docomomo International is a non-profit organization dedicated to the documentation and conservation of buildings, sites and neighborhoods of the modern movement. It aims at:

• Bringing the significance of the architecture of the modern movement to the attention of the public, the public authorities, the professionals and the educational community.
• Identifying and promoting the surveying of the modern movement’s works.
• Fostering and disseminating the development of appropriate techniques and methods of conservation.
• Opposing destruction and disfigurement of significant works.
• Gathering funds for documentation and conservation.
• Exploring and developing knowledge of the modern movement.

docomomo International wishes to extend its field of actions to new territories, establish new partnerships with institutions, organizations and NGOs active in the area of modern architecture, develop and publish the international register, and enlarge the scope of its activities in the realm of research, documentation and education.
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Editorial

Designing Modern Life
The argument of this docomomo Journal stands for interior design identified as a key conservation issue for modern living. docomomo acknowledges the major relevance of reflecting on the Modern Movement heritage, focusing on one of the most fragile conservation issues: modern interior space namely on modern furniture and product design questions.

The aim is to contribute for the discussion that relates modern heritage and interior space, common daily life and musealization of Modern Interior Spaces, gathered underneath a global strategy, to better understand and preserve these delicate monuments. In fact, the interior space with all devices and furniture pieces is frequently not appreciated as an essential matter in safeguard interventions. That’s why 2012 docomomo Journals are devoted to interior design and furniture, discussing preservation strategies and critical reflexions.

Ranging from restoration process research and know-how, new modern materials and techniques are discussed facing up to new conservation process and innovative rehabilitation solutions, as well. One knows that Modern spatiality must require furniture conceived under a unitary design concept, which implies today to identify every detail with the aim of a reconstruction process, where research on documentation is one of the success keys.

This year of 2012, when docomomo major Conference is hosted at the Espoo Cultural Center, the stimulus of this city center settlement in connection to Otaniemi University Campus is the starting point that justifies going deeper in the relation that connects form and function, esthetics and ethics. In fact, as Gropius stated, the “design from the cup of coffee to the urban plan” ability is the motto challenge for the 12th docomomo International Conference simultaneously with Helsinki being the World Design Capital 2012 dealing with all disciplinary aspects.

Finally, this issue wishes to pay tribute to the Finnish culture and its original contribution to Design. Indeed, through the conception of organic forms and the use of natural materials, a different path has been explored answering to sensorial and tactile comfort. Following the global design idea, this theme is the result of a challenge which is related to the Finnish approach to Modern Movement architecture, namely to an organic character that privileges comfort and economy, beauty and utility, simplicity and synthesis; improving regional roots in order to fulfill the sense of the place.

I wish to thank Bárbara Coutinho who acted as guest editor of this “Designing Modern Life” Dossier. Due to her knowledge and know-how acquired within a transversal framework as an art historian, researcher, curator and MUDE director, together with the knowledge shared by a range of authors, in connection with pioneer practical investigation on the subject carried out by restorers and researchers, it is possible to extend this debate over the reflection on the creation itself, the tools created by Modern Movement architects and designers to answer to efficiency and economy, improving comfort and beauty in daily life.

Ana Tostões, Chair of docomomo International
Location Map

1. Espoo Cultural Centre
   Arto Sipinen
   1989

2. Weilin&Göös Printing Plant – WeeGee
   Aarno Ruusuvuori
   1964-1974

3. Tapiola School
   Jorma Järvi
   1959-1960

4. Tapiola Baths
   Aarne Ervi
   1965

5. Kontionkenttä Park
   Jusi Jännès
   1959-1961

6. Technical University
   Alvar Aalto
   1964

7. Dipoli Kongressikeskus
   Reima & Raili Pietilä
   1961-1966

8. Otaniemi Chapel
   Heikki & Kaija Siren
   1957

9. Housing Buildings
   Alvar Aalto
   1962-1967

10. Studio in Munkkiniemi
    Alvar Aalto
    1956

11. Töölö Rowing Stadium
    Hilding Ekelund & Alpo Lippa
    1940

12. Olympic Stadium
    Yrjö Lindegren & Toivo Jäntti
    1940-1952

13. House of Culture
    Alvar Aalto
    1955-1958

14. City Theatre
    Timo Penttilä
    1959-67

15. Finlandia Hall
    Alvar Aalto
    1967-1971

16. Temppeliaukio Church
    Timo & Tuomo Suomalainen
    1969

17. Portania
    Aarne Ervi
    1957

18. Rautatalo
    Alvar Aalto
    1951-55

19. Academic Bookshop
    Alvar Aalto
    1962

National Pensions Institute
   Alvar Aalto
   1952
Pääkaupunkiseutu
Helsinki Metropolitan Area
Why Preserve Modern Now?  

By Bárbara Coutinho

Coming to design in a natural development from architectural practice, Le Corbusier considered design not as a sum or addition to architecture. Its existence decisively constructed and modulated interior space, as light and shadows, materials or planes. From that belief, he quests the perfect and ideal form that asserts itself as a model of universal validity, arriving at three different furniture types: type–needs, type–furniture and human–limb objects. Consequently, together with Charlotte Perriand and Pierre Jeanneret, in 1928 he drew the prototype of the Grand Confort armchair, presented the following year at the Salon d’Automne in Paris. In the photomontage published in L’Architecture Vivante (Spring, 1930), the armchair is in a foremost position, occupying the foreground, isolated in a no gravity and transparent space, where Charlotte Perriand reclines on the famous LC4 chaise longue. Grand Confort is the mirror of a decade that takes the chair as a space of experimentation and the tubular steel as the main material of research. Icon of the Esprit Nouveau, its also conveys a new conception of space, time and object, revealing the rationalist aesthetic that characterized the first decades of the 20th century. Eighty years later, like many other examples of Modern design, its copies and reproductions get multiplied, although since 1964 Italian Cassina has the exclusive worldwide rights to manufacture it, being nowadays the only company authorized by Fondation Le Corbusier.

As from 1980, the heirs of the Anti–Design and Radical Design movements further questioned the Modern definition of design and its heritage, proclaiming the death of functionalism and debating the object itself, its utility, aestheticization, cultural heritage, image and value, relation with economy system and language. This criticism is evident, for instance, in Mies Lounge Chair of the Archizoom Associati. With similar radicalism, almost ten years later, in 1978, Alessandro Mendini camouflaged Marcel Breuer’s Wassily chair and introduced a religious touch to Gerrit Rietveld’s Zig–zag chair, both symbols of Modern ideology that were reedited at the time. More recently, there are several interpretations of Modern chairs. Particularly from Le Corbusier’s Grand Confort we can find three examples of three authors: “Grand Confort/Comfort Sans, the Corbu Dommage” (1980) by Stefan Zwicky; “Le Corbusier Chair” (1994) by Jorge Pardo; and “Naked Confort–Corrupted Classics Collection” (2003–2004) by John Angelo Benson.

