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# Conference Program

**THURSDAY 26·04·2018**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00 - 10:30</td>
<td>Accreditations &amp; Welcome Pack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30 - 11:00</td>
<td>Welcome and Presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11:00 - 13:30</td>
<td><strong>con-texts</strong> <em>(This section will take place in Spanish)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Speakers

- **Sílvia Colmenares** + **Luis Rojo**
  - Directors Critical

- **Lina Toro**
  - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA
  - "Teóricos francotiradores. La posibilidad de un pensamiento dibujado como práctica específicamente arquitectónica"

- **Raúl Castellanos**
  - Universidad Politécnica de Valencia, Departamento de Proyectos Arquitectónicos, Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura, Valencia
  - "Poché. Historia y vigencia de una idea"

- **Jorge Borondo**
  - Universidad Politécnica de Cataluña, Departamento de Proyectos Arquitectónicos, Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura, Barcelona
  - "Ways of seeing"

- **Álvaro Moreno**
  - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA
  - "Notas sobre una arquitectura líquida"

- **Rodrigo Rubio**
  - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA
  - "Aftermath"

- **Martino Peña**
  - Universidad Politécnica de Cartagena, Arquitectura y Tecnología de la Edificación, ETSAE, Cartagena
  - "Artefactos energéticos: la energía como parámetro proyectual"

- **Elena Martínez Millana**
  - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA
  - "Paradoxes of Domesticity and Modernity"

- **Esteban Salcedo**
  - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA
  - "Play to the gallery"

- **Damián Pouganou**
  - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA
  - "Rincones de la función"

- **Luz Carruthers**
  - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA
  - "Con P de Pragmatismo"

- **Luis Moreda**
  - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA
  - "Martha Stewart. A contemporary icon"

- **Antonio Cantero**
  - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA
  - "Proyectos encubiertos. Entrevistas entre arquitectos"

- **Luis Navarro**
  - Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA
  - "Estímulos y reacciones, deseos y afectos, hilos intencionales"

### Discussion

12:44
### Thursday 26·04·2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>Lunch Time</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:30</td>
<td>Panel #1 [anthology problematized]</td>
<td>Alessandro Canevari, Università degli Studi di Genova, dAD, Genova, Italy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14:45</td>
<td>“Anthology is ontology. The power of selection and the ‘worldmaking’”</td>
<td>Marcos Pantaleón, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Departamento de Proyectos Arquitectónicos, Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura, Madrid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:00</td>
<td>“Anthology as collection: Althusser vs. Benjamin”</td>
<td>Giacomo Pala, Institute of Architectural Theory (Architekturtheorie), Innsbruck, Austria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:15</td>
<td>“Historicizing the desire to historicize”</td>
<td>Jorge Minguet Medina + Carlos Tapia Martín, Grupo de Investigación DUT, Arquitectura, Departamento de Historia, Teoría y Composición Arquitectónicas, ETS Arquitectura, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15:30</td>
<td>Discussion</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:00</td>
<td>Coffee break</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>Panel #2 [the spanish perspective]</td>
<td>Leandro Medrano + Luís Recamán + Mariana Wilderom + Raphael Grazziano, University of São Paulo, Faculty of Architecture and Urbanism, History of Architecture and Project Aesthetics Department, São Paulo, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:30</td>
<td>“Reassessing Spanish Modernity Discourses through Mass Media”</td>
<td>Belén Butragueño + Javier Raposo + Maríasun Salgado, UPM, Department of Architectural Graphic Ideation, School of Architecture (ETSAM), Madrid, Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16:45</td>
<td>“Architectural Theory anthologies from a Spanish perspective”</td>
<td>Mattias Kärholm + Paulina Prieto + Rodrigo Delso, Lund University, Architecture and the Built Environment, Lund, Sweden, and Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura de Madrid, UPM, Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17:00</td>
<td>“Writings on Photography and Modern Architecture in Spain. A critical reading of a Contemporary Anthology”</td>
<td>Guido Cimadomo + Vishal Shahdadpuri Aswani + Rubén García Rubio, Universidad de Málaga, Departamento de Artes y Arquitectura, ETS Arquitectura, Málaga, Spain and Al Ghurair University, College of Design, Dubai, Emirates Arab United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moderators:**
- Ignacio Barrego, Full Professor at the Technische Universität Berlin
- Sergio Martín Blas, Associate Teacher of the Architectural Design Department at the ETSAM (UPM)
- Juan Elvira, Assistant Professor of the Architectural Design Department at the ETSAM (UPM), Professor at IE University
- Hilde Heynen, Full Professor Architectural Theory, University of Leuven. KU Leuven, Belgium

