

Inventory

Andrew Leach

Several years ago I wrote an essay called 'The Inconceivable Agenda' together with three colleagues then at Ghent University: Wouter Davidts, Maarten Delbeke and Johan Lagae. Each one of my co-authors were, at the time, within five years of completing their doctorates, while I was some months away from submission.¹ Within our own doctoral studies we had worked on different topics in different ways, with a common attitude that any given problem has an interior logic, never free from external interference, which nevertheless informs the choices faced by the doctorandus in the process and representation of research - in our case in the history and theory of architecture and architectural history.² The title of our essay was a direct response to the fourth (and final?) colloquium of neTHCA - the (Belgian) Network for Theory, History and Criticism of Architecture - in which was posed the problem of the 'PhDesign: The Unthinkable Doctorate' (Brussels, 14-16 April 2005).

Our position then, as now, was that in calling for a ground up reconsideration of the status, objectives, media and process of making doctorates in architecture, that the conference had posed the wrong question.³ To put it another way, in confusing an institutional agenda for an intellectual agenda and questions of media for questions of method and epistemology, the conference had overlooked the fact that the kind of reconsideration of fundamentals it sought was built into the very idea of the doctorate - its historical function within the university - and especially into the idea of the doctorate

in architecture as a degree with a much shallower heritage. Refuting the position that a 'professional' mode of knowing architecture was just as rigorous as and more perceptive than 'traditional' academic approaches to the architectural subject and to research within the architecture discipline, we argued that the conference had sought to bed down differences it expressed a wish to overcome. We countered: 'It is precisely by "thinking" of "scientific work in architecture" as a genuine architectural enterprise that we can redraw the current - admittedly often quite stubborn - practices and formats of doctoral study in architecture.'⁴ Our claim was that the discussion sought to reinvent the wheel instead of turning it in a different direction because its proponents had not stopped to notice its shape. Defending the implied position of the 'unthinkable doctorate' that *only* architectural design - the principal vehicle for architectural practice - can contribute to architectural knowledge, we asked: 'Does the fact that one borrows insights, tools and analytical strategies from extra-architectural sciences and associated disciplines imply that one is no longer able to pose architectural questions and to work within an architecturally specific way of thinking?'⁵

It is important that the doctorate is something on its own. As we will see below, it is uniquely positioned to attend to matters of architecture's disciplinarity - the body of its knowledge as distinct from its practice - and to the institutions that secure and advance that knowledge, sometimes by prompting change within those very institutions. In this

sense, the discipline of architecture is not identical to the profession or practice of architecture, and even if many things happen under both monikers and thereby make such a distinction muddier than it might be otherwise, to draw a line between one and the other allows us to avoid the problem of treating a very particular, institutional question with too broad a brush.

The institutional premise to which 'The Unthinkable Doctorate' attended is by now common to many countries around the world, including those where I have taught and conducted research in recent years. As academics we are increasingly accountable for the way we spend the time apportioned to us to conduct research, which informs our contribution to disciplinary knowledge and its transmission through teaching and public outreach. Academics who are also practicing architects - teaching studio and preparing students for a professional life - have been forced to confront a shift in institutional attitudes whereby one's authority in the classroom no longer rests either on writing books or on realizing projects as buildings or on paper when not at the lectern or convening studios, but on conducting research, where the definition of research has had to expand to accommodate professional activities: sometimes by tacit agreement that research in architecture can look the same as what was once defended as professional practice (the embodied knowledge argument), and sometimes by genuine attempts to articulate how thinking and the transmission of ideas happens through architectural design (where the relationship between epistemology and media is at stake).⁶ It cannot be the case that knowledge is formalized *only* by writing, but by the same token, where not every piece of writing communicates research and scholarship in the hard sense demanded of and by the university, neither does every drawing or building.

It follows that if everyone in the university is to do research, then everyone needs a research qualifi-

cation, the doctorate; it is no longer enough to be professionally qualified or to do professional work without taking the extra step of arguing its contribution to disciplinary knowledge, in which one has proven oneself by defending original research, as well as to the stock of contemporary architecture, to which one contributes as a certified professional. And if, as in Belgium and the situation faced by the *hogescholen* (or as faced by the Australian institutes of technology from the end of the 1980s), an institution needs now to offer the doctorate even if its competencies have been firmly centred to one side of those fields that have habitually dominated the production of PhDs - the architectural sciences and humanities - then it is clear that something profound is shifting in the institutional landscape that required attention and discussion seven years ago and continues to do so.

