

## 14

## 3 exhibitions, 2 curators, and 1 museum: Kevin Roche John Dinkeloo and Associates through the MoMA, NYC.

Laura Sánchez

In the 1960s and 1970s, the Kevin Roche John Dinkeloo and Associates had a great repercussion in the international architecture scene. The three MoMA exhibitions the firm participated in, constituting the guiding thread of this article, attests to that. Through detailed analysis of these three shows I wish to demonstrate how important architecture exhibitions are as sources in research, representing, as they do, the times in which they were held, and serving as a thermometer of the discussions of the period. The objective here is to reconstruct the theoretical framework into which the museum exhibited the work of KRJDA, and the process of connecting the firm to the debates and professionals of the particular moments.



Once the works of architecture and their authors were considered worth studying and presenting in museums, architectural discourse took on new aspirations of cultural importance that transcended the bounds of the actual profession.

In this regard, without a doubt, the most influential institution has been New York's Museum of Modern Art (MoMA). So many exhibitions held there have opened up new roads for architecture since 1932, when a curatorial department devoted to architecture and design kicked off, under Philip Johnson, with the exhibition "Modern Architecture: International Exhibition". The 1960s and 1970s, the focus of this article, were busy decades for the department, which put together a variety of shows, alternating collective displays conceived around ideas or typologies with retrospectives on individual architects.

These two decades were also the peak years of Kevin Roche John Dinkeloo and Associates (KRJDA) in the world scene, and their presence at the MoMA between 1966 and 1981 verifies it'. No fewer than three exhibitions, organized by two different curators, in a museum that during those fifteen years paid tribute to figures like James Stirling, Frei Otto, Charles, Eames, Louis Kahn, Mies van der Rohe, Le Corbusier, Marcel Breuer, and more<sup>2</sup>.

This text aims to demonstrate the importance of exhibitions as a research source that throws light on the theoretical dis-

course underlying the work of an architect, and in addition enables us to place it in the context of the exact time of its development. Practically all the documentation used has come from the actual museum archives: on one hand the digital archive, open and accessible through the Internet, where one finds press releases, photographs, and in some cases even catalogs; and on the other hand the physical documents kept in the museum, where the information extends to a motley collection of publicity fliers, instructions regarding exhibition setups, correspondence between curators and authors, interviews, and a range of other items that tell the researcher about the management, procedures, and interests behind each show. Studying these documents has shed light on the concepts that the curators wished to emphasize in the work of KRJDA; ideas which undoubtedly linked up with the concerns of the moment, and which to a great extent were the architects' point of contact with the public at large.

The first matter to consider is the variety of exhibitions that the article refers to, summed up in the following table (fig. 02). The first one took place in 1968 and was collective. It was focused on a typological study of museums, a field where KRJDA stood out from the start.

The second exhibition, held in 1970, is better understood as a monographic presentation of architecture in the United States at that moment in time, embodied in three American greats: Roche, Rudolph, and Johnson. Shortly afterwards, in 1979, a third exhibition, once again collective, delved into questions of style and theory. Featuring many architects, it sought to throw light on the connections between architecture of the period and the beginnings of modernity. Detailed examination of these three exhibitions unveiled a theoretical framework upon which the work of KRJDA rests.

On 25 September 1968, the exhibition "Architecture of Museums", under the curatorship of Ludwig Glaeser, opened to the public. On view for almost two months (it closed on 11 November), were models, photo murals, and other graphic documentation on 71 museum buildings. Most of them had gone up in the 1950s and 1960s, but there were also a number of historical examples, and even unbuilt projects for locations in some twenty-two countries.

Glaeser deemed it fitting to include the Oakland Museum, still a few months short of completion, and two other KRJDA projects that were never built: the structurally daring Air Force Museum (1964) and the small Orangerie (1968) that the firm designed for one of its clients<sup>3</sup>. But it was the Californian museum that most drew attention and sparked intense debate, thanks, too, to a horizontal display element containing a large model, a mural-sized photograph, and a selection of drawings with other information.

