable ways.

Paolo Girardelli & Mercedes Volait
Chairs

Paolo Girardelli (Boğaziçi University, Turkey) & Mercedes Volait (CNRS/INHA, France)

Speakers

Cristina Pallini (Department of Architecture, Built Environment and Construction Engineering ABC, Politecnico di Milano, Italy) and Armando Scaramuzzi, The project by Paolo Caccia Dominioni for the Italian Embassy in Ankara.

Vilma Fasoli and Michela Rosso (Dipartimento di Architettura e Design, Politecnico di Torino, Italy), Rome/Kabul/Rome: transcultural exchanges and the project of an embassy.

Emanuele Giorgi & Liu Kan, Li Lun (Università degli studi di Pavia, Italy), Cultural Transfer and Architecture: The Buildings of European Diplomacy in Modern Shanghai (1843-1949).

Abstracts

The project by Paolo Caccia Dominioni for the Italian Embassy in Ankara

Cristina Pallini, Department of Architecture, Built Environment and Construction Engineering ABC, Politecnico di Milano, Italy, and Armando Scaramuzzi.

In October 1938 the Italian Ministry of Foreign Affairs appointed Paolo Caccia Dominioni to direct construction of the Italian Embassy in Ankara, for which a preliminary project had been developed by Luigi Vietti Violi (1935), followed by a more detailed proposal by Florestano Di Fausto.

In those years Ankara was itself a huge building site: the new capital of Republican Turkey was then rising at the feet of the ancient citadel, following the two axes of Gazi Boulevard and Istasyon Avenue. According to the plan by the German architect Hermann Jansen (1928) an “embassy district” was to develop at the southern edge of Gazi Boulevard, just where the Italian Embassy had been planned. Paolo Caccia Dominioni (1896-1992), son of a diplomat from a noble family and an officer in the Italian army, had settled as an engineer in Cairo in 1924, where had directed the building of the Italian Embassy designed by Di Fausto (1928-1930).

Based on research carried out at the family archive (including plans,
drawings, photos, writings and a diary on the Italian Embassy works) this paper attempts to reconstruct the history of the project and its implementation, clarifying the role of Caccia Dominioni in the architectural configuration of the embassy complex. Caccia Dominioni reinterpreted Di Fausto’s project, choosing a new location for the ambassador’s residence. He then developed a new layout exploiting the topographic features of the site, so that the embassy – a complex of ten buildings – could feature a sort of “village”, where each functional unit could acquire an autonomous architectural character.

Rome/Kabul/Rome: trans-cultural exchanges and the project of an embassy

Vilma Fasoli and Michela Rosso, Dipartimento di Architettura e Design, Politecnico di Torino, Italy.

As symbols of the State, as well as places devoted to the representation of sovereignty, embassies represent one aspect of that “conspicuous visibility” of Italians abroad that still deserves some overall attention. A cursory overview of the recent historiography shows the episodic nature of the architectural literature on the Italian embassies, often addressed from a lateral perspective, as one chapter of a history of the Italian architects, engineers and builders active outside their native country. Although the Italian unification undoubtedly marked a new departure in the way national governments shaped their foreign policy also by means of architectural projects abroad, it is especially during the Fascist regime that the national propaganda found its spatial materialization through the promotion of new embassy buildings, of which the one at Ankara is only one example. This paper proposes to explore the overlooked case of the Italian embassy at Kabul whose beginnings and subsequent history are necessarily intertwined with the historic phases of the Italian politics, from the end of the Great War, through the rise of Fascism until the post WWII years, marked by a new aspiration towards a moral and physical reconstruction of the country. The embassy’s origins can be traced back to 1922, when Carlo Sforza, the Italian plenipotentiary diplomat at Istanbul, signed an agreement with the Afghan king Amanullah Khan, thus ensuring the Italian financial support to the Third Afghan War. The design for the present embassy building was commissioned to the architect Andrea Bruno who since the early 1960s had participated in the restoration works of the Buddhas of Bamlyan, later to be declared part of the World Heritage. The building, inaugurated in 1973, remained operative only until 1993. It reopened in 2001, after the end of the civil war, and was restored on a project by Bruno.
Cultural Transfer and Architecture: The Buildings of European Diplomacy in Modern Shanghai (1843-1949)

Emanuele Giorgi & Liu Kan, Li Lun, Università degli studi di Pavia, Italy, Cultural Transfer and Architecture: The Buildings of European Diplomacy in Modern Shanghai (1843-1949).

Shanghai’s modern urban identity is strongly affected by the assimilation of Western cultural models. Modern Shanghai, mainly developing in the second half of the 19th century, fused the Western architectural culture and practices with Chinese traditional construction and living habits, creating the so-called “Shanghai modern” architecture. Shanghai modern (1843-1949) reveals a widespread adoption of regional styles in architecture, the scope of which spread from British to American, French, Japanese, German, Spanish, Russian, Italian, Indian, and Northern European influences.

