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### Conference Program

**THURSDAY 26-04-2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Session</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00 - 10:30</td>
<td>Accreditations &amp; Welcome Pack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 - 11:00</td>
<td>Welcome and Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - 11:30</td>
<td><strong>con-texts</strong>  [this section will take place in Spanish]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - 11:08</td>
<td>Silvia Colmenares + Luis Rojo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:16 - 11:24</td>
<td>Lina Toro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:32 - 11:40</td>
<td>Raúl Castellanos</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:48 - 11:56</td>
<td>Jorge Borondo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:04 - 12:12</td>
<td>Álvaro Moreno</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:20 - 12:28</td>
<td>Rodrigo Rubio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:36 - 12:44</td>
<td>Martino Peña</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12:52 - 13:00</td>
<td>Elena Martínez Millana</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:08 - 13:16</td>
<td>Esteban Salcedo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:24 - 13:32</td>
<td>Damián Pouganou</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:40 - 13:48</td>
<td>Luz Carruthers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13:56 - 14:04</td>
<td>Luis Moreda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:12 - 14:20</td>
<td>Antonio Cantero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:28 - 14:36</td>
<td>Luis Navarro</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:44 - 14:52</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Lectures**

- Silvia Colmenares + Luis Rojo
  - **Directors**
  - Lina Toro
    - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA
  - Raúl Castellanos
    - Universidad Politécnica de València, Departamento de Proyectos Arquitectónicos, Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura, Valencia
  - Jorge Borondo
    - Universidad Politécnica de Cataluña, Departamento de Proyectos Arquitectónicos, Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura, Barcelona
  - Álvaro Moreno
    - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA
  - Rodrigo Rubio
    - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA
  - Martino Peña
    - Universidad Politécnica de Cartagena, Arquitectura y Tecnología de la Edificación, ETSAE, Cartagena
  - Elena Martínez Millana
    - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA
  - Esteban Salcedo
    - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA
  - Damián Pouganou
    - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA
  - Luz Carruthers
    - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA
  - Luis Moreda
    - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA
  - Antonio Cantero
    - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA
  - Luis Navarro
    - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA

**Presentations**

- "Teóricos francotiradores. La posibilidad de un pensamiento dibujado como práctica específicamente arquitectónica"
- "Poché. Historia y vigencia de una idea"
- "Ways of seeing"
- "Notas sobre una arquitectura líquida"
- "Aftermath"
- "Artefactos energéticos: la energía como parámetro proyectual"
- "Paradoxes of Domesticity and Modernity"
- "Play to the gallery"
- "Rincones de la función"
- "Con P de Pragmatismo"
- "Martha Stewart. A contemporary icon"
- "Proyectos encubiertos. Entrevistas entre arquitectos"
- "Estímulos y reacciones, deseos y afectos, fibras e hilos intencionales"

**Discussion**
THURSDAY 26 · 04· 2018

14:30 - 16:00 panel #1 [anthology problematized]

Alessandro Canevari
Università degli Studi di Genova, dAD, Genova, Italy

Marcos Pantaleón
Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Departamento de Proyectos Arquitectónicos, Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura, Madrid

Giacomo Pala
Institute of Architectural Theory (Architekturtheorie), Innsbruck, Austria

Jorge Minguet Medina + Carlos Tapia Martín
Grupo de Investigación OUT, Arquias, Departamento de Historia, Teoría y Composición Arquitectónicas ETS Arquitectura, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain

Moderators:
Ignacio Borrego
Full Professor at the Technische Universität Berlin

Sergio Martín Blas
Associate Teacher of the Architectural Design Department at the ETSAM (UPM)

Lunch Time

14:30  “Anthology is ontology. The power of selection and the ‘worldmaking’”

14:45  “Anthology as collection: Althusser vs. Benjamin”

15:00  “Theorem. A case for an Anthology today”

15:15  “Historicizing the desire to historicize”

15:30 Discussion

16:00 Coffee break

16:30 - 17:45 panel #2 [the spanish perspective]

María Antón Barco + Verónica Meléndez
ESNE, Madrid, Spain

Aída González Lleova
Universidad de Castilla La-Mancha, Escuela de Arquitectura de Toledo, Departamento de Proyectos Arquitectónicos, Área de Historia y Composición, Toledo, Spain

Amparo Bernal + Iluki Bergera
Polytechnic University of Burgos, Graphic Expression Department, Spain / University of Zaragoza, Architecture Department, School of Engineering and Architecture, Spain

Moderators:
Carmen Espegel
Tenured Professor of the Architectural Design Department at the ETSAM (UPM)

Jesús Ulargui
Tenured Professor of the Architectural Design Department at the ETSAM (UPM)