The purpose of the exhibition was not only to draw attention to the selected buildings dedicated to art, but also to contribute to the then-ongoing debate on the function that museums should serve in society<sup>4</sup>. According to the curator, the museums selected, besides being excellent architectures, "suggest an ambiance congenial to the immanent values of the collection and to the contemplative moments of the viewer"<sup>5</sup>.

The exhibition began in the 18th century with the Cenotaph for Sir Isaac Newton by Boullée (1783), continuing with some works of Karl Friedrich Schinkel, such as the Altes Museum (1830), to then focus on great pieces of the 1950s and 1960s, including mythical buildings by architects like Marcel Breuer, Louis I. Kahn, Alvar Aalto, Oscar Niemeyer, and Aldo van Eyck. Among the examples of around the same time as the Oakland Museum, the curator highlighted pieces like the Everson Museum of Art in Syracuse by I.M. Pei (1968), the Joseph I. Nirshhorn Museum in Washington D.C. by Gordon Bunshaft (although it would not be completed until 1974), and the interventions carried out by Michael Graves in the Newark Museum from the late 1970s on.

The Oakland belonged to the group of 'invisible' or buried museums, along with the Shrine of the Book in Jerusalem (1965) by Frederick Kiesler and Armand Jartos, the Art Gallery in New Canaan (1965) by Philip Johnson, the Gallo-Roman Lapidary in

Buzenol-Montauban, Belgium (1960), by Constantin L. Brodzki, the Albright-Knox Art Gallery in Buffalo (1962) by SOM, the Louisiana Museum in Humlebaek, Copenhagen, by Jørgen Bo and Vilhelm Wohlert (1958), and, though set within a totally different context, the Museum of the Treasury at San Lorenzo Cathedral in Genoa (1956) by Franco Albini<sup>6</sup>.

MoMA's four-page press release gave the Oakland Museum a ten-line paragraph, highlighting it over the rest of the institutions featured. Only the notes on Mies van der Rohe, Le Corbusier, and Frank Lloyd Wright got similar space. Besides a short description, Ludwig Glaeser put in a good word on the KRJDA project, praising the building's innovative typology and its capacity to blend with the surroundings:

"Oakland is not only an exceptional museum scheme but also unique as an architectural solution. Rather than striving to design a monument to culture, the architects have buried the building under its own landscape. The building thus acknowledges its urban function by being in effect a park, but also acknowledges its expanded function as a museum by providing a congregating place"<sup>7</sup>.

The importance that this museum took on in the exhibition was reflected in the reviews that the written press devoted to the show. A case in point is the article that Ada Louise Huxtable wrote for *The New York Times* on 25 September 1968. Titled "Architecture: A Museum is also Art, Exhibition Shows", it came with a picture of the Oakland Museum<sup>8</sup> and spoke of its innovative character.

"In terms of design and environment, Oakland may be one of the most thoughtfully revolutionary structures in the world"<sup>9</sup>.

Another reason why the Californian museum stood out was the fact that it was halfway between the two poles of the exhibition: museums that take on the role of neutral containers giving all protagonism to the art works on display (such as Mies van der Rohe's Berlin gallery), and museums that present themselves as works of art in themselves (epitomized by the Guggenheim of New York)<sup>10</sup>. The Oakland was admired for reconciling those extremes. Its landscaping character, terraced and original, made it a beautiful to gaze at, but the neutral interior spaces maximized visitors' enjoyment of the actual exhibits.

In 1970, just four years after KRJDA was formally established, the MoMA put together a retrospective on three practicing architects: Philip Johnson, Kevin Roche, and Paul Rudolph. This time the curator was Arthur Drexler, who the previous year had taken over as head of the Department of Architecture and Design. Drexler selected twenty-five projects to share with the public, from 1 October 1970 to 3 January 1971, by means of models, drawings, and photographs.

