





EDITED: critic|all PRESS + DPA (Dpto. Proyectos)  
ISSN: 2603 - 9923  
© 2018critic|all.  
© Texts and photographs of the authors  
This work is published under Creative Commons Licence.  
Attribution-NonCommercial-NonDerivs 2.5 Generic.

# critic|all

III International Conference  
on Architectural Design & Criticism

DIGITAL PROCEEDINGS

**ORGANIZING COMMITTEE**

Silvia Colmenares | Director  
Luis Rojo | Director

Sara Galante | General Coordinator

**SCIENTIFIC COMMITTEE**

Juan Herreros  
Sylvia Lavin  
Hilde Heynen  
James Graham  
Valéry Didelon  
Federico Soriano  
Nicolás Maruri  
Jesús Ulargui  
Juan Elvira  
Maria José Pizarro  
Fernando Rodríguez  
Sergio Martín Blas  
Diego García Setién  
Nieves Mestre  
José Aragüez  
Jesús Vassallo  
Juan Ruescas  
Ignacio Senra  
Ignacio Borrego

**INDEX**

<b>01</b>	<b>Presentation</b>
<b>02</b>	<b>Call for Papers</b>
<b>03</b>	<b>Conference Program</b>
<b>04</b>	<b>Index of selected papers</b>
<b>05</b>	<b>Papers</b>
<b>06</b>	<b>Index of selected contributions to the 'con-text' section</b>
<b>07</b>	<b>Con-texts</b>

## 03

# Conference Program

## THURSDAY 26-04-2018

	10:00 - 10:30	Accreditations & Welcome Pack
<b>Silvia Colmenares + Luis Rojo</b> Directors Criticall	10:30 - 11:00	Welcome and Presentation
	11:00 - 13:30	<b>con-texts</b> [this section will take place in Spanish]
<b>Lina Toro</b> <i>Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA</i>	11:00	"Teóricos francotiradores. La posibilidad de un pensamiento dibujado como práctica específicamente arquitectónica"
<b>Raúl Castellanos</b> <i>Universitat Politècnica de València, Departamento de Proyectos Arquitectónicos, Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura, Valencia</i>	11:08	"Poché. Historia y vigencia de una idea"
<b>Jorge Borondo</b> <i>Universidad Politécnica de Cataluña, Departamento de Proyectos Arquitectónicos, Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura, Barcelona</i>	11:16	"Ways of seeing"
<b>Álvaro Moreno</b> <i>Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA</i>	11:24	"Notas sobre una arquitectura líquida"
<b>Rodrigo Rubio</b> <i>Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA</i>	11:32	"Aftermath"
<b>Martino Peña</b> <i>Universidad Politécnica de Cartagena, Arquitectura y Tecnología de la Edificación, ETSAE, Cartagena</i>	11:40	"Artefactos energéticos: la energía como parámetro proyectual"
<b>Elena Martínez Millana</b> <i>Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA</i>	1:48	"Paradoxes of Domesticity and Modernity"
<b>Esteban Salcedo</b> <i>Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA</i>	11:56	"Play to the gallery"
<b>Damián Pouganou</b> <i>Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA</i>	12:04	"Rincones de la función"
<b>Luz Carruthers</b> <i>Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA</i>	12:12	"Con P de Pragmatismo"
<b>Luis Moreda</b> <i>Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA</i>	12:20	"Martha Stewart. A contemporary icon"
<b>Antonio Cantero</b> <i>Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA</i>	12:28	"Proyectos encubiertos. Entrevistas entre arquitectos"
<b>Luis Navarro</b> <i>Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, ETSAM. DPA</i>	12:36	"Estímulos y reacciones, deseos y afectos, fibras e hilos intencionales"
	12:44	Discussion

