

UCLA

UCLA Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Title

The NAI Effect: Museological Institutions and the Construction of Architectural Discourse

Permalink

<https://escholarship.org/uc/item/86f568d3>

Author

Figueiredo, Sergio Miguel

Publication Date

2014

Peer reviewed|Thesis/dissertation

UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA

Los Angeles

The NAI Effect:
Museological Institutions and the
Construction of Architectural Discourse

A dissertation submitted in partial satisfaction of the
requirements for the degree Doctor of Philosophy
in Architecture

by

Sergio Miguel Figueiredo

2014

© Copyright by
Sergio Miguel Figueiredo
2014

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION

The NAI Effect:

Museological Institutions and the
Construction of Architectural Discourse

by

Sergio Miguel Figueiredo

Doctor of Philosophy in Architecture

University of California, Los Angeles, 2014

Professor Dana Cuff, Chair

While historically, institutions shaping architectural discourse have been primarily academic, recently, architecture museums and institutes have emerged as increasingly influential platforms in furthering architectural debate. As nexus of architectural knowledge, these institutions have become particularly operative in contemporary society, primarily by involving a wide audience. By not only engaging the concerns of a broad audience, but allowing a broad audience to engage with the stakes, processes and concerns of architecture, architecture museums have effectively democratized the architectural discipline, inevitably altering architecture's perception, blurring its boundaries and exploring new territories for presentation, reflection, and discussion.

This dissertation attempts to precisely elucidate the question of how architecture museums have continued to impact the production and consumption of architecture, particularly as primary

interfaces between the interiority and exteriority of the discipline. It is thus argued that architecture museums occupy a unique position within the discipline (and among their institutional counterparts), as they both are defined and define architecture's present perception. Given their fundamental connection, by interrogating the architecture museum, an original understanding of the architectural discipline was produced.

Founded on the premise of architecture's social and political engagement with society, the Netherlands Architecture Institute (*Nederlands Architectuurinstituut*, or NAI) became paradigmatic of this condition. With a modern organization and a systematic engagement with different audiences, in less than twenty-five years the Rotterdam institute emerged as a forceful voice in the globalized discussion of architecture, while also influencing the development of a remarkable architecture culture in the Netherlands. Therefore, by analyzing the conceptual and institutional dimensions of the NAI grounded on a thorough historical examination, this doctoral research advances not only the existing scholarship on the institute (and on architecture museums), but also produces a novel insight into the contemporary moment of the discipline through the under-analyzed perspective of architectural museological institutions.

The dissertation of Sergio Miguel Figueiredo is approved.

Sylvia Lavin

Wim de Wit

Dana Cuff, Committee Chair

University of California, Los Angeles

2014

For Siska

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT OF THE DISSERTATION	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vi
LIST OF ACRONYMS FOR ARCHIVES.....	xi
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	xv
VITA.....	xvii
INTRODUCTION	1
1. ARCHITECTURE IN THE GALLERY: THE MUSEUM AND THE ARCHIVE	7
The Order of the Archive	15
A Note on the Historiography of the Architecture Museum	18
Critical Depth of Private Collections	22
Collecting Architectural Ideas.....	23
The Antiquarian Methods.....	31
Architectural Narratives	38
From Private Collections to Critical Depth.....	41
Encyclopedic Breadth of Enlightenment Museums.....	44
The Encyclopedic Public Museum.....	45
Specialization and Classification of the Architectural Archive	48
Public Accessibility.....	60

The Implosion of Meaning in the Architectural Archive.....	63
The Emergence of a Third Way.....	75
A Dialectical Relationship.....	76
Architecture Museum without Walls.....	83
2. THE CONSTRUCTION OF DISCOURSE: SOCIETIES OF ARCHITECTURE (1818-1921)	87
Previous Scholarship and other Resources.....	89
<i>Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst</i>	92
Foundation and Precedents.....	93
Membership	98
Objectives and Activities.....	101
1880 Amendment.....	123
The New Communal Building	130
Beyond the <i>Maatschappij</i>	145
<i>Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia</i>	145
Jan Leliman and his son Willem Leliman	158
A Tale of Two Museums.....	177
3. MUSEUM OR INSTITUTE: FROM PROJECTIVE TO REFLECTIVE AND BACK AGAIN (1912-	
1983)	182
Reflective Museum, Projective Institute.....	187
After Willem Leliman	192
The Committees of the <i>Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia</i>	193

The Institute that Never Was	204
The 1918 Commission for a State Architecture Museum.....	210
The 1923 Jubilee Architectural Exhibition.....	219
An Architecture Museum in the <i>Zuiderkerk</i>	224
An Architecture Museum in the <i>Rijksprentenkabinet</i>	227
Institutionalizing an Architectural Archive	233
Reviving the Discussion in the Postwar Years.....	233
The <i>Tentoonstellingsraad voor Bouwkunst en Verwante Kunsten</i> (Exhibition Council for Architecture and Related Arts)	239
The <i>Stichting Architectuurmuseum</i> (Architecture Museum Foundation).....	244
The <i>Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst</i> (Netherlands Documentation Center for Architecture).....	250
From Museum to Institute	268
4. TOWARDS AN ARCHITECTURE INSTITUTE (1978-1983)	273
National Conditions and International Context	277
Searching Architectural Quality.....	277
Learning from Abroad.....	281
International Confederation of Architecture Museums (ICAM).....	284
A Benchmarking Exercise.....	291
Criticality in the Architecture Institute.....	297
From Operative to Critical History	298

<i>Deutsches Architekturmuseum</i> (German Architecture Museum, or <i>DAM</i>).....	312
Canadian Centre for Architecture / <i>Centre Canadien d'Architecture</i> (CCA).....	323
<i>Nederlands Architectuurinstituut</i> / Netherlands Architecture Institute (NAi).....	335
Histories and Theory of Architecture Institutes	354
5. A PUBLIC SPHERE FOR ARCHITECTURE: CREATING THE <i>NEDERLANDS</i>	
<i>ARCHITECTUURINSTITUUT</i> (1984-1994)	359
Following the “Polder-Model”	362
The Informative Period	362
The Amsterdam-Rotterdam Dispute	372
Organizing the Architecture Institute: Steering Committee and Working Group.....	382
Building a New Building.....	390
The Multiple Commission.....	390
Assessing the Proposals	401
A Difficult Decision	409
Appointing a Director.....	415
The Netherlands Architecture Institute	422
Collections Department / <i>Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst</i>	424
Presentation Department and Journal / <i>Stichting Wonen</i>	429
Leliman Association / <i>Stichting Architectuurmuseum</i>	445
Consolidating the Institute.....	449
A Cultural Infrastructure for Dutch Architecture	458

6. GROWING PAINS: THE ECONOMICS OF ARCHITECTURE CULTURE (1994-2012)	460
A Loss of Direction.....	463
Changing Landscape	480
From Critical Discussion to Projective Exhibition.....	500
Selling Architecture	510
<i>Het Nieuwe Instituut / The New Institute</i>	529
An Alternative Ending?.....	534
EPILOGUE: BETWEEN CRITICAL AND POPULAR.....	539
The Societal Interface of Architecture.....	540
Critical Processes, Popular Products	542
From Popular to Commercial.....	545
Criticality in the Museum.....	547
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	550

LIST OF ACRONYMS FOR ARCHIVES

Archive of the *Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst* (NDBK):

- NDBK 33: "Nota betreffende de plaats en taak van het NDB binnen de organisatie van de RDMZ." 1977.
- NDBK 35: Nota getiteld "Het Nederlands Instituut voor Architectuur en Stedebouw." 1982.
- NDBK 67: Overzichten van medewerkers. ca. 1988.
- NDBK 122: Stukken betreffende op het NDB aanwezige archieven. (1968)-1984.
- NDBK 235: Stukken betreffende de tentoonstelling "Biënnale Jonge Nederlandse Architecten 1983." 1983.
- NDBK 274: Stukken betreffende de tentoonstellingen "Auke Komter / Architect" en "Jan Wils - Olympisch Stadion." 1978-1979.
- NDBK 300: Stukken betreffende het congres ICAM III dat in 1984 gehouden werd in Amsterdam: Stukken betreffende de rapporten aan het congres. 1984.
- NDBK 311: Stukken betreffende het congres ICAM I gehouden in 1979 in Helsinki. 1978-1980.
- NDBK 312: Stukken betreffende het congres ICAM II gehouden in 1981 in Londen. 1980-1981.
- NDBK 338: Brieven van de beheerder van het NDB aan het bestuur van de SAM betreffende de problemen tussen de stichting en het NDB, concept. 1980.
- NDBK 391: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de werkgroep [van vertegenwoordigers van WVC, VROM, NDB, SAM, Stichting Wonen]. 1984-1985.
- NDBK 392: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de subwerkgroep A: beleidsplan. 1984-1985.
- NDBK 393: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de subwerkgroep B: "status aparte." 1984-1985.
- NDBK 394: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de subwerkgroep C: collectie + wat daar mee verband houdt. 1984-1985.
- NDBK 395: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de subwerkgroep D: externe ondersteuning. 1984-1985.
- NDBK 396: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de subwerkgroep E: organisatie. 1984-1985.
- NDBK 397: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de subwerkgroep F: b3 status. 1984-1985.
- NDBK 398: Nota "Ontwerp voor een Nederlands Instituut voor Architectuur en Stedebouw" opgesteld door een werkgroep bestaande uit vertegenwoordigers van de ministeries van WVC en VROM (23 november 1984). 1984.
- NDBK 399: Nota "Ontwerp voor een Nederlands Instituut voor Architectuur en Stedebouw" opgesteld door een werkgroep bestaande uit vertegenwoordigers van de ministeries van WVC en VROM, het NDB, SAM en de Stichting Wonen (1 december 1984). 1984.
- NDBK 400: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen [tussen SAM, NDB en de Stichting Wonen]. 1984.
- NDBK 407: Stukken betreffende de keuze van de plaats en huisvesting van het nieuwe architectuurinstituut. 1984-1985.
- NDBK 414: Agenda's met bijlagen van de vergaderingen [Stuurgroep project oprichting architectuurinstituut]. 1986-1987.