The exhibition mainly featured projects yet to be built which, by the curator's criteria, reflected a commitment to the idea that architecture ought to produce artistic objects<sup>11</sup>. Arthur Drexler wanted to tell the public about the level of excellence that North American architecture had reached during those years, a level he considered above that of any other place in the world. And he chose a trio of architects who in his opinion had much contributed to this American scene.

"This exhibition reviews twenty-five current projects by three architects who are making major contributions to the American scene. (...) All of them reflect a commitment to the idea that architecture, besides being technology, sociology, and moral philosophy, must finally produce works of art if it is to be worth bothering about at all"<sup>12</sup>.

Again, many of these projects were still under construction or in early design stages, and this was reflected in the exhibition title: "Work in Progress: Architecture by Philip Johnson, Kevin Roche, Paul Rudolph"<sup>13</sup>.

We get a good understanding of Arthur Drexler's objectives, and his interest in these architects, by looking at the first question he asked Kevin Roche in the preliminary interviews he conducted with all three in order to gain insight into their thinking:

"Let me quickly give you an idea of the kinds of questions I have been asking Philip and Paul. With Philip I was particularly interested in his attitude toward structure now because most of his work has been concerned with the articulation and sometimes the decoration of structure and I wanted him to talk about this and the way he saw it now, and with Paul I was again interested not so much in structure as in comparable formal problems. I am more interested in getting from each of you attitudes about the art of architecture, not necessarily about the problems of the world except that I was interested in both Philip and Paul's and I think yours also, about your reactions as to what is going on in the schools now and your own feelings about how you would teach architecture if you suddenly found yourself in that unfortunate position"<sup>14</sup>.

Drexler's reasons for including KRJDA were explained in curator's texts that accompanied the items on display:

"The work of Kevin Roche and John Dinkeloo may appear at first sight to be simply and unusually precise handling of conventional steel and glass construction. But Roche has been increasingly interested in problems of urban scale; he has sought to enlarge the apparent size of urban buildings so that they may visually stabilize their surroundings and be recognized from great distances. Where most architects would strive for a broad range of dimensions—from the smallest visible texture to large elements—Roche tends to enlarge the scale throughout, as with the four corner towers of the Knights of Columbus Office Building in New Haven, producing a kind of giant order that is astonishingly effective in the urban scene"<sup>15</sup>.

Hence, the first important idea behind the exhibition had to do with scale, taken from the angle of the urban environment and the presence therein of buildings, and putting forward the efficiency of large forms at all levels.

Secondly, Drexler emphasized technical questions behind KRJDA buildings, specifically the firm's work and research in glass, which enabled them to put gardens inside buildings, and in doing so, change the character of interior spaces; a feature of its work which they continued to develop throughout its career.

"Another characteristic of Roche's work is the building conceived almost entirely as a glass envelope—roof as well as walls—and he has used glass to make more apparent the often gigantic spaces—sometimes more like greenhouses than conventional rooms—that he now seeks to incorporate in most of his large buildings. Thus the indoor garden of the Ford Foundation on 42nd Street has evolved into the forty story high glass-enclosed vertical room of the United Nations Development Project"<sup>16</sup>.

Drexler also stressed the landscaping aspects of KRJDA's work, represented by two projects that stretched out in the territory and have always been commended for the way they are integrated into it: the Oakland Museum again, and the Cummins Engine Company Manufacturing Plant in Walesboro, Columbus.

"Notwithstanding his preoccupation with bold and conspicuous forms, Roche has occasionally taken up a theme more related to landscape design than to architecture proper. His Oakland Museum in California is essentially a terracing of the site; his recent design for the Cummins Engine Company Manufacturing Plant in Indiana places most of the building underground, so that it appears as a slight and relatively inconspicuous interruption to the flat landscape"<sup>17</sup>.