Following the city’s opening to international trade in 1843, European settlements on extra-territorial concessions began to transform its urban structure and image. At the core of this transformation were the European consulate buildings, far oversized in comparison to similar diplomatic structures in Western cities. The establishment of the British Consulate (1843) was followed by the American (1846) and the French (1848). Until 1855, five other countries established their diplomatic offices in Shanghai: Germany, Austria, Spain, Holland and Denmark. Between 1867 (Italy) and 1934 (Greece), no less than ten more European countries opened their consulates in structures that deserve attention from the architectural and urban point of view.

Selecting and illustrating some significant cases, this paper will propose a critical reflection on the role of diplomatic architecture in the development of a complex notion of modernity, which still affects the urban and architectural image of Shanghai.
European architects have worked beyond Europe since the time of the Crusades. Many architectural historians have documented these practices. In recent years particular attention has been paid to architects who emigrated to escape authoritarian regimes and who are widely credited with having brought modernism with them. Most of this literature, however, floats independently of social science scholarship on transnationalism, and much of it focuses on the movement of forms and theories, rather than on how people structure their own identity in relationship to their experiences of other places and cultures. Moreover, relatively little of this writing engages the role of the client, although the role of local building cultures is beginning to receive the attention it deserves. And finally, very little of it is comparative. What is the difference between Genoese settlements on the Black Sea, for instance, and Portuguese ones on the African coast?

This session seeks papers that rectify this situation. Particularly welcome are contributions that consider current anthropological investigations of transnationalism and theories of cultural transfer and their applicability to architectural history. What can architectural historians learn from methodologies developed largely to analyze more portable forms of artifacts, not to mention ideas? Also desired are papers that seek to conceptualize the ways in which transna-
tional architectural practice has changed across time. What, for instance, distinguishes the German architects that came to the United States following 1933 from those who emigrated after 1848? Papers might also examine the problem of determining what role biographical experience plays in the designs of any architect. This is particularly important in the case of a profession that is profoundly collaborative, engaging clients, builders, and users as well as designers. Other questions that might be addressed include what motivates clients to hire architects from other countries and how do these architects operate once they have such commissions. Are they employed because of technical or stylistic expertise gained abroad, or are other factors at work? What types of information and ideas travel with them, and under what circumstances are what local conditions taken into account?

Kathleen James-Chakraborty
Building Buenos Aires: cultural and technical transfers (1880-1960)

Thibault Bechini, Ecole normale supérieure de Lyon, France.

At the end of the 19th century, Buenos Aires was an attractive pole for European migrants. In those years, the city appears as a perpetual worksite which gathered many architects, engineers and builders born on the other side of the Atlantic. If Buenos Aires is often called “Southern Paris” – because of the haussmannization process engaged by the mayor Torcuato de Alvear in the 1880s – the architectural forms of the city highlight the role of cultural and technical transfers in the buildings’ design.

A close attention to the building process helps us understand how much the local reception of European canons gave way to improvisation and appropriation, underlining the constant tension between a supposed “model” of urbanization and its Argentine interpretation. Paying attention to the evolution of Buenos Aires houses - from the reinvention of the “colonial mansion” plan to the conception of modern houses in Capital Federal suburbs, such as those designed by Walter Gropius, Auguste Perret or Le Corbusier - , it can be shown that the introduction of every new stylistic
or technical element is a compromise between the “European modernity” and the vernacular building art, even when the professionals involved in the building sector were born in Europe.

Moreover, understanding the connection between the Argentine building market and the European professionals, such as the architects and engineers, seems decisive. Paying particular attention to Franco-argentine relations in this sector leads one to realise the importance of the networks between diplomatic, financial and architectural circles. If the Argentine building market can appear as a commercial opportunity for French contractors, we have to mention the “inverse transfers” which allow foreign engineers and architects to benefit of their Argentine experience in their posterior projects and realisations. Furthermore, their South-American trip often seemed a good way to boost their careers. A focus on various architects and engineers trajectories will illustrate this point.

Thus, the building sector of Buenos Aires not only was a fruitful testing ground for European architectural theories, but also is a case par excellence to enrich our understanding of the debates and interchanges of French and Argentine professionals.

Migration currents and building practice exchanges in the Portuguese diaspora

Ricardo Agarez, London, UK.