17:00  “Rearranging Spanish Modernity Discourses through Mass Media”

17:45  “Architectural Theory anthologies from a Spanish perspective”

17:00  “Writings on Photography and Modern Architecture in Spain. A critical reading of a Contemporary Anthology”

17:15 Discussion

FRIDAY 27·04·2018

10:00 - 11:30 panel #3 [anthology today]

Leandro Medrano + Luís Recamán + Mariana Wilderom + Raphael Grazziano
University of São Paulo, Faculty of Architecture and Urbanism, History of Architecture and Project Aesthetics Department, São Paulo, Brazil

Bélen Butragueño + Javier Raposo + Mariasun Salgado
UPM, Department of Architectural Graphic Design, School of Architecture (ETSAM), Madrid, Spain

Mattias Kärholm + Paulina Prieto + Rodrigo Delso
Lund University, Architecture and the Built Environment, Lund, Sweden, and Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura de Madrid, UPM, Spain

Guido Cimadomo + Vishal Shahdadpuri Aswani + Rubén García Rubio
Universidad de Málaga, Departamento de Arquitectura, ETS Arquitectura, Málaga, Spain and Al Ghurair University, College of Design, Dubai, Emirates Arab United

Moderators:
Juan Elvira
Assistant Professor of the Architectural Design Department at the ETSAM (UPM), Professor at IE University

Lluis J. Lilian
Professor at the Master in Advanced Architectural Projects at the ETSAM (UPM)

10:00  “Space and the otherness. An anthology”

10:15  “Practical theorization in the digital era”

10:45  “Towards a (new) Historiography of Architecture for a Digital Age”

11:00 Discussion

11:30 Coffee Break

12:30-14:00 Key-note speaker

Hilde Heynen
Full Professor Architectural Theory, University of Leuven. KU Leuven, Belgium

“Configuring a discipline. Anthologies in architectural theory”

Closing cocktail
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Ruth S. Cowan describes in her article "The Consumption Junction: A Proposal for Research Strategies in the Sociology of Technology" how what is truly important is not the study of the veracity of ideas, but rather how these affect society. If we were to paraphrase society as a collection of subjects, we could argue that value doesn't reside in things themselves, but above all in the representation provoked within ourselves. We could also argue that the construction of our sensibility might depend on this performance.

Cowan’s writing belongs to the book “The Social Construction of Technological Systems”, published in 1987, which gathered a collection of thirteen articles where new ways of understanding technology—and therefore, its history—were introduced. The book and its authors displayed a new approach to investigation referred to as SCOT (Social Construction of Technology), where the complexity of the technological crucible—its evolution, development and representation—unfolded as an ocean of social, technical, economical and political ideas. Consequently diffusing the mask belonging to the myth that was in charge of sponsoring a history of technology written exclusively by a handful of white men. At the same time, the creation of the technological object was understood as a collaboration of several relevant social groups.

In the same book, Trevor Pinch and Wiebe Bijker crumbled the evolution of the bicycle as a consequence of a sensible and relevant pilgrimage through artisan events. The image of the present artifact—the bicycle—is a byproduct of the incessant answers to the ‘problems’ of several social groups; from the production depending on the engineer, up to the skirts of women or the reflexes of the elderly. Just as in the means of natural selection, the artifact manages its evolution by adapting to the changes in its perception. When the bicycle was, for instance, conceived as a naïve sport-related device—enjoyed by young men—, both the brakes or the lower saddle were not a requirement from any social demand (since the subjects—and the eyes—responsible for such request were not yet at stage). Elder or more cautious people, women, and other figures quite distant from the regular white man archetype, adapted technological representation to make it mirror society. Its evolution was therefore not exclusively driven towards form, but mostly regarded the progress in its perception as an instrument with which to interact with society, and its reflection.

And so it seems that the technological object reveals itself as a work (ouvrage) possessor of a social dimension. The way in which the bicycle is perceived might discuss the space of the absence; the empty space between the subject and the object. The space that lies between what sees and what is seen is suddenly colonized by natural connotations of responsibility or sensibility when the gaze empathizes with and not just through. To perceive—even an image—is also to build. When the space between the subject and the object is woven through an expansive design, a change in the cultural scheme and in the conception of the innovative process is definitively required.

Underlying the crust of time—the time of the object, apparently neutral—we tend to discover a mirror braided by the people. A dual mirror, projected both into its process and into its usage. In the first place, the infinite development of technology is a consequence of an accumulative and orgasmic dance of determinants and social processes. It doesn't derive from an instantaneous miracle bound to an individual genius—being that the inventor or the architect—and therefore, its usage blends with the experiences of the user.
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This article aims to put a new perspective on the essay by Hilde Heynen “Modernity and Domesticity. Tensions and Contradictions.” It seeks to shed light about its most radical contributions so as to value them. It also intends to show something that is equally important, its immediate context in the book Negotiating Domesticity: Spatial Productions of Gender in Modern Architecture, in which it was published for the first time.

