

14th
METU
Architectural History
Graduate
Symposium

18-19
12/2025
Kubbealtı

Spaces/Times/Peoples

FUTURE & architectural history

book of abstracts

Mekanlar/Zamanlar/İnsanlar

GELECEK & mimarlık tarihi



ODTÜ MİMARLIK TARİHİ METU ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY

14.
ODTÜ
Mimarlık Tarihi
Lisansüstü
Sempozyumu

14th METU Architectural History Graduate Symposium

14. ODTÜ Mimarlık Tarihi Lisansüstü Sempozyumu

18-19/12/2025 @ Kubbealtı, Faculty of Architecture, METU

Spaces/Times/Peoples

The Future & Architectural History

Mekanlar/Zamanlar/ İnsanlar

Gelecek & Mimarlık Tarihi

Scientific Committee

Ali Uzay Peker
Belgin Turan Özkaya
Ekin Pinar
Lale Özgenel
Pelin Yoncacı Arslan
T. Elvan Altan

Organizing Committee

Elif Kaymaz
Gizem Güner
Nesrin Erdoğan
Orçun Sena Saracoğlu

Organizing Committee Assistants

Deniz Ak
İrem Aslanbaş
Roha Yousaf Mughal

Design & Creatives

Elif Kaymaz
Deniz Ak

© of the text their authors

Cover drawings Sartwell, C. (2018, November 19). Opinion
How Would You Draw History? The New York Times.

The Organizing Committee extends its sincere thanks to the METU Rectorate; the Dean's Office of the METU Faculty of Architecture; the Head of the METU Department of Architecture; and the faculty members of the Architectural History Program for their generous support.



Call for Papers

Bildiri Çağrısı

The Future & Architectural History

As climate change, pandemics, geopolitical instability, and technological acceleration reshape public life, they unsettle our sense of the future. Architectural history confronts these pressures not only in the past it studies but also through the concepts and tools with which it works. Concerns with risk, resilience, heritage, and planetary scale belong to our present vocabulary, yet they also open new ways of revisiting how earlier societies projected possibilities via precaution or negligence. Emerging tools, from digital archives and GIS mapping to environmental modelling and AI, further transform how such pasts and futures can be traced. This connection between history and futurity is not new. Histories of the built environment have long been written with horizons to come in view: operative narratives intervened in the present, preservationist accounts sought to secure what might otherwise be lost, and visionary projects imagined transformation. The archive acts where aspirations and anxieties were contested, recast, or erased, beyond the repository of evidence (Vogiatzaki, 2025).

Conceptual frameworks help make this position explicit. Reinhart Koselleck described historical time as the tension between the “space of experience” and the “horizon of expectations” (2002). Mihai Nadin, drawing on Heinz von Foerster, inverted causality with the provocation that “the cause lies in the future” (2010), reminding us that anticipation organizes imagination and action, shaping institutions, practices, and environments in advance of their realization. Horizons are always political and ambivalent: they may open or close possibilities, appear utopian or dystopian, calculative or charismatic, public or secret (White, 2024). Imaginaries of risk generate regimes of governance (Beck, 2013), yet they can also produce practices of resilience and solidarity. The foreclosure of possibilities may signal ethical theft across generations (Ahmed, 2004), but hopes of prosperity and collective responsibility have likewise animated visions of the built environment. Architecture and urbanism provide the terrains where these tensions became material, as progress and modernity, fear and catastrophe, expertise and imagination all found expression in plans, infrastructures, regulations, and designs.

We invite contributions from graduate students and early-career researchers that explore the intersections of architectural, urban, and planning history with the problem of futurity. Possible directions include case studies of how the future shaped architectural or urban practices; analyses of crises, risks, and emergencies as temporal conditions of the built environment; reflections on historiography and how our discipline has been written with futures in view; or methodological explorations of how emerging tools and technologies expand our temporal and spatial horizons. We welcome papers across geographies and periods that examine not only how the built environment was mobilized in the name of worlds-to-come, but also how the writing of history itself has been directed by futures imagined, threatened, or lost.

Gelecek ve Mimarlık Tarihi

İklim değışikliđi, pandemiler, jeopolitik dalgalanmalar ve teknolojik hızlanma toplumsal yaşamı dönüřtürdüķe, geleceđe dair algımız da giderek daha kırılgan hâle geliyor. Mimarlık tarihi bu baskılarla yalnızca incelediđi geçmiş aracılığıyla deđil, aynı zamanda kavramsal çerçeveleri ve kullandığı yöntemler üzerinden de yüzleşir. Risk, dayanıklılık, miras ve gezegen ölçeđi bugün düşünsel repertuarımızın parçasıdır; ancak aynı zamanda, geçmiş toplumların ihtiyat ya da ihmal yoluyla geleceđe nasıl yöneldiklerini yeniden değerlendirmek için yeni olanaklar sunar. Dijital arşivlerden CBS haritalamaya, çevresel modellemekten yapay zekâya uzanan yeni araçlar, geçmiş ile gelecek arasındaki ilişkileri izleme biçimlerimizi kökten dönüřtürmektedir. Elbette geçmiş ile gelecek arasındaki ilişkiler yapılı çevrenin tarihi içinde çeşitli şekillerde konu edilmiş, ayrıca çeşitli beklentiler gözetilerek yazılmıştır: müdahaleci anlatılar bugüne yönelmiş, korumacı yaklaşımlar kaybolabilecek olanı güvenceye almaya çalışmış, vizyoner projeler ise dönüşümü tahayyül etmiştir. Arşiv de yalnızca bir belge birikimi deđil; arzuların ve kaygıların tartışıldığı, yeniden biçimlendiđi ya da ortadan kaldırdığı bir alan olarak işlev görür (Vogiatzaki, 2025).

Kavramsal çerçeveler bu konumu belirginleştirir. Reinhart Koselleck, tarihsel zamanı “deneyim alanı” ile “beklentiler ufku” arasındaki gerilim olarak tanımlamıştır (2002). Mihai Nadin ise Heinz von Foerster’den hareketle nedenselliđi tersine çevirmiş ve “asıl sebep gelecektedir” önermesiyle (2010), beklentinin salt spekülasyon deđil; hayal gücünü ve eylemi düzenleyen, kurumları, pratikleri ve mekanları şekillendiren bir güç olduğunu vurgulamıştır. Geleceđe bakış her zaman politik ve çelişkilidir: olasılıkları açabilir ya da kapatabilir, ütopyacı veya distopik, araçsal ya da cazibeli, kamusal ya da özel olarak tezahür edebilir (White, 2024). Risk imgeleri özgöl yönetim rejimleri üretir (Beck, 2013), ancak dayanıklılık ve dayanışma pratiklerini de doğurabilir. Olasılıkların yitişı kuşaklar arası etik bir kaybı işaret edebilir (Ahmed, 2004); öte yandan refah ve kolektif sorumluluk umutları da yapılı çevreye dair vizyonları besleyebilir. Bu bağlamda, mimarlık ve kentleşme ilerleme ve modernite, korku ve felaket, uzmanlık ve hayal gücü arasındaki bu gerilimlerin maddi olarak cisimleştiđi zeminlerdir.