On the border between art and design, Benson upholds the tubular chrome steel structure and the original cubic shape, replacing leather components with an unusual material, straw. With humour, Benson seems to undermine the architectural thinking of Le Corbusier, but paradoxically when he undresses the chair he emphasizes its skeleton and structure in a de–construction process that leads us to the rethinking of the main Modern principles. Although it may be seen as an iconoclast gesture, Naked Confort highlights the value of the original piece by reinterpreting it. In his “Corrupted Classics Collection” Benson also works with the Red-Blue chair by Gerrit Rietveld and the Barcelona chair by Mies van der Rohe and Lilly Reich to create “Red and Blue, but clear” and “Mies Lobby Trap”. The choice is categorically incisive because he picks from our collective memory three classics of Modern design which are universally recognized. Or we know the original works or we will not be able to interpret Benson’s pieces. With that he makes us more aware of the timeliness of these icons, especially when our material culture has transformed them into appealing images widely reproduced and consumed, with a series of copies, reproductions and re–editions distancing themselves from the Modern original. Ultimately, the result is a reflection on our own memory of the Modern, its significance for society, heritage and cultural importance.

Moreover, we are going through a profound transformation in our global society, standing by a new economic paradigm, growing technological complexity and renewed social demands. Cities are changing, and so are we. The way we live, work and inhabit, but also learn, communicate, and move, shifted in the last years. The increasing use of new technologies or new materials have expanded the possibilities of production and conservation, while at the same time they have also provoked profound changes in design philosophy and methodology. In a wide range of disciplines, the research that has been carried out into the physical behaviour of materials has led to major reinventions in each field, allowing more complex, organic or aerodynamic solutions. When the
borders between design, art and crafts are broken down, younger generations seek for alternative manufacturing processes, return to traditional handcraft techniques and investigate on new forms of recycling. Countless projects show a more widely ethical consciousness and a social responsibility. The aim is to develop products, systems and services with a longer life cycle.

In this context, studying, understanding, preserving and reinterpreting Modern heritage gains a wider importance. To preserve Modern architecture, interior designs and furnishings means necessarily to rehabilitate or reuse, turning them effectively alive. But it also implies to raise public awareness of the cultural value of this heritage and to make a profound study of the ideology and context that gave rise to them. Therefore, we need to reflect on its contemporaneity and the way it can contribute to a more sustainable and responsible development. To preserve Modern heritage is a highly relevant theme due to its significance in our times but also due to a number of conceptual and technical challenges. It’s important to discuss the method and extension of each intervention, the material, formal or ideological authenticity regarding the original program, durability, and foresee future needs. But it is also important to value the level of interference, the basis from which it is made and the consequences of new performances or functions. Therefore, it demands a multi–faceted approach. As a result, the articles gathered in this Journal aim to address the multiple ways in which Modernism has been claimed and to present different and complementary perspectives of preservation, highlighting recent examples and successful case studies. Emphasizing the holistic character of the Modern

Figure 1. John Angelo Benson. Naked Confort (2003). Hay, Petit Confort (LC2) frame produced by Cassina. 67h x 76w x 70d cm
Movement and its goal to design Modern life in a gesamtkunstwerk spirit with housing as the central theme of study and innovation, two essays explore the recently restored Tugendhat House by Mies van der Rohe and an another article analyzes the coherence and unity of Charles and Ray Eames’ work and thought. Monika Wagner shows how the Tugendhat House is a perfect metaphor of Mies’ purist classicism, architectural space and living concept, explaining how materials, surfaces, furniture, light and nature decisively contribute in lightness, unity and tactility. Miroslav Ambroz emphasizes how Tugendhat is an expression of gesamtkunstwerk with every detail [textiles, upholstery, covering material, colors] subordinated to the whole. Further on, he focuses on the reconstruction process to describe the importance of an initial research and documentation for the subsequent production of authentic replica furniture that respect the original pieces. Regarding Charles and Ray Eames, Kyle Normadin addresses the way they articulate the principles of Modernism with wartime technology to design a Modern living in a post-war era. The article also underlines the importance of Case Study House nº 8 as a mirror of a global living space and the house conservation project for a better understanding of their work and significance.

Looking at the legacy of ethics and Modern philosophy, Klaus Klemp concentrates on the “Ten design principles” of Dieter Rams and on his reflection about good design, specially his ideas of simplicity, innovation, technology, economy, intelligibility and utility. The result is the reinforcement of Dieter Rams’ importance for the praxis and ethics of nowadays design.

Although the history of the Modern movement continues to stress it as a result of western culture, spread afterwards from Europe to the rest of the world, we talk more and more of peripheral Modernities. Louise Noelle speaks about furniture and interior designer Clara Porset, putting in evidence the way she linked Modernity with local Mexican tradition and crafts in her interior designs. On the other hand, Marc Dubois focuses on Belgian architect Gaston Eysselinck, mainly in his masterpiece, the Post Office building in Ostend, stressing the reasons why this building continues to be incorrectly forgotten.

Jurjen Creman and Otakar Mácel focus more directly on Modern furniture and its relation with Modern architecture. While Creman presents the restoration process of the Zig-zag chair by Gerrit Rietveld to explain how the new materials and new techniques used by Modern architects requires today new conservation solutions, Mácel concentrates on the complementarity between design and architecture. He focuses on the steel tube furniture and the cantilever chairs and highlights their real contribution to the successful creation of Modern spatiality, specially its geometric, lightness and abstract character.

This Journal especially emphasizes the role of Finnish Modern design through the figure of Alvar Aalto and the way he represents a different path in the Modern movement, more organic, preferring to bend wood and seeking cozy and comfortable environments with as much natural light as possible. Pekka Korvenmaa writes an article about the architect’s Modernity, thought and attitude, while Mia Hipel focuses on the importance of Artek, created in 1935. The author bears witness of the importance of the company in the production, distribution and marketing of Aalto’s pieces, and also of the worldwide promotion of Scandinavian design, spreading its simplicity, elegance, comfort, warmth and humanism. Cristian Suau puts the emphasis in the ephemeral architecture of exposition pavilions, discussing the significance of rebuilt this spaces and explaining in detail the philosophy and materiality of Aalto’s Metsapaviljonski.

Notes
1. The title was inspired by Why Design Now? – National Design Triennial at 2010 in Cooper-Hewitt, National Design Museum where the main question was to know how design could help solving the problems of our society.
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Figure 2. Le Corbusier Chair, 1994, by Jorge Pardo
Figure 3. “Grand Confort/Comfort Sans, the Corbu Dommage”, 1980, by Stefan Zwicky.
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What “Rights” for 20th Century Monuments?
A troublesome topic for a Meeting at the Accademia di Architettura in Mendrisio

By Roberta Grignolo docomomo Switzerland, vice chair

The final round table of the international study days “Diritto e salvaguardia dell’architettura del XX secolo / Law and the Preservation of 20th Century Architecture”, June 18-19, 2012. From left to right: Bruno Reichlin, Ana Tostões, Roberta Grignolo, Marco Borghi

The protection of 20th century architecture has by now become a fully-fledged part of the discipline of preservation, and even the heritage of the second post-war period is increasingly recognised as worthy of conservation. Nonetheless, in practice, this cultural awareness still clashes with the difficulties attached to adapting buildings to present day regulations. Even when intervening on buildings that are officially recognized as “monuments”, from one country to another and even from one region to another in the same country, there is great variety in how dispensations from applicable regulations are allowed.