Firstly, an analysis will be carried out on the impact and reception the book and essay had on the scientific community. In order to do this, several published reviews over a period of time will be examined; also, the main data bases will be consulted to quantify the variations of the above cited references. In this first section, it will be possible to substantiate that the essay has attracted more interest over the course of time.

Secondly, the essay will be evaluated with the objective to visualise the analytical operation in which Heynen overturned the common opinion of the scientific community about the relationship between domesticity and modernity. She highlighted the most profound oxymoron, a unity of disparity. In this second section, her significant contribution to the theory of architecture—and conclusively to human thought—will be evaluated so that it is not only constrained from the masculine experience.

The book Negotiating Domesticity began to take shape at the annual meeting of the Society of Architectural Historians in 2003, shortly after the general reaction against the theory of architecture which occurred at the end of the 1990s. At this meeting, Hilde Heynen and Gülşüm Baydar co-directed the session “Domesticity and Gender in Modern Architecture,” concluding in a book published in 2005, two years later.

Therefore, “Paradoxes of Domesticity and Modernity” seeks to contribute to the dissemination of Heynen’s essay. In the second part of this new vision, is provided to value it. Here a reduced version of the original essay is added with a homonym title, which Heynen prepared for the colloquium “Gender Studies: een genre apart? Een stand van zaken” for the Sophia Belgian Gender Studies Network in 2005. It should be mentioned that recently the full article has been re-published and translated into Spanish, and due to the length of the document it was divided into two. The analysis presented earlier was reduced version at the authors request, however it includes sufficient arguments so that the development of this paper can be seen with greater clarity. The existence of this reduced version also enables it to be put forward for the Critical Un-Thology which re-stricts the length of the essays. Moreover, the analysis of the reduced version awakens the curiosity of the reader to look for the full text.

Heynen began her essay with a meaningful quote from the book by Marshall Berman, All That Is Solid Melts Into Air. The Experience of Modernity, “To be modern is to find ourselves in an environment that threatens to destroy everything we have, everything we know, everything we are.”

Henderson did not develop any theory about the first chapter by Hilde Heynen “Modernity and domesticity, Tensions and contradictions,” she only described it as a “largely theoretical exegesis.” She then listed all the titles of the essays contained in the book and their respective authors, with a brief summary of some of them. Finally, she concluded her review by emphasizing what she had suggested at the beginning and tried to demonstrate with its development: “As is often the case with edited collections, Negotiating Domesticity makes sound arguments or follows a consistent line of investigation. One hopes, however, that the thoughtfulness and expertise demonstrated by its authors are an indication that singly authored and more focused studies will soon emerge to substantively elucidate this complex subject.”

A year later in 2008 the second review was published in the Gender, Place & Culture journal, written by Ann Varley. Varley started with a brief commentary about Heynen’s article and after mentioning the various themes that Heynen discussed in the book, she remarked how different they were: “Its contributors certainly speak to differences in modern architecture constructions of gender and domesticity.” And concluded praising the contents of the book: “Even if they do not, then, persuade me that earlier contribu-

Henderson’s criticism about the absence of a singular argument and qualified the book as a platform: “Negotiating Domesticity has provided a sustaining platform, not an argument, for interdisciplinary discourse that is only beginning to bear fruit.” Furthermore, she added even greater praise: “It promises us adventure, power, joy, growth, transformation of ourselves and the world —and, at the same time, that threatens to destroy everything we have, everything we know, everything we are.”

As explained in this article, the evolution of the reviews of this book is very significant, as well as the increasing number of times that scientific articles and books have cited them. It is worth anticipating Heynen’s objective so as not to be misled throughout the course of the paper since, on the whole, Heynen used two extensive sections to expose predominant discourses on the subject “Modernity and homelessness” and “The gender of modernism.” These two arguments reinforced each other and declared that modernity and domesticity are opposite terms.

