

ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY AND THEORY:
20th CENTURY TO THE PRESENT

Instructor: Dr. Ted Cavanagh / ted.cavanagh@dal.ca

Office Hours: by email, HISTORY QUERY as subject line

Class Time: Lectures: Tuesday 11:30 am - 1:00 pm URL sent by email and URL posted on Brightspace

Seminars: Thursday 11:30 am - 1:00 pm and/or Friday 11:30 am - 1:00 pm pm on Teams

Tutorials: These are Wednesday afternoons or are recordings available Wednesday afternoons with Susanne Marshall

TAs: Milena Kocay (ml284376@dal.ca), Luke Stock (lk338184@dal.ca), Matt Card (matt.card@dal.ca)

Brightspace Site: <https://dal.brightspace.com/d2l/le/content/123879/Home>

Calendar Description: This course investigates the history and theory of architecture as cultural expression from the 20th century to the present. It explores design practices, theories, and paradigm shifts in recent decades and diverse global contexts, including questions of class, gender, race, and ecology.

Additional Description:

History is often told as a continuous narrative of cause and effect. This ignores the importance of discontinuities, disruptions and paths not followed – rich or ignored directions in architecture. The questions you ask at your drawing board are questions that were asked before in different times and places. This is the value of seeing history not as one story, but as many coincidental stories. The task is to find the story or stories that best relate to your concerns. This is a long way of describing why there are many readings in this course.

This course is a series of introductions – various intriguing points of entry into an endless series of thematic histories connecting many of the architects and buildings of the modern era. Any point of introduction will do. For if there is one thing that I would like to convince you of, it is that sustained historical investigation – critical reading, critical analysis, and critical interpretation – is a continuous network of investigation from article to footnote to drawing to building. Many historians see themselves as detectives, sifting facts, distinguishing between primary and secondary sources, questioning received opinion, and seeking truth (however contingent that truth may be). Architects, too, should enter that quest to different purpose, so that critical understandings of others' work can improve your own. We will spend the semester with this in mind.

Learning Objectives:

- Ability to build knowledge on the history and theory of architecture and its cultural context from the 20th century to the present
- Ability to analyze and research the history and theory of architecture
- Ability to build a critical position on the history and theory of architecture and connect it to local and more global conditions
- Ability to express a critical position on the history and theory of architecture through language (oral and written).

Required Text: - continues B2 History — Ingersoll, Richard and Spiro Kostoff. World Architecture: A Cross-Cultural History. Oxford University Press 2013 — please read individually for general understanding (no assigned readings)

- Seminar readings will average 60 pages each week. These are required readings.

seminar readings are available as identified in the course outline. Difficulties please contact your TA.

Course Format: Attendance and participation in lectures, seminars, and tutorials are required. This three-credit-hour course expects students to spend approximately nine hours per week on all activities, including reading and assignment time.

University Policies and Resources

This course is governed by the academic rules and regulations set forth in the University Calendar and the Senate. See the School's "Academic Regulations" page (tinyurl.com/dal-arch-regulations) for links to university policies and resources:

- Academic integrity
- Accessibility
- Code of student conduct
- Diversity and inclusion; culture of respect
- Student declaration of absence
- Recognition of Mi'kmaq territory
- Work safety
- Services available to students, including writing support
- Fair dealing guidelines (copyright)
- Dalhousie University Library

Tuesday, May 5, 11:30am

Lecture 1 Course Introduction (Brightspace)

Thursday, May 7, 9.30am

Seminar A.1 case study — readings presented, discussed, begin next week's History presentation
 student led Thursday 11:30 am - 1:00 pm 1) context, 2) order, 3) transparency (Teams > select issues group)
 TA convenor Friday 11:30 am - 1:00 pm 1) craft, 2) material (Teams > select issues group)
 1) MC 2)LS 3)MK Continue in these groups at the same times for the rest of the readings.