- NDBK 415: Agenda's met bijlagen van de vergaderingen [Stuurgroep project oprichting architectuurinstituut]. 1987-1988..
- NDBK 416: Notitie "Procedure en opdracht nieuwbouw architectuur Instituut." 1986.
- NDBK 417: Stukken betreffende de voorbereidingsgroep van SAM, NDB en de Stichting Wonen. 1986.
- NDBK 419: Stuk getiteld "Nederlands Instituut voor Architectuur, Stedebouw en Landschapsarchitectuur. 1987.
- NDBK 420: Stuk getiteld "Schets beleidsplan architectuur-instituut." 1986.
- NDBK 421: Stuk getiteld "Organisatie architectuurinstituut." 1987.
- NDBK 422: Nota's "Organisatie architectuur instituut" (3 versies) en "Activiteiten Architectuurinstituut 1989-1992." 1988.
- NDBK 424: Afschrift van de volmacht van de Stichting Wonen aan H. Andersson en stukken betreffende het ontwerp van de akte en statuten voor de oprichting van de Stichting Nederlands Instituut voor Architectuur en Stedebouw. 1988.
- NDBK 444: Stukken betreffende de oprichting van een architectuurmuseum, afdrukken (afkomstig uit het archief van het Rijksprentenkabinet van het Rijksmuseum). 1913-1919.
- NDBK 445: Stukken betreffende de oprichting van een architectuurmuseum, Afdrukken (afkomstig uit het archief van het Rijksprentenkabinet van het Rijksmuseum). 1918-1928, 1934-1938, 1950.
- NDBK 455: Geschiedenis architectuurmuseum, engelse versie. ca. 1984.

Archive of the *Stichting Architectuurmuseum (SAMU)*:

- SAMU 29: Stukken betreffende de wijziging van de statuten. ca. 1971-72.
- SAMU 28: Stukken betreffende de oprichting van de stichting. 1955.
- SAMU 30: Stukken betreffende de overdracht van de archieven aan de Staat der Nederlanden. 1972.
- SAMU 78: Brochure getiteld "Architectuur Museum, nu of nooit....!" ca. 1980.
- SAMU 94: [Overleg over op te richten Architectuurmuseum] stukken 1928-1930, stukken 1967, stukken 1979-1983
- SAMU 127: Stuk "Beleidsoptiek van de Stichting Architectuurmuseum."
- SAMU 142: Nota "Ontwerp voor een Nederlands Instituut voor Architectuur en Stedebouw," december 1984.
- SAMU 143: Stukken betreffende de oprichting van een architectuurinstituut: het beleid, de organisatie, de vestigingsplaatskeuze en nieuwbouw, het fusieproces en de sluiting van het NDB. Correspondentie, nota's, notities en verslagen. 1983-1987, 1989.
- SAMU 145: Stukken betreffende protesten tegen de vestigingsplaatskeuze.
- SAMU 158: Advies van de Rijkscommissie aan de Minister van WVC over oprichting van een architectuurinstituut dd 16 december 1982 en reacties hierop van de Amsterdamse Kunstraad en BNA-kring Rotterdam. 1982-1984.

Archive of the *Stichting (Goed) Wonen (SGWO)*:

- SGWO 95: Stukken betreffende besprekingen met WVC over de fusie. 1985-1986.
- SGWO s1: Architectuurinstituut Algemene zaken
- SGWO s7: S.A.M.

- SGWO s13: Verslagen werkgroepen A t/m E architectuur instituut. 1986.
 SGWO s19: 7 A Architectuur instituut tot 1986. 1986.
 SGWO s20: Verslagen stuurgroep + werkgroep arch. instituut v.a. sept. '88, staf AI bouwcommissie AI. 1987-1988.
 SGWO s23: Architectuurinstituut vanaf 1-1-1986, W.V.C. correspondentie v.a. 1985. 1985-1986.

Archive of the *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia* (ARAM):

- ARAM 3: Notulen van ledenvergaderingen, 1855-1971, 22 okt. 1862 - 2 feb. 1870. 1870.
 ARAM 86: Jaarverslagen over de jaren 1856-1867. 1867.
 ARAM 87: Jaarverslagen over de jaren 1868-1877. 1877.
 ARAM 92: 'Concept-programma voor de Vereeniging A. et A.' 1855.
 ARAM 204: Rapport van een commissie, bestaande uit J. Ingenohl, J.H. de Groot en W. van de Pluym, betreffende een architectuurmuseum, 1913, met afschrift van de akte van oprichting van de Stichting Architectuurmuseum, 1955. 1955.

Uncatalogued Institutional Archive *Bestuur Nederlands Architectuurinstituut* (BEST, Board of the Netherlands Architecture Institute):

- BSTU 1988: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de Bestuur van het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut. 1988.
 BSTU 1989: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de Bestuur van het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut. 1989.
 BSTU 1994: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de Bestuur van het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut. 1994.
 BSTU 1995: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de Bestuur van het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut. 1995.
 BSTU 1996: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de Bestuur van het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut. 1996.
 BSTU 1997: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de Bestuur van het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut. 1997.
 BSTU 1998: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de Bestuur van het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut. 1998.
 BSTU 1999: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de Bestuur van het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut. 1999.
 BSTU 2000: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de Bestuur van het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut. 2000.
 BSTU 2001: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de Bestuur van het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut. 2001.
 BSTU 2002: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de Bestuur van het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut. 2002.
 BSTU 2003: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de Bestuur van het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut. 2003.

**Uncatalogued Institutional Archive *Raad van Toezicht Nederlands Architectuurinstituut*
(RVTO, Supervisory Council Netherlands Architecture Institute):**

- RVTO 2004: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de Raad van Toezicht van het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut. 2004.
- RVTO 2005: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de Raad van Toezicht van het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut. 2005.
- RVTO 2006: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de Raad van Toezicht van het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut. 2006.
- RVTO 2007: Verslagen met bijlagen van de vergaderingen van de Raad van Toezicht van het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut. 2007.

**Uncatalogued Institutional Archive *Voorgeschiedenis Nederlands Architectuurinstituut*
(VNAI, Prehistory of the Netherlands Architecture Institute):**

- VNAI 1984, 1912-1975 Voorgeschiedenis van het Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst, overdracht van de collecties naar het NDB. 1912-1975
- VNAI 1984, 1977-1979 Correspondentie, persknipsels en andere stukken. 1977-1979.
- VNAI 1984, 1981-1983 Oprichting Architectuur Museum. 1981-1983.
- VNAI 1984, 1984 Documentatie en persknipsels over locatiekeuze voor een op te richten Instituut voor Architectuur en Stedebouw. 1984.
- VNAI 1985-1992, 1985 Correspondentie, persknipsels, en brochure getiteld "Architectuur bij Opbod: Informatie over een betwiste ministeriële beslissing en over de vanzelfsprekende vestigingsplaats van een Nederlands instituut voor architectuur en stedebouw met toekomstperspectief. Stichting Wonen - SAM - NDB." 1985.
- VNAI 1985-1992, 1986 Persknipsels over nieuw bouw voor het Architectuur Instituut. 1986.
- VNAI 1985-1992, 1987 Correspondentie met WVC, persknipsels, en Nota getiteld "Nederlands Instituut voor Architectuur, Stedebouw en Landschapsarchitectuur (November 1987)." 1987.
- VNAI 1985-1992, 1988 Uitnodigingen en persknipsels over ontwerpen voor het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut. 1988.
- VNAI 1985-1992, 1989 Persknipsels, uitnodigingen en andere stukken. 1989.
- VNAI 1985-1992, 1990-1991 Persknipsels, uitnodigingen en andere stukken. 1990-1991.
- VNAI 1985-1992, 1992 Persknipsels over bouwen nieuw bouw NAI. 1992.
- VNAI 1993, 1993 Voorgeschiedenis en Geschiedenis Architectuur Instituut. 1993

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

While at times a lonesome endeavor, this dissertation would not have been possible without the advice, support, and generosity of countless people. I am indebted to them all.

I am particularly grateful to my advisor, Dana Cuff, whose guidance, insight, and kindness have not only made this dissertation possible but also better in every possible way. I am equally grateful for the continued support and advice I received from my dissertation committee members, namely Wim de Wit's insightful comments and enthusiasm, Diane Favro's generous support, and Sylvia Lavin, whose exploration of architecture exhibitions remains a source of inspiration.

For graciously making the time to discuss with me their insights on the NAI and experience with Dutch architecture culture, I am greatly indebted to Ruud Brouwers, Mariet Willinge, Hans van Dijk, Bernard Colenbrander, Hans Ibelings, Simon Franke, Alfred Marks, Caroline Bos, Kamiel Klaasse, Patrick van der Klooster, Junior Brussems, Bernard Hulsman, Hans Oldewarris, Janny Rodermond, Michael Speaks, Joop Linthorst, Hans Andersson, Elco Brinkman, Adri Duivetseijn, Aaron Betsky, and Ole Bouman. Access to the NAI's—at the time yet uncatalogued—institutional archive was also important for this research, for that I must thank Ole Bouman for graciously accepting my request.

I would also like to express my gratitude for the general availability, affability, and tolerance from all the staff at the NAI archives, study room, and library, who efficiently accommodated my requests and provided invaluable assistance. I am particularly thankful to Frans Neggers for his assistance in retrieving and accessing all the uncatalogued archives.

The intellectually demanding context that I found at UCLA, where my ideas were often first voiced, must also be acknowledged. Through the collaboration and discussion with (former and present) fellow doctoral candidates at AUD such as Per-Johan Dahl, I became a better scholar, but it was the many readings and comments from Michael Weismeyer and Courtney Ryan that made me a

better writer. I am also grateful to the opportunities provided by AUD's Hi-C group. As we explored the boundaries between designers and scholars, presentation and discussion, my ideas on architecture museums and exhibitions were indelibly shaped.

My gratitude is also directed at colleagues, conference attendees, and anonymous readers, since this dissertation greatly benefitted from their comments and discussions. Most notably, a version of the epilogue was previously published in the magazine *Volume*, while earlier versions of select sections of chapters 5 and 6 were presented at the Society of Architectural Historians Australia and New Zealand (SAHANZ) and published on *DomusWeb*.

This dissertation would not have been possible without the ongoing financial support from several institutions. I am particularly grateful to all the support provided by the Fulbright Commission Portugal (FLAD), which was above and beyond financial assistance, as well as the funding provided by the *Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia* (FCT), the Elaine Krown Klein Fine Arts Scholarship, and UCLA's Dissertation Year Fellowship.

A word of gratitude is also due to those who, with their friendship and support, have helped me make a new home in Los Angeles, particularly Sérgio and Inês. I also found another home away from home in Sint-Laureins, and for that I am grateful to my adopted Belgian family.

I am also thankful to my family in Portugal, who despite the long distance have remained close with their continued support and affection. My heartfelt gratitude is particularly owed to my mother, Isabel. It was her example of curiosity and perseverance that set me on the path that culminates with this dissertation.

