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Prelude

A continuous and intensifying criticism of late modernist architecture during the 1960s – against its built environment as much as against its protagonists and theories – led not only to the phenomena of postmodernism in the decades to follow but also to a crisis of architectural education. This chapter proposes that one of the responses to this observed crisis was the internalizing of critique within architectural education as history and theory. Significantly, both the Eidgenössische Technische Hochschule (ETH – Swiss Federal Institute of Technology) in Zurich and the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT) in Cambridge (Mass.) were among the first architectural schools to institutionalize history and theory: the Institut für Geschichte und Theorie der Architektur (gta – institute for history and theory of architecture) was founded at the ETH by Adolf Max Vogt and Paul Hofer in 1967 while the History Theory Criticism of Art and Architecture (HTC) program at MIT by Stanford Anderson and Henry (“Hank”) A. Millon followed in 1974, after a longer phase of incubation. Yet these events speak of more than just an ostensible rapprochement with architectural history in the education of architects, which had been questioned since the modernist critique of historicist eclecticism. Rather, there was nothing less at stake here than a revision of modernity as a scientific project (and modernism as its formal expression). The institutional shift of research and doctoral programs from art historic programs where they had traditionally been housed to schools of architecture – and with ETH and MIT being two similarly polytechnic-modernist ones – resulted on the one hand from the changed architectural discourses of the time and, on the other hand, accelerated the criticism by internalizing it.
Situation of the 1960s

Postwar modern architecture faced growing critique both from within as well as from outside the discipline. Representative of the former are books such as Architettura della Città by Aldo Rossi and Complexity and Contradiction by Robert Venturi, both published in 1966, followed in 1969 by Meaning in Architecture by Charles Jencks and George Baird, which introduced semiotics to architecture long before Jencks’s epochal collection The Language of Post-Modern Architecture (1977).\(^1\) Also, the proliferation of radical small magazines and periodicals around 1968 speaks volumes about the internal reaction against modernist architecture and pedagogy.\(^2\) Exemplary of the external criticism against postwar operational thinking and technocratic optimism in architecture are The Death and Life of Great American Cities by Jane Jacobs (1961) and – in the German-speaking discourse – Die Unwirtlichkeit unserer Städte by Alexander Mitscherlich (1965).\(^3\)

Of course, multiple trends contributed to the rediscovery of history and theory in schools of architecture: for one, the Society of Architectural Historians (SAH) was founded in 1940 by a group of young US academics (John Coolidge, Walter Greese, Rexford Newcomb, Donald Drew Egbert, etc.) interested in the history of ideas rather than styles. In parallel, Sigfried Giedion – art historian, secretary-general of the CIAM, and bridge between the Swiss ETH and US academic institutions at Cambridge – held the Charles Eliot Norton lectures at the Graduate School of Design at Harvard at the invitation of Walter Gropius, an attempt to provide the (at the time still evolving and expanding) modern movement with (art)historic legacy. As a pupil of Heinrich Wölflin, Giedion took a distinctively Hegelian dialectic approach to architecture as organic expression of the epoch. His lectures were edited and published as Space, Time and Architecture in 1941 and turned within short period into the official historical account of the modern movement (next to Nikolaus Pevsner).\(^4\) In 1956 the German-born art historian Rudolf Wittkower (teacher of both Colin Rowe at the Warburg Institute in London and later of Stanford Anderson in New York) accepted a professorship at the Department of Art History and Archaeology at Columbia University (New York), where he stayed until 1969. There, he spread his formalist comparativist method in interplay with religious-philosophical content, as he explicated in Architectural Principles in the Age of Humanism (1949).\(^5\) This study on the Italian Renaissance (which combines diagrammatic analysis with humanist Neo-Platonism and Neo-Pythagorism) enjoyed wide distribution among architects, including Alison and Peter Smithson, Reyner Banham, and Peter Eisenman.\(^6\) The already mentioned Robert Venturi also took note of it and recycled the ideas and image materials he had gathered during his stay at the American Academy in Rome (1961–62) – which manifested into the aforementioned Complexity and Contradiction – directly for his teaching at the University
of Pennsylvania and then Yale School of Architecture, where he taught, according to his own account, the supposedly first course in architectural “theory” that was unattached to either history or to design studio. Even if this self-assessment does not hold up, his image-saturated teaching style of precedents – fed by his interest in predominantly complex architecture (Mannerism, Baroque, Eclecticism) – and the methodological clues he took from the New Criticism in literature (as his repeated reliance on T.S. Eliot shows) plus the inspiration he drew from Pop Art and pop culture indicate a different type of intellectual engagement with architecture. The Princeton School of Architecture on the other hand, where Venturi had received his education, developed a curricular emphasis on architectural history under Donald Drew Egbert – one of the SAH cofounders (see above) and architect-scholar on medieval art, French Beaux-Arts, and US civilization – and the French-born architect Jean Labatut – who combined Beaux-Arts principles with French modernism of the 1920s and introduced a distinctively French flavored Neo-Thomist phenomenology at Princeton.7 Labatut – a design instructor and long-time director of graduate studies at Princeton – explored both the experiential qualities of architecture as well as its spiritual existential (specifically Catholic) contents, which allowed for an analytic approach to architectural history beyond stylistic categorization, including that of Modernism. Labatut served as advisor for supposedly the first dissertation at an architecture program in the US in 1958: Water and Architecture by Charles W. Moore,8 who in turn would become one of the most important protagonists and educators of a phenomenologically inspired postmodern architecture.

