Architectural Theory Review

ISSN: (Print) (Online) Journal homepage: https://www.tandfonline.com/loi/ratr20

Architectural Contact Zones: Another Way to Write Global Histories of the Post-War Period?

Tom Avermaete & Cathelijne Nuijsink

To cite this article: Tom Avermaete & Cathelijne Nuijsink (2021): Architectural Contact Zones: Another Way to Write Global Histories of the Post-War Period?, Architectural Theory Review, DOI: 10.1080/13264826.2021.1939745

To link to this article: https://doi.org/10.1080/13264826.2021.1939745

© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group

Published online: 09 Jul 2021.

Submit your article to this journal

Article views: 212

View related articles

View Crossmark data

Full Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at
https://www.tandfonline.com/action/journalInformation?journalCode=ratr20

ARCHITECTURAL THEORY REVIEW
https://doi.org/10.1080/13264826.2021.1939745

OPEN ACCESS

Architectural Contact Zones: Another Way to Write Global Histories of the Post-War Period?

Tom Avermaete and Cathelijne Nuijsink

ETH Zurich

ABSTRACT
This position paper addresses the ways that we historicise architectural modernism, especially within the context of the unprecedented global movements of people, ideas, materials and labour that characterised the post-war period. It suggests an alternative theoretical framing and corresponding historiography of global modernism, based on the concept of cross-cultural "contact zones." A notion first coined by literature scholar Mary Louise Pratt in the context of colonial studies, architectural contact zones—competitions, exhibitions, congresses, biennales, summer schools—offer the possibility to rethink what innovation in architecture culture entails. Rather than underscoring the originality of the single genius-architect, contact zones offer a conception of architectural development that is based on a more global and multidirectional exchange of knowledge. Scrutinising the mechanisms behind architectural contact zones can result in a reframing of the history of architectural modernism as a cross-cultural, multi-authored and poly-conceptual matter.

KEYWORDS
Architecture historiography; authorship; contact zone; cultural encounters; knowledge exchange; methodological framework; transculturation

Introduction

Though architecture had been for a long time embedded in a set of global economic, political and social connections, the scale, intensity and density of global encounters and collaborations gained momentum after 1945.[1] Following advances in transportation and communication technologies, but also as a result of a major geopolitical restructuring of the world, the nature of "contact" changed. Through decolonisation, the instauration of Cold War alliances and the recognition of the so-called "Third World" as an important field of architectural and urban activity, an unprecedented movement of people, goods, ideas and labour emerged. These processes of globalisation had a fundamental and structural impact on the way that modern architecture was conceived, constructed, used and experienced. Sociologist Anthony Giddens connects these to "the intensification of worldwide social relations which link distant localities in such a way that local happenings are shaped by events occurring many miles away and vice versa." This resulted, in the opinion of historian Jürgen Osterhammel, in an

CONTACT Cathelijne Nuijsink cathelijne.nuijsink@gta.arch.ethz.ch

© 2021 The Author(s). Published by Informa UK Limited, trading as Taylor & Francis Group
This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial-NoDerivatives License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/), which permits non-commercial re-use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited, and is not altered, transformed, or built upon in any way.

increasingly "flattened world" which caused, in the eyes of geographer David Harvey, a "time-space compression," shrinking the understanding of global space relative to time.[2] Architectural design would increasingly become a cosmopolitan practice with renowned architects designing projects across the globe, architectural knowledge circulating in ever wider geographies and more intense ways, and buildings that would more than ever be composed of materials and elements that were sourced globally.[3]

The Historiographical Challenges of the Flattened World

This "flattened world," with its regimes of circulation, not only affected the practice and thinking of architecture historically, but today also poses challenges to the historiography of this same post-war period. While international travel and encounters have always been part of modern architecture's historical narratives—think, for instance, of the many studies on the "grand tours" of modern architects—the intensified regime of global encounters, exchanges and collaborations in the post-war years rebuts the theoretical vantage points and methods that are employed in the canonical histories.[4]

A first challenge concerns the way that authorship in architectural design practice is addressed in the conventional historical studies of modern architecture. As Colin Davies remarks, "[a]rchitecture is in practice a collaborative enterprise […]. The idea that a building should be credited to a single author seems on the face of it to be untenable, yet we continue to pay lip service to it."[5] Davies' remarks problematise the way that most histories of modern architecture have engaged with the agency of the architect. Echoing a tradition in the history of art, these histories have often focused on heroic genius as the propeller of invention and development in architectural culture. Many studies on modern architecture—think of some of the canonical accounts of Alvar Aalto, Louis Kahn or Mies van der Rohe, to name three stalwarts of the Pantheon of modern architecture—have celebrated this model of the solitary virtuoso.[6] And while such an approach might be useful in describing a specific tier of artistic practice, in the cross-cultural field of post-war modern architectural practices, its validity seems to be very limited.

