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In its own words, the Carnegie Corporation of New York, which was established by Andrew Carnegie in 1911, “to promote the advancement and diffusion of knowledge and understanding”. The Corporation is one of the oldest, largest and influential of American grant-making foundations and focuses on the issues that Andrew Carnegie considered of paramount importance: the strength of democracy, international peace and the advancement of education and knowledge.

It serves as an incubator of ideas, a convenor of scholars, educators, policymakers and others, and as a strategic investor in organisations and institutions that can demonstrably contribute to the betterment of society. It was in this spirit that the Carnegie Corporation of New York generously founded the Andrew Carnegie Lecture Series at The University of Edinburgh in 2013. This ten-year initiative strengthens our outreach to the public and brings world-leading thinkers and practitioners in the arts ever closer to the interests and concerns of our colleagues and students. At Edinburgh College of Art we have been fortunate to host a number of exceptional speakers whose careers have demonstrably changed our understanding of the world we live in. Aside from delivering a public lecture, speakers join our community, engage with student work and contribute to a legacy publication so that their thoughts might reach a wider international audience. It is in this spirit that I am happy to introduce the ideas of Professor Beatriz Colomina. We are grateful to the Carnegie Corporation of New York for its generous support and hope you enjoy the outcome.

FOREWORD

by Professor Christopher Breward

Principal, Edinburgh College of Art
Vice Principal for the Creative Industries & Performing Arts, The University of Edinburgh
INTRODUCTION

Professor Mark Dorrian
Forbes Chair of Architecture at The University of Edinburgh

For many of the intellectual and cultural movements that emerged in the decades following World War II and that projected new kinds of individual consciousness and social relationships no longer structured by violence and domination, the question of the university held a special place.

On one hand, it appeared as an instrument for the reproduction of already-existing society, an institution of acculturation underwritten by its hierarchies and expectations. Thus, it was characterised as, “a form of initiation” in the 1966 pamphlet On the Poverty of Student Life, co-authored by the Situationist International and a student group at Strasbourg and, “a rehearsal for [the student’s] ultimate role as a conservative element in the functioning of the commodity system”.1 On the other hand, precisely because of this, the university emerged as a strategic site for reimagining and enacting other ways of being, both through the materials studied and discussed, and the critical reassembly of the structures of the institution itself. Such interests led to experiments such as The Free University of New York, which began in 1965, and the related Antiuiniversity of London that opened three years later. The latter’s participants included R D Laing, Stuart Hall, Juliet Mitchell and Alexander Trocchi. Trocchi’s idea of a, “spontaneous university”, as articulated in his text Invisible Insurrection, was apparently one of the Antiuiniversity’s wellsprings.2 Within this force field, the arts and arts-education played an important role, indicated not least by the importance that Black Mountain College (which ran between 1933 and 1957 and at which Buckminster Fuller, John Cage, Josef and Anni Albers, Willem de Kooning and Merce Cunningham had all taught) came to hold for many of the radical thinkers on education at the time. Within the postwar contestations around education, architecture and urban planning was an area of particular tension in its inter-related capacities as an instrument of capital, a tool of spatial and social organisation, a material expression of state or corporate power, and an art closely imbricated in technoscientific development. If what was at stake was subjectivity, and this was shaped by environmental conditions and the existing relations of power inscribed within them, then architecture and planning was a field of pressing concern.

The period from the 1950s to the late 1970s saw a remarkable effusion of new approaches to architectural education, and it is these that Professor Beatriz Colomina and her collaborators set out to document in their important Radical Pedagogies project, which she described in her Carnegie Lecture. While the name Radical Pedagogies, as she explains, plays upon Germano Celant’s notion of, “radical architecture”, at the same time it echoes the idea of, “radical education” which had been such a rallying cry in the 60s.3 But what, in Professor Colomina’s project, does, “radical” mean? Derived from the Latin radix (root) specifically-political usages of the term first appear in the eighteenth century, eventually tending to be used (as Raymond Williams has
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noted) to denote positions to the right of the political spectrum. In twentieth-century US usage (and thereafter more generally) however, the word comes to be applied to the left, perhaps (Williams surmises) due to difficulties with the specific definitions of, “socialist” and, “communist”. “Radical”, he writes, “seemed to offer a way of avoiding dogmatic and factional associations while reasserting the need for vigorous and fundamental change”. While, “radical” has latterly come to function as a general semantic marker of opposition to, “moderate”, its importance to the Radical Pedagogies research lies in the way it points to forms of inquiry and experimentation that pose questions of the constitutive conditions and limits of the discipline, and in its corresponding educational procedures and protocols. It is this emphasis on ideological construction and coercion, and the related sense of contingency and understanding that things could be different, which tends to differentiate the endeavours of the period from the naturalism of earlier returns to beginnings.