The question of whether PhD research can be conducted in the mode of architectural design has two interrelated institutional ideas at stake. Firstly, if academics receive 'credit' as researchers for framing professional practice as research, then an extension of this acceptance is that one must be able to conduct research at the scale of the PhD in this same mode. One cannot allow one without the other, since the difference between a paper and a dissertation is a matter of scale in writing and question, not of a shifting definition of research and its proper methods and media. Secondly, it assumes that all matters concerning architectural education in the university - or in the institution that behaves, or now must behave like the university - pertain to a profession that is within a discipline claimed by the university as its domain. In this, I draw greater clarity from the situation in Australia, where the two forces of architectural culture are the professional institute and the university, with no institutions muddying the disciplinary-professional affiliations we can assign to them. In those countries and regions where exist those institutions with exhibition programmes and a publication mandate, such as in Flanders or the

Netherlands, we must admit a more complicated story that speaks to tendencies that are, in Australia, already delineated with greater clarity.

A PhD as a disciplinary degree reinforced by a recognizable contribution to the disciplinary field (through production and extension of knowledge), offers a different qualification than the terminal professional qualification reinforced by a recognizable contribution to the architecture profession (through professional and experimental practice). In the end, these two institutional ideas are widely confused. In the United States, in contrast, the persistent tendency of architectural culture is for graduate schools to be staffed by faculty whose terminal degree is either the MArch or the PhD, which tends to indicate whether an individual is attending to the discipline or the profession of architecture.⁷ There is a clarity to this relationship between training and teaching that is no longer widespread. The distinction is, of course, rife with ambiguities, exceptions and (hence) confusions, but we might at least agree that there is a difference in mode and constituency between understanding how air conditioning works in a multistorey building from understanding how the discourse on deconstructivism impacted on architectural design since the end of the 1980s.

Our contribution to this discussion was straightforward, and recalled the long-term status of the doctorate as a space of authorized departure from the burdens of habitual knowledge.⁸ The doctorate offers an invitation to walk into a problem armed with disciplinary tools and tasks knowing that what one finds there might change those very tools and tasks, as well as the discipline or field of study and the problems it contains. The doctorate is, in other words, charged with holding disciplines accountable to themselves and the university accountable to its broader social, cultural, technological and intellectual missions. Many things are possible within the doctorate, so long as the candidate can demonstrate a grasp of the discipline, rigorous thought and

method, and an evident appreciation of what he or she has added by conducting research therein. One complication of the situation lies with the position of architecture within the university as a field of study and research that has disciplinary *and* professional responsibilities. In this, architecture is different to the fine arts and music, for which are made parallel claims to research through practice, but then without professional regulation of that practice beyond mechanisms of criticism and reputation. It is also different to the law, where research can occur through courtroom activities, but which has such a fundamental relationship with the very notion of the Western university that professional and university interests have become, out of practice, much more closely aligned.

We observed in 2005: 'The university is held morally accountable on two grounds: to "supply" graduates that are useful to architectural culture, who have skills enabling their entry to the profession, as well as to test the intellectual and technical limits of the profession by entering that same profession equipped with intellectual and technical knowledge indebted to the research-led teaching of university professors.'⁹ If the university is to continue fulfilling its mandate as society's critic and conscience - while now also acting as its research and development workhorse in the applied sciences - then a 'local' variation of that self-imposed obligation is to hold architecture (as a profession and as a discipline) accountable for the limits of its knowledge and for its habits, 'to work towards defined institutional goals while testing the validity of those goals at every move'.¹⁰

If the doctorate is charged with holding the university accountable for knowledge and its production and maintenance, be it within a concept of the discipline or of interdisciplinarity, then doctoral research in architecture has the additional responsibility of testing that disciplinary knowledge on which the profession draws in its determination of its own

status, tools and tasks, which shape, in turn, the profession's expectations of the university as it produces work-ready, critically capable graduates to staff its offices. As we earlier noted: 'While the university is not the only place where architecture can be thought, it is one of the rare places where [it] can be thought outside of [the profession] and the exigencies of architectural practice.'¹¹ So runs the logic: the PhD in architecture has dual constituencies, these being the discipline (and architectural discourse, architectural science, as broadly conceived) and the profession (which relies on new entrants to meet competencies supplied by the university and to be capable of thinking and acting in such a way as to extend architecture's bases of knowledge and practice within the profession). Of course, no single PhD project reconstitutes the whole game in one hit. Through the cumulative attention by hundreds of vastly different studies into the limits of architecture's tools, tasks and knowledge, however, each project inevitably serves microcosmically in this larger role.