Mimarlık, kent ve planlama tarihinin geleceksellik sorunuyla kesişimlerini araştıran katkılar için lisansüstü öğrencileri ve erken kariyer araştırmacıları davet ediyoruz. Bu katkılar arasında geleceđin mekansal pratikleri nasıl şekillendirdiđine ilişkin çalışmaları; krizlerin, risklerin ve aciliyetin yapılı çevrenin zamansal koşulları olarak analizi; disiplinimizin tarih yazımının gelecek ufkuları gözeterek nasıl inşa edildiđine dair yansımalar; ya da yeni araç ve teknolojilerin zamansal ve mekansal ufkumuzu nasıl genişlettiđini irdeleyen yöntemsel sorgulamaları konu edinen araştırmalar yer alabilir. Farklı coğrafya ve dönemleri kapsayan, yapılı çevrenin geleceđe yönelik olarak nasıl seferber edildiđini ve tarih yazımının da tahayyül edilen, tehdit edilen ya da yitirilen gelecekler tarafından nasıl yönlendirildiđini inceleyen makaleleri bekliyoruz.

Symposium Program

day 1 _ 18/12/2025 Thursday

KUBBEALTI, faculty of architecture

13:30 - 13:45 **Opening and Welcoming Talks**

13:45 - 15:15 **Session 1 _ EXPERIENCE _ Everyday Imaginaries of the Future**

Chair: T. Elvan Altan

Batuhan Yerlikaya (*METU, Architectural History*)

Imagining the Future Otherwise: Radical Student Experiments at METU Faculty of Architecture (1965-1970)

Duygu Gören (*METU, Architectural History*)

Invention of and Imagination for Another Future: Spatial Appropriations and Visual Productions of the METU Students (1968-1971)

Berkan Kahvecioğlu, Filiz Sönmez, Semra Arslan Selçuk (*Gazi University, Erciyes University, Gazi University, Architecture*)

Erken Cumhuriyet Döneminde Gelecek Tahayyülleri: Kayseri Tren İstasyonu Lojmanlarında Modern Gündelik Hayatın Mekansal İfadesi

Büşra Topdağı Yazıcı (*KTU, Architecture*)

Geleceği Yazmak: "Halkın Sesi" Köşesinde Yurttaşın Mekânsal Tahayyülü (1950-1954 Milliyet Gazetesi)

15:15 - 15:30 **Coffee Break**

15:30 - 17:00 **Session 2 _ METHOD _ Digital Infrastructures and the Future of Architectural History**

Chair: Pelin Yoncacı Arslan

Mark Bessoudo (*Bartlett School of Architecture*)

Google Street View and the Photographic Futures of Architectural History

Feyza Yağcı (*ITU, Architecture*)

Rethinking Evidence in Architectural Historiography in the Age of AI

Hüma Tülce Uman (*ABU, Interior Architecture and Environmental Design*)

Reconstructing the Future: Representation, Memory, and Digital Re-Imagining in Architectural Historiography

Zeynep Köksoy (*YTU, History and Theory of Architecture*)

Reframing Architectural History Through Immersive Digital Technologies: The Case Of The Ephesus Experience Museum

day 2 _ 19/12/2025 Friday

KUBBEALTI, faculty of architecture

9:30 - 11:00

Session 3 _ MEMORY _ Histories Written Toward the Future

Chair: Suna Güven

Yeşim Kutkan Öztürk (*TEDU, Interior Architecture and Environmental Design*)

The Nation as a Project of the Future: Architectural Power, Myth and Memory in Turkey

Guido Campi (*Bauhaus University Weimar, History of Architecture*)

Marina Waisman: Between Environmental Systems, Latin America, and a Future-Oriented History of Architecture (1972-1995)

Nil Nadire Gelişkan (*IZTECH, Architecture*)

Rethinking Progress and Memory in Architectural History via İzmir's Architectural Narratives

Ezgi İşbilen (*Washington Alexandria Architecture Center of Virginia Tech*)

TIMEBRIDGE 1901-2001: Konrad Wachsmann's Autobiography as Literature of the Witness

11:00 - 11:15

Coffee Break

11:15 - 12:45

Session 4 _ CRISIS _ Environments of Crisis and Contested Futures

Chair: Ali Uzeyir

Nehir Melis Doğu (*METU, Architecture*)

Anticipating Change: Domesticity in the Age of Environmental Crisis

Diğdem Angın (*METU, Architectural History*)

A Failed Future: Mersin Free Zone and Mersin Trade Center

Gürkan Okumuş (*İstanbul Topkapı University, Interior Design*)

Özgür Ediz (*Uludağ University, Architecture*)

Transhüman Kültürü Batı Toroslar'da Deneyimlemek: Girdev Yaylasi Peyzajı

Feray Karaca (*İzmir Democracy University, Architecture*)

Hikmet Eldek Güner (*İzmir Democracy University, Architecture*)

Gelecek Tahayyülü Olarak Kültürpark

12:45 - 14:00

Lunch Break

day 2 _ 19/12/2025 Friday

KUBBEALTI, faculty of architecture

- 14:00 - 15:30** **Keynote Lecture by**
Kim Förster (University of Manchester)
The Past, Present and (Imagined) Futures of Cement
Moderator: Belgin Turan Özkaya
Microsoft Teams: Meeting ID: 387 895 707 821 96 Passcode: xp3Yt6zo
- 15:30 - 15:45** **Coffee Break**
- 15:45 - 17:15** **Session 5 _ POSSIBILITY _ Experiments for Open Futures**
Chair: Ekin Pinar
- Buse Ezgi Sökülmez** (*IZTECH, Architecture*)
Spaces of Intelligence: Anticipating the Future in Speculative Architectural Culture (1960s-70s)
- Emine İnci Şahin** (*METU, Architectural History*)
Futurity in Site-Specificity: Exploration of Space Time After Time
- Cem Yılgin** (*METU, Architectural History*)
From Monumentality to Modularity: Revisiting Jørn Utzon's Additive Architecture as a Model for Adaptive Futures
- 17:15 - 18:15** **Closing Remarks & Reception**

Sessions & Abstracts

session 1

EXPERIENCE

Chair: T. Elvan Altan

Everyday Imaginaries of the Future

Imagining the Future Otherwise: Radical Student Experiments at METU Faculty of Architecture (1965–1970)

Batuhan Yerlikaya

(METU, Architectural History)