Beginning with 1968, Professor Colomina’s lecture takes us backwards and forwards in time in order to map a constellation of pedagogic endeavours that were emerging in the global context. From the case of the Unité Pédagogique d’Architecture No. 6 in Paris, we move to – amongst others – the founding of the Hochschule für Gestaltung in Ulm, Germany in 1953; to Mexico City and Valparaíso, Chile; to the Italian collective Global Tools and Giancarlo de Carlo’s International Laboratory of Architecture and Urban Design; to the peripatism of Cedric Price’s and Peter Murray’s Polyark Bus; to Emilio Ambasz’s Universitas Project symposium of 1972 and Peter Eisenman’s inauguration of the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies in 1967; to the summer meetings Woman’s School of Planning and Architecture; to representation and activism around issues of disability and access at UC Berkeley; to the pedagogies of John Hejduk and Colin Rowe respectively at the Cooper Union and Cornell University, Joseph Rykwert and Dalibor Vesely at the University of Essex, and Robert Venturi, Denise Scott Brown and Charles Moore at Yale. It moves on through the global perspectives of Buckminster Fuller and of Alvin Boyarsky, chair of the Architectural Association between 1971 and 1990, to Charles and Ray Eames’ proposals for design education in India, and the investigations in computation and design undertaken first at the Harvard Graduate School of Design, and then at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology beginning in the mid-1960s and leading, in the latter, to the founding of the MIT Media Lab under the directorship of Nicholas Negroponte in 1985. Of the various thoughts and reflections that the project prompts, perhaps the most intriguing is to do with the complex legacy of this work and the question of what a radical pedagogy in the present looks like. At one point Professor Colomina writes of the pedagogical experiments that she examines: “Much of architectural teaching today still rests on the paradigms they introduced”. This is certainly an affirmation, but at the same time it seems a qualified one. Are we to take the becoming-paradigmatic of these experiments a sign of their success or failure? Does it register their effectiveness and continuing force, or rather their institutional absorption and formalisation and a relative loss of the insistent interrogative imperative that first animated them? Certainly the term, “paradigm” seems loaded insofar as it implies the ascendance to the official – and even doctrinal – of what had hitherto been oppositional. Here, it is perhaps helpful to turn to Giorgio Agamben’s exploration of the paradigm. Agamben notes that, in terms of the theory of knowledge, it emerges as a third kind of procedure in

---

3 Raymond Williams, *Keywords: A Vocabulary of Culture and Society* (London: Fontana Paperbacks, 1983): 252

relation to induction and deduction. Where induction moves from the particular to the universal, and deduction from the universal to the particular, the paradigm operates in analogical way, by moving from particular case to particular case. In doing so, he argues, it suspends the particular/universal dichotomy and establishes a relation predicated upon its singularity. This relation is not rule-based and pre-given, but is actively constructed, generated through a process of setting one thing alongside another. In this understanding, paradigmatic capacity does not derive from some prior condition of universality, but rather inheres in the very singularity of the case itself. Perhaps this then indicates a way of thinking about the paradigmatic potential of the field of radical pedagogies that the project studies, and also Professor Colomina’s important claim that, “it is the diversity of strategies that constitutes the radicality of the period”. The task then would not be to seek to derive some kind of rule-bound pedagogic approaches or techniques from them, but instead to explore the paradigmatic capacities they hold as an array of singularities that can be brought to bear in a non-totalising way upon present problems.

Finally, it is important to acknowledge the extent to which the Radical Pedagogies project itself represents a kind of radical pedagogy – one that mobilises a network of students and other contributors in an open-ended and multiple-authored project of documentation that has global reach and that works across diverse modes (including exhibitions) to disseminate its research. If it provides a toolbox, then perhaps it is one whose instruments we might rightly expect to be taken up and used in unforeseen and as yet unknown ways.
CHAPTER 1
THE RADICAL PEDAGOGIES PROJECT

In a remarkable photograph of May 1968, Giancarlo de Carlo is in a vigorous debate with the students taking over the Milan Triennale in protest. He leans forward, angry but listening intently, as a student lectures him. Both sides, the teacher and the students surrounding him, are radicals. Despite his jacket and tie, Giancarlo de Carlo is a self-professed anarchist and the students are paradoxically following his call to question institutional authority by refusing to follow him. The whole ecology of architectural education is destabilised, twisting restlessly around itself in a kind of vortex. The circle of students has become a classroom – a portable, improvised space in which the streets become the real teacher. The line between urban life and education has dissolved. Protest has become pedagogy (FIG. 1).