Considering modern architecture as a phenomenon that is intrinsically related to processes of global exchange among people, images, texts and knowledge requires that the notion of authorship in architectural design practice is carefully reconsidered. After all, a global perspective raises our awareness of the negotiated character of architecture, as design is often driven by multiple architects (with both local and international pedigrees) or emerges from the complex interplay between various actors from different national and professional geographies, such as craftspeople, constructors, commissioners and politicians. New scholarship has also started to address other actors in the design process to narrow the gap of gender disparity, focusing, for instance, on the importance of the commissioner.[7] Accounting more fully for this negotiated and cooperative character in architectural design practice, in which multiple actors are involved, seems to be one of the main historiographical challenges that scholars have come to recognise, but are yet to fully address.[8]

Davies' observation on the collaborative character of architecture is not only relevant in the realm of design but holds for architectural culture at large. Many of the key moments in architectural culture—think of important associations, meetings and publications—depend strongly upon the cooperation and negotiation between different actors.[9] However, until now many of these have been described as one-(wo)man shows, ascribing, for instance, the impetus of the *Congres Internationaux de l'Architecture Moderne* (CIAM) to Le Corbusier, the curatorship of the Ekistics meetings to Constantinos Doxiadis and the editorship of the journal *Architectural Design* (1945–75) to Monica Pidgeon. In all of these cases, it is too often denied that many other people contributed to achieving these key vehicles of architectural culture. Recent studies have made attempts to recapture these "other" actors. Hence, the important role of urban designer Jacqueline Tyrwhitt—both at the heart of the CIAM organisation and the centre of the Ekistics meetings—has been thoroughly investigated, as has the role of the so-called "boys" or technical editors that contributed to *Architectural Design* under Pidgeon herself.[10] However, if we do not want important actors and voices to remain lost in the canonical histories of modern architecture, we will have to *structurally* replace the myth of the solitary genius with the idea of multiple authorship.[11]

A more global history of modern architecture also requires that we develop methods and perspectives to illuminate the complex processes of knowledge exchange that are at the heart of the multi-authored character of architecture. Though many historians are very aware of the negotiated character of architectural knowledge, we seem at times to lack the theories and methods needed to qualify these processes of negotiation. In the histories of modern architecture, the transduction of knowledge between different actors is still too often analysed as solely a matter of "influence" between different architects, of "teaching" between masters and pupils, as well as the "import" and "export" of ideas. A good example are the many architects that have been cast as pupils of Le Corbusier, including German Samper and Rogelia Salmona (Colombia), Lúcio Costa and Oscar Niemeyer (Brazil), Emilio Duhart and Guillermo Jullian de la Fuente (Chile), Justino Serralta (Uruguay), Charles Correa and Balkrishna Doshi (India) and Junzo Sakakura and Kunio Maekawa (Japan).

As Mercedes Volait and Joe Nasr have repeatedly argued, a "flattened world," with multiple and multidirectional encounters between people and ideas, demands a more complex approach to qualify the entangled ways that knowledge is transmitted in architectural culture.[12] Recent studies have started to unravel the complex character of knowledge exchange within the modern movement, as exemplified by Annie Pedret's *Team 10: An Archival History* or the study "Making CIAM: The Organizational Techniques of the Moderns 1928–1959," by Andreas Kalpacki.[13] However, the complex modes through which knowledge is transmitted between different actors—through texts, drawings and buildings, as well as through particular forms of organisation—alongside the processes by which transmitted knowledge is (incompletely) received and (to a degree) further developed, are issues that deserve further attention in the historiography of modern architecture.

Thirdly, the writing of global histories has exposed the Euro-American bias of existing historical narratives in the field of architecture. Scholars have criticised the fact that it has been mainly Western countries and cities conceived as the pinnacles of architectural progress, omitting key developments that took place in other regions and territories. Jennifer Robinson, for example, claims that the geographies of urban design history are characterised by an enduring divide between "First World" cities and regions that are seen as models, generating theory and policy, and "Third World" towns and territories that are seen as problems, requiring diagnosis and reform. She holds that these "First World biases do not remain without impact" and that "much of 20th century historiography, with its roots lying overwhelmingly in the Global North West, suffers from intellectual parochialism."[14]

For those scholars working on territories, cities and buildings beyond Europe and North America, it remains a challenge to overcome an imperial view. In architectural and urban histories of non-Western forms of modernism, imperial powers have often been seen as dominating the global history of this period—in some combination of coercive geopolitical and cultural power. While it is difficult to deny the centrality of actions and ideas emanating from the world's imperial powers, historians have increasingly sought to recognise the active role played in global history by territories and architects that are variously labelled as the "margins," the "peripheries," the "colonised," or the "subaltern."