Even as we increasingly acknowledge the artificiality of geographical and professional boundaries in processes of built environment change, architectural history accounts still tend to overlook potentially vital contributions from ‘peri-architectural’ fields such as technology, labour and migration history studies for a multifaceted, transnational building history. My paper seeks to probe their importance by looking at the effects of transcontinental migration currents of Portuguese labour on the (re)definition of building practices in European, African and American sites of settlement. Drawing on the findings of a fine-grain study of building tradition and modernization in Algarve, south Portugal, in the last century, this paper will pursue new lines of enquiry that suggest the significance of essential shifts in the region’s social history – in which migration was a key factor – for our understanding of its changing built and urban fabrics, as well as of its echoes overseas. Traces of parallel developments in ‘vernacular’ building custom in Algarve and (post-colonial) Brazil during the 1870s; of the work of Algarvian fishermen turned house builders in Morocco and Mozambique in the 1930s; of civil engineers building skyscrap-
ers in São Paulo in the 1950s, and of traders prospering in Venezuela and becoming modernism-supporting developers back in Algarve in the 1960s – signal the impact of transcontinental migration flows, from Portugal and back, on the production of built constellations. Beyond the canonical narratives of diaspora architecture by European luminaries lies a fertile ground for research that pushes the boundaries of architectural history to encompass the agency of non-architect migrants and their many roles: as markedly mobile designers, builders, dwellers and clients, they were often the conduit of architectural change that determined the vast swathes of practice that remained marginal to the profession, and in some instances the work of key architect players in such contexts. Selected examples of ongoing research will allow me to interrogate the limitations of established architectural history methodologies and (hopefully) to foster a discussion on the potential and hurdles of methods from other social sciences.

**Architecture, Ethnography, and the “Irresistible Call” of Adventure: German Architects’ Engagement with World Cultures c. 1900**

*Itohan Osayimwese, Brown University, USA.*

By the turn of the century, German architects had become increasingly mobile and had traveled beyond Europe to parts of Africa and Asia. A close analysis of their activities reveals a pattern of private and government-sponsored travel that merged with professional practice abroad.

In this paper, I trace the nationalistic and transnational activities of five architects, Hermann Frobenius, Heinrich Hilderbrand, Franz Baltzer, Ernst Boerschmann, and Karl Döhring, who practiced in China, Japan, and Siam. I argue that European territorial expansion, non-Western modernization efforts, the emerging discipline of ethnography, and changes in architectural education and the structure of the profession, enabled this opening up of German architectural activity.

Moving away from a consideration of these architects’ disproportionate impact on architectural discourse in their host societies, I invert the “imperial gaze” by analyzing reverberations within Germany. Upon returning to Germany, these archi-
tects produced a new genre of writing, “architectural-ethnography,” based on architectural documentation and ethnographic fieldwork that they had conducted in situ. The rationale for engaging in travel and publication was connected to potential gains in cultural capital that could transform architects from mere technicians to intellectuals.

But the corpus of texts produced by these architects were similar in format, deeply intertextual, and self-reproducing. They formed part of a growing archive of non-Western material that architects of the subsequent generation, including Bruno Taut and Mies van der Rohe, cannibalized as they formulated an anti-historicist, elemental architectural language for the modern age.

Reversing the gaze reveals German architects’ role in the production and proliferation of knowledge about the architectural Other and begs a reconsideration of the history of German architecture in the modern era.

**Israeli architects in Iran: a case of changing transnational practices** (video-conferencing)

*Neta Feniger, Architecture Department at the Technion - Israel Institute of Technology, Israel.*

Iran-Israel diplomatic relations (1950-1979), ideologically based on the nations’ mutual outlook concerning their situation in the Middle East, created an opportunity for Israeli architects to extend their professional enterprises in the region. Though, in the period in which Israeli architects worked in Iran (mainly the 1960s and 1970s), a clear shift in their transnational architectural practice occurred.

In the 1960s Israeli architects were mostly part of technical assistance teams exporting Israeli development know-how, needed in Iran’s national modernization efforts. By the 1970s, Iran was going through petrodollar fuelled economic growth, followed by fast urbanization, generating a building market attractive to many international construction firms, among which Israeli ones.

This paper focuses on three projects planned and built by Israeli teams. The first was an Israeli technical assistance mission, sponsored by UNTA, after the 1962 earthquake in the Qazvin region. The large reconstruction project aimed to modernize the region and the devastated villages, according to an Israeli development method created during nation building years. The second was a modernist urban plan of massive housing and public amenities for the Iranian Navy on the coast of the Persian Gulf. The third, Eskan Towers in Tehran, was a mixed land use complex of residential luxury towers and a commercial centre catering for the Iranian elite.
These projects reflect different approaches to transnational architecture. While some Israeli architects were closely following their imported methods, others viewed the transnational process as a chance to advance their architectural practice. In other cases, architects were participating in a supranational free-market, making the knowledge they gained back home rather redundant. Thus, the cases under review indicate that national knowledge was not always the basis for transnational planning, and that the international arena itself became the source of knowledge and flow.
Architecture as development aid. 