In the 2010 protests against the latest university reforms promoted by Italian Minister of Culture Maristella Gelmini, students marched on the streets of Rome. In a performative political-act, they took over the public space of the city with shields reproducing covers of seminal books. The scene captures the intersection of protest, education and Italian design, with the brightly-coloured shields lined up as a visual manifesto. Rather than addressing the content of the protest, the Minister of Culture responded: “Do not let professors manipulate your opinions”. Active political engagement was suddenly reduced to a faded replica of 1968, instigated by now tenured radicals. The scene in the streets was treated as just a classroom exercise. Pedagogy has become protest (FIG. 2).

Radical Pedagogies explores a series of pedagogical experiments that played a crucial role in shaping architectural discourse and practice in the second half of the twentieth century. As a challenge to normative thinking, they questioned, redefined and reshaped the postwar field of architecture. They are radical in the literal meaning stemming from the Latin radix (root), as they question the basis of architecture. These new modes of teaching shook foundations and disturbed assumptions, rather than reinforcing and disseminating them. They operated as small endeavours, sometimes on the fringes of institutions, but had long-lasting impact. Much of architectural teaching today still rests on the paradigms they introduced.

Radical pedagogies belong to a period of collective defiance against the authority of institutional, bureaucratic and capitalist structures. The world, as it was known, was undergoing drastic transformations on all scales. The geopolitical landscape was completely reshaped by the Cold War, the Vietnam War and the Space Race. At the same time, the domestic environment was increasingly refurnished with objects of mass-produced and mass-consumable desire. Utopian technological prophesies, foretold in science fiction tales, now manifested in a brave new world of computation,
gadgets and spaceships. Architecture was anything but impervious to such shifts. Highly self-conscious, the architectural radicalism of this era revealed the anxieties caused by the discipline’s uncertainty about its identity in a rapidly-transforming world. The question of architecture’s sociopolitical value, in light of its evident complicity with capital, repeatedly came to the fore. No aspect of architecture could be taken for granted. To imagine its future, architecture was forced to re-examine its own disciplinary protocols. While some forms of radical practice celebrated architecture’s integration into a larger cultural and environmental milieu, others responded with a retreat to the specificity of the discipline itself though the investigation of language and abstract form.

The Radical Pedagogies project was born out of a deep interest in these historical experiments. It is an ongoing, multi-year, collaborative research-project led by myself with a team of PhD students of the School of Architecture at Princeton University. It has so far involved three years of seminars, interviews, archival research, guest lectures, along with contributions by protagonists and scholars from around the world, culminating in a major installation at the Venice Biennale of 2014 and the 7th Warsaw Under Construction Festival in 2015. In this and similar research projects conducted at the PhD program at Princeton, architectural history and theory are taught and practiced as an experiment in and of themselves, exploring the potential for collaboration (in what is often taught to be an individual field) and addressing the challenges and opportunities of new media. The name Radical Pedagogies is a play on, “radical architecture”, a term coined by Germano Celant for the diverse productions of a menagerie of Italian groups, individuals and publications, ranging in time from 1963 to 1971, including Superstudio, Archizoom, UFO, etc. Our point is that there was also a parallel subversion of architectural education and not just in Italy. This subversion took multiple forms: challenging programs, architecture schools, institutions and even the basic relationship between teacher and students. The diversity of pedagogical experiments was a crucial aspect of its radicality. Any sense of architecture as a singular, stable phenomenon was jettisoned by a kaleidoscopic array of challenges to conventional thinking. The Radical Pedagogies project presents a kind of taxonomy of all these different species of experimental architectural education.

