Collective imagination has traditionally associated architecture with political and economic power. As a result, when quoting Edward Said: «Modern Western culture is, in large part, the work of exiles, émigrés, refugees», the last people we typically consider are exiled architects. But is the heritage left by exiled architects truly insignificant? Can we find expressions of their spiritual quest, new life experiences, nostalgic feelings, and aesthetic shocks in their works? When does Modernism cease to be a universal language and instead becomes an existential language of the exile – and can they both coexist? The international conference *Architects in Exile. Stories of New Spatial Experiences* aims to address these questions.
It was Henry Corbin’s gift to enable us to experience in this room thoughts that come from another language and culture, as if they were of our own hearts. He spoke from within his speech; he was his words. This rhetorical imaginative power is himma of which Corbin writes in his study of Ibn ‘Arabī. This power of the heart is what is specifically designated by the word himma, a word whose content is perhaps best suggested by the Greek word enthymesis, which signifies the act of meditating, conceiving, imagining, projecting, ardently desiring – in other words, of having (something) present in the thymos, which is vital force, soul, heart, intention, thought, desire.

James Hillman, The Captive Heart
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Boris Chukhovich, Andrea Gritti

Exile Studies is a relatively new field in the humanities, seeking to analyze the global phenomenon of migration that emerged in the 20th and 21st centuries. Although this field is essentially related to anthropology and sociology, a number of scholars also focus on the specific artistic experiences of the exiled, produced outside the cultural and social context, in which they grew up and spent a significant part of their lives.

Not surprisingly, there are far fewer studies of exiled architects than of other artists: writers, poets, musicians. Architecture is the least literary and narrative art, even in comparison with music. Moreover, architecture has always been closely connected with power, and this factor often prevents architects-in-exile both from getting work, and from introducing specific exiled motifs and subjects into their work. This is precisely why the activities of architects in foreign cultural contexts have long been viewed through the prism of transculturalism, and more recently, through the concept of cultural transfers. There have, however, been exceptions.

The exodus of Bauhaus leaders from the Old World after the Nazis came to power seems to be an iconic story of architectural exile. However, many aspects of their activities in the USA show differences between their exile in America and that experienced by Thomas Mann or Bertolt Brecht. The latter were motivated by the idea of opposing Hitlerism with a kind of other Germany, and returned home after the end of the war. In contrast, Mies van der Rohe, Walter Gropius and others were the bearers of a universal project, ready to implement it anywhere in the world. Thus, while they were refugees in the political sense, they were not exiles as far as their work on a new architectural language was concerned. The same effort of universalizing modernization characterized practices of Western modernist architects in the colonial world. Contemporary scholars sometimes try to present the fate of Michel Écochard or Fernand Pouillon in the Maghreb as exile, which seems true as a fact of biography. But architects in exile do not always create exile architecture.

Limbo, slits and circles of Hell, gates and ledges of Purgatory, spheres of Paradise – this mental construct, comparable in popularity and number of subjects with the Gospels and ancient myths, emerged in the fantasy of a 14th century exile, forced to leave his hometown. His emblematic experience demonstrated that the exile is associated with a particular mobilization of imagination, revealing one’s ability to reincarnate, to see another world beyond reality. The abandoned country does not dissolve in the memory. It breaks away from the territory, transported across borders, beyond linear time, and is filled with tales and symbolic images. The migrant’s dreams and his work are a field of hybrid otherness. The artist-exile’s Paris resembles Vitetks, Buenos Aires resembles the Old World. Joseph Brodsky compared the vantage point of exile to being on a pass from which one can view two slopes simultaneously; Edward Said reminded us that the exile is familiar with at least two cultures.

According to him, the view of «the whole world as if it were a foreign land» was a guarantee of originality, which, in fact, made the work of exiles, migrants, and refugees become the modern culture.

Is it possible to find, in the works of architects in exile, expressions of their spiritual quest, new life experiences, nostalgic feelings and aesthetic shocks? If so, is it possible to outline within the creative evolution of the architects in exile, certain typical stages that writers, artists, or filmmakers go through, such as pre-exile, exile as such, post-exile, and nomadism? When does modernism cease to be a universal language of domination, and become an existential language of the exile – and can both coexist?

In posing these questions, we want to continue the reflection, begun four years ago by researchers who devoted a collection of articles to the exile of architects. Their innovative research focused on the social fate of architects in exile, and on the possibilities for cultural transfers, and the circulation of ideas that this opened up. Our questioning is more concerned with those cases, where the aesthetics of exile directly affected architectural forms.

1 These categories were studied in the collective work of the research group Poexil, which worked in the University of Montreal during 10 years, from 2002 until 2012 under direction of Alexis Nouss.

The Architecture of Exile: A Journey through Spatial Narratives

Sofia Celli, Federica Deo

The international conference *Architects in Exile: Stories of New Spatial Experiences* (Milan, May 29-30, 2023) aims to explore a research field that has gained attention in recent years within cultural studies but remains unexplored from an architectural perspective: the exiles and migrations that have characterized the 20th century.

The valuable studies conducted so far on this topic have mainly focused on the biographical aspects of the individuals involved in these processes and their production, interpreted in a rather narrative sense. Architecture offers new keys for understanding and interpreting the complex phenomenon of ‘exile’, taking into account its heterogeneous nature.

Through the engagement of scholars whose research has focused on the examined themes from different disciplinary perspectives, the international conference *Architects in Exile. Stories of New Spatial Experiences* seeks to open new perspectives on the relationship between Exile and Architecture.

The conference gathered the contributions of 48 scholars who proposed declinations and interpretations of the phenomena of exiles and exoduses, both collective and individual, imposed and voluntary, defining a new historical atlas for this complex phenomenon. Such topics will be discussed in 10 thematic panels. The opening day of the conference, inaugurated by a lecture by Caroline Maniaque, includes the following sessions: *Architecture in Exile: Models and Typologies; Architecture in Exile: Before and in the Era of Nations; Architecture in Exile: the in-Between; Pre-Exile, Exile, Post-Exile, Nomadism.* The second day, opened by Alexis Nouss’ talk, discusses the following topics: *Exilic Trajectories of the BBPR; Exilic Ramifications of the Bauhaus; Exile and Architectural Hybridations; Exile and Cultural Transfers; Exile and Homeland; Exile and Utopia.*

The victory of fascism in the Spanish Civil War (1936-39) meant a brutal disruption of multiple progressive developments that had been gathering momentum in the years previous to the conflict. Very remarkable among these developments was GATCPAC (Grup d’Arquitectes i Tècnics Catalans per a l’Arquitectura Contemporània), one of the most forward-looking European associations of architects that fostered a thorough transformation of society through urban, architectural and object design.

Three founding members of GATCPAC kept their friendship after the disaster of losing the war and epitomize three modes of exile that, in Catalonia in particular but can probably be generalized elsewhere, anytime, constitute three modes of surviving through barbaric times. Three modes to face catastrophe that are still pungently topical nowadays, and that may serve as a point of reference in our troubled times.

Josep Lluís Sert (Barcelona, 1902-1983) moved to United States and developed a well-known career there, augmenting the influence and the contacts he had initiated since working for Le Corbusier in 1929. Sixte Illescas (Barcelona 1903-1986) chose to remain in Barcelona and was prosecuted by francoist authorities and forbidden to work as architect, although he managed to produce some significant designs in this adverse situation. Germà Rodríguez-Arias (Barcelona, 1902-1987) after moving to Mexico and Chile chose the interior exile of Eivissa, a backwards island in the 1950s, where he could develop a contextual, austere architecture very much in line with the modern ideals preconized by GATCPAC.

It was in Eivissa, a territory they had mapped in their early attempts to match Mediterranean tradition and modernity, where they met again for the first time after the war. Cultivating their friendship, they ended up developing a small resort for their families and relatives, a sort of space where the hardships of dictatorship and its generalized social repression could at least be forgotten, if not avoided. A sort of renewed Paradise Found where three different modes of exile that are still meaningful to us, and which represented three different directions in life, converged and could keep the high aspiration for Civilization to return. They had hope for all of us.

Dedicated to Oleg Pachenkov and Lilia Voronkova, exiled from Russia.
Deemed enemy aliens and facing institutional and professional hostility, central European émigré architects nevertheless reshaped the built form of post-World War II Australia. This paper investigates the ways in which these architects’ experiences of exile imbued their architectural production with significance and purpose, and how this production illustrated and animated their new life experiences. Grounded in the work of Esra Akcan and Edward Said, this paper seeks to gain a deeper understanding of exile, meaning and aesthetics via an overview of the built work of the entire cohort of architects who fled Hitler’s Europe and migrated to the state of Victoria, Australia in the period 1935-1940. Specifically, it utilises the records of the Architects Registration Board of Victoria and the Commonwealth of Australia’s migration admission files to construct a database that details the careers and built work of all 48 Central European architects who migrated in this period. Each architect in this survey was a genuine exile seeking refuge: the study does not include the many economic migrants who arrived at this time seeking greater employment opportunities. This paper proposes four categories for understanding the ways in which experiences of exile are expressed architecturally: replica, regeneration, translation and counterpoint. The study documents architects intent on recreating the built form of their homeland, and those setting out to build community anew. It investigates architects focused on translating their past architectural experiences into their new environment, and those whose architectural imagination was forever caught between two worlds: Europe and the distant, and arguably unknown destination of the Antipodes. Each of these modes of architectural production sheds new light on the agency of émigré architects, the variety of their architectural responses to exile, and illustrates the early stages of the construction of 20th century multicultural Australia.
Of the same generation, Boris Iofan and Andrej Beloborodoff arrived in Rome from Saint Petersburg beyond the Russian Revolution: the first one before and the other after. Both after their studies (Iofan at the Art Institute of Odessa and Beloborodoff at the Imperial Academy of Fine Arts) had a professional practice in the Russian Empire capital in the key of new-born neoclassicism.

Iofan came in Italy in the autumn of 1914, most probably to avoid the enrolment in the army with the beginning of the WWI against the German aggression. Strengthening his education at the Academy of Rome, he had successful career and built in different Italian cities as an architect of roman school, applying new construction technologies to neo-classical and neo-baroque trends. As he was actively involved in the socialist circles and became one of the founders of Italian Communist Party, his condition was deeply compromised after the fascist March on Rome of 1922. He emigrated in 1924 in, at this point, Soviet Moscow to become the winner of the Palace of Soviet competition with roman school eclectic project, which launched the turn from revolutionary modernism to the heritage assimilation course.