## THURSDAY 26 · 04 · 2018

		Lunch Time
<b>14:30 - 16:00</b>	<b>panel #1 [anthology problematized]</b>	
	<b>14:30</b>	"Anthology is ontology. The power of selection and the 'worldmaking'"
<b>Alessandro Canevari</b> <i>Università degli Studi di Genova, dAD, Genova, Italy</i>		
	<b>14:45</b>	"Anthology as collection: Althusser vs. Benjamin"
<b>Marcos Pantaleón</b> <i>Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Departamento de Proyectos Arquitectónicos, Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura, Madrid</i>		
	<b>15:00</b>	"Theorem. A case for an Anthology today"
<b>Giacomo Pala</b> <i>Institute of Architectural Theory (Architekturtheorie), Innsbruck, Austria</i>		
	<b>15:15</b>	"Historicizing the desire to historicize"
<b>Jorge Minguet Medina + Carlos Tapia Martín</b> <i>Grupo de Investigación OUT_Arquías. Departamento de Historia, Teoría y Composición Arquitectónicas ETS Arquitectura, Universidad de Sevilla, Spain</i>		
	<b>15:30</b>	Discussion
		Moderators: <b>Ignacio Borrego</b> <i>Full Professor at the Technische Universität Berlin</i> <b>Sergio Martín Blas</b> <i>Associate Teacher of the Architectural Design Department at the ETSAM (UPM)</i>
	<b>16:00</b>	Coffee break
<b>16:30 - 17:45</b>	<b>panel #2 [the spanish perspective]</b>	
	<b>16:30</b>	"Reassessing Spanish Modernity Discourses through Mass Media"
<b>María Antón Barco + Verónica Meléndez</b> <i>ESNE, Madrid, Spain</i>		
	<b>16:45</b>	"Architectural theory anthologies from a Spanish perspective"
<b>Aída González Llavona</b> <i>Universidad de Castilla La-Mancha, Escuela de Arquitectura de Toledo, Departamento de Proyectos Arquitectónicos, Área de Historia y Composición, Toledo, Spain</i>		
	<b>17:00</b>	"Writings on Photography and Modern Architecture in Spain. A critical reading of a Contemporary Anthology"
<b>Amparo Bernal + Iñaki Bergera</b> <i>Polytechnic University of Burgos, Graphic Expression Department, Spain / University of Zaragoza, Architecture Department, School of Engineering and Architecture, Spain</i>		
	<b>17:15</b>	Discussion
		Moderators: <b>Carmen Espegel</b> <i>Tenured Professor of the Architectural Design Department at the ETSAM (UPM)</i> <b>Jesús Ulargui</b> <i>Tenured Professor of the Architectural Design Department at the ETSAM (UPM)</i>

## FRIDAY 27-04-2018

	<b>10:00 - 11:30</b>	<b>panel #3 [anthology today]</b>
	<b>10:00</b>	"Space and the otherness. An anthology"
<b>Leandro Medrano + Luiz Recamán + Mariana Wilderom + Raphael Grazziano</b> <i>University of São Paulo, Faculty of Architecture and Urbanism, History of Architecture and Project Aesthetics Department, São Paulo, Brazil</i>		
	<b>10:15</b>	"Practical theorization in the digital era"
<b>Belén Butragueño + Javier Raposo + Mariasun Salgado</b> <i>UPM, Department of Architectural Graphic Ideation, School of Architecture (ETSAM), Madrid, Spain</i>		
	<b>10:30</b>	"Catching glimpses. The fragment-anthology as a strategy for architectural research"
<b>Mattias Kärholm + Paulina Prieto + Rodrigo Delso</b> <i>Lund University, Architecture and the Built Environment, Lund, Sweden, and Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura de Madrid, UPM, Spain</i>		
	<b>10:45</b>	"Towards a (new) Historiography of Architecture for a Digital Age"
<b>Guido Cimadomo + Vishal Shahdadpuri Aswani + Rubén García Rubio</b> <i>Universidad de Málaga, Departamento Arte y Arquitectura. ETS Arquitectura, Málaga, Spain and Al Ghurair University, College of Design, Dubai, Emirates Arab United</i>		
	<b>11:00</b>	Discussion
		Moderators: <b>Juan Elvira</b> <i>Assistant Professor of the Architectural Design Department at the ETSAM (UPM), Professor at IE University</i> <b>Lluís J. Liñan</b> <i>Professor at the Master in Advanced Architectural Projects at the ETSAM (UPM)</i>
	<b>11:30</b>	Coffee Break
	<b>12:30-14:00</b>	Key-note speaker
		<b>Hilde Heynen</b> <i>Full Professor Architectural Theory. University of Leuven. KU Leuven, Belgium</i>
		Closing cocktail