Academic institutions became a space of confrontation – sites of extended intellectual, political, economic and physical battles. On the one hand, institutions were understood as necessary hosts for the erosion of established structures of power. On the other hand, they were perceived as mechanisms for the reproduction of existing systems of domination. Institutional authority was critiqued through a broad range of counter-institutions and alternative pedagogical platforms that undermined hierarchical structures. The historical marker for this period of reconfigurations is often taken to be 1968, with the student revolts that took place around the world and the pedagogical transformations that surrounded them. While these revolts greatly exceeded the confines of architecture schools, architecture students were key in some of these protests. Central to the outcomes of these revolts, as they developed in Paris for example, was the formation in 1969 of the Unité Pédagogique d’Architecture No. 6 (UP6), which famously promoted an alternative to the pedagogy of the Beaux-Arts School. The UP6 openly accused the school’s prevailing curricula and teaching methods of being incapable of addressing architecture’s
relationship to contemporary social and political maladies, and demanded that their vision of a new social order be reflected in the very basis of their studies. This demand was thought to concern, not only the content of pedagogy, but also the mode of teaching and its institutional framework. In post-1968 Paris, architectural pedagogy was revised at the same time that the university was redefined. Similar concerns triggered revolts in architecture schools worldwide. The 1969 burning, allegedly by students, of Yale’s Art and Architecture building, which had been completed only in 1963, symbolised the sudden unrest within the bastions of disciplinary authority. At Yale, this phenomenon took the form of eruptions – with sit-ins, occupations, explosions and demonstrations. The Black Panther trials were in progress and there were riots in the city and rallies at Yale. Two bombs went off at the university hockey rink. A, “Free the Panthers” banner appeared on the burned building of the school of architecture. Yet, some of the radical experiments aimed at a political reconfiguration of society prior to the 1968 revolts. The Hochschule für Gestaltung (HfG) in Ulm, Germany, for example, aimed to re-democratise Germany through design toward a, “better society”. The school was founded in 1953 by (among others) Inge Scholl, sister of the Nazi resistance activists Sophie and Hans Scholl. Drawing on the functionalist-humanist legacy of the Bauhaus, on the one hand, and cybernetics and process design, on the other, the HfG was conceived of as site for institutionalised discourse and reinvention of the role of the designer. Architectural education was a deeply political project for its protagonists, one that provoked intense debates and diverse ideologies. The school finally closed its doors 1968, due to internal disagreements and a conservative government withdrawing funds. Precisely, the year of the student revolts across the Western world had become the endpoint for this experiment.

Radical experiments in architectural education went far beyond these well-known cases and were a truly global phenomenon whose reach extended beyond the geopolitical borders of the Western world and democratic regimes, as defined during the Cold War. With the Institutional Revolutionary Party in power for several decades, for example, architectural education in Mexico during the 1970s had become increasingly disassociated from the country’s reality. As a response, faculty and students at the Escuela Nacional de Arquitectura took radical action by occupying parts of the school and proposing formed a new architectural curriculum for the school. Entitled Autogobierno (Self-government), this new curriculum was based on principles of self-management and open to student enrollment for almost four years.

A series of upheavals led by students and faculty at the School of Architecture in Valparaíso, Chile in 1967, seemingly shared some similar concerns to those contemporaneously erupting worldwide. Yet, rather than participating in any pursuit for political change, this particular experiment remained a radical pursuit for ‘a change of life’ through pedagogical practices that obliterated the boundaries between learning, working and living, rejecting any political emphasis to, “change the world”. In fact, the activities of the School survived the tumultuous environment of the 1970s and 80s in Chile by refusing to participate within it. Simultaneously, the work of young socialist architects and urban planners exerted an allure on radical educators of democratic countries. That was the case of the Soviet group the New Element of Settlement (NER) – a group of Soviet architects that presented their work in the 1968 Milan Triennale after the invitation of
Giancarlo De Carlo. Their book NER, *On the Way to a New City* (1966) was one of the most highly influential tomes that came out of the Soviet Union in the 1960s, primarily because of its critique of post-Stalinist Soviet planning practices. It was through educators like de Carlo, that NER’s rather audacious critique, along with their proposals towards a new spatiality of socialism, crossed the seemingly insular border of the Iron Curtain during the late 1960s (Fig. 6). In other instances, architectural pedagogues tried to reinvent architectural education outside of the academic context. Educators often claimed their ‘independence’ from the institutions in which they operated (even if the degree of this independence might be debatable). Many of them exploited, subverted or simply needed those institutions as contrast to their radical self-definition. The latter was the case of Global Tools, a group of architects that operated in Italy from 1973 to 1975; its protagonists included Archizoom Associati, Remo Buti, the Casabella and Rassegna editorial group, Riccardo Dalisi, Ugo La Pietra, 9999, Gaetano Pesce, Gianni Pettena, Ettore Sottsass Jr., Superstudio, UFO and Zziggurat. Defined as, “a counter-school of architecture (or non-architecture; or again non-school)”, they simultaneously challenged architecture’s own constituency and the nature of academic institutions. Set up as a system of laboratories between Milan and Florence, with meetings held in the countryside around Florence, the Global Tools group evaded the institutional confines by organising trips as part of their educational program. These trips provided the opportunity for an education without a fixed studio setting in a particular school, expanding the ‘building’ of the architecture school to a network of places. Different workshops aimed to promote the free development of individual creativity. Using diverse methods that ranged from survival techniques to communication technologies, Global Tools attempted to bridge, “the activities of the hand with those of the mind” (a connection that they deemed lost due to the rise of specialisation). While holding these workshops in a number of changing locations, the members of Global Tools still remained attached to different institutional frameworks. Positioning themselves on the edge between institutionality and radicality, many of the members of Global Tools taught at the School of Architecture at the University of Florence (Unifi). At the same time, the group depended heavily on publishing ‘institutions’ (such as the magazines Casabella and Rassegna) for the communication of its work to the wider architectural audience.