Instead, Beloborodoff’s rapid and lucky career, launched during his studies at the Academy in Saint Petersburg, finished in 1917, when all his powerful commissioners became people’s enemies and left Russia. His exile started in 1919, in 1930s he established in Rome. He has never adopted Modern Movement language, probably for rejection of bolshevism or for hometown nostalgia, and remained one of most convinced classicists of his time. He designed some villas and apartments in France, but in Italy worked mostly as a graphic. Despite some attempts to catch the sympathy of the fascist regime, the important commissions started to arrive to him only in the post-WWII period and mostly remained unrealized because of architect’s death.

The paper, based on Iofan’s and Beloborodoff’s archives in Italy, investigates two mirror careers of architects, comparing the émigrés professionals’ conditions and issues in Italy before and after Russian Revolution and different faces of exile.
The great diaspora of artists after the sack of Rome in 1527 might be seen as an impulse to spread the Renaissance throughout Italy and Europe. Actually, the trip of many artists and architects toward other places began before 1527 and lasted long after the sack, and somehow Galeazzo Alessi, like Giulio Romano or Sansovino before him, was forced to find opportunities for his profession outside Rome.

Galeazzo Alessi self-exile to Genoa allowed him to develop an architecture that on the one hand was inclined to indulge the taste for the abundant and grotesque decorations favoured by the nobility of the time, and on the other hand, to start to conceive architecture essentially as a tool capable of generating a new economic value. The social and political situation of Genoese patronage helped him to focus on that task. For example, the new urbanization of Strada Nuova was conceived as a building speculation able to generate whose capital gain that was used to finish the construction of the city’s main public work, the Cathedral of San Lorenzo. Even the Sauli family’s private chapel, the huge Basilica of Carignano, is not only a scaled-down copy of Bramante’s design for St. Peter in Rome, but also a tool to expand the city on the hill of Carignano and urbanize an agricultural land owned by the Sauli family themselves. In Genoa Alessi experimented with and refined this idea of architecture as a useful tool for economic purposes, then succeeded in exporting this model to Milan, Bologna, and Varallo, and finally to his hometown of Perugia.

Alessi was able to formulate an extremely modern architecture, attentive to volumes and urban relationships, but standardized in detail and delegated in execution. His projects often enacted interesting economic-financial strategies and succeeded in combining the needs of promotion and cultural affirmation of the rising Genoese bourgeois class with the use of architecture as an instrument for enhancing the family wealth and the development of the city.
In July 1944 when the German front line was breached and the Soviet army returned to Lithuania, almost 60,000 Lithuanian citizens left with the retreating German army to escape from the threat of Soviet terror. Together with intellectuals and professionals, many prominent architects, teachers and students also left. Following the Germans surrender, the United Nations Relief and Rehabilitation Administration (UNRRA) was appointed to take care of the influx of mass refugees and accommodated them in displaced persons (DP) camps in Germany. Due to the fact that the architects were not able to engage in their professional work, they developed an incredibly intense cultural life in the DP camps. They established an Association of the Lithuanian Expatriate Engineers with 345 members in 1946, and started the Association's professional magazine *The Engineer's Way*. Optimistic that with the help of the United States the Baltic countries would soon regain their independence, they became actively involved in organizing the *Reconstruction of Lithuania* conference and conceptualised the future Lithuanian architecture. An architectural competition in search of the ideal future Lithuanian family house in 1947 attracted forty-five entries submitted by thirty applicants. These activities lasted until 1949 when DP camps were closed. This research on architectural activities of the exile architects will be presented in the conference discussing the questions of collective architectural thought, memory and ideas about future under the extreme circumstances.
From Yerevan to Norilsk: Architects and Architectures in Exile

Taline Ter Minassian
Institut National des Langues et Civilisations Orientales, Paris

Between biography and history of Soviet architecture, I wish to present my work dedicated to the history of architects Kévork Kotchar and Mikael Mazmanian, Soviet Armenian architects deported to Noril’lag in 1937. This work took the form of a small book published by Editions B2 (2018) entitled, Norilsk: Architecture au Goulag, Histoire Caucasiennne de la Ville Polaire Soviétique (Norilsk: Architecture in the Gulag, Caucasian History of the Soviet Polar City). Who were the hundreds of thousands of zeks who built Norilsk, the coldest and northernmost city in the world, but also among the most polluted mining sites in Russia? How did the Norilsk Nickel Company (founded in 1935) rule over this urban construction in an extreme environment, and what contribution did the zeks-architects assigned to live in the Russian Arctic make? I propose to shed light on the astonishing and little-known careers of Kévork Kotchar and Mikael Mazmanian, both of whom came from the Soviet constructivist movement and were victims of Stalinist repression. As architects in exile, they were assigned a mission: within the Noril’lag concentration camp, they had to meet the challenges posed by the construction of a city cut off from the world, to which no road still leads today. To build a real city of sumptuous appearance in the Stalinist neoclassical style on a perpetually frozen ground is the challenge taken up by the team of architects at Noril’lag. The architecture of the city of Norilsk bears the clues and signs of exile: there is a strange resemblance between Norilsk and Yerevan. Beyond a common matrix of Russian urbanism (the Petersburg model), the experience of Armenian architects deported to Noril’lag is an extreme spatial experience, tracing a diagonal from the solar city, Yerevan, to the polar city, Norilsk. Today, the work of the two architects in Norilsk (at least what remains of it), echoing the ne-o-Armenian style of Yerevan, undoubtedly bears the marks of nostalgia and exile.
Hossein Amanat is an Iranian-Canadian architect considered one of the most influential architects in exile. Born in Tehran, Amanat’s most famous work is the Azadi Tower in Tehran (Iran), which was completed in 1971 and has become a symbol of Iranian national identity. The tower is considered a landmark of Iranian architecture and has been widely celebrated for combining modern and traditional architectural elements. However, Amanat was forced to leave the country after the Iranian Revolution and continued his practice in Canada.

In addition to his work in Iran, Hossein Amanat has also been involved in several projects outside of the country, such as the Canadian Museum of Immigration at Pier 21 in Halifax (Canada), the Aga Khan Museum in Toronto (Canada), the Persian Heritage Museum in Beverly Hills (California), and the proposed Iran Heritage Foundation in London (England). These projects demonstrate Amanat’s continued influence and impact as an Iranian architect in exile. Amanat’s work reflects the complexities of negotiating cultural identities and maintaining a connection to one’s heritage while adapting to new cultural surroundings. In this way, Hossein Amanat’s work and legacy are potent examples of the experiences and narratives of Iranian architects in exile. His designs reflect the resilience and determination of architects in exile and their essential role in shaping the discourse on architecture and cultural identity.

Ernest Hébrard, GranPrix de Rome 1908, emigrated from Paris to the colonies of South East Asia as a result of a severe depression due to the failure of the World Communications Centre project. The latter was commissioned by Paul Otlet and later reworked in a simplified version by Le Corbusier. Hébrard’s first commission in Vietnam was the development of the tourist city of Da Lat and later developed the plan for the future capital of Indochina located in the ancient city of Than Long, commonly known as Hanoi. The plan was developed in a late 19th century style but the functions allocated within the urban fabric already belonged to the culture of the modern, in fact they largely coincided with the experience gained in the experiment of the Centre International. Hebrard designed public buildings and museums and he founded the Hanoi School of Architecture, the first in the country, and directed it until his return home in 1929 due to the economic crisis that aborted the development of his plan for the Greater Hanoi.

After 1975 the country was unified and Vietnam became fully affiliated to the Soviet Union. Many Russian specialists were sent for reconstruction, including internationally renowned socialist architects and town planners. I.S. Sokolov, director of the Leningrad School of Urban Planning, and G. G. Isakovich, architect and co-author of the prestigious Lenin Memorial in Ulyanovsk, settled in the city of Hanoi for almost a decade (1976-1985). Both of these figures shaped the image of the capital: Sokolov developed the new urban development plan, in partial continuity with Hebrard’s choices and introduced, for the new growing proletariat, the socialist typology of the Microrayons. Instead, Isakovich was in charge of the city’s architecture, replacing the symbols of colonial public spaces, and above all, in collaboration with his colleague Nguyen Truc Luyen, he designed the most prestigious public building of the time: the Ho Chi Minh’s mausoleum, located exactly in the diamond-shaped area designed fifty years earlier by the exile Hebrard.

These forgotten stories of architects in intentional or involuntary exile, between struggle and liberation, rewriting and legacy of the past, have substantially influenced the primordial essence of Hanoi city, which today consumes everything in its uncontrolled and hypertrophic development, capable of compromising a valuable historical and cultural heritage that defines the identity of this rapidly expanding metropolis.
The Merriam-Webster dictionary defines the word *exile* as the state or the period of forced or voluntary absence from one’s country. This definition lies on a binary interpretation of the experience of exile, based on either the presence in a *home country* or the act of living abroad. The biography of Oskar Stonorov (1905-1970) depicts a more complex trajectory: born in Germany into a family of Russian origin, educated in Italy, Switzerland and France, Stonorov embarked on a solid career as architect and planner once he crossed the Atlantic Ocean and settled in the United States in 1929.

The partnerships established with George Howe, Victor Gruen, and Louis Kahn, as well as the collaborations with prominent housing agencies and labour union organizations, seem to portrait the profile of a successful practitioner, a well-established *émigré* in the Promised Land. Yet, Stonorov’s path is characterized by both the activities undertaken in his context of immigration and a constant reference to his European background.

This paper intends to look at the case of Stonorov as an example of how the experience of the exiled is, at once, one of integration and alienation. Stonorov put to good use his European pedigree, which included the preparatory work for Le Corbusier’s *OEuvre complète* and an unrealized project in Kharkiv, to secure commissions and a place in the cultural discourse of his adoptive country; but he also remained somewhat suspended between two worlds and not always coinciding ways of conceiving architecture and urbanism. The paper will initially focus on his pre-war activity in the field of housing, considering then his role as intermediary between the United States and Europe during the years of the reconstruction and the Cold War. The goal is to highlight a continuous inhabiting of an undefined terrain, between immersion into a new reality and attachment to the past.