Certainly, institutional complicity is required to prevent the most adventurous experiments from going wrong, whether those experiments be medial or structural: juries and examiners open to the consequences of allowing the PhD to fulfil this traditional function; and an administrative scaffolding capable of seeing past habits and of sustaining variance. Ultimately, the university is reasonable in its demand for some reassurance that the emperor is not naked. It seems that these were precisely the kind of hurdles the organizers of 'The Unthinkable Doctorate' were intent on addressing alongside the rather more banal question of how architecture practice can also be understood to contribute to disciplinary knowledge as research, and how research conducted through professional practice can fulfil the basic requirements of the doctorate to demonstrate a contribution to the discipline through the practice of advanced and rigorous research. And it seems that institutions (broadly conceived)

have by and large stepped up to the problem where it presented as such. They have not only allowed many things that once happened under the label of practice to instead serve as research, with some careful qualifications and some adjustments both to practice itself and the way it is reported within the university. Such exercises as the Australian 'Excellence in Research' [ERA] assessment of university research quality demonstrate that this has been possible. They have also fostered a way of conducting advanced research and scholarship on architecture's disciplinary problems and materials by using architecture's tools and media to fulfil the requirements of the PhD while also attending to the need for communicability to an informed non-specialist audience. Problem solved, right? To a large degree, yes, allowing for the ongoing discussion on the extent to which the tacit knowledge embedded in architectural design requires explication or elaboration, and excepting the ongoing discussion on the extent to which architectural design can serve the traditional architectural sciences, where science is meant in the broadest sense of objective knowledge and study.¹² One can choose to 'trust' the PhD by architectural design or not, but it is no longer (if it ever was) 'unthinkable'.

Where shifts in attitude and institutions have allowed for this development, however, those same shifts have introduced a new kind of problem for the organization and exercising of architectural knowledge that while still in its infancy may become troubling over time. The increased acceptance of the position that research in architecture, and therefore the doctorate, can explore architectural matters by architectural means and with architecture's traditional and emerging media has shored up the institutional relationship outlined above. It reinforces the idea that the PhD in architecture is accountable to an architectural culture that now more prominently figures the practice of architecture and its various ways of thinking, working and communicating. The new kind of question this raises

is for the so-called traditional modes of conducting research in architecture: such discursive modes as have long been appropriate for architectural history and architectural theory, and for the more recently clarified category of architectural culture's intellectual history; for such scientific modes as have long been appropriate for understanding the performance of materials and design solutions in light of natural and environmental conditions (gravity, light, thermodynamics, etcetera); and for such social science modes as required in studies of individual and social response to buildings and cities, to the sociology, anthropology, economy and psychology of architecture.

Among all of these, the historiographical study of architecture has the loosest connection to an architectural mode of thinking about and conducting research in architecture. And the decidedly architectural idea of architectural history as a 'project' - aligned with the behaviour of architecture within the modern era - is remarkable enough to have been one of the enduring phrases attached to the legacy of the architect-trained historian Manfredo Tafuri, whose department of architectural history in Venice sat within a university institute of architecture.¹³ It has the greatest propensity to stray from the domain of architectural studies that can easily be allowed to occupy the zone of the project - to enjoy the freedom of assessing knowledge through research and holding habit accountable to the same - and to fail their perceived obligation to return doctoral research to the architecture discipline *and* the architecture profession as a check on both. Because the history of architecture has not grown exclusively out of the study of architecture from within the field of architecture, but from the histories of art and culture, architectural history and the intellectual history of architectural culture have more recently entered into a decidedly insecure position relative to the other modes of enquiry within architecture discipline and into architecture as a subject of academic study. Even if architectural history

has in recent decades been institutionalized within schools of architecture, and for the academic habits it could import from faculties of arts and letters has led the development of doctoral studies in architecture, the position architectural history occupies within architecture is not, read this way, natural, but has been widely regularized in response to broader shifts in knowledge and institutions within the last half century.