Since its inception as the Federal Institute of Technology in 1855, the ETH Zurich housed a department of architecture, which in the postwar area was committed to a modernist progressivism.9 Very similarly, the School of Architecture and Planning of MIT existed since the founding of the institute in 1865, which makes it the oldest architectural department in the US. And after a long phase of imitating the Parisian École des Beaux-Arts and École Polytechnique, MIT had been a stronghold of modernism since the 1930s and by the 1960s was immersed into a technologically driven optimism of “scientific planning.” Yet at the same time, the architecture departments of both ETH and MIT had brought on board ambitious history faculty, who envisioned a role for their subject beyond the obligatory teaching of survey courses.

Events on the way to HTC: CASE and the 1964 Teachers’ Conference

In 1964, the Conference of Architects for the Study of the Environment (CASE) was founded at the initiative of the young Peter Eisenman, who had just returned to New York City after completing his PhD at the University of Cambridge in
England. By invitation only, CASE convened a small group of young architects, critics, and assistant professors, many of whom soon took on key positions within US academia, such as Kenneth Frampton, Michael Graves, Richard Meier, John Hejduk, Stanford Anderson, Henry Millon, and the English critic Colin Rowe (distinguished already by his senior professor position at Cornell University). Attempts to include Robert Venturi remained fruitless (and may have led to the infamous grey versus white debate in the 1970s). CASE was the breeding ground for both the New York Five (Eisenman, Graves, Gwathmey, Hejduk, Meier) and their exhibition plus catalogue at the Museum of Modern Art New York,10 as well as for the Institute of Architecture and Urban Studies (IAUS) in New York cofounded by Eisenman and Emilio Ambasz, which served as a research, exhibition, publication, and education platform independently from existing universities.11