Other similarly ‘independent’ pedagogical groups exploited the resources of well-established institutions to forge alternative educational practices that, in turn, challenged the fundamental notion of institution. This was the case of the itinerant summer workshops of the International Laboratory of Architecture and Urban Design (ILA&UD), led by Giancarlo de Carlo with the participation of members of Team X. Starting in 1976, these workshops were held in different cities, including Urbino, Siena and Venice, as well as in the microstate of San Marino. Often tapping into local universities, such as the Istituto Universitario di Architettura di Venezia (IUAV) in Venice or the Università degli studi di Urbino (where De Carlo had authored a number of buildings). ILA&UD’s geographic rotation challenged institutional stasis, both spatially and temporally. In addition to its changing roster of critics, the workshops’ participants were drawn from around a dozen architecture schools in different countries. Faculty and students could decamp to Italy for a few weeks each year to study common concerns, interests and problems without the baggage and politics of their home institutions. ILA&UD’s
mobility, autonomy and diversity questioned the theoretical self-definition of the academic institution as a stable body where regulated processes are reiterated. In these and other experiments, the school tried to undo the central institution of teaching. Such was the case of the mobile network of academic structures designed by Cedric Price in his Potteries Thinkbelt (1965), and Candilis, Josic and Woods’ open-system building for the Freie Universität (FU) in Berlin (1967–73). These attempts tried to manifest an open-ended structure both for method and building. The network schemes and integrative spaces both symbolised that knowledge was no longer transmitted but produced, while at the same time hoping to actually recondition student-teacher behaviours through their choreography of physical and intellectual ‘freedom’ of movement. Cedric Price’s and Peter Murray’s Polyark Bus in 1973, for example, tried to mobilise architectural education in an immediate way. Picking up students from one school and dropping them off at another, it probed the foundation of institutional continuity by simply exchanging a part of its population. In other cases, the academic building was left behind altogether, undoing its role as pedagogue and pedagogical symbol. That was the case of Valparaíso, where a multitude of activities brought students outside the classroom, in exploratory exercises throughout the city, or increasingly through trips being incorporated as part of the School’s activities. This subversive use of non-architecture as an alternative site for pedagogy pushed the understanding of a ‘school’ as material manifestation beyond its architecture. It expanded the role of the building-as-teacher to that of the environment teaching the architect.

Architectural education was also challenged from the outside by professionals and intellectuals from other fields. Design pedagogy was not only seen as symptomatic of larger issues, but had also become the field for a re-thinking of pedagogy at large. The 1972 symposium The Universitas Project, organised by Emilio Ambasz at MoMA in New York, is an example of these speculations. In a series of meetings, round tables and texts historians, writers, artists, philosophers, scientists, architects and educators offered proposals for a design education in a post-technological society. The list of speakers invited to the symposium included, among many others: Hannah Arendt, Jean Baudrillard, Gillo Dorfles, Umberto Eco, Suzanne Keller, György Kepes, Henri Lefebvre, Octavio Paz and Denise Scott Brown. Rather than offering experimental anti-institutional alternatives, Ambasz sought to devise a new framework that he defined as, “a new type of institution centered on the task of evaluating and designing the man-made milieu”. A group of high-profile thinkers inside and outside the discipline was gathered to consider design education as a key challenge of the period. Meanwhile, the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies (IAUS), founded in New York in 1967 by Peter Eisenman, had a pedagogical program run by a core group of scholars and architects, which was offered to universities in the United States as a package for a year of study in New York. While teaching at IAUS, many of the members of this group held positions within prominent academic institutions on the East Coast of the US. The formation of the IAUS was an attempt to create a different kind of institution for architectural education outside the traditional academic setting, yet it was thoroughly academic in its network and ambitions, with lectures, courses, exhibitions and publications. Whether they chose to replace one institution with another, or to drive traditional institutions into new directions, the educators in radical pedagogies were ultimately institutional figures. The very attempt to reject
institutions positioned them in relationship with institutions; they inevitably become institutional figures in alternative structures that, in some case, were not anti-institutional, but rather hyper-institutional.