Actors, networks and mechanisms in the design of institutional buildings in the post-colonial global South

This session deals with the theoretical and practical architecture expertise which emerged through development aid in the ‘global South’ after decolonisation. By looking specifically at development aid organisations, the aim is to unravel mechanisms of architecture and knowledge production specific to the postcolonial context, characterized by shifting political and economic conditions as a result of the Cold War. Through a particular focus on the design of institutional buildings (schools, universities, hospitals, etcetera), the session seeks to produce a mapping of postcolonial networks of expert(ise)s which substituted former métropole-colony relations.

Questions that could be addressed by the papers are: How did a specific type of ‘global expert’ emerge through development aid? What was the role and position of such architect-experts within the highly institutionalized aid bodies they worked for, and to what extent could they operate autonomously within those organisations? What kind of architectural discourse was implicitly or explicitly constructed by development aid bodies? How did this lead to a particular approach to the design of institutional buildings? What was the role of African actors in the production of those buildings?
Ultimately the session seeks to understand the specificity of the architecture production realized through development aid, and to recognize the particularity of the role of the ‘architect-expert’ within aid organisations. This will allow identifying the continuities and shifts in discourse, mechanisms and architectural language with respect to the production of institutional buildings in the late colonial period, while also tentatively putting the increasing globalisation of the architecture practice today into a historical perspective.

Kim De Raedt & Tom Avermaete
**Chairs**

Kim De Raedt (Ghent University, Belgium) & Tom Avermaete (Delft University of Technology, the Netherlands)

**Speakers**


Elke Beyer (ETH Zürich, IRS Erkner/Berlin, Switzerland), Building Institutions in Kabul in the 1960s. Sites, spaces and architectures of development cooperation.

Ezio Godoli and Nazila Khaghani (Universita degli studi di Firenze, Italy), The work of Luigi Moretti and Roman architectural firms for Algeria.

Luce Beekmans (Ghent University, Belgium), The architecture of nation-building in newly independent states: the case of Senegal (Dakar), Tanzania (Dodoma) and Congo (Kinshasa).

**Abstracts**

**Scales of Engagement: Zalman Enav’s Institutional Networking in Ethiopia, 1959-1965**

Ayala Levin, The Graduate School of Architecture, Planning and Preservation at Columbia University, NY, USA.

This paper follows the work of Israeli architect Zalman Enav who worked extensively in Ethiopia throughout the 1960s, and eventually was appointed on behalf of the Ethiopian government to design a school building project funded by the World Bank. Unlike other Israeli architects who worked across Africa as part of Israeli technical aid, Enav acted as a free agent in Addis Ababa where he resided from 1959 to 1965, and increasingly became involved in the social life and the formation of the disciplinary discourse in the city.

In this paper I trace the gradual levels of engagement through which Enav, as a young graduate of the Tropical Architecture Department at the Architectural Association in London, constituted his practice as central in the 1960s competitive expatriate architectural community of Addis Ababa. By partnering and mentoring Michael Tedros, who is considered until today to be the first Ethiopian architect, Enav positioned his practice as distinctively local, and as committed to the for-
mation of an Ethiopian-based disciplinary discourse. Alongside their very prolific list of public commissions across the city, including the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Filoha Baths, and the Ethiopian Mapping and Geography Institute, Enav and Tedros established the architecture department at the University of Haile Selassie I, and were instrumental in the founding of the Ethiopian Association of Engineers and Architects, of which Tedros was the first president.

Weaving his practice into an array of institutional and social spheres of engagement, from the expatriate Jewish community to the local governmental and cultural elite, Enav’s “network” will be dealt with both in the literal sense to denote the various interest groups he associated with to promote his practice, and in the metaphoric sense to analyze his architectural and institutional intervention into the urban fabric of Addis Ababa, before he embarked on the task of networking the entire country with a prefabricated school system.

Building Institutions in Kabul in the 1960s. Sites, spaces and architectures of development cooperation

Elke Beyer, ETH Zürich, IRS Erkner/Berlin, Switzerland.