This is what led to the idea of a supranational forum for a comparison of customs and practices associated with the “rights of monuments”. The International Study Days on “Law and the preservation of 20th century architecture”, organised by Roberta Grignolo and Bruno Reichlin, were held at the Accademia di Architettura in Mendrisio (Università della Svizzera Italiana), on June 18 and 19, 2012 as part of the interfaculty research project “Critical Encyclopaedia for the Restoration and Reuse of 20th Century Architecture”.

The intent of the meeting organisers was to gather around a table not only architects and engineers engaged in 20th century preservation (familiar participants in 20th century heritage meetings), but legal experts and lawyers too, specialised technical practitioners, as well as representatives of architects and of national and international preservation institutions.

As the preparatory discussions revealed, the topic of the meeting immediately aroused great interest because of its focus on “issues no one wants to deal with”. The top echelons of docomomo International and the Legal Office of the Swiss Society of Engineers and Architects (SAI) chose to sponsor the initiative and take an active part in the organisation of the conference.

One might rightly question as to whether, in dealing with the issue of how law and heritage are related, it was appropriate to limit the scope of the debate to 20th century monuments alone.

We believe that, in discussing laws, standards and regulations, there is no substantial difference in how they are applied to 20th century architectural heritage as opposed to the heritage of previous centuries.

Legal provisions applicable to monuments are applied equally to all heritage buildings, regardless of their period. But this, possibly, is one of the most sensitive issues.

The heritage of the 20th century exhibits specific features that cannot be disregarded when authorities require that compliance measures be applied.

Firstly, compared to architecture from previous centuries, 20th century buildings present greater complexity in many areas. Suffice it to think of high-rise buildings, of large residential complexes (e.g. Le Corbusier’s Unités d’Habitation), of the variety of building types that modern civilisation has developed to accommodate large numbers of people or public flows (entertainment facilities like theatres or stadiums, and infrastructure hubs like airports and railway stations). In addition, some of the intrinsic features of recent architecture also require consideration: the spatial complexity, one of the drivers in 20th century architectural research (think of the spatial continuity which marks many 30s and 50s masterpieces), and the poor thermal inertia of 20th century envelopes, which is an issue in improving energy efficiency.

A second good reason for focusing on the last century when debating the issue of how law and heritage are related, is the fact that, compared to the revered architecture of previous centuries, it is far more difficult to defend recent architectural works against the demands of compliance authorities in fields like safety, seismic risk, etc.

It should be added that the temporal, formal and technical proximity of the last century’s heritage to contemporary architecture, frequently induces compliance authorities to expect that 20th century buildings be brought up to the standards applied to new buildings (this is especially true with respect to energy efficiency and systems).

There are different levels at which legal issues can affect interventions on existing buildings, and this was taken into account by the structure of the meeting.

The first level concerns the types of instruments available to protect and list heritage buildings.

Protection exists in differing degrees according to the country being considered (in the UK buildings can be listed “grade I”, “grade II*” or “grade II”; in France one finds “bâTIMENTS CLASSÉS” or “inscrits”; etc.) and the efficacy of listing provisions also varies from country to country (in France, protection covers building exteriors, interiors and proximal surroundings; in the Netherlands and Norway protection only applies to building exteriors, unless otherwise specified in the listing document; in the UK instead, listing applies to the whole building and all its contents at the time the listing becomes effective, regardless of actual or alleged authentic-
The above differences reveal the diversity of national cultures where preservation is concerned, and at the same time they also influence national heritage culture.

The duration of protection may also vary: in some American states, officially recognized monuments enjoy protection in perpetuity, while in many European countries listed buildings may, in some cases, be “de-listed” or “de-classified”, without any cultural explanation.

Moreover, heritage legislation may also have economic consequences with respect to eligibility for preservation work financing and funding, as well as tax facilitations or incentives, etc.

The meeting also addressed a further instrument for the protection of 20th century heritage: authors’ rights. This set of laws was created to protect works produced by human creativity from subsequent changes, and it can be enforced for the preservation of outstanding 20th century architectural work. A point in case is the Flaminio stadium in Rome, designed by Pier Luigi Nervi between 1956 and 1958. Extensive restructuring work had been envisaged to turn it into the city’s main rugby stadium. Action taken by the engineer-author’s heirs led to a confrontation between the relevant authorities and the transformation project was abandoned.

In other cases, however, the issue of authors’ rights may prove to be double edged. The Olympic stadium in Munich, designed for the 1972 Olympics by Günter Behnisch was listed in 1998. When the municipality and the managing company decided to erect new buildings within the original complex, Behnisch asserted his author’s rights to avoid having someone else modify the complex. However, the alternative project he submitted envisaged such extensive alterations that the local heritage authorities had to step in to avoid disruptions of the original complex.

The above issues are some examples of the topics discussed during the first session of the meeting.

Regulatory compliance is another level at which legal issues may affect interventions on existing buildings, and this was the focus of the discussion for the remaining sessions of the study days.

In intervening on a heritage building, architects must ensure that the building complies with current planning regulations and in particular with provisions relating to fire safety, the elimination of architectural barriers, public safety, the safety of staff and maintenance personnel, seismic safety, and lastly sustainability and energy efficiency.

In cases of legally recognised “monuments”, applications can be presented to obtain dispensations. These are equivalent safety solutions which have a lower impact on a building that is considered to be of public interest. The term dispensation, however, often seems to imply an attempt to find loopholes to avoid problems, and this is why one often speaks of the conflict between cultural and safety interests when heritage is at stake. It actually is more a matter of different facets of one and the same issue: the overall public interest.

Furthermore, as already stated, obtaining dispensations varies greatly from one country to another and even within the same country. Additionally, compliance or habitability certification authorities appear to enjoy varying degrees of freedom: in some cases a dialogue-negotiation process is possible (or even required) between the architects and the relevant authorities, in other cases such dialogue is practically non-existent.

To provide the audience with a better understanding of the legal notions involved, several experts discussed the issues of dispensation and equivalent safety, illustrating how they are implemented and providing replies to questions such as: Can one refer to common sense (the kitchen recipe notion of “as required” or “quanto basta”) in adapting buildings to existing regulations? In the case of buildings for which the probability of certain types of accident is minimal (e.g. a fire breaking out where there is nothing combustible), how can one require that the principle of proportionality be applied to the actual risk and to the required compliance interventions?