The late 1960s was among the most turbulent yet generative moments of the twentieth century, when nonconformist social and architectural movements led by the youth culminated all around the globe. Architecture students from different geographies actively participated in these movements, whose creative and collective modes of protest targeted various phenomena of the era—such as consumerism, rapid industrialization, and prevalent architectural theories, practices, and pedagogies that championed the grounded premises of modernism. The radical engagement of architecture students with the 1960s subversive movements was not limited to acts of resistance against the status quo, as they ardently developed experimental forms of production to promote alternative formations in architecture, education, and society. METU Faculty of Architecture witnessed the emergence and activism of a defiant student body during the second half of the decade, which similarly challenged the existing conditions through inventive, collaborative, and multimedia sets of visionary practices. Against this backdrop, this paper explores the granular imaginative narratives of METU architecture students within the transnational framework of the student movements in the postwar period. Drawing on extensive research and oral history interviews, it expounds how their intellectual and material experiments against the architectural culture, pedagogical ethos, and sociopolitical climate of the era were shaped not only by their discontent with the present but also by their aspiration to build envisioned futures. In doing so, I focus on the METU students' future-minded experimentations within the faculty building that ranged from spatial interventions and megastructure projects to manifestos and political posters. Ultimately, I introduce architecture students as central actors of historical inquiry—who have often been overlooked in architectural histories—by situating the late 1960s as a time when they stood at the forefront of youth movements in pursuit of alternative architectural, pedagogical, and social worlds-to-come.

Keywords: postwar student movements, architecture students, METU Faculty of Architecture, envisioned futures, radical experimentation

Invention of and Imagination for Another Future: Spatial Appropriations and Visual Productions of the METU Students (1968-1971)

Duygu Gören

(METU, Architectural History)

This study examines the spatial appropriations and visual productions of METU students through insurgent and revolutionary political actions between 1968 and 1971, focusing on how these practices related to the past, the present, and the future. In the context of the global wave of protests circa 1968, and the rising student movement in Türkiye, the period between 1968 and 1971 witnessed manifold forms of political actions, particularly boycotts and occupations in university campuses. In this regard, METU students constituted themselves as political subjects who articulated a revolutionary position not only toward problems within the university system, but also toward the broader political trajectory of Türkiye. The METU campus, therefore, became one of the main spaces where spatial appropriations and the collective inventions of new political and spatial practices were embodied. Among distinct examples of these practices, METU Revolutionary Poster Atelier (1968-1971) was both a spatial and visual radical practice that produced political posters initially for the campus and the city and then expanded to other cities. The first part of this work situates these practices in a global context as well as the sequential waves of boycotts in Türkiye, by showing the interconnections and expansions through the spatial repertoire of political actions. The second part examines the spatialities of resistance in METU and then specifically focuses on the productions of Revolutionary Poster Atelier, by revealing the dissemination of collective creations across distinct spaces and times. The third part traces the recurrences and transmissions of these practices after the examined period, highlighting the ‘tradition of invention’ inscribed and reproduced in these spaces. The study argues that these practices not only challenged and disrupted the existing spatial and temporal order and redefined them, but also were associated with the future regarding shaping the spatial and political imagination by opening new horizons and possibilities. The spatialities and visualities of these political actions are comprehended as constitutive and decisive, rather than as ephemeral and fleeting, in terms of the transmittance of experiences, building the imaginations and trajectories of the political struggles, and connecting with the past and the future.

Keywords: political action, spatiality and temporality, spatial appropriation, visual production, invention, imagination

Erken Cumhuriyet Döneminde Gelecek Tahayyülleri: Kayseri Tren İstasyonu Lojmanlarında Modern Gündelik Hayatın Mekansal İfadesi

Berkan Kahvecioğlu

(Gazi University, Architecture)

Filiz Sönmez

(Erciyes University, Architecture)

Semra Arslan Selçuk

(Gazi University, Architecture)

Bu bildiri, 1920’li yılların sonunda inşa edilen Kayseri Tren İstasyonu Lojmanlarını, Erken Cumhuriyet döneminin modernleşme ideallerini gündelik yaşam ölçeğinde somutlaştıran bir gelecek tahayyülünün mekânsal ifadesi olarak ele almaktadır. Türkiye Cumhuriyeti Devlet Demiryolları’nın altyapı yatırımlarının bir parçası olarak tasarlanan bu lojmanlar, yalnızca memurlar için konut üretimi değil; devlet eliyle biçimlenen yeni bir yaşam kültürünün, çalışma disiplini ve toplumsal düzen anlayışının da taşıyıcısıdır. Bu yönüyle, modernleşmenin temel ilkeleri olan modern konuttaki hijyen (mutfak, banyo, lavabo, havalandırma vb.), rasyonel plan kurgusu ve üretkenlik (disiplinli yaşam, zaman kullanımı, iş ve ev arasındaki hiyerarşik ilişki vb.) kavramlarının mekâna dönüşmüş hâllerini temsil etmektedir. Cumhuriyet’in ilk yıllarında demiryolu yapımları yalnızca ulaşım altyapısı değil, aynı zamanda modern toplumun örgütlenme biçimini temsil eden mimari ve sosyolojik projeler olarak ele alınmıştır. Bu bağlamda Kayseri lojmanları, yeni vatandaşın yaşam biçimini, kamusal davranış kalıplarını ve modern aile ideallerini biçimlendiren deneysel mekânlar olarak değerlendirilmektedir. Çalışma, Reinhart Koselleck’in “deneyim alanı” ve “beklentiler ufku” kavramlarından yararlanarak geçmişten devralınan mekânsal alışkanlıklarla modern konut ideallerinin geleceğe yönelik kurgusu arasındaki zamansal gerilimi analiz etmektedir. Yöntem olarak tarihsel yorumlayıcı analiz, mekânsal tipoloji çözümlemesi ve söylem analizi bir arada yürütülmüştür. Araştırma sürecinde arşiv belgeleri, TCDD planları, yerel basın ve dönemin mimarlık dergileri (Arkitekt, Ölkü, Demiryollar, Erciyes vb.) incelenmiş; lojmanların plan tipleri, yönlenme kararları, yapı tekniği, malzeme özellikleri ve sosyal kullanımları üzerinden dönemin modern konut politikaları değerlendirilmiştir. Bu bağlamda çalışmanın araştırma sorusu, erken Cumhuriyet’in gündelik yaşamı dönüştürme politikaları ekseninde şu şekilde formüle edilmiştir. Kayseri Tren İstasyonu Lojmanları, geleceğin modern vatandaşını gündelik yaşam ve mekân örgütlenmesi üzerinden nasıl tahayyül etmiştir? “Gelecek tahayyülü” bu çalışmada yalnızca ideolojik bir kavram değil, mimarlığın toplumsal dönüşümü planlama, yönlendirme ve temsil etme gücünü ortaya koyan bir analitik araç olarak ele alınmaktadır. Sonuç olarak, Kayseri Tren İstasyonu Lojmanları, erken Cumhuriyet’in geleceğe dönük modernleşme vizyonunu gündelik yaşamın mekânı üzerinden okunabilir kılarak, mimarlık tarihini yalnızca geçmişin değil, geleceğin de üretildiği bir alan olarak yeniden düşünmeyi önermektedir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: modern gündelik hayat, gelecek tahayyül, erken cumhuriyet dönemi mimarlığı, konut ve lojman mimarisi, Kayseri Tren İstasyonu Lojmanları