During the 1960s, the Afghan capital Kabul became a hotspot of competitive development initiatives unfolding in the setting of the global Cold War – since the USSR began to intensify its economic involvement in its Southern neighbour state in 1955. Planning urbanization and regulating building activity in the country were an important priority on the Afghan development agenda, whether formulated in cooperation with the U.N., the USSR, the USA, or lesser powers eager to market their modernization expertise. This paper explores how specific actors, networks and mechanisms interacted within processes of “institution building” in the field of architecture and urbanism in Kabul by focusing on three instances of multilateral and Soviet-initiated development cooperation: first, the establishment of a Central Authority of Housing and Town Planning in the early 1960s, in the wake of the drafting of the first General Plan for Development of Kabul in 1960-62 by the Soviet Central Institute for Urban Planning; second, the opening of the Kabul Polytechnic University in 1967, a modern campus sponsored and designed by the Soviet Union; and third, a U.N.
A seminar series on planning and building New Towns for experts from so-called “developing” countries, including Afghanistan, hosted by the above-mentioned Soviet Central Institute for Urban Planning in Moscow. Particular attention will be paid to the sites, spaces, and locations that were produced as these institutional arrangements were put into place. Departing from these examples, the paper aims to formulate a research agenda for a history of the institutional architectures of development cooperation that equally accounts for the architectural, technical, material, social and political components at play.

The work of Luigi Moretti and Roman architectural firms for Algeria

Ezio Godoli & Nazila Khaghani, Universita degli studi di Firenze, Italy.

Luigi Moretti (1906-1973) is internationally known for accomplishments that are the product of considerable real estate investments, such as the Watergate complex in Washington (1960) or the Stock-Exchange Tower in Montreal (1962-67, in collaboration with Pier Luigi Nervi). Peculiar feature of these works has been the ability to reconcile economic imperatives with the invention of forms outside the orthodoxy of the International Style, which are imposed as signs of strong impact on the urban skyline. Professionally cultured and refined, marginalized from academic circles and not adequately taken into consideration by architectural magazines (with the exception of “Domus” directed by Gio Ponti) who tended to regard him as an interpreter of the requirements of a wealthy middle class and of speculative interests within influential real estate groups, Moretti did not disdain to even get to the service of the state apparatus of countries in the developing world. Since the late 1960s, Moretti has carried out an intense activity for the Algerian government. In addition to the more well-known projects to enhance the hotel system in the country, must be reported his contributions in the fields of school building (high school in Ain El Hammam, 1972-77) and residential ensembles (HBM complex and HLM in the province of Algiers and Tizi Ouzu). In several monographs and exhibitions devoted in recent years to Moretti, his work in Algeria has been treated only partially, while little attention has been paid to the many projects that have been commissioned by the governments of Libya, Kuwait, Saudi Arabia and Iran. It is an impressive corpus of projects that, by refusing a mechanical application of the formulas of the International Style or the landing regionalism, aims to define a paradigm for the assimilation of the architectural language of globalization in different local contexts,
seeking a balance between technological innovation and local building traditions, without neglecting the climatic and morphological characteristics and the landscape of the sites.

The architecture of nation-building in newly independent states: the case of Senegal (Dakar), Tanzania (Dodoma) and Congo (Kinshasa)

Luce Beekmans, Ghent University, Belgium.

After independence around 1960, colonial states in Africa started a long and often ambiguous process of nation-building. This process was also literally a process of building as colonial states initiated large-scale projects by which they aspired to represent their power in urban space. Instead of looking for new norms and forms to express their identity as new and independent Africans states, they mainly borrowed planning models and architectural styles from the former colonizer, but also from new international players that emerged on the scene as a result of the Cold War conflict. The main reason for this is that they, often because of a lack of available funds and expertise, commissioned foreign architects within the framework of a cooperation program with this task. A consequence of this outsourcing was that the imported, but often highly edited, styles, models and concepts often conflicted with their political discourse. A case in point is the plan for a new Capital Center for Dodoma, the new capital of Tanzania from 1974 onwards, including a new Parliament Complex and Washington-inspired Grand Mall, designed by the Canadian firm Project Planning Associates Ltd. (in collaboration with architect C. Ros-sant). While this monumental project housed the new administration of president Nyerere, it was at the same time little consistent with Nyerere’s socialist ideology of low-profile ujamaa villages.