**Problematizing the Exile: Oskar Stonorov and His Entangled Cultural and Professional Trajectories**

Gaia Caramellino, Paolo Scrivano
Department of Architecture and Urban Studies, Politecnico di Milano

Why City Planning is Your Responsibility,
(New York: Revere Copper and Brass Inc., 1942).
The influence of displacements or migrations on the cultural processes and the development of forms in arts and architecture has been largely recognized since ancient times. Nevertheless, in the cultural conjecture of the 1960s and 1970s, modernity would incorporate other meanings, such as extraterritoriality or the strategy of permanent exile proposed by George Steiner. In Latin America, from the 1980s onwards, the post-modern formulations concerning the incredulity towards metanarratives open the historiographical space to the recognition of the heterogeneous process of cultural exchange and the co-existence of other multicultural dimensions within the apparent homogeneity that described the idea of national culture. In the new cultural context, the deconstruction of the established historiographical discourse on modern architecture allowed the recognition of the role played by immigrant professionals in the forging of a modern cultural landscape in the country.

Through the vicissitudes of architect Lucjan Korngold (1897-1963), a Polish immigrant who arrived in Brazil in 1940, our presentation proposes two main and complementary theoretical approaches for a more comprehensive analysis of the production of the interwar European émigrés in their Latin American exile. The first is based on Lyotard’s formulation of language spaces, searching to reveal the dynamics of interactions, meaning the associations and dialogs between foreigners and nationals in the urban space. The second approach, founded on Levinas’s concept of alterity, understood the architect’s language of forms and contents as the result of the problematic dialogue between the stranger and the national, which in Korngold’s particular case could be identified since his Polish production.
Originally from China, Chen Kuen Lee (1915–2003) came to study in Berlin in 1930, where he received his diploma in 1937. Since the Japanese had already invaded his homeland at that time, he stayed in Germany and was able to work with Hans Scharoun. Given that, like his friend Hugo Häring, Scharoun was almost unable to work during the war, they founded, together with Lee, an informal German-Chinese Werkbund and looked into transforming Chinese traditions, such as Feng Shui, for their idea of a new art of building.

Around 1954, Lee, who was then living in Germany as a stateless person, was able to open his own office with the help of Scharoun. His search for a translation of Chinese ideas into a contemporary architectural language continued. The idea of the sloping roof, which in his case became a folded roofscape, the linking of interior space and landscape (which he always planned in collaboration with landscape architects) as well as the translation of questions of content from the philosophical context into a radically new form, determined his architectural search.

His building work remained almost exclusively in private housing, mainly small single-family houses. One reason for this was that Lee was not only a stateless Chinese, but also gay, which was a punishable offence in West Germany up until 1969. This inclination was an open secret and many colleagues disapproved of his sexual orientation. Therefore, it can be assumed that Lee had no choice but to build for tolerant private clients. For if he had been given a public contract, there would always have been the danger that he would have been denounced to the authorities.

For Lee, the examination of the architecture of his native China was of essential importance. However, he quite consistently avoided adopting formal elements, instead attempting to develop his own formal language from the content, which addresses the need for a life in and with nature against the background of Chinese philosophy. In my contribution, I will discuss the context of Lee’s work and the transformations, as well as his position within German post-war architecture.
Khrushchev’s reforms of the late 1950s, which prompted the emergence of Soviet modernism, also induced a devolution of decisive powers in architectural and urban planning to the administrations of Soviet national republics. In many cases, this devolution swiftly led to a certain ethnic homogenisation of the profession within republics, and forced Russian specialists, who arrived during the previous decade with a reconstruction and modernisation agenda (and the Stalinist eclectic dogma), to leave quietly. Meanwhile, other republics became receptors of the rejected Russian specialists. Soviet Belorussia offers a most profound example of such a case. The unprecedented level of destruction during WWII, and the most ambitious programmes of reconstruction, industrialisation and urbanisation ventured by the republican administration in the aftermath of the war, turned any specialist available within the Soviet borders into a welcomed addition to the local architectural profession. The extreme shortage of the architectural workforce opened promising career prospects to architects, unwanted elsewhere, nearly regardless of their prehistories (if not their gender).

In the context of examining the condition of Soviet coloniality, the paper traces the professional immigration to Soviet Belorussia and examines its sustaining impact on architectural profession of the republic. It follows some architects of Russian origins, who arrived in the Belorussian capital during the revolutionary reshuffle, in order to transform themselves from accomplished Stalinist classicists into the leading figures of Belorussian modernism.
Leonardo Mosso voluntarily leaves the Polytechnic of Turin in November 1984. His decision is motivated by the awareness that his research in the structural field can no longer continue in the Turin university. It is a decision that will mark the biography of Mosso, who after leaving Turin will begin a long career outside Italy, still unknown today. With a significant change of field of work: the teaching will be in art academies, the practice will be increasingly artistic.

This paper follows the solicitations of Alexis Nouss. It proposes a study of the period preceding Mosso’s resignation, as the basis for understanding his migration and the dimension of the voluntary distance from the Turin cultural context. Mosso will however always remain linked to that context, as a lover and scholar of architectural and artistic memories of the 20th century, collecting together with Laura Castagno many collections of Turin artists and architects and conserving the atelier of Nicola Mosso. He also looked to Turin as the place in which to seek recognition for one’s work, a due compensation.

The paper proposes two fields of investigation I consider fundamental (my study is in progress). The first one is Mosso’s teaching activity, an experimental activity, a laboratory of spatial forms to create a language for a new architecture, the centre of an extensive research work which placed Mosso on the international scene since the 1960s.

In the reorganization of courses involving Mosso’s careers since the 1960s, the Faculty of Architecture in Turin will be increasingly oriented towards the definition of a transmittable polytechnic culture. Mosso’s last teaching in Composizione Architetturale (1981-82) entitled Metodologia della progettazione strutturale semiotica nel confronto tra progetto materiale e progetto idealistico definitively marks the autonomy of his research from the Turin academic context.

Mosso’s experimental activity would not be understood in its originality and then in its isolation if one does not consider the Turin cultural context, the second line of my research. From the 1961 International exhibition in Italy, the city will be open to the artistic new avant-gardes (local and international), connecting different generations of artists and architects and urban elites. In the ‘70s, due to its ideological centrality into the new problems of industrial society, Turin will experience cultural and political turning points, in which Mosso’s experimentation will no longer receive recognition.
How to escape the Soviet Union so-called proletarian paradise? Many architects faced this harsh dilemma after having been put aside of the architectural community. This for ideological reasons or for not willing to build according to official stylistic preferences. During the Stalin Era, this led some former constructivists in a chosen or undergone interior exile. A few found a survival strategy, by specializing in specific programs. However, even this was sometimes not enough to avoid pernicious attacks.

For instance, in the mid-1930s Viktor Kalmikov had to forget his visionary urbanistic proposals for Central Asia, building then almost only cinema theatres. After the war, Volodimir Zabolotni’s project for rebuilding Kiev was labelled as "ukrainian bourgeois nationalism", and accused of being a hidden enemy – so he carefully withdraw from the competition. Soon, campaign against cosmopolitism forced several Jewish architects to unemployment, like Iosif Karakis also in Kiev, despite having many projects planned. Later, the Brezhnev Era persistent antisemitism provoked several (un)successful attempts from Jewish builders to leave the USSR. Some managed to begin a new career in capitalist countries, like Gary Faif in France and Gary Bercovich in the USA. Strangely enough, Faif entered the French Communist Party and worked mostly on social housing for communist mayors. Bercovich joined first SOM, before opening his own firm. Still concerned by the works of Jewish architects in Tsarist or Soviet Russia, he recently published a four-volume synthesis on the topic. The “paper architects” of the 1980s chose interior exile as a sign of contestation against the heavy prefabricated architecture, before sending projects to international competitions. Some left Russia after the fall of the USSR, like Mikhail Belov or Iskander Galimov, sometimes returning.

How these different kind of exiles troubled the Soviet architectural scene? How architects incurred this situation? To the contrary, how it changed their career? Therefore, these exiles can be seen both as a plague and a chance.
Abdulla Akhmedov, who held the position of chief architect of the capital of Turkmenistan Ashgabat for more than a quarter of century (1961-1987), was one of the most famous Soviet modernists. Not only did he strive for ultimate austerity in his own projects (the most known of which remains the National Library named after Karl Marx), but, by virtue of his institutional position, he influenced works of his colleagues and shaped Ashgabat as a radically modernist city. According to various sources, Akhmedov especially strongly rejected attempts to create new orientalist architecture decorated with elements of the historical heritage of Central Asia. However, in 1987, after a conflict with the future dictator of Turkmenistan Saparmurat Niyazov (Turkmenboshi) who just came to power, Akhmedov was forced to leave Ashgabat forever. The place of his exile was Moscow. The Moscow period of Akhmedov’s creativity always puzzled his admirers. In new cultural and political context, the architect began to cultivate some approaches that he avoided and blocked in the activities of his subordinates in Ashgabat. Modernism gave way to a paradoxical play with historical quotations. Moreover, this transition to post-modern playing with elements of historical styles, characteristic of many former modernists during the collapse of the USSR, was carried out in Akhmedov’s works in paradoxical and grotesque forms. Many consider as inexplicable that the architect, who knew to resist to the Communist party leaders in their orientalist quest for national architecture, easily succumbed to the tastes of the new bourgeoisie that emerged in post-Soviet Russia. I would suggest considering these works in the optics of the category of post-exile, developed in the activities of the Montreal-based research group Poexil. The essence of this concept is that at a certain stage exile begins to contribute to the blending of several chronotopes and memorial realms in the artist’s imagination, sharpening his fantasy and reorienting him to the crossing of reminiscences with reality.
Exile is often discussed as a laceration between love of homeland and enforced transference to an alien culture. But there are those for whom displacement, and the skills required to profit from it, become second nature. Each new country visited permits an accretion of new enthusiasms balanced by criticisms of the local culture and people and expression of nostalgia for the homeland. To be a professional exile is to position oneself as a knowing outsider.