Geleceği Yazmak: “Halkın Sesi” Köşesinde Yurttaşın Mekânsal Tahayyülü (1950-1954 Milliyet Gazetesi)

Büşra Topdağı Yazıcı
(KTU, Architecture)

Bu çalışma, 1950-1954 yılları arasında Milliyet gazetesinde yayımlanan “Halkın Sesi” köşesini, gündelik hayatın mekânları üzerinden geleceğe dair toplumsal tahayyüllerin nasıl kurulduğunu anlamak amacıyla inceler. Yurttaşlar tarafından kaleme alınan bu metinler, dönemin hızla dönüşen kent ortamında barınma, ulaşım, çevre, altyapı ve kamusal hizmetlere ilişkin deneyimleri dile getirirken, sıradan bireylerin kentsel mekâna ilişkin seslerini görünür kılar. Böylece gazete sayfası, yurttaşın yaşadığı çevreyi tanımladığı, eleştirdiği ve dönüştürme talebinde bulunduğu bir kamusal temsil alanına dönüşür. Çalışmada, yöntem olarak niteliksel içerik analizi ve söylem çözümlemesini bir arada kullanır. Bu yaklaşım, bireysel deneyimlerin nasıl ortak bir kamusal dile dönüştüğünü ve bu dilin mekânsal değerler, adalet duygusu ve modern yaşam beklentileri etrafında nasıl biçimlendiğini araştırır. Bu şikâyetler, yalnızca mevcut durumun bir eleştirisi değil, aynı zamanda ‘nasıl bir kentte yaşamak istiyoruz?’ sorusuna verilen bir cevap, yani kolektif bir gelecek tahayyülü olarak okunacaktır. Bu çalışma, Jürgen Habermas ve Michel de Certeau’nun kuramsal yaklaşımlarını birbirini tamamlayacak biçimde bir araya getirir. Habermas’ın kamusal alan kuramı, gazete sayfasını yurttaşın söz ürettiği bir kamusal arena olarak kavramsallaştırmaya imkân tanırken de Certeau’nun gündelik pratikler yaklaşımı, bu arenada ortaya çıkan bireysel seslerin, küçük ama etkili taktiksel müdahaleler biçiminde nasıl işlediğini anlamayı sağlar. Böylece iki kuram birlikte, 1950-1960 döneminde yurttaşın kentleşme sürecine ilişkin söz üretimini hem yapısal hem eylemsel düzeyde incelemeye olanak verir. Bu çerçevede “Halkın Sesi”, kentleşme sürecinin yalnızca devlet ve uzmanlar tarafından değil, gündelik yaşamın aktörleri tarafından da tartışıldığı bir katılım mecrası olarak ele alınır. Bu metinler, mimarlık tarihini profesyonel üretimlerin değil, gündelik deneyimlerin oluşturduğu bir tarih olarak yeniden düşünmeye imkân tanır. “Halkın Sesi” böylece, 1950-1954 döneminde modern Türkiye’nin kentsel geleceğinin kamusal söylem aracılığıyla nasıl müzakere edildiğini gösteren alternatif bir tarihsel kaynak niteliği kazanır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: gelecek tahayyülü, halkın sesi, yurttaş mektupları, kamusal alan, gündelik hayat

session 2

METHOD

Chair: Pelin Yoncaci Arslan

Digital Infrastructures and the Future of Architectural History

Google Street View and the Photographic Futures of Architectural History

Mark Bessoudo

(Bartlett School of Architecture)

This paper examines Google Street View, part of Google Maps, as a multi-positional object in architectural and urban history: a medium, a method, a document, an archive and a condition of spatial representation. Conceived as a street-level navigational platform, Street View now operates as a vast visual infrastructure, producing a layered historical record of the everyday built environment. By comparing Street View with earlier urban photographic practices, the paper situates it within longer traditions of visual recording. Through comparative visual analysis, it considers Eugène Atget's urban surveys of Paris (Bibliothèque Historique de la Ville de Paris), which sought to document the city's architectural fabric; Nigel Henderson's street photographs of post-war East London (1949–1953, Tate Archive), which combined social observation with an emerging concern for lived urban realities; and Ed Ruscha's *Every Building on the Sunset Strip* (1966), a continuous photographic panorama of Los Angeles captured from a moving car. Furthermore, Street View's automated image production situates it within the condition of post-photography, defined by Joan Fontcuberta as a shift from authorial capture to networked image generation, thereby challenging established categories of architectural photography and urban documentation. The discussion also examines contemporary practitioners, such as Jon Rafman and Mishka Henner, whose reappropriations of Street View imagery interrogate authorship, surveillance and digital spectatorship while revealing its implications for the visual legibility of urban space. The paper argues that Street View not only preserves architectural and urban conditions with unprecedented reach, but also transforms how urban space is constructed, circulated and imagined, extending Ariella Azoulay's claim that photography is not a neutral record but an evolving civic contract between image, viewer and subject. It thus proposes Street View as both a research tool and historiographic model for rethinking the urban image as document, and for envisioning new futures for architectural history.

Keywords: Google Street View, architectural historiography, visual culture, post-photography, urban representation

Rethinking Evidence in Architectural Historiography in the Age of AI

Feyza Yağcı
(ITU, Architecture)

The accelerated digitization of archives and the growing integration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems are reshaping the methodological and conceptual foundations of architectural historiography. While these tools expand access to data at unprecedented speed and scale, they simultaneously introduce new epistemic vulnerabilities. Architectural historians must now confront how algorithmic systems operate as “invisible editors”, embedding lurking bias into the very processes of knowledge selection and omission. These mechanisms of algorithmic curation determine what becomes visible as evidence and what remains silent or inaccessible, subtly reconfiguring the boundaries of the architectural past. A critical risk emerges when AI interprets data absence as historical absence. Localized and embodied traditions—such as master craftsmanship, oral histories, and community memory—often remain outside digitized archives, yet their omission renders them effectively invisible to AI-driven analysis. However, data absence does not only stem from materials that are difficult to digitize; it also includes those that have not yet been digitized, or that belong to less globally recognized, non-iconic, and still undervalued architectural heritage whose significance has not yet drawn broad scholarly attention. Human historians, by contrast, recognize such absences as epistemic silences that point to marginalized realities. When AI attempts to fill these gaps through hallucinated or fabricated references, the line between evidence and invention becomes dangerously blurred, allowing false authority to circulate as credible knowledge within the digital archive. As AI increasingly mediates historical interpretation, architectural futurity depends on how the past is curated through computational infrastructures. Misrepresented or selectively edited pasts risk constraining the horizon of expectations, shaping future decision-making on flawed premises. In a world increasingly saturated with data, distinguishing what constitutes reliable evidence will become a critical methodological challenge, demanding new frameworks for evaluating truth and authenticity. This paper underscores the irreplaceable epistemic role of the architectural historian—as producer, verifier, and critical interpreter of knowledge—whose scrutiny remains essential to maintaining the discipline’s integrity. By examining recent cases where algorithmic distortions surfaced in AI-assisted research, the presentation invites renewed reflection on how digital tools may enrich, rather than erode, the evidentiary foundations of architectural history.