Another key issue is accident liability: in most legal systems it lies with the owner. In the event of the owner being a private citizen, it will not be in his best interest to seek dispensations from existing rules and regulations, whereas the paradox of owners being less willing than compliance authorities, to accept equivalent safety solutions.

Following the overview of theoretical issues and key legal notions during the first day of the meeting, the second day focused entirely on practice.

Experts and technical practitioners from several countries presented their national rules and regulations for fire safety, accessibility, seismic safety, securing hazardous materials and compliance with energy standards. The goal of the session was to discover common practices and their underlying principles, from which generalisations can be more easily drawn.

During the last session the floor was handed over to practitioners: architects from a variety of countries, each with his or her extensive experience in the field of recent heritage. They presented cases of heritage interventions in which regulations played an important role in defining the solutions that were then implemented. The cases included, among others: Wilhelm Marinus Dudok’s Collège Néerlandais (1927) in the Cité Universitaire in Paris, where fire compliance in the auditorium was achieved by expanding the compartmentalisation area to a point in which the fire doors could not disrupt the original material elements and spatial perception; Alvar Aalto’s House of Culture in Helsinki (1955-58), where the original wooden fire doors were preserved and merely coated with intumescent paint; Vantaa City Hall (1957), where the parapets were restored to their original state—despite their non-compliance—thanks to the argument that the building is only used during the day and that it is not attended by children; Scharoun’s Geschwister-Scholl-Gesamtschule in Lünen (1956-62), where a fragmentation of the interior space of the hall, with its almost urban features, was avoided by compartmentalising only the upper part of the staircases to the first floor; Haefelt, Moser and Steiger’s Kongresshaus in Zurich (1936-39), where the spatial continuity between areas located on different levels still remains an unresolved fire safety issue.

The contributions presented during the study days testify to the great diversity of heritage provisions and approaches from one country to another. The meetings are in no way intended to provide ready recipes for regulatory compliance procedures, nonetheless, it was clear to all meeting attendees that the greater the number of regulatory compliance cases one can refer to, the more easily one can find alternatives for prescribed solutions by ensuring equivalent safety levels. An anecdotal collection of recent heritage restoration and reuse cases, where issues related to protection, listing, and compliance requirements (in the areas of personal safety, fire safety, accessibility, energy efficiency, etc.) have been addressed and solved in ingenious ways, can become a useful instrument for architects involved in this field, allowing them to develop arguments and find solutions that local authorities can approve.

For these same reasons, we chose the supra-national level to discuss relevant legislation and regulations for architectural heritage interventions. Consequently, the objective of the final discussion was to gather arguments, stimuli, positions and best practices so as to then make them available to international protection associations like docomomo International.

The meeting contributions and the closing discussion made it clear that one of the key issues is the extraordinary proliferation of regulations from the second half of the 19th century onwards: this subverted the previous interrelation between so-called “technical standards” and the Constitution. Architecture was originally governed by “standard practice”, but gradually this has given way to a proliferation of technical regulations that have
Colonised fundamental constitutional rights, like the preservation of cultural heritage. Hence, despite the principle of constitutional primacy, technical standards—which are basically derived from a practice-based induction approach—have gradually gained the upper hand and are now applied with a literal and paralysing attitude on the part of authorities or experts who are terrified by civil and criminal liability issues.

One way out of this impasse would be to require "constitutionality control or opinion", whereby architects, with the support of a legal expert, could challenge a compliance request from a relevant authority, were it to be deemed contrary to the "rights of the monument". Were such a proposal to take foot, it would restore the correct priorities of legal provisions, conferring primacy to constitutional principles and placing practice based regulations at a lower level.

The meeting also highlighted how present-day architects, whose practice is in the field of 20th century heritage, bear the full burden of having to prove the quality features of the monument they are dealing with, often without having a specific institutional or regulatory framework. Over the coming years heritage interventions—recent heritage especially—are bound to acquire increasing weight when compared to new building. To avoid approaching this substantial stock of heritage as if it were always an exception to the rule, it would be in the interests of architects’ associations to create a legal framework or specific instruments—ad hoc regulations, committees of experts, specialised surveyors, etc.—to strengthen and assist this expanding sector.

In today’s financial and environmental situation, the protection of recent architecture has ethical as well as aesthetic implications. A new institutional framework could be applied to listed buildings first, and then to architectural work where value has been recognised by historiography, but not yet by institutions.

It is to be hoped that, on the basis of different national experiences and by developing ad hoc policies and legal instruments, it may become possible to guide interventions on existing buildings toward a more realistic approach, without penalising the use and reuse of existing resources.

Jointly with all the participants in the meeting, the organisers hope that national and international bodies concerned with the protection of recent heritage will make use of the proposals that have issued from the study days and take them to a higher level of discussion. Were they to be conveyed to the relevant policy makers, they could become valuable material to support the development of more consistent national and international strategies which, at last, would assure fitting consideration for the "rights of 20th century architectural heritage".

Roberta Grignolo
Assistant professor of restoration and reuse of 20th century architecture at the Accademia di architettura in Mendrisio (Università della Svizzera Italiana). She is co-leader, together with professor Franz Graf, of the Swiss interfaculty research project titled “Critical Encyclopaedia for Restoration and Reuse of 20th Century Architecture”, funded by the Swiss University Conference. / roberta.grignolo@usi.ch
The Maslennikov factory canteen, also known as the Fabrika Kukhnya or Factory Kitchen, was a canteen producing meals on an industrial scale, a vital typology for the early Soviet urbanism. By providing inexpensive and healthy food, they aimed to free people, especially women, from ‘domestic slavery’ and to give them more time for education and other forms of personal development, and, at the same time, to foster the spirit of collectivism. Every new residential area was supposed to have a factory-kitchen, and they were usually prominently placed and have expressive architecture. Sometimes they were municipal, and sometimes they belonged to a factory.

Factory Kitchen in Samara belonged to the Maslennikov Factory. The building is absolutely unique in its plan in the shape of a hummer-and-cycle, symbol of the union of the working people. The ‘hummer’ held the kitchen and storage, and the ‘cycle’ was occupied by dinner-halls. The architect, Ekaterina Maksimova, was a VKHUTEMAS graduate and one of the very few women architects of the time.

The building underwent a number of transformations, but still retains its characteristic shape and can be restored. More than once it was under the threat of demolition, and now its future is unclear. Local activists for many years led a campaign to preserve the factory-kitchen building. Among their supporters are the Union of Architects of Russia, the State Museum of Architecture (MUAR), and well-known experts. The site was visited by delegations of SAVE Europe’s Heritage and Moscow Architecture Preservation Society (MAPS); the visit resulted in publications in the international press and petitions to save the building. It was spared the demolition, but still is not protected by the preservation law, and its condition continues to deteriorate. Official application by a certified expert stating that the building should be listed as a cultural heritage site was ignored by the Samara Ministry of Culture. Today, the owner of the buildings intends to demolish it and built a multistory commercial centre on its place.