06

## Index of selected contributions to the 'con-text' section

	Authors	pag.	Con-texts
	<b>Borondo, Jorge</b>	163	Ways of seeing.
	<b>Cantero, Antonio</b>	167	Proyectos encubiertos: entrevistas entre arquitectos
	<b>Carruthers, Luz</b>	170	Con P de Pragmatismo.
	<b>Castellanos, Raúl</b>	173	Poché, historia y vigencia de una idea.
	<b>Martínez-Millana, Elena</b>	178	Paradoxes of Domesticity and Modernity
	<b>Moreda, Luis</b>	182	Martha Stewart: A contemporary icon.
	<b>Moreno, Álvaro</b>	184	Notas sobre una arquitectura líquida.
	<b>Navarro, Luis</b>	188	Estímulos y reacciones, deseos y afectos, fibras e hilos intencionales.
	<b>Peña, Martino</b>	191	Artefactos energéticos: la energía como parámetro proyectual.
	<b>Plouganou, Damián</b>	194	Rincones de la función.
	<b>Rubio, Rodrigo</b>	197	Aftermath.
	<b>Salcedo, Esteban</b>	200	Play to the gallery.
	<b>Toro, Lina</b>	204	Teóricos francotiradores. La posibilidad de un pensamiento dibujado como práctica específicamente arquitectónica.

**07**



**Con-texts**

## Paradoxes of Domesticity and Modernity

### Modernity and Domesticity. Tensions and contradictions. Hilde Heynen (2005)

Martinez-Millana, Elena<sup>1</sup>

1. Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, Departamento de Proyectos Arquitectónicos, Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura, Madrid, Spain, elena.martinez.millana@upm.es

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 about its most radical contributions so as to value them. It also intends to show something that is equally important, its immediate context in the book *Negotiating Domesticity: Spatial Productions of Gender in Modern Architecture*,<sup>1</sup> 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 had 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 reference. 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, “it is a paradoxical unity, a unity of disunity.”<sup>2</sup> 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 construed 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 which occurred at the end of the 1990s.<sup>3</sup> 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 later. *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 their interdisciplinary 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.”<sup>4</sup>

Despite having been cited in hundreds of articles and books, *Negotiating Domesticity* has received very few reviews. Nevertheless, it is interesting to examine those which were published as it is possible to understand the evolution of the reception of this type of book and its contents, through the criticism and praise it 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, the published literature offers us mostly overviews of its historical development, while narrowly focused interpretative essays proliferate. *Negotiating Domesticity*, growing out of a symposium panel, reflects this circumstance, offering us a wide array of subjects and ranging from the historical study to autobiographical interpretation.”<sup>5</sup>

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, *Negotiating Domesticity* makes no sustained argument or follows a consistent line of investigation. One hopes, however, that the thoughtfulness and expertise demonstrated by its authors are an indication that singly authored and more focused studies will soon emerge to substantively elucidate this complex subject.”<sup>6</sup>

A year later in 2008 the second review was published in the *Gender, Place & Culture* journal, written by Ann Varley. Varley started with a brief commentary about Heynen’s article and after mentioning the various topics approached in the book, she remarked how different they were: “Its contributors certainly speak to differences in modern architecture constructions of gender and domesticity.”<sup>7</sup> And concluded praising the contents of the book: “Even if they do not, then, persuade me that earlier contribu-

tions were too ‘simplistic’ (she refers specifically to Heynen words in her essay “Modernity and domesticity: tensions and contradictions,” subtitle: Architecture and domestic realm), the chapters in this rich and enjoyable book nonetheless provide fascinating new material to further debate about the relationship between modern architecture, gender and domesticity.”<sup>8</sup>

The last review was written by Julieanna 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, she pointed out 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 bounty.”<sup>9</sup> Furthermore, she added even greater praise: “It promises (and delivers) a cluster of explorations about domesticity and gender that collectively resist a binary resolve and demonstrate alternative ways of reading and writing architectural history and theory that contemporize the editors’ embedded cultural and political values. Heynen and Baydar are provoking us to rethink domesticity.”<sup>10</sup>

As explained in this article, the evolution of the reviews of this book is very significant, as well as the increasing number of times that scientific articles and books have cited them.<sup>11</sup> It has been fifteen years since Heynen and Baydar co-directed the meeting at the Society of Architectural Historians and thirteen since the book was published. Why is it that today the scientific community is showing an even greater interest in the book than before?