Roche's proposals, as Drexler further emphasized, were valuable in their use of known or traditional tools to create unexpected situations.

"Many of Roche's buildings present details or spaces familiar enough in other contexts, but in his interpretations they take on semi-surreal

overtones. The restraint and sobriety with which these effects are stated do not disguise Roche's underlying perception of the fantastic in twentieth century urban life<sup>18</sup>.

The exhibition presented nine projects by Philip Johnson, two of them completed, eight by KRJDA, four of them built, and six by Paul Rudolph, all unfinished. All in all there were fourteen models: six from Johnson, five from Roche and Dinkeloo, and three from Rudolph<sup>19</sup>. Logically, because it was semi-monographic, this exhibition was the one that involved the most exhaustive research on the work of KRJDA, and the one from which we can extract the most amount of theoretical substance from. As we can see, the allusions and concepts assessed are many.

The KRJDA projects included in "Work in Progress" were the Irwin Union Bank and Trust Company in Columbus, the United Nations Development Center (UNDC) in New York, the Computer Technology Museum in Armonk, New York, the Cummins Engine Company Manufacturing Plant in Columbus, the College Life Insurance Company of America in Indianapolis, the Knights of Columbus Office Building in New Haven, the New Haven Coliseum, and the new campus of the Rochester Institute of Technology. Of the first five, models were presented, some of them expressly made for the occasion to convey the idea of a transparent and technological envelope of glass, as in the College Life Insurance building<sup>20</sup>. The other four models were of completed buildings.

Figure 07 documents the list of projects selected (along with projects considered precedents in each category) and its distribution according to the previously expressed ideas. The first group, encompassing the glass enclosures and the public spaces formed indoors, included the Irwin Union Bank (which replaced the initially chosen Worcester Bank), the United National Development Center and the Computer Technology Museum, and the precedents named were the Ford Foundation and the exhibition areas in the National Fisheries Center and Aquarium in Washington, D.C., the latter designed in collaboration with Charles Eames but never executed. The second category focused on landscape and drew attention to the project for the factory for the Cummins Engine Company in Columbus. The precedents offered were the Oakland Museum and, because of its horizontality, the Richard C. Lee High School in New Haven. The last section sought to highlight groupings of elements, referring to the use of mass and scale. Here were the College Life Insurance, the complex formed by the Knights of Columbus tower and the New Haven Coliseum, and the Rochester Institute of Technology, undertaken in collaboration with other architects. At the outset the intention was to have a category on pavilions, which would have shown the University of Massachusetts Fine Arts Center and the Wesleyan University Center for the Arts, with the small Orangerie as precedent. This fourth section was shelved<sup>21</sup>.

In the interviews conducted before the exhibition, the curator made clear his interest in architecture being understood as an artistic expression, a position which Roche had always distanced himself from. Roche pointed out that he accepted architecture as an art, as it had evidently been in history, but with the nuance that thinking of architecture solely from an artistic angle was to miss misunderstand its true nature. His discourse was more pragmatic and upheld the idea that the greatest challenge of architecture in those years was to provide large numbers of people with the chance to live a life of better quality<sup>22</sup>. In Roche's opinion, cultivation of the best relationship between architecture and art lay in making both express the conditions of the moment of their conception, and offer solutions.

"I guess that at one time painters painted because there was a reason to paint, other and above the things that they felt they had to do – it was really a social reason and then they developed their techniques and expressed their art abilities or capabilities inside that reason. And I think that is a very legitimate approach to the problem of architecture"<sup>23</sup>.

The last show analyzed took place in 1979, from 23 February 1979 to 24 April. Arthur Drexler, still at the helm of the MoMA's Department of Architecture and Design, curated "Transformations in Modern Architecture", another choral exhibition, with photographs of over 400 buildings, that in the same year became a hugely successful book edited by the museum itself.