Finally, I owe a lifelong debt of gratitude to my wife, Siska, not only for her unconditional support and boundless patience but also for her continued belief in my capabilities and my work, even when I doubted them myself. This dissertation is hers too.

VITA

2004	Integrated Masters of Architecture and Urbanism Lisbon Technical University, Faculty of Architecture Lisbon, Portugal
2004-2005	Assistant Designer Urban Urban Design Amsterdam, the Netherlands
2006	Designer MVRDV Architecten Rotterdam, the Netherlands
2007	Master of Architecture Amsterdam Academy of Architecture Amsterdam, the Netherlands
2007-2010	Teaching Assistant University of California Los Angeles, California
2012-2013	Lecturer / Teaching Fellow University of California Los Angeles, California
2010-present	Senior Lecturer Otis College of Art and Design Los Angeles, California

Publications and Presentations

- Figueiredo, Sergio Miguel. "Japan Looked from Me." *Kindai Kenchiku (Modern Architecture)*, February 2004.
- Figueiredo, Sergio Miguel. "A Brave New World: After We Gave Them Firearms." *Archifant* 1, no. 1 (May 2004): 23–27.
- Figueiredo, Sergio Miguel. "HEMPorium." In *A/S/L Yearbook Academy of Architecture Amsterdam 2004-2005*, 105. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2006.
- Figueiredo, Sergio Miguel, and George Kamberidis. "Portugal 212." Edited by Teresa Stoppani. *Haeceity Papers* 2, no. 1 (Fall 2006): 29–40.
- Figueiredo, Sergio Miguel. "Cultura Táctica / Tactical Culture." In *A/S/L Yearbook Academy of Architecture Amsterdam*, 220–223. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2008.
- Lavin, Sylvia, Per-Johan Dahl, and Sergio Miguel Figueiredo. "IAUS: Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies." *Log* 13–14 (Fall 2008): 154–158.
- Figueiredo, Sergio Miguel. "Branding Catastrophe." *Places* 21, no. 1 (June 2009): 21–24.
- Figueiredo, Sergio Miguel. "Building Images." Paper presented at the 63rd Annual Meeting of the Society of Architectural Historians, Chicago, Illinois April 22-25, 2010.
- Figueiredo, Sergio Miguel. "Going Dutch." *Conditions* no. 5–6 (2010): 30–34.
- Figueiredo, Sergio Miguel. "Imaging Buildings and Building Images: From De Kiefhoek to Hageneiland and Beyond." *ARQ: Architectural Research Quarterly* 15, no. 01 (Spring 2011): 35–46.
- Figueiredo, Sergio Miguel. "An External Perspective on Dutch Architectural Policy." Key note presentation at "International Meeting on Dutch Architectural Policy," the Hague, the Netherlands, April 27, 2011.
- Figueiredo, Sergio Miguel. "The Cultural Dimension of Architecture: Or the Enlarged Audience of the Netherlands Architectuurinstituut." Paper presented at the 28th Society of Architectural Historians Australia and New Zealand, Brisbane, Australia, July 7-10, 2011.
- Figueiredo, Sergio Miguel. "Architecture Museums: Between Critical and Popular." *Volume* 36 (July 2013): 126–130.
- Figueiredo, Sergio Miguel. "De Política Cultural a Politiquice Económica: 25 Anos de Políticas de Arquitetura na Holanda (1991-2016)." *Boletim Dos Arquitectos* 21, no. 231 (September 2013): 30–32.

INTRODUCTION

The construction, articulation and dissemination of architectural discourse has been continuously shaped and expanded as much by individuals as by institutions. But while the impact of periodicals, publications, individuals, collective groups, movements, and academic institutions on the architectural discipline and discourse is well documented and studied, the influence of museological organizations that often host, facilitate, and support many of these activities has commonly been overlooked. Moreover, with the onset of globalization, the reach of institutions and their effects on the discipline have been widely amplified, making a comprehensive research addressing how institutions construct, articulate, and disseminate architectural discourse remarkably timely.

The problematic of discourse, its production, articulation and transmission has been at the center of the architectural discipline since its very inception. Contemplation and theorization, the basis for discourse, have traditionally distinguished the architect from the builder. Thus, by investigating the construction of architectural discourse and the transmission of architectural knowledge and experience within the institutional framework of museological institutions, the very conception of the discipline was analyzed in a unique perspective.

Unsurprisingly, the current moment of architecture is greatly shaped by an intersection and collusion of different issues that are also prominent in the definition of the role of institutions in the shaping of architectural knowledge (the meta-topic of the research) and the particular approach pursued by the Netherlands Architecture Institute (*Nederlands Architectuurinstituut*, or NAI). Thus, this doctoral research has reflected on the conception of the architectural discipline by revealing how the architecture museum in general and the NAI in particular are defined by issues like the primacy of the archive in the organization of the modern architectural discipline; the constitution of inclusive public spheres for the enunciation of architectural discourse; the instrumentalization of

spectacle and powerful imagery; or even the use of branding as a necessary competitive strategy in an increasingly globalized world.

Founded on the premise of architecture's social and political engagement with society, the Netherlands Architecture Institute (*Nederlands Architectuurinstituut*, or NAI) became paradigmatic of this condition. With a modern organization and a systematic engagement with different audiences, in less than twenty-five years the Rotterdam institute emerged as a forceful voice in the globalized discussion of architecture, while also influencing the development of a thriving architecture culture in the Netherlands. Therefore, by analyzing the conceptual and institutional dimensions of the NAI grounded on a thorough historical examination, this doctoral research advances not only the existing scholarship on the institute (and on architecture museums), but also produces a novel insight into the contemporary moment of the discipline through the under-analyzed perspective of architectural museological institutions.

As the title and abstract already indicate, this dissertation is based on a case study research of the NAI. Therefore, this dissertation is also the result of a combination of quantitative (analysis of pertinent financial and institutional records documenting the activities at the NAI) and qualitative methods (archival perusal and interviews with key people involved in the NAI's development) supported by a resilient theoretical framework established by a thorough literature review. Furthermore, this dissertation is grounded on a combination of primary and secondary sources that provide a broader, deeper and more inclusive understanding, approaching a 'thick description' of the NAI's institutional development. Since the NAI is a Dutch institution, attempting to (primarily) affect Dutch architecture culture, and mainly funded by Dutch public subsidies, the overwhelming majority of primary research material consulted was written in Dutch. Therefore, all the translations from the original Dutch documents and articles to English included in this dissertation are of my own responsibility.

In documenting and analyzing the development of the architecture museum from its origins emulating public art galleries to their contemporary proliferation as platforms for architectural discussion, this dissertation has been organized into six chapters. These chapters, both establish the conceptual framework of the overall research and trace this specific progression with a close analysis of the NAI. Therefore, a chronological order is followed, reflecting on a sequence of different issues surrounding the establishment of an architecture museum in the Netherlands.

The introductory chapter presents the early history of the (proto) architecture museum and establishes that this institutional typology is primarily defined by its instrumentalization of the architectural archive. Accordingly titled *Architecture in the Gallery: The Museum and the Archive*, this chapter also reveals the dialectical relation established between the two extremes of the wide spectrum of architecture museums from which a third way is presently emerging, one that combines the qualities of both 'critical depth' and encyclopedic breadth.'

In the following chapter *The Construction of Discourse: Amsterdam Societies of Architecture (1818-1921)*, nineteenth-century Amsterdam societies of architecture are identified as the origins of the architecture museum in the Netherlands. By organizing exhibitions and competitions, producing publications and journals, and hosting discussions and lectures, these societies operated as proto-architecture museums without the title. Accordingly, it is sustained that the history of the NAI began in this period, particularly through the efforts of Johannes Hermanus (Jan) Leliman, an active member in the two leading architecture societies of the period.

The third chapter, *Museum or Institute: From Projective to Reflective and Back Again (1912-1983)*, traces and reflects on the changing perception of an architecture museum in the Netherlands since 1912. In this year, the discussion regarding an architecture museum gained some urgency in the Netherlands with the publication of the article *Een Architectuurmuseum* (An Architecture Museum) by Willem Leliman (Jan Leliman's son), which has been canonized by the NAI's

historiography as the starting point for the establishment of an architecture museum in the Netherlands. This chapter, thus reflects on the opposition between two distinct conceptions of the architecture museum (and inherently of architecture): the 'reflective' museum which approached architecture as any other artistic endeavor and as such past knowledge was rarely challenged, and the 'projective' institute in which architecture was defined by its own qualities and the architectural archive was to be constantly confronted with contemporary architectural ideas.

The fourth chapter, *Towards an Architecture Institute (1978-1983)*, identifies the ideas of Manfredo Tafuri as the theoretical framework of the contemporary architecture museum as a forum for inclusive discussion. Specifically, it is claimed that institutions like the DAM (German Architecture Museum), but particularly the CCA (Canadian Centre for Architecture) and the NAI were the institutionalization of Tafuri's claims that only a dialectical opposition between architecture's past and present, between history and design practice could advance the discipline in meaningful ways. Therefore, this chapter also establishing a comparison between the DAM, the CCA, and the NAI, revealing a close affinity between the CCA and the NAI and a distance between the NAI and the DAM.

The following chapter, *A Public Sphere for Architecture: Creating the Netherlands Architectuurinstituut (1984-1994)*, argues that the establishment of the NAI was intended (and succeeded) in creating the conditions and context for fostering an inclusive and rational discussion about architecture. This chapter also traces the different initiatives that would culminate in the establishment of the NAI in Rotterdam's *Museumpark*, from the Dutch government's initial announcement of its intention to create an architecture institute, to the merger of three existing organizations (*Stichting Wonen*, *NDB*, and *SAM*) to the construction of a new building and the appointment of its first director.

The final chapter, *Growing Pains: The Economics of Architecture Culture (1994-2012)*, reveals the growing influence of economic interests in shaping the policy and strategy of the NAI. Therefore, it is claimed that while at first these interests were productively co-opted to expand the institute's approach and understanding of architecture, eventually they were also responsible for the demise of the institute's cultural standing and effectively its closure at the end of 2012. As with previous chapters and with other periods discussed, the conditions affecting the institute merely reflected the wider context in which contemporary architecture operates.

The final epilogue *Architecture Museum: Between Critical and Popular* complements these six chapters by presenting a balance and reflection on the research, while establishing a forceful argument for the continued significance of the architecture museum. Specifically, this epilogue reiterates how the architecture museum has been—and continues to be—a crucial instrument in connecting the interior and exterior of the architectural discipline by occupying a territory between critical discussion and popular dissemination of architecture. As the enunciation of the discipline to a wider audience becomes increasingly important, the fast-changing context also poses new challenges to the architecture museum as a favored mediator for the discipline.