Recent scholarship has started to surmount this asymmetrical ignorance in architecture historiography.[15] New architectural and urban historiographies look beyond Europe and North America to pay attention to scholarship on cities that have long been ignored.[16] Important contributions are made by focused work on the "Global South" as an alternative to studies that merely shed light on the "origins" of its architecture in the "Global North."[17] Equally productive are corrections of architectural historiography made by scholars who are themselves situated in the Global South or originate from the Global South.[18] Scholars have also made attempts to eliminate the exclusive concept of authorship in which mainly designers—specifically those who are well known—are assigned all the agency concerning the conception and construction of buildings and cities. Starting with the feminist critiques of the 1970s, new scholarship has made explicit attempts to re-inscribe actors and voices that hitherto remained lost in the canonical histories of modern architecture.[19] Yet other recent historical narratives have tried to overcome the categories of the national or the regional as common-sense containers of history and to structure narratives according to logics of exchange, encounter, translation, connection, transposition and transaction between seemingly distant and distinct geographies.[20] This last category of historical studies has illuminated the importance of studying the "entanglements and interconnections across nations and cultures that have produced a good deal of architecture."[21]

As argued above, although many compelling contributions have been made in recent scholarship, we believe that one of the biggest challenges remains the development of more nuanced methodological and theoretical frameworks that can account for the character and impact of transcultural and transdisciplinary exchanges in architectural culture. We hold that the historiography of architectural modernism, remaining inordinately focused on narratives of architects as single authors, too easily conceives of global histories as a matter of simple widening of the geographic scope, and too often continues to apply simplistic categories to qualify cross-cultural knowledge exchange.

The Concept of the "Contact Zone"

To contribute to the ongoing quest for a more dynamic and inclusive global history of architecture, this paper advocates a reorganisation of the architectural history of the second half the twentieth century around the concept of cross-cultural “contact zones.” The notion of “contact zone” was first coined by literature scholar Mary Louise Pratt in the context of colonial studies.[22] According to Pratt, contact zones are “social spaces where cultures meet, clash and grapple with each other, often in contexts of highly asymmetrical relations of power.”[23]

Scholars from different fields have inventively appropriated Pratt’s concept. English literature scholar Patricia Bizzell, for example, suggests that instead of thinking in typical unifying categories of style or chronology, historians should focus on contact zones of *differences*. She maintains that looking upon literary developments as “sites of struggle” can radically reorganise the canonical histories of English literature.[24] Historian James Clifford caused upheaval after introducing the notion of contact zones as a way to rethink the multiple relations between curators and audiences.[25] Following initiatives from Asian curators and curators of Asian origin, Clifford’s call has made curators around the world more careful in crafting exhibitions that do not display a unidirectional view but express the confrontation and dialogue between collecting institutions, stakeholders and audiences.[26]

Political science scholar Elizabeth Kath, commenting on the differences between Latin American dance and music in its original form and that performed overseas, argues that “in a world where images, ideas, sounds and other abstracted cultural forms fly around the globe faster than people ever could” we need to think about cultural contact in a multidirectional and multi-layered way.[27] Kath proposes to distinguish *layers* of transculturation, to account for people and cultural forms moving around the world, across national boundaries and for their coming into contact with one another.

Applied to the field of architecture, we envision contact zones as intense sites of encounter (competitions, exhibitions, congresses, biennales, summer meetings) between different architectural cultures in which ideas, approaches and tools are negotiated, selectively borrowed, partially adapted or rejected. In this sense, architectural contact zones suggest that ideas are not simply exported, imported or translated but that they move across different cultural contexts through complex processes of transculturation, including attitudes of acculturation, deculturation and neoculturation. At the heart of each contact zone lies a common design problem, a provocative theme or a shared discussion topic that causes certain “uproar” among the actors involved. Following this encounter, architectural ideas bounce back and forth and undergo a process of cultural negotiation and adaptation. The outcomes of the contact zone illustrate the multi-authored character of architecture: actors adapt and adjust (*acculturation*) or intermingle their opinions with those of different cultures (*neoculturation*) to arrive at a new inter-referenced form of architectural knowledge (*transculturation*).