Vladimir Shukhov, docomomo Russia Chair
Anna Bronovitskaya, docomomo Russia Secretary General
docomomo International signed the petition and wrote letters to the Governor of Samara and to the senator from Samara urging them to take measures for the listing and preservation of the Factory Kitchen.
Sandoz Headquarters
Office Complex Novartis, Rueil-Malmaison, 1962-1968
by Martin Burckhardt and Bernard-Henri Zehrfuss

Agnès Cailliau, Chair of docomomo France, alerted docomomo International that the original Headquarters and Laboratories of Sandoz were going to be completely demolished. After writing letters to the Mayor of Rueil-Malmaison and to Novartis’s President, the pharmaceutical company answered that their previous Basel intervention was an example of their care for heritage, that the structure of the building in Rueil-Malmaison had not aged well and did not live up to the company’s standards and that the project of architect Patrick Berger was in line with their heritage policy. The campaign continues with the support of many people such as Francis Rambert, Pierre-Antoine Gatier, Rudy Ricciotti, or Dominique Perrault.

Upon the decision to build the new French headquarters of Sandoz, the company expected a tertiary architecture at the forefront of Modernity to echo the image of a prestigious company on a protected landscape site. The Sandoz family believed that Modern architecture would serve the project after Jean Tschumi (1904-1962) had designed the Sandoz laboratories in Orleans (1949-1953) and Martin Burckhardt had made the Basel headquarters. The project had to respond to a request for 12,000 m² of offices, laboratories, meeting rooms, a restaurant and a cafeteria. The selected site was the former estate of the Richelieu Park and, in order to respect height constraints and preserve the harmony of the wooded area, a rather low building (4 floors) was proposed and built upon a two level basement. It is in perfect harmony that Buckhardt and Zehrfuss worked together between 1965 and 1968 to meet the constraints of the site punctuated by ponds, to set up a composition of low buildings leaving the park open by following the access boulevard. The main pond dictated the fragmentation of the program into three entities. In a game of transparencies and reflections, the main building articulated the axis towards the restaurant landscape and a functional axis towards the laboratories. We must now admit that these very constraints due to the location of the project in a rare site are at the origin of the remarkable series we admire today. Bernard Zehrfuss pointed out “the whole point of the project was to maintain the spirit of the park and build around the lake, knowing that the Swiss are wonderful people who have such a respect for nature”.

While Buckhardt said “In Rueil, we found nothing but positive opportunities, a wonderful park with its ponds and old trees, a customer who wanted a neat group of buildings, a high-class Parisian colleague, Zehrfuss, Premier Grand Prix de Rome.”

In the fall of 2010, the Regional Directorate of Cultural Affairs (DRAC) Île de France sought advice from Christine Desmoulins—a historian and author of a thesis and a book on the work of the architect Zehrfuss because the main building overlooking the boulevard de Richelieu was highly threatened. The principle of demolition seemed to have already been accepted by the municipality late 2010, although the DRAC was then consulted. A review of the PLU was then announced in order to densify the site. This decision seems unrealistic when one considers the Richelieu domain fortunately protected by its historical monument status.

The owner cunningly chose a famous, undisputed architect, Patrick Berger, to build the new building, a formidable technique to modify or remove buildings of high quality while not being blamed for that.
In the historic city of Kyoto, located inside Okazaki Park across from the Heian Jingu Shinto shrines, sits a representative Modern architectural heritage, Kyoto Kaikan. However, today, it faces an imminent threat of destructive alteration, thus calling attention for the Heritage Alert at the ICOMOS ISC20C.

Kyoto Kaikan is a multi-purpose cultural complex accommodating a concert hall, a theater and an international convention center. The complex was conceived as an edifice symbolizing the post-war reconstruction in Kyoto. It was built in 1960 and was designed by Kunio Mayekawa, a renowned vanguard architect who apprenticed under Le Corbusier in Paris from 1928 to 1930 as the first Japanese architect to do so. Without any doubt Kyoto Kaikan has been one of the most outstanding Modern buildings in Japan. As such it was awarded in 1960, its inaugurating year, the Architectural Institute of Japan Annual Prize, and more recently in 2003, it was registered as part of the docomomo Japan list of significant Modern heritage buildings.

Kyoto Kaikan was designed to be harmonious with its context that provided a rich concoction of natural as well as man-made ‘historic’ environment. It was laid out to form a courtyard embodying the adjacent Kyoto Municipal Museum of Art Annex by asserting a strip of oversized and deep concrete eaves—in loose reference to the traditional Japanese wooden construction design—to bind it horizontally. The exterior walls made of large size bricks and the pilotis as a sifting device moderated between the outer city and the inner spatial realm. Accordingly, Mayekawa created an architectural complex that convincingly reflected the design fundamentals of the Modern Movement while simultaneously making it fit with the historic traditional context of the Kyoto cityscape.

In June 2011, the City of Kyoto, the owner of Kyoto Kaikan, announced abruptly its plan to demolish more than a half of the complex in order to build in its place a new theater with a stage height that exceeds 30 meters. If the plan is allowed to proceed as announced, the authenticity of the complex would be categorically lost. Moreover, an emergence of massive volume done in a factory or plant like stage/theater structure would be certain to cause discord with the specific surrounding ‘historic’ traditional context that Mayekawa had so endearingly accorded in his design. The loss of Kyoto Kaikan would forebode the deprivation of the built environment permeating Kyoto with a rich assortment of cultural endowment.

Hiroshi Matsukuma, docomomo Japan Vice Chair
Dinamo Stadium, Moscow, 1927-1936
by Aleksandr Langman and Leonid Cherikover

The following letter was sent to the Mayor of
Moscow by Anna Bronovitskaya, Secretary General of docomomo Russia, with the support of
Docomomo International:

On February 10, 2012, the demolition of the faça
de walls of the cultural heritage building of re
gional significance Dinamo Stadium got underway
(Leningrandsky Prospect, 36). There is no need to
prove the value of the building which was construct-
ed in two stages in 1927-1936 upon the project of
L. Cherikover and A. Langman. In 1987 the Stadium
was placed under special protection of the state.

However, it is worth noting that after the demoli-
tion of the Kirov Stadium in St. Petersburg in 2007,
Dinamo Stadium remains the last large-scale sports
structure of the 1920-1930s, and it needs a special
solicitous attitude.

When and on what grounds was the status of
cultural heritage building of regional significance
changed for “capital construction object” within the
bounds of “place of interest”?

Such definitions are provided in Appendixes to
Government Decree of the City of Moscow dated
January 25, 2012 #314 “On the area boundaries
acknowledgement of cultural heritage object of
regional significance Dinamo Stadium, 1928, by ar-
chitect L. Cherikover” and in the Government Decree
of the City of Moscow #15-PP ”On the confirmation
of land use provisions and city-planning regulations
on the territory of cultural heritage object (place of
interest) of regional significance Dinamo Stadium,
1928, by architect L. Cherikover”, where it is written
about “demolition of southern, northern, eastern
parts of the building.”