The pragmatic turn in architectural culture of late has provided an excellent substratum on which to build up a strong case for architectural research by 'architectural' means, for thinking through architecture rather than about architecture. The ways in which this research met the criterion of demonstrating that it could fulfil the university's requirements for formally testing and returning knowledge to the discipline was a harder battle, but the lobbies for this change must concede progress even if some are dissatisfied with its speed. One consequence of this general shift in attitude within schools and faculties of architecture towards more pragmatic and professionally orientated research - and in architectural history, doctoral studies concerned with the contemporary - is the increased traction given to the idea that any given project submitted for the PhD in architecture should demonstrate an awareness not only of how the research articulates with and contributes to disciplinary knowledge, but also how it contributes to architecture as an idea and field of activity that is not only bound by the discipline and hence the university and the activity of academics and theoreticians, but also includes architecture's practitioners. To borrow the sentiments of a local colleague to make this point, one writes architectural history in a school of architecture in order to make better architecture - history of architecture for its own sake is what art history does.

Thankfully, this sentiment is not universal, but if architecture is currently in a swing towards pragmatism rather than abstraction, towards the profession

over the discipline - to pursue a distinction over which we could, of course, spill a certain amount of ink - then this places in a difficult position that research (and therefore those doctorates) whose ambition is to extend disciplinary knowledge *without* any ambition to affect or to directly contribute to contemporary architecture. What does this mean for the most speculative research in architecture? And what does it mean for historiographical research in architecture in those topics or questions that cannot (and should not) be argued as somehow contemporary? What is the effect, in other words, of being obliged not only to understand how doctoral research extends disciplinary knowledge, but also how it improves the present-day position of the architecture profession? Registering this as a problem is not to reverse the position of the PhD in architecture as described in the pages above. Even within the diagram that has doctoral research simultaneously testing disciplinary and professional knowledge and institutions, there remains scope for it to do so by attending to knowledge for the sake of knowledge rather than applied knowledge. It is this latter possibility that I notice waning.

To a very large extent I am extrapolating a general observation from circumstances and tendencies I have noted in my own wanderings in Australasia, Europe and North America. I have not conducted a systematic and international study to reach this point, and so what I have written above may not resonate with PhD candidates at the Courtauld Institute, the University of Pennsylvania or the Centre d'Études Supérieures de la Renaissance at Tours. The local manifestations of the tendencies I describe here are neither unimportant nor universal. The same goes for the exceptions one might think of that run against the grain of what I imagine - from my office near the beach - to be taking place in the rest of the world. I suspect that Australian academic culture has, in general, more eagerly accepted (embraced) the pragmatic, utilitarian demands made of it by government more so than

British, American or European academic culture. Although the discussion within architectural culture around the idea of post-criticality and the end of the theory moment has largely been banal, underwritten by institutional rather than intellectual motives, it serves as intra-disciplinary and trans-disciplinary evidence of a pragmatic drift that has undermined intellectual culture in Australian architecture and eroded the once much broader scope of historiographical activity in Australian universities.

Casual observation suggests that this present moment, when nations are watching their budgets with concern and institutions are checking on the financial health of their endowments, has provoked a certain acceleration in the effects of this drift, which is now tinged with an anxiety that investment in education and research should register a return in a nation's economic health. This, clearly, is a situation against which the humanities have rightly taken a stand in defence of their longer-term and non-monetary importance to culture and society. We have to allow for a certain amount of nostalgia (always tinged with falsehood) for a less regulated past when academics outnumbered administrators and pursued a life of the mind with sufficient resources at their disposal. Nevertheless, the measure of the contemporary effect or impact of research matters to a greater extent than before. It determines the flow of funds, which in turn enhances or inhibits the possibilities of individual disciplines. In one sense, this simply demands a greater creativity in framing research projects as one applies for the means to conduct research or to secure stipends for doctoral candidates, but as an index it also points to a structural issue that has largely been left unattended by architectural culture, but which has been flagged within the humanities more generally. This, namely, is that pursuit of knowledge for its own sake - where research extends knowledge and conducts criticism without programming its extra-disciplinary application - is an endangered exercise in the modern university. The demand 'so what?' exceeds with

greater clarity disciplinary knowledge and expectations, increasingly favouring the extra-academic constituency for research and scholarship.