Homeland for Berthold Lubetkin (1901-1990) was a well preserved secret. Although he possessed a birth certificate stating that he was born in Warsaw in 1903, it is now thought that he was the son of a Jewish engineer in Tbilisi, Georgia. He told me that he was born in the back of beyond and did not hesitate to leave home to study in Moscow and Leningrad where he participated in the Revolution of 1917. Sent to Berlin in 1922, Lubetkin decided to stay in Germany and then move to Paris and then, in 1931, England where he became the most brilliant of the modern architects practicing in the 1930s.

In Paris, he presented himself as a Russian Constructivist while absorbing the formal language of Le Corbusier. In England, he promoted Corbusian modernism while evoking the kinetic abstraction of his fellow Russian exile Naum Gabo. Despite his reputation as a leftist enfant terrible he had the ability to interest a wide range of clients, including the trustees of the Zoological Society responsible for the Regents Park Zoo in London where his first well known buildings were constructed. He positioned himself critically towards English modern architects both in political and formal terms, refusing the dogmas of functionalism but advocating fundamental social reform. His work for the Borough of Finsbury was the most consistent and coherent example of how to use modern architecture for social ends. At the same time, his buildings for London, Whipsnade and Dudley zoos are among the most joyful expressions of formal modernism in England. He employed humour and brilliant pedagogic techniques to explain his work to the public, thus becoming in many ways the public face of modern architecture in Britain.

In this paper I propose to focus on Lubetkin’s work in the 1930s, analysing the mechanisms of absorption and contrast which are the typical tools of the exiled artist.
Architects in Exile. Stories of New Spatial Experiences
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Cino Calcaprina (Genoa, 1911-Tucumán, 1977) was not an exile persecuted for his ideas. He was displaced and coercible to leave his home because he was disillusioned with the paths that post-war reconstruction took in Italy.

His activism in the APAO and the Metron group proposed a vision associated with the idea of organic as the key to social organization and its urban and architectural responses. Faced with the impossibility of carrying out his ideas in democratic planning, he accepted the opportunity of a new future in another place where his agenda would assume another significance. His arrival in Argentina in 1947, as part of the group hired by the University of Tucumán proposed the transfer of his knowledge and ideas to training. The estrangement with respect to the Argentine situation proposed the implementation of the continuity of the professional identity formed in Italy.

But, even so, an oblique glance typical of foreigners showed the relationship of the transported knowledge with the local situation. The need to technically organize the migration of Italians to Argentina after the emigration crisis of the years 47-50 proposed to face local conditions from the point of view already formed and developed a planning proposal at the national level. Since 1955, the interactions will already have another meaning, presenting a more in-depth reading of the local reality. The accomplishment of the urban plan for Tucumán, and the establishment of his professional studio and a small construction company marked the definitive moment of interaction with the place of residence.

The paper proposes to establish the three times following the ideas proposed by Said, Chambers, and de Certeau, regarding their initial formation, cultural and symbolic capital that accompanies their displacement, estrangement, and uncertainty regarding the situation he faces in the place of residence, and his later interaction with the daily dimension that allowed him to find what he could not have in his place of origin.

Displacements, Estrangements, Interactions: Cino Calcaprina and the Democratic Planning
In 1981 my family and I emigrated from the USSR to the USA. In the previous six years I was working on my PhD thesis entitled *Soviet architecture 1932-1954. Cultural interpretation*. One of the reasons for emigration was the verdict of my professor: «I like your thesis very much», he said, «but nobody will ever let you defend or publish it». Four years later it was published in the US, in Russian, by ARDIS (Ann Arbor) as *Culture Two*, then in English by Cambridge University Press, and later in other languages.

While the Jewish Family Service (JFS) was working on getting us American visas, we had to stay in Rome and wait. The next three months were spent walking the streets of Rome. It was bliss. The low-quality B&W slides from my and my wife’s art history classes were coming alive in full colour as we explored our favourite masterpieces of Rome.

Moving to Southern California was shocking. The plane landed in Los Angeles at night. Volunteers from JFS met us at the airport and drove us to the apartment they had already arranged for us. I looked out from the car window – nothing but freeways and traffic signs.

«How far is the city?» I asked.

They laughed.

«You are right in the middle of it. But your apartment is forty miles south, in Anaheim, Orange County, across the street from the Disneyland».

Walking the streets of Anaheim was impossible because these streets were built for driving, not walking. If we asked, for example, «how far is the post office?». The answer was «only five minutes». It meant «five minutes of driving». For us it meant forty minutes of walking. And exploring architectural masterpieces was impossible for the lack thereof.

How did it happen that we ended up loving Los Angeles? That’s what the story is about.
The theme of architects in exile can be defined over time in the most diverse meanings, in the Italian case certainly the experience of the exiles for political and racial persecution went to Switzerland, in the years just before and during World War II, represents a case of particular interest, not only for the individual figures of designers involved, among the main protagonists of the Milanese reconstruction, but also for the cultural climate and the technical-structural and linguistic experimentation that came to be defined within the Champ Universitaire Italien in Lausanne, the internment camp, directed by the anti-fascist engineer Gustavo Colonnetti from Turin when in 1945, he was appointed president of the newly founded CNR. From that experience in which architecture and engineering were tightened in a profound and ideological interdisciplinarity aimed at a design progress destined for an Italy to be saved and rebuilt, (many converged not coincidentally in 1948 in the MSA), in overcoming a first-generation rationalism, a highly recognizable strand of architectural research arose, centered on attention to structural conception and, in particular, to prefabrication. Dating from that period is the presence of Ernesto N. Rogers, who had left in ‘43 because of the racial laws, among the teachers at Champ along with Aldo Favini and Franco Levi, first, and then at the Haute école d’architecture in Geneva and among those in charge of the Centre d’étude pour le batiment in Lausanne and Winterthur in 1945. Here among the young students were Antonio Chessa, Luigi Fratino, Angelo Mangiarotti, Alberto Rosselli, Vico Magistretti, Vito Latis and others. To them, professors and students, to their direct testimony in writings of memoirs and theorists, in the documents kept in personal and institutional archives, is addressed this in-depth proposal, not exempt from the analysis of the architectural works and experiments by conducted these educated and polytechnic professionals, in which it is possible to trace a recognizable fil rouge in the common interest in building industrialization, and not only, anticipatory also of languages and perhaps traceable to those Swiss years.
Exile and Deportation in BBPR Studio
Experiences

Giulia Menzietti
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Eduardo Vittoria, University of Camerino

Exile is a term encompassing various meanings and connotations. Reflecting on the theme of the exile within the field of architecture, diverse scenarios emerge. A possible analysis regards exile as a personal experience defining a distinct before and after in the life of the architects. Another possible consideration recognizes exile as a key to interpreting the meaning that one’s place, environment and society assume in the production of architecture. The experience of alienation from one’s context is particularly significant in the field of design, where the relationship with one’s surroundings serves as its primary nourishment.

Particularly significant as a field of investigation in this scenario is the case of BBPR studio. Made up of four elements, three were forced to exile. Ernesto Nathan Rogers, a Jew by birth, went into exile in Switzerland in 1943; in 1944 Lodovico Barbiano di Belgiojoso and Gian Luigi Banfi, active in the fascist resistance, were first deported to Fossoli, then to Bolzano, and finally to Gusen where Banfi died, while Belgiojoso managed to save himself.

After the liberation in 1945, the studio resumed design activity, opening a new phase of its production. In this moment a particular attention to the theme of commemoration emerges. Likely intensified by personal experiences, these aspects will then materialize into a rich production of monuments.

This contribution aims to investigate whether and how some of the themes crucial in Rogers’ research and in the studio’s works have been influenced by the individual experiences of exile and deportation. Specifically, the analysis refers to the concept of memory, this time understood as a civil duty to not forget, and simultaneously as a strategy to resist the intellectual alienation of the concentration camps. Other crucial themes, such as attention to the context and the relationship with the environment, are also investigated in light of having experienced, albeit temporarily, the violent detachment from one’s habitat, to then return to it.
Serena Maffioletti
Dipartimento di Culture del Progetto, Università Iuav di Venezia

It is with the resumption of civilian life after the years of the regime that the BBPR give shape, not only to a new idea of the city but also to the renewal of design education. The crucible of this reform is the post-war CIAM, of which Enrico Peressutti oversees the 7th edition (Bergamo, 1949). Since then, the teachings of the BBPR have had an impact on Italian schools, combining professional training with intellectual engagement.

Belgioioso and Rogers revolve around the faculties of Venice and Milan, main poles of reflection on the Modern, while Peressutti, having obtained his habilitation to teach, does not establish an academic position in Italy but becomes a visiting professor in the United States, opting for a more direct and free teaching approach. After a semester at the Architectural Association in London (1950-51), in 1952 he is at MIT in Boston, in 1955 and 1962 at Yale University, but it is with Princeton’s School of Architecture that he consolidates a constant relationship from 1952 to 1960. He is the first Italian architect to teach regularly in the USA.

In a dialogue between American and European culture, while maintaining important relationships with American artists and architects and working in the field of museums (Thonet Exhibition, MoMA 1953), Peressutti combines the renewed pedagogy of design with a cultural approach in reflecting on history as a dynamic factor. In this way, he contributes to the direction set by Jean Labatut for a school far from the modernist mainstream: here he invites Louis Khan to a jury and has Charles Moore as his assistant; here he outlines a pedagogy based on imagination, visual culture, critical thinking, and dialectical conditions among students to generate stronger convictions in them. As a traveler and photographer, he takes students to Mexico to learn about the history of the place where they will design a museum, considering a deep connection with our time essential through training stays: «It would be very important for opening the eyes to history, human life, on why some forms ‘some architectural forms’ are as they are» (EP).
During the first half of the 20th century, a number of German, Austrian and other Center-European architects traveled to Chile, bringing modernist ideas in their intellectual baggage, leaving interesting traces of their work that can still be found in the country. Some of them were driven to migrate by political repression and exile. However, not all of them under the same circumstances: Josef Albers was one of the first BAUHAUS architects to leave Germany as Nazism came to power in 1933, settled in the USA with wife Anni, and did from there several trips to Chile between 1934 and 1967, with a big local impact. Ernst Bodenhöfer married in 1941 Leni Alexander, a Jewish musician who was exiled in 1939 and was in turn forced to live in exile himself. Martin Punitzer, after a successful career in Berlin before 1933, was persecuted and exiled, moved to Chile, where his career picked up only partially. Oskar Prager was unable to return to the USA after WWI, and thus further emigrated to Chile, where he developed a reputed work as landscape architect. Tibor Weiner, a BAUHAUS architect born in Hungary, first left to the U.S.S.R. with Hannes Meyer, where they fell out of favor with the Stalinist authorities, thus leading Weiner to Chile, where he became a professor at the University of Chile (1946-8), was then persecuted as a communist in Chile on the basis of the Ley de Defensa Permanente de la Democracia (1948) and would return to Hungary.