Tuesday, May 12, 11:30am

Lecture 2 Theory & Practice: Modern, Post-Modern, Contemporary — architects who write and build
 Historical Perspectives on the case study issues

Thursday, May 14, 9.30am

Presentation 20 minute presentations of the theory behind the 'issues'.
 Thursday 11:30 am - 1:00 pm 1) context, 2) order, 3) transparency (Brightspace > select issues group).
 Friday 11:30 am - 1:00 pm 4) craft, 5) material (Brightspace > select issues group).

Tuesday, May 19, 11am

Lecture 3: Austerity: Work (Morris), Health (Duiker), Science (Meyer) ...
 submit one-page design statement proposal in conjunction with design strategies submission in design

Thursday, May 21 and Friday, May 22, 11.30am

Seminar A.2 Readings
 student led Thursday 11:30 am - 1:00 pm 1) context, 2) order, 3) transparency (Teams > select issues group)
 TA convenor Friday 11:30 am - 1:00 pm 1) craft, 2) material (Teams > select issues group)
 Tutorial 1 available on-line. Developing a research dossier — Susanne Marshall. Q&A by email.

Tuesday, May 26, 11am

Lecture 4 Austerity: Work (Morris), Health (Duiker), Science (Meyer) ... (cont'd)
 Today: Sustainability and the Aesthetic of Reuse

Wednesday May 27 3:30pm

Tutorial 2 Preliminary review research dossier — Susanne Marshall (attendance recorded)

Thursday, May 28 and Friday, May 29, 11.30am

Seminar B Readings

Tuesday, June 2, 11am

Lecture 5 Abstract and Real: Beaux Arts, Vkhutemas, Bauhaus, and later schools

Thursday, June 4, 10:30am

Hand-in **Research Dossier for Term Paper**

Tuesday, June 9, 11am

Lecture 6 Social: U.S. Privatization (Wright), Soviet Collectivization (Ginzberg), and Role of the User (Kroll)
 Today: Participatory Design and the Role of Things

Thursday, June 11 and Friday, June 12, 11.30am

Seminar C Readings
 Tutorial 3 available on-line. Developing an outline — Susanne Marshall. Q&A by email.

Monday, June 15, 10.30am

Hand-in **Term Paper Outline**

Tuesday, June 16, 11am

Lecture 7 Production: New materials (glass), Crystal Palace, Chrystal Chain, prefabrication, systems
 Today: the rise of consumption and the dream of mass customization

Thursday, June 18 and Friday, June 19, 11.30am

Seminar D Readings
 Tutorial 4 design statements — Ted Cavanagh at 11:30 Th & Fr, length based on attendance

Tuesday, June 23, 11am

Lecture 8 Vernacular and Pop: Interiors (MacIntoshes and Loos), Exteriors (Venturi and Scott Brown),
 The Crisis of Building Type 1917 and today

Thursday, June 25 and Friday, June 26, 11.30am

Seminar E Readings
 Tutorial 5 Preliminary review outline to paper — Susanne Marshall (attendance recorded)

Tuesday, June 30, 11am

Lecture 9 Working with History, historiography, history and theory, history and design
 Today: Change and large systems: technological, social, political and ecological

Thursday, July 2 and Friday, July 3, 11.30am

Seminar F Readings

Monday, July 6, 10.30am

Hand-in Final Term Paper

Tuesday, July 7

no class — SRI date

Thursday, July 9 and Friday, July 10, 11.30am

Tutorial 6 Design Statement (bring your statement) — Ted Cavanagh at 11:30 Th & Fr, length based on attendance

Assignment 1

This work is done in groups — everyone who is assigned to your ‘issue.’ There are three readings, please divide them evenly in your group. Read the reading before the seminar. First, discuss and summarize the reading with the others in your group who read it, second, present to the rest of the group, and third, discuss and summarize the similarities and differences. Plan a presentation to the class of 15-20 minutes about the theory behind the ‘issues.’ Is there a history to the theory about this issue? How do modern, post-modern and contemporary architects work with the issue?