Within Australia and over the last few decades, architectural history as a field of research, doctoral study and education has moved from being split between departments of art history and professional schools of architecture to being centred (although not, as yet, with complete exclusivity) on the architecture school. As a consequence, where some PhDs in the history of architecture were once offered within arts faculties - where the responsibility of the PhD is to articulate and extend disciplinary knowledge, a responsibility, therefore, solely to the university on behalf of culture - the vast majority are now offered by those faculties in which architecture is taught professionally - rendering the architectural history PhD a doctorate in architecture, with the dual constituencies observed above, to the university *and* to the profession, and rendering it subject to the pragmatic drift of that same discipline and the adherent qualification implied as to the possibilities for research.

Although it was not always so, architectural history today does not have an uncontested 'natural' home and there are two often conflicting schools of thought as to where the appropriate 'formation' of the architectural historian lies.¹⁴ Some argue that it properly belongs in the professional training of the architect, where architectural history is a post-professional specialization, and where one's professional insights into architecture and the thinking of the architect make for better history, which will inevitably inform the broader culture where architecture is produced. The contra position is that architectural historians should be first trained in history - the history of art or the history of culture - so that architectural history is taken up as an historical specialization informed by a sound training in historical and historiographical method, where one's training in the humanities makes for better history

that better articulates knowledge of architecture as a subject and as evidence, thereby advancing knowledge in the human sciences. Just as the historian of painting can learn about the painter's technique, so too can the historian of architecture learn about the architect's professional knowledge. This is a very long discussion provoked by the increased attention to history within schools of architecture since the end of the Second World War. It was in some domains exacerbated and in others nullified by a split in discourses and research agendas, formalized by habit by the end of the 1980s, between that work conducted for the sake of architectural historiography and that work conducted for the sake of architecture.

To be explicit, my view is that one can learn the architect's perspective on architecture, just as one can acquire the historian's skills of analysis and argument, and both within the disciplinary training necessary for the doctorate. I hold in high regard architectural historians with both kinds of formation, where the architect-historian's insights and the art historian's erudition can be equally profound on quite different terms, and where one cannot be at all certain of where an individual's training, in fact, lies, in light of the complete command with which they hold their subject. I do not consider the institutional split unhealthy to the extent that there remains sufficient cross-fertilization so as not to skew the idea of 'disciplinary knowledge' to exclude research being conducted and thinking being done in the opposite 'camp' from that in which the doctoral candidate is working. To describe the work of architect-trained historians as amateur historiography, when compared with the professional architectural historiography practiced by the art historically-trained historian is unproductive, as it is to admonish art historically-trained historians of architecture for treating their subjects 'art historically' in paying heed to questions other than the contemporaneity of their topic or to its relevance to the body of knowledge the architecture profession regards as properly its own.

I have heard and read both lines numerous times. We could discuss the merits of either case at great length, notwithstanding the simplicity with which I have reduced them here, but given the dogmatism that abounds on this matter we are bound to agree, at best, on disagreement.

All of that said, however, when doctoral studies in architectural history only happen in the professional schools, and where the professional schools are subject to an increased pragmatism in their research programmes in relation to contemporary architecture, then the question of the architectural historian's proper formation is no longer as key as it once was for this matter, and as it remains for other kinds of disciplinary and institutional issues. Instead, it is the issue of critical distance that becomes the more serious matter. For how long can the doctoral candidate let out the rope that will eventually return him or her to the exigencies of disciplinary and professional knowledge, thereby delaying the question of relevance, contemporaneity and application to architecture? And thereby allowing for the least degree over the conclusions readers will draw from the work? Should the doctoral candidate in the twenty-first century study, as architectural history, the architecture of medieval France? Or of Roman antiquity? Is there scope in the school of architecture for a doctoral student to pursue the subjects once followed by Jean Bony or William McDonald? Is it the case that one can tag along behind Tafuri to critique Le Corbusier's ambitions in Algiers but not to redefine the historical significance of the proto in Venice or to further test the attributions he makes to Francesco di Giorgio Martini?