An Architectural Culture of Contact Zones

For the field of architectural history, the contact zone also seems to offer a productive theoretical and methodological vantage point. Scholars like Jordan Sand, Esra Akcan, and Christiane Gruber have started to explore this notion in their historical studies of buildings and cities.[28] However, we propose to take the concept of the “contact zone” one step further and to look upon contact zones as one of the main drivers of architectural culture. In other words, we provocatively advocate that the theory and practice of architecture is largely propelled by architectural contact zones. The concept of the contact zone reminds us of the various important points of encounter and exchange between different actors in architectural culture with its asymmetries of power. Think of the many events that literally or virtually have confronted architects from different cultural geographies and which have contributed—sometimes crucially—to the course of modern architectural culture. The 1953 CIAM conference in Aix-en-Provence, which illuminated the crisis of the foundations of the modern movement, the gathering of local and international architects in 1969 as part of the Proyecto Experimental de Vivienda (PREVI) competition in Lima that evoked discussion on alternatives to massive informal settlements, and the 1968 Triennale of Milano that problematised participation in architecture are but a few examples. The beauty of the concept of the "contact zone" lies in its power to conceptualise these intense get-togethers, not merely as distinct international events but as constructive encounters that produce irritation and resistance as much as "exhilarating moments of wonder, revelation, mutual understanding and new wisdom."[29]

The Mechanisms and Character of Architectural Contact Zones

Looking upon architectural culture through the lens of contact zones evokes new fields of inquiry. Architectural culture is, obviously, not propelled by a single type of contact zone. Hence, we will need to start differentiating between contact zones with a distinctive character and internal mechanism.

Crucial to the differentiation between different types of architectural contact zone seems to be their regimes of initiation and access. A contact zone can be set up "intentionally" or "incidentally." The International Laboratory of Architecture and Urban Design (ILAUD) summer meetings, for instance, are a good example of how a contact zone between professors and students from different countries was intentionally set up by Giancarlo De Carlo, while a coincidental cross-cultural collaboration in a workshop—many of them taking place in the context of international exchanges between architectural schools—illustrates a more incidental contact zone. Another aspect of the contact zone is its regime of access, which is often conditioned by economic and power relations. Access to the contact zone can range from "free" to "selective" or "enforced." When the contact zone entails an open design competition announced in a journal, access might seem "free" for those who have access to this medium, but at the same time language may form a large barrier to participation. An invitation to take part in an emergency reconstruction programme, to name another type of architectural contact zone, is a good example of a "selective" and often politically regulated form of access. However, in architectural culture, we also find contact zones with enforced access, such as was the case of the architects and urban planners of the Yugoslavian *Teknoproject* in the 1960s who, for geopolitical reasons, had to collaborate with colleagues from the non-aligned world.[30] Equally, contact zones exist that are less structured and are only on the verge of emerging. Think of problem statements that academics launch in conference presentations but are still works-in-progress, or built-in contact zones, such as periodical meetings in the context of institutional collaboration.

Next to regimes of initiation and access, contact zones in architectural culture are also defined by their internal organisational logic. Questioning what exactly creates the negotiation between the actors involved, and in what way knowledge between the different actors is shared, is crucial to elucidating the underlying mechanisms. In this regard, it seems that architectural contact zones take specific organisational shapes. First, there is the "classroom," such as the Conference on Tropical Architecture in Caracas (1947), the United Nations Seminars on Housing and Community Improvement in Delhi (1954) and Zagreb (1961), the International Union of Architects (IUA) conferences in places like Rabat (1951) and Havana (1963), which act as learning environments that include—literally or metaphorically—both teachers and students. Second, contact zones can take the shape of a "collaborative project" in which participating agents are faced with a common challenge, such as in the reconstruction of Agadir after it was destroyed in the 1960 earthquake or the planning of the new city of Chandigarh in a post-partition India. Third, architectural contact zones can take the organisational form of "the forum," such as in the Shinkenchiku Residential Design Competition or the Venice Architecture Biennale exhibitions, which manifest as virtual or analogous platforms of exchange.