In the contextualization process one considers that it could be due to two issues: on the one hand, the format of the book consists of a collection that combines two strategies that are very different and yet complementary, a panoramic vision with a wide and exhaustive study of the existing research, together with a series of essays which analyse specific case studies so that they are clearly focused. On the other hand, the key question is its content: the domesticity in architecture is studied with an interdisciplinary spirit, so that literature, philosophy, sociology etc. feed the debate.

Therefore, “Paradoxes of Domesticity and Modernity” seeks to contribute to the dissemination of Heynen’s essay. In the second part of this paper, a new vision is provided to value it. Here a reduced version of the original essay is added with a homonym title, which Heynen prepared for the colloquium “Gender studies: een genre apart? Een stand van zaken” for the Sophia Belgian Gender Studies Network in 2005.<sup>12</sup> It should be mentioned that recently the full article has been re-published and translated into Spanish, and due to the length of the document it was divided into two.<sup>13</sup> The analysis presented here is produced from the reduced version which was presented at the colloquium as it contains sufficient arguments so that the development of this paper can be seen with greater clarity. The existence of this reduced version also enables it to be put forward for the Critic|all Un-thology which restricts the length of the essays.<sup>14</sup> 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*, “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.”<sup>15</sup> The essays’ title along with the quotation clearly suggested the hypothesis that Heynen matured about the “tensions and contradictions” of modernity and domesticity or its “paradoxes,”<sup>16</sup> as Berman described. It is worth anticipating Heynen’s objective so as not to be misled throughout the course of the paper since, on the whole, Heynen used two extensive sections to expose predominant discourses on the subject, “Modernity and homelessness” and “The gender of modernism.” These two arguments reinforced each other and declared that modernity and domesticity are opposite terms.

In the first part, “Modernity and homelessness,” Heynen explained the predominant discourse about the metaphorical “homelessness” associated with modernity. As the house was associated with women and femininity, this metaphor reinforced identifying modernity with masculinity: “The conceptualisation itself of modernity as the embodiment of the struggle for progress, rationality and authenticity, also bears gendered overtones. In as far as modernity means change and rupture, it seems to imply, necessarily, leaving home.”<sup>17</sup> Later, in the second part, “The gender of modernism,” Heynen delved into the gender of modernity and made reference to the argument upheld by Christopher Reed about the divergence between domesticity and modernity which he raised in *Not at Home. The Suppression of Domesticity in Modern Art and Architecture*. The main reason that Reed offered to justify this divergence was to associate modernity with the idea of avant-garde, because “as its military-derived name suggests, the avant-garde (literally ‘advanced guard’) imagined itself away from home, marching toward glory on the battlefields of culture.”<sup>18</sup>

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.”<sup>19</sup> Heynen suggested that there is a direct connection between the emergence of an ideal domesticity on the one hand 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 investigation more widely, and includes as well the more hidden 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.”<sup>20</sup> This perspective gives way to numerous discourses, for example, the essays that are included in *Negotiating Domesticity*.

This article has aimed to explain the reasons why the essay “Modernity and domesticity. Tensions and contradictions” should be included in the Criticall Un-thology, through two reflections that reinforce each other. The first argument has focused on the relationship between the essay and the book in which it was published, where two significant issues could be demonstrated: at the same time it has been established that the scientific community’s interest is on the increase, the structure of the book that Heynen sets out as co-editor has been appraised. Her essay in the first chapter offers a broad and complex approach to domesticity and modernity, as an introduction and a warning to this new re-lecture 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.<sup>21</sup>

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.”<sup>22</sup> Thus Heynen managed to provide a consistent basis to help identify the virtues and shortcomings of past and current domesticity, and encouragement to follow in the footsteps of the research.