The exhibition maintained that architecture of the 1960s and 1970s was an expounding of ideas first put forward in the 1920s and 1930s<sup>24</sup>. Obviously, because the research encompassed so many architects, mentions of Roche and Dinkeloo were few, but it is interesting to note how they were included and with what other projects and architects they were associated with.

Three categories were established: architecture as an invention of sculptural form, architecture as structural form, and vernacular architecture. KRJDA's work only comes under the second category, which, in words coming from the museum, was defined in this manner:

"Structural form deals with what the architect Mies van der Rohe called 'skin and bones' architecture: a steel or concrete skeleton structure that is covered by a glass or metal skin. This type of architecture relies on structure to communicate visual information about a building, regardless of its intended use. The current development of this kind of architecture returns to the earlier emphasis on the skin, as can be seen in today's ubiquitous 'mirror' buildings. Utilizing tinted and reflecting glass, they communicate little or no information about themselves and carry architectural abstraction to its furthest point. A special feature of this exhibition is a room devoted to color transparencies of these mirror buildings, in which 'substance dematerializes and objective technique culminates in the subjective contemplation of us and sunlight'<sup>25</sup>.

In accordance with the definition of this second category, the concepts that in the eyes of Arthur Drexler endorsed the work of KRJDA had to do with the interactions between structure and skin, the development of glass envelopes and the consequent formal abstraction. This idea is very close to the concerns expressed by the architects themselves in their comments and buildings alike. It would be good to recall John Dinkeloo's interest in an improved construction industry, and specifically in the development of new materials. Reflective glass, so present in this exhibition, was precisely one of Dinkeloo's major contributions to the history of architecture.

But as this article has shown, such penchant for the development of technology was not the only theoretical virtue that the MoMA attached to the works of KRJDA, or better, its discourse. On the contrary, the New York museum pointed out parallelisms with different works and architects of the same time as Roche and Dinkeloo, and gives them a theoretical support that is synthesized in the following table.

By way of summary, through these three exhibitions it would be possible to establish three main blocs of ideas associated with KRJDA: typological innovation, reflected in the novel Oakland Museum and the creation of interior green spaces; technical and material innovation, with special attention on the many potentials of glass; and careful engagement of the work with the landscape and surroundings. All this, in full force during the period being studied, confirms the importance and leading role that these architects played in the American architecture scene since the start of their professional careers.

### Laura Sánchez Carrasco

Architect by ETSAM since 2007 and Ph.D in Architecture by UPM since 2017. She is currently an associate profesor in the Department of Architectural Composition at ETSAM, where she teaches *Introduction to Architecture*, among others subjects. Her research, disseminated through articles and conferences, focuses on the architecture of the United States after World War II, specifically in the work of Kevin Roche John Dinkeloo and Associates. She has also been a member of the research team of various state-funded research projects. She combines teaching and research work with professional practice and has been awarded in several architectural competitions.

#### Notes

**01.** The period of time chosen for this research is focused on the 15 years in which the two original partners, Kevin Roche and John Dinkeloo, worked together, until the last one passed away in June 1981.

**02.** The exhibitions developed at MoMA since 1929 until nowadays is published and open-accessed at the website of the museum. 32 displays about architecture took place during the fifteen years in which this research is focused. Ref. web 01: [http://www.moma.org/learn/resources/archives/archives\\_exhibition\\_history\\_list](http://www.moma.org/learn/resources/archives/archives_exhibition_history_list). Read: 3 June 2016.

**03.** The works included in the exhibitions were found in: The Museum of Modern Art Archives. Collection: Pl. Series. Folder: II.B.648.

**04.** Press release sent by the MoMA to the media. In this same note a pass for the press was established on 24 September 1968 at 2 p.m., one day before the opening to the public. Logically, on the 25th of the same month, the newspapers wrote about this exhibition, most of them, mentioning explicitly the contribution of KRJDA to the show. Ref. web. 02: [https://www.moma.org/d/c/press\\_releases/W1siZilsjMyNjU4MCJdXQ.pdf?sha=c473970ca3ec5494](https://www.moma.org/d/c/press_releases/W1siZilsjMyNjU4MCJdXQ.pdf?sha=c473970ca3ec5494). Read: 4 April 2016.

