european
architectural
history
network

Call for Papers

Submission deadline: September 19, 2025

Abstracts are invited for the paper sessions and round tables listed below by **September 19, 2025**. Abstracts of no more than **300 words** should be submitted **directly to the chairs**, along with the applicant's name, email address, professional affiliation, address, telephone number and a short curriculum vitae (maximum one page).

Sessions (2 hours)

Sessions will consist of 4-5 papers, with time for dialogue and questions at the end. Presentations should be limited to 15–20 minutes each. For example, a session with 4 papers may allow up to 20 minutes per presentation, while a session with 5 papers should limit each to 15–18 minutes. Abstracts for presentations should define the subject and summarize the argument to be presented in the proposed paper. The content of that paper should be the product of well-documented original research that is primarily analytical and interpretative rather than descriptive in nature.

Round Tables (2 hours)

Round tables will consist of five to ten participants and an extended time for dialogue, debate and discussion among chair(s) and public. Each discussant will have 5-10 minutes to present a position. Abstracts for round table debates should summarize the position to be taken in the discussion.

Papers may not have been previously published, nor presented in public. Only one submission per author will be accepted. No participant may serve both as a chair of a session or round table and as a speaker or discussant in another session or round table. Members of the EAHN board may submit proposals to sessions or roundtables.

EAHN 2026 - AARHUS

All abstracts will be held in confidence during the selection process. In addition to the thematic sessions and round tables listed below, open sessions may be announced. With the author's approval, thematic session chairs may choose to recommend for inclusion in an open session an abstract that was submitted to, but does not fit into, a thematic session.

Session and round table chairs will notify all authors of the acceptance or rejection of their proposals, along with comments, by **21 November 2025**. Chairs reserve the right to recommend revisions to abstracts to better align them with the session or round table program. Accepted speakers must submit their revised abstracts to the chairs by **19 December 2025**.

Authors of accepted paper proposals must submit the complete text of their papers (suitable for a 15–20-minute presentation) to their session chair, or a full draft of their discussion position (for a 5–10 minute presentation) to their round table chair, by **20 February 2026**. Chairs may suggest editorial revisions to ensure the paper or discussion position meets the session or round table's guidelines. These comments will be returned to speakers by **13 March 2026**.

Speakers must complete any final revisions and send the final version of their paper or discussion position to the chair(s) by **17 April 2026**. Chairs reserve the right to withhold a paper or discussion position from the program if the author fails to comply with these guidelines.

It is the responsibility of chairs to inform participants of these guidelines and the general expectations for sessions and participation in the meeting. All speakers and chairs must fund their own registration, travel, and expenses to attend the conference in Aarhus, Denmark. **Only registered participants will be included in the final program.** The final program of sessions and round tables will be announced in **late April or early May 2026**.

Please note: *EAHN 2026 will not publish formal proceedings. Final papers and discussion texts are for the use of chairs only, to read and/or circulate prior to the conference.*

This Call for Papers and Discussion Positions is also available on the EAHN website: https://eahn.org

Sessions (in alphabetical order)

Animal, Industry, and Labor: Towards an Architectural History of Intensive Animal Farming

Chairs and Contact Details:

Sofia Nannini, Politecnico di Torino
sofia.nannini@polito.it
Víctor Muñoz Sanz, TU Delft
V.MunozSanz@tudelft.nl

Animal based products are everywhere: on our supermarket shelves, in our skincare routines, or in the shoes we wear. Yet the scale and quality of the places where those products come from are far from our collective imagination or set in some form of idealized countryside. Industrial livestock farming is a pervasive planetary phenomenon. Scientists warn us that factory farming crucially contributes to the climate emergency: the breath and flatulence of cows warm the planet; monocultures of animal feed crops drive deforestation, biodiversity loss, and challenge the livelihoods of many; overcrowding increases zoonotic risks to human and non-human health. At the same time, in Europe and beyond, farmers are protesting in defense of what they consider their culture and mission to feed the world.

Caught in the middle, the lives and deaths of billions of non-human animals annually continue occurring in buildings which are little known, if not wholly invisible. Somehow, the history of these buildings, with their layouts and technologies, is also opaque and often disregarded by architectural historiography, with a few exceptions (Garric 2014; Alsayer 2021). Conversely, since Sigfried Giedion's *Mechanization Takes Command* (1948), many studies have focused on the architectural, urban, and social history of the slaughterhouse and of the packing industry (Cronon 1991; Vialles 1994; Young Lee 2008; Pachirat 2013; Pacyga 2015).

From sixteenth-century Palladian villas to today's concentrated feeding operations, Western architecture has evolved along the entanglements between humans and domesticated animals – mostly cattle, pigs, poultry, and horses. How do we conceptualize an *architecture* of animal farming – when we are dealing with a blend of technologies, animal bodies, ideal abstractions, and dirty realities? The architectural history of intensive animal farming is scattered among different geographies, actors, and institutions – and it is often a history without architects. Who has designed these spaces since the industrial revolution – architects, engineers, veterinary doctors, agrarian experts, or also the animals themselves? Which zootechnical elements or typologies date back to pre-industrial times and attest to a *longue durée* of rural and farming practices? What was the architectural impact of the animal welfare debate, sparked in the 1960s with the publication of *Animal Machines* by Ruth Harrison (1964)?

While animal farming and its environmental impact has been the object of attention in anthropology, geography, STS, environmental humanities, and the arts, investigating this architecture and its paradoxical and multifaceted global histories is now more urgent than ever (Schrepfer & Scranton 2004; Blanchette 2020; Piazzesi 2023; Wadiwel 2023). This session welcomes case studies on the architectural history of animal farming at a global scale, with a preference for papers that present original archival investigations and that shed light on the industrialization of rural practices that occurred in the past three centuries. Key questions we would like to address in this session include, but are not limited to: what are the models, technologies, building materials that most contributed to the industrialization of animal agriculture? What have been the key institutions, companies, professional figures, and geographies in

this history? To what extent have farming practices been technologies and instruments of Western colonialism (Fischer 2015; Specht 2019)? How have societal and cultural ideas on 'the animal' and welfare influenced the architecture of industrialized farming? What has been the role of human and non-human labor in the spatialization of factory farming?

With this session we aim at increasing our knowledge and awareness on animal farming, in order to promote a deeper understanding of the Anthropocene and its alternative definitions – most notably, the *Thanatocene*, or the era of massive global death (Bonneuil/Fressoz 2016). If the future is closely dependent on our capacity of historical analysis, research into the history of industrial farming may suggest new modes of positive and responsible coexistence and allow the architecture discipline to participate in the search for more livable other worlds.

Selected Literature

Alsayer, Dalal Musaed. 2021. "Chicken of Tomorrow and Farm of Today: The Chicken, the Farm, and the Greenhouse." In *On Foraging: Food Knowledge and Environmental Imaginaries in the UAE's Landscape*, edited by Faysal Tabbarah, Dima Srouji, and Meitha Almazrooei, 48–59. Abu Dhabi, UAE: Warehouse 421.

Blanchette, Alex. 2020. *Porkopolis: American Animality, Standardized Life, and the Factory Farm*. Durham: Duke University Press.

Bonneuil, Christophe, and Jean-Baptiste Fressoz. 2016. *The Shock of the Anthropocene*. London/New York: Verso.

Cronon, William. 1991. *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West*. New York: W. W. Norton.

Fischer, John Ryan. 2015. *Cattle Colonialism: An Environmental History of the Conquest of California and Hawai'i*. Chapel Hill: The University of North Carolina Press.

Garric, Jean-Philippe. 2014. *Vers une agriteture: Architecture des constructions agricoles (1789-1950)*. Bruxelles: Mardaga.

Pachirat, Timothy. 2013. *Every Twelve Seconds: Industrialized Slaughter and the Politics of Sight*. New Haven/London: Yale University Press.

Pacyga, Dominic A. 2015. *Slaughterhouse: Chicago's Union Stock Yard and the World It Made*. Chicago: Chicago University Press.

Piazzesi, Benedetta. 2023. *Del governo degli animali. Allevamento e biopolitica*. Macerata: Quodlibet Studio.

Schrepfer, Susan R., and Philip Scranton, eds. 2004. *Industrializing Organisms: Introducing Evolutionary History*. New York/London: Routledge.

Specht, Joshua. 2019. *Red Meat Republic: A Hoof-to-Table History of How Beef Changed America*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Vialles, Noilie. 1994. *Animal to Edible*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Wadiwel, Dinesh Joseph. 2023. *Animals and Capital*. Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press.

Young Lee, Paula. 2008. *Meat, Modernity and the Rise of the Slaughterhouse*. University of New Hampshire Press.

Architectural Histories and Practices and the Aerial Spatial Revolution

Chairs and Contact Details:

Katrin Albrecht, Eastern Switzerland University of Applied Sciences
katrin.albrecht1@ost.ch
Lisa Henicz, Eastern Switzerland University of Applied Sciences
lisa.henicz@ost.ch

The conquest of the air by balloons, kites, dirigibles and controlled powered flight at the threshold of the 20th century and the discovery of the air as a new element for movement and communication have profoundly transformed our way of perceiving, thinking and practicing space. New airborne technologies and visual media such as aerial photography, satellite imagery and drone vision have since become powerful means for surveying, representing, planning and designing architecture, cities, infrastructures and landscapes.

The gaining of a new vision indicated a revolutionary shift in design practice and theory, even if first balloon surveying attempts were doubted to 'ever be found practical and prove of more than theoretical interest' (E. Deville 1895). However, whereas air views could show the 'beauties and defects' (P. Abercrombie 1919) of the fast-growing historical cities by revealing a 'new urban façade and perspective never before known' (J. L. Sert 1942), they would soon equally facilitate planning in remote, yet unmapped and seemingly uninhabited regions by enabling rapid data collection containing a

striking 'abundance of details' (R. Danger 1933) and by providing efficient tools for exploring and conquering new territories. Beyond the technical, analytical and documentary value of aerial means for planning and research, the changing perception and experience of spaces and bodies were assumed to also impact the overall 'sensing of gravity, dimension, density and quantity' (P. Zucker 1929), and, consequently, to 'enlighten and expand the spirit' (Le Corbusier 1942) of all architectural and urban configurations.

Given the interdependence between spatial perception, representation and design, the proposed session aims to investigate the impact of the "aerial" on concrete architectural and urban design practices in the 19th and 20th century by focusing on key projects, places, figures, networks, documents and procedures that address issues such as urban patterns and developments, high- and low-rise construction, techno-colonial endeavours, aerial threat and scientific missions. The session seeks to explore the possibilities and intentions associated with new aerial means, ranging from the conditions of production, dissemination and reception of aerial imagery to its use and relevance for planning, design and theory formation and its function as visual, informational, representational and design means. It thereby intends to question technically and culturally conditioned approaches to architecture, the limits of spatial and morphological perception and representation, and the relevance of scale and distance required for design, particularly in relation to human scale.

Contributions on physical-material expressions of space, its formal treatment as well as its intrinsic conception are welcome. Papers may, for instance, discuss methods and practices of modern urban design and architecture; ideas and ideological underpinnings of architecture, city and territory revealed by the aerial; material and structural aspects of works affected by the conquest of the third dimension; or medial, iconographic and instrumental characters of aerial imagery. Transdisciplinary, transoceanic and transcultural issues related to architectural histories and practices are particularly encouraged.

Architectural Objects of Colonial Consumption: The Material and Visual Worlds of Tea, Coffee, Chocolate, and Other Hot Beverages

Chairs and Contact Details:

Laura Hindelang, University of Bern
laura.hindelang@unibe.ch
Anne Hultzsch, ETH Zurich
hultzsch@arch.ethz.ch

Sipping hot cocoa, grown in present-day Ghana, in 19th-century Poland from a porcelain cup decorated with a castle veduta / Stirring matcha in a ceramic chawan showing a landscape painting in 18th-century Japan / Savouring tea, traded in China against opium, served on a tray on which is painted the scene of an 18th-century English salon.