### Friday 27·04·2018

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Speaker(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10:00</td>
<td>Panel #3 [anthology today]</td>
<td>Leandro Medrano + Luís Recamán + Mariana Wilderom + Raphael Grazziano, University of São Paulo, Faculty of Architecture and Urbanism, History of Architecture and Project Aesthetics Department, São Paulo, Brazil</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:15</td>
<td>“Space and the otherness. An anthology”</td>
<td>Belén Butragueño + Javier Raposo + Maríasun Salgado, UPM, Department of Architectural Graphic Ideation, School of Architecture (ETSAM), Madrid, Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:30</td>
<td>“Practical theorization in the digital era”</td>
<td>Mattias Kärholm + Paulina Prieto + Rodrigo Delso, Lund University, Architecture and the Built Environment, Lund, Sweden, and Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura de Madrid, UPM, Spain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10:45</td>
<td>“Towards a (new) Historiography of Architecture for a Digital Age”</td>
<td>Guido Cimadomo + Vishal Shahdadpuri Aswani + Rubén García Rubio, Universidad de Málaga, Departamento de Artes y Arquitectura, ETS Arquitectura, Málaga, Spain and Al Ghurair University, College of Design, Dubai, Emirates Arab United Arab Emirates</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Moderators:**
- Hilde Heynen, Full Professor Architectural Theory, University of Leuven. KU Leuven, Belgium

**Closing cocktail**
### Index of selected contributions to the ‘con-text’ section

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Authors</th>
<th>pag.</th>
<th>Con-texts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
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<td>Borondo, Jorge</td>
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<td>Plouganou, Damían</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>Rincones de la función.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rubio, Rodrigo</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>Aftermath.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salcedo, Esteban</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>Play to the gallery.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Toro, Lina</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>Teóricos francotiradores. La posibilidad de un pensamiento dibujado como práctica específicamente arquitectónica.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Ways of seeing
Seeing the invisible: new perceptions in the history of technology. Carrol Purrsell. 1995
Icon: Journal of the International Committee for the History of Technology, vol 1, pp. 9-15

Borondo, Jorge
1.Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura de Barcelona, 2018 MBArch Candidate, Barcelona, Spain, jorge.borondo@gmail.com

´Ce que nous voyons ne vaut – ne vit – que par ce qui nous regarde´
-Georges Didi Huberman

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

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

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

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

Underlying the crust of time -the time of the object, apparently neutral- we tend to discover a mirror braided by the people. A dual mirror, projected both into its process and into its usage. In the first place, the infinite development of technology is a consequence of an accumulative and orgasmic dance of determinants and social processes. It doesn’t derive from an instantaneous miracle bound to an individual genius -being that the inventor or the architect-. And therefore, its usage blends with the experiences of the user.
Paradoxes of Domesticity and Modernity


Martínez-Millana, Elena

This article aims to put a new perspective on the essay by Hilde Heynen. Modernity and Domesticity. Tensions and Contradictions. It seeks to shed light on the book's most radical contributions so as to value them. It also intends to show something as equally important, its immediate context in the book Negotiating Domesticity. Spatial Productions of Gender in Modern Architecture, in which it was published for the first time.