Within different experiments, radical pedagogical experiments introduced new constituencies within the discipline. The experimental summer programs of the Women's School of Planning and Architecture, established in 1974, gathered different feminist sensibilities in the USA. Rather than merely opening a space for women within the profession, it rehearsed collaborative and non-hierarchical structures against the model of male-dominated institutions. At UC Berkeley, the collaboration between the Center of Independent Living and the College of Environmental Design in the 1970s led to the introduction of physical accessibility as a topic of architectural education inside the classroom and the studio. The ambition to give equal access to diversely-abled bodies within the built environment was the spatial analog of a more general concern with the inclusion of ever new voices and sensibilities within the University. In fact, this collaboration cannot be detached from the heated political debates, protests and strikes that were taking place on campus at the time, starting with the Free Speech movement in 1964. Political action took shape as a series of physical interventions on the Berkeley campus, such as curb cuts to form accessibility ramps. Policy changes that ensued these events, culminated into the passage of the Americans with Disabilities Act in 1990.

In all these cases, radical pedagogies questioned architecture's disciplinary assumptions on the one hand and architecture's relation to social, political and economic processes on the other. It was precisely because architecture’s disciplinarity could no longer be taken for granted that radical pedagogies addressed such instability, both through self-reflective studies of its own autonomy and in an explosion and promiscuity with neighboring fields. One form of this disciplinary self-reflection interrogated the historical and formal bases of Modernist traditions. The group of architects known as the Texas Rangers at the University of Texas School of Architecture in the fifties (1951–58) and, later, John Hejduk and Bob Slutzky at The Cooper Union in New York (1964–2000) and Colin Rowe at Cornell (1962–1990) placed an emphasis on addressing the autonomy of architecture through its formal language, considering it the very root of architectural creation. It manifested itself in the formulation of famous exercises such as the “nine-square grid” problem. The architectural historian Joseph Rykwert and the theorist Dalibor Vesely, likewise, aimed to redefine architecture's essence, but on the basis of phenomenology and the hermeneutic tradition. The master’s level course they led at the University of Essex from 1968 to 1978 became a de facto school of architecture, its legacy traceable in the work of their disciples dispersed around the world, such as Daniel Libeskind, Robin Evans, David Leatherbarrow, Mohsen Mostafavi and Alberto Pérez-Gómez. Rykwert’s and Vesely’s method was based on theoretical production, and resulted in a distinctive approach to architecture as a discipline, rooted in an architectural interpretation of phenomenological philosophy. Both in Texas and in Essex, the challenge to the status quo focused on architecture’s inside, countering architecture’s instability with the idea that architecture has a core identity that can be uncovered and refined.

Other experiences focused on architecture’s outside, with cues taken from fields such as linguistics, sociology, philosophy and psychoanalysis, as well as the feminist movement. Throughout the 1960s and ‘70s, different schools around the world became hubs for a redefinition
of, “architecture” through seemingly external methods. The search for answers to the question: What is architecture? was not, however, limited to either the inside of the field or input from other academic fields. Design studios led by Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown at Yale (and more broadly the pedagogy promoted under Charles Moore’s tenure as Dean of Yale from 1965 to 1970), attempted to reframe, “architecture” without the capital, “A”. Using sociological techniques of observation and documentation, architecture here was situated (formally and symbolically) in the language of popular and vernacular culture. Whether the protagonists attempted an introspective redefinition or a reorientation with borrowed tools, all of these approaches put architecture’s self-understanding on trial. Beyond self-analysis and self-recrimination, some experiments were set up to transgress disciplinary limits altogether and engage in the transformation of social, political, economic or technological conventions. Buckminster Fuller’s widely-successful geodesic-construction workshops, for example, wielded architecture as a universal technological-apparatus in response to newly global topics, such as resource management, waste and climate. Based at the Southern Illinois University at Carbondale during the 1960s, Fuller globalised his teaching by visiting countless schools around the world\textsuperscript{24} (FIG. 8). In reverse, the Architectural Association (AA) in London became a ‘jet-age school’, with an international body of students and faculty.\textsuperscript{25} The institutionalisation of a global diversity of studio-visitors and guest lectures offered a dense pedagogical menu of subjects and techniques to order from.\textsuperscript{26} Such importation of global pedagogical expertise to a cosmopolitan hub like London had its simultaneous counterpart in cases where architectural teaching methods were ‘exported’. In the late 1950s, Charles and Ray Eames, for example, were brought in as experts to develop a new pedagogical program for design education in Ahmedabad. In their 1958 report to the Government of India, the Eameses recommended the implementation of a communications-based design-training program to assist with the country’s industrial development.\textsuperscript{27} Architectural education was to become not just the site of experiments, but the tool for national economic improvement. On a parallel front, and part of many of these experiments, architecture’s traditional bond with technology was reprogrammed through visionary science fiction and the advent of computation and robots. The Laboratory for Computer Graphics and Spatial Analysis at the Harvard Graduate School of Design (GSD), for example, comprised architects, geographers, cartographers, mathematicians, computer scientists and artists who were invested in the idea that the introduction of the computer into an academic setting could profoundly alter the ways in which design disciplines operated.\textsuperscript{28} Founded in 1964, the lab rehearsed its pedagogical role through a series of self-proclaimed experimental workshops and seminars that aimed to displace the use of the computer from the periphery of the architectural profession (essentially its use in structural engineering, mechanical engineering, contracting and cartography) to the centre of the design process.\textsuperscript{29} A few years later, and within walking distance of the GSD, Nicholas Negroponte’s Architecture Machine Group spearheaded a desire to forge alliances with the expanding world of computation. Carrying out experiments with cybernetics and artificial intelligence at MIT in the late 1960s, the Architecture Machine Group promoted a synthetic relationship between man and machine.\textsuperscript{30} The development of the MIT Media Lab out of these experiments shows how new strategies within architectural schools could reorganise the wider
institution and open up new cross-disciplinary spaces.