In this work, we parallel the diverse trajectories with the architectural work of these architects in order to better understand their production and the way exile played (or not) a role in it. To do so, we study their buildings, projects, writings and other documents from direct and secondary sources in Chile and in Germany, in search of specific traits that may help understand the impact exile had in their lives and careers.
Harry Siedler’s International Vision of Sidney. An Interview with Penelope Seidler

Samuel Joseph Drago
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Harry Siedler is considered one of the main architects that brought modern architecture to Australia. His exile led him to settle in Australia bringing alongside his worldwide cultural experience of the evolution related to the principles laid by masters of the Bauhaus like Walter Gropius and Marcel Breuer. Many projects were handed to Harry Seidler, his modernism experience led to a strong presence of his view onto the Sydney skyline. Seidler always tried to find the best worldwide solutions for each project no matter where the artist came from. But in Australia, at first, this behaviour was misunderstood, Seidler was seen more as un-Australian for this approach. Harry’s Wife, Penelope, a local Australian but also an architect, played an important role in dealing with the constant local mentality and the difficulties they went through confronting themselves with citizens strongly attached to their land. She has helped me understand the way some projects, for example the project for the Australian square Building, developed and realized together with Italian Pier Luigi Nervi, became a discussion for comprehending global experience versus local drive towards progress, Alexander Calder’s and many other artists art perception and how it relates to aboriginal art. How primordial shapes and archetypes became channels of communication and understanding. I therefore analyse the relationship between technical decisions and symbolic meanings, also exploring the organization between place and urban context and how his strong international vision led to design choices that still today are seen as a lesson.

View of the Australian Square Building, Harry Siedler, Sydney 1967.
Hannes Meyer with His Preserved Private and Published Materials During the Emerging and Forming Stalinist Architectural and Urbanistic Discourse

Maria Gvozdeva, Aliaksandr Shuba
Bauhaus - Universität Weimar

Hannes Meyer’s Marxist and Socialist views with sympathies toward Communism after working as director of the interwar Bauhaus played a role in his and his few Bauhaus students’ migration to the USSR. During the first decade of Stalinism, when the artistic and architectural orientations were changing in Moscow and beyond, architectural practices and cooperation with their Soviet colleagues took place that resulted in numerous contacts and planned projects. Those were before the tragic events during the Stalinist repressions. His time in the USSR was his first exile due to his political views, where the economic crisis emerged in numerous capitalist countries, and his second exile was in Mexico during the Second World War. The critical analysis enlightens a few preserved materials from H. Meyer that act as evidence of his familiarity with the early Soviet architectural discourse of the Stalinist epoch, and its promotion and interpretation abroad. This research focuses on H. Meyer’s Russian private archive and library, the relationships with his books, and a few following published reflections on Stalinist architectural practices. With the architectural contextualisation and biographical references, critical and discourse analysis reflects on the collected books and other private materials from H. Meyer and their connections toward his publications after his work with Soviet colleagues that appeared after his creative evolution due to the artistic and architectural changes of the early 1930s. In relation to the architectural practices, his private books in Russian are critically analysed, which his family preserved from the USSR, and his wife transferred to one of the university archives in Weimar. His professional profile with the relevant archival and published materials brings the idea of how the creative evolution of his Soviet colleagues had happened and in what it resulted after his departure from the USSR. His valuable private materials were present and obtained when the emerging Soviet architectural discourse of the 1930s directly affected H. Meyer’s perception and interpretation of his Soviet colleagues practices in Czechoslovakia, Mexico, and the USA, while he was living abroad.
If the first Modern Movement and its Bauhaus influences can be described as orthodoxy, then its successive waves can be described as transmigrations as, often, a vernacularisation of its tenets occurred so as to suit place, culture and available technologies. The Modern Movement was disseminated not only through publications and education but also through architects that consciously moved to other places in the world\(^2\). Amongst these, a lesser-known but important north-south transmigration occurred through the development of the domestic architecture of Pius Pahl, a 1930-33 Bauhaus graduate\(^3\) who emigrated from Germany to South Africa in 1952.

In 1994, Pahl began the design of his last building before his death in 2003. The holiday house, named Waterplaats, is in the coastal town of Betty’s Bay, near Cape Town, South Africa. It is here, nearly half a century after Pahl arrived in South Africa, that the purity of Bauhaus beliefs was still consciously distilled through a reinterpretation of Cape-Dutch vernacular architecture, available materials and technologies and a deep appreciation of the values of physical context.

This paper will highlight Pahl’s physical transmigration and the antecedents\(^4\) which facilitated a new and unique Cape architectural aesthetic. Then Pahl’s attenuative\(^5\) approach to design will be explained through selected examples of his domestic architecture built over a 50 year period. It will be shown, as one of the main authors of Modern Movement orthodoxy Le Corbusier once described, that «the rusticity of materials is in no way a hindrance to the expression of a clear plan and a modern aesthetics»\(^6\).
Lina Bo Bardi (1914-1992) thought of Brazil as a place where she could realise her utopias. With Pietro Maria Bardi, in 1946 she set out on a journey of no return: a voluntary exile that was both necessary and desired. From Rome to Milan, from Rio de Janeiro to São Paulo, from one exile to the next, Bahia, the last place of exile, was to be the place where she developed revolutionary ideas about art and culture, combining architecture and design, education and communication. Summoning up a playful dream world with Felliniesque, even surrealistic, overtones, her drawings are proof of her magical lyricism to the representation of concepts and designs while transferring cultures.

In that way, she was able to express a hybrid culture: that was very much her own mixing which she had acquired in her youth with the experience of illustration and publishing, associating the word with the image, when in Italy she had participated in various magazines in the years before the war, working with Gio Ponti (1891-1979), Bruno Zevi (1918-2000) and Carlo Pagani (1913-1999); while reading the Brazilian cultural climate, Lina’s radical modern beliefs were reinforced by her paying special attention to the natural context. A student of Giovannoni (1873-1947), a reader of Gramsci (1891-1937), Lina brought Benedetto Croce (1866-1952) into Brazilian historic centres, defending popular art and a kind of neo-realism coupled with the magic of primitive creation. With her all-inclusive anthropological reading, she tackled the questions of the past and of history in the present in a pioneering manner, looking at the built heritage without any hierarchies. For her, monumental or erudite heritage and popular or industrial heritage were of equal value.

It was within this framework that the miscegenation of black, Indian and white cultures was recognised, focusing on the population shift resulting from the slave trade and what this meant for the creation. The argument is that the cultural transfer is revealed in Lina’s works (MASP, Secil Pompeia; Solar do Unhão) as an aesthetic which has its seeds in the exile experience. By giving privilege to the creative process, informality, versatility, miscegenation and inclusion, Lina was able to address new spatial experiences.
The Architect Mario Soto left Argentina at the end of 1974, a few months after his wife, Myriam Goluboff, also an Architect, and his young son had left the country. Soto’s political militancy and the signs that anticipated the military coup of March 1976 helped them make the decision to emigrate to Galicia, Spain, where Soto had family roots.

The arrival of the Soto-Goluboff couple occurs just as one dictatorship is born and another is dying. In Galicia, the small group of architects working in their cities, all trained in Madrid or Barcelona, promoted the creation of the professional organization and the School of Architecture, just in the year in which the dictator died. Mario and Myriam find in Galicia a favourable climate that welcomes them. Mario Soto and Myriam Goluboff were trained as architects in a cultural environment that was well connected internationally and presided over by the enormous influence of the master Le Corbusier. The diffusion of the modern ideology by Amancio Williams (1914-1989) or the heterodox work of Clorindo Testa (1923-2013) accompanied the career of Mario Soto (1928-1982), in a context of large architectural programs for an expanding territory. Upon his arrival in Galicia, in the brief years of activity until his death, Soto’s work is marked by the effort to understand and adapt a way of understanding architecture to an intensely humanized territory, with a dense history and isolated during the four decades of dictatorship. At that time, Galician architecture was looking towards identity features and towards a Europe that was exploring the possibilities of overcoming modernity. Soto employs new compositional strategies in the projects he develops in Galicia. This process of adaptation and hybridization is what we propose to investigate in a paper for Architecture in Exile. The untimely death of Mario Soto interrupted that search, which Myriam Goluboff continued from her creative personality.
One of the main architects and engineers of the fascist regime for over 20 years, Angiolo Mazzoni (1895-1979) left for a voluntary exile in Colombia in 1948, after the end of the WWII, where he started a new season of personal and professional life that lasted for about 15 years, until his return to Italy in 1963.

Well-known for the realisation of several public buildings in Italy (among them, the Post and Telegraph buildings in Trento, Ferrara, Latina, Sabaudia, Agrigento, and the Railway stations in Trento, Bolzano, Siena, Montecatini, Reggio Calabria), starting from the 1920s, Mazzoni’s work is characterized by a strong aptitude for experimentation with architectural languages and building materials. Pupil of Marcello Piacentini (from whom he inherited Monumentalism influences) and close to Giorgio De Chirico and Filippo Marinetti (with whom he shared his adherence to Futurism), his Italian activity was focused on modernist and functionalist visions, always linked to the political context.

The paper aims to analyse the years of Mazzoni’s exile in South America as architect, scholar and consultant for the Ministerio de Obras, trying to understand how his past activity influenced the more recent design experiences. Meeting and progressively learning the local culture, his work seems to gradually show a partial adherence to the Colonial style, without losing the Modernist attitude that characterised the first part of his career.