Combined, these chapters present an argument based on a thorough historical analysis that furthers our understanding of both the NAI and the typology of the architecture museum. As such, this dissertation contains several detailed descriptions of moments, episodes and documents that may at times become overbearing. Although the level of detail is not always necessary to advance the argument being made, the inclusion of these detailed descriptions add a crucial dimension of historical documentation of events and occurrences that had never been made available, nor published (neither in English nor in Dutch). The depth of the comprehensive perspective regarding the establishment of an architecture institute in the Netherlands not only constitutes an original contribution of this research, but becomes particularly important in reflecting the evolving

conditions and context for architecture and how the very idea of the architecture museum was often instrumentalized in wider discussions.

Among the most significant findings of this comprehensive study are both the recognition of the fundamental role of the architectural archive in defining the architecture museum and the unique ambition of these institutions to not only passively document, but also actively engage with the discipline. Underlying these findings—and equally significant—this dissertation demonstrates how architecture museums have continuously evolved, adjusting to architecture’s changing context and perception. Today, architecture museums and institutes continue to reposition themselves in an ever changing cultural landscape, engaging with new electronic networks of information (such as the internet) and other digital tools (such as smartphones) to develop new discursive practices. An investigation of the challenges and possibilities created by this digital paradigm remains to be developed, in what can only be considered the natural extension of the work initiated with this dissertation.

1. ARCHITECTURE IN THE GALLERY: THE MUSEUM AND THE ARCHIVE

On March 15, 2011, the Netherlands Architecture Institute (NAi) issued a press release stating that when it (re)opened its doors to the public on the following July 1st it should no longer be referred to as NAi, but instead as “NAi, Museum for Architecture.”¹ The same statement claims the change of nomenclature to reflect the actual cultural mission and intended reach of the NAi, namely that the institution was “not only a challenging place for architects and designers but also an exciting and inviting place for all other people” who are inevitably, even if unaware, involved with architecture in their daily life.² The renaming of the institute was intended to dispel some misconceptions and perceived barriers.³ It was devised as a marketing strategy to reposition the NAi to cultural consumers and attract new visitors beyond the confines of architectural circles by simply clarifying what it was.⁴ While only conceived as a short-term marketing strategy, the renaming of the NAi reveals the historical difficulty in defining the architecture museum to the exterior and the interior of the discipline alike. Focusing on the term “museum” rather than “institute” may have somewhat clarified to a larger public the NAi’s most prominent activity of exhibiting architecture, but even still, the definition of the “architecture museum” remains rather elusive.

¹ Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, “Persbericht 15 Maart 2011: Architectuur Dichterbij Dan Je Denkt,” *NAi Nieuws*, March 15, 2011, http://www.nai.nl/content/943823/persbericht_15-3-2011_architectuur_dichterbij_dan_je_denkt. Last accessed March 1st, 2012. The NAi had closed to the public from May 2010 to July 2011 for a complete renovation of the building’s entrance.

² Ibid. It is specifically referred that “architecture is everywhere,” in our places of living, working, travelling and recreation

³ The confusion provoked by the title “institute” was a recurrent issue constantly discussed within the NAi throughout the years, often paired with suggestions to change the institute title to “Netherlands Museum for Architecture.” Monika Platzer, “Interview with Mariet Willinge,” *ICAM Print* 3 (December 2009): 52.

⁴ Ole Bouman, interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo, audio, May 2, 2011.

With exhibition spaces and a compelling collection dedicated to architecture, the title of “architecture museum” would certainly seem apt to describe this institution. However, architecture museums come in all shapes and sizes. From simple exhibition and information centers to architecture-centric libraries, the definition of the “architecture museum” has been notoriously supple and difficult to accurately define. This has been the position expressed by most commentators of architecture museums. Rather than focusing on the similarities of these institutions, the perceived differences and singularity of each organization have so far been directing the conversation. Dietmar Steiner, director of the Austrian *Architekturzentrum Wien* (AZW), reached the logical conclusion of this “singularity argument” when he utterly rejected the possibility of a typology and claimed that “[t]he architecture museum does not exist. Each architecture museum must find an appropriate role for itself within the local culture and its own context.”⁵ Also John Harris, the notorious long time curator at the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) Library and Drawings Collection, had already expressed the ambiguity of what constituted an architecture museum, by pointing out the diversity of institutions and organizations (such as libraries, academies, technical universities, schools of architecture, professional architectural institutions, and “so-called architecture museums”) represented in the International Confederation of Architecture Museums (ICAM).⁶

It is impossible to dissociate the perceived ambiguity of the architecture museum and the international organization dedicated to the communication between these institutions. The ICAM (of which Harris was the first president and Steiner currently presides) sponsored this ambiguity since its inception simply by adopting the title of “Confederation” (rather than the initially

⁵ Dietmar Steiner, “ICAM, 30 Years Lecture: Architecture Museums Today,” ed. Monika Platzer, *ICAM Print* 3 (December 2009): 56–63.

⁶ John Harris, “Storehouses of Knowledge: The Origins of the Contemporary Architecture museum,” in *Centre Canadien d’Architecture/Canadian Centre for Architecture: Building and Gardens*, ed. Larry Richards (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989), 15.

proposed “Union”) to better “describe the looser knit character of architecture museums, archives, collections, libraries, and information centers.”⁷ Rather than focusing on the commonality between these institutions, there has been a consistent approach of acknowledging singularity and difference.

While singularity should be acknowledged, it is equally important to understand the underlying commonality of these institutions. Claims of distinction should be supplemented by an inquiry of the common ground within which these organizations operate. The spectrum of institutions is plural and diverse, with a variety of financial and organizational settings, but there is an underlying structure that unites them: the collection and dissemination of architectural knowledge.⁸ The focus on architecture permeates these institutions organization and has directly influenced not only the particular museological approach to architecture, but the discipline of architecture in general. It is my contention that by engaging the ever-present tension between the singularity and commonality of architecture museums, the current conversation will be productively expanded. Particularly, as it will be complemented with a necessary reflection on the structural foundation of the architecture museum, that is, on the conceptual framework from which difference and singularity arises.

Although there has been a growing interest in understanding the architecture museum as a structural instrument of a dynamic architecture culture, comprehensive scholarship is still quite limited. In fact, existing scholarship has been mostly sporadic and all but entirely dedicated to singular issues and the historical precedents of specific institutions. Conversely, this doctoral

⁷ “ICAM from 1979 to 2010,” *ICAM Print 3* (December 2009): 32–33. Angela Giral, “International Confederation of Architecture museums, A History,” *ICAM Print 3* (December 2009): 8–15.

⁸ While the expression “architectural knowledge” has not been specifically defined before, the notion that the architecture museum collects and disseminates architectural knowledge (and not merely architectural representations) is implicit in the overwhelming majority of arguments and claims on the architecture museum. Perhaps the most explicit expression of this assumption is revealed in Johh Harris’ overview of the architecture museum, aptly titled “Storehouses of Knowledge.”

project intends to provide an overarching understanding of the architecture museum as instrumental element in architecture's disciplinary apparatus by establishing connections and complement existing scholarship.

Accordingly, this project is a comprehensive exercise that reveals the origins of the architecture museum in the eighteenth and nineteenth-century's yearning for the advancement of the discipline through a combination of popular dissemination and critical discussion and traces the supra-structures then established to their contemporary expression. Therefore, this project serves to argue for a unified understanding of the architecture museum, contrasting and broadening the current prevalent notion that favors a discussion of these institutions' singularity.

Through the history of its collection and the multiple efforts to establish an architecture museum in the Netherlands, the NAI's development closely parallels the inception and evolution of the modern architecture museum. Like the objects in a series that inherently represent an entire class of objects, the NAI history both intersects and reveals the largely untold history and themes of these institutions. Reflecting on the common organizing principles of architecture museums (present in all their diverse realization) not only contextualizes the NAI, but also assesses the impact and the (often obscured) instrumentality of these institutions.⁹ Moreover, considering the structural-conceptual framework of the architecture museum, allows an understanding of its societal and disciplinary position, specifically in its dual role as physical location and imagined site for the collection and dissemination of architectural knowledge.

⁹ John Harris engaged in a similar, yet embryonic, project by identifying the functional "typical components of some modern architecture museums" in order to contextualize the (then) recently inaugurated Canadian Centre for Architecture. See Harris, "Storehouses of Knowledge: The Origins of the Contemporary Architecture museum."

Despite the current eclecticism of institutions and organizations dedicated to “promoting the better understanding of architecture,” the practice of establishing an archive of architectural artifacts seems to be transversal to all.¹⁰ In fact, the constitution of an architectural archive and the institution of public accessibility have come to define the assortment of architectural museological institutions under the auspices of the ICAM. Archives and public accessibility can be used to classify the variety of organizations dedicated to the advancement of the discipline into three categories: architectural archives and libraries, architecture centers and architecture museums. Architectural archives possess significant holdings of architectural knowledge but lack exhibition space dedicated to its public presentation, of which Columbia University’s Avery Architectural and Fine Arts Library in New York and RIBA’s Architectural Library in London are paradigmatic. Conversely, architectural centers possess exhibitions areas dedicated to the public presentation of architecture but lack any significant architectural archive. With 4,000 square feet of gallery and without any type of collection, the A+D Architecture and Design Museum in Los Angeles would be an apt example of an architectural center. Unlike architectural archives and centers, the architecture museum combines *both* extensive architectural archives and dedicated exhibition spaces, of which the Canadian Centre for Architecture (CCA) in Montreal and the NAI in Rotterdam have become the standard.

By collecting architectural archives and making them accessible, architecture museums have come to define a specific territory within the discipline. The particular position occupied by these museums is instigated by their institutional focus on architecture and is revealed by their shared approaches, objectives and instruments. As it will be later discussed, by engaging and exhibiting architecture, these museums inevitably and resolutely reinforce a basic tenet of the modern architectural discipline: the prominence of architectural processes over products, that is, of abstract

¹⁰ Colophon of ICAM Print(s), the publication of the International Confederation of Architecture museums since 2005.

ideas over material construction. Therefore, these institutions reveal a common set of concerns and traits that support a conceptual—rather than formal—characterization of the architecture museum.

Museological institutions dedicated to architecture have established their particular position within the discipline as fundamental means of engagement and dissemination, becoming an influential instrument in architecture's disciplinary apparatus. While often overlooked, these museums have guided the development of the discipline in specific directions. Moreover, the exhibition of architecture in a museological setting has also traditionally operated as an interface between the interiority and exteriority of the discipline, often directing the increasingly relevant enunciation of architecture to a wider audience. By discussing the issues, concerns and intentions of architecture with a general audience, architecture museums have become platforms for debate and considerable champions in directing public appreciation of architecture. As interest in architecture (both its discourse and practice) continues to grow beyond architectural circles, the position of the architecture museum at the vanguard of the enunciation of the discipline continues to be consolidated.¹¹ Therefore, a critical evaluation of this institutional typology is not only propitious for a renewed insight into architecture's contemporary condition, but also particularly timely.