## Notes

- Hilde Heynen, “Modernity and domesticity. Tensions and Contradictions,” in *Negotiating domesticity: spatial productions of gender in modern Architecture*, ed. Hilde Heynen and Gülsüm Baydar (London and New York: Routledge, 2005), 1-29.
- Marshall Berman, “Introduction. Modernity: Yesterday, Today and Tomorrow,” in *All That Is Solid Melts Into Air. The Experience of Modernity*. (London and New York: Penguin Books, 1988), p.15 This citation expresses the deepest sense of the paradox 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 maelstrom of perpetual disintegration and renewal, 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.”
- Hilde Heynen and Gülsüm Baydar, “Domesticity and Gender in Modern Architecture” (session co-chaired at the Annual Meeting of the Society of Architectural Historians, Denver, Colorado, US, April 23-27, 2003).
- Gülsüm Baydar, “Figures of woman in contemporary architectural discourse”, in *Negotiating domesticity: spatial productions of gender in modern Architecture*, ed. Hilde Heynen and Gülsüm Baydar (London and New York: Routledge, 2005), 41.
- Susan R. Henderson, review of *Negotiating domesticity: spatial productions of gender in modern Architecture*, ed. Hilde Heynen and Gülsüm Baydar, *Journal of Design History* 20, no. 3 (Spring 2007), 83.
- Ibid., 84.
- Ann Varley, review of *Negotiating Domesticity: spatial productions of gender in modern Architecture*, ed. Hilde Heynen and Gülsüm Baydar, *Gender, Place and Culture. Journal of Feminist Geography* 15, no. 5 (October 2008), 556.
- Ibid., 557.
- Julieanna Preston, “In the Wake of Negotiating Domesticity” review of *Negotiating Domesticity: spatial productions of gender in modern Architecture*, ed. Hilde Heynen and Gülsüm Baydar, *Interiors: Design, Architecture, Culture* 2, no. 1 (October 2008), 136.
- Ibid., 135.
- Verified from three main data bases: Web of Science, Scopus and Google Academic. For example, according to Web of Science the book *Negotiating Domesticity* was cited 185 times, of which 121 correspond to the period of 2014-2018, this demonstrates the increasing interest in the book.
- Hilde Heynen, “Modernity and Domesticity. Tensions and Contradictions” (paper presented at the colloquium “Gender studies, een genre apart? Een stand van zaken. Savoirs de genre, quel genre de savoir? Etat des lieux des études de genre” for the Sophia Belgian Gender Studies Network, Brussels, Belgium, October 20-21, 2005), 101-113.
- Hilde Heynen, “Modernidad y domesticidad: tensiones y contradicciones. Primera parte,” *Bitácora Arquitectura*, no. 33 (Marzo-Julio 2016), 4-13. Hilde Heynen, “Modernidad y domesticidad: tensiones y contradicciones. Segunda parte,” *Bitácora Arquitectura*, no. 34 (Julio-Noviembre 2016), 130-139.
- Whilst the full text has a length of approximately 10.000 words, the version here has 5000; the main issues are raised and comply with the rules of the length of the text for the Criticall Un-thology.

- Hilde Heynen, “Modernity and Domesticity. Tensions and Contradictions” (paper presented at the colloquium for the Sophia Belgian Gender Studies Network, Brussels, Belgium, October 20-21, 2005), 101.
- See complete citation in note 2.
- Hilde Heynen, “Modernity and Domesticity. Tensions and Contradictions”, 102.
- Christopher Reed, “Introduction,” in *Not At Home. The Suppression of Domesticity in Modern Art and Architecture*, ed. Christopher Reed (London: Thames and Hudson, 1996), 7.
- Hilde Heynen, “Modernity and Domesticity. Tensions and Contradictions”, 104.
- Ibid., 107.
- Walter Benjamin, “N: On the Theory of Knowledge, Theory of Progress,” in *The Arcades Project*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1999), 462. In the words of Walter Benjamin: “It’s not that what is past casts its light on what is present, or what is present its light on what is past; rather, image is that wherein what has been comes together in a flash with the now to form a constellation.” [Awakening. N2a,3]
- Walter Benjamin, “K: Dream City and Dream House, Dreams of Future, Anthropological Nihilism, Jung,” in *The Arcades Project*. (Cambridge: Harvard University Press. 1999), 388-389. “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.” [K1,2]