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

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

The book Negotiating Domesticity began to take shape at the annual meeting of the Society of Architectural Historians in 2003, shortly after the general reaction against the theory of architecture that occurred at the end of the 1990s. At this meeting, Hilde Heynen and Gülsüm Baydar co-directed the session “Domesticity and Gender in Modern Architecture,” concluding in a book published in 2005, two years after the colloquium. Negotiating Domesticity is a testimony of the editors’ interest, together with the other authors who contributed to it, in revitalizing architectural research from the gender perspective. The sixteen authors delved into the relationship between domesticity, gender and modern architecture through a series of essays. The title of the book is an invitation to debate about domesticity, as Baydar explains, “domesticity is not a notion to be discarded, but one that needs to be thought about differently.”

Despite having been cited in hundreds of articles and books, Negotiating Domesticity has received very few reviews. Nevertheless, it is interesting to examine which was published as it is possible to understand the evolution of the reception of this type of book and its contents, through the critical reviews that the book received. The first review was written by Susan Henderson and published in the Journal of Design and History in 2007. Two years after its publication, the author stressed the wide range of topics that the book included: “The domestic realm is of tremendous topical significance. Still, it is a testimony of the editors’ interest, together with the other authors who contributed to it, in revitalizing architectural research from the gender perspective. The sixteen authors delved into the relationship between domesticity, gender and modern architecture through a series of essays. The title of the book is an invitation to debate about domesticity, as Baydar explains, “domesticity is not a notion to be discarded, but one that needs to be thought about differently.”

Henderson did not develop any theory about the first chapter by Hilde Heynen “Modernity and domesticity. Tensions and contradictions,” she only described it as “a largely theoretical exegesis.” She then listed all the titles of the essays contained in the book and their respective authors, with a brief summary of some of them. Finally, she concluded her review by emphasizing what she had suggested at the beginning and tried to demonstrate with its development: “As is often the case with edited collections, it is important to consider the hypothesis of the work. In this case, the result is a collection that combines two strategies that are very different and yet form a whole. On the one hand, the key question is its content: the domesticity in architecture is studied with an interdisciplinary approach, and on the other hand, the key question is its content: the domesticity in architecture is studied with an interdisciplinary approach, and the book provides a new vision that can value it. Here a reduced version of the original essay is added with a homonym title, which Heynen prepared for the colloquium “Negotiating Domesticity: A gender agenda?” Even the title of this essay is a reduction of the book and this essay is an edition of the original essay. The domesticity in architecture needs to be thought about differently.”

Henderson began her essay with a meaningful quote from the book by Marshall Berman, All That Is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity, “Negotiating Domesticity: To modern is to find ourselves in an environment that promises us adventure, power, joy, growth, transformation of ourselves and the world—and, at the same time, that threatens to destroy everything we have, everything we know, everything we are.” This quote highlights the tension and contradiction in modernity, as the essay itself will demonstrate. The essay of the reduced version also enables it to be put forward for the Critical Un-Theory which restricts the length of the essays. Moreover, the analysis of the reduced version awakens the curiosity of the reader to look for the full text.

Heynen began her essay with a meaningful quote from the book by Marshall Berman, All That Is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity, “Modern is to find ourselves in an environment that promises us adventure, power, joy, growth, transformation of ourselves and the world—and, at the same time, that threatens to destroy everything we have, everything we know, everything we are.” This quote highlights the tension and contradiction in modernity, as the essay itself will demonstrate. The essay of the reduced version also enables it to be put forward for the Critical Un-Theory which restricts the length of the essays. Moreover, the analysis of the reduced version awakens the curiosity of the reader to look for the full text.

The last review was written by Juliana Preston and published in Interiors. Design, Architecture, Culture in 2011. In it, the author quoted the criticism that Henderson made six years previously to refute it. Preston agreed with what Varley had stated, and although not directly mentioning her, Henderson’s criticism about the absence of a singular argument and qualified the book as a platform: “Negotiating Domesticity has provided a sustaining platform, not an argument, for interdisciplinary discourse that is only beginning to bear fruit.” Furthermore, she added even greater praise: “It promises us adventure, power, joy, growth, transformation of ourselves and the world—and, at the same time, that threatens to destroy everything we have, everything we know, everything we are.” This quote highlights the tension and contradiction in modernity, as the essay itself will demonstrate. The essay of the reduced version also enables it to be put forward for the Critical Un-Theory which restricts the length of the essays. Moreover, the analysis of the reduced version awakens the curiosity of the reader to look for the full text.