Beyond defining their own territory within the discipline, architecture museums have also distinguished themselves from their museological counterparts. By occupying the intersection between architectural discipline and museological practices, the institutional development of the architecture museum is indelibly associated to the very conception of its subject, namely the prominence of architectural processes over products. While art museums traditionally present finished objects of different artistic endeavors in their galleries, for the architecture museum it is

¹¹ The increased interest in architecture by a wide audience is acknowledged by several observers, but perhaps most clearly by Cynthia Davidson's editorial for a special issue of the journal *Log* dedicated to "Curating Architecture" where she claims that there is a "sheer proliferation of architectural exhibitions." Cynthia Davidson, "Editorial," *Log* 20 (Fall 2010): 2.

often physically impossible to collect and exhibit the “conventional” end products of its subject matter, that is, buildings.¹² Given this significant restriction, architecture museums have instead focused their attention in presenting the processes rather than the products of the discipline, reinforcing the basic premise notoriously established in *De Re Aedificatoria*.¹³ In his inaugural architectural treatise, Leon-Battista Alberti “famously defined the modern principle of architectural design as an intellectual endeavor,” predicated on the separation of the material act of construction and the abstract act of design.¹⁴ Such intellectualization of architecture “has proved decisive for [architecture’s] cultural standing,” as it not only allowed architecture to become a staple in the pages of books, journals and magazines, but also enabled the assemblage of architectural ideas into significant archives and collections from which meaning could be constructed and reconstructed with each access.¹⁵ The centrality of the disciplinary archive in the architecture museum both originates and expands the primacy of abstract ideas over concrete construction in architecture. By constituting and instrumentalizing repositories where architectural ideas can be accumulated,

¹² There are several outdoor museums that have collected architectural replicas, or have moved entire buildings into the museum precincts, to construct romanticized visions of historical (and societal) conditions, of which Greenfield Village in Dearborn, Michigan stands as a germane example. For a discussion of the evolution of these architectural collections from garden pavilions to entire villages, see Edward N. Kaufman, “The Architecture museum from World’s Fair to Restoration Village,” *Assemblage* no. 9 (June 1989): 21–39. Conversely, other museums have commissioned buildings from several famed architects with the specific intent to create a collection of architecture excellence, of which the most notable must be the Vitra Design Museum, boasting several buildings by Pritzker prize recipients in its campus. See Dietmar Stock-Nieden, “Die Bauten der Vitra Design GmbH in Weil am Rhein 1981-1994: Untersuchungen zur Architektur- und Ideengeschichte eines Industrieunternehmens am Ende des 20. Jahrhunderts” (Dissertation, Universität Freiburg Philosophische Fakultät. Kunstgeschichtliches Institut, 2005).

¹³ In a special issue of *Log* dedicated to “Curating Architecture,” most contributors acknowledge—even if indirectly—the difficulty in collecting and exhibiting, but Eve Blau is perhaps the most incisive of all as she identifies it as the “central paradox of the architecture museum.” See Eve Blau, “Curating Architecture with Architecture,” ed. Cynthia Davidson, *Log* 20 (Fall 2010): 18–28. Leon Battista Alberti, *On the Art of Building in Ten Books* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1988).

¹⁴ Mario Carpo, “Monstrous Objects, Morphing Things: On Alberti, Wiki and Bloggers,” *Perspecta*, no. 40 (September 2008): 18.

¹⁵ Kurt W. Forster, “Why Buildings Need Books,” *Log* 15 (Winter 2009): 17–23.

juxtaposed, retrieved, and interpreted, museums uniquely contribute to the advancement of the discipline.

The assemblage of abstract ideas in a physical archive involves specific policies which further distinguish architecture museums within the museological complex. The architectural ideas these museums are dedicated to collect and present are not materialized in singular objects but exist, and at times are only present, in a multiplicity of material. Drawings, models, correspondence, artifacts, and other objects populate architectural archives, forming comprehensive collections of architects' *oeuvres*, impelling the museums hosting them into unparalleled archival breadth. Contrasting with such "encyclopedic breadth" of architectural archives, some institutions have pursued an approach based on "critical depth."¹⁶ Rather than collecting a multiplicity of objects and material, this approach only integrates into its collection specific elements that have been deemed to best represent select ideas. Both these approaches have complementary merits and shortcoming and all contemporary architecture museums have developed their particular policies in between these two extremes (often of hybrid nature). However, even in their marked difference both approaches reveal the fundamental conception of architecture and the architecture museum to be indelibly associated with the constitution of its disciplinary archive.

In order to understand the contemporary positioning of architecture museums and their association with architecture's disciplinary archive it is necessary to examine the origins and contexts of this association. Critically analyzing the evolution of the architecture museum—from its preliminary eighteenth-century efforts to its more recent widespread materialization—reveals how the contemporary architecture museum has been fashioned from the early conceptions of the architectural archive. Such an historical overview of the development of the architecture museum

¹⁶ See Terence Riley, "Drawn into a Collection: A Context of Practices," in *Envisioning Architecture: Drawings from the Museum of Modern Art* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2002), 11–17.

institutional typology creates a workable definition of what an architecture museum is, while also constituting an original framework for architecture's disciplinary apparatus. This also allows for specific institutional and disciplinary dynamics to be both reflected upon and understood, while revealing general tendencies within architecture in its various systems of production, communication and consumption.

The Order of the Archive

A fundamental epistemological shift lays at the grounding of architecture's disciplinary project, namely, the concept that architecture is not exhausted in the construction of buildings, but is actually animated by an underlying intellectual endeavor of ideas.¹⁷ With the publication of the first book on architecture since antiquity, Alberti's treatise articulated an idea that has become central to the development of architecture as a discipline: architectural design is an intellectual rather than a material endeavor.¹⁸ Its best expression was not found in the physical execution of building, but instead in drawings and models which would later be exactly reproduced in construction.¹⁹ The unmooring of architecture from the concrete and physical form of construction to the indefinite and abstract realm of ideas implied that building was just one possible manifestation of architectural concepts, and not even the better manifestation at that. With this conceptual shift, architecture was no longer limited to a fixed physical location or finite, but instead transmittable, supple, infinite, and collectable.

¹⁷ Pointed by many as the crucial moment for the formalization of architecture as a discipline, the importance of Alberti's treatise was perhaps best articulated by Patrik Schumacher, who described "Alberti's distinction between form and material [as being] constitutive for the emergence of architecture as intellectual discipline." See Patrik Schumacher, *The Autopoiesis of Architecture: A New Framework for Architecture* (Wiley, 2011), 83.

¹⁸ See Alberti, *On the Art of Building in Ten Books*.

¹⁹ See Mario Carpo, "The Turning Point of 1450: Abstract Rules versus Standardized Components in Albertian Theory," in *Architecture in the Age of Printing: Orality, Writing, Typography, and Printed Images in the History of Architectural Theory*, trans. Sarah Benson (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001), 119–139.

The primacy of ideas forcefully argued by Alberti enabled a dematerialization of architecture which—while necessary—was still insufficient for the establishment of an architectural discipline. In order for architecture to present an intellectual project, an instrument for engaging and correlating architectural experience had to emerge, a system that could organize the production and understanding of (different) meaning by enabling the spread of architectural knowledge across space and time. The constitution of architecture's archive was thus complementary to architecture's dematerialization and intrinsic to the establishment of a discipline of architecture. The constitution of the architectural archive was inherent to its intellectualization, that is, to the very essence of the modern conception of architecture.

By establishing a conceptual field and defining a space of communication where possible interventions and discussion can exist, the archive goes beyond its material function as a physical repository of artifacts and representations and becomes a central instrument in architecture's disciplinary apparatus. The architectural archive has constantly enabled the advancement of the discipline by governing the emergence of statements, grouping together knowledge and experience in distinct figures, as well as establishing multiple relations. As Michel Foucault argued, the archive is not merely the sum of all texts and artifacts that define a culture nor the set of institutions that make it possible to record and preserve them. Instead, "[t]he archive is first the law of what can be said, the system that governs the appearance of statements as unique events."²⁰ Since for Foucault the archive is the "general system of the formation and transformation of statements," it inherently "governs what is said or unsaid, recorded or unrecorded."²¹ Despite its superficial claims of neutrality, the archive always embeds significant systems of control and structures of power.

²⁰ Michel Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, World of Man (New York: Pantheon Books, 1972), 129.

²¹ Ibid., 130. Charles Merewether, "Art and the Archive," in *The Archive* (London: Whitechapel, 2006), 11.

While Foucault intended to completely disconnect the constitution of the archive from its physical expression as a collection of statements, it is the combination of both that makes it such a compelling instrument. This combination allows not only for new statements to be enunciated, but also for previous statements to remain present and relevant, in a continuous production of knowledge. Such condition was recognized by Derrida, who claimed the impossibility of the archive without the “consignation in an external place which assures the possibility of memorization, of repetition, of reproduction.”²² While archival impulses are incited by the threat of forgetfulness and the threat of radical finitude to our future, the result is not only the possibility of memorization and repetition but also the production of new meanings. While Derrida (also) acknowledges that the act of “archivization produces as much as it records an event,” he associates this condition to both the political power inherent in the archive and to the technical structures of the *archiving* archive that “determines the structure of the archivable content even in its very coming into existence and in its relationship to the future.”²³ Therefore, the archive is not merely a passive repository of memory, but instead informs and regulates how history is understood and new meanings are formulated. It is the archive that allows for the enunciation of ideas and the creation of any meaning for an intellectual endeavor.

The architecture museum is the clearest expression of the concrete and abstract qualities of the archive within architectural culture. It is not only a physical location where documents, manuscripts, drawings and other artifacts are collected, catalogued and stored, but also an abstract conception where knowledge is produced and meaning created. As the conception and perception of architecture has evolved, so has the archive been recontextualized and reconfigured, constantly reflecting the evolving attitudes towards the discipline. Investigating the historical trajectory of the

²² Jacques Derrida, *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996), 11.

²³ *Ibid.*, 17.

architecture museum through the perspective of the archive (as its organizing principle) not only grounds the definition of this institutional typology, but reveals the historical development and inherent tendencies of architecture's disciplinary project. It reveals not only the changing attitudes towards the dissemination of architectural experience, but, most importantly, the advancement of architectural discourse.