This session brings together three phenomena: ceramics featuring architectural motifs; the consumption of hot beverages, made from substances, including tea, coffee, and chocolate, which played a significant role in colonial trade and imperial networks; and their spatial environments. Through this specific group of illustrated objects and the built spaces in which they were used, thus bridging material and visual cultures, we seek to tell architectural histories of global colonial entanglements and distinct spatial practices before ca. 1900. European elites from the 16th century onwards began to define themselves through the consumption of exclusive hot beverages that contained an intrinsic trace of an elsewhere; later, their consumption often turned into popular everyday culture. Such ceramics, including

porcelain, amalgamate the ingestion of procured addictive substances with the consumption of architectural imagery and, thus, the symbolism attached to architectural spaces. We consider them highly potent objects and environments through which to complicate architectural historiographies, reflecting on who, under which conditions – in terms also of class, race, or gender – produced and consumed both substance and container.

We explore questions such as: What kind of sceneries were displayed on architectural ceramics? To what extent did these real or imagined spaces relate to the physical spaces of both the production and consumption of hot beverages, including plantations and coffee or tea houses? How can we conceptualize the intimate bodily encounters with architectural porcelain, the processes of ingesting addictive or stimulating substances such as hot chocolate, tea, coffee, mate, or matcha? How can ceramics manifest a space or constitute a spatial practice within the global-colonial networks necessary to produce, trade, transport, and sell not only the beverages but also the vessels? Through these objects and their environments, how can we tell marginalized stories of exploitation, oppression, asymmetrical power relations, use, and abuse – but also of agency and resistance – in relation to architectural histories?

We are interested in papers that reflect on, but are not limited to:

- the architectural imagery on beverage containers like cups, saucers, pots, storage vessels, or trays and slop bowls;
- the spatial practices and environments of consumption and preparation, such as parlour, salon, teahouse, coffeehouse, bedroom, boudoir, or kitchen;
- the spatial practices and environments of production and trade, such as plantations, potteries, ships, and manufactories;
- strategies to expand or contest established architectural histories through intersectional, feminist, queer, decolonial, or other novel theories and methodologies.

We invite papers that centre on a specific object or space and its agency as a prism through which to interrogate broader spatial histories in any geography; we focus on the period from ca. 1500 to 1900 but are also interested in examples outside this time span if they reflect on the above questions.

Between Mental Health and Punishment. From the Convent to the Asylum

Chairs and Contact Details:

Elisa Boeri, Politecnico di Milano
elisa.boeri@polimi.it
Francesca Mattei, Università degli Studi Roma Tre
francesca.mattei@uniroma3.it

This session aims to critically and comparatively examine the evolution of the design and urban history of psychiatric care facilities, from the initial interventions involving the adaptation and transformation of existing structures (such as monasteries, prisons, etc.), to the systematic design of new buildings and urban systems, which began with the socio-political dynamics of the Enlightenment and continued into the contemporary era.

Since the Middle Ages, society has sought to isolate and conceal those considered "different" from established norms, a matter that has been addressed over time through various practices, both

architectural and procedural. These range from the domestic care of madness to confinement aimed at managing public order issues; from the hospitals built in the Islamic world for the care of the sick (the *Bimaristan*), where the peacefulness of the place contributed to the treatment of the mind, to psychiatric institutions that have become political devices helping to control various forms of (political and civil) disobedience.

Architectural structures designed to confine "the other" do not always originate with this specific function. This is evident, for instance, in conventual buildings, which commonly also accommodated the indigent, pregnant women without families and chronic or psychiatric patients, thus highlighting the overlap between the concepts of 'confinement' and 'exclusion.'

In Western contexts, these spaces frequently emerge through the repurposing of buildings initially intended for other functions, as illustrated by Het Dolhuys in Haarlem, which began as a leper hospital and later became a lunatic asylum in the 16th century. On other occasions, their histories are far older, such as that of the Bethlem Royal Hospital in Bromley (London), founded in 1247, though subsequently relocated and transformed. These institutions are often situated on the periphery of cities, isolated and relegated to the margins, or otherwise located outside city walls - examples of which include Bethlem Royal Hospital itself, as well as the Hospital of San Vincenzo in Prato, Milan, one of the earliest asylums in Italy (second half of the 15th century).

Starting from the 17th century, and with greater emphasis between the 18th and 20th centuries, there was a systematic experimentation with the topic of asylum space and the moral rehabilitation of the mentally ill. This development occurred in parallel with shifts in European and non-European political and social landscapes, as well as advancements in medical and scientific studies (such as the emergence of occupational therapies like ergotherapy and the reformist movement led by Philippe Pinel, director of the Bicêtre in Paris). Consequently, there was a growing focus on the built environment dedicated to the treatment of mental illnesses. In the 19th century, the circulation of architectural models for asylums revolved around well-defined typologies, ranging from the radial model (e.g., the Devon County Pauper Lunatic Asylum in Exeter) to the widely adopted pavilion hospital layout (from the Norwich Pauper Asylum to the San Niccolò Asylum in Siena). In this context, architecture also began to play a role in classifying and separating various degrees of mental illness.

The session seeks to investigate the practices associated with the design of psychiatric care facilities within both European and non-European contexts, spanning from the medieval to the contemporary period. The aim is to highlight the history and often conflicting memories of these places of social exclusion.

Possible themes (but not limited to) may include:

- Documents and sources for the history of asylums;
- Spaces and architectures of exclusion and repurposing: from convent to asylum;
- Psychiatric "citadels" between the 18th and 19th centuries;
- The use of mental illness as a principle of social exclusion for individuals deemed "dangerous" (political prisoners, dissidents, but also—under oppressive or dictatorial regimes—women considered libertine or immodest);
- The relationship between architecture and landscape in the treatment of mental illness.

Selected Literature

Airoldi C., Crippa M.A., Doti G., Guardamagna L., Lenza C., Neri M.L., *I complessi manicomiali in Italia tra Otto e Novecento,* Milano: Electa, 2013 Birdsall, C., Parry, M., and Tkaczyk, V., *Listening to the Mind,* in "The Public Historian", Vol. 37, No. 4 (November 2015), pp. 47-72.
Epicoco, G., *Indagini sullo stato patrimoniale di un ospedale prima della riforma amministrativa quattrocentesca: San Vincenzo in Prato e il suo libro di conti (Milano, 1449),* in "Studi di storia medioevale e di diplomatica", Nuova Serie, (7), 2023, pp. 445–459 doi: 10.54103/2611-318X/20158.

Foucault M., *Folie et déraison. Histoire de la folie à l'âge classique*, Paris: Plon, 1961
Geltner, G., *A Cell of Their Own: The Incarceration of Women in Late Medieval Italy*, "Signs ", Vol. 39, No. 1, pp. 27-51 (monographic issue: Women, Gender, and Prison: National and Global Perspectives, Autumn 2013)
Goffman, E., *Asylums: Essays on the Social Situation of Mental Patients and Other Inmates*. New York: Anchor Books, 1961.
Hickman, C., *The Picturesque at Brislington House, Bristol: The Role of Landscape in Relation to the Treatment of Mental Illness in the Early Nineteenth-Century Asylum,* "Garden History", Summer, 2005, Vol. 33, No. 1 (Summer, 2005), pp. 47-60.
Howayda, A., *The Concept of Space in Mamluk Architecture*, "Muqarnas", 2001, Vol. 18 (2001), pp. 73-93.
Iaria, A. (ed.), *L' Ospedale psichiatrico di Roma: dal Manicomio Provinciale alla chiusura*, 2003.

Building Science: The City as a Site and Object of Knowledge-Making in the Early Modern Period

Chairs and Contact Details:

Christine Beese, Ruhr Universität Bochum
Christine.Beese@rub.de

When the Swedish natural scientist Olof Rudbeck embarked on a *peregrinatio medica* to the Netherlands in 1653, he not only became acquainted with the latest techniques and instruments of anatomical dissection. The site of Leiden University, a former beguine church, was also home to a maths school for future engineers who were to map, build and secure the young republic. After his return, Rudbeck was appointed professor of natural history at the Royal University of Uppsala, where he taught anatomy and botany as well as architecture. To promote technical skills, he soon set up a 'mechanical house', a workshop where craftsmen, land surveyors, and instrument makers were trained. On behalf of the crown, the city council, the university, the church, and individual citizens, Rudbeck and his students erected buildings, surveyed land, designed technical equipment, and improved the city's sanitary infrastructure.

In his book series Atlantica, Rudbeck furthermore tried to scientifically prove that the Swedes were born with a special degree of technical ability that legitimised them as a hegemonic power. Based on archaeological findings, he attempted to identify Uppsala as the former capital of the lost Atlantis. In this way the city was supposed to embody a model of society that was considered natural. Both the architectural form and the mythological narratives that characterise the image of the city of Uppsala in the 17th century thus originate from very different fields of knowledge and served practical, epistemological and political goals.

As the Swedish example shows, several actors were actively engaged in the creation, implementation, and dissemination of knowledge within the early modern city. From scholars to craftspeople, from the church to the courts – actors with different institutional, social, and cultural backgrounds contributed to the formation of an urban body that was shaped by and through their knowledge-making. Objects and materials of local, regional, and even global origin were as much involved as images, histories, and stories.

Numerous scholars have explored the situatedness of knowledge production (Livingstone, Shapin), the relationship between craft and academic knowledge (Smith, Bertucci), and between architecture and natural science (Galison, Gerbino). The significance of instruments (Bennett, Dupré), objects (Findlen, Bertoloni Meli) and maps (Ballon, Friedman) for knowledge production and (global) circulation has been considered as well as the relationship between urban space and knowledge (Sennett, De Munck, Long).

Based on this research, the session aims to shed light on the city as a contact zone and as a subject and object of making, circulating, implementing, and institutionalising knowledge in the early modern period. In order to gain insights into the reciprocal process that both practically and theoretically shapes the city and situates architecture within a broader field of knowledge-making, we seek contributions that address the following topics, among others:

1. Institutions of knowledge production and their urban and social context (e.g. the architecture of workshops, guilds, universities, academies).
2. Urban space and architecture as an object and laboratory of transdisciplinary knowledge production (e.g. excavations, surveys, fortifications, but also lighting, hygiene, burial, building standards, pattern books).
3. The city as a contact zone across different fields and cultures of knowledge (e.g. natural and political philosophy, mathematics, medicine, arts and crafts).
4. Conceptualizations and representations of the built city (e.g. as models of social order, in terms of territorial or cultural affiliation).

We warmly welcome contributions from across the globe.

Caring for Aging

Chairs and Contact Details:

Michael Asgaard Andersen, Royal Danish Academy, Copenhagen
masg@kglakademi.dk
Solmaz Sadeghi, Royal Danish Academy, Copenhagen
skha@kglakademi.dk

As demographic shifts transform societies, the question of how architecture can care for aging populations becomes increasingly urgent. This session, *Caring for Aging*, explores how housing for elderly people has been imagined, designed, and inhabited across time, placing architecture at the center of a broader inquiry into welfare, dignity, and the experience of growing old.

Focusing on Europe while remaining open to global parallels, the session seeks to critically examine how architectural practices respond to different welfare regimes (ranging from Nordic public sector-led approaches to mixed or privatized systems elsewhere), degrees of institutionalization, and configurations of public and private responsibility. Are current models reproducing outdated forms of care, or are they reimagining aging through new typologies, participatory processes, and inclusive urban strategies? Contributions are encouraged to address both state-sponsored schemes and bottom-up or hybrid initiatives – including cooperative housing, self-organized projects, and non-institutional alternatives – that challenge normative assumptions around aging and dependency.

We invite a broad scrutiny of architectural approaches that extends from significant historical examples to lesser-known projects and overlooked actors. From anonymous collectives and grassroots efforts to underrecognized architects and transdisciplinary collaborations, these works can offer crucial insights into how architectural design mediates between autonomy and care, privacy and collectivity, standardization and specificity.