After the student protests of 1968, the College of Environmental Design at the University of Berkeley sought to transform the architect into a political agent, deploying an interdisciplinary approach that integrated sociology, policy making and regional planning into the curriculum. Likewise, Giancarlo de Carlo, who had anarchist affiliations prior to the 1950s, called for a new architectural pedagogy in the early 1960s that promoted activist interventions and would itself be a form of political activism. The role of the pedagogue was to transform the student into an intelleltuale dell'architettura – someone who understands the role of the architect as an ethical and sociopolitical one.

Radical pedagogies operated between two modes of action: either maintaining a clear position against a ruling power from the outside or proposing alternatives from the inside. There is often ambiguity between them. For example, the Hochschule für Gestaltung in Ulm posed its model as an alternative to the normative Polytechnique. Yet, when it was offered to become part of the Technical University of Stuttgart, after internal struggles and political quarrels, the vote of students and faculty was in favour of terminating the experiment of the HfG. In the case of Valparaíso, an escape was posed as a utopian alternative, moving away from the mainstream, rather than attempting to move the mainstream itself.

Architecture's perceived complicity with capitalism was not limited to the shaping of consumable goods. Many of the educational experiments and institutions at stake (such as the HfG) were supported by public funds, making them inherently dependent on the system they wanted to overturn, or at least a challenge. While one could expect an uncomfortable tension as a result, the responses to such dependency were multiple: some experiments were considered to be rightful forms of education that should be supported by public money; others operated from within a funded institution, following the strategies (or rhetoric) of subversion. Others denied outside funds, trying instead to set up an independent model of operation through guerilla tactics. Once again, it is the diversity of strategies that constitutes the radicality of the period. Architecture and its education were put on trial and ruthlessly interrogated in every possible way.
Chapter 2
THE WARSAW EXPERIMENT

The latest phase of the Radical Pedagogies project is the exhibition Radical Pedagogies: Reconstructing Architectural Education, which was part of the 7th Warsaw Under Construction Festival in Warsaw between October 9 and November 8, 2015. The exhibition added a whole new layer of research, continuing the original mission of creating an ever-expanding ‘open archive’ that encourages debate regarding the history and future of architectural pedagogy.

Conceived as an interactive platform, the installation at the Warsaw Faculty of Architecture incorporated take-away texts, facsimiles, original publications and teaching documents, archival films, and implemented interactive features through augmented reality. The first two exhibitions of the project scratched the surface of the global dimension of architectural education, tracing the movements of students and educators (such as that of the Italian diaspora for the exhibition in the Venice Biennale) across an ever-shrinking world. For this occasion we opened up new directions and a new density of global interconnections. Africa, East Asia, Australasia and Eastern Europe become the protagonists; opening new insights into pedagogical experimentation in the postwar years. The full counter-hegemonic force of radical pedagogy can be seen as people and ideas cross continents and political systems. This charting of experiments in architectural education across new regions did not arise from any desire to craft a ‘global history’ that includes the ‘non-West’. Instead, it evolved organically as the project incorporated the invaluable input of an ever-expanding research team of educators, architects and students from around the world. Thus, we turn the spotlight on histories that are worth telling; multiple histories of architectural education whose groundbreaking dimensions can only be discerned and assessed vis-à-vis the context within which they unfold. The new archive allows the resonances and dissonances between these experiments to be seen and discussed. The notion of radicality has acquired more and subtler hues.