**05.** "In addition to their architectural excellence, the examples chosen suggest an ambiance congenial to the immanent values of the collection and to the contemplative moments of the viewer". Words of Ludwig Glaeser in the press release sent by the MoMA to the media. Ref. web. 02.

**06.** The works exhibited and the division in different groups according to the concepts that represented were taken from: The Museum of Modern Art Archives, NY. Collection: Pl. Series. Folder: II.B.648.

**07.** Words of Ludwig Glaeser in the press release sent by the MoMA to the media. Ref. web. 02.

**08.** The other image included in the article is of the Neue National Gallery in Berlin by Mies van der Rohe.

**09.** Ada Louise Huxtable, "Architecture: A Museum is also Art, Exhibition shows", *The New York Times*, 25 de septiembre de 1968.

**10.** "The Art of Making the Magic Box", *Progressive Architecture* 11 (noviembre 1968): 56.

**11.** Press release sent by the MoMA to the media for publication on 1 October 1970. Ref. web 03: [https://www.moma.org/d/c/press\\_releases/W1siZilsjMyNjcwNCJdXQ.pdf?sha=c393818cff7547cc](https://www.moma.org/d/c/press_releases/W1siZilsjMyNjcwNCJdXQ.pdf?sha=c393818cff7547cc).

**12.** Extract of the informative poster placed at the entrance to the exhibition, signed by Arthur Drexler. Ref. web 03.

**13.** In this exhibition it was already evident that the figure of Kevin Roche worked better in the media world than that of John Dinkeloo (the same can be said of Philip Johnson and John Burgee). On 14 September 1970, because of concerns expressed by Kevin Roche, Arthur Drexler wrote John Dinkeloo a letter to explain the reason for the exhibition's title. In fact, in the exhibition's central panel and in all the texts accompanying it, definitely including the catalog, what appears is the full name of the practice. The Museum of Modern Art Archives, NY, Collection: MoMA Exhs. Series. Folder: 940.11.

**14.** The Museum of Modern Art Archives, NY, Collection: MoMA Exhs. Series. Folder: 940.6.

**15.** Taken from the panels accompanying the exhibits, obtained through the MoMA's digital archive. Ref. web 03.

**16.** Taken from the panels accompanying the exhibits, obtained through the MoMA's digital archive Ref. web 03.

**17.** Taken from the panel placed at the entrance to the exhibition, signed by Arthur Drexler. Ref. web 03.

**18.** Taken from the exhibition's initial panel, signed by Arthur Drexler. Ref. web 03.

**19.** Taken from the checklist for exhibition, available at the digital archive of the MoMA. <https://www.moma.org/d/c/checklists/W1siZilsjMyNjcwMyJdXQ.pdf?sha=9c246f0cfe1522ea>

**20.** The Museum of Modern Art Archives, NY, Collection: MoMA Exhs. Series. Folder: 940.12.

**21.** The Museum of Modern Art Archives, NY, Collection: MoMA Exhs. Series. Folder: 940.18.

**22.** The Museum of Modern Art Archives, NY, Collection: MoMA Exhs. Series. Folder: 940.6.

**23.** Words of Arthur Drexler when interviewing Kevin Roche. The Museum of Modern Art Archives, NY, Collection: MoMA Exhs. Series. Folder: 940.6.

**24.** "Photographs of more than 400 buildings, many of which seem to reject familiar notions of what modern architecture is, illustrate the exhibition's claim that the history of modern architecture during the last two decades involves the elaboration of ideas first propounded 30 or 40 years ago". Press releas sent by the MoMA to the media. Ref. web 04: [https://www.moma.org/d/c/press\\_releases/W1siZilsjMyNzlwMSJdXQ.pdf?sha=313626d5cebd628a](https://www.moma.org/d/c/press_releases/W1siZilsjMyNzlwMSJdXQ.pdf?sha=313626d5cebd628a).