While contemporary approaches are welcome, this session also emphasizes the need for historical depth. We ask how past architectural experiments – whether postwar welfare housing, modernist care

facilities, or informal support structures – continue to shape today's spatial and ideological frameworks. In this way, the session bridges architecture's material history with the political, social, and emotional realities of aging.

Drawing on interdisciplinary research in design, gerontology, and critical social theory (e.g., Anderzhon 2012; Stern 2017; Nelson 2017; Scharoun 2021), the session positions elderly housing as a site of negotiation between policy, place, and personhood. It aims to expand the discourse on elderly housing by exploring architecture's potential to foster emotional well-being, intergenerational exchange, and a dignified, purposeful experience of aging. By situating design within broader socio-political and cultural frameworks, we seek to move beyond merely functional responses toward architectural strategies that enable older adults not only to remain in place, but to thrive—socially, emotionally, and spatially. Ultimately, we hope to reimagine elderly housing not merely as infrastructure, but as a profound ethical and civic endeavour, a testament to how we choose to age, together.

'Character' in Global Encounters with Architecture, c. 1700-1900

Chairs and Contact Details:

Sigrid de Jong, ETH Zurich
sigrid.dejong@gta.arch.ethz.ch
Nikos Magouliotis, ETH Zurich
nikolaos.magouliotis@gta.arch.ethz.ch
Dominik Muller, ETH Zurich
mueller@arch.ethz.ch

The eighteenth century was at once the period when Classical architecture was canonized in the Western world and beyond, and the moment when its supposedly universal ideal came into crisis. The study of competing practices and traditions of various medieval (Romanesque, Gothic, Byzantine) and vernacular architectures in Europe, and the allure of 'Oriental' styles (filtered through Turquerie and Chinoiserie) challenged the claims of Classicism, as did the encounters with different extra-European building traditions through travel and colonialism. These encounters prompted an avid preoccupation with cultural difference, as evidenced in Voltaire's *Essai sur les moeurs et l'esprit des nations* (1756), Vico's *Principi di una scienza nuova d'intorno alla natura delle nazioni* (1725–1744) or Hume's *of National Characters* (1748).

Before the systematic global histories of architecture of the nineteenth century, and previous to the notion of style, Western authors employed a particular term to describe cultural specificity and difference: *character.* Stemming originally from the Greek word χαρακτήρ, its meaning evolved from the tool with which one carved signs on a wax or stone surface, over denoting these signs themselves, to the imprint these had on a reader or viewer. The distinctiveness of that impact, and the marks of identity of a whole culture in its environment and material culture, was encapsulated by its *character.* As such, from 1750 onwards the notion of *character* became ubiquitous in a variety of languages and was used in reference to people, buildings and landscapes, and shared across different genres of writing and scientific disciplines: from travel literature, political theory and ethnography, over treatises of art and architecture, to gardening manuals.

This session interrogates the architectural category of *character* in the globalizing world of the long eighteenth century, by zooming in on its meanings, implications and complexities in moments of encounter between Western and non-Western cultures and architectures. We draw on recent inquiries into how Western travellers conceptualized non-Western architectures (Brouwer, Bressani & Armstrong, *Narrating the Globe*, 2023), but also on works aiming to show how indigenous thinking conceptualized and criticized Western political and aesthetic norms (Graeber & Wengrow, *The Dawn of Everything*, 2021).

We are interested in instances of encounter addressing the following questions:

- How have Western accounts used the notion of *character* to describe non-Western architectures, building traditions, cultures, landscapes and places? How was the notion of *character* employed for architectures that challenged Western taxonomies and categorizations of architectural style?

- Which are the analogous notions in native languages that have been used to respond to encounters with Western architectures? How were these employed to process cultural specificity and otherness, and to describe, translate, acculturate or criticize Western cultural expressions (including mores and manners) from an indigenous perspective?

We welcome papers dealing with one or more of these questions in the period c. 1700-1900, across geographies.
We are eager to discuss a variety of written, visual and material sources, drawn from various disciplines, to expand the critical history of the term *character* beyond its well-established place in the history of European architectural theory.

Disability x Architectural Production: Bodily Diversity in the Construction of the Built Environment

Chairs and Contact Details:

Megha Chand Inglis, The Bartlett School of Architecture UCL
m.inglis@ucl.ac.uk
Nina Vollenbröker, The Bartlett School of Architecture UCL
nina.vollenbroker@ucl.ac.uk

This session invites contributions which share our conviction that it is important to consider architecture's histories through the diversity of bodies that construct our built environment.

Diverse individuals make up the architectural production workforce, and recent architectural histories have paid much-needed attention to marginalised voices, addressing, for example, gender, culture, and race in the construction of the built environment. Making buildings, however, is deeply linked to a further critical factor which remains under-researched: disability (including deafness, neurodiversity, and chronical illness).Many construction workers identify as disabled (approx. 20,000 in the UK), and architectural production systems are a key cause of disability.

At the same time, disabled bodyminds make distinct creative contributions to architecture. Overlooking disability within architectural production reinforces problematic spatial perceptions which create certain bodies as less impactful, less modern, or less worthy than others and sidelines the generative and creative potential of disability and difference.

As examples we highlight

- the proposed deskilling of construction labour, advocated by architects including Albert Kahn (1918), to allow eco-nomic integration of the war-wounded.
- the Viennese settlement project, including the construction system designed by Adolf Loos (1920-1921), which envisaged disabled veterans as co-operative producers.
- the bush-hammering of concrete at the Barbican Centre, London (1962-1982), which resulted in black construction workers contracting neurological damage.
- the widespread silicosis in India's contemporary temple building industry, revealing a lack of care towards *adivasi* (tribal) stone carvers.
- the spatial practices of deaf contractors changing perceptions of how disability can organise construction sites, counter discrimination, and create networks of solidarity.

Lately, Critical Disability Studies has gained traction in architectural discourse, but its concerns remain limited to building users and, more recently, to disabled architects. It therefore seems crucial to bring the bodies and minds of those who make our architecture to Disability Studies.

Similarly, architectural history has been invigorated by the emergent field of Production Studies, advancing critical understandings of relationships between the design of the built environment and the labour of constructing it. However, it does not yet specifically address disability.

Using both fields' historical, methodological, and political concerns, this session encourages the explorations of new architectural histories focusing on social and spatial justice from the vantage of disabled bodies. Papers might address urgent questions such as:

- What is the creative potential of disability in the construction workforce and how has this played out historically?
- How can research at the intersections of Disability Studies and Production Studies problematise the fast and able productive body working in capitalist regimes of labour?
- How do production systems and processes affect the world of disabled users, architects, and builders?

Equally, themes might include: the disabling nature of building work; disabled architects' and designers' relationship to construction sites; stories of solidarity or marginalisation (e.g. disabled building users employing disabled builders; the construction industry's historically difficult relationship with legal frameworks and employment practices).

Overall, approaching the construction of the built environment through a non-normative lens, this session highlights histories, bodies, and design and building practices usually left in the shadows of architectural scholarship.

Displaying Gardens, Landscape Architecture, and Architecture: Exhibition Cultures 1850-1950

Chairs and Contact Details:

Catharina Nolin, Stockholm University
catharina.nolin@arthistory.su.se
Elin Bergman, Stockholm University
elin.bergman@arthistory.su.se

Exhibitions and public installations of different scales have since the late 1700s been an established and important medium to exhibit, present, and display innovative industrial and engineering inventions as well as arts and architecture, all contributions forming a contemporary snapshot of the period's most advanced developments and ideals in different fields (Greenhalgh, 2011; Bremmer, 2015). The emergence of large international exhibitions during the mid nineteenth century developed an exhibition culture that drew large audiences, which in turn lead to great exposure of the exhibited objects on-site and the exhibition phenomena as such (Ekström, 1994; Filipová, 2015). Furthermore, the widespread reports in newspapers and magazines expanded the impact of the exhibitions, through which the objects, innovations, and ideals thereby reached further in time and space than the actual ephemeral event of the exhibition.

The scholarly investigation of exhibition cultures has to a great extent focused on industrial innovations, the exhibitions as an area to represent ideas about national identity, and exhibitions in relation to other mediums of representations in general (Smeds, 1996). The field of design and architecture was an important part of the exhibited content, and even though the display of examples of gardens, landscapes, and architecture to some extent has been researched, there are more themes to discover and develop further (Maloney, 2012, Rydell, 2018). The exhibitions were important for various reasons. For the individual designer and for firms, the exhibitions provided an arena to present their work and to attract customers and expand their professional networks. During the period 1850-1950 women gardeners, landscape architects, and architects entered the professional arena and participated frequently in exhibitions alongside other (male) professionals both as individual designers and in collaborative projects (Boussahba-Bravard & Rogers, 2018; Nolin, 2024).

The over-arching purpose of the session is to contribute to that cause and deepen the understanding on how elements of our designed surroundings have been presented to a wider audience 1850-1950, with emphasis on content and presentation. We therefore welcome papers from scholars working on exhibitions, exhibition practices, and exhibited objects in a broad sense within the fields of horticulture, garden and landscape design, and architecture. Paper proposals are encouraged to deal with – but are not limited to – themes concerning *sites* (e.g. exhibition spaces, three-dimensional installations), *techniques* (e.g. drawings, plans, photographs, models, horticultural displays), *pedagogy* (e.g. presentation, propaganda, distribution of new developments), *actors* (e.g. exhibition directors and committees, designers), *social aspects* (e.g. exhibitions as sites of social intermingle between different social groups, gender relations, representation, and professionalisation processes), *historiography of exhibitions* (e.g. exhibition history and practices, politics of exhibitions) and *methodologies* on how to research ephemeral phenomena such as exhibitions, temporary installations and exhibited objects of different kinds.

Selected Literature
Boussahba-Bravard, M., & Rogers, R. (2018). *Women in international and universal exhibitions, 1876-1937.* Routledge.
Bremmer, M. (2015). *Konsten att tämja en bild: Fotografiet och läsarens uppmärksamhet i 1800-talets Sverige.* Mediehistoria, Lunds universitet.

Ekström, A. (1994). *Den utställda världen: Stockholmsutställningen 1897 och 1800-talets världsutställningar*. Nordiska museet.
Filipová, M. (2015). *Cultures of International Exhibitions 1840-1940*. Routledge.
Greenhalgh, P. (2011). *Fair world: A history of world's fairs and expositions, from London to Shanghai, 1851-2010*. Papadakis.
Maloney, C. Jean. (2012). *World's fair gardens: Shaping American landscapes*. University of Virginia Press.
Nolin, C. (2024). *Kvinnliga trädgårdsarkitekter i Sverige: En yrkesroll växer fram*. Appell förlag.
Rydell, R. W. (2018). Exhibition architecture in American world fairs. *Oxford Art Online*.
https://doi.org/10.1093/oao/9781884446054.013.2000000052
Smeds, K. (1996). *Helsingfors - Paris: Finlands utveckling till nation på världsutställningarna 1851-1900*. Svenska litteratursällsk. i Finland.

Excavating the Landfill: Towards an Environmental History of Architecture's Waste

Chairs and Contact Details:

Kim Förster, The University of Manchester
kim.forster@manchester.ac.uk
Dr. Adam Przywara, University of Fribourg, Switzerland
adam.przywara@unifr.ch, przywara.adam@gmail.com

The Trümmerberge in post-war Germany, Crosby Beach outside Liverpool, Leslie Spit in Lake Ontario near Toronto and Fresh Kills on Staten Island in New York City are paradigmatic examples of the construction and demolition waste (CDW) landfills of the 20th century that characterise the modern cityscape. These landforms are a unique material record and expression of architectural production. Yet despite growing academic interest in extraction, consumption and waste in architecture and urban studies, it is surprising that the history of landfills has yet to be unearthed.