A third way to distinguish the character of architectural contact zones is by their temporality. The short-term architectural contact zones refer to events with a limited duration, such as competitions, exhibitions, fairs, expositions, symposia and conferences. These events are marked with a start and end date and habitually focus on a dominant theme. A real clash of opinions and actors may happen in this kind of encounter—think of the fierce discussions in some of the *ANY* conferences (Buenos Aires in 1996, or Ankara in 1998) or the Lido debate in the 1976 Venice Biennale.[31] Middle term architectural contact zones do not emphasise the singular actor but rather the collective moment. It implies encounters in which participants come together at repetitive moments and develop a project together. Take the summer workshops of the ILAUD, which each summer bring together students and tutors to compare ideas, explore theoretical themes and draw up projects on a line of common interests. The most complex are the *longue durée* contact zones, such as those staged in large international offices (Ove Arup, Oscar Niemeyer) or research institutes (Harvard GSD, AA School of Architecture), and which can be analysed over a period of several decades. Operating on a global scale, with a constant coming and going of people with different cultural backgrounds, these contact zones bring a constant influx of new ideas. *Longue durée* contact zones are especially appealing to investigate because they are contact zones that can be re-activated time and time again, allowing different actors to add new impulses and allow discussions or develop a specific research programme to develop over time. The three categories of short, middle and long should not be seen in isolation. The participation in a short time event, like an exhibition or participation in a Biennale can have a decisive influence on an existing debate with an "international office" and thus affect a *longue durée* contact zone.

Approaching the history of post-war modern architecture as a matter of "contact zones" also requires a different approach to research. For a complete picture of the multiple actors and stakeholders that are part of the cultural encounter, we cannot rely on one archive alone. Sources will have to be found in both local architectural debates as well as in larger international architectural discussions. Lost documents will have to be reconstructed, and underrepresented voices complemented using oral history. Consulting a kaleidoscope of sources "relevant to depict the struggles within" will bring the necessity of a clear system of organisation. Using (digital) concept-mapping techniques to visualise the plurality of effects and aftereffects seems unavoidable.

Our proposal to address post-war modern architectural culture as a matter of "contact zones" also demands that we situate architectural histories in very concrete ways in post-colonial perspectives of empire, power, gender and race. In the post-war era, political borders were redrawn and sometimes even retracted around nation-states. It was a period of decolonisation and reconstruction in which architecture came to be understood as a tool of nation-building. New alliances were constructed across the decolonised world, with architects and urbanists travelling between young nation-states.[32] At the same time, former geopolitical relations were confirmed in neo-colonial forms of development aid, resulting for instance in new expert cultures and the instauration of special programs of architecture education in former centres of colonial empires such as London and Paris. As a result of these processes, the nature of contacts changed. A history of "contact zones" should reflect the changing borders, the new sites of encounter and the alternate modes of exchange in post-war architectural culture, but above all, has the capacity to expose the regimes of power and nation-building, as well as the conceptions of race and gender, that define them. Studying, for instance, the relations between the different agents of a contact zone, will allow scholars to detect and reveal the inherent asymmetries that characterise post-war architecture culture at large.

Towards an Architectural History of Contact Zones?

The aim of this position paper is to enthuse scholars to explore the potentials of contact zones as a theoretical and methodological framework in the field of architecture historiography. We imagine that this can lead to a revised historiography of the post-war period in which existing global narratives of unidirectional exchange of knowledge are complexified, canonical categories of centre-periphery and chronology are blurred, and marginalised or previously unheard voices (women, minorities, colonial subjects) are included. Operating as a retroactive reflection on architectural encounters, it is meant to question what contact zones serve to unsettle.

Contact zones can help us to comprehend the complex circulation of ideas within architectural culture. They are defined in space and time as particular "events" but are not restricted to geographical borders.[33] On the contrary, they have borders which are pliable and mutable, allowing additional sources and underrepresented voices to join the dialogue. In addition to depicting a multidirectional exchange of knowledge, contact zones are also a powerful concept to analyse a "marginal" peripheral story and expose power relations. At the same time, an architectural history of contact zones would encompass the power to account for a global history of cultural encounter while focusing on the small scale of activity and exchange.

As cultural spaces, social spaces and spaces of ideas, "contact zones" play a key role in architectural culture. Moreover, the notion of "contact zone" provides the opportunity to think in a different way about the agency of architecture and architects on a global scale. It offers a conception of architectural development that is based on a more global and multidirectional exchange of knowledge and reframes the history of architectural modernism as a cross-cultural, multi-authored and poly-conceptual matter.

A history of contact zones will need to engage with the inherent asymmetry that is at play in an architectural contact zone. A selection committee, government agency or competition judge is likely to have a stronger voice during the negotiation process. In addition, it will remain difficult to evaluate how representative a single contact zone is within architectural culture until the method has been thoroughly tested.[34] Lastly, the situational encounters and specific points of intersection to which we refer are obviously insufficient to account for architectural culture at large. We have to stay alert for those historical developments that might take place outside these zones of encounter and occurs in parallel with, or in relation to changes at the macro level.