Assigned readings:

context:

1. Esin Komez Daglioglu, The Context Debate: an archaeology, *Architecture Theory Review* 20, 2 (2015) 266-79. <https://www.tandfonline-com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/toc/ratr20/20/2?nav=toClist> enter through Dalhousie Libraries > ejournals > journal title > year and issue no.
2. Aldo Rossi, *The Architecture of the City*, MIT Press (1982) 48 - 70, 86 - 101.
3. Robert Venturi, Denise Scott Brown, Steven Izenour, *Learning from Las Vegas*, MIT Press (2001, 1972): 3 - 72

order / proportion:

1. Anthony Vidler, “Palladio Reassessed by Eisenman.” *The Architectural Review* (2012) <http://www.architectural-review.com/essays/palladio-reassessed-by-eisenman/8637478.article> or http://www.grahamfoundation.org/system/grants/press/303/original/YaleSchoolofArch_MediaCov_ArchitecturalReview_20121023.pdf and <http://mimohaus.com/formal-analysis-rudolph-hall/>
2. Rudolf Wittkower, “The Changing Concept of Proportion,” *Daedalus* 89, 1(1960): 199-215. https://www-istor-org.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/stable/20026560?seq=1#metadata_info_tab_contents enter through Dalhousie Libraries > ejournals > journal title > year and issue no.
3. Colin Rowe, *The Mathematics of the Ideal Villa and Other Essays*, MIT Press 1976 [1947]: 1 - 28. https://monoskop.org/images/9/96/Rowe_Colin_1947_1976_The_Mathematics_of_the_Ideal_Villa.pdf

transparency / view:

1. Beatriz Colomina. “Intimacy and the Spectacle: the interior of Loos,” in *Strategies of Architectural Thinking* Cambridge: MIT Press, 1991. (pp. 68-88) pdf available
2. Colin Rowe, Robert Slutzky, “Transparency: Literal and Phenomenal,” in *Perspecta: The Yale Architectural Journal* 8 (1964), pp. xx-xx https://monoskop.org/images/4/42/Rowe_Colin_Slutsky_Robert_Transparency.pdf
3. Anthony Vidler, “Transparency,” in *Architecture of the Uncanny*, MIT Press (1992), 216 - 225, 246-7. <https://pdfs.semanticscholar.org/9891/24e1e6572f2ed4f35b87ed32c5cd8ac1a544.pdf>

craft / production:

1. Lucien Kroll, (1987). *An Architecture of Complexity*. MIT Press. p. 32-76
2. Giuseppe Zambonini, “Notes for a Theory of Making in a Time of Necessity” *Perspecta: The Yale Architectural Journal* 24 (1988), pp. 2-23. e journal
3. Mary McAuliffe, “Small Craft Warnings: Thickening horizons, hollowing walls” *Modulus* 22 (1993): 94 - 111

material qualities / haptic:

1. Walter Benjamin (1968, trans.1939, 1935). Hannah Arendt, ed. “The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction”, *Illuminations*. London: Fontana. pp. 214–18. [online] <https://www.marxists.org/reference/subject/philosophy/works/ge/benjamin.htm>
2. Juhani Pallasmaa, (2005) *The Eyes of the Skin: Architecture and the Senses*, Chichester UK: Wiley. pp39 - 73. https://arts.berkeley.edu/wp-content/uploads/2016/01/Pallasmaa_The-Eyes-of-the-Skin.pdf
3. Timothy Culvahouse, “Figuration and Continuity in the Work of H.H. Richardson.” *Perspecta: The Yale Architectural Journal* 24 (1988): 24-39. e journal

Assignment 2

Seminar

In the weekly reading seminar, you will meet with your TA — Milena, Luke and Matt — in a group of about 13 students (Teams > issue groups). Please set up a discussion group by splitting this group in half (Teams > buildings 1-6 and buildings 7-13).

Check schedule to see if you meet with your TA on Thursday or Friday at 11:30. Also on the schedule are tutorials (times and URL to be announced) focused on research, writing, and interpretative skills for your individual papers. Participation in the reading seminars is mandatory. Absence will result in a grade of zero for that seminar. Attendance will be taken in the tutorials and it will influence grading of your research dossier and paper outline.