**25.** Press release sent by the MoMA to the media. Ref. web. 04.

## Images

**01.** Model and picture of the Oakland Museum in the exhibition "Architecture of Museums" at the MoMA (1968). Photographic Archive. The Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York. IN867.5. Photograph by George Cserna.

**02.** Summary chart with the analyzed exhibitions, including KRJDA's works shown on them. By the author.

**03.** The Oakland Museum display, with the Neue Nationalgalerie (Berlin) by Mies van der Rohe and the Guggenheim Museum (NYC) by Frank Lloyd Wright in the background. From the exhibition "Architecture of Museums" at the MoMA. Photographic Archive. The Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York. IN867.5. Photograph by George Cserna.

**04.** John Dinkeloo and Kevin Roche in front of the model of College Life Insurance building at the dinner organized by the MoMA before the opening of the exhibition "Work in Progress: Architecture by Philip Johnson, Kevin Roche, Paul Rudolph". Image from: The Museum of Modern Art Archives, NY. Collection: Pl. Series.Folder: II.B.829.

**05.** Models and pictures of KRJDA's works shown at the MoMA in 1970. The models highlight transparency and glass enclosures at UN Plaza and College Life Insurance buildings. Photographic Archive. The Museum of Modern Art Archives, New York. IN940.2. Photograph by Alexandre Georges.

**06.** Arthur Drexler distributed KRJDA's works in four blocs of ideas that can be understood with this document of the exhibition preparation. The last one, pavilions, was finally dismissed. Image from: The Museum of Modern Art Archives. Collection: MoMA Exhs. Series.Folder: 940.18.

**07.** Photo mural in the exhibition "Transformation in Modern Architecture" (1979). In the middle

of the image can be seen the Knights of Columbus Office Building in New Haven, by KRJDA.

**08.** Summary chart with the concepts associated to KRJDA's work in every exhibition and the relationships that the curators established between the protagonists of this paper and other professionals or buildings. By the author.

## 15

# Building the "Archive" 856 Architecture Exhibitions in Barcelona Nuria Ortigosa

Building an "archive" of this kind involves compiling all the architecture exhibitions ever held in Barcelona throughout its history. This compilation or archive focuses on *what* has been seen and less on *how*, on the content rather than the medium, on the abstract behind the display, without overlooking the moments when both have an intentional relationship. This "archive" is approached from the perspective of the proactive architecture project, as an active and useful resource and not from a historical and conservationist perspective.



### THE 'ARCHIVE'

Building an 'archive' of this kind involves compiling all the architecture exhibitions ever held in Barcelona throughout its history. This compilation or archive focuses on *what* has been seen and less on *how*, on the content rather than the medium, on the abstract behind the display, without overlooking the moments when both have an intentional relationship. In addition to centralizing information which today is spread throughout the city and at times is unknown to people who want to research architecture exhibitions and have access to a specific archive, the "archive" is compiled with the intention of charting subsequent relationships that enable studying them and most importantly, through this being capable of being proactive regarding what the material refers to.

Between January 1939 and December 2018, at least 856 architecture exhibitions have taken place in Barcelona. These range from monographs about architects or important projects of a style or period to household fairs, local and international architecture, awards, contests, landscape, urban plans, criticism and even more experimental exhibitions somewhere between art and architecture. The 856 compiled exhibits could be visited in at least forty-five different exhibition spaces in the city –indoors and outdoors, public and private, cultural and educational, permanent, temporary or circumstantial. They vary from occasional locations, where an exhibit could only be seen one time owing to some special reason, such as the Diocesan Museum during the Year of Gaudí, to other venues such as Tinell Hall, which has housed twelve of these