Building further on the work of, among others, Lawrence Vale (Architecture, Power and National Identity, 1992), this paper will explore post-colonial plans for governmental buildings, such as parliaments, ministries, public administrations and party head centers, for the proposed capital centers of Dakar (Senegal), Dodoma (Tanzania) and Kinshasa (Congo) by Michel Ecochard, Macklin L. Hancock (Project Planning Associates) and August Arsac form the Mission Française d’Urbanisme (MFU) respectively. Drawing on new archival sources from the Centre d’Archives d’Architecture du XXe Siècle, Institut Français d’Architecture (Fonds Ecochard) in Paris, the University of Guelph Library (Macklin L. Hancock - Project Planning Associates Fonds) in Guelph (Canada) and the Archives of the Bu-
reu d’Études d’Aménagement et d’Urbanisme (BEAU) in Kinshasa, we will scrutinize the design of these capital centers, often called ‘core’ in the CIAM tradition, and administrative complexes in relation to the prevailing political discourse. In addition, we will explore to what extent these imported planning models and architectural styles have been integrated into the existing urban fabric and were accessible to the African urban dwellers.
‘Tropical Architecture’, used as a term here to define a particular strain of construction that seeks to address the hot, humid, and dry climes found between the Tropics of Cancer and Capricorn, is inextricably connected with the colonial endeavours of Europe. Traditional scholarship has sought to historicise the canon and to look to early encounters between travellers, missionaries, military engineers and local populations. This seems like a sensible mode of enquiry from which to begin. Participants are encouraged to present research papers that have examined how ideas have travelled, been interpreted and eventually built, with particular interest on the indigenous perspective. We are also however seeking papers that take us beyond the archive; thus in addition to examining records of the indigenous contribution to tropical architecture, what of those forced to live in tropical dwellings, or to occupy schools, courts, and other such buildings? How did they modify or enhance the tropical capabilities of the buildings they occupied and what recorded or pictorial evidence do we have that shows what they thought of their surroundings? Finally, and importantly we are interested in the domestic setting; what constituted the ‘everyday’, what were the female, (and possibly youth) perspectives, on life in these new tropical dwellings? Also how was environmental comfort and hygiene, evaluated by local residents, as compared with the plans and expectations of the tropical research establishments in the home countries?
Tropical Architecture is a blunt, but useful term. Can we begin to draw out some revealing tributaries? The architecture of Port Cities and ‘sailor towns’, will inevitably vary to that of the hinterland, hill station, administrative centre or desert. What about the island, archipelago, peninsula, and mainland as specific places of exchange, encounter, settlement and isolation- can we begin in a more concerted manner to consider the architecture of these territories and conditions whilst thinking about the tropical? The architecture of trade, railways, stations, warehouses, dock walls and shipping offices all need further investigation.

Tropical architecture ‘at the edges’ is also pertinent; beyond the cosmic boundaries imposed by Cancer and Capricorn, what happens at the edges of the tropical – the subtropics and other such regions that form the imagined boundary. Is the architecture of these almost-tropical places of note, and how does it borrow or contribute to the broader debates? Other boundaries seem to exist at The Americas and Caribbean; they have not featured to the same extent as other geographic areas in recent scholarship. Is there a reason for this? Is the architecture of Rudolph and Polevizky in Florida, or Ossipoff in Hawai’i, or Kurchan and Hardoy in Buenos Aires not the right type of tropical architecture, or is there simply less to say about these, often glamorous, projects or places?

Biography is a contested historiographical method, but can we look more closely at the indigenous architects who have contributed to this canon often working alongside European architects, or should we accept that they should retain their anonymity in light of our concerns about biographical narratives? Equally should we continue to explore the life stories of Europeans who worked in the tropics? Should we be placing them more carefully within a broader narrative? Or indeed when does biography become hagiography – to what purpose and for what audience is it really meant?
Colonies within colonies, or neighbouring territories may offer new insights. For example, was the French Indian colony of Pondicherry culturally isolated from its surroundings, or can we discern ‘knowledge transfers’ and modes of exchange? How did the French differ in their approach to tropical design to the British, or Portuguese in Goa, for example? Taking this premise to its other extreme, what characterises early Indian labour settlements in Durban, or Chinese settlement in areas like San Francisco on America’s Western Seaboard, or West Indian/returnee African settlements in Sierra Leone, Liberia and other countries on the West African coast?

Ola Uduku & Iain Jackson
Much like, as Kay Anderson has argued, contact with Australian Aborigines questioned enlightenment ideals of humanism, so too did the climatic and geographical variation presented by Australia’s nineteenth century [white] settlements fundamentally challenge Western constructs of architectural practice. Linking architecture to philosophical, aesthetic or moral systems (such as the sublime, picturesque or discourses on genius) in order to distinguish it from the related practises of building, surveying and engineering, the discipline of architecture was also attached to specific climatic (commonly temperate) norms. While the early architecture of white Australia aspired to approximate that of “home,” at least in material and formal terms, the climatic variation of the new colonies conceptually questioned the ability of these structures to be artistic, inventive or original, the product of imagination or genius, and therefore architectural.

The aim of this paper is to examine this conceptual crisis as it developed in the nineteenth century colony of Queensland. Initially set
tled as a site of secondary punishment for the convict population of New South Wales and gaining its autonomy in 1859, Queensland was both climatically diverse, ranging from the sub-tropical to the tropical, and ethnically varied, possessing the largest population of European migrants (primarily German) in the Australian colonies. An Aboriginal population, which outnumbered the white community by four to one, also ensured it was racially conflicted. While each of the above “effectively thwarted” a straightforward “recreation of a New Britannia in the southern semi-tropics,” they also challenged the architect’s ability to assert his disciplinary autonomy and artistic authority.