What were the main elements of contaminations with the local culture and how did these change his work? How did the polychromy and multi-materiality that characterised his eclectic activity evolve during his stay in Colombia? Starting from the documentation kept in the MART Archive, the paper deepens the theme of the architect’s exile by analysing the main project designed during the years away from Italy, focusing the investigation on the relationship between the architect’s work and his new cultural horizons.
This paper will focus on the critical figure of Victor Gruen (Vienna, 1903-1980), the pioneer of the shopping centre, who was absorbed and forced to be part of a tragic architectural diaspora, as it was called by Sibyl Moholy-Nagy, when Nazism forced him and his wife to emigrate from his beloved Vienna to the US in 1938, before the outbreak of World War II.

In the US, the mall maker Gruen explored a dialectic profession between the architectural and the urban scale, between private commercial spaces and public spaces; he highlighted and developed a crucial interaction between the design interest and the theoretical one, care for the environment and high-culture modernist references.

His city of origin, Vienna, Europe’s centre of intellectual and cultural life, represented Gruen’s professional and personal link with the European historical city and modern European architecture, in particular with the works of Loos. The mix of European architectural schooling and traditionalist urban origins of Gruen, the thoughtful American, remained as the primary reference to be translated, reinterpreted and grounded in the American context where he prepared the rise of a brand new architectural-urban archetype: the shopping centre.

The paper particularly focuses on the influence of his city of origin, Vienna, Europe’s centre of intellectual and cultural life, on Gruen’s theoretical and design activity transplanted in the USA.

From Gruen’s Charter of Vienna to his defensive rings in Fort Worth to his continuous modernist resonances, the paper will consider how Vienna became, for Gruen, an urban symbol for safeguarding society through the defence of the Environment in the USA and the rest of the world, through the commercial design principles of the shopping centre.
From 1943 to 1945, Arne Jacobsen and his wife Jonna lived in exile in Sweden to escape the Nazi occupation of Denmark. Although he was a highly prolific architect and designer, there are relatively few traces of his exile period, among them some landscape watercolors, graphics and textile prints produced for the Nordic Company in Stockholm and exposed in Sweden in 1944. These drawings suggest a creative activity that, far from being isolated and detached from Jacobsen research, powerfully indicate relevant features of his subsequent landscape works. When looking at the gardens and landscape projects realized after the end of World War II, and the return from the exile, indeed one can easily observe how he began to more consciously interweave architectural projects with the natural world and the design of the external spaces.

On the one hand, his most famous prints and wallpapers, with their reiteration of shapes, essential patterns and vegetal elements floating on a neutral background, may be linked to a modernist lexicon, and recall, for example, the vertical green walls in the St. Catherine’s campus in Oxford (1962), or the spatial organization of bulbs inside the winter garden and the Orchid Bar in the Royal SAS Hotel in Copenhagen (1956–60). On the other hand, his less known exile drawings embody a different, multifaceted understanding of botanical and landscape issues, focusing on fragments of Swedish shady forests (1943), wild heaths, or unruly vegetation jumbling alongside the road (1944).

In this perspective, the proposed contribution reflects on Jacobsen inventive landscape solutions after his exile and on how the Swedish watercolors and textile patterns can be linked, in particular, to the sperimental design (and the unceasing handmade modifications) of his own garden in the Seholm complex (1946–71), opening-up to a more organic, material-based and naturalistic approach.
Between 1942 and 1945, many Danish architects were forced to leave the country and take refuge in nearby Sweden following the Nazi threat. Tobias Faber, Ole Helweg, Finn Monies, Eva and Niels Koppel, Jørn Utzon, and Erik Christian Sørensen are some of the architects who found work in the Swedish capital.

During the period in Stockholm, they had the opportunity to study an architecture that claimed light and space, let in the sun and delighted in expressing the function of things. We can interpret this phenomenon as a direct consequence of the concepts from the Stockholm Exhibition of 1930 and some iconic works, such as the Göteborg Law Court by Gunnar Asplund.

The paper focuses on Jørn Utzon and Erik Christian Sørensen, both deeply influenced by the experiences lived in those years. In particular, Jørn Utzon works with Asplund and Aalto, while Erik Christian Sørensen with Sven Markelius and Sune Lindström. The first one finds in Asplund a reference for prefabricated techniques and spaces flooded with natural light. At the same time, working with Aalto, he understands a paratactic way to join volumes. Sørensen, on the other hand, started a work focused on rhythm, proportion, and structure, from the principles of Swedish Grace. Thanks to Asplund, visiting professor at the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts during the Kay Fisker courses, he approaches frame structures that can be considered as an incredible conjunction between function, construction and form. Following the studies on the same topic by Loos and Mies in 1910 and 1923, Sørensen started his research on bulhus, a specific timber-frame structures from the traditional wooden houses from Denmark.
The experience of exile often embodies the loss of the homeland, a voluntary or forced displacement through migration or expulsion, thus a moving-away-from more than a going towards. The case of Max Fabiani may seem paradoxical in this sense.

From being the architect at the centre of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, who contributed to Otto Wagner’s Modern Architecture, Fabiani chose voluntarily to give up his position to return to his native soil, in the framework of the not-yet-finished WWI and the rise of border fascism. The place was marked by a multilingual culture and a fluid society which will no longer last. His decision will reverse emphatically in the experience of becoming a foreigner in his homeland, isolated on exilic grounds, dealing with shifting power structures, interfacing with one social group in conflict with another, at the margins of a provincial and polarised society.

By questioning this voluntary exile as a state of transition and suspension in time and space, it is possible to observe how the project for the Ferrari villa and garden (Štanjel/San Daniele del Carso, from 1920), on the backdrop of the Plan for the reconstruction of the towns, villages and hamlets of the Isonzo–Soča river basin (Isontino–Posočje, 1917-22) reveals tensions and contradictions between a banned past and an uncertain future, while new figures and set of relations may arise.

The project thus discloses camouflages, counterpoints, negotiations, mediations and co-existences between vernacular and modern, not a nostalgic nor epic conception but the prospective search for the grounded otherness of the place, that acts as a form of projective resistance to all those disruptions enacting the architect’s hell.

Exile unfolds here a wandering through the deserts of the Carso/Kras not to reach a promised land but to enduringly question its survival by design.
During the 20th century, exiles, exoduses and other complementary phenomena have altered the geography and history of humanity, taking on a particular intensity and drama with the rise of totalitarian systems, Nazism in particular. At the end of the WWII, the Purge from the Italian professional registers of people compromised with Fascism forced many architects to undertake complex journeys, sometimes without return, because they were exiled from their professional sphere. The biography of Alziro Bergonzo (1906-1997) offer an opportunity to observe and reflect on the parallel between Purge and exile in architecture. Graduated from the Polytechnic of Milan with Piero Portaluppi (1933), Bergonzo was, until 1944, a militant architect who contributed to building the image of Fascism through a large number of works he designed and built, often in collaboration with relevant sculptors and artists. Expelled from the professional register, Bergonzo was reinstated in 1946 when he won a competition for the Lido of Venice. In the short period of his Purge, Bergonzo developed a new belief, which led him to abandon the architectural language that had distinguished him as a prominent exponent of the historicist tendency of regime. After opening a new studio in Milan, involved in projects in Egypt, Saudi Arabia and Malta, Bergonzo moved back to Bergamo in 1954 to design and build the new headquarters of the Reggiani plants, appearing on the cover of the third number of «Lotus». Through a comparative analysis of Bergonzo’s work before and after the Purge, this contribution aims to answer three questions. The first one reflects retrospectively on the intellectual biography of the architect by wondering to what extent the period of Purge contributed to the transformation of the architectural language of an author who seemed to have fully shared the ethical and esthetic goals of the fascist regime. The second question concerns how most purged architects were quickly reinstated. Finally, the third one regards why critics have prolonged Bergonzo’s exile from the pages of the great history of architecture, despite the assignment of important commissions.
The proposed contribution deals with a group of Hungarian architects born in the 1920s and their architectural production during the post-war decades. The argument is that their remarkable yet relatively unknown œuvre reflects various forms of exile. Special attention is hereby given to the phenomenon of new architecture in historical environments in Budapest after 1956 which has been associated with the international experiences of architect emigrés. The investigation concerns Farkasdy Zoltán (1923-1989), Jánossy György (1923-1998), and Dragonits Tamás (1924-), who among many others experienced forced emigration to Germany in 1944 when the Hungarian far-right leadership had ordered the rescue of several university students to supply key professions for the anticipated post-war reconstruction. With the end of WWII, they had to escape to Scandinavia where they found work at architectural firms. After their return to Hungary in 1946, this first, physical exile was soon followed by a second, professional one. It implied the relative isolation from contemporary discourses due to the growing constraints in the Soviet sphere of influence.

Against this background, the proposal seeks to explore how diverging exile experiences shaped the work of the three architects. In this, it looks at the case of projects which were built in the Buda Castle District between 1957 and 1981 and which have been attributed to situated modernism. The given approach combines contemporary surveys on-site conducted in 2022 and bibliographic research on pertinent journal articles in Hungarian Architecture (Magyar Építőművészet). The aim is to shed light on the role of international knowledge transfer in the architecture of Central-Eastern Europe, and by that, to counter-balance predominant contributions on Western architects in 20th century historiographies.
This paper aims to contribute to the discussion on exile architecture by addressing the topic of voluntary exile. We also compare two auto-imposed life choices: the voluntary exile and the self-isolation, which often characterize the life of an architect when they obsessively revolve for years around an only project which never sees the light of day. The experience of Roberto Gottardi at Cuba’s National Art Schools is the case study chosen by the authors to address this topic.

Roberto Gottardi (1927-2017) was an Italian architect who, soon after graduation, left his country to seize opportunity abroad, landing in Venezuela first and then in Cuba, where he ultimately spent the rest of his life. After the 1959 revolution, together with two colleagues (Ricardo Porro and Vittorio Garatti), he was called to construct a new utopic society, which possibly found its fullest expression in the National Schools of Art. Within this framework, Gottardi was asked to design the School of Dramatic Arts, where he attempted to combine his experience of Venice with modern architecture and the revolutionary spirit of that season.

The National Schools of Art testified to a feverish moment of complete freedom and faith toward the future. However, as any utopia, it just could not come true: the ambitious project was set aside before completion in 1965 when Cuba tightened the relationship with the USSR. From that moment on, the schools were strongly criticized and labeled as anti-revolutionary, and they slowly sank into oblivion. The three architects were persecuted: Porro and Garatti eventually fled the country, exiled to Europe, where they both continued their careers as architects in France and Italy. Gottardi chose to stay and spent the rest of his life in Havana, in a voluntary and conscious auto-exile from the rest of the world, sharing the same choice Cuba made as a nation in the second half of the 20th century. While working as a state architect, he stubbornly continued to develop his project for the School of Dramatic Arts for forty years, drafting a lot of drawings and preparing many versions, although construction works never started.