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the author(s).

Notes on contributors

Tom Avermaete is Professor for the History and Theory of Urban Design at ETH Zurich, Switzerland. His research focuses on the architecture of the city and the changing roles, approaches and tools of architects and urban designers from a cross-cultural perspective. His recent book publications include *Architecture of the Welfare State* (with Mark Swenarton and Dirk Van Den Heuvel, 2015), *Casablanca—Chandigarh* (with Maristella Casciato, 2015), *Acculturating the Shopping Centre* (with Janina Gosseye, 2018), and *The New Urban Condition* (with Leandro Medrano and Luiz Recamán, 2021).

Cathelijne Nuijsink is a Lecturer and Postdoctoral Researcher at the Institute for the History and Theory of Architecture (*gta*) at ETH Zurich, Switzerland. She obtained master's degrees in Architecture from TU Delft and the University of Tokyo before earning a PhD in East Asian Languages and Civilisations from the University of Pennsylvania in 2017. Her current research focuses on cross-cultural, interdisciplinary knowledge exchange in architecture culture and aims to contribute to a more dynamic and inclusive history of architecture post-World War Two.

ORCID

Tom Avermaete http://orcid.org/0000-0001-7359-7475
Cathelijne Nuijsink http://orcid.org/0000-0001-8900-6529

Notes

1. This is the thesis that historian Emily Rosenberg maintains in Emily S. Rosenberg, *A World Connecting: 1870–1945* (Cambridge, MA: Belknap Press of Harvard University Press, 2012).

2. Anthony Giddens, *The Consequences of Modernity* (Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press, 1990), 64; Jürgen Osterhammel and Patrick Camiller, *The Transformation of the World: A Global History of the Nineteenth Century* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2014); and David Harvey, *The Condition of Postmodernity: An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change* (Cambridge, MA: Blackwell Publishers, 1980).
3. One of the forces that changed the nature of contacts between architects was the circulation of architectural journals. From 1946 onwards, India had its very own first magazine to address modern architecture and town planning, *Marg*. The French architectural journal *l'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui* had been in operation since 1930, but saw a tremendous increase in subscriptions after the Second World War, featuring on a regular basis architecture from outside Europe and the United States. In 1956, the publishing house Shinkenchiku introduced the English-language magazine *The Japan Architect*, which added an entirely new dimension to the exchange of architectural ideas between Japan and the English-speaking world. For an overview of themes and subscriptions of *l'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui*, see Annelies Cornelis "De 'Geografische Blik' van Architectuurtijdschriften. De Presentatie Van Afrika en Latijns-Amerika in l'Architecture d'Aujourd'hui (1945–1975)" (MIng diss., Ghent University, 2009).
4. Within and beyond the field of architecture, "global history writing" is a field that is "in the making." A precise notion of what the field comprises and how it differs from other fields of study, such as postcolonial historiography, seems to be lacking at this moment. Initiatives like the Global Architectural History Teaching Collaborative (GAHTC, http://gahtc.org) can be looked upon as attempts to clarify the definition of global history in the field of architecture.
5. Davies offers an elaborate discussion on how a conventional vision of authorship biases architectural practice and historiography. See Colin Davies, *The Prefabricated Home* (London: Reaktion, 2006).
6. Monographs that centre around heroic architects and their individual achievements include, for example, Alvar Aalto, Karl Fleig, H R. Mühll, and William B. Gleckman, *Alvar Aalto* (Stuttgart: Krämer, 1963); Alvar Aalto and Peter Reed, *Alvar Aalto, 1898–1976* (Milan: Electa, 1999); Joseph Rykwert, Louis I. Kahn, and Roberto Schezen, *Louis Kahn* (New York: Harry N. Abrams, 2001); Peter Blake, *Mies van der Rohe: Architecture and Structure* (Harmondsworth: Penguin Books, 1963); and Werner Blaser, *Mies Van Der Rohe* (Basel: Birkhäuser, 2000). Scholars still make monographs on the work of a single architect, but they try to innovate in other ways, not the least correct the myth of the heroic genius. See, for instance, Hilde Heynen, *Sibyl Moholy-Nagy: Architecture, Modernism and its Discontents* (London: Bloomsbury, 2021).
7. Misattribution of work to the male partner in professional partnerships is corrected by many scholars nowadays. Think of Ann Tyng's contribution to the office of Louis Kahn, or the petition for architect Denise Scott Brown to retroactively receive recognition for the Pritzker Prize that her husband and partner Robert Venturi won in 1991, and the event organized by two students from the Harvard Graduate School of Design. Louis I Kahn and Anne Griswold Tyng, *Louis Kahn to Anne Tyng: the Rome Letters 1953–1954* (New York: Rizzoli, 1997). On patronage and joint creativity between (male) architect and (female) client, see for example Alice T. Friedman's ground-breaking work *Woman and the Making of the Modern House: A Social and Architectural History* (New Haven, CT: Yale University Press, 2006).
8. See, for instance, Mark Crinson, *Modern Architecture and the End of Empire* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2003); Swati Chattopadhyay, "The Globality of Architectural History," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 74, no. 4 (2015): 411–15.
9. See also Maristella Casciato, "Authorship and Heritage Issues," in *Modern Architectures: The Rise of a Heritage*, eds. Maristella Casciato and Émilie d'Orgeix (Wavre: Mardaga, 2012): 43–60.
10. For a recuperation of these other actors, see, for instance, Ellen Shoshkes, *Jaqueline Tyrwhitt: A Transnational Life in Urban Planning and Design* (Farnham: Ashgate, 2013);