Focusing on the climatic complexity of nineteenth century Queensland, the paper seeks to understand the conceptual framing of the architectural profession as it emerged within this instance of the colonial tropics. Centred within communities that were described by the nineteenth century discourse as infertile, unproductive and lacking in character, the paper seeks to document the tensions generated by the development of a profession who actively positioned its practice as architecture proper - as belonging to a larger philosophical system of the arts. Mapping the strategies developed by Queensland architects to promote their disciplinary authority, and specifically their artistic status, the paper not only seeks to understand the representation of architectural practice within a tropical context but also the conceptual modifications that were necessary to make this possible.

From tropical medicine to tropical architecture

Jacopo Galli, IUAV University of Venice, Italy.

Tropical architecture has often been described as a neutral, ahistorical discourse dealing with technical problems. This paper argues that the attitude and method of analysis used in tropical architecture were deeply rooted in British culture since the XIX century. The ancestors of tropical architecture can be found in the fields of hygiene and tropical medicine that played a key role in shaping the European idea of Africa. The incredibly high mortality rates of the “White’s man grave” gave birth to the hypochondriac imperialism, the idea that Africans were racially pathological and that tropical diseases were “diseases of strangers” as James Lind, one of the main supporter of the miasmatic theories, defined them in 1811. These concepts proved to be hard to erase and shaped a view of Africa built not only by scientific and empiric datas but also by desires, repressions and projections. In order to cope with the harsh tropical climate medical topology was invented related to the idea that through
examining tropical architecture: in different international contexts

a careful analysis of the landscape over-layered with medical data: it was possible to define the most healthy sites to settle. This scientific attitude constitutes one of the main debts that Tropical Architecture owes to tropical medicine. In the second part of the XIX century the substitution of miasmatic theories with germ theories did not help change the European view of the tropics and instead moved the topic from geographical conditions to personal behaviour. This ideas gave birth to a series of “tools of empire” that range from the bungalow to the solar topi: western fetish. However the work of many pioneers such as Patrick Manson were influential in the adaptation of European building prototypes to the tropical zones and established an experimental approach that this paper intends to investigate as an ancestor of the quantitative approach used by the architects of tropical architecture.

Linkages between villes nouvelles and West Africa: the case of HLM Dakar

Anna Magrin, Università IUAV di Venezia, Italy & Monica Coralli, ENSA Paris La Villette, France.

During the last 50-60 years of the twentieth century, we are witnessing a re-issue of the Modern Movement and its rules that unfolds through a re-evaluation of the constitutive principles of the “traditional city”. Against this background, the French villes nouvelles emerged as an answer to the “evil” produced by grands ensembles and were presented an opportunity to explore the practice of “making city”: public space and urbanity were re-investigated with renewed interest. However, the demographic pressure after World War II imposed the search for instant solutions, especially in the domain of housing. In this respect, the experience of architects and urban planners who worked in the territories of the colonies, where they learned to ‘make from scratch’, from tabula rasa, was re-employed in France, to design and build new cities. We propose an investigation of the France-Africa connection and, more particularly, the connection that existed between the Hexagon and Senegal. Black Africa has always been regarded almost exclusively as a passive recipient of settlement models already developed in Western Europe, typological patterns and architectural devices first tested in the motherland and later imposed elsewhere as universally valid, although unsuitable for local ways of life and different climatic conditions.

Our paper questions this idea of a unidirectional and strict transposition (from France to Africa), arguing instead that there existed a more complex interrelationship. The project for social housing in Dakar, investigated through its chronology,
biographies of some of its authors and analysis of architectural solutions (drawing on the archives of the former office of HLM Dakar) suggests an alternative narrative: contrary to what one might expect, the French villes nouvelles are the result of models (housing prototypes) produced and tested at different scales in an African testing ground, the HLM neighborhood of Dakar, before being re-imported into France in a revised and corrected version.

**Architecture, Agency and Empire: a Portuguese colonial settlement in a global context**

*Nuno Grancho, Universidade de Coimbra, Instituto de Investigação Interdisciplinar and CES - Centro de Estudos Sociais, Portugal.*

Diu was a Portuguese colonial territory/island/city under Portuguese rule, located at physical and cultural contact zone of the coastline of Gujarat, India. Unlike the general assumption of postcolonial studies on colonial architecture and urbanism stating that colonial power in India primarily intervened and manifested itself via centers of governance, I propose to shift the focus to a peripheral place like Diu, which will require the application of another perspective in order to tackle a more broad and current frame of colonial India.