By examining the unpublished documentation of his work now stored at Princeton University, we will describe the evolution of Roberto Gottardi’s architectural language. We will trace the development of that project on which he continued to work, thus self-exiling himself also from a professional point of view in the obsession to complete an unfinished architectural dream.
The city *Ciudad Abierta de Amereida* is the product of an architectural and urban experiment, born from a process of (self)exile of its founders. During the 1960s the Faculty of Architecture of the Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaiso in Chile was a place of avant-garde and architectural experimentation. In this academic context, a group of thinkers was born, who would later be the founder of the *Ciudad Abierta de Amereida*. A heterogeneous set of South American architects, poets and artists led by professor architect Alberto Cruz and the Argentine poet of Italian origin Godofredo Iommi. They shared the need to find a new architecture, based on the poetic conception of its land: América. For this reason, moved by the postcolonial desire to give a new meaning to the origin and culture of their continent, they embarked on a journey. A continental crossing starting from the Tierra del Fuego in Chilean Patagonia, in the direction of Santa Cruz in Bolivia, through what they called “the American inland sea”.

A sort of self-exile aimed at the re-discovery of América by its own inhabitants. Upon returning from the crossing, the set of writings and collective drawings that the crew produced to communicate a new way of inhabiting the continent was published in 1967. Amereida was the title of the publication: a word that combines the meanings of the discovery of América and the epic poem Aeneid of Virgil. But if Aeneas is an exile who leaves his native land to embark on a journey full of adventures in search of a place to find his new homeland, the founders of *Ciudad Abierta* abandon their land and then return, building a city imbued with the new meanings they assimilated during their exile.

In 1969 began the work of participatory design among professors and students of the Faculty of Architecture of Valparaiso for the construction of *Ciudad Abierta*. It is still an inhabited city, composed of an archipelago of about 40 buildings including houses, an amphitheater, a garden and a cemetery.

The place chosen for the foundation of this city is located in front of the Pacific Ocean among the dunes of Punta de Piedra, in a vast land north of Valparaiso of landscape beauty. Architectures built with recycled materials integrate perfectly into the Chilean landscape and became an example of *autochthonous architecture*.

*Ciudad Abierta de Amereida* was an architectural, urban, poetic, artistic and political experiment where exile is a project tool for the construction of a utopia.
Manlio Michieletto  
Department of Architecture & Urban Design, German University of Cairo

After his experience in the Weimar Republic and the USSR, Ernst May bought 1934 a farm in Tanzania. Still, he soon found himself sitting at the drawing table in Nairobi, eager to restart his work as an urban planner. The research aims to investigate the projects that the German architect designed and realised in the East Africa region targeting the process of contextualising a model already experimented with in Europe: The Trabantstadt. Ernst May reshaped the development of the cities according to the satellite growing process involving himself not only on the scale of the site plan but also on the definition of the single unit. Two case studies are analysed through a comparative method highlighting the analogies with the past and the continuity with the local context: The Kampala Extension Scheme and the Port Tudor Settlement. Once he regained freedom, in 1947, after being imprisoned by the Allies, he carried out a project to redevelop some districts of the Ugandan capital city. The overall plan is notable for its progressive idea of including large settlements for low- and middle-income indigenous people, resulting in one of the first large residential projects designed for East African locals. Then, May worked in the port city of Mombasa, Kenya, which saw its economy and population proliferating, given its strategic location on the coast of the Indian Ocean. In 1952, the German architect designed the first social housing project for Africans in Port Tudor, understanding the importance of tackling the housing issue of different social income classes by providing affordable and flexible typologies. Moreover, Ernst May’s legacy is studied, which has been stretched to nowadays, with the new Master Plan of Kigali based on a polycentric urban development strategy. The capital city of Rwanda represents a definitive case study in the East African Region and the whole continent tackling the issue of urban growth through the project.
Why Leave?
Being welcomed in exile
Returning from exile

Research Perspectives on Architects in Exile and Migration

Caroline Maniaque
French Ecoles d'architecture, École nationale supérieure d'architecture de Normandie

This work on the theme of architects in exile began, with Marie Gaimard, in 2018¹. For the colloquium at Polimi, I want to focus on three moments in the trajectory of exile: 1. Why leave? 2. Being welcomed; 3. Returning from exile. I will track these moments in some case studies that were included in the Cahiers: Journal for the Study of Architecture, Urbanism and Landscape special issue.

Why leave? Professionals working in the design of buildings and landscapes or in town planning, had various reasons for emigrating. Sometimes they were obliged to leave, but sometimes it was a personal choice. Political crises or emergency situations can be determinant, but so can the economic or intellectual conditions of a country. The lack of real possibilities for education and training or the absence of professional expertise can also contribute to the brain drain.

Being welcomed. Another important element to consider is how these architects, town planners and landscape designers were welcomed in the new country, on a variety of different levels – be it by friends, by the profession or from an administrative or legal perspective. We can acquire an overview of the professional situation of the welcoming country by considering the administrative and legal systems intended to support or, on the contrary, to exclude architects coming from abroad. Under what circumstances is the immigration of architects, town planners or landscaper designers perceived as an asset, or, conversely, as a source of imbalance?

Returning from exile. Being in exile can be a temporary situation. How can the return to the native country be considered? Can it be seen as a kind of reconquest? The decision may either be greeted with approbation or may encounter resistance from compatriots. What lessons did architects learn during their period of exile? In what form and how do they pass this on to their colleagues, their students, their disciples?

Most studies of architects in exile have focused on the experience of individuals, but a different approach has been proposed by the METROMOD research group in Germany whose work is now available in publications and online. How might we apply their topographical approach to architects in exile?

¹ Marie Gaimard, Caroline Maniaque, Partir et revenir de l'exil: perspectives scientifiques, in «Les Cahiers de la recherche architecturale urbaine et paysagère» [on line], n°2, 2018: http://journals.openedition.org/craup/921
Exilic Architecture or Inhabiting (the) Nowhere

Alexis Nuselovici (Nouss)
Faculty of Arts, Letters, Languages and Humanities,
Aix-Marseille Université (France)

Home is somewhere, somewhere is home. It is true following a certain kind of spatial and political logics. However, such an order could be disturbed by history or experience. Here comes the category of exilic nowhere which is not the opposite of somewhere (no/where) but another way of defining identity and belonging (now/here), allowing to inhabit (the) nowhere.

Caspar David Friedrich,
Wanderer above the Sea of Fog, 1818.
Architects in Exile. Stories of New Spatial Experiences

Fernando Agrasar Quiroga is an Architect by the E.T.S.A.A. of A Coruña (1989); PhD by the University of A Coruña (2001); Professor of Architectural Design at the University of A Coruña, of which he is currently a Researcher with a specific focus on the conservation and management of 20th-century architecture. He has been Visiting Scholar at the CCA in Montreal, and the Israel Institute of Advanced Studies, where she co-chaired the research project The Terms of the Game: How to read architecture when public buildings are Europe meets America: William Lescaze, Architect of Modern Housing. The Housing Project (co-edited), Postwar Middle-Class Housing (co-edited) and Storie di Case. Abitare l’Italia del boom (co-edited). She has been awarded individual grants from the Graham Foundation, the Rockefeller Foundation, Radcliffe Institute for Advanced Studies, and she was the national coordinator of the Havana’s National Projects Architectures for the middle-class in Italy, 1950s-1970s (edited by the Italian MIUR), the co-chair of both the Habitation Middle-class Mass Housing in Europe and the Housing Histories research network supported by the EAHN.

Fernando Agrasar Quiroga is an Architect by the E.T.S.A.A. of A Coruña (1989); PhD by the University of A Coruña (2001); Professor of Architectural Design at the University of A Coruña, of which he is currently a Researcher with a specific focus on the conservation and management of 20th-century architecture.
In particular, she is taking part to an ongoing international re- search which aims to safeguard and valorise the modernist ar- chitectural heritage of Tashkent (Uzbekistan).

Boris Chukhovskij is a visit- ing scholar in Polimi, associat- ed scholar in the University of Morden, Professor and Researcher, Universi- ty Católica de Chile, in the areas of architectural design and building technology.

Giorgio Danesi is a Post-doctoral research fellow at Università luve di Verona, Italy. He is involved in several research in Architecture for Conser- vation (Master’s degree, 2013), he is interested in the history of architectural conservation and restoration of buildings. He is co-ordinated the plan for the National Arts School of Cuba (2018- 2020). He is the author of more than 100 publications.

Sara Di Resta is Associate Pro- fessor of Architectural Con- servation at University of Venice. Ph.D. in Conservation of Architectural Heritage, her re- search activities focuses on the preservation of 20th-century heritage and on the architectural language in conservation de- sign. She is responsible for Edu- cation and Internationalization of SISBA – the Specialisation School on Architectural and En- vironmental Heritage in Venice. She is member of the boards of directors of Docomomo Italia and SIRA – the Italian Society of Architectural Conservation

Samuel Joseph Drago born in Sydney, Australia. He earned his degree in architecture (Aachen-Palermo 2005), scientific research activity (RWTH Aachen, Germany 2010) and a PhD in architectural design (UPC Barcelona, 2015, tutor: Carlos Martí Arias), he has been teaching in international univer- sities in the past years developing activities in the MBAC Mas- ter’s degree in advanced studies in architecture (UPC Barcelona, Spain 2017), Durban University in South Africa, Perm University in Russia and the RWTH University in Aachen, Germany, focusing on research based on architecture archetypes. His professional archi- tectural activity is carried out in Barcelona, Munchen, Sydney, Perm (Russia) and Milan.

Marija Dremaié has a PhD in ar- chitecture (2006) and is a profes- sor at the Faculty of History, Vil- nius University. She is interested in architecture of the 20th cen- tury from historical, sociological and anthropological perspec- tive. Dremaié is active in Balt- ic Modernism: Architecture and Housing in Soviet Lithuania (Berlin, 2017) and edited Archi- tecture of Optimism: The Kaunas Phenomenon 1918-1940 (Vilnius, 2016). Currently she is interested in research of architects as a col- lective group, migration process- es and exile – this interest pro- duced the book: The making of national architects in Lithuania in the 1930s and their survivals after 1940 (2020). On this book, she is engaged in research which aims to safeguard and enhance the modernist ar- chitectural heritage by promoting heritage and its importance.