Over the past decades, architectural historians have demonstrated significant engagement with the concept of waste and wasteland, facilitating their transformation into productive properties throughout pre-modern Europe (Di Palma, 2014) and dealing with deindustrialized sites resulting from C20 capitalist and socialist industrialism (Hauser, 2001). This panel aims to collect analyses that emphasizes the historical role of the architectural profession and the architecture industry regarding waste, both its generation and the creation of landfills at the end of the product chain. Within urban contexts, scholars have elucidated the ways in which built environment has become involved in existing processes of wasting (Labban, 2019). By drawing theoretical frameworks that advocate for a critical examination of the negative conditions of architecture (Cairns and Jacobs, 2014), we seek to foster a deeper understanding of architecture and waste.

CDW has long been a defining feature of urban development (Foster and Schopf, 2017). Practices such as earthworks, backfilling, land reclamation, river regulation, and landfilling contribute to the creation of environments with unique historical contexts that necessitate analysis in relation to the histories of building that prompted these material flows. Simultaneously, landfills across time and space exhibit distinct material, spatial, technological, social and economic dimensions, which may offer a productive and optimistic perspective on the reciprocal landscapes (Hutton, 2018) of building materials and wasting. Fostering a historical understanding of CDW is crucial for critically contextualizing the contemporary challenges posed by landfills contaminated for example with asbestos and polychlorinated biphenyls (PCBs), or, in the most extreme, the construction of repositories designed to contain the demolition waste generated by decommissioned nuclear power plants.

We invite proposals that investigate the architectural history of landfills from the onset of the Industrial Revolution to the present day. We seek contributions that examine the material, social, cultural, political, and economic dimensions associated with the deposition of construction industry waste within the landscape. Additionally, we are particularly interested in papers that offer insights into historiographical methods designed to incorporate the study of landfills into broader disciplinary discussions.

Selected Literature
Abramson, Daniel. *Obsolescence. An Architectural History* (University of Chicago Press, 2016).
Cairns, Stephen and Jane Jacobs. *Buildings Must Die: A Perverse View of Architecture* (MIT Press, 2014).
Cronon, William. *Nature's Metropolis: Chicago and the Great West* (W W Norton & Co Inc, 1991).
Di Palma, Vittoria. *Wasteland: A History* (Yale University Press, 2014).
Foster, Heidy and Jennifer Schopf. "Urban ecological evolution through mineral migration: Extracting, recomposing, demolishing and recolonizing Toronto's landscape," *Landscript* 5 (2017): 47–64.
Hauser, Susanne. *Metamorphosen des Abfalls. Konzepte für alte Industrieareale* (Campus, 2001).
Hutton, Jane. *Reciprocal Landscapes: Stories of Material Movements* (Routledge, 2019).
Labban, Mazen. "Rhythms of Wasting / Unbuilding the Built Environment," *New Geographies* 10 (2019): 33–41.

Frontiers: Kinetics of Expulsion, Expansion, and Contestation

Chairs and Contact Details:

Elif Kaymaz, Middle East Technical University
elifkaymz@gmail.com; ekaymaz@metu.edu.tr
Emine Esra Nalbant, Binghampton University
enalban1@binghamton.edu

Lucien Febvre's (1928) etymological and conceptual exploration of the term *frontière* in the context of French history reveals its militaristic, architectural, and juridical dimensions: it refers the frontline of an army, the façade of a building, and the shifting boundaries of territory. Similarly, the Arabic term *cabha(t)* (جبهة), meaning "forehead" or "front," highlights the symbolic and spatial significance of the frontier, rooted in *cbh* and reflected in Aramaic/Syriac as a "high place." This is paralleled in Turkish with *cephe*, which carries the additional meaning of "a certain point of view." From Frederick Jackson Turner's (1893) "frontier thesis," which employed the frontier as a flexible concept to justify settler colonialism by framing it as a space of opportunity while simultaneously obscuring the violence of Indigenous displacement and dispossession, to Eyal Weizman's (2007) notion of "frontier architecture," which describes frontiers as "deep, shifting, fragmented, and elastic territories" that extend beyond the mere edges of political space to permeate its depths. Frontiers serve not only as sites of spatiality and imagery but also as fertile grounds for explanation. While often equated with borders, boundaries, and limits, frontiers transcend the notion of mere liminality. They represent both a site of expansion and a point from which one projects outward. As such, a frontier delineates the boundary of one's existence, extending outward to encompass nations, military zones, territories, and even atmospheric boundaries as entities.

This session seeks to explore frontiers as both a framework for discussing the histories of built environments and as material realities where complex, dynamic, and multifaceted architectural situations unfold. We approach frontiers not solely as dividing lines, zones of transition, or mechanisms of control, but also as sites of activism, resistance, and change. We are particularly interested in histories of frontiers that reflect the "restless, nervous energy," as Turner describes it.

We invite contributions that critically examine frontiers through a tri-fold structure, addressing one or more of the following dimensions:

- Spatial Frontiers: including urban-rural dichotomies and built frontiers where architecture navigates defense, capital, and cultural exchange, ultimately creating hybrid identities within spatial practices.
- Environmental Frontiers: examining the transformation of landscapes through architecture, resource extraction, and artificial boundaries, challenging the notion of "natural frontiers" as inherent dividers. Instead, we recognize these frontiers as products of historical and political contexts, along with the environmental consequences of static frontier structures.
- Political Frontiers: encompassing zones of conflict and contestation that shape sovereignty, territoriality, and state power, as well as internal frontiers created by gentrification and segregation, which foster political exclusion.

Departing from Thomas Nail's (2016) approach that reduces the frontier to a functional boundary, while also acknowledging his assertion that it serves as a generator of processes such as expulsion, expansion, and compulsion, this session aims to expand on the questions such as how frontiers operate spatially? What kind of building stories do frontiers generate? What critical issues emerge when we put frontiers in use as a concept in architectural history?

We particularly welcome papers that challenge conventional narratives, critically reflect on the researcher's positionality, and engage with a variety of methodological approaches, including the analysis of archives, maps, diagrams, and spatial data. By framing architecture as a mediator of movement, conflict, and transformation, this session seeks to deepen our understanding of how kinetics of frontiers –the shifting, unstable, and contested nature— have functioned in building, unbuilding, and imagining environments.

Learning from Collaboration – On the Many People who Worked Together to Create the Welfare States' Building Boom

Chairs and Contact Details:

Henriette Steiner, University of Copenhagen
hst@ign.ku.dk
Maximilian Sternberg, University of Cambridge
mjg75@cam.ac.uk

In the emerging European welfare states of the post-World War 2 period, the building boom from roughly 1945 to 1975 was characterized by great technological, architectural, urban and social innovations which went hand-in-hand with industrialization of architectural construction. While the latter has often been subject to criticism, several researchers have pointed out that the architecture of the period was also characterized by an exceptional type of holistic thinking whereby architects, landscape architects and planners worked closely together across professional divides and joined forces with engineers, politicians, builders, artists, social workers, teachers, doctors, residents and many others to create a new built environment that would befit the period's emerging welfare states.[1] This particularly concerns large-scale public architecture projects such as public housing, museums, hospitals and schools – Aarhus University being a seminal example from Denmark. Moreover, this happened at a time when the educational landscape was changing, and new social groups were entering educational programmes and thus also entering professional practice in the design fields.

The contributions of practitioners across architecture, landscape architecture and planning have traditionally been investigated in separate streams of historical research. But how did people from these professions work together in the building boom period of the mid-20th century? What characterized their invisible collaborations across differences of profession, class, gender, generation and geography? In which ways was their work interlaced with that of people from other disciplines or societal sectors when it came to the value-driven transformative ethos that characterized much of welfare state architecture, landscape architecture and planning? What, then, did it take to make a collaboration successful, and when and where did barriers and conflicts emerge? And what value did these collaborative constellations hold for architecture in a period where the built environment was changing rapidly? These are the questions that will broached by the contributors to this session, thereby challenging architectural historians to shed light on the invisible collaborations that have shaped the built environment of the mid-20th century's European welfare states. Methodologically, moreover, the session will ask what strategies can be developed in the face of the dearth of archival material that researchers often face when looking for documentation of collaborations across professional boundaries and diverse social groups.

We welcome papers from different national contexts that bring to light case studies of collaborative efforts in particular on public commissions of European welfare states in the mid-20th century, covering different paradigms of post-war Western European welfare states,[2] as well as looking for case studies from other national contexts and covering different typologies of publicly commissioned projects such as public housing, museums, hospitals and schools.

The session will provide invaluable knowledge about how the cities and landscapes of this period – a period which has left the greatest imprint in physical terms on the current built environment of Europe – came to be. In doing so, it will create a more accurate basis for today's many tasks regarding the repurposing or transformation of the built fabric from the mid-20th century building boom period, highlighting the relevance of architecture history for spatial practitioners today.

1 See e.g. *Woudstra, J*,"Danish Landscape Design in the Modern Era (1920-1970)", in: *Garden History 2*, 1995, pp. 222-241 and Bendsen, J.R., Riesto, S. and Steiner, H., "Collaboration – A Story About how Architecture Comes Into Being", chapter 5 of *Untold Stories*. Copenhagen: Strandberg Publishing 2023, pp. 248–95. Whilst the architectural and urban histories of the post-war welfare states have formed a burgeoning field in recent years, key publications include Worpole, K., *Here Comes the Sun. Architecture and Public Space in Twentieth-Century European Culture*, London: Reaction Books, 2000; Wagenaar, C. ed., *Happy: Cities and Public Happiness in Post-war Europe*. Rotterdam: NAIPress, 2004; Avermaete, T., van Heuvel, D., eds., "The European Welfare State Project: Ideals, Politics, Cities and Buildings". Special Issue of the *Footprint Journal*, 9, Autumn 2011; Swenarton, M., Avermaee, T., van den Heuvel, D. eds., *Architecture and the Welfare State*. New York: Routledge 2015. Lotz, K., Simpson, D., Raahauge, K. M., Vindum, K., Jensen, M. J., & Bendsen, J. R., eds. *Forming Welfare*. Copenhagen: The Danish Architectural Press, 2027.
2 See Esping-Andersen, G. *The Three Worlds of Welfare Capitalism*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1990.

Materials and Techniques on the Move

Chairs and Contact Details:

Caterina Cardamone, Vrije Universiteit Brussel
caterina.cardamone@vub.be
Lorenzo Vigotti, Alma mater studiorum – Università di Bologna
lorenzo.vigotti@unibo.it

In his 1645 French edition of Palladio, Pierre le Muet eliminated the chapters on building materials because of the differences between local practices in Italy and in France ("beaucoup de choses sont extremement differentes de celles qu'on pratique aujourd'huy en France"). Materials and techniques do not circulate well on paper. A stucco recipe may easily be disseminated with Italian architectural

treatises, but North of the Alps its composition might change, leaving out marble powder. Building materials and the associated techniques are thus closely linked to their region of origin, even more so in a period in which the costs and difficulties of travel and long-distance transport added to their prestige.

This session asks how exactly building materials and related techniques circulated across late medieval and early modern Europe, and how their travels affected their meanings.

A first issue concerns the actual transport of materials, the routes they follow, the movement of specific techniques and instruments, the migration of specialized craftsmen. How do foreign materials and people adapt to the local context and its traditional building practices? Well-known examples such as the use of Istrian stone along the Italian Adriatic coast or the export of black marble from 'Flanders' to other parts of Europe (Northern Europe but also Florence) show that these materials mainly travelled over water and along established trade routes. But what other routes did materials follow? Did the difficulties of transportation add value and meaning to these materials?

Another, more literary issue concerns the circulation and perception of materials and techniques as documented in treatises, ekphrastic descriptions and other writings highlighting the materiality of architecture. In this case the distance bridged might not only be geographical but also temporal, as materials and techniques from Antiquity such as stucco, concrete, and porphyry were being rediscovered. What ancient or modern narratives and iconologies on building materials circulated in Europe? How did these impact the perception, use and imagery of these materials?