The archive has not only continuously defined the architectural discipline, but the discipline constantly defines the archive. Such condition is particularly visible in the specific archival policies and strategies adopted by modern architecture museums. Far from being a monolithic condition, archival policies within contemporary architecture museums vary considerably, in a contemporary expression of the diverging early constructions of the architectural archive. Paradoxically, such diverging stances towards the archive both reflect the different museums' conceptions of architecture and reinforce the centrality of the archive as the instrument where claims are made and statements established. While their basic perspective of architecture may differ, all museums instrumentalize the archive to validate and legitimize their specific conception of the discipline.

A Note on the Historiography of the Architecture Museum

Despite being a fundamental instrument in architecture's disciplinary apparatus, historical research into the origins and development of the "architecture museum" has been rather limited. In fact, scholarship concerning the historical and theoretical precedents of the contemporary architecture museum has been primarily sporadic and cursory. Interest in this topic surged during the 1980s, as several architectural museological institutions were established.²⁴ Since most studies

²⁴ Most notably, the *Deutsches Architektur Museum* (DAM) in 1978, the Canadian Centre for Architecture (CCA) in 1979, the *Institut Français d'Architecture* (IFA) in 1981, and the *Nederlands Architectuurinstituut* (NAi) in 1988.

were sponsored or supported by national interests and specific museological projects, serving as historical validation to their cultural ambitions, the architecture museum's historiography has been constantly framed by contemporary museological projects. Within this context, the disciplinary debate regarding the history of the architecture museum has been primarily dictated by an exchange between two towering figures: Werner Szambien and John Harris.²⁵

As a widely respected scholar of architecture in the Revolutionary period, Werner Szambien's most significant contribution to the debate took the form of a volume titled "*Le Musée d'Architecture*."²⁶ In this book Szambien traces the origins of the architecture museum, particularly in the myriad of initiatives during the Revolutionary period in France. In examining the plethora of initiatives and discussions, Szambien attempts "to demonstrate the homogeneity of concerns in the age of neo-classicism according to contemporary standards."²⁷

Criticism of *Le Musée d'Architecture* has primarily denounced Szambien's analytical limitation to French projects (with English and Italian initiatives being dismissed by passing references) and the blatant elevation of some enterprises and individuals like architect and professor of architecture

²⁵ There are several instances in both scholars' writing where the tension between their contrasting arguments is palpable, but perhaps the most direct repudiation of an opposing assertion comes from Szambien, who derided Harris by claiming that "[i]f John Harris claims that all museums of architecture are posterior and modeled on Sir John Soane's Museum in London, institutionalized in 1833, he is obviously required to qualify a museum existing in 1806 as a project." Szambien would go on to state that Harris' "fundamental error is to consider collections of drawings as the essential starting point for the establishment of museums of architecture, because this is a view that only dates from the second half of the twentieth century." Werner Szambien, *Le Musée d'Architecture* (Paris: Picard, 1988), 63 footnote 66. Both remarks relate to John Harris considerations in John Harris, "Le Dessin d'Architecture: Une Nouvelle Marchandise Culturelle," in *Images et Imaginaires d'Architecture: Dessin, Peinture, Photographie, Arts Graphiques, Théâtre, Cinéma En Europe Aux XIXe et XXe Siècles* (Paris: Centre National d'Art et de Culture Georges Pompidou, 1984), 78.

²⁶ Szambien, *Le Musée d'Architecture*. Previously Szambien had also published an article in which the major arguments of the book are outlined. See Werner Szambien, "Les Origines Du Musée d'Architecture En France," *Gazette Des Beaux-Arts* 108, no. 1413 (October 1986): 135-140.

²⁷ Szambien, *Le Musée d'Architecture*, 10.

history Léon Dufourny and traveler and artist Louis-François Cassas.²⁸ While certainly valid, a contextualization of the production of the volume provides insight into these obvious limitations. Specifically, the book was the result of a research undertaken by Szambien at the French *Centre Nationale de la Recherche Scientifique* (CNRS, or National Center of Scientific Research) which resulted in a governmental report (from which the book derived) in support of the convergence of the scattered French architectural archives.²⁹ Despite the specific nature of Szambien's argument, critics have unanimously praised the thorough archival research supporting *Le Musée d'Architecture*, as well as the inclusion of a collection of reprinted original source material. These comprise a full third of the volume and consist of a variety of material, including inventories of private and public collections of architecture, correspondence, contemporary articles and even a report (by Dufourny) describing a complete museum of architecture.

John Harris, who in subsequent writings has claimed to be “indebted to Werner Szambien's *Le Musée d'Architecture* (Paris: Picard, 1988) on the [history of the] architecture museum in France,” approached the history of the architecture museum in a different manner than Szambien. Instead of a complete volume, the longtime curator at the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) Library and Drawings Collection authored a variety of publications that both directly and indirectly offered considerations on the history of the architecture museum. Harris initially approached the debate through research focused on the history of the different collections (and architects) that have come to make part of the RIBA's collection, particularly the Burlington-Devonshire collection.³⁰ Perhaps

²⁸ For the critical reception of Szambien's book, see Barry Bergdoll, “Book Review: *Le Musée d'Architecture* by Werner Szambien,” *The Burlington Magazine* 131, no. 1035 (June 1989): 433–434; Christopher Mead, “Book Review: *Le Musée d'Architecture* by Werner Szambien,” *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 50, no. 2 (June 1, 1991): 203–205.

²⁹ Werner Szambien, *Le Musée d'Architecture (1776-1836), Un Projet Inachevé* (Paris: I.E.R.A.U. / S.R.A., 1984).

³⁰ Several of Harris' articles address the different stages in the life of the Burlington-Devonshire collection, from Inigo Jones original assemblage of drawings to Lord Burlington's (second) revival of Palladianism in England. See John Harris, “The Colen Campbell Drawings,” *Royal Institute of British Architects*

enthused by his presidency of the nascent ICAM, during the 1980s Harris attempted to directly tackle the problematic of the historical origins of the architecture museum, first identifying it in Sir John Soane's Museum, and later on the sketchbooks of medieval masons.³¹ Given his responsibilities at RIBA's Drawing Collection, it is not surprising that throughout John Harris *oeuvre* the architecture museum has been framed as primarily a collection of drawings, even when its audience was limited to the collecting mason, architect, or dilettante.

Other authors have also added to the discussion, but they too have attempted to delineate the historical precedents of the architecture museum in accordance to the holdings of particular institutions. For example, while addressing an audience at the Chicago Art Institute, an institution famed for its great collection of architectural fragments, Edward Kaufman traced the origins of the museum of architecture to early collecting practices of *spolia* and natural-sized casts.³² Although unwittingly, Kaufman, Harris, and Szambien's work already alluded to a latent connection between the museum of architecture and the architectural archive.

While espousing diverging views regarding what constitutes preliminary efforts in the establishment of the architecture museum, the combination of this diverse set of historical material results in a resilient resource in understanding the diversity of origins that have created the multitude of institutions dedicated to the documentation and public presentation of architecture. Thus, the present chapter of this dissertation project draws from the archival and historical research of not just Szambien, Harris, or Kaufman but also additional authors in support of a

Journal 74 (July 1967): 269–270; John Harris, "John Talman's Design for His Wunderkammern," *Furniture History* 21 (1985): 211–216; John Harris, "RIBA 'Doesn't Deserve Drawings Collection,'" *Architects' Journal* 184, no. 0.41 (October 8, 1986): 18.

³¹ See Harris, "Le Dessin d'Architecture: Une Nouvelle Marchandise Culturelle"; Harris, "Storehouses of Knowledge: The Origins of the Contemporary Architecture museum."

³² Edward N. Kaufman, "A History of the Architectural Museum: From Napoleon to Henry Ford," in *Fragments of Chicago's Past: The Collection of Architectural Fragments at the Art Institute of Chicago*, ed. Pauline A. Saliga and Robert Bruegmann (Chicago: Art Institute of Chicago, 1990), 16–51.

renewed perspective of the contemporary implications of both origins and developments of the architecture museum. Likewise, the additional research conducted for this dissertation project has allowed some previous inaccuracies to be fully registered and accordingly rectified. Jointly considering these diverging claims to the history of the architecture museum has enabled the emergence and recognition of new patterns transversal to all architecture museums, regardless of their holdings consisting of drawing, original fragments, plaster casts, or models.

Critical Depth of Private Collections

The fundamental reconceptualization of architecture as an intellectual discipline was an essential condition in the establishment of the archive as the organizing principle of both the architecture museum and the discipline. However, such an essential condition has only been maintained and expanded through the instrumentalization of the archive. Only the archive, and a comprehensive one at that, allows for several different meanings to be produced.

The primacy of the archive in architecture and its fundamental function as an organizing principle of the contemporary architecture museum was already suggested in the museum's historical forerunners. Foucault and Derrida's claims on the archive are also revealed in architecture, as the architectural archive, in its very structure, both shapes the perception of the past and conditions the formulation of the future.³³ Before any architecture museum was ever founded, early collecting efforts indicated the importance of the architectural archive in the documentation and dissemination of architectural knowledge. Such precocious collections firmly established the archive as the primary operating principle of the discipline while also allowing architecture knowledge to become emancipated from the physical limitations of construction. The

³³ Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, 130; Derrida, *Archive Fever*, 17.

constitution of a disciplinary archive composed by drawings and other artifacts not only enabled architectural ideas to circulate, but also reinforced the primacy of ideas over objects within the discipline.

Collecting Architectural Ideas

One of the earliest iterations of an operative architectural archive was established by architects and dilettantes who assembled and maintained private collections of architectural drawings, models, original fragments, plaster casts and texts. The collecting practices of these individuals hold a prominent position in the historical arc of the architecture museum as several of the most renowned contemporary architecture museums find their direct roots in eighteenth-century private architectural collections.

Since the inception of the discipline, architects have kept working collections of architecture that operate as sets of references, assisting in their daily practice. The assemblage of architectural collections was considerably expanded when, associated with a rediscovery of classical antiquity's art and architecture in the seventeenth century, architects (among others) embarked on "Grand Tours" of ancient Greek and Roman sites in Italy, Greece, and beyond. In their travels, architects not only experienced firsthand the monuments of classical antiquity, but documented and codified the architectural ideas of these structures into drawings, models, and casts.³⁴ Given that the measurement and drawing of classical monuments was believed to be a fundamental component (and an important rite of passage) in the training of the architect, comprehensive sets of

³⁴ "The discoveries at Pompeii, Herculaneum and Paestum roused the great admiration of all Europe. Architects devoted themselves to sketching the monuments of the past and publishing their drawings." Annie Jacques, "French Architects and the Prix de Rome," in *Ruins of Ancient Rome: The Drawings of French Architects Who Won the Prix de Rome, 1786-1924*, ed. Roberto Cassanelli and Massimiliano David, trans. Thomas M. Hartmann (Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2002), 12.

architectural references were accumulated in the architect's sketchbook or composed by drawings, books, models, and other artifacts as standard resource for any architectural studio.