The initial research team of PhD students at Princeton has grown exponentially to over 78 contributors from more than two dozen countries. The number of case-studies has likewise grown to over 90, and it continues to grow in this extended collaborative project to build a new kind of archive of disruptive pedagogical practices that can act as a tool-box for students, teachers, designers and historians. The Radical Pedagogies project is carried out in the conviction that many of the radical experiments engaged with issues that have become again urgently relevant in today’s world. A number of the strategies are no longer disruptive and have been normalised as a part of educational research and design practice, but many of the experiments would still be considered controversial, if not highly-disruptive today.
The new case-studies are grouped under what we consider six characteristic threads that run through the expanded archive of the project. “Participative Educational Democracies” presents an array of non-French case-studies that predate and succeed May ’68, where the right to participation and self-governance were mobilised to subvert conventional curricula and administrative structures (Fig 9). “Post-Independence Modernisation” showcases experiments of national self-determination through architectural education in settings like Kumasi (Fig 10) and Baghdad, where resistance to power structures extended beyond the mandates of local institutions. “Postwar Modernisation Labs in the East” presents two seemingly antithetical educational laboratories in Japan that both turned to the sciences and ethnography in order to provide new modes of architectural pedagogy. “Experimental Media Politics” demonstrates how architectural politics are not merely performed through drawings, models or buildings, but also through the form, content and dispositions of media that are mobilised as teaching tools. “Politics of the Body” regards non-orthodox educational settings where questions of physical and symbolical access to architecture – and by extension to the cultural ‘edifices’ and processes it houses – served as points of departure for challenging traditional design priorities. Lastly, “Feminist Pedagogies” introduces key examples where female activists in North America fiercely campaigned for women’s fundamental right to design education through self-organisation and hands-on action.

Radical Pedagogies is a project of collective intelligence. In that respect it is a scholarly and pedagogical experiment in its own right that questions traditional models of academic authorial production. It delves into the largely uncharted territory of extra-large collaborative projects that source expertise from a global network of scholars – a model with a large history in the academic fields of the sciences but rarely the humanities. Radical Pedagogies seeks to present a horizontal cut through architectural education throughout the second half of the twentieth century – a history of which, or multiple histories, has yet to be written.
LECTURE 2: TOWARDS A RADICAL PEDAGOGY

3 FIGURES

FIGURE 1
Giancarlo De Carlo debates with Gianemilio Simonetti as protesting students take over the Milan Triennale in May 1968.
Photo by Cesare Colombo, 1968
© Cesare Colombo
Students march on the streets of Rome with shields reproducing covers of seminal books in protest against the latest University reforms in 2010.
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Figure 3
Radical Pedagogies: ACTION-REACTION-INTERACTION, installation at the 14th Venice Biennale of Architecture

Photo by Evangelos Kotsioris, 2014
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Reynner Banham in Ulm with Tomás Maldonado

Photo by Wolfgang Sief, 1959
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FIGURE 5
Tournaments in the Course Culture of the Body: “Giro y realce de triple corrijo sobre volutas”. Escuela de Arquitectura y Diseño, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso
Archivo Histórico José Vial, Escuela de Arquitectura y Diseño, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Valparaíso, 1975
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FIGURE 6
The NER group at Markhi (Moscow Institute of Architecture), March 1961
© Courtesy of the NER Group Archive
FIGURE 7

Demonstration by students of the Center for Independent Living at Berkeley University, Berkeley, ca. 1975–77

Photo by Deborah Hoffman. Published in Raymond Lifchez and Barbara Winslow, Design for Independent Living (London: The Architectural Press), 30

FIGURE 8

Buckminster Fuller students build an 8ft-diameter tensegrity sphere at the Southern Illinois University of Carbondale, adaptable as an environment control structure, 1959

Photo by: Architectural Design 31 (July, 1961)
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The installation at the Venice Biennale was curated by Beatriz Colomina with Ph.D. students Ignacio González Galán, Evangelos Kotsioris, Anna-Maria Meister, Britt Eversole and Federica Vannucchi. The exhibition in Warsaw was curated by Beatriz Colomina, and Evangelos Kotsioris. For further information on the (more than) 90 case studies, including the full list of over 78 worldwide contributors, see: www.radical-pedagogies.com

See Radical Pedagogies [R.P. from now on] contribution by Jean-Louis Violeau in www.radical-pedagogies.com

The brutalist building of the School was designed by Paul Rudolph and completed between 1959–1963. Rudolph served as the School’s Dean between 1958–64

See R.P. contribution by Beatriz Colomina

See R.P. contribution by Anna-Maria Meister


See R.P. contribution by José Esparza. On the introduction of the new curriculum, see: Arquitectura Autogobierno: Revista mensual de material didáctico n.1 (October 1976)

See R.P. contribution by Ignacio González Galán


See R.P. contribution by Andrea Merrett