Keywords: algorithmic curation, digital archives, epistemic silences, futurity, AI hallucination

Reconstructing the Future: Representation, Memory, and Digital Re-Imagining in Architectural Historiography

Hüma Tülce Uman

(ABU, Interior Architecture and Environmental Design)

Architectural history has long negotiated the tension between reconstruction and representation — between the aspiration to recover the past and the urge to reimagine it. Yet, in the digital age, this tension acquires a new temporal and epistemic dimension. The expanding use of AI-based tools, digital reconstruction, and virtual archives has transformed the way architectural historians visualize, narrate, and even anticipate architectural pasts. As digital mediation reconfigures both memory and representation, the historical archive shifts from a static repository toward a dynamic space of reinterpretation. This paper explores how these emerging technologies reframe not only the representation of lost or damaged heritage but also the historiographical frameworks through which the discipline envisions its own future. Focusing on the shifting notion of “authenticity,” collective memory, and the agency of digital reconstruction, the study revisits key moments in architectural historiography where future-oriented imagination guided acts of representation — from 19th-century restorative visions of Viollet-le-Duc to today’s algorithmic reconstructions of sites such as Palmyra or Notre-Dame. By tracing this genealogy, it argues that digital reconstructions function not merely as visual simulations but as anticipatory narratives: they reshape the ways we remember, preserve, and project architecture into futurity. Ultimately, the paper suggests that the digital turn transforms architectural history into a speculative practice — one that archives not only what has been, but also what could be. Through this lens, reconstruction becomes both a historiographical and a futurological operation, revealing how shifting memories and reinterpretations of the past continuously construct the horizon of architectural futures.

Keywords: reconstruction, representation, memory, architectural historiography, digital re-imagining

Reframing Architectural History Through Immersive Digital Technologies: The Case Of The Ephesus Experience Museum

Zeynep Köksoy

(YTU, History and Theory of Architecture)

Digital technologies are increasingly reshaping the ways in which architectural history is studied, narrated, and experienced. Tools such as virtual reconstructions, holograms, and immersive systems expand both spatial and temporal horizons, allowing interaction with the architectural and urban forms beyond their material remains and archival information. Immersive digital technologies transform architectural historiography into a dynamic medium capable of animating the past and making it relevant for future-oriented interpretations. This paper explores how immersive digital tools transform architectural historiography, introducing new possibilities and challenges. By collapsing temporal distances and reconstructing spaces, immersive digital tools transform history into an open horizon of possibility. The historiography becomes an instrument of animation—a medium through which architectural forms and cultural narratives are made to live again. As a case study, the Ephesus Experience Museum exemplifies these dynamics in practice. By employing holograms, projections, and virtual reality, the museum reconstructs vanished spaces and layers of historical experience, creating an environment in which architectural history is not only observed but lived. The Ephesus Experience Museum illustrates how digital technologies expand the scope of historical practice, situating it at the intersection of memory, imagination, and future possibilities. Thus, the paper aims to discuss how immersive reconstructions alter the boundaries of architectural history through the case of the Ephesus Experience Museum, while also engaging with discussions on authenticity, ethical responsibility, empathy, and participation. Ultimately, this case study highlights the convergence of architectural history with the challenge of futurity. It is no longer limited to the domain of what has been; it also shapes collective imaginaries within the evolving field of digital interaction. In doing so, it challenges us to reconsider architectural history as a dynamic field in active interplay between past, present, and future.

Keywords: architectural history, futurity, immersive digital technologies, experiential historiography, Ephesus Experience Museum

session 3

MEMORY

Chair: Suna Güven

Histories Written Toward the Future

The Nation as a Project of the Future: Architectural Power, Myth and Memory in Turkey

Yeşim Kutkan Öztürk

(TEDU, Interior Arch. and Environmental Design)

Over the past two decades, architecture and urban design in Turkey have become key instruments of a renewed nation-building agenda. As Bülent Batuman (2019) has argued, the production of millet mimarisi (the architecture of the nation) by the current political regime operates beyond aesthetic revivalism; it constitutes a spatial strategy for re-inscribing ideological continuity. Through monumental reconstruction, religious iconography and selective historicism, the state seeks to fuse political legitimacy with architectural permanence—translating the temporal fragility of power into enduring form. This paper explores how such architectures of nationhood might be approached by future architectural historians. How will these constructions be interpreted once their political and economic conditions have faded? Will they be seen as monuments to sovereignty or as artefacts of crisis—testimonies to how architecture was enlisted to stabilise a fragile narrative of collective identity? In this sense, millet mimarisi poses not only a question of style or symbolism but also a question of historiography: how the present scripts its own future archive. Drawing on Reinhart Koselleck's distinction between the space of experience and the horizon of expectation, the study argues that these built forms project a specific temporality of anticipation—an imagined future where the past is continually re-performed to secure national cohesion. Yet, as climate anxiety, urban precarity and political volatility reshape our collective horizons, such temporal loops risk becoming unreadable or ironic. Methodologically, the paper situates architectural history as a critical practice of futurity: it considers how our current modes of documentation, heritage discourse and academic writing already prefigure how these structures will be remembered, contested or forgotten. By treating millet mimarisi simultaneously as artefact and anticipation, the paper calls for a reflexive historiography attuned to the political construction of futures—and to their inevitable decay in the very monuments that claim to immortalise them.

Keywords: architectural historiography, nation-building, memory, political imagination, monumentality

Marina Waisman: Between Environmental Systems, Latin America, and a Future-Oriented History of Architecture (1972-1995)

Guido Campi

(Bauhaus University Weimar, History of Architecture)

After WWII, designers lost trust in past traditions. As a result, history was removed from the design process. In reaction to this, Argentinian architectural historian and critic Marina Waisman (1920-1997) published *The Historical Structure of the Environment* in 1972. In it, she tried to write a history that could be operational for the future. She engaged with design methods, systems sciences, and cybernetics—an unstudied aspect of her work that I analyze in this paper. A cybernetic reading of her work reveals her view of architecture as a historical feedback loop. Design occurred as ideas were extracted from and reintroduced into a broader system of architectural knowledge—history. This approach allowed Waisman to link history with questions about the future of architecture, the environment, and the activity of designers, challenging how politics should be considered in design. Waisman's later work shows how she used architectural history to serve the future. In *Inside History* (1993) she outlined a proposal for a Latin American architectural historiography. Parallely, as a critique, she aimed to help develop a regional architectural identity deeply embedded in the future, as an alternative to emerging postmodernist nihilisms. In *Architecture, decentered* (1995) she proposed a method to recover urban memory in face of a complex and fragmented world influenced by neoliberal logics. Heritage, for Waisman, could be a medium to store collective memories and counter entropy or the loss of memories, typical of ahistorical futures proposed by modernism. In her quest for an organicist understanding of time, Waisman reflected the development of cybernetics as the science of complex feedback systems, observation, and ecology. Her work provides insights into a relational approach still useful for connecting history with questions raised by contemporary technological systems, institutions, and sense-making processes involved in the city, its architecture, and its memories.