and Peter Murray, “Leading Lady: Monica Pidgeon, Editor of *Architectural Design*, 1946 to 1975,” *Architectural Design* 80, no. 2 (2010): 106–109.

11. Architecture is not the only field in which this is the case; this is also true for literature. See Jack Stillinger, *Multiple Authorship and the Myth of Solitary Genius* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1991).
12. Joseph Nasr and Mercedes Volait, *Urbanism: Imported or Exported? Native Aspirations and Foreign Plans* (London: Academy Editions, 2003).
13. Annie Pedret, *Team 10: An Archival History* (London: Routledge Taylor & Francis, 2013); and Andreas Kalpacki, “Making CIAM. The Organizational Techniques of the Moderns 1928–1959,” (PhD diss., ETH Zurich, 2018).
14. Jennifer Robinson, *The Ordinary City: between Modernity and Development* (London: Routledge, 2006).
15. An overview of this new scholarship has been offered by Kathleen James-Chakraborty, “Beyond Postcolonialism: New Directions for the History of Nonwestern Architecture,” *Frontiers of Architectural Research* 3, no. 1 (2014): 1–9.
16. Francis D.K. Ching, Mark Jarzombek and Vikramaditya Prakash, *A Global History of Architecture* (Hoboken, NJ: Wiley, 2007); Jean-Louis Cohen, *The Future of Architecture since 1889* (London: Phaidon, 2012); Richard Ingersoll, *World Architecture: A Cross-Cultural History* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2019); Banister Fletcher, Murray Fraser and Catherine Gregg, *Sir Banister Fletcher’s Global History of Architecture*, 21st ed. (London: Bloomsbury Visual Arts, 2020).
17. The scholarly work that was performed by the researchers involved in the COST Network “European Architecture Beyond Europe” (http://architecturebeyond.eu.huma-num.fr) offers a good example of this new focus.
18. Duanfang Lu, *Third World Modernism: Architecture, Development and Identity* (London: Routledge, 2011); and William Siew Wai Lim and Chang Jiat-Hwee, *Non-West Modernist Past: On Architecture & Modernities* (Singapore: World Scientific Publishing, 2012). Art historians that have been exploring tangible connections are, for example, Saloni Mathur and Steven Nelson, *The Migrant’s Time: Rethinking Art History and Diaspora* (New Haven, NT: Yale University Press, 2011); or Steven Nelson, “Diaspora and Contemporary Art: Multiple Practices, Multiple Worldviews,” in *Companion to Contemporary Art Since 1945*, ed. Amelia Jones (Oxford: Blackwell, 2006), 296–316. For Europe and North America’s international engagement with the Islamic world, see for example, Peter H. Christensen (ed.), *Expertise and Modern Islamic Architecture: A Critical Anthology* (Bristol: Intellect, 2018). A very recent contribution to scholarship exploring a complex set of connections is Łukasz Stanek, *Architecture in Global Socialism: Eastern Europe, West Africa, and the Middle East in the Cold War* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press, 2020).
19. This had been challenged by feminists already for decades. See, for example, Susana Torre, *Women in American Architecture: A Historic and Contemporary Perspective* (New York: Whitney Library of Design, 1977), and more recently, Kathleen James-Chakraborty, *Architecture Since 1400* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2014).
20. Examples of such studies can be for instance found in Jean-Louis Cohen and Christa Weil, *Scenes of the World to Come: European Architecture and the American Challenge 1893–1960* (Paris: Flammarion, 1995); Esra Akcan, *Architecture in Translation: Germany, Turkey, & the Modern House* (Durham, NC: Duke University Press, 2012); Tom Avermaete, *Crossing Boundaries: Transcultural Practices in Architecture and Urbanism = Grenzenloos: Transculturele Praktijken in Architectuur en Stedenbouw*, special issue, *Oase* 95 (2015).
21. Joe Nasr and Mercedes Volait, “Still on the Margin,” *ABE Journal* 1 (2012), 304. http://journals.openedition.org/abe/304.
22. Mary Louise Pratt, “Arts of the Contact Zone,” *Profession* 91 (1991), 34.
23. Pratt, “Arts of the Contact Zone,” 34.