In published sources there is no information
on any act of state historical/cultural expert as-
gessment and no administrative document which
change the status of Dinamo Stadium to “place of
interest”.

It is doubtless that the FIFA World Football Cup
which will take place in Moscow in 2018 is an im-
portant event. But it cannot serve as the basis for
destruction of the heritage as a way to keep the
memory of the time when football had its highest
uplift in Russia. Inconformity of the Stadium’s facili-
ties with FIFA standards indicates that it should not
be used for holding high-status matches but that it
should be operated and maintained as one of the
city sports and cultural grounds which are in great
demand today.

The demolition which is underway now brings
into discredit the very idea of heritage conservation.
In order to satisfy investors’ needs the significant
monument and the surrounding park which are the
objects of public domain are being sacrificed. This
demolition will be a great loss for the city and an
offence to its residents. One must also think about
the injury to the extranational reputation of Russia
which can be caused by this uncivilized handling
with the social heritage. We strongly urge you to
look into the situation and take undelayed action to
stop the demolition.

Anna Bronovitskaya

docomomo Russia Secretary General
Ricardo Legorreta
An Architect in Search of Modernity Within Tradition
By Louise Noelle

Ricardo Legorreta is one of the Mexican contemporary architects who have garnered the most recognition; only in 2011 he was distinguished as Doctor Honoris Causa by the Universidad Nacional Autónoma de México, UNAM, and the Praemium Imperiale in Japan. One year before, on August 27 at the docomomo Conference held in Mexico City, he gave a memorable Keynote Speech on the main figures of the Modern Movement in Mexico, José Villagrán and Luis Barragán, that the attendants treasured in their memories.

He was born in Mexico City on May 7, 1931, and he studied architecture precisely at the UNAM; he started his professional life working with José Villagrán García, who is considered to be the pioneer of Mexican Modern architecture, and eventually became his partner between 1955 and 1960. His work stemmed from the analysis and comprehension of the values of architecture and the mastery of technique, as well as from the Mexican roots and traditions, drawing near Luis Barragán’s proposals. His first personal expression can be seen fully at the Hotel Camino Real in Mexico City (1968), a building that combines an intimate nature with the complex needs of the hotel industry, a genre where he had several successful examples. The main characteristics of his style are shown in a privileged way of using a wall, which enable him to use light sparingly and fitly. The exterior result is of marked and powerful volumes, with a horizontal tendency that protects generous internal spaces, kind and welcoming, with a constant feeling of belonging to the local.

His vast and varied architectural production was developed starting in 1963 where he headed Legorreta Arquitectos, where in the last two decades the works related to culture and education had an important place; in these instances he looked not only for an adequate urban presence of the buildings but for a solution to the specific requirements that go beyond the technical settings. We are talking about complex problems such as the ones presented by libraries and the relentless growth of their archives, like in the libraries of: Universidad Autónoma de Nuevo León (1994) in Monterrey and the Centro Nacional de las Artes in Mexico City (1994); the Central Library, in San Antonio, Texas (1995), and the one in Chula Vista, in California (1995).

Regarding institutions of higher education, his designs considered the contemporary means of transmitting knowledge, without leaving behind the quality of student interactions; we can witness this at the Instituto Tecnológico de Estudios Superiores in Monterrey, ITESM, with the Graduated School of Business (2001) and the campus “Santa Fe” in Mexico City (2009), as well as the Graduated School of Economy at the UNAM (2010). In the United States he carried out the Schwab Residential Centre at Stanford University (1997), the Max Palevsky Residence Hall at the University of Chicago (2001) and the Community Centre of UCSF in San Francisco (2005). In the Middle East he designed for the Qatar University at Doha, the Texas A&M Engineering College (2007) and the Carnegie Mellon College of Business and Computer Science (2009), as well as the Student Housing and the Campus centre at the American University in El Cairo (2009).

Finally, the museums and exhibition rooms, in various shapes and forms, where part of the challenges he accepted, starting with the Children’s Discovery Museum (1989) and the Technological Museum of Innovation (1998) in San José California. In the new century he designed: the Pabellón de México (2000) at the Expo-Hannover in Germany; the Museum for Zandra Rhodes in London (2001); the Art Museum of South Texas in Corpus Christi (2006); the Museo Laberinto de las Ciencias y las Artes in San Luis Potosí (2008); and the Museum of Science and History at Fort Worth (2010).

With the death of Ricardo Legorreta on December 30, 2011, contemporary architecture has lost one of its main actors and docomomo a trusted friend.

1. First he established a society with Noé Castro and Carlos Vargas, which was transformed in 2000 as Legorreta + Legorreta, with Víctor Legorreta, Noé Castro, Carlos Vargas, Adriana Ciclik and Miguel Almaraz.
**Book Reviews**

**La Cité du Lignon 1963–1971, Étude Architecturale et Stratégies d’Intervention**
By Franz Graf and Giulia Marino
Publisher: Patrimoine et Architecture, Cahier hors série, Infolio, Genève
Language: French
[English and French Abstracts]
Year: 2012

Building large residential complexes that will grow in height and length, leaving the territory in green, and allow the housing of a large number of residents with low cost and suitable conditions of life, was a Modern vision that saw implementation mainly in the 1950’s and 1960’s. Le Corbusier’s “la nature est inscrite dans le bail” was part of the programming principle of the new lifestyle. Over the years these Modern complexes have lost much of the glamour of the original intent, facing many problems, which included energy consuming construction, social conditions and poor maintenance. And while many of these were demolished in the late 20th century, their architectural and environmental values have been widely recognized in recent years, with the consequent need to protect some of them as an architectural and cultural heritage. The crucial question in this case was the way in which environmental conditions and architectural quality could be restored to ensure heritage, energy and economy all together.

The case of the Cité du Lignon at Geneva is a prime example. The Lignon was constructed between 1963 and 1971 to house 10,000 people with an ambitious architectural program, improving many technical features and a curtain wall in the residential units. The complex included a long zigzag asteroid bar and two towers with extensive gardens and communal facilities. The listing of the complex in 2008 was a real challenge that was successfully faced by the Laboratoire des Techniques de la Sauvegarde de l’Architecture Moderne of the EPFL, proposing a pilot study based on exhaustive documentation, and a correspondingly exhaustive technical and energetic diagnosis. The proposals that were implemented managed to combine harmoniously the Modern architecture and green growth in a difficult building complex, giving the city environment and aesthetics. Therefore the important thing is not the restored building per se but the restoration process as a result of the methodology followed by the TSAM laboratory. It is this effort which is detailed in this book, together with historical and theoretical but mainly technical documentation, and has to be an effective tool for all those who are involved in the restoration of buildings of Modern architecture.