Anat Falbel received her Ph.D in Architecture and Urbanism from the University of São Paulo, with the thesis Lucjan Krogolz: the trajectory of an immigrant architect (2003) dealing with the subject of émigrés architects between the 40s and 60s in the city of São Paulo. His main field of research is a post-doctoral fellow at Università luve di Verona, Italy. He has been involved in several research projects concerning the history of Italian contemporary archi- tecture. Among them: Radici. La Scuola di Architettura di Napoli: maestri e opere, METRICS. Metodo- dologica e tecnologie per la gestio- ne e la riqualificazione dei centri storici e degli edifici di pregio. He has also collaborated in the organization of several exhibitions, in- cluding: Santiago Calatrava. Nella luce di Napoli (2019, Museo di Ca- pomonte), Terragni e Galosov: Novocomum a Como Cumb Zee a Mosca. Aenapea a confronto (2019/2020, Archivio Terragni/ MuAr, Museo di Architettura di Stato A.V. Shohouse) and Salerno Moderna. Le opere e i progetti di Michele De Angelis (2020, Archi- vio di Stato di Salerno).

Davide Del Curto is an Associate Professor of architectural pres- ervation at Politecnico di Milano, Dept. of Architecture and Urban Studies. His research deals with building diagnostics and preven- tive conservation of the architec- tural heritage, focusing on the 20th-century. He participated in national and international re- search programs and restoration campaigns for heritage buildings from the 13th to 20th centuries. He was awarded a gold med- al in the Domus International Prize in 2016 designed for the museum of former sanatoriums in Sondalo. Within the Getty Foundation’s Keeping it Modern program, he was responsible for the task sustainability within the international heritage conservation management plan for Giancarlo De Carlo’s Collegi in Urbino (2015-2016), and he

the Cultural Revolution (MIT Press, 2006, winner of the MLA’s Katherine Singer Kovacs Prize), Freud in the Americas: Into the Wilds of Psychoanalysis (MIT, 2010, winner of the Gradiva Prize), Proust’s Latin Americans (Hopkins, 2014). He is also a novelist and was pub- lished two books on Cuba: Teoría y práctica de la Habana (2017) and Muerte en la Habana (2021). His work has been translated into French, Spanish, Italian, Japa- nese and Chinese. He is a mem- ber of the American Academy of Arts and Sciences and serves on the board of the Freud Museum, Vienna.

Carmen Gomez Maestro Ma. Architect, graduated by Univer- sidad Politécnica de Valencia, Director of Program for Resto- ration of Heritage Assets, Fun- dación Instituto Profesional Duoc UC Arts, she is a Ph.D. architect at REDDO Architec- ture, Director of the Diploma on Earth (University of Molina, Universidad Católica de Chile).

Oxana Gourinovitch is archi- tectural historian, architect and curator; currently a senior re- searcher at the RWTH Aachen University, lecturer at the Hellen Berlin, and member of the In- ternational Heritage Centre at the Bauhaus-University Weimar. Her recent and current research concerns architectural production and management. Her prize-winning dis- sertation National Theatre, Archi- tecture of Soviet Modernism and Nation Building will be published in 2024 by Spector Books.

Andrea Gritti is Associate Pro- fessor in Architectural and Urban Design at the Politecnico di Mila- no. He studies the role of reusing and recycling in the theory and practice of architectural design. AmT: The Architecture of Aufbau und Auf- ulazioni. La concezione scalare in architettura (2018), Autostrof

Nouvissima (2018) and Architecture at work. Towns and Landscape of Industrial Heritage (2020). He is the author of many books on Twentieth Cen- tury restoration works of St. Mark’s Basilica in Venice. From 2018 to 2020 he worked as Researcher at the RWTH Aachen University, Faculty of Architecture and Arts of the Southern Federal University (Russia). She is currently a PhD student at the Bauhaus Univer- sity of Weimar (Germany) under the supervision of Jörg Paulus and Jasper Cepel. Her research project titled In the archival foot- prints of Hannes Meyer focuses on discovering and analysing of architectural materials linked with the life and work of the second director of the Bauhaus, Hannes Meyer. She has completed a five-year PhD scholarship at the Royal Col- ford Russia Fund and Thuringian Graduate Fund. In addition to this, she has also recently par- ticipated in the international research conferences Bauhaus and avant-garde art schools (Mos- cow) and Bauhaus in the context of world architecture. XXX Aaa- toy readings (Moscow), in parallel to her scientific research she is a practicing junior architect in Berlin.

Eduard Kögel studied at the faculty of Architecture, Urban and Landscape Planning at the University of Kassel in Germany. From 2007 to 2008 he was Assistant Professor at the Tech- nical University in Darmstadt in Germany. He is a Post-doctoral Fellow at the Centre for Architecture and Urban De- velopment, 2007 he received his doctoral degree from the Bau- haus-University in Weimar. Edu- ard Kögel works on the history of architecture and urban planning in Asia. He currently lectures at the University of Technology. Eduard Kögel works as Research Advisor and Programme Cura-
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Serena Maffioletti is an architect and professor of Composizione architettonica e urbana presso l’Università Iuav di Venezia, dove insegna dal 1992 e dal 2012 è Coordinatrice scientifica dell’Archivio Progetti, centro di ricerca sull’architettura contempornanea, nell’ambito del quale ha svoltò il proprio recente percorso di conferenze, mostre, pubblicazioni e convegni. La ricerca teorico-critica è rivolta all’architettura italiana del secondo decennio del XX secolo, alla quale ha dedicato numerose mostre e pubblicazioni, di cui si menzionano: BBPR (1994); Ernesto N. Rogers. Architettura misura e grandezza dell’uomo (2010); The Harmony of Human Proportions: BBPR’s Architectural Dialogues (2019). Ha sviluppato ampi percorso di ricerca sul tema del progetto infrastrutturale e della valorizzazione dei paesaggi culturali. Come docente l’attenzione è focalizzata sulla complessità della città e delle sue strutture, come architetto ha partecipato a numerosi concorsi nazionali e internazionali.

Caroline Maniache is an architect and historian, HDR, professor at the French Ecoles d’architecture in the field of Architectural Histories and Cultures, Ecole nationale supérieure d’architecture de Nantes, also known as INSA-Nantes. She is a researcher at the Architectural and Urban Planning laboratory, Territory, Environment; associate researcher at the IPRAS laboratoire, UMR AUSser CNRS 3329. Her work focuses on cultural exchange and the circulation of ideas between the United States and Europe, and on the training of architects. She has notably published Fashion Encounters with the American Counterculture, Ashgate, 2011; Go West! Des architectes aux pays de la contre-culture, Parenthèses, 2014; Whole Earth Field Guide, MIT Press, 2016 (with M. Gaglioli); and was responsible for the collection of texts Les années 68 et la formation des architectes, Point de vues, 2018 and co-edited Architectural 68. Panorama international des renouveau pédagogiques, Métis-Presse, 2020. Recently she published L’aventure du Whole Earth Catalog, Paris, Les productions du EFFA, 2021.

Enric Massip-Bosch Founder & Principal at EMBA_ESTUDI MASSIP-BOSCH ARCHITECTS. Dr. Massip-Bosch, architect and Professor at UPC-BarcelonaTech, has been a Member of the Advisory Committee on Urban Affairs to the City of Barcelona (2011–15) and of the Agenzie Nazionale di Valutazione del Sistema Universitario e della Ricerca (Italian Government, 2012–14). In 1990 founded EMBA with which he has won many international competitions and awards, among which the Leaf Awards 2011 Best World Office Building for Diagonal ZeroZero Telefonica Tower skyscraper in Barcelona and the Abitare il Mediterraneo 2009 Award for Place République remodelling in Leucate (France). TC Cuadernos published the first volume of his collected works EMBA-ENRIC MASSIP-BOSCH: ARQUITECTU- RA 2005-2015 in its prestigious collection of monographs. His theoretical work has been widely published in magazines, top–search laboratory Architecture, Territory, Environment; associate researcher at the IPRAS laboratoire, UMR AUSser CNRS 3329. Her work focuses on cultural exchange and the circulation of ideas between the United States and Europe, and on the training of architects. She has notably published Fashion Encounters with the American Counterculture, Ashgate, 2011; Go West! Des architectes aux pays de la contre-culture, Parenthèses, 2014; Whole Earth Field Guide, MIT Press, 2016 (with M. Gaglioli); and was responsible for the collection of texts Les années 68 et la formation des architectes, Point de vues, 2018 and co-edited Architectural 68. Panorama international des renouveau pédagogiques, Métis-Presse, 2020. Recently she published L’aventure du Whole Earth Catalog, Paris, Les productions du EFFA, 2021.

In 1990 founded EMBA with which he has won many international competitions and awards, among which the Leaf Awards 2011 Best World Office Building for Diagonal ZeroZero Telefonica Tower skyscraper in Barcelona and the Abitare il Mediterraneo 2009 Award for Place République remodelling in Leucate (France). TC Cuadernos published the first volume of his collected works EMBA-ENRIC MASSIP-BOSCH: ARQUITECTU- RA 2005-2015 in its prestigious collection of monographs. His theoretical work has been widely published in magazines, top–search laboratory Architecture, Territory, Environment; associate researcher at the IPRAS laboratoire, UMR AUSser CNRS 3329. Her work focuses on cultural exchange and the circulation of ideas between the United States and Europe, and on the training of architects. She has notably published Fashion Encounters with the American Counterculture, Ashgate, 2011; Go West! Des architectes aux pays de la contre-culture, Parenthèses, 2014; Whole Earth Field Guide, MIT Press, 2016 (with M. Gaglioli); and was responsible for the collection of texts Les années 68 et la formation des architectes, Point de vues, 2018 and co-edited Architectural 68. Panorama international des renouveau pédagogiques, Métis-Presse, 2020. Recently she published L’aventure du Whole Earth Catalog, Paris, Les productions du EFFA, 2021.
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