Lurking in the background of the discussion on the legitimization of architectural design as research is the counter-question of what determines a *proper* subject for architectural research, where propriety is tested against the perceived needs of contemporary architectural culture rather than by architectural history - in our case - and its imperative, formally

tested by structures located in the university, to know more and better. This counter-current has placed the work of those doctoral candidates in architectural history engaged in research within the school of architecture in a position of having to defend how their research contributes not simply to knowledge but also to architecture. Both are contemporary qualifications, but where the former implies a long accumulation to be held accountable over time, a lot of time, the latter implies the application of research in order to reach into the future. That work which appears to be dislocated from professional exigencies and from the issues most obviously at stake in contemporary architectural culture does not fulfil the (moral) requirements of the increasingly pragmatic PhD in architecture as it has started to take shape in its contemporary incarnation.

My observation is that the number of students engaged in architectural history studies where the topics pre-date the nineteenth century is negligible. In Australia architectural history is a field dominated by the twentieth century, and increasingly by the post-war period, with a current boom in studies of the 1960s and 1970s (the 1980s and 1990s will be online before we know it). This is something more than a correction of the lacuna that modern architecture was not old enough to be history that persisted widely until the end of the 1980s. It is also a simple, but clear demonstration of the effect of the test of a doctoral topic against the question of its pertinence to contemporary architecture: the diminished sphere of research activity, the narrowed definition of the historical field of contemporary architecture. Given the cyclical structure of research-led teaching informing a student's choice to enter a research career, it will require an act of will - institutional or disciplinary - to reverse the trend, assuming that others share my disquiet. In those institutional contexts where the discipline of art history continues to teach and conduct research in the history of architecture, that field can always take up the slack created by architecture's preoccupation with its own

present moment. I regard the absence of such a check, such as I perceive it, to be concerning.

Curiously, a more recent development in frame and method has moved to serve, within architecture, where art history once served from outside its disciplinary confines. It emerged out of the hey-day of architectural theory, the *Oppositions* and *Assemblage* moments, running counter to the currents of post-criticality and also, to an extent, to the traditional work of architectural historians. This, in short, is the intellectual historiography of architectural culture, which has taken as its mandate the historical criticism and historicization of contemporary architectural ideas through recourse to history. From the middle of the 1990s onwards an increasing number of doctoral studies - many later published as commercial books - conducted historical research into the field of architectural ideas. A historiographical turn within a post-historical era, this work has served to clarify the conditions in which knowledge and intellectual practices in architectural culture have been formulated and transmitted, and to clarify the uses to which architectural ideas and practices have been put beyond the control of architecture as an institution. This is not (or has not necessarily been) in order to advance contemporary architecture, but instead serves to remind the discipline and its institutions of the historicity and institutional specificity of its various incarnations and issues.

Several volumes to 'graduate' from dissertations defended at the doctoral programmes in architectural history and theory at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology and Columbia University have sent a clear signal in this direction, lending form to an intellectual agenda I believe to offer a crucial line back to those historical topics we might otherwise have overlooked: the history of historians not for the sake of introspection, nor in order to force the expansion of contemporary architecture's historical field (although this would naturally follow). Thus, we might ultimately return to medieval

France through the study of Bony, or Imperial Rome by attention to McDonald. I regard this as part of the 'political mission' on which Jean-Louis Cohen mused in his keynote address to the 2008 Annual Meeting of the Society of Architectural Historians, which 'can be assigned to architectural history in the first decade of the millennium'. I am deliberately twisting his conclusions to suit the agenda I have contrived for myself and my PhD students, but I regard the pursuit of the history of ideas in architectural culture, at this moment, to serve history's broader political ambition as 'a method in the struggle against the repression and the oblivion to which the "losers" and "defeated" are condemned'.¹⁵

Notes

1. Wouter Davidts, Maarten Delbeke, Johan Lagae and Andrew Leach, 'The Inconceivable Agenda', *Journal of Architecture* 11, 3 (2006), pp. 353-57. The paper was first presented at the 4th International Conference of neTHCA at Sint Lucas, Brussels, the full proceedings of which are published as *The Unthinkable Doctorate*, ed. by Marc Belderbos and Johan Verbeke (Brussels: Sint Lucas Hogeschool voor Wetenschap en Kunst and the Network for Theory, Criticism and History of Architecture, 2005).
2. The titles of our respective studies perhaps illustrate this point: Maarten Delbeke, 'La fenice degl'ingeni: Een alternatief perspectief op Gianlorenzo Bernini en zijn werk in de geschriften van Sforza Pallavicino'; Johan Lagae, 'Kongo zoals het is: Drie architectuurverhalen uit de Belgische kolonisatiegeschiedenis (1920-1960)'; Wouter Davidts, 'Museumarchitectuur van Centre Pompidou tot Tate Modern: Verschuivingen in het artistieke begrip van openbaarheid en hun impact op het architectuurprogramma van het museum voor hedendaagse kunst'; Andrew Leach, 'Choosing History: A Study of Manfredo Tafuri's Theorisation of Architectural History and Architectural History Research', PhD diss., Ghent University, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2006, respectively.
3. 'Call for Papers' = 'Appel à contribution' in *The Unthink-*