In establishing these repositories of architectural knowledge, architects not only collected representations of classical monuments, but also incorporated drawings of their own past work. In these early architectural archives, authorship and ownership coincided as these archives were composed by drawings and other architectural representations authored by the collecting architect, be it of his previous work or of classical structures. With architects being the first systematic collectors of architecture, architectural archives came to represent the cumulative knowledge of the architect. The architectural archive became "the intellectual and artistic capital of the atelier, a record of achievements as well as the basis for educating draftsmen and apprentices."³⁵ Recognizing that the value of the drawings in their archives derived from the ability to codify and communicate architectural ideas, architects soon came to complement their working collections with drawings authored by their most respected peers.

Apparently a subtle change, the shift in the archive's composition and in collecting practices would have a profound impact in the definition of the discipline and in the dissemination of architectural knowledge and ideas. Most significantly, the collected drawings and artifacts did not have construction at their genesis, but were themselves the genesis of construction. Previous reference material in the architectural archive had been mainly personal exercises in the reverse-engineering of architectural ideas. From direct observation and measurement of built structures, architects attempted to understand and codify the underlying architectural ideas of these constructions into drawing. Conversely, the collection of original drawings of fellow architects greatly limited the layer of interpretation from the codification of architectural ideas. In fact, the

³⁵ Riley, "Drawn into a Collection: A Context of Practices," 12.

comparison between the built structure and its original drawings would only reveal the disjunction between original idea and construction, thus further reinforcing the notion that construction was an imperfect expression of architectural ideas.

The drawings that at the turn of the fifteenth century were welcomed in the architectural archive might have been created to assist in construction, but they were also autonomous elements that served and documented a specific purpose: the development of an architectural idea.³⁶ By being documents of the process, and where architectural ideas were first codified, these representations of architecture revealed more clearly the development of the original architectural idea than any representation of the built work could ever achieve. In short, drawings were more expressive of the design process than what could be surmised by the observation of the finished construction. In fact, by being unencumbered by reality—be it financial, material, political, or even physical constraints—these drawings revealed the integrity of the ideal object devised by the architect.

As intrinsic visual statements of architectural ideas, original architectural drawings became valued over any representation of the actual built work. With these drawings, the primacy of construction was once and for all displaced from the discipline, since circulating material derived directly from the intellectual work of the architect rather than the manual labor of the mason. Actual buildings were relegated to mere execution, while it was reinforced that the conception of architecture was to be found in the original ideas that were directly expressed in these drawings. It was in drawings that the production of architecture occurred. These drawings were the only place where the architect's intentions were to be found and from which the best lessons could be learned. As an early collector of art and architecture drawings, renaissance architect, artist and historian

³⁶ Matilda McQuaid, "Acquiring Architecture: Building a Modern Collection," in *Envisioning Architecture: Drawings from the Museum of Modern Art* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2002), 19.

Giorgio Vasari particularly esteemed drawings within architecture's creative process. Vasari considered drawings to be the foundation and the animating principle of not only architecture, but all fine arts. As something that originated in the mind and was articulated by the hand, drawing was the clearest and most visible physical expression of the inner conception of architecture, even idealizing it as an unobstructed conduit between abstract idea and the exterior world.³⁷ Beyond an invaluable conduit and repository of architectural ideas, early architecture collectors also prized original drawings penned by previous masters for their ability to establish a direct connection to a past genius.

Inigo Jones was the first architect to be known to actually collect other architects' drawings as a sign of respect and praise, beginning what might have been the most notable early architectural collection in Europe.³⁸ Jones' architectural archive did not include only the drawings produced by his own architectural practice but also "contemporary drawings from English, French, Italian, and Flemish sources."³⁹ Jones' collection would, however, become renowned for including a great number of historical drawings, particularly as he famously gathered many of Andrea Palladio's drawings for public and private buildings.⁴⁰ The first drawings by Palladio were offered to Jones by Sir Henry Wotton in 1613, but Jones would soon complement his collection by acquiring additional sets of drawings in his many trips to Italy to observe firsthand the architectural production of classical antiquity and Italian Renaissance. Thus, even though Jones personally visited Palladio's

³⁷ Giorgio Vasari, "The Nature and Materials of Design or Drawing," in *On Technique: Being the Introduction to the Three Arts of Design, Architecture, Sculpture and Painting, Prefixed to the Lives of the Most Excellent Painters, Sculptors and Architects*, trans. Louisa S. Macle hose (London: J. M. Dent, 1907), 205–206.

³⁸ While before Inigo Jones other architects already included in their working collections of architecture original drawings, this practice was limited to the drawings handed down by masters who passed their collected architecture knowledge to their apprentices in the form of their original drawings. Serlio receiving Peruzzi's drawings and Scamozzi receiving Palladio's are the most prominent examples.

³⁹ Riley, "Drawn into a Collection: A Context of Practices," 13.

⁴⁰ W.G. Keith, "Inigo Jones as a Collector," *Royal Institute of British Architects Journal* 33 (December 19, 1925): 94–108.

buildings and produced analytical sketches of his own, he still relied on the original drawings to reveal Palladio's initial intent and ideas unencumbered by the realities of construction.⁴¹ Such interest in Palladio's original drawings signaled the primacy of ideas over construction as the fundamental component of architecture. The ideas in this architecture collection were purposefully leveraged by Inigo Jones to reshape the architectural culture of his time, being "hard to imagine the spectacular rise of Palladianism throughout England ... without considering Jones's incredibly influential collection of drawings and books."⁴²

In 1701 a significant portion of Jones' collection of Palladio's drawings found its way to fellow architect William Talman's comprehensive collection of architectural books, prints, and drawings. Talman, a prolific collector of architectural artifacts, organized his collection with a museum-like taxonomy, even stamping each individual item with his personal collector's mark.⁴³ Even though the use of a methodic organization based on a system of code numbers and symbols might have indicated some form of museological intent, Talman's collection remained very much a private set of architectural references.⁴⁴ Indicative of such condition is the fact that Colen Campbel, the author of *Vitruvius Britannicus*, was entirely unaware of the drawings by Palladio in Talman's great collection until at least 1715.⁴⁵

Campbel would have more access to Palladio's drawings when his patron Richard Boyle, the Third Earl of Burlington, purchased them from Talman's estate in 1720. However, these were not the first Palladian drawings to be acquired by Lord Burlington since a year earlier he had visited Palladio's buildings in the Veneto and purchased seven volumes of Palladio's drawings in Venice.

⁴¹ The direct assimilation of Palladio's lessons by Jones included several annotations in his own copy of Palladio's *I Quattro Libri dell'Architettura*.

⁴² Riley, "Drawn into a Collection: A Context of Practices," 14.

⁴³ John Harris, *William Talman, Maverick Architect* (London: Allen and Unwin, 1982).

⁴⁴ Harris, "Storehouses of Knowledge: The Origins of the Contemporary Architecture museum," 18.

⁴⁵ T. P. Connor, "The Making of 'Vitruvius Britannicus,'" *Architectural History* 20 (January 1977): 22.

Much like Inigo Jones a century earlier (whose drawings he also purchased from the Talman estate), Lord Burlington saw in these drawings not only a way to collect architecture but also the clearest expression of Palladio's and Jones' ideas. Like Inigo Jones, Burlington was intent on using his collection as a pivotal instrument in his campaign to educate architectural taste and establish a (new) Palladian revival in Britain.⁴⁶ Thus, besides assembling an impressive library of references, Burlington not only gave his social and architectural circles direct access to these primary sources but also published (in very limited runs) several of the most prized drawings in his collection. By all measures, Burlington achieved his objectives through a shrewd instrumentalization of his collection of architectural drawings. Burlington's influence in the development of British architecture of the time attested both to the primacy of an accessible archive as a driving force in the advancement of architecture and to the architectural archive as a fundamental instrument in liberating architectural production from its original spatial and temporal confines.

The great architectural collection of over five-hundred drawings assembled by Burlington was cut off from architectural circles, as it made its way through the estate of successive heirs to the Third Earl of Burlington. The collection would not resurface for nearly a century, until an assessment of the drawings was presented by Ambrose Poynter and Thomas Leverton Donaldson in a general meeting of the Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) in 1845.⁴⁷ Entitled "*A Note on the collection by Andrea Palladio in the possession of the Duke of Devonshire at his villa at Chiswick, near London,*" the assessment served as basis for the gift in trust of the *Burlington-Devonshire Collection of Drawings* to the RIBA by the Duke of Devonshire in 1894. The collection of architectural ideas initiated by Inigo Jones several centuries earlier would thus become a founding

⁴⁶ John Harris, *The Palladian Revival: Lord Burlington, His Villa and Garden at Chiswick* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994).

⁴⁷ Sir Banister Fletcher, *Andrea Palladio: His Life and Works* (London: G. Bell and Sons, 1902), 106–107. Since Thomas Leverton Donaldson was the first the first Professor of Architecture at University College, London, Fletcher refers to him simply as Professor Donaldson.

component of one of the most prominent contemporary architectural archives, continuing to influence the direction of the discipline, now in an institutional context.

The century-long exclusion from architectural circles of such an influential collection such as the one assembled by Lord Burlington might have influenced the unfaltering belief in public accessibility to architectural collections of another prolific British collector. Sir John Soane, who collected numerous architectural artifacts and drawings in his home and studio on Lincoln's Inn Fields, envisioned his private collection to become a proper architecture museum (despite its unsystematic collection and display). In his sixth Royal Academy lecture, Soane identified his appointment as Professor of Architecture at the Royal Academy in 1806 as the moment when he "began to arrange the books, casts and models in order that the students might have the benefit of easy access to them."⁴⁸ By announcing to students that "they could visit his house the day before and the day after each of his lectures to inspect the drawings and other collections," Soane opened up his private collection to a larger audience.⁴⁹ In preparation, Soane initiated a systematic cataloguing and arrangement of his eclectic collection of manuscripts, drawings, models, and works of art for display and easy access.⁵⁰ Although in a limited fashion, public accessibility to Soane's private collection was the only way to transform his whimsical collection to a proper architectural archive and museum. Only through greater public exposure could the collected architectural ideas there contained be disseminated and new meanings be constructed.