Heynen began her essay with a meaningful quote from the book by Marshall Berman, All That Is Solid Melts Into Air: The Experience of Modernity, “Modern is to find ourselves in an environment that promises us adventure, power, joy, growth, transformation of ourselves and the world—and, at the same time, that threatens to destroy everything we have, everything we know, everything we are.” This quote highlights the tension and contradiction in modernity, as the essay itself will demonstrate. The essay of the reduced version also enables it to be put forward for the Critical Un-Theory which restricts the length of the essays. Moreover, the analysis of the reduced version awakens the curiosity of the reader to look for the full text.
So, faced with the dominant discourse that established the gender of modernity as masculine as opposed to the feminine domesticity, in the third part “The cult of domesticity”, Heynen contrasted less obvious discourses, “a focus on domesticity itself on the other hand reveals a rather different mode of interconnection.” Heynen suggested that there is a direct connection between the emergence of an identity for the body and the rise of industrial capitalism and imperialism on the other, “etymological nearness of ‘domesticity’ and ‘to domesticate’ is not a coincidence.” Heynen maintained that modernity and domesticity cannot be seen as opposites “if one opens up the scope of investigatory research beyond the more obvious layers of social and economic determinants that often remain concealed on the level of modernist discourses and practices, it becomes clear that there is also a certain complicity between modernity and domesticity.” This perspective gives way to numerous discourses, for example, the essays that are included in Negotiating Domesticity.

This article aims to explain why the essay “Modernity and domesticity. Tensions and contradictions” should be included in the Criticall Un-Biology, through two reflections that reinforce each other. Hello�on has focused on the relationship first by reiterating what Heynen set out as co-editor has been appraised. Her essay in the first chapter offers a broad and comprehensive approach to an introduction of modernity and domesticity, as an understanding of the new re-interpretation of the term; and its recognition reveals that it is the opportune moment to rethink domesticity in the architecture of the past and its connection with the present.

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

Notes


2. Marshall Berman, “Introduction: Modernity: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow,” in All that is solid melts into air: Experi- ence of Modernity, (London and New York: Penguin Books, 1988), p.15. This citation expresses the deepest sense of the para- dox of modernity. The highlighted part of the text quotes what Heynen showed in her essay when she defines modernity: “There is a mode of vital experience —experience of space and time, of the self and others, of life’s possibilities and perils— that is shared by men and women all over the world today. I will call this body of experience ‘modernity.’ To be modern is to find ourselves in an environment that promises us adventure, power, joy, growth, transformation of ourselves and the world—and, at the same time, that threatens to destroy everything we have, everything we know, everything we are. Modern environments and experiences cut across all boundaries of geography and ethnicity, of class and nationality, of religion and ideology. In this sense, modernity can be said to unite all mankind. But it is a paradoxical unity, a unity of disunity: it pours us all into a single, strong current of modernity, a current of struggle and contradiction, of ambiguity and anguish. To be modern is to be part of a universe in which, as Marx said, ‘all that is solid melts into air.’”


6. Ibid., 84.


8. Ibid., 557.


10. Ibid., 135.


12. Ibid., 557.


14. The full text has a length of approximately 10,000 words, the version here has 5000; the main issues are raised and compiled with the rules of the length of the text for the Criticall Un-Biology.
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23. Formerly it was thought that a fixed point had been found in what has been; and one saw the present engaged in tentatively concentrating the forces of knowledge on this ground. Now this relation is to be overturned, and what has been is to become the dialectical reversal —the flash of awakened consciousness. Politics attains primacy over history. (…) There is a not-yet- conscious knowledge of what has been: its advancement has the structure of awakening.”

Biography


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

Ukiyo-e (浮世絵), “pinturas del mundo flotante” o “estampa japonesa”, es un género de grabados realizados mediante xilografía o técnica de grabado en madera, producidos en Japón entre los siglos XVII y XX, entre los que se encuentran imágenes paisajísticas, del teatro y de zonas de alterne.

Biography


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