Seminar Questions

Participation in weekly seminars means doing the readings and/or watching video materials, arriving on time and participating in the discussion, and giving the seminar leader a copy of your reading notes at the beginning of the seminar. To prepare for the seminar, all students should explore the following questions through the assigned readings, and bring a written summary of their findings to share with fellow students in the seminar. It is highly recommended that you meet in your half-groups a day prior to your reading seminar to help you prepare.

1. Who are the authors of the readings/video materials? When do they write?
2. What is the main argument made by the author(s)? (provide a short bullet summary of the key arguments)
3. What evidence, if any, do the authors use to support their argument? (provide examples)
4. What methods do the authors use (case-study, discourse analysis, archival research, ethnographic study, etc.)? Do you think it is effective for the kind of argument they are trying to make?
5. Compare authors' writings. Do they have different/similar approaches and ideas? Explain and bring examples.
6. What are the objectives of each author? From which or whose perspective does the author write? Whose interests does the text serve? (Please provide an answer for each reading/video.)
7. What are your thoughts/critique of the text? Explain your position.

Leader(s)

Over the course of the term, each person in the seminar group will co-lead a seminar. The seminar leaders facilitate the discussion using the seminar questions and with the assistance of the TA. The leaders take notes on the discussion and collect the notes from each participant at the start of the seminar. The seminar leaders are also responsible for writing a seminar report (3-page synopsis) and for submitting it by the Monday following the seminar. The report should include the leader's answers and notes to the seminar questions. It should also include a selection of interpretive comments that derive from the discussion with the seminar group. Quotations must be properly attributed using the Author-Date-style, go to <http://tinyurl.com/chicago-full>, log in, then go to Chapter 15. At the end of the report, the leader should include the notes from the other participants in the seminar.

Assignment 3 — Term paper submit to Brightspace > Assignment

Paper of 2500 - 3000 words. Identify two architects, a generation apart, who build and write, either from the contemporary or post-modern or modern periods. You may also pick architects whose built work has been critically assessed and are not writers themselves. At least one of the architects must be outside of North America and Western Europe, or be of an under-represented group. Investigate the consequences of the work and compare it to their intentions. Isolate an issue they are passionate about. Consider this issue in an architectural way, but also bring to bear some research from another field. Compare and contrast the two positions. Consider the generational difference and whether the times have changed to make the positions more or less tenable. The paper must include some original analytical work in both words and images. Images must be manipulated in some way that enhances the paper content (possible manipulations — contrast, overdraw, juxtaposition, ...). Captions are important and must do more than describe the image. This is an opportunity to hone in on a particular aspect of architecture that interests you and that you have considered and will consider in your design work, and perhaps your thesis.

Research Dossier for Term Paper due Thursday, June 4, 10:30am

Term Paper Outline due Monday, June 15, 10:30am

Final Term Paper due Monday, July 6, 10:30am

Evaluation:

The instructor expects students to come to class having completed the assigned readings for that day's seminar. All assignments, even those done in groups, will be assessed individually. Grades and evaluators will be assessed as follows:

1) Case Study Presentations of Theory and Concepts behind the Issues (Instructor 15%)

- Clear presentation and organization
- Presence of in-depth analysis, promising arguments and ideas
- The points sustaining the analysis are supported by appropriate documents and references
- Identification and elaboration of points of agreement and disagreement among the readings
- thoughtful speculation on the implications of different conceptual positions

STUDENTS APPLYING FOR TRANSFER CREDITS WILL STILL BE REQUIRED TO COMPLETE THIS COMPONENT.