Not only marbles but also other natural stones and ceramic tiles were evidently vehicles of iconological meanings (Barry 2020, Dressen 2008, Butters 1996), because of their colors and texture, the difficulty of their fashioning, or the associated narratives on their history and provenance. How did these layered meanings contribute to the self-representation of patrons? What role did the imitation of materials, through painting or other media, play in this regard?

We invite papers that address any of these issues to illuminate how materials and their meanings travelled across Europe, and beyond, in the late medieval and early modern period.

Notes on the Underground. Politics, Aesthetics, and Ecologies of the Subterranean

Chairs and Contact Details:

Silvia Balzan, The University of Manchester
silvia.balzan@usi.ch
Giulia Scotto, USI, Mendrisio Architecture Academy
giulia.scotto@usi.ch

From urban sewage systems repurposed as shelters by homeless people to high-speed transit tunnels promising rapid connectivity, subterranean spaces have historically played a dual role: as places of refuge and sources of unease, as futuristic sites of technological innovation, and as spaces of dispossession and invisible labor.

Moreover, the concept of the underground also signifies the internal subconscious dimensions of the human mind. In Dostoevsky's novel *Notes from Underground* (1864), the subterranean served as a metaphor for human isolation, alienation, and resistance to rationalist modernity. Historian Rosalind Williams, in her 1990 book, whose title borrows from Dostoevsky's work, interpreted fictional

undergrounds—such as those depicted in Jules Verne's and H.G. Wells' novels—as offering a prophetic lens on life in a technology-dominated world, highlighting the fragility of finite ecosystems and the technical consequences of "the human empire on earth."

During the same period, the idea of the underground as a site of clandestine and unruly activity emerged, as argued by Lara Langer Cohen (2023). Popularized as a metaphor through newspaper coverage of the "Underground Railroad"—the secret network of routes and safe houses that helped enslaved people escape to freedom in the United States in the 1840s—the underground offered new language and imagery for envisioning alternative modes of living. In this sense, the underground is where prohibited socio-cultural phenomena hide and alternative forms of political imagination materialize.

This session seeks to bring together architectural historians and scholars from related disciplines who, in their research, examine the socio-political, aesthetic, and ecological meanings of underground spaces across geographies and timeframes. Case studies may include realized and speculative underground spaces from the domestic to the planetary scale, encompassing:

Inhabitation Forms: Permanent settlements or temporary refuges, such as war bunkers.
Storage Spaces: Bank vaults, archival repositories, and energy storage facilities;
Sacred Spaces: Cemeteries and sites of worship;
Transportation Systems: Subways and high-speed tunnels;
Communication Networks: Internet cables and their geopolitical implications;
Infrastructure: Pipelines for water, sewage, and oil;
Metaphorical Undergrounds: Secret or invisible spaces tied to clandestine communities.

Topics for discussion may include:

Racialized Undergrounds: The connection of underground spaces to ideas of race and indigeneity, including the role of sciences such as geology and archaeology in enabling racialized dispossession, as seen in colonial mining and the relegation of Indigenous life underground to legitimize settlers' claims to land above.

Underground Subversion: The ways underground spaces facilitated hidden movements that disrupted power hierarchies.

Underground Ecologies: a) How human interventions in subterranean ecosystems and their afterlives may have spurred environmental consciousness. b) Exploring how subterranean environments can address climate change, energy efficiency, urban cooling, and ecological integration while debating their potential and risks.

Underground Fictions: Speculative narratives reimagining underground spaces as models for alternative societies. Underground spaces in literature, film, and art.

Underground Subway Aesthetics and Symbolism: The cultural and ideological roles of subways, from their design and materials to their representation in art and literature as symbols of modernity, state power, and collective urbanism.

Underground Palimpsests: The role of subterranean spaces in revealing historical and temporal layers of urban transformation and their relationship to the preservation of historical structures in contemporary developments.

We aim to gather diverse contributions connected by the concept of the underground, fostering a discussion that "unearths" thematic threads and advances socio-cultural, political, and spatial interpretations of the subterranean.

On Thresholds and Junctions – Reading Transport Architecture across Scales

Chairs and Contact Details:

Johan Lagae, Ghent University
johan.lagae@ugent.be
Monika Motylińska, IRS, Leibniz Institute for Society and Space
monika.motylinska@leibniz-irs.de

In the aftermath of the spatial and infrastructural turns, global histories of transport infrastructure are being written across a wide range of disciplines in the humanities and social sciences (e.g. van Laak 2004, Harvey 2016, Zunino 2018). Yet the "stubborn materiality" (Bridges 2023) and spatiality of roads, railways, subways, ports, as well as the buildings that serve them – infrastructures we would like to define as "transport architecture" – remain conspicuously understudied.

In order to bring this materiality and spatiality of transport architecture to the centre of the analysis, we propose to dedicate attention specifically to architectural structures that function as thresholds or junctions, as intermediaries connecting and bordering different social conditions and spatial regimes – analogically to the bridge and the door (Simmel 1909, Teyssot 2013). We are interested in discussions of how transport architecture responds to these differences on each side of the threshold in its design and materiality and how it alters them. We also seek to identify junctions in the infrastructural systems, acting as visible and invisible joints and divides between various modes and patterns of mobility. Following this aim, we intend to dissect the analysed structures both from horizontal and vertical perspectives and across different scales, from the small to the large (Bélanger 2006).

This approach leads us to consider such questions as what kind of transport architecture emerges, for instance, at border crossings, where road or railway infrastructures need to be adapted to different regulations and norms related to design or operation. It also invites us to investigate revolving doors at the entrances to a temperature-controlled skyway system or other liminal spaces connecting different climatic conditions. In line with the work of historians like Mirko Zardini (2005) or Thomas Van Leeuwen (2023), who have written stimulating studies engaging with the surface, be it of roads or *trottoirs*, we are equally interested in papers investigating how the horizontal surface – as a threshold between the world above and below the crust of the earth – informs the design of transport architectures such as subway stations, underpasses or animal crossings.

While transport infrastructure has most often been studied from the vantage point of the spectacular (the bridge as an *oeuvre d'art*, for instance), we are particularly looking for contributions that engage with transport architecture starting from the small and the mundane, and draw on unexpected or often overlooked source material. We are also open to papers engaging with thresholds or junctions connecting and dividing different modes of mobility. The focus on unimposing architectures that are easy to overlook *en passant* shall allow us to consider how transport architecture inscribes itself in transient places (Jirón 2018). Chronologically, our session focuses on the late 19th and 20th century while it aims to be global in scope.

Plantation Worlds, Plantation Architectures

Chairs and Contact Details:

Will Davis, Università della Svizzera italiana
will.davis@usi.ch
Rixt Woudstra, University of Amsterdam
r.l.woudstra@uva.nl

Plantations have been sites of bodily and environmental violence since the sixteenth century on, when the shipment of people and things—sugar, tobacco, coffee, cotton, timber, and cacao—across the Atlantic, Indian, and Pacific oceans began. Architectural sites that pertain to plantation worlds are manifold. Big houses and haciendas, jails and watchtowers, slave gardens and maroon communities, mills and storage sheds, situated on land reshaped and reconfigured as commercial resource. A way to understand the plantation in history can be characterized by what Maan Barua calls the "plantation multiple," identifying how it is the "production of sameness, the violent exploitation of human labor and other-than-human work, the transterritorial circulation of biota, the generation of simplified ecologies, and the ongoingness of extraction and plunder proliferate and become extensive with a wider set of practices in a social and ecological field."(16)

The rural buildings and landscapes of the plantation find their metropolitan colonial counterparts in docks, warehouses, office buildings, and manor houses, department stores and stock exchanges strewn across contemporary cities today. In this session, we propose that to provincialize Europe, we must simultaneously cosmopolitanize the plantation by looking at European sites and those peripheral places that were crucial to its wealth together. Rebecca Ginsburg, Kathrine McKittrick and others have described plantations as villages, even urban structures, with their own legal and political regulations. In this way, rural, provisional, ephemeral structures facilitating monocrop agriculture in tropical places, like tobacco drying sheds in Cuba or Sumatra, can be read through the same global matrix as the headquarters of colonial trading companies or shopping arcades in London, Paris, or Amsterdam.

Following this line of thinking, where, we ask, does the plantation begin and end? And to what extent does this conceptual model enable new ways of thinking and doing architectural history? What geographic, cultural, environmental, or economic entanglements situate the rural architecture and landscapes of the plantation at the center of plantation worlds? The plantation itself enables a global history of architecture through the shared climatic histories of the tropical band, presenting ways of thinking through history beyond singular hegemonic structures of colony or nation. We are interested in the way that conceptual models help to bridge geographies of knowledge, and how architectural historians might draw inspiration from examples such as Paul Gilroy's "Black Atlantic" (1993) or Henley and Wickramasinghe's recent "Monsoon Asia," (2023) which have provided an opening for shared social and environmental histories.

Contributions that address notions of (economic) risk and volatility incorporated into the logic of plantation architectures, as well as buildings that embody the clashes and confrontations between plantation capitalist worlds and their opposites, such as maroon communities, runaways, resistances, and the forms of small-scale settlement, farming, and living that come with it are especially welcome.

Privacy, the Private, and Architecture

Chairs and Contact Details:

Nuno Grancho, The Royal Danish Academy, Copenhagen / University of Copenhagen / University Institute of Lisbon
nuno.grancho@teol.ku.dk, nuno.grancho@iscte-iul.pt

This session explores the complex relationship between privacy, the private, and architecture throughout history. While privacy in Western contexts extends beyond individual concerns to shape relationships with space, self, and community, architectural history has yet to fully engage with privacy as a critical lens of analysis.

Despite extensive scholarship on public and private realms in other disciplines, privacy remains underexplored in architectural discourse. Drawing on theoretical frameworks established by scholars like Jürgen Habermas, Hannah Arendt, and Michel Foucault, who have examined the evolution of public/private distinctions and spatial power dynamics, this session aims to bridge this gap. More recent contributions from scholars such as Beatriz Colomina on the mediated nature of modern architectural privacy, Georges Teyssot on the body's relationship to domestic space, Mette Birkedal Brunn on Early Modern Privacy and privacy studies method, and Peter Thule Kristensen on Early Modern Privacy and architecture will further inform our discussions.

Rather than simply applying existing privacy theories to architecture, we seek an interdisciplinary exchange that allows architectural elements to be reinterpreted through privacy studies and privacy concepts to be reconsidered through architectural analysis. We are particularly interested in how architecture becomes symbolically charged with privacy meanings, and conversely, how privacy is shaped by architectural forms and practices.

To provide focus for this broad topic, we encourage papers examining privacy and architecture from the Early Modern period to the present, a timeframe that encompasses critical transformations in Western conceptions of privacy alongside significant architectural developments.

This session invites contributions examining specific building typologies where privacy plays a central role in their conception, organisation, and use. For example:

Monasteries and convents: These structures provide rich case studies in how architecture regulates private devotion, communal living, and isolation. From the individual cell to the cloister, monastic architecture influenced Western conceptions of privacy and continues to resonate in staging prayer, study, and spiritual intimacy.

Domestic architecture: From the development of corridor plans that separated servants from family life in 17th-century homes, to the open-plan living of modernism that reconfigured private/public boundaries, to contemporary smart homes with surveillance capabilities that redefine intimacy.

Civil and military buildings: create spaces of secrecy, shelter, and privacy through secure architecture, restricted access, and controlled spatial organisation.

Healthcare facilities: The evolution of hospital wards from large common rooms to private patient rooms reflects changing attitudes toward privacy in healing environments and medical ethics.

Educational institutions: Boarding schools, dormitories, and study spaces reveal how architecture shapes learning through varying degrees of privacy and surveillance.

Cultural institutions: Museums, libraries, and theaters that simultaneously offer public access while creating zones of private contemplation, study, or viewing.