In addition, CASE figures as an important clearinghouse for ideas: besides the question of the “discipline,” its core and its limits (the notion of autonomy – a quest that keeps some of its original members busy until this day), the group discussed the relationship of theory to practice, especially from the vantage point of an alternative form of architectural education different from modernism. Here the CASE group could rely on some of its members’ experience as “Texas Rangers,” as the generation of young educators came to be known whom Dean Harwell Hamilton Harris had hired at the University of Texas School of Architecture, Austin, between 1951 and ’58. Developing formalist approaches to design, this generation included Colin Rowe, John Hejduk, Robert Slutzky, Werner Seligmann, Lee Hirshe, Bernhard Hoesli (who then joined the ETH Zürich and was instrumental in founding the institute gta), Lee Hodgden, Jerry Wells, John Shaw, and W. Irving Phillips, Jr.12 At CASE the discussions around pedagogy took a slightly different spin towards postgraduate education, because of two architects who had earned PhDs from art history programs: Stanford Anderson (Columbia University) and Peter Eisenman (Trinity College Cambridge, UK). One of the recurring themes was the question of “research in architecture” and how it could contribute to a discipline-specific doctorate (in difference to the existing ones in art history departments). This is significant at a time when none of the architecture programs in America offered a PhD. Eisenman quickly found an answer with the inauguration of the IAUS in 1967 as a platform for “discourse” – as one quickly learned to say – that acted as vessel for research grants, stipends, postgraduate education, donations, etc., and in the early years even design studies for public housing, which dried up quickly because of changes in HUD funding and the looming bankruptcy of New York City. Stanford Anderson took a different approach on “research” and, together with his art-historian colleague Henry Millon, cofounded the HTC program at MIT in 1974 – ten years after he had started his position at MIT in 1964.
In 1964 – the same year as the inaugural CASE meeting – another important conference took place: a teacher seminar on history, theory, criticism held at Cranbrook Academy in Michigan, cohosted by the Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (ACSA) – which represents academic architecture programs in North America – and the American Institute of Architects (AIA), the US national professional organization. Chaired and organized by the aforementioned art historian Hank Millon, it included Reyner Banham (London), Bruno Zevi (Rome), Colin Rowe, and Sibyl Moholy-Nagy as distinguished guest speakers. The participants tried to grapple with the problem of how architectural historians should react to a second and third generation of modernists, who imagine themselves as ahistorical. The convened group of scholars perceived a crisis of architectural history within architectural education across the US, because most schools had adapted some variation of modernist Bauhaus pedagogy and thereby had incorporated its originating defect. In 1919 Bauhaus founding director Walter Gropius had banned history courses from the curriculum of the revolutionary design school, regarding them as instruction in stylistic eclecticism. The long-lasting result, according to the scholars gathered at Cranbrook, was a fundamental split between architectural history and studio instruction, which had led to a non-reflected resurfacing of eclectic tendencies – if not historicism proper – in the late 1950s and early 1960s, for example in the work of Philip Johnson. The answer, according to most speakers at the seminar, would have to be sought in a redirection of architecture (and architectural history) towards “research,” conceived of in the full breadth of both natural and technical sciences as well as the humanities. In retrospect, the discussion set up by Millon seems to have been crafted as a testing ground and as legitimization by his peers in the field for a potential HTC program at his own institution – MIT. Significantly, Millon’s younger colleague, the recently appointed architect and art historian Stanford Anderson, held a programmatic lecture in which he applied Karl Popper’s scientific theory directly to architecture in order to dissect Reyner Banham’s naïve functionalist position on both the methodological and rhetorical levels.

Previous to MIT HTC there has been a pilot for a graduate and PhD program for architectural history established at the College of Architecture at Cornell University, in addition to (and with support of) the existing program in art and architectural history at the Department of Art History at the university’s College of Arts and Sciences. There were other precursors, of course, such as the PhD program in urban planning at MIT – and similarly at other schools of architecture, such as Cornell and Princeton – that had resulted directly from a new institute: the Center of Urban and Regional Studies (1957), which was soon after its inception brought into the Joint Center for Urban Studies in cooperation with the Harvard Graduate School of Design (1959). Yet here research studies focused almost entirely
on mathematical-cybernetic models and first applications of computers. Exemplary of this approach is the doctoral thesis of the Austrian-born, Oxford-educated mathematician and architect Christopher Alexander. Sociology, economy, politics, and humanities were regarded primarily as providers of data, while one of today’s most well-known products, The Image of the City17 authored by Kevin Lynch, with Donald Appleyard, Sydney Brower, Michael Southworth, and György Kepes, the latter of whom had formed a “visual studies” group within the MIT-Harvard Joint Center for Urban Studies, remained rather an exception. It was not until 1967 that Kepes was able to institutionalize the Center for Advanced Visual Studies as an independent unit within MIT.