Panayotis Tournikiotis
Chair docomomo Greece
Chair ISC Technology

**Architectures Modernes. L’Émergence d’un Patrimoine**
By Maristella Casciato and Émilie d’Orgeix
Publisher: Mardaga, Wavre
Language: French
Year: 2012

The headquarters of Docomomo International moved from Delft to Paris in 2002 with Maristella Casciato as Chair and Émilie d’Orgeix as Secretary General. Some years later, Anne-Laure Guillet joined the team as Director, leading altogether an intense and bright period of Docomomo and highlighting its missions. In 2010 the headquarters were relocated to Barcelona. This book aims, primarily, to reformulate a feedback on the evolution of speeches and dialectics that have profoundly changed the theories and practices regarding Modern heritage since the 1980s. It aims to be a retrospective focusing on the views and experiences of practitioners deeply involved in the recognition, enhancement and conservation of the architectural and urban heritage of the 20th century. The title Modern Architectures. The Emergence of a Heritage, wants to establish a causal link between the awareness of the multiplicity of Modernisms and, by extension, the ability to establish, in response to the current emergency, a selective and conscious process of “patrimonialization.” The magnitude of these relations has profoundly influenced the raison d’être of Docomomo International during the ten years of the authors’ mandate.

docomomo members focus on these aims related to the book’s four chapters: Narrative and Memory; Place and Identity; Centre and Periphery; and Theory and Practice.

This publication is definitely a key tool to explain 10 years of Docomomo International’s history.

Ivan Blasi
Secretary General docomomo International

**Pioneers of Modern Design**
By Nikolaus Pevsner
Publisher: Palazzo Editions, Bath
Language: English
Year: 2011

A new edition, fully illustrated in color, of one of the most widely read books on Modern design. Nikolaus Pevsner’s landmark work was first published in 1936. Pevsner saw Modernism as a synthesis of three main sources: William Morris and his followers; the work of the 19th century engineers; and Art Nouveau. All these form the essential background to the work of the early Modernists, with their rejection of ornament, their use of new materials and their commitment to “utility” and the machine age. This new edition of this classic work is fully illustrated in color, with new feature spreads on the key protagonists and movements and a new introduction by Professor Richard Weston.

Palazzo Edions, Bath
Visions 10. Dret a un Habitatge Digne i Adequat
By Zaida Muxí
Publisher: ETSAB, Barcelona
Language: Catalan, Spanish
Year: 2012

After the Project
Updating Mass Housing Estates
Actualització de polígons residencials II EcoRehab
By Adolf Sotoca [editor]
Publisher: Iniciativa Digital Politècnica (UPC), Barcelona
Language: English, Catalan
Year: 2012

Visions is the name of the magazine published by the Barcelona Architecture School. This number was dedicated to the right to a decent and adequate home. Ana Tostões, who had been invited to give a lecture on housing at the “Laboratory of Housing of the 20th century”, the Master directed by Zaida Muxí and Josep Maria Montaner, wrote an article entitled “Between Cancer and Capricorn: an Architecture Laboratory. Housing in Sub-Saharan Africa, case studies of Angola and Mozambique.”

After studying the Modern Movement in Portugal, focusing on the postwar period of World War II and the analysis of the influence of Modern Brazilian architecture, she had an interest in research on Modern architecture and planning in the former Portuguese colonies in Africa. With the new field work information gathered from her last visit to both Angola and Mozambique, the text shows the influence of Modern architecture in these countries through specific case studies. These works are a small sample of potential output asserted by Modern architecture in Angola and Mozambique, evident in the iconic qualities, tectonic and programmatic legacy, unique in every way. Docomomo as an organization committed to the documentation and preservation of Modern architecture is committed to preserving this unique and expressive Modern tropical landscape, a point which is highlighted in the publication.

Ivan Blasi
Secretary General docomomo International

The need to rebuild our cities on themselves seems very questionable today. In this context, the massive housing projects that met the urban explosion of the second half of the 20th century are a vital presence that demands answers. Despite the considerable experience accumulated in intervention, approaches offering comprehensive and systematic deep in thought approaches or overall approaches allowing compared visions on the diversity of processes, problematic and answers, are not common.

As discussed in the introduction, these mass housing areas currently accumulate problems dealing with physical and typological housing obsolescence; social problems arising from the progressive aging of the population and the arrival of new immigration waves; and urban integration problems generated from geographical marginalization. The regeneration of these estates therefore requires assessing the physical conditions of built heritage in order to address livability issues; improving urbanity conditions in these areas with the provision of facilities, characterization of open spaces and the improvement of internal accessibility; and finally solving their territorial integration problems.

This collective publication, steered by Adolf Sotoca, and generated from different studies on case studies in Barcelona, aims at placing it in an international context. It does so by making a first-hand comparative view of mass housing formation processes in five cases rather distant from Barcelona: Seoul, Krakow, Belgrade and Bucharest. The generality of these processes is effectively highlighted together with the peculiarities of each case and its problematic. Within this international perspective, the case of Barcelona is introduced through an interview by Francesc Peremiquel to Pere Serra on the experiences of renewal of housing estates of the last 30 years.

The three case studies, used as a touchstone, are estates located more than 40 years ago in one of Barcelona’s rear parts which has now become its eastern façade, subject now to renovation projects and processes. Besides its strategic location, the selection of these case studies has clearly distinct legacies and situation points, and they allow working hypotheses to be set seeking for a more general reflection. The remodeling of the Bon Pastor neighborhood, a so-called cheap housing estate erected in 1929, has generated much controversy between social and urban memory preservation and the improvement of living conditions. It offers a line of work and a reflection which are settled on the tension between the need for major renovation and sensitivity to existing reality. The case of Ciutat Meridiana—a private estate built in 1984 in a hardly reasonable situation due to the climatic conditions, rough topography and difficult access, only understandable because of the low cost of the land—raises yet a considerable space for improvement, both internal and especially external due to its connection with the natural environment, the Parc Natural de Collserola, and its accessibility by means of public transport. To jointly address the neighborhoods of La Mina, the subject of one of the most elaborate and interesting recent projects, and the Sud-Oest del Besòs neighborhoods brings up the question of the delimitation of these interventions and their effects on the design responses.

Each of these case studies counts with the contributions of qualified specialists which enrich the approaches to each of these mass housing estates: José Luis Oyón on Bon Pastor, Olga Tarrasó on Ciutat Meridiana and Sebastià Jornet on La Mina neighborhood. The conclusion appears as an interview with Amador Ferrer-whose 1982 thesis was the first to examine systematically and to claim Barcelona’s estates from the second half of the 20th century—assesses and proposes a new scenario for these mass housing estates.

This publication is a necessary and extremely useful contribution to address a critical issue, absolutely current and which has broad impact both on the national and international context.

Manuel Guardia
Universitat Politècnica de Catalunya
By AA.VV.
Publisher: Actar, Barcelona
ISBN: 978-8-4936-9014-4
Language: English
Year: 2012

Coup de Dés is the title of a series of seminars that have the intention to depart from a series of completed works and to open up a debate on their significance.