We welcome papers exploring diverse architectural elements that frame privacy, including:

- Urban plans that establish public/private boundaries
- Spatial hierarchies and circulation patterns that control access and visibility
- Thresholds, screens, and partitions that mediate between private and public realms
- Sensory dimensions of privacy through acoustics, lighting, and material properties
- Domestic elements like alcoves and private rooms that accommodate bodily needs
- Documentation practices that reveal or conceal private aspects of architectural use

We particularly value contributions that examine concrete examples and take critical stances on the relationship between privacy and architecture, questioning conventional narratives and offering new interpretative frameworks.

Religious Enlightenment(s): Spirituality and Space in the Long Eighteenth Century

Chairs and Contact Details:

Demetra Vogiatzaki, ETH Zurich
vogiatzaki@arch.ethz.ch

In recent decades, the traditional view of the Enlightenment as a period of radical secularization and material monism has been substantially revised. Scholars such as David Sorkin, Jonathan Israel, Catherine Maire, Paschalis Kitromilides, and Robert Darnton have emphasized the enduring and multifaceted role of religion and spirituality—across both institutional and popular expressions—in shaping the politics, culture, and everyday life of the long eighteenth century. Architectural surveys of the period, however, have often lagged behind this historiographical turn, overlooking the importance of religion and spirituality in the shaping of Enlightenment culture, limiting their scope to a strictly formal analysis, or dismissing non-sanctified spaces and experiences of spirituality as anomalies in the progressive, inevitable 'disenchantment' of the world.

This session invites papers that explore the political, social, and aesthetic resonances of sacred space in the Enlightenment. From little studied state-sponsored and public programs, all the way to local, vernacular and/or intimate expressions of sacrality, how did architecture and the built environment broad-writ reflect or resist evolving religious identities, dogmatic debates, and communal rituals? Following the lead of such studies as Karsten Harries' work on Bavarian Rococo Churches, or Ünver Rüstem's reading of Ottoman Baroque forms and their entanglement with local Christian and Islamic traditions, the goal is to integrate formal analysis with socio- politically embedded approaches, foregrounding spatial practices that have often been overlooked in dominant narratives of Enlightenment architecture.

Topics might include, but are not limited to:

- Patronage networks and sacred architecture in diasporic or commercial communities, as in the port towns of the Mediterranean.

- Reused or re-interpreted religious sites in post-Jesuit or post-missionary contexts (ie. in the Ethiopian highlands).
- Syncretic religious spaces shaped by colonial conquest and negotiation, as for example, in and around the settlements of New France.
- Ephemeral structures associated with pilgrimage, mourning, or ritual performance.
- Staged sacred environments in Enlightenment theatre, festivals, and visual culture.
- Interfaith collaborations and architectural vocabularies in multi-confessional settings.

We particularly encourage proposals that attend to sacred experiences and spatial practices beyond the bounds of formal religious architecture, and that consider the ways in which spiritual expression operated through, and resisted Enlightenment-era aesthetics.

Rendering and Architectural Knowledge

Chairs and Contact Details:

Lutz Robbers, Jade University
lutz.robbers@jade-hs.de
Roy Kozlovsky, Tel Aviv University
rkozlov@tauex.tau.ac.il

Architecture renders the real. In our contemporary understanding, architectural rendering has become synonymous with photorealistic, often glossy visualizations of finalized architectural design projects, the metamorphosis of digital 3D models into highly persuasive, perspectival views of architectural and urban spaces to be built. Renderings have become ubiquitous elements of most design projects and competitions, striking simulations of predictable realities calculated more or less instantaneously by powerful CAD agents to seduce jury members, real estate developers, and policymakers. Hyper-realistic renderings change the way architecture is perceived and conceived. What still functions today as the translation of digitally modeled geometry by an underlying algorithm into a quasi-photographic image is currently being surpassed by powerful AI tools that generate architectural 'renderings' based on language prompts or diagrammatic notations.

Yet, despite the ubiquitous presence of renderings in today's architectural practices and discourses, little scholarly attention has been devoted to better understand what renderings are and how they have changed the design process, as well as how they operate as and within media of architectural knowledge. In addition, further inquiries are needed to elucidate rendering's diachronic characteristics, including pre-digital, analog, and early historical rendering practices. A brief look at the extraordinary multitude of meanings the word 'render' evokes ("to supply", "to transmit", "to cause to become", "to convert", "to translate", "to give back", "to surrender", "to put a first layer of plaster on a wall") hints at a more complex phenomenon that exceeds simple notions of architectural representation or visualization. One might ask, whether present renderings continue the privileging of precise lines over decorative shadows, of rational and technical geometries over poetic and symbolic "embodied experience" which began with the architectural sciences since the French notion of dessin in the seventeenth century (Perez-Gomez/Pelletier 2000). Computational design no longer needs visual media such as lines to 'represent' space and the objects within it. Digital design allows for a deeper link between numbers and images to emerge, rendering both lines and shadows obsolete. Or, one might ask, whether renderings can still be conceived of architecture "giving back" reliable data of a measurable empirical reality, as it did, for example, in the case of Verniquet's plan of trigonometric

operations of Paris from 1792, or as "making complete", as Quatremère de Quincy put it in 1832, or as media of "restitution" (Allais 2020).

The proposed panel invites specific case studies, both historical and contemporary, that address rendering practices in order to further explore the nexus between architecture and the image. Explorations of rendering further develop the intuition expressed by Walter Benjamin in 1933, when he discovered in Carl Linfert's *Grundlagen der Architekturzeichnung* a specific type of image that no longer "reproduces" but "produces" architecture as both planned reality and dream image (Benjamin 1933). How can architectural renderings contribute to contemporary debates about the "operative" (Krämer 2009; Bredekamp 2010) or mimetic potential of images? What role do renderings play in the constitution of architectural knowledge in the context of a supposed analogue/digital divide (Carpo 2010)? How do renderings fit into the constellation of imaging technologies and architectural historiography? How does the ongoing development of rendering practices (e.g. real-time rendering tools; animated renderings of movement through space; AI-generated renderings) alter the epistemological questions of architectural history and theory?

Stilled Lives: Living Materials and their Architectural Afterlives in Premodern Buildings

Chairs and Contact Details:

Costanza Beltrami, Stockholm University
costanza.beltrami@arthistory.su.se
Saida Bondini, University of Zurich / Kunsthistorisches Institut in Florenz – Max-Planck-Institut
Saida.Bondini@khi.fi.it

'Although plants have no sense of touch, they nevertheless suffer when they are cut [...] for their roots function as a mouth, to receive food; and the bark as skin; and the wood as flesh; and the knots or branches as arms with their nerves and veins' writes Vincenzo Scamozzi discussing the use of wood as a building material in his *The Idea of Universal Architecture* (Venice, 1615), citing Aristotle. Scamozzi's reflection about natural suffering surrendering to human necessity embodies a collision of ecological consciousness and anthropocentric values that also animates modern debates around natural and cultural heritage.

In addition to wood, coral, palms, reeds, bark, and turf (as in Scandinavian 'sod roofs') have long been used in architecture for their strength, flexibility, and insulating properties. In pre-modern epistemologies, even stone was seen as 'alive' and endowed with human qualities (Scamozzi's *pietra viva*). Central to pre-modern building practices, yet side-lined in stories of architecture (with some exceptions, e. g. Payne 2013), living building materials offer a new angle to rethink the discipline from the perspective of the more-than-human, the cyclical, and the living.

Ecocritical and post-anthropocentric studies have challenged the long-established dualism between nature and culture. Proposing new ways of understanding such relations, from "vibrant matter" (Bennet 2010) to "naturalism" and "animism" (Descola 2005), such research urges a reconsideration of the historical entanglements between human and nonhuman dimensions. This panel wishes to engage with these debates by foregrounding the architectural traces of such interconnection: where life becomes form, and ecosystems are refigured as structures. Building as a form of human manipulation participated in a process of material as well as conceptual conversion: it turned animate, ecologically embedded life-forms into static, structural components of human spaces. Architectural structures thus

emerge as hybrid entities, natureculture bodies that resonate with memories of the former lives of their natural materials.

We invite papers exploring these and related questions across all geographic areas during the premodern period (from antiquity to ca. 1750). Papers may investigate the architectural "afterlife" of living materials, with particular attention to how such transformations were understood, represented, or ritualized in historical contexts. What were the ecological, spiritual, or symbolic implications of turning the natural environment into the built "environment"? How did premodern societies conceptualize or mediate the shift from life to lifelessness, from ecological actor to architectural object? And how might examining these material histories illuminate broader understandings of human-nature entanglements in the premodern world?

We particularly encourage contributions considering multiple materials or contexts from a micro-historical or comparative perspective. Further topics may include:

- The architectural use and symbolic transformation of wood, coral, leather, bone, shell, stone or other once-living (or understood-to-be-living) substances;
- Reuse and recycling of organic matter in construction practices, including its material decay;
- The environmental impact of organic material extraction, production, and exchange;
- Cosmologies, ontologies, and ecologies underlying material choices;
- Theoretical approaches to material vitality, decay, and transformation.

The Book, The Self, and the City: Architectural Histories of Guidebooks and Urban Idealizations

Chairs and Contact Details:

Gregorio Astengo, IE University Madrid,
gastengo@faculty.ie.edu
Linda Stagni, ETH Zurich
linda.stagni@gta.arch.ethz.ch

Historically, guidebooks have propagated idealized images of cities. By offering strict selections of buildings, neighbourhoods and urban itineraries, guidebooks have consistently reproduced, reinforced and multiplied the expectations of readers/travellers. Over the centuries, this paradigm has been consolidated further by the referentiality and interdependency of this literary genre. Not only successive editions of the same book, but even different authors have reshaped similar content, imposing a tradition of authority and ideological visions of urban spaces and landscapes. A case in point is Girolamo Franzini's edition of the 1557 book *Le Cose Meravigliose dell'Alma Città di Roma*. Republished in 1588 to celebrate the 1590 jubilee, the booklet established religious itineraries and practices of pilgrimage throughout the city. Structured as a limited list of significant places of worship, *Le Cose Meravigliose* propagated the glories of the capital of Christianity by constructing an organised and controlled urban realm for the economies and bodily practices of the Catholic faith. Franzini's publication exemplifies how the guidebook builds urban ideals by normalising public expectations of the city.

The construction of a 'promised' city comes with the assumption that many of the more complex variables that shape urban space (local economies, collective spaces, social tensions, morphological transformations, environmental conditions…) are irrelevant to urban exploration. Instead, guidebooks tend to produce simplified and individualized contexts and often operate under the assumption that

cities are limitless resources. Through the guidebook, cities are presented as objects of temporary consumption, shaped into idealized spaces of organised, tailored movement, yet they are also adaptable to any community of readers/travellers.

This session seeks to study when and how cities have historically clashed with the environmental, social, religious, political, and cultural idealization provided by guidebooks. We explore how guidebooks have abstracted, codified, and rendered the thresholds between the marketable city, the expectations of the reader/traveller and the limits of the urban realm. We are especially interested in the ways in which a specific image of the environment (urban, natural, social…) has been idealised, and how this projected and mediatised reality relates with the more complex conditions of a place and the experience of the individual. We are interested in collecting the widest possible spectrum of this publicly produced type of media (pamphlets, maps, booklets…), from all periods and geographies.

Possible themes include, but are not limited to:

- Material histories of guidebooks and of their production through specific interests and cultural projects (propagandistic, political, religious, financial…);
- Written histories of a place (buildings, cities, landscapes…) through its mediatization and its exploration;
- Histories of tourism and travel through the individual or collective experiences of guidebooks (travel writing, diaries…);
- Environmental histories of places as interrelated, dependent, or opposed to the urban environment;
- Digital humanities projects that explore the movements of the reader/traveller in the city.