Portuguese colonial urban settlements in India, except for Diu and the by now no longer existing Velha Goa, were characterized by three spatially distinct entities: the fortress, inhabited by Europeans, a non-aedificandi area (esplanade) and a Catholics settlement, surrounded by a wall and inhabited by European and native catholics. At a distance was located the settlement inhabited by non-Christians, the so called “de cima”, contrasting with the former called “de baixo”. In Diu, the settlement of non-Christian religions was under colonial rule. There was no boundary between the town and the embryonic Catholic settlement. Thus, the inhabited and fortified perimeter not only corresponded to Christian villages, but also to non-Christian villages and to the fort. Other European urban settlements in India (Dutch, English, Danish and French), of the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries - more than a century and a half after Portuguese settlements – showed a spatial configuration characterized by the fortress, inhabited exclusively by Europeans, an esplanade, a “white” village and “native” village. Unlike Portuguese towns - but similarly to Diu – there sometimes was a perimeter, with a fortress and a wall, protecting the whole city (Travancore, Pondichery, etc.) and inhabited by Europeans and “natives”. In some English colonial urban settlements (Calcutta, Bombay, etc.), a fortified perimeter did not exist, only a fortress.
In this sense, Diu forms a singular case within Estado da Índia in architectural, spatial and political terms. This paper attempts to characterize this singularity and discuss its circumstances and causes.

The Cultural Expression of the Bungalow in India: The Colonial Legacy and its Post-Colonial Manifestation

Miki Desai & Madhav Desai, CEPT University Ahmedabad, India.

The British and other colonial rulers left a far-reaching impact on the architecture and urbanism in India. Of this colonial legacy, one of the important socio-spatial concepts—the ‘bungalow’—remains a dominant house form. Towards the turn of the twentieth century, it emerged as a new generic dwelling type when a major conceptual/cultural shift occurred away from the various existing traditional dwelling systems, bringing about a historical revolution in its plan, form, style and structure. Begun as a basic tropical dwelling by military engineers, it metamorphosed into an imperial house that responded to the transitional technological, political and cultural forces. From a homogeneously conceived spatial lay out, it developed heterogeneous variations (including in the hill stations) at pan Indian level in response to regional climate, mostly hot or humid and culture, almost becoming an agent of social change. It was also influenced by international styles as ideas traveled from overseas.

The suburbs became the new hygienic and ordered landscapes based on modern scientific and philosophical thoughts that modified the urban geography of cities. The bungalow, located in the new suburbs, evolved along with the trajectory of the society, with the changing role of genders, family structures and lifestyles profoundly affecting the spatial organisations. In the cultural production of the bungalow, the European and the indigenous interacted and modified the original type in terms of building materials, technology, craftsmanship and symbolism. The constant theme, however, was the idea of modernity as the Indian society embraced the future. Through empirical research and extensive illustrations this discourse analyses the concept of cultural transfer in the marginalized genre of domestic architectural history in colonial and postcolonial South Asia.
The House as a Contact Zone? Colonial Domestic Architecture in East Africa and the History of Everyday Life

Britta Schilling, University of Cambridge, UK.

This paper takes a historical perspective on tropical architecture by investigating homes planned and built by British and German settlers and missionaries for the colonies in East Africa between 1850 and 1945. Using several case studies, it will explain how domestic architecture produced by a range of professional and lay architects for the colonies responded to stylistic traditions at home and climactic challenges, new materials, and indigenous traditions abroad, as well as how building styles and techniques evolved over time. Moreover, colonial homes will be examined not just for their structural design, but also for their psychological dynamics of inclusion and exclusion – what they have to tell us about the relationship between British and German settlers and colonial subjects in everyday life.

Historians are well aware that each European colonial power had a slightly different approach to ruling subalterns, and, depending on location, practised vastly different degrees of social interaction with indigenous populations. But how did these theoretical approaches to colonialism actually play themselves out ‘on the ground’? We can begin to answer this question by exploring both the construction and use of European domestic architecture in East Africa.

In terms of construction, this paper explores to what extent European homes were reproductions of German or British national norms, and to what extent they incorporated indigenous knowledge. Was there an understanding of ‘European’ style of domestic architecture, or was the approach to construction nationally determined? Over time, did colonial settings become ‘laboratories’ for modern living, or did they tend to represent the social and cultural ideals of a bygone era? This section also describes how and when local craftsmen were employed to fashion colonial homes, and what their working conditions were like.

In terms of use, the second part of the paper presents situations in which homes were clearly used by Europeans as a means of setting boundaries between ‘self’ and ‘other’, but also situations in which they became zones for intercultural interaction. It looks at how architecture structured the everyday lives of domestic servants, often serving as agents between the ‘foreign’ exterior and familiar interior. It also considers the placement of the home in its surroundings and the resulting impact on race relations. Ultimately, this contribution considers whether we should understand colonial
domestic architecture as a form of ‘cultural imperialism’ or as a ‘contact zone’ between people and design traditions (Marie Louise Pratt, 1992).
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