Keywords: Marina Waisman, cybernetics, operational history of architecture, Latin America

Rethinking Progress and Memory in Architectural History via İzmir's Architectural Narratives

Nil Nadire Gelişkan
(IZTECH, Architecture)

Architectural history, while ostensibly devoted to the past, has long been organized around visions of the future. From the early twentieth century onward, modernism positioned itself as “the architecture of tomorrow,” using the rhetoric of progress, innovation, and rupture to claim historical authority. İzmir's modern architectural history offers a striking example of how the future shapes the writing of the city's past. Throughout the 19th century, the transformations it underwent, followed by the city's reconstruction after the Great Fire of 1922 and the changes it experienced in the early years of the Republic, turned architecture into both a material and symbolic tool reflecting visions of progress, nationalism, and modern life. The modernist city plan, international-style buildings, and developments along the coastline embodied a forward-looking optimism that positioned İzmir as the “city of the future.” However, this futuristic narrative also shaped the historiography of İzmir, highlighting moments of modernization while overlooking the social, local, and environmental layers that coexisted with or resisted modernist ideals. This article examines the city's planning history, and architectural representations to explore how imagined, threatened, and hoped-for futures have shaped both the formation and memory of İzmir's built environment. Re-examining İzmir's modern architecture through the lens of the future reveals a more complex temporal landscape where visions of progress, fears of decline, and desires for continuity constantly intersect. In doing so, the article argues that the city's architectural history is not only about its modern past but also about the futures it continues to imagine, inherit, and debate. By tracing how imagined, threatened, and hoped-for futures have guided both architectural practice and historical writing, this paper argues that the discipline of architectural history is itself a history of futurities that are constantly rewritten as each generation redefines what it means to build, remember, and anticipate.

Keywords: urban memory, architectural historiography, urban imaginaries of İzmir

TIMEBRIDGE 1901-2001: Konrad Wachsmann's Autobiography as Literature of the Witness

Ezgi İşbilen

(Washington Alexandria Architecture Center of Virginia Tech)

Factual or fictional, every recorded story implies a future reader. Robinson Crusoe kept a journal, as did Samuel Pepys during the Great Fire of London, and Anne Frank wrote in hers while hidden in her attic. Recording is an act of hope. Hope for a free reader who, despite the delay in encountering these stories, will ultimately bear witness to them. The literature of the witness is produced so that the unpredictable future will not unfold as if the narrator never existed. The witnessing becomes legacy. Such is the encounter with Konrad Wachsmann's unpublished autobiography TIMEBRIDGE 1901-2001 (1981), to its small audience, who have access to one of its two archival copies, one in the US, the other in Germany, and neither is an original. Puzzling, fascinating, and complicated by postmortem editing. Born in Prussia at the turn of the century, Konrad Wachsmann describes his childhood as "living in the Victorian era, while "looking longingly toward the Zeppelin." The longing for the new and the future remains a central theme in his story. Initially trained as a cabinetmaker, and never officially finished his fragmented architectural education, Wachsmann designed countless buildings, serving as the chief architect of one of Europe's largest prefabricated construction factories. He published books on timber buildings and prefabricated construction, and decisively constructed an image of an inventor ahead of his time. This paper introduces Wachsmann's autobiography as a document and narrative, exploring how the concept of the future reader impacts storytelling. It contrasts this with Michael Grüning's *Der Wachsmann-Report* (1988), which presents Wachsmann's story in a fragmented form through a series of interviews in German. Between the two alternative tellings of the story, one finds magnifications, omissions, erased names, and political stances. More importantly, one finds another story of modern architecture, written from the emigrant's perspective.

Keywords: autobiography, literature of the witness, storytelling, technology, legacy

session 4

CRISIS

Chair: Ali Uzay Peker

Environments of Crisis and Contested Futures

Anticipating Change: Domesticity in the Age of Environmental Crisis

Nehir Melis Doğu
(METU, Architecture)

This paper reconsiders domesticity as a speculative and anticipatory condition in the age of environmental crisis. Rather than a private refuge against planetary instability, the home is approached as a laboratory of futurity, where the imagination of survival, adaptation, and coexistence is continuously rehearsed. In the face of climate change, resource depletion, and social precarity, domestic environments become critical sites in which the boundaries between the human and the nonhuman, the interior and the exterior, are reconfigured. Drawing on Hannah Arendt's notion of worldliness and Donna Haraway's call to stay with the trouble, the paper positions domestic space as a locus where ethics of care and responsibility toward the world are materially negotiated. Through case studies of adaptive reuse practices, and agro-domestic landscapes in the Black Sea region, particularly in Rize, the research examines how the dwelling operates both as an infrastructure of daily life and as a medium for imagining collective futures. The domestic sphere thus becomes not merely a site of consumption or shelter but a generative interface between ecological consciousness and spatial agency. Methodologically, the study bridges architectural history, environmental humanities, and feminist theory to interrogate how domesticity has been shaped by, and in turn has shaped, the temporalities of crisis and resilience. By tracing the shifting imaginaries of dwelling across modern and post-anthropocentric contexts, the paper argues that domestic architecture embodies a fragile yet productive anticipation of change: it is within the intimate scale of home-making that new temporal and ethical frameworks for living on a damaged planet can emerge.

Keywords: domesticity, futurity, environmental crisis, resilience, ecological ethics

A Failed Future: Mersin Free Zone and Mersin Trade Center

Diğdem Angin

(METU, Architectural History)

Mersin, a prominent Eastern Mediterranean port city, is also an important trade center since its foundation in the mid-nineteenth century. Modernization of Mersin port in the 1950s caused an increase in trade volume, provoked the establishment of modern industrial facilities and drew the population from the environs to the city center. Establishment of a free zone in the area had been envisioned since the construction of the modern port, which was finally realized in 1985. After declaration of a free zone in Mersin, the biggest project of the city, even the country, was proposed just in 1986: Mersin Trade Center (MERTİM). Considering Asian examples, such as Singapore, Hong Kong, etc., Mersin was expected to be highly developed in the following years. MERTİM with its 52-stories was the highest building in Turkey when it was built in 1987 and continued to maintain that title until 2000. This scale alone presents the expectations from the Free Zone for the development of the city. 'The Skyscraper', the name given by Mersin locals, was designed by one of the prominent architects in Turkey Cengiz Bektaş, who was known for his local architecture studies. Therefore, MERTİM became the most controversial project of his. In the following years, the building itself could not meet the expectations, even though the architect defined the building optimistically as the reference point, bulunak, of the city. Inarguably MERTİM is the landmark of Mersin, yet, being the landmark could not guarantee its success. The building has never been fully operated as a business center and the bazaar area has never become a popular spot in the city. In this study, I will present the establishment progress of Mersin Free Zone and the construction process of Mersin Trade Center. Following that, I will try to explore the expectations from Mersin Trade Zone and the reasons behind the failure of MERTİM project. To be able to do so, first the construction process of the modern port in the 1950s and then, the endeavors to establish a free zone in Mersin port since the 1950s will be examined. Main source of the study will be a local newspaper in Mersin, Yeni Mersin, which will be reinforced by archive of Cengiz Bektaş and the current literature about the Mersin Free Zone.