2) Seminar Report (TAs, 35% — see chart page 6 for rubric)

- Readings/Video Materials are clearly presented
- Questions are well engaged (there is in-depth analysis and critique)
- Seminar discussion is used in an effective way
- The organization of the Report is clear
- Quotations use the author-date style in an appropriate way

3) Research Dossier (TAs, 10%)

- Appropriate written sources and images
- Clear presentation and organization
- Presence of in-depth analysis, promising arguments and ideas
- Appropriate writing style and proper citation of the images used

4) Paper Outline (Instructor, 15%)

- Clear thesis supported by appropriate material and good conclusions
- Presence of promising arguments and ideas
- Appropriate sources, writing style, and images citation

5) Research Paper (Instructor, 25%)

- The thesis is clear, clearly organized and demonstrated
- The points sustaining the thesis are supported by appropriate documents and references
- Images are effectively used to sustain the argument and properly cited
- Conclusions are clear and interesting
- The paper presents in-depth analysis and critique

After outline and final paper submissions, students will receive rubric-based written evaluations of their work. Plagiarism software is being used. For reading seminars all late submissions will receive a grade of zero. All other late submissions will be penalized by reducing the final mark in the course at the rate of 2% per week day until the component is zero. No work will be accepted after July 5th, 2018, without an authorized excuse.

Grade	Grade Point Value	Percent Equivalent	Definition	Notes
A+	4.3	90-100	Outstanding	Exceptional to considerable [excellent, very good] evidence of original thinking; demonstrated outstanding capacity to analyze and synthesize; outstanding grasp of subject matter; evidence of extensive knowledge base
A	4.0	85-89	Excellent	
A-	3.7	80-84	Very Good	
B+	3.3	77-79	Good	Evidence of grasp of subject matter, some evidence of critical capacity and analytical ability; reasonable understanding of relevant issues; evidence of familiarity with the literature.
B	3.0	73-76		
B-	2.7	70-72		
C+	2.3	65-69	Satisfactory	Evidence of some understanding of the subject matter; ability to develop solutions to simple problems; benefitting from his/her university experience
C	2.0	60-64		
C-	1.7	55-59		
D	1.0	50-54	Marginal Pass	Evidence of minimally acceptable familiarity with subject matter, critical and analytical skills
F	0.0	0-49	Inadequate	Insufficient evidence of understanding of the subject matter; weakness in critical and analytical skills; limited or irrelevant use of the literature assignments.
INC	0.0	Incomplete		
W	Neutral and no credit obtained		Withdrawn after deadline	
ILL	Neutral and no credit obtained		Compassionate reasons, illness	[Documentation must be submitted to the School of Architecture office within one week of due date]

Case Study Presentations (15%)	Clear presentation and organization	Presence of in-depth analysis, promising arguments and ideas	The points sustaining the analysis are supported by appropriate documents and references	Identification and elaboration of points of agreement and disagreement among the readings	thoughtful speculation on the implications of different conceptual positions
	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%

Seminar Report (20%)	Reading/Visual materials are clearly presented	Questions are well engaged with strong analysis, and critique	Seminar discussion is used effectively	The organization of the report is clear	Compilation and submission of others' notes
	20%	30%	20%	20%	10%

Seminar Notes/Attendance (15%)	Preparation for the seminar; understanding of the readings	thoughtful responses to seminar questions	constructive participation	clear oral expression	Attendance	You will receive a grade each seminar; only the top 5 seminars attended will be counted in the final grade. However, attendance is mandatory and unless a Declaration of Absence is submitted, a 0% for missed seminars will be counted in the final grade.
	20%	30%	20%	20%	10%	

Research Dossier (10%)	Appropriate written sources and images	Clear presentation and organization	Presence of in-depth analysis, promising arguments and ideas	Appropriate writing style and proper citation of the images used
	20%	20%	40%	20%

Paper Outline (15%)	Clear thesis supported by appropriate material and good conclusions	Presence of promising arguments and ideas	Appropriate sources, writing style, and images citation
	40%	40%	20%

Research Paper (25%)	The thesis is clear, clearly organized and demonstrated	The points sustaining the thesis are supported by appropriate documents and references	Images are effectively used to sustain the argument and properly cited	Conclusions are clear and interesting	The paper presents in-depth analysis and critique
	20%	20%	20%	20%	20%

The BEDS/MArch program enables students to achieve the accreditation standards set by the Canadian Architectural Certification Board. They are described at <https://tinyurl.com/cacb-spc-2017> (pages 14–17). This Dalhousie ARCH course addresses the CACB criteria and standards that are noted on the "Accreditation" page of the School of Architecture website: <https://tinyurl.com/dal-arch-spc>.