In the first part, “Modernity and homelessness,” Heynen explained the predominant discourse about the metaphorical “homelessness” associated with modernity. As the house was associated with women and femininity, this metaphor reinforced identifying modernity with masculinity: “The conceptualisation of modernity as the embodiment of no sustained or established family, nature and authenticity that bears gendered overtones. In as far as modernity means change and rupture, it seems to imply, necessarily, leaving home.” Later, in the second part, “The gender of modernism,” Heynen delved into the gender of modernity and made reference to the argument upheld by Christopher Reed about the divergence between domesticity and modernity which he raised in Not at Home. The Suppression of Domesticity in Modern Art and Architecture. The main reason that Reed offered to justify this divergence was to associate modernism with the idea of avant-garde, because as “its military-derived name suggests, the avant-garde (literally ‘advanced guard’) imagined itself away from home, marching toward glory on the battlefields of culture.”
So, faced with the dominant discourse that established the gender of modernity as masculine as opposed to the feminine domesticity, in the third part “The cult of domesticity”, Heynen contrasted less obvious discourses, “a focus on domesticity itself on the other hand reveals a rather different mode of interconnection.” 10 Heynen suggested that there is a direct connection between the emergence of an ideology of domesticity on the one hand and the rise of industrial capitalism and imperialism on the other, “etymological nearness of ‘domesticity’ and ‘to domesticate’ is not a coincidence.” Heynen maintained that modernity and domesticity cannot be seen as opposites “if one opens up the scope of investigative gaze and makes visible,” as well as the more hidden layers, and social, economic, and political determinants that often remain concealed on the level of modernity discourses and practices, it becomes clear that there is also a certain complicity between modernity and domesticity. 11 This perspective gives way to numerous discourses, for example, the essays that are included in Negotiating Domesticity.

This article has aimed to explain why the essay “Modernity and domesticity. Tensions and contradictions” should be included in the CriticAll Un-Holology, through two reflections that reinforce each other. First, and by way of introduction, the essay focuses on the relationship first in the book in which it was published, where two significant issues could be demonstrated: at the same time it has been established that the scientific community’s interest is on the increase, the structure of the book that Heynen sets out as co-editor has been appointed. Her essay in this first chapter offers a broad and complex approach to domesticity and modernity, as an opening up the scope of investigation concerning this new re-lecture of the term; and its recognition reveals that it is the opportune moment to rethink domesticity in the architecture of the past and its connection with the present. 12

The second argument has served to exemplify the utility of Negotiating Domesticity, through Heynen’s essay, by involving the reader from the beginning on the ambivalence of domesticity, by visualising its paradoxes in modernity. Meaning that Heynen’s essay invites the reader to reconsider domesticity and to blow up all previous material on “what has been.” 13 Thus Heynen managed to provide a consistent basis to help identify the virtues and shortcomings of past and current domesticity, and encourage to follow in the footsteps of the research.

Notes

“There is a mode of vital experience —experience of space and time, of the self and others, of life’s possibilities and perils—that is shared by men and women all over the world today. I will call this body of experience “modernity.” To be modern is to find ourselves in an environment that promises us adventure, power, joy, growth, transformation of ourselves and the world—and, at the same time, that threatens to destroy everything we have, everything we know, everything we are. Modern environments and experiences cut across all boundaries of geography and ethnicity, of class and nature, of religion and ideology. Modernity, sense, modernity can be said to unite all mankind. But if it is a paradoxical unity, a unity of disunity: it pours us all into a manifold, complex, and contradictory whole, of struggle and contradiction, of ambiguity and anguish. To be modern is to be part of a universe in which, as Marx said, “all that is solid melts into air.”

6. Ibid., 84.

8. Ibid., 557.
10. Ibid., 135.
11. Verified from three main data bases: Web of Science, Scopus and Google Academic. For example, according to Web of Science, the book Negotiating Domesticity was cited 186 times, of which 121 correspond to the period of 2014-2018, which demonstrates the increasing interest in the book.
14. What the full text has a length of approximately 10,000 words, the version here has 5000; the main issues are raised and comply with the rules of the length of the text for the CriticAll Un-Holology.


Satoyama (里山) es un término japonés que se aplica a la zona existente entre las colinas al pie de las montañas, el piedemonte, y la llanura cultivable. Literalmente, sato (里) significa tierra arable o gleba y tierra humanizada, y yama (山) significa colina o montaña.

Ukiyo-e (浮世絵), “pinturas del mundo flotante” o “estampa japonesa”, es un género de grabados realizados mediante xilografía o técnica de grabado en madera, producidos en Japón entre los siglos XVII y XX, entre los que se encuentran imágenes paisajísticas, del teatro y de zonas de azar.
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She is associated professor at Escuela Técnica Superior de Madrid, within Juan Herreros’s Unit (2008-), associated professor at the IE, School of Architecture, IE University (2013-), co-leading the Final Thesis Project (2013-2017) and teaching in different Design Studios levels.

“An architect who designs, teaches, investigates and builds is, at some point, bound to blend these fields into a single, creative milieu of methodological, projectual and intellectual interests. I intend to keep running a challenging, multidisciplinary practice through which to address different projects from a wide range of scales and fields. In parallel, I aim to keep developing my academic profile by implementing the very many theoretical findings derived from my PhD research into new teaching methodologies.”