The first step towards an institutionalization of HTC was the introduction of a bachelor in history theory criticism of art and architecture within the School of Architecture and Planning at MIT in 1966, only two years after the first CASE meeting and the ACSA/AIA teachers’ conference. The new undergraduate program instigated two new assistant professors – Wayne Andersen (1964) and Rosalind Krauss (1967), both art historians – which distinguished the MIT HTC from any other school of architecture in the US at that time. The second step was the draft for a PhD program in “History Theory Criticism of Art, Architecture, and Urban Form” (sic) which was soon changed to “History Theory Criticism of Art, Architecture and Environmental Studies” while the program came to be known by the name “History Theory Criticism of Art and Architecture”) written up by Hank Millon and Stanford Anderson in 1971.18 Yet things were complicated because of the leave of Millon to the American Academy Rome in 1973, followed by his final departure to become the founding director of the Center for Advanced Study of the Visual Arts at the National Gallery Washington, DC, in 1979. Rosalind Krauss moved from MIT to Princeton in 1973, so that the emerging HTC program had to be shouldered by the two remaining young professors Stanford Anderson and Wayne Andersen. In 1973, the new hires of Dolores Hayden (who did not have a PhD) and Donald Preziosi, both on assistant professor level, promised support, as did illustrious visiting faculty, but the program did not fully consolidate until the arrival of David Friedman in 1978.

From the MIT HTC program draft one can draw the following points for the discussion of the institutionalization of critique within academia:

First, the authors critique an “engaged” or “operative” (Tafuri) type of architectural history à la Pevsner, Giedion, Zevi or the aforementioned Banham, which Millon and Anderson view as “partisan” (hence not “scientific” in the sense of historiography). Yet the authors position themselves also against the more traditional and conservative mainstream art historians who (according to Millon and Anderson) concentrate on image, form, and meaning rather than addressing questions of materiality, production processes, technique, and the social, economic, and
urban contexts and conditions architects must face, simply because art historians lack the competency in design and construction of architecture and urbanism necessary to describe and analyze these aspects.

Second, the authors call for a specific architectural writing of history, which, per Millon and Anderson, should not be housed in art history programs but rather developed in direct confrontation with practicing architects, artists, and students within schools of architecture, with the goal of growing a new generation of architectural historians educated as architects (which was already discussed at the first CASE meeting by Eisenman and Anderson).

Third, the authors propose the triad of History Theory Criticism, each provided with specific roles within architectural education: “History” should be “scientific” in the sense of a general historiography, that is, as (semi-)autonomous with regard to architecture, with its own set of questions and findings (here Anderson’s familiarity with the theories of science of Karl Popper and Paul Feyerabend comes into play). “Theory” should address the methods of historical writing, their reflection – especially from a comparative standpoint to other sciences: sociology, anthropology, philosophy, history, and theory of science, via linguistics all the way to informatics and technical sciences – but also include reflections on curricula and pedagogy. “Theory” is per se critical of the logical impossibility of a “universal theory of architecture” (which was directed against modernism and its theoretical underpinnings, such as Giedion’s Hegelian claims of the spirit of time in *Space, Time and Architecture*). Furthermore, “Criticism” was understood by Millon and Anderson as a confrontation with design, which is why both authors repeatedly collaborated with designers and wrote on design methods. Anderson’s engagement with CASE went so far as to result in an MIT design contribution to the MoMA exhibition *The New City: Architecture and Urban Renewal* in 1967, parallel to his long-term project on a speculative prognosis for the social-cultural framework for the future of architectural practice. In addition, “criticism” should act as a systematic testing ground (or “falsification,” in the words of Popper) of the models, methods, and hypotheses developed in architectural history and theory.