Seminar Readings

Seminar A.1 and A.2

Report and discuss readings in Case Study Assignment.

Readings — Seminar B

1. Levine, Neil. "The Book and the Building: Hugo's Theory of Architecture and Labrouste's Bibliotheque Ste-Genevieve," in *The Beaux-Arts and Nineteenth Century French Architecture*, Robin Middleton, ed. Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 1982. (pp. 138-73). on Brightspace.
2. Brett, David. "Decoration in Structure: The Role of Drawing," in C.R. Macintosh: *The Poetics of Workmanship*. Cambridge MA: Harvard University Press, 1992. 46-74. On Brightspace.
3. Bressani, Martin and Marc Grignon. "Henri Labrouste and the Lure of the Real: Romanticism, Rationalism and the Bibliotheque Sainte-Genevieve," *Art History* 28 (2005): 712-51. <https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/doi/epdf/10.1111/j.1467-8365.2005.00486.x> enter through Dalhousie Libraries > ejournals > journal title > year and issue no.
4. Emmons, Paul & Matthew Mindrup, *Material Models and Immaterial Paradigms in the Rietveld Schröder House* *Journal of Architectural Education* Volume 62, Issue 2, 2008: pages 44-52. <https://onlinelibrary-wiley-com.ezproxy.library.dal.ca/doi/epdf/10.1111/j.1531-314X.2008.00239.x>

Readings — Seminar C Dalhousie Libraries > ejournals > journal title > year and issue no.

1. Buchli, Victor. "Moisei Ginzburg's Narkomfin Communal House in Moscow: Contesting the Social and Material World," *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, Vol. 57, No. 2 (Jun., 1998), pp. 160-181.
2. Twombly, Robert. "Saving the Family: Middle Class Attraction to Wrights Prairie House 1901-1909," *American Quarterly* 27/1 (1975): 57-72.
3. Christopher Long, *The House as Path and Place: Spatial Planning in Josef Frank's Villa Beer, 1928-1930*, *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 59,4 (2000), pp. 478-501 .
4. Caroline Constant, E. 1027: *The Nonheroic Modernism of Eileen Gray* *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 53,3 (1994), pp. 265-279.

Readings — Seminar D

1. Farias, Ignatio and Thomas Bender, eds. *Urban Assemblages. How Actor Network Theory Transforms Urban Studies*. London: Routledge (2012): pp. 20 –40. [Google books]
2. Schrijver, Lara, *Utopia and/or spectacle? Rethinking urban interventions through the legacy of modernism and the situationist city* *Architectural Theory Review* 16/3 (2011): 245 - 58.
3. Halskov, Kim, Nicolai Brodersen Hansen *The diversity of participatory design research practice at PDC 2002–2012* *International Journal of Human-Computer Studies* 74(2015) 81 – 92
4. Waldheim, Charles, ed. *Introduction and Chapter One, The Landscape Urbanism Reader* Princeton Architectural Press (2004): 13 - 34. [Google books]

Readings — Seminar E

1. Britton, Karla. "The Poetic Economy of the Frame: The Critical Stance of Auguste Perret." *Journal of Architectural Education* 54/3 (2001): 176 – 184.
2. Kahn, Andrea. "The Invisible Mask," in Andrea Kahn, ed., *Drawing/Building/Text*. New York: Princeton University Press. 1991. 85-106.
3. Brett, David. "Drawing and the Ideology of Industrialization," in Dennis Doordan, ed., *Design History: An Anthology*, Cambridge MA: MIT Press, 1995. 3-16.
4. Cavanagh, Ted. "Dream or Dilemma: the unconscious construction of the modern house," *Journal of Architectural Education* 70/2 (2016): 300 - 310.

Readings — Seminar F

As a group, read, report and discuss:

Findlay, Lisa *Building Change: architecture, politics and cultural agency*. London: Routledge, 2005. [Dalhousie Library on line] everyone should read chapter 1 and chapter 6; split the remaining chapters among you.