Keywords: Mersin, free zone, trade center, port city, Cengiz Bektaş

Transh mans K lt r  Batı Toroslar'da Deneyimlemek: Girdev Yaylası Peyzajı

G rkan Okumu 

(İstanbul Topkapı University, Interior Design)

 zg r Ediz

(Uluda  University, Architecture)

Akdeniz havzasının kıyı d zl kleriyle da lık kesimler arasında transh mans (yaylacılık) yarı g  er k lt r  geli ir. Akdeniz  obanı, binlerce yıldır s regelen ova otlaklarıyla da lık ekosistem arasında mevsimlik yer de i tirme hareketi ger ekle tirir. Co rafi temelli dikey hareket, topra ın d ng sellili ine g re  ekillenirken hayvanların sa lıklı otlaklara ula masını sa lar. Toroslar, y ksek da lar, derin vadi, ova ve nehir gibi do al peyzajdaki  e itlili iyle y r k ya am bi imine olanak tanır. Batı Toroslar peyzajı, yarı g  er k lt r n mevsimsel salınımı ve kırsal barınma eyleminin g zlemlenmesine imk n veren kadim bir hafıza yeridir. Bu  er evede  alı ma, transh mant y r k toplulukların Batı Toroslar'daki izlerini belgelemeyi ama lamaktadır.  alı mada,  zg n literat r ara tırmasıyla olu turulan kuramsal zemin, saha  alı masıyla  rneklendirilir. Bildiri kapsamında Akda ların (Kragos) zirvesindeki Girdev Yaylası incelenmektedir. Girdev Yaylası, Pisidia ve Likya uygarlıkları arasında ve Tlos-Oinoanda sınırında yer alır. Bu alanın antik hafızada otlak, kereste ve tarım amacıyla kullanıldı ı bilinmektedir. Oinoanda'ya ba lı sayfiye k y  olan yayla 1775 metre y kseklikte, Batı Torosların uzantısındaki Akda , Eren ve Tezekli Da ları arasında bulunmaktadır. Ayrıca Girdev, krater g l  ve zengin biyo e itlili iyle  ok katmanlı bir k lt rel peyzajdır. G l n kuzey ve batısında antik ta  bloklar ve aslanlı lahit kapa ı yer almaktadır. Bug n, yaylada  atma a ıl,  adır ve ardı -ta  str kt rden olu an barınaklar bulunur, yaz aylarında  evredeki farklı k ylerden pek  ok aile hayvancılık ve tarım i in buraya gelir. Yaylacı toplulukların yerli bilgi ışığında  a lar boyunca geli tirdikleri yaratıcı ve  zg n ya am k lt r , Girdev Yaylası'nın ya ayan miras de eridir. Binlerce yıldır biriktirilen deneyim, s rd r lebilir ge im kaynakları sa larken mera ekosistemini korur. Bu geleneksel bilgi, iklim ve  evresel krize kar ı m cadele eder, g  er-yerle ik gerilimindeki ya am prati ini sorgular, nesiller arası ekolojik bir referanstır. Antroposen  a , arazi ve co rafyayı hızla kaynak haline getirerek t ketir, pastoralist bilgiyi tehdit eder, do al ve k lt rel peyzajın s rekliili ine keskin bi imde m dahale eder. Bu ba lamda, oldu a sınırlı sayıdaki yarı g  er prati in hafızasını kayıt altına almak pastoralist bilginin gelece e aktarılması i in son derece de erlidir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: transh mans k lt r, Akdeniz havzası, Likya, Batı Toroslar, Girdev Yaylası

Gelecek Tahayyülü Olarak K lt rpark

Feray Karaca

( zmir Democracy University, Architecture)

Hikmet Eldek G ner

( zmir Democracy University, Architecture)

K lt rpark, 1922 yangını sonrası kentin yıkıntılarından yükselen bir “yeni başlangıç” anlatısı  zerine in a edilmi ; Beh et Uz’un vizyonu do rultusunda ulusal kimli in, modern ya am bi imlerinin ve kalkınma tahayy llerinin sergilendi i bir gelecek  retim mek nı h line gelmi tir. Bu y n yle park, yalnızca ge mi in temsili de il, gelece in nasıl tahayy l edildi ini ve bu tahayy llerin nasıl maddile ti ini g steren dinamik bir k lt rel peyzajdır. Bu bildiri, K lt rpark’ı yalnızca ge mi i  rten bir kentsel katmandan  te; modernle me tahayy l n  kuran ve gelece e dair senaryoları  ekillendiren ideolojik bir “gelecek- rt s ” olarak ele alır. “ rt ” kavramı, hem maddi hem simgesel boyutlarıyla, unutmaya ile gelece e y nelme arasındaki gerilimi a ı a  ıkaran ve mimarlık tarihine uygulanabilir bir mek nsal okuma y ntemi olarak  nerilmektedir. Bu metodoloji, ar iv belgeleri, d nemin s ylemleri ve tarihi harita-katmanları arasında etkile imli bir c z mlleme yaparak, K lt rpark’ın hangi pratiklerle ve hangi s ylemlerle gelece i “maddi” hale getirdi ini ortaya koymayı ama lar. C alı ma, Reinhart Koselleck’in “deneyim alanı” ile “beklentiler ufku” kavramsalla tırmasından ve Mihai Nadin’in “asıl sebep gelecektedir” yakla ımından hareketle, K lt rpark’ın in asını bir gelecek kurma sistemi olarak okur. Bu ba lamda “ rt ”, ge mi i gizleyen bir y zey olmanın  tesinde; g r n r/g r nmez, koruma/d n   m ve hatırlama/unutma ikilikleri arasında gelece i kuran bir aray z olarak yeniden tanımlanır. Y ntem    a amalı bir analiz  nerir: K lt rpark’ın kurulu  ba lamının ar iv temelli bir okuması, d nem s ylemlerinin incelenmesiyle hangi “gelecek ufukları”nın  retildi inin c z mlenmesi, harita verilerinin katmanlı okunmasıyla “ rt ”n n neyi  rtt    ve neyi g r n r kıldı ına dair analiz. Bu c oklu okuma, yalnızca ge mi in temsillerini de il, aynı zamanda gelece e d n k tahayy llerin nasıl maddile ti ini g stermeyi hedefler. Son a amada, belge ve g stergelere dayalı    kısa senaryo geli tirilecektir: mirası korumaya  ncelik veren bir gelecek, hibrit koruma-s rd r lebilirlik senaryosu, d n   m/yeniden yapıla ma baskısını  ne  ıkaran bir gelecek. B ylece K lt rpark’ın yalnızca ge mi le de il, farklı geleceklerle de nasıl ili kilendi i tartı maya a ılacaktır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: K lt rpark, gelecek tahayy l , mimarlık tarihi, koruma senaryoları,  rt 

session 5
POSSIBILITY

Chair: Ekin Pinar

**Experiments for
Open Futures**

Spaces of Intelligence: Anticipating the Future in Speculative Architectural Culture (1960s-70s)