24. Patricia Bizzell, "'Contact Zones' and English Studies," *College English* 56, no. 2 (1994), 166.
25. James Clifford, "Museums as Contact Zones," James Clifford. *Routes: Travel and Translation in the Late Twentieth Century* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 1997), 17–46
26. Vishakha Desai, "Re-Visioning Asian Art in the 1990s: Reflections of a Museum Professional," *Art Bulletin 77*, no. 2 (June 1995): 169–74. Vishakha Desai, "East in the West: Presentations of Contemporary Asian Art in the U.S.," Japan Foundation Symposium "Asian Contemporary Art Reconsidered," 1997.
27. Elizabeth Kath, "On Transculturation: Re-enacting and Remaking Latin American Dance and Music in Foreign Lands," *Narratives of Globalization: Reflections on the Global Condition*, ed. Julian C.H. Lee (London: Rowman & Littlefield International, 2016), 25.
28. In addition to the examples listed in the paper, see Sherry Simon "Translating and Interlingual Creation in the Contact Zone," in *Post-Colonial Translation: Theory and Practice,* ed. Susan Bassnett and Harish Trivedi (London: Routledge, 1999). In 2005, Esra Akcan, in her doctoral dissertation theorized translation as a "contested contact zone." Esra Akcan, "Modernity in Translation: Early Twentieth Century German-Turkish Exchanges in Land Settlement and Residential Culture" (PhD diss., Columbia University, 2005). More recent alternative histories that used the metaphor of the contact zone are Tom Avermaete, "Coda: The Reflexivity of Cold War Architectural Modernism," *Journal of Architecture* 17, no. 3 (2012): 475–77; Jordan Sand, "Imperial Tokyo as a Contact Zone: The Metropolitan Tours of Taiwanese Aboriginals," *Asia-Pacific Journal* 12, no. 10 (2014), 4089. https://apjjf.org/-Jordan-Sand/4089/article.pdf; Christiane Gruber, *Islamic Architecture on the Move: Motion and Modernity* (Bristol: Intellect, 2016).
29. Pratt, "Arts of the Contact Zone," 39.
30. See Łukasz Stanek and Tom Avermaete, "Cold War Transfer: Architecture and Planning from Socialist Countries in the 'Third World'," special issue, *Journal of Architecture* 17, no. 3 (2012): 361–86.
31. The contact zone also plays out in research collaboratives and anthologies that evolve out of international symposia. Think of the 1953 Conference on Tropical Architecture at University College London that brought about a new Department of Tropical Architecture at the AA School of London and subsequently an encounter between local and British experts debating architectural modernism in tropical countries. A requirement from the sponsor of the *ANY* Conferences, Shimizu Corporation, was the making of a conference catalogue after each conference. The *ANY* Books resulting from these conferences were not a mere summary of the conference itself but included a synthesis from the editors as well as extra materials in the form of "letters to the editors."
32. An introduction to these logics can be found in Avermaete, et al. (eds.), *Crossing Boundaries*.
33. Contact zones allow us to think beyond nationalist and regionalist labels and as such do away with terms such as "Japanese history" or "South East Asian architecture."
34. For an in-depth discussion of the workings of one particular case study "contact zone," see Cathelijne Nuijsink, "Negotiating Comfort in the Metropolis: Peter Cook, Toyo Ito and the *Shinkenchiku Residential Design Competition*, 1977 and 1988," *ABE Journal* 18 (April 2021), https://doi.org/10.4000/abe.10444, and Tom Avermaete and Cathelijne Nuijsink, "An Architecture Culture of 'Contact Zones': Prospects for Changing the Historiography of Modernism," *Rethinking Global Modernism: Architectural Historiography and the Postcolonial*, ed. Vikramaditya Prakash, Maristella Casciato, and Daniel E. Coslett (New York: Routledge, 2022), both using a long-running ideas competition from Japan as a way to clarify the internal mechanism of one kind of contact zone.