Finally, both authors acknowledge the importance of an in-house academic press, which existed independently at MIT since 1962, in order to publish the findings of its research centers and carry the research back into the discipline as well as society at large. They thus helped to establish HTC quickly as a brand name in the academic world and a model taken up by others to this very day.

As a result, the MIT HTC program pursued the *institutionalization* of history, theory, and criticism of architecture in the US in the 1970s and 80s (in parallel, yet independent of the IAUS in New York) as a form of *legitimizing* architecture within a research-intensive technical university such as MIT as well as a form of *intellectualization* of the practice of architecture (based on its own histories and
traditions) through a rigorous, systematic, and interdisciplinary research program. It could draw on support from new institutions and programs (such as the CCA in Montreal, founded in 1979, or the Graham Foundation, founded in 1956), grants, and publications, at just that moment when the perceived failure of late-modern architecture collapsed the revolutionary narration and technological determinism of the modern project, which in itself was the first subject for historical analysis and (re-)contextualization, as exemplified by Anderson’s own dissertation on Peter Behrens, the *Werkbund*, and the early modern movement.\textsuperscript{22}

**MIT HTC and Institut gta at ETH Zurich compared**

The situation at the architecture department at the ETH in Zurich shows many parallels:\textsuperscript{23} despite (or because of?) an academic context characterized by late modernist technological determinism, the founding of the gta in 1967 stands for a return of history and theory within the architecture program, parallel to the expansion of the disciplinary focus on sociology, anthropology, art and literature criticism, philosophy, linguistics, semiotics and structuralism, as well as a renewed interest in popular culture and the vernacular.