The Ceiling

Chairs and Contact Details:

Mari Hvattum, The Oslo School of Architecture and Design
mari.hvattum@aho.no

A ceiling is the upper interior surface of a room. Sometimes simply the underside of the floor or roof above, other times an independent membrane, the ceiling has an ambiguous tectonic status. Miming structure but rarely structural and often with an unobvious materiality, ceilings offer an unsurpassed field for representation, play, mimicry and metamorphosis. This session explores the richness and ambiguities of the ceiling – an architectural element charged, so says Gottfried Semper, with the task of overcoming "the oppressive feeling evoked by any separation between us and the open sky."

The ceiling has a unique position among the elements of architecture. While other bits of buildings – floors, walls, windows, doors – are busy fulfilling their practical functions, distributing people, practices and objects as occasion requires, the ceiling is given over to something else altogether. In modern architecture, that "something else" is often pure technical performance, with ventilation, acoustical devices, and lighting densely packed into the ceiling's suspended grid. Historically, the ceiling has taken on a far wider range of tasks. It announces the purpose of the room; the dreams and aspirations of the patron; the spiritual horizon within which the building belongs. In the ceiling of the royal tombs of Uganda the carefully aligned reed rings hung from the outer roof speak simultaneously of the identity of past kings and the cosmic order of the world. In Egyptian burial chambers, the ceiling embodies a miniature firmament through which the soul may travel, while in Chinese temples, the central dome forms a "sky-well" connecting heaven and earth.

Looking for papers that explore the meaning, making, and materiality of ceilings, the session is open to scholarship on any place or period. Of particular interest is the migration and metamorphosis of ceiling motifs across cultures and periods, for instance the way the coffered ceiling was translated into a multitude of hybrid materialities in the late middle ages onwards, or the way the Arabic muqarna ceiling changed its materials and construction principles when transferred from the Middle East and Northern Africa, to Spain and beyond. Or indeed; the reimagining of the ceiling in post-war architecture, when architects like Louis Kahn swore that he "did not want to die under a false ceiling." While "staring at the ceiling" is often taken to represent lethargy, loss, and idle longing, it can also – as this session sets out to show – give unexpected insights into the built world and beyond.

The Reception of Gothic Architecture in Italy, 1300–1700: Disapproval, Indifference, Appreciation?

Chairs and Contact Details:

Gianluca Belli, Università degli Studi di Firenze
gianluca.belli@unifi.it
Pieter Martens, Vrije Universiteit Brussel
pieter.martens@vub.be

While much has been written about the negative reception of gothic architecture in Renaissance Italy, the positive appreciation there of the architectural culture of northern Europe has scarcely been investigated. Yet there are manifold indications that the first-hand experience of the architecture, cities and ways of living in northern Europe elicited appreciative responses from Italian travellers, merchants, architects and patrons. This is particularly evident for regions such as Flanders that were intensely travelled by Italian merchants fascinated by the fine artworks and luxury objects produced there. This session aims to explore to what extent not only the arts from the north (Belozerskaya 2002, Nuttall 2004) but also its architecture was positively appreciated south of the Alps.

We are not only interested in the favourable appraisal of the formal vocabulary associated with the gothic style, but more broadly in the reception of a foreign architectural culture, as expressed in writings, interior decorations and manners of dwelling, or in fictitious architectures imagined in paintings and prints. For example, many interiors in Renaissance Florence were decorated with Flemish objects, including tapestries or paintings depicting northern, gothic buildings, as in Hans Memling's *Last Judgement* triptych for Angelo Tani's chapel in the Badia Fiesolana.

The adherence to gothic architecture in Renaissance and Baroque Italy has already been studied for specific contexts, such as Venice, Milan, and Southern Italy, nuancing the opposition of "Gothic vs. Classic" (Wittkower 1974). Yet the well-known criticisms by Filarete, Vasari, Raphael and others of the so-called *maniera tedesca* still overshadow the more appreciative comments on the *architettura oltremontana* by writers such the humanist Enea Silvio Piccolomini, even though studies on the phenomenon of "Renaissance Gothic" (Chatenet & De Jonge 2011, Kavaler 2012) have convincingly challenged the conventional view inherited from Vasari in which the late gothic in northern Europe is seen as inferior or retrograde in comparison with the new Italianate *all'antica* style.

Building on this historiography, we invite papers that shed new light on the appreciation and possible impact in Italy of gothic architecture from northern Europe or elsewhere. How was this region's

architectural culture understood, or misunderstood? Which qualities, positive or negative, were associated with its manners of building and dwelling? Was the northern gothic perceived as inherently different from the local gothic which persisted in projects such as Ghiberti's sacristy in Santa Trinita in Florence or Filarete's *Ospedale* in Milan? Papers may focus on all aspects of architectural culture, including formal and constructional aspects, interior decorations and manners of living, and the *fortuna critica* of northern treatises in Italy. They may consider travelling patrons, architects, and engineers, as well as other vehicles for the import of foreign architectural ideas, such as texts, drawings, building materials, and paintings depicting architecture.

The 21st Century History of Architecture Theory

Chairs and Contact Details:

Joseph Bedford, Virginia Tech
jtb@vt.edu

As we move into the second half of the third decade of the 21st century it is time to start writing the first chapter in the history of 21st century architecture theory, addressing the events, people, places, institutions, artifacts, documents, and debates, that characterized the recent history of ideas that have shaped the production of the built environment.

This session calls simultaneously for two intersecting things. Firstly, it calls for a focus on the history of theory, something that is rarely given space in meetings of architectural historians. Secondly, it calls for a focus on the history of the more recent past, something which historians are reluctant to address.

When Hanno-Walter Kruft, published his monumental *History of Architectural Theory: From Vitruvius to the Present* in 1985 and when Harry Francis Mallgrave published his equally monumental, *Modern Architectural Theory: A Historical Survey, 1673–1968* in 2005, they could not foresee the discourses and events that would unfold in the first decades of the new millennium. And while we have a consolidated history of architectural theory going back to the earliest origins, given to us by these historians, we have only a very sketchy understanding of the developments in architectural theory in that last quarter of a century.

The same distance that once separated the generation of historians of the 1960s from the modern movement now separates us from such complex historical horizons as 9/11, the dot.com bubble, the Iraq war. The session asks historians to treat the 21st century with historical distance, even though it is still within living memory.

Papers might address the history of ideas about such matters as theories of architectural representation, drawing and computation; philosophies of perception; discourses of race, gender and disability; discourses of affect, mood, sensation and atmosphere; debates about the critical and the projective; the phenomenon of "starchitecture" and iconic building; parametricism; digital fabrication and mass customization; architecture's relationship to capitalism; theories of surfaces, skins and envelopes; debates about autonomy; theories of the role of culture, tradition and meaning in architecture; the turn to preservation and adaptive re-use; the activist turn in architectural design culture; the material turn; theories of post-digital aesthetics in architecture or of post-internet culture; the turn to new philosophies from Speculative Realism, New Materialisms and Object-Oriented Ontology, to theories of the Anthropocene and Capitalist Realism; discourses of care, repair, and maintenance; theories of Labor,

Work, and the organization of the architectural profession; concepts of climate, planetarity, non-extractive architecture, and carbon form; Automation and BIM, Artificial Intelligence and Big Data.

Transimperial Contact Zones and Collision Space in Southeast Asia

Chairs and Contact Details:

Robin Hartanto Honggare, National University of Singapore
robin@nus.edu.sg
Amy Y.T. Chang, Harvard University
amychang@g.harvard.edu

Recent works by Amanda Achmadi, Paul Walker, and Prita Meier have brought attention to the connected architectural histories of empires, while Gauvin Alexander Bailey, Ines G. Županov, and Sidh Losa Mendiratta have opened up new directions in thinking about persistence, assimilation, competition, and contact between new colonial entrants to the Indian Ocean and pre-existing powers in highly desired trade zones. Yet much remains to be explored regarding how architecture shaped or became implicated in transimperial interactions, a topic for which Southeast Asia is a particularly productive space of examination. During the heyday of colonialism, many imperial powers, including the Spanish, Portuguese, Dutch, French, British, US, and Japanese empires, mobilized their military and economic arms to claim and exploit different parts of Southeast Asia. They did not operate in isolation. Empires communicated, collaborated, and collided with each other as well as with local rulers, their transimperial contacts shaping the lives of millions of people.

State officers negotiated imperial boundaries across both land and water and fought over overlapping territorial claims, conceiving agreements, such as the Spanish-Portuguese Treaty of Saragossa in 1529 and Anglo-Dutch Treaties of 1870–1871, that influenced the demarcation of borders. Yet those lines were not rigid walls: corporate and financial transactions involved traders and companies across colonial territories, resulting in the construction of ports, offices, markets, and other intersecting economic, administrative, and intangible spaces that produced encounters among people from different countries and empires. The development of the shipping and aviation industries in the early twentieth century intensified the flows of people and goods in the region. This simultaneously encouraged colonial tourism, humanitarian work, missionizing activities, and scientific networks. All of these involved laymen and professionals from neighboring empires working for multi-national collaborations in corporate, governmental, educational, or scientific enterprises, creating ideological, technological, and epistemological exchanges and networks.

However, transimperial interactions were not always cooperative. Power takeovers, such as the British invasion of Java in 1811, the US acquisition of the Philippines in 1898, or the Japanese occupation of British Malaya and the Dutch East Indies between 1942 and 1945, produced military zones and carceral spaces, including internment camps and prisons, as well as creating parallel spaces of exile and displacement, and networks of resistance or rivalry that extended beyond claimed spaces. While the indentured labor system, which powered economic developments across colonies, hinged on transitory sites that interpenetrated and stitched together discontinuous territories, such as labor recruitment offices in China, the Straits Settlements, and Java, and migration and quarantine stations at work destinations, which often involved carceral logics and exploitative operations of restriction and surveillance.

These examples bring us to the challenge of conceptualizing architecture that exceeds empire. This session calls for papers that discuss transimperial contact spaces and collision zones in Southeast Asia from the 16th to the 20th centuries. We invite works that investigate social, political, financial, cultural, technological, material, and other aspects of transimperial contact and collision, foregrounding buildings and environments that facilitated exchange, encounter, and collaboration; or which constituted sites of overlapping jurisdictional and territorial claims. We seek to foster a conversation on approaches, theories, issues, and case studies that bring new perspectives to our understanding of colonial architecture, especially as it concerns transimperial interactions.

Water as an Ecological Mediator in Architecture: Tracing Connections from Antiquity to the Modern Age

Chairs and Contact Details:

Martina Frank, Ca' Foscari University of Venice
martina31@unive.it
Myriam Pilutti Namer, Ca' Foscari University of Venice
myriam.piluttinamer@unive.it

This session investigates the multifaceted role of water – whether seas, rivers, lakes, lagoons, or artificial basins – as a crucial element in shaping architecture and urbanism. Spanning the period from Antiquity to the Modern Age, prior to the Industrial Revolution, it focuses on the Mediterranean region and its sub-basins, such as the Adriatic Sea, while also welcoming broader geographical perspectives and comparative analyses. Water is examined not merely as a practical resource or scenographic medium but as a dynamic ecological force and a cornerstone of material culture that has shaped human interaction with the built environment across time and space.

The session foregrounds the relevance of ecological theory as a lens to understand historical engagements with water. Ecological theory emphasizes the interconnectedness of natural and human systems, inviting a reassessment of how architecture and urbanism have adapted to and co-evolved with aquatic environments. Recognizing water as an active agent within ecological systems – rather than merely a backdrop – allows for a deeper comprehension of historical architectural practices as complex environmental adaptations.

Through a variety of sources – including historical drawings, cartography, treatises, architectural plans, digital media, and photography – the session explores the cultural, technical, and environmental dimensions of water's integration into architecture. Key questions include: How has water served as an ecological mediator, influencing architectural design and urban planning across different historical and cultural contexts? How have communities leveraged water's physical and symbolic properties to negotiate the interplay between natural and built environments? How can ecological theory reshape our interpretation of the historical built environment in light of contemporary environmental challenges?