- able *Doctorate*, ed. by Belderbos and Verbeke, pp. 13-15, 17-20
4. Davidts, Delbeke, et al., 'The Inconceivable Agenda', p. 355.
 5. Davidts, Delbeke, et al., 'The Inconceivable Agenda', p. 355.
 6. Compare Bart Verschaffel, "'Recherche": de l'Art en tant que Forme de Connaissance', in *B-Sites: A propos de la place d'un Centre d'Art et de Recherche à Bruxelles*, ed. by Wouter Davidts and Tjil Vanmeirhaege (Brussels: Bruxelles 2000, ville européenne de la culture de l'an 2000, 2000), pp. 46-51; and *De Zaak van de Kunst: Over kennis, kritiek en schoonheid* (Ghent: A&S Books, 2011), esp. pp. 37-47.
 7. Compare the contributions to Andrzej Piotrowski and Julia Williams Robinson, eds, *The Discipline of Architecture* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2000).
 8. In this I very much favour the description of the 'project' by Boris Groys in *De Eenzaamheid van het Project = The Loneliness of the Project* (Antwerp: Museum van Hedendaagse Kunst Antwerpen, 2002), also in the *New York Magazine of Contemporary Art and Theory* 1, 1 (2008), online at <www.ny-magazine.org>. As we wrote: 'The doctorate, consequently, is beyond the university while at once being inextricably bound to it. It is an institutionally authorized challenge to the disciplinary bases and techniques of architecture itself, however specific or traditional the individual project. By challenging the university from the intellectual 'safety' of the doctoral project, the doctorate in turn tests the institution that assumes responsibility for testing the limits of practice. When the doctoral candidate looks beyond the strict confines of their literary, scientific or technical inheritance, they subject to reappraisal both the institution that frames their study and the profession that practices within the broadly defined discipline of architecture.' Davidts, Delbeke, et al., 'The Inconceivable Agenda', p. 355.
 9. Davidts, Delbeke, et al., 'The Inconceivable Agenda', p. 355.
 10. Davidts, Delbeke, et al., 'The Inconceivable Agenda', p. 355.
 11. Davidts, Delbeke, et al., 'The Inconceivable Agenda', p. 357.
 12. Consider the ambitions of the conference 'Theory by Design: Architectural Research Made Explicit in the Design Teaching Studio', Artesis University College of Antwerp, 29-31 October 2012, online at <www.theory-bydesign.eu> [accessed 17 December 2012].
 13. On this example, compare Marco Biraghi, *Progetto di crisi. Manfredo Tafuri e l'architettura contemporanea* (Milan: Christian Marinotti Edizione, 2005); Andrew Leach, *Manfredo Tafuri: Choosing History* (Ghent: A&S Books, 2007); and Anthony Vidler, *Histories of the Immediate Present: Inventing Architectural Modernism* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 2008), pp. 157-89.
 14. To illustrate this point, compare Andrew Leach, *What is Architectural History?* (Cambridge: Polity, 2010) and the review by Andrew Hopkins in the *Journal of Art Historiography* 5 (December 2011), online at <www.arthistoriography.wordpress.com/number-5-december-2011>. For documentation on the literature around this issue, see Leach, *What is Architectural History?*, pp. 156-63.
 15. Jean-Louis Cohen, 'Scholarship or Politics? Architectural History and the Risks of Autonomy', *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 67, 3 (September 2008), p. 329.

Biography

Andrew Leach is an Associate Professor of Architecture at Griffith University, Australia, where he teaches architectural history and conducts research in the intellectual history of twentieth-century architectural culture. Among his books are *What is Architectural History?* (Polity 2010), *Architecture, Disciplinarity and the Arts* (A&S 2009, ed. with John Macarthur) and *Manfredo Tafuri: Choosing History* (A&S 2007).