Although details remain hidden in the gta archives, the institute gta experienced a shorter incubation period from proposal to establishment in summer 1967 compared to the decade it took to set up HTC at MIT. In close parallel to the reasoning of Millon and Anderson at MIT, the gta started immediately with its own academic outlet – the gta Verlag – as a side product of the forming of the institute in 1967, with the opening address as the first publication of the gta series in 1968.\textsuperscript{24} The new institute claimed to cover areas ranging from art and architectural history, theory, to historic preservation, yet already the opening address of the gta shows latent tensions between the linguistic art historical approach of Adolf Max Vogt and the archeological historical building research represented by Paul Hofer.\textsuperscript{25} Vogt provocingly argues for texts, images, and ideas stronger than stone – providing as examples the Pythagorean theory of a harmonious order of the cosmos reaching from early high cultures all the way to Le Corbusier’s *Modulor*, the example of Abbé Laugier and the notion of the “primitive rustic hut” for the development of neo-classicism, and the example of Serlio’s print of Bramante’s unrealized regular design for the cupola of St. Pietro in Vaticano echoing in Wren’s St. Paul’s Cathedral, in Boullée’s “église métropolitaine,” and even in the redesign of the US Capitol in Washington, DC, in the mid-nineteenth century.\textsuperscript{26} Vogt continues this historic trajectory of texts and images prevailing over the material fact of “stones” into the 20\textsuperscript{th} century and identifies both the CIAM and Sigfried Giedion’s *Space, Time and Architecture* as potential lines for research: he imagines an analysis
of the reception between “theory” (here understood as the “fundamental convictions” of the historian Giedion,\textsuperscript{27} that is, as a form of ideology) and “practice” (here understood as the work of the modernist masters described by Giedion as well as the influence of the latter’s book on the second and third generation of modern architects). In other words, with his emphasis on “reception” and “effect,” Vogt envisions a historization of the modern movement similar to Anderson at MIT, yet with the difference that he still seems to embrace Giedion’s “operative” history which Anderson and Millon (and Tafuri) had already criticized and rejected. Hofer, on the other hand, takes the materiality of stone literally and provides an analysis of the techniques of surface treatment of medieval stonemasons in order to date the excavated Romanesque castle in Bern.\textsuperscript{28} Even if Hofer positions himself closer to the notion of “\textit{Baugeschichte}” (building history) of the German polytechnic tradition, which is informed by archaeology and natural and building sciences and treats the existing structure as material witness and primary source, the institute gta chose the opposing model of “\textit{Architekturgeschichte}” (architectural history) infused by art historical methods, which used to be primarily text based (archive) and image-centric (drawing, photo). Accordingly, preferred hires up to this day at the ETH gta have been art historians rather than architect-scholars, not to speak of the new type of researchers that Millon and Anderson sketched out in the MIT HTC draft during the same period. No wonder that the docent for built heritage preservation, Albert Knoepfli, who was originally integrated into the gta in 1967, went on to found his own institute (\textit{Institut Denkmalpflege}) at the ETH as soon as he was promoted to full professor status at the department of architecture in 1972. The result of this positioning of the gta firmly on the side of authored “architecture” (rather than “building” and its vernacular, anonymous, and archeological undertones) and on that of art historian methods (form, text, image) has brought a deepening division between practical conservation and building research (with its strong apparatus of natural sciences) on the one side and the institute gta on the other. From its initiation, the institute gta focused on monographic methods, archival research, studies of reception, influences, and discourses – that is, primarily on questions of communication, meaning, and interpretation, which also drove the postmodern movement as critique of the primarily technological, functional, and abstract references of late-modern architecture. On the other end of the spectrum, the institute gta separated history and theory from studio instruction (note the absence of “criticism” in its name!) by prioritizing the educational formats of slide lecture and seminar. In comparison, the MIT HTC proposes an alternative approach – the direct confrontation and involvement with design (even if this has proven to be more complicated in the real existing MIT School of Architecture than in the HTC draft program, as the author noticed during his visiting position at HTC in 2010). Yet one does not even have to go as far as Cambridge, MA, to
find that alternative setups would have been possible: in the same year 1967 that saw the founding of the institute gta, Jürgen Joedicke at the Technische Hochschule Stuttgart (today University of Stuttgart), another polytechnic institution similar to ETH and MIT, founded the “Institut Grundlagen der modernen Architektur” (IGMA – the Institute for the Principles of Modern Architecture), which combined historical research (predominantly on the modern movement) with a critique of late modern tendencies and direct involvement in design studios, such as courses in design methodology – clearly in difference to the ETH at Zurich. And since there are various connections between Joedicke and the ETH (via his publications, specifically the CIAM as well as via the Swiss journal *Bauen + Wohnen* where Joedicke served as editor in the 1960s), he must be regarded as part of the network of protagonists rethinking architectural education and pioneering history, theory, and criticism in the 1960s and 1970s in parallel to Anderson and Millon at MIT or Vogt and Hofer et cetera at ETH.

The institute gta also includes an exhibition platform (gta Ausstellungen) and an archive, which received upon inauguration the documents of Gottfried Semper from the ETH library as a first gift, and which has been collecting architects’ estates and holds the CIAM papers. In parallel MIT HTC chose a slightly different institutional setup, since the MIT Library Special Collections and the Rotch Architecture Library keep archives and estates and yet are not directly part of HTC. Similarly, MIT set up its own exhibition program at Hayden Gallery (since 1948/50, today MIT List Visual Art Center) that worked in close connection with Kepes’s aforementioned CAVS (since 1967) and with MIT Media Lab (since the 1980s) but has its own director and curator(s) independently from the HTC program.