## References

- Benjamin, Walter. *The Arcades Project*. Cambridge (Mass.): Harvard University Press, 1999. [translation of Walter Benjamin, *Das Passagenwerk*, 1982].
- Heynen, Hilde. “Modernity and domesticity. Tensions and Contradictions.” In *Negotiating domesticity: spatial productions of gender in modern Architecture*, eds. Hilde Heynen and Gülsüm Baydar, 1-29. London and New York: Routledge, 2005.
- “Modernity and domesticity. Tensions and Contradictions.” In proceedings of the 2005 Sophia Colloquium *Genderstudies: een genre apart? / Savoirs de genre: quell genre de savoir?* 101-113. Brussels, Belgium, 2005. Accessed January 3, 2018. <http://www.sophia.be/index.php/fr/pages/view/1161>
- “Modernidad y domesticidad: tensiones y contradicciones. Primera parte.” *Bitácora Arquitectura*, no. 33 (March-July 2016): 4-13. Accessed December 27, 2017. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22201/fa.14058901p.2016.33.57453>
- “Modernidad y domesticidad: tensiones y contradicciones. Segunda parte.” *Bitácora Arquitectura*, no. 34 (July-November 2016): 130-131. Accessed December 27, 2017. <http://dx.doi.org/10.22201/fa.14058901p.2016.34.58103>
- Henderson, Susan R. Review of *Negotiating domesticity: spatial productions of gender in modern Architecture*, edited by Hilde Heynen and Gülsüm Baydar. *Journal of Design History* 20, no. 3 (Spring 2007): 83-84. Accessed December 27, 2017. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/4540342>
- Preston, Julieanna. “In the Wake of Negotiating Domesticity” review of *Negotiating domesticity: spatial productions of gender in modern Architecture*, eds. Hilde Heynen and Gülsüm Baydar. *Interiors. Design, Architecture, Culture* 2, no. 1 (October 2008): 133-138, accessed 27 December 2017. <https://doi.org/10.2752/204191211X12980384100319>
- Reed, Christopher. “Introduction.” In *Not At Home. The Suppression of Domesticity in Modern Art and Architecture*, ed. Christopher Reed, 7-17. London: Thames and Hudson, 1996.
- Varley, Ann. Review of *Negotiating domesticity: spatial productions of gender in modern Architecture*, eds. Hilde Heynen and Gülsüm Baydar. *Gender, Place and Culture. Journal of Feminist Geography* 15, no. 5 (October 2008): 556-557. Accessed 27 December 2017. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09663690802300894>

## Biography

**Elena Martínez-Millana** studied architecture at the Polytechnic University of Valencia, Spain, and l’École d’Architecture Paris-Malaquais, France (2013). She has collaborated in architectural offices such as UAPS, Paris and OAB, Catalonia. She has a Master in Advanced Architectural Design from the Polytechnic University of Madrid (2015), and is a PhD candidate in the Architectural Design Department - Collective Housing Research Group (GIVCO). Her doctoral thesis is ‘Disassembling Domesticity: Habiting Heterotopias’ under Andrés Cánovas. She has participated in conferences: “Le Corbusier, 50 years after, International Congress” (2015), “IV Workshop on Educational Innovation in Architecture (JIDA)” (2016), “III International Conference on Gender and Architecture (MORE)”, “I International Conference in Architectural Communication (COCA)”, “I International Congress on Architecture Doctorates (IDA)”, “I Symposium UPM” (2017), amongst others. Her doctoral thesis has been selected for the Spanish Pavilion at the Venice Architecture Biennale (2018). She has been awarded a scholarship from the European Social Fund and the Community of Madrid (2018).

Supported by:  
Universidad Politécnica de Madrid  
Escuela Técnica Superior de Arquitectura  
Departamento de Proyectos Arquitectónicos