Buse Ezgi Sökülmez
(IZTECH, Architecture)

The contemporary spatial presence of artificial intelligence invites us to revisit an earlier moment when intelligence and space were first imagined together in architectural thought. In the Cold War context, speculative architecture of the 1960s-70s—and its roots in 1950s systems theory, cognitive-spatial models, and cybernetics—began extending intelligence beyond mind and machine. Intelligence came to be conceived as distributed across space, shifting from a mental or mechanical attribute to an environmental, processual, and collective condition. Architecture similarly moved beyond technical problem-solving toward an anticipatory practice concerned with how futures are conceived, at a time when imaginaries of the future were strategically modeled, anticipated, and contested amid intertwined anxieties, planning regimes, and techno-optimism. Focusing on this threshold, this study examines how spaces of intelligence came to reshape modes of anticipating the future in 1960s-70s speculative architectural culture. The argument unfolds through three trajectories: environments, temporal processes, and collective agencies. First, intelligence operates as an environmental form of anticipation, where infrastructural media project possible futures — as in Banham's *The Well-Tempered Environment* (1969), Price's *Fun Palace* (1961-1964), Superstudio's *Continuous Monument* (1969), and Archizoom's *No-Stop City* (1968-1972). Second, intelligence takes a temporal form, in which space continuously reconfigures future conditions — as in Price's *Generator* (1976-1979), Constant's *New Babylon* (1956-1974), and Enzo Mari's *Autoprogettazione* (1968-1972). Third, intelligence emerges as a collective agency, defined by reciprocal agency between technological systems and social formations — as in Negroponte's *Soft Architecture Machines* (1975), Friedman's *Ville Spatale* (1958-1962), Archigram's *Instant City* (1968-1970), and Haus-Rucker-Co's *Mind Expanders* (1967-1975). Spaces of intelligence in these cases operate as technological imaginaries that anticipate spatial boundaries, temporalities, and collectivities. Following Koselleck's "space of experience" and "horizon of expectation" and Nadin's claim that "the cause lies in the future," this study reads its cases as epistemic constructs of future-oriented thought. In a moment of uncertainty and strategic competition over the future, speculative architectural culture treated the future as an open problem by spatializing intelligence—not to predict, but to generate knowledge. Architectural history thus becomes an inquiry into future horizons and the evolving relation between intelligence and space.

Keywords: speculative architecture, intelligence and space, knowledge production, spatial imagination, architectural history

Futurity in Site-Specificity: Exploration of Space Time After Time

Emine İnci Şahin

(METU, Architectural History)

This study explores the site-specificity through the lenses of futurity and temporality, framing it as a form of critical spatial practice. Historically and by definition, site-specificity has been understood as a practice rooted in its particular site and moment in time. It was thought to be a destruction to remove, or relocate, and it was considered an artistic practice inseparable from the space and time of its making. However, time has shown that site-specificity can be relocated, reinterpreted, re-exhibited, and regain complex and new layers within each new spatial and temporal context. Therefore, site-specificity from the lens of futurity becomes an investigative tool that can magnify the site-art relationship, which would help to analyze shifts, transformations, and mutations of terms, practices, and spaces. The aim of this study is to reconsider site-specificity as a manifestation of future anticipation embedded in art and architecture. Two contemporary site-specific practices, Hale Tenger's *We Didn't Go Outside, We Were Always on the Inside; We Didn't Go Inside, We Were Always on the Outside*, and Cevdet Ereğ's *Bergama Stereotype* series, serve as case studies. Both works engage with the politics of site and memory, yet their re-exhibitions across different contexts generate new spatial relations in these new sites. Tenger's interior world and Ereğ's sonic architectures become temporal constructs, where each iteration re-inscribes the work's critical potential within shifting socio-political horizons. By tracing how these practices project futures within their spatial histories, this paper reframes site-specificity as an anticipatory condition of spatial and temporal experience, in which each re-exhibition of a work reconfigures both its site and its moment in time.

Keywords: recurrence, spatio-temporality, site-specificity, display spaces, critical spatial practice

From Monumentality to Modularity: Revisiting Jørn Utzon's Additive Architecture as a Model for Adaptive Futures

Cem Yilgin

(METU, Architectural History)

The crises of our present demand forms of architecture that are flexible, resilient, and capable of transformation. This paper revisits Jørn Utzon's (1918-2008) post-Sydney Opera House turn towards his Additive Architecture manifesto (1970) as a response to precisely such conditions of uncertainty and change. Departing from the monumental roof-earthwork dualism of the Sydney Opera House, Utzon's Additive theme articulated a vision of architecture as an evolving organism - composed of repeatable, modular units that could expand, adapt, or be reconfigured across time. Situating Utzon's manifesto within the broader historical discourse of architectural futurity, this paper argues that Additive Architecture can be read as both a response to the architectural and architectonic weaknesses of his Plateaus and Platforms (1962) manifesto, and a precursor to contemporary ideas of crisis-responsive design. As seen in his Farum Town Center (1966) project with an urban approach, by emphasizing prefabrication, incremental growth, and multifunctional use, Utzon anticipated architectures capable of growing. If one module could be constructed, the other modules also could be; unlike the monumental shell-roof of the Sydney Opera House, the Additive projects could easily expand, thanks to their allocation of a single roof per single room. This new monumentality pursued by Utzon, which was through multiplicity rather than singularity, had developed to its most mature form in his nominal work, the Kuwait National Assembly (1972-82). Through a close reading of his writings, drawings, and unrealized projects, this study explores how Utzon's speculative shift from the singular monument to the additive system reframed the architect's role: from master-builder of the future to participant in an ongoing process of space-making. Ultimately, the paper suggests that revisiting Utzon's additive logic reveals a methodological lens for reimagining architectural history itself—as an assemblage of contingent, extendable, and open-ended narratives.

Keywords: the Sydney Opera House, Jørn Utzon, additive architecture, modular design, prefabricated construction

Notes

Notes

Notes

Notes

Notes



ODTU MİMARLIK TARİHİ METU ARCHITECTURAL HISTORY