*(Instead of a) conclusion: The end of theory?*

During the 1960s both the practice and the pedagogy of late modern architecture came into crisis. Once the superstructure of the profession came to be seen as questionable, architecture learned to build a new ideological project out of the very criticism that it encountered: rather than technological optimization or planning for a society to come, the vector of intellectual speculation turned towards history, sociology, philosophy, anthropology, linguistics, feminism, cultural studies, and other humanities (both of the discipline itself as well as the society at large). Significantly, this process of internalization can be tracked with the institutionalization of history and theory (and criticism) within leading schools of architecture, especially those of polytechnic tradition deeply immersed in the technological positivist agenda of that period (MIT, ETH, TH Stuttgart). The combination of the criticism against the modern project, which demanded reconsideration and historization (that is, to be
framed as something of the past to be studied), as well as the notion of “research” as common goal at these types of technical universities opened paths towards new programs in history and theory (and criticism) within schools of architecture. Other impulses came from the institutionalization of criticism on the fringes of academia, such as the IAUS in New York, or organizations such as CCA Montreal and DAM Frankfurt. These initiatives fundamentally changed the way in which architecture is conceived, discussed, and written about, but also how it is taught, and eventually how it is practiced.

Today, some fifty years later, this project of internalized critique has itself come under scrutiny. The “long summer of theory” – as the period from the 1960s to the ’90s has been dubbed – led to a quick come and go of fashionable “theories,” which after the fall of the Iron Curtain gave way to a pragmatic design engagement around the newly opened global marketplace for architecture that seemed too busy for elaborate readings before the legitimizing role of history and theory shifted over to technology. Accelerated (but not caused) by the hardening grip of the licensing and accreditation bodies (NAAB/AIA in the US, RIBA in UK, the Bologna bachelor and master system in the EU), architectural education has moved towards emphasizing sets of skills and tools, especially in digital applications and representation, in sustainable and resilient benchmarks and codes, as well as in material science and fabrication. In parallel, a historicization of the 1960s and the emerging postmodern moment, and with it, the “birth” of architectural theory and history, began. The archival interest in the period of the 1960s to 80s recalls the historicization of the modern movement by the protagonists of this very phase (e.g. Anderson on Behrens, Joedicke on Häring, Vogt on CIAM, etc.). Yet the question remains: has the institutionalization of criticism in the form of history and theory within architectural education come full circle and are we experiencing another technological driven phase of neo-modernity (or “reflexive modernity” or “liquid modernity” to use the phrases of Beck or Bauman respectively)? Or are we on our way towards a very different cultural frame, in which the historicization of the previous present indicates a transition to something yet unknown?

Notes


16. Christopher Alexander, Notes on the Synthesis of Form (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1964). This PhD was awarded by the Harvard Graduate School of Arts and Sciences; the Harvard GSD did not start its own PhD program in architecture before 1987.


21. A precursor, the Technology Press, existed since 1932 in cooperation with the commercial publishing house John Wiley & Sons.


24. Jakob Burckhardt, Adolf Max Vogt, and Paul Hofer, *Institut für Geschichte und Theorie der Architektur an der ETH – Reden und Vortrag zur Eröffnung, 23.6.1967* (=Schriftenreihe des Instituts für Geschichte und Theorie der Architektur an der Eidgenössischen Technischen Hochschule Zürich, Band 1), (Basel, Stuttgart: Birkhäuser, 1968); the gta Verlag started as cooperation with commercial publishers (Birkhäuser Basel/Stuttgart; Ammann Bern; Ernst & Sohn Berlin), before it became completely independent in the 1990s.

25. Both Adolf Max Vogt (PhD in art history at the University of Zurich) and Paul Hofer (PhD in art history at the University of Bern) try to set themselves apart from the Basel tradition of stylistic art history as represented by Jacob Burckhardt and Heinrich Wölfflin, see here for example the obituary for Wölfflin by Paul Hofer, “Heinrich Wölfflins Gegenwart,” *Freistudentische Zeitschrift* 27, no. 5 (November 1945), where Hofer describes Wölfflin as a giant of art history – but of the pre-WWI area – whose belief in organic form of the classic periods his generation would look upon with awe and bewilderment.


30. A discussion of Jürgen Joedicke and the institutional history of the IGMA in Stuttgart goes beyond the scope of this paper.


32. Today often compiled into readers and anthologies, that is, historicized and turned into a subject for historical analysis itself, like this text and the conference it was written for.