Regarding the concept behind this series, Ignasi de Sola-Morales established its defining principles before his premature death in 2001: “The reference to the text by Mallarmé serves as our departure point. There is nothing pre-established. Not even plurality, hybridization or multiplicity. Today’s architectural project is a risk, calculated or not, faced with an unlimited number of possibilities. Acuteness, ingenuity, astuteness or chance are the reference points of a reality that appears un-disciplined, disordered, un-leashed. To pose the questions why does this happen, what is proposed and what is trap some kind of energy, a form, a trait. To design is to launch a configuration, a hypothesis, convinced of an interfaculty research project named “Critical Encyclopedia for the Restoration and Reuse of 20th Century Architecture”. In 2008 the project received funding from the Swiss university conference to promote cooperation between the main Swiss schools of architecture (Swiss Cooperation Project in Architecture). The research project comprises four sections: the first, “Historical-Critical Tools and Preservation” is coordinated by Roberta Grignolo and Bruno Reichlin (USI), the second, “Material History of Buildings” is led by Franz Graf (EPFL and USI), the third, “Preservation of the City in the 20th Century” is coordinated by Vittorio Magnago Lampugnani (ETHZ) and the fourth, “Methodological Tools” is led by Giacinta Jean (SUPSI).

Mendrisio Academy Press/Silvana Editoriale

Lo Spazio interno moderno come oggetto di salvaguardia
Modern Interior Space as an Object of Preservation
By Roberta Grignolo and Bruno Reichlin
Publisher: Mendrisio Academy Press/Silvana Editoriale, Milano
ISBN: 978-8-8366-2417-1
Language: Italian/English
Year: 2012

In 20th century heritage preservation projects, Modern interior space often receives secondary consideration. This is one of the main reasons for which it has been chosen as the main topic of this volume which gathers the re-shaped and revised contributions from the international study days held at the Academy of Architecture in Mendrisio. These meetings, held under the title “Modern Interior Space as an Object of Preservation” were organized as part of an interfaculty research project named “Critical Encyclopedia for the Restoration and Re-use of 20th Century Architecture”. In 2008 the project received funding from the Swiss university conference to promote cooperation between the main Swiss schools of architecture (Swiss Cooperation Project in Architecture). The research project comprises four sections: the first, “Historical-Critical Tools and Preservation” is coordinated by Roberta Grignolo and Bruno Reichlin (USI), the second, “Material History of Buildings” is led by Franz Graf (EPFL and USI), the third, “Preservation of the City in the 20th Century” is coordinated by Vittorio Magnago Lampugnani (ETHZ) and the fourth, “Methodological Tools” is led by Giacinta Jean (SUPSI).

Mendrisio Academy Press/Silvana Editoriale

Architecture industrialisée et préfabriquée: connaissance et sauvegarde

Understanding and Conserving Industrialised and Prefabricated Architecture
By Franz Graf and Yvan Delemontey
Publisher: Presses polytechniques et universitaires romandes
ISBN: 978-2-8807-4960-6
Language: French and English
Year: 2012

An neglected area until quite recently, the industrialization of construction during the 20th century has become a hot topic among architectural historians in recent years. This two-day international conference, organized in connection with the project entitled “A Critical Encyclopedia for the Restoration and Re-use of 20th Century Architecture”, engages with renewed interest in this area of study. But unlike other meetings, this conference is not only concerned with retracing the historical de-
The book proposes a series of reflections about a particularly exciting time in the history of glass: the interwar period. The idea of a solid through development but also with taking stock—by means of case studies—from the conservation problems posed by industrialized and prefabricated architecture today. Just as the way we construct history is inseparable from the thoughts and challenges we face in our present society, the way we treat our heritage is nourished by turning our thoughts back to the history that produced it. This two-way movement is something we wish to examine during our conference by exploring the linkages between recent built heritage and contemporary architectural activity.

This international conference is therefore structured around four themes. Day One, which opens with an historical panorama of the industrialization of building during the last century, dwells on one of its essential aspects: architecture imagined as technical object.

Focusing specifically on the post-war period, Day Two will show how the industrialization of building generally and prefabrication in particular led to the advent of mass housing and helped to disseminate it worldwide. The meeting will end with a look at the technical object.

The reasons are many but the main ones are related to transparency, which creates the illusion of an apparent “non-material” and the fragility that suggests impermanence. By focusing on the specific characteristics of these glasses, their production processes which have now disappeared, and in relation to their spread and their use, the book highlights a complexity in terms of material culture of great interest not only in the field of architecture, but also for the cultural, political and economic fields. Through a rereading of some restoration of the most significant architecture of the period after the wars, it is stressed that specific knowledge of the “materiality” of architecture can lead to a design approach that can combine—in whole or in part—conservation instances with the main problematic related to the reuse of interior spaces. Francesca Albani is a researcher in Architectural Restoration at the Politecnico di Milano. Since 2003, she has addressed issues related to conservation and reuse of the 20th century developed in her doctoral thesis (2006, Politecnico di Milano in collaboration with the University of Geneva), the doctoral dissertation (2007, Politecnico di Milano), then pursued through national (MIUR-PRIN) and international (University of Italian Switzerland, Mendrisia Academy of Architecture) research grants and research collaborations. Since 2008 she has been concentrating on the task of teaching the fundamentals of design for historic buildings.

Presses polytechniques et universitaires romandes

Superfici di vetro negli anni Trenta
By Albani Francesca
Publisher: Maggiole Editore, Santarcangelo di Romagna
ISBN: 978-8-8387-6090-7
Language: Italian
Year: 2012

La arquitectura desde el interior, 1925-1937
Lilly Reich y Charlotte Perriand
By María Melgarejo Belenguer
Publisher: Fundación Caja de Arquitectos – Arquia/Tesis
ISBN: 978-8-4939-4091-1
Language: Spanish
Year: 2011
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Contribute to the next journal
Journal 47 is scheduled for November 2012. Authors who would like to contribute to this issue are kindly invited to contact docomomo@misiecn.com.
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• A hard copy on paper by postal mail. The title and author’s name should be clearly mentioned on each page of the manuscript and the name, title, postal address and e-mail address should also be given at the end of each contribution.

Form
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• Manuscripts should be written with double spacing and margin widths with all pages numbered in sequence.
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• Illustrations referred in the text should be mentioned as follows (Figure 1).
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docomomo International is a non-profit organization dedicated to the documentation and conservation of buildings, sites and neighborhoods of the modern movement. It aims at:

- Bringing the significance of the architecture of the modern movement to the attention of the public, the public authorities, the professionals and the educational community.
- Identifying and promoting the surveying of the modern movement’s works.
- Fostering and disseminating the development of appropriate techniques and methods of conservation.
- Opposing destruction and disfigurement of significant works.
- Gathering funds for documentation and conservation.
- Exploring and developing knowledge of the modern movement.

docomomo International wishes to extend its field of actions to new territories, establish new partnerships with institutions, organizations and NGOs active in the area of modern architecture, develop and publish the international register, and enlarge the scope of its activities in the realm of research, documentation and education.