The session highlights Venice as a paradigmatic case where the inseparable relationship between water and architecture is most visible. The city's Grand Canal palaces and mainland villas illustrate how waterways shaped economic, cultural, and urban frameworks, demonstrating water's centrality to the material and symbolic organization of space. Venice itself can be understood as a complex ecological system, where natural and human-made environments are interwoven. Its continuous negotiation with water across centuries connects practices rooted in Antiquity with innovations that shaped the Medieval and Modern Age, offering a unique model of adaptive resilience and environmental integration. In

addition, comparative perspectives, such as Lisbon's engagement with the Tagus River, Edo's (Tokyo's) canal networks, and New Amsterdam's (New York's) waterfront spaces, underscore water's role as both a vital resource and a driver of urban form across different cultures and periods. By interpreting the relationship with water through the prism of ecological theory, the session highlights how understanding past interactions between natural forces and built environments can enhance strategies to preserve heritage today while promoting sustainable practices attuned to ecological realities.

Selected Literature

Ammerman, A. J., 2003. Venice before the Grand Canal. *Memoirs of the American Academy in Rome*, 2003, 48, 141–158.

Ciriacono, S., 2006. *Building on Water: Venice, Holland, and the Construction of the European Landscape in Early Modern Times*. New York; Oxford: Berghahn Books.

Kassler-Taub, E., 2019. Building with Water: The Rise of the Island-City in the Early Modern Mediterranean. *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 1 June 2019; 78 (2): 145–166. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1525/jsah.2019.78.2.145

Merrill, E.M. and Gianaris's, S., 2019. From the Pantheon to the Anthropocene: Introducing Resilience in Architectural History. *Architectural Histories*, 7(1), 7. DOI: http://doi.org/10.5334/ah.406

Morton, T., 2009. *Ecology without Nature. Rethinking Environmental Aesthetics*. Cambridge, Massachusetts; London, England: Harvard University Press.

Morshed, A.Z 2024. Water as a Disciplinary Challenge in Architectural History. *Water Hist* 16, 1–20. DOI: https://doi.org/10.1007/s12685-024-00342-9

Roundtables (in alphabetical order)

Self (Hi)Stories: The "I" in Architectural Historiography

Chairs and Contact Details:

Vanessa Grossman, University of Pennsylvania
vagross@design.upenn.edu
Daria Ricchi, Oxford Brookes University
dricchi@brookes.ac.uk

First-person narration in architectural history offers an intimate perspective that connects past and present, bringing personal insights, emotions, and reflections often missing from third-person accounts. This approach humanizes architectural history by grounding it in lived experience rather than abstract facts. However, it raises concerns about subjectivity, bias, and the potential to obscure broader historical contexts. This roundtable invites a reflection on the role of the first-person in architectural histories, particularly through feminist and queer lenses that highlight emotion, identity, and positionality, distinguishing the conventional academic "I" from a more subjective, embodied one.

First-person travelogues played a foundational role in the construction of European world histories, particularly during the colonization of the "New World." Informed by colonial ideologies, these narratives engaged with natural landscapes and the built environment while drawing on Indigenous knowledge—perspectives that were often marginalized, distorted, or erased in the final texts. By the late eighteenth century, the rise of modern historiography marked a methodological shift, aligning historical writing with the empirical frameworks of the natural sciences. Historians increasingly employed third-person narration to present evidence as neutral and systematic, a move that distanced the authorial voice and reinforced the divide between memoir—rooted in subjective experience—and history—positioned as objective, analytical discourse.

In the nineteenth century, European historians of architectural styles, deeply influenced by racial biases, shaped architectural history in ways that excluded marginalized voices. While historical fiction grew popular, the first-person voice remained linked to fictionalization. In the twentieth century, thinkers like Paul Ricœur emphasized the importance of maintaining a clear distinction between verifiable history and imaginative fiction. The avant-garde movements of the early twentieth century began to blur the lines between artistic expression and historical narration, further destabilizing traditional views of historical objectivity. The concept of the "death of the author" further destabilized the notion of objective truth in writing, including historical texts. A pivotal shift occurred in 1987, when Pierre Nora published *Ego-histoire*, marking the first time a historian explicitly used the first-person pronoun to reflect on their own subjectivity in historical writing. That same decade also saw the emergence of Carlo Ginzburg's microhistories, which revealed how individual, seemingly marginal narratives could illuminate broader historical truths—elevating the personal to History with a capital "H."

Feminist scholars, such as Donna Haraway, have influenced contemporary architectural thought and historiography, introducing concepts like "situated knowledge" and embodied experience. These ideas underscore the partial and positional nature of all knowledge, challenging traditional narratives that have historically excluded personal identity and emotion. This shift has informed approaches where autobiography and architectural history intersect, as seen in works that explore modernism and women in architecture, such as Eva Hagberg's *When Eero Met His Match* (2022). The growing prominence of

first-person narratives in urban and architectural histories is further evident in works like *Remaking Beijing* (2005), Jane Rendell's "The Siting of Writing and the Writing of Sites" (2017), and AbdouMaliq Simone's *Improvised Lives: Rhythms of Endurance in an Urban South* (2018). These examples highlight how personal narration in architectural discourse can offer fresh insights, revealing how feminist and personal perspectives shed light on the broader, more complex narratives of space and urban development.

This roundtable invites contributions from a variety of historical periods and geographies, exploring how first-person narration, emphasized by feminist, intersectional and queer frameworks, can bridge individual experience and collective memory in architectural history. We encourage papers that engage with the emotional, political, and methodological implications of this approach, while also addressing the tensions between subjectivity and historical representation in contemporary contexts.

Transmedia Architecture Archive: Historical Knowledge in the AI Era

Chairs and Contact Details:

Dirk van den Heuvel, TU Delft
d.vandenheuvel@tudelft.nl
Eytan Mann, TU Delft
e.m.mannkanowitz@tudelft.nl

The archive is undergoing a profound transformation. Once conceived as static repositories for historians to explore, archives have expanded into dynamic, digital platforms attempting to democratize narration of history. With the advent of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Extended Reality (XR), the notion of the archive encounters ideas of collective, decentralized intelligence and multisensory engagement. The convergence of AI's analytical capabilities with XR's immersive technologies creates unprecedented opportunities for architectural research, enabling scholars to simultaneously analyze vast datasets while experiencing spatial configurations in virtual environments. This transmedia approach allows researchers to move fluidly between different modes of knowledge - from AI-powered pattern recognition across historical documents to embodied understanding through virtual site visits - creating richer, more nuanced and multivocal interpretations of architectural history. These technologies open new possibilities for studying architectural history, yet they also present ethical and critical challenges that demand reflection and debate.

This roundtable invites scholars to interrogate the "Transmedia Architecture Archive" as a space where storytelling and knowledge production span multiple media, blending traditional archival materials with computational and simulation tools. It focuses on the implications of moving from metadata-based systems to AI-driven epistemologies and how real-time simulation technologies introduce intimacy, empathy, and urgency to historical narratives.

The following questions will guide the discussion:

1. What does the advent of AI entail for architectural historiography, and how does it reshape the agency of individuals and institutions in historical interpretation?
2. What tools and methodologies can breathe life into static collections, transforming them into participatory and experiential spaces?

3. How can XR technologies, like AR and VR, foster emotional connections to historical spaces, enabling users to experience the intimacy of past lives and the urgency of systematically excluded histories?
4. What ethical considerations come into play when adopting AI and XR technologies in contested or marginalized historical contexts? How can we ensure these technologies do not reinforce existing power structures through biased training data? Special attention must be paid to questions of data sovereignty while allowing open access.

By addressing these pressing issues, the roundtable aims to push the boundaries of architectural historiography, proposing new ways to engage with the past while acknowledging the challenges of doing so in the AI age. The discussion will bring together voices from architectural history, critical theory, and archival practice, fostering dialogue between diverse scholars. By connecting historical expertise with technological innovation, we seek to understand how transmedia archives might redefine the roles of historians, architects, and the public in shaping historical narratives. The roundtable invites both speculative and grounded contributions, inviting participants to imagine and critically examine the future of architectural knowledge production at the intersection of traditional scholarship and emerging technologies.

Women's Collective Organizing in Architecture: From the Grassroots to the Global, 1960-2020

Chairs and Contact Details:

Karen Burns, University of Melbourne
karen.burns@unimelb.edu.au
Lori Brown, Syracuse University
lbrown04@syr.edu

Over the last 190 years collective organising has been a strategic tool for marginalised and under-represented groups. The final decades of the long twentieth century, marked by 'cleavages, conflicts and confrontations', produced a dense cluster of social movements and distinctive forms of collective, activist organising. The global women's movement was the largest of these social mobilisations.

This panel calls for papers that investigate how women organised collectively in architecture to enact demands for professional equity, new knowledge and social justice in the period 1960-2020. By focussing on campaigns, actions and networks, this panel aims to expand new areas for women's history in architecture. It seeks to move beyond histories of individual figures and their buildings produced in the context of private firms or state bureaucracies. It aims to situate women in architecture as social actors in civil society in pursuit of emancipation and transformation.

Drawing attention to architecture's activist past, we aim to situate women's collective organising within a diverse set of geographies and histories. Early feminist or women's collectives such as Matrix (London, 1980) and the Women's School of Planning and Architecture (US, 1974) are well established in the historical record, but other lesser-known examples include the First Women's Collective (Iran, 1974) and Thyra (Copenhagen, 1979). How does the inclusion of overlooked collectives alter the received historiography of the influence, origins and growth of the intersecting women's movement and architecture? What social and political forces and conditions specific to the profession and civil society

have driven the rise of new collectives over the last decade, for example Counterspace, Johannesburg (founded 2015) and professional women's organisations such as Women in Architecture and Design (founded Ahmedabad, 2016)?

Frequently shut out of the 'great man, great monument' model of mainstream architectural history, how does an examination of women's collective organising raise the visibility of other kinds of architectural labour and innovation: such as collective activist pedagogy - 'What's 'race doing in a nice field like the built environment?', UCL, 2020 or 'Contesting the Canon' by the Feminist Art and Architecture Collective, founded US, 2018, or the mobilisation of research as an activist tool in older media forms such as *Women in American Architecture* (1977) and *Making Space* (1984) or in new digital platforms (Parlour, Australia, 2012 and FAME, London, 2018). How does this new work decentre the discipline's objects of knowledge by centring experience, everyday lives and lived moments of sexism and racism?

Conferences and their ensuing publications have offered important temporary mobilisations of collective exchange, support, and new knowledge (for example Desiring Practices, London, 1993; Alterities, Paris, 1999; An Emancipated Place, Mumbai, 2000; Architecture and Feminisms, Stockholm, 2016). These published anthologies contain multiple voices and have proven to be a key format for women's knowledge, but traditional print media has limited circulation and requires capital. How has digital media democratised the space of global collective information, such as that provided by una día / una arquitecta (Uruguay, Spain, Argentina, founded 2016) with its daily profile of woman architects and its formation of a counter-archive? In recognition of broader knowledge shifts, other platforms such as #WIKD (US, 2015) have co-located digital and physical spaces in events designed to expand the lists of women on Wikipedia.

Attention to women's collective identity, protest and empowerment also invites us to ask how intersectionality and solidarity work. What kinds of labour and care are required to hold together campaigns and coalitions? What happens when they fall apart? Are these the unrecorded, difficult histories of women in architecture?

By using the temporal frame of the long twentieth century, we hope to establish persistent genealogies in women's organising. We encourage a broad range of papers, from those that provide historically situated case studies to those that develop new methods for studying women's collective action, agency and identity.

EAHN Roundtable: Teaching Architectural Histories in the Age of Global Polycrisis

Chair: Léa-Catherine Szacka, EAHN Vice-President, University of Manchester**.**

Roundtable organized by the EAHN executive committee (participation by invitation).