Soane made certain that his collection would not suffer the same fate as the Burlington-Devonshire collection and be removed from architectural circles (or worse, be broken apart and

⁴⁸ David Watkin, *Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought and the Royal Academy Lectures*, Cambridge Studies in the History of Architecture (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996), 529.

⁴⁹ Helen Dorey, "12-14 Lincoln's Inn Fields," in *John Soane, Architect: Master of Space and Light*, ed. Margaret Richardson and Mary Anne Stevens (London: Yale University Press, 1999), 150.

⁵⁰ See Tim Knox, *Sir John Soane's Museum, London* (London: Merrell, 2009), 28.

sold by his son) by aggressively lobbying for a parliamentary private act to ensure that his collection would remain open and accessible upon his passing. Passed in Parliament in April 1833, “*The Soane Museum Act*” stipulated that Soane’s collection and house would pass on to the care of the State through a board of trustees, and would be preserved as nearly as possible as Soane had left them.⁵¹ Such mandate has been followed by subsequent directors and curators who, for the most part, have maintained until today the house-museum on Lincoln’s Inn Fields open to the public and as Soane left it, nearly two centuries ago.⁵²

With the (albeit restricted) opening of Sir John Soane’s collection to architecture, painting, and sculpture students and amateurs granted by legislation, a significant step was taken in recasting private architecture collections as early architecture museums. Such recasting was particularly important since it implied an institutional valorization of personal collecting impulses as pedagogical instruments in the elevation of architectural taste. More significantly, the transition from collection to museum institutionalized antiquarian practices as a valid approach to the construction of architecture’s disciplinary archive.

These early collections of architecture would eventually become the basis for the establishment of a specific type of architecture museum, which was dubbed by John Harris as the “domestic prototype of architecture museums.”⁵³ Essentially, these are architecture museums that have originated from private collections of references and precedents used in architectural offices to

⁵¹ The official title of the Act was the descriptive and lengthy “An Act for Settling and Preserving Sir John Soane’s Museum, Library, and Works of Art in Lincoln’s Inn Fields, in the County in the County of Middlesex for the Benefit of Public and for establishing a sufficient Endowment the due Maintenance of the same.” See Sir John Soane’s Museum, *General Description of Sir John Soane’s Museum, with Brief Notices of Some of the More Interesting Works of Art* (Oxford: H. Hart, 1910), 11.

⁵² In some instances, directors of the Sir John Soane Museum have embarked on projects to undo changes performed to the house by their predecessors, that is, to further “reinststate Soane’s historical arrangements.” Knox, *Sir John Soane’s Museum, London*, 42.

⁵³ Harris, “Storehouses of Knowledge: The Origins of the Contemporary Architecture museum,” 17.

which public accessibility has been granted. Like with Sir John Soane's Museum, public access to these collections has usually involved the systematic cataloguing and classification of the included drawings and artifacts but also the addition of gallery space and lecture rooms.⁵⁴

Beyond pointing towards a more public future, such noteworthy early collecting efforts also reaffirmed the centrality of the archive in the transmission of architectural experience and in architecture's disciplinary project. It was still in the archive that architecture ideas could be collected and disseminated. It was still the archive that produced new meanings for its components. Moreover, since in the private architectural collections of the seventeenth century the organizing archive functioned as a reference library, drawings and other artifacts composing these collections were perceived as important records of ideas but not necessarily as visual masterworks with inherent aesthetic qualities or worthy of contemplation. The status of the object would be dramatically questioned when architecture enunciated its ideas to a larger public.

The Antiquarian Methods

Like other early collecting impulses, private collections of architecture employed antiquarian practices in the construction of the architecture archive. These early assemblages of architecture were not particularly concerned with explaining or elucidating any situation but were instead focused on specific periods, architects or architectural ideas that were of interest to the architectural antiquarian.⁵⁵ The early collector of architecture, akin to the antiquarian, was more

⁵⁴ While the institutionalization of private architecture collections was most prevalent in the nineteenth century, more recent institutions like the Canadian Center for Architecture in Montreal were also founded in similar terms. See Phyllis Lambert, "The Architecture museum: A Founder's Perspective," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 58, no. 3 (September 1999): 308–315.

⁵⁵ A typical distinction between the historian and the antiquarian identified in Arnaldo Momigliano, "Ancient History and the Antiquarian," *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 13, no. 3/4 (January 1950): 286.

concerned with artifacts rather than narratives of the discipline's past.⁵⁶ Instead of contextualizing periods, architects, or ideas, early collecting practices of architecture defined their collecting subjects as autonomous fragments within the discipline. Focusing on the particular rather than the general implied that the composition of the early architectural collection was based on the exceptional, rather than the typical. Only drawings, manuscripts, models, original fragments, plaster casts and other artifacts that were directly related to the subjects being collected would ever be integrated into these collections. Inherently, there was a great accumulation of material regarding exceptional examples and particular ideas of architecture, but the connection between them (and other elements of the discipline) was only construed by juxtapositions within these early architectural archives. These were isolated fragments of architectural knowledge which simply overlooked everything in between.

The antiquarian practice of judicious selection of contents (both conceptually and materially) was an important organizing principle in the constitution of the early architecture archive. By being extremely focused on specific architectural ideas (rather than the totality of the discipline), early architecture collectors could concentrate their resources in accumulating a wealth of material directly concerning exemplary moments within the discipline. The collection of drawings, original fragments, models, and other artifacts offered a visualization and materialization to exceptional moments of the architecture discipline through which past ideas could now be engaged. Such engagement with past ideas was articulated in a growing interest in both investigation and discussion of the latent issues materialized by the collected artifacts, inevitably impelling a greater knowledge regarding the architectural ideas being collected. In short, the agglomeration of different

⁵⁶ For an extensive discussion on the influence of antiquarianism in modern collecting practices and museum culture, see Martin Myrone and Lucy Peltz, eds., *Producing the Past: Aspects of Antiquarian Culture and Practice, 1700-1850* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999).

artifacts revealing different facets of the same architectural idea provided the necessary critical depth to seriously inquire and surmise meaning to the architectural ideas being collected and thus provide a greater understanding of exemplary moments in architecture.

The narrow preoccupation with select architectural objects and subjects was inherent to the limitations of collecting, but its resultant critical depth was a fundamental instrument in realizing the main ambition of all early architecture collections: the elevation of architecture and the edification of society. By collecting and presenting exceptional moments of architecture in the form of drawings, models, fragments, casts and other artifacts, early collectors believed that taste could be elevated and architecture properly appreciated. Lord Burlington and Sir John Soane did not shy from declaring their ambition to employ their phenomenal collections of architecture in the advancement of the discipline. In fact, the elevation of architecture and its service for the edification of society was often the main reason for the establishment of early architectural collections.

Such manifest edifying objective was not limited to these private collections but is transversal to all contemporary architecture museums. Antiquarian methods, however, are not employed by all architecture museums in accomplishing such goal. Established in 1932, the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) Department of Architecture in New York has most prominently institutionalized and adapted the legacy of early private architecture collections to contemporary museological conditions.⁵⁷ Like Jones, Lord Burlington or Soane, MoMA's main objective has been the edification of society, particularly with an appreciation of modern art and architecture. MoMA's first director,

⁵⁷ MoMA's Department of Architecture was founded after the success of its first exhibition of architecture, the influential "Modern Architecture - International Exhibition" organized by Henry-Russell Hitchcock and Philip Johnson. The Department was merged in 1949 with the Department of Design, thus establishing its present configuration as the Department of Architecture and Design. Harriet Schoenholz Bee and Michelle Elligott, eds., *Art in Our Time: A Chronicle of the Museum of Modern Art* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2004), 37. In 1949 the museum merged the departments of Architecture and Design establishing the present configuration of the Department of Architecture and Design.

Alfred H. Barr Jr., notoriously intended to reorient the culture of his time towards a new artistic paradigm which was to be documented and defined by the Museum of Modern Art.⁵⁸ Barr thus perceived MoMA's cultural mission to be the active definition, institutionalization, and promotion of modern artistic practices, including architecture.⁵⁹ Just like the early collectors of architecture, MoMA's Department of Architecture was established expressly to elevate architectural taste and further the appreciation of (modern) architecture, as its director and curators "vigorously pursued their aim to replace the pluralism of current American architecture with what they saw as a cohesive modern style based on the work of a select group of Europeans."⁶⁰ The edifying ambitions of the MoMA were so prominent that its first charter characterized it as an educational institution rather than a museum.⁶¹

Beyond relying on its collection for the elevation and advancement of architecture, MoMA's Department of Architecture and Design also devised an acquisition policy akin to the antiquarian practices of early architecture collectors. Terence Riley, the longtime Chief Curator of MoMA's Department of Architecture and Design, identified the affinity between MoMA's collecting practices and the private architectural collections of times gone, classifying it as the "critical depth" of MoMA's collection.⁶² By not attempting to engage with the totality of the architectural discipline, MoMA's Department of Architecture and Design, like early architecture collectors, has continued to

⁵⁸ Riley, "Drawn into a Collection: A Context of Practices," 15.

⁵⁹ The Department of Architecture was the first of several new additions to the fledgling MoMA, with "Barr consider[ing] the establishment of the Department of Architecture his most important success." Barr later praised the department by stating that that "in [his] opinion the Architecture Department has exerted a more active, tangible, and salutary influence in its work than any other department of the Museum." Sybil Gordon Kantor, *Alfred H. Barr, Jr., and the Intellectual Origins of the Museum of Modern Art* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002), 312 and 242.

⁶⁰ Henry Matthews, "The Promotion of Modern Architecture by the Museum of Modern Art in the 1930s," *Journal of Design History* 7, no. 1 (1994): 43.

⁶¹ Bee and Elligott, *Art in Our Time*, 26.

⁶² Riley, "Drawn into a Collection: A Context of Practices," 15.

focus its attention and resources on specific territories of the discipline and assert “a resolute distinction of quality from mediocrity.”⁶³

Following the principle of “critical depth,” MoMA’s architecture archive has been assembled by singular pieces over complete series, that is, singular pieces that are valued for their exceptional nature rather than their capacity to represent significant series. While crucial architectural work and moments of twentieth and twenty-first centuries are present in MoMA’s architectural archive—from J.J.P. Oud to Rem Koolhaas, from the “International Style” to “Deconstructivist Architecture”—these are still materialized in an assemblage of discrete drawings, models and photographs. The artifacts collected certainly resonate with the meta-topics that frame MoMA’s entire architecture archive, but over-arching topics are nevertheless represented by disparate objects greatly decontextualized from their original formulation. Simply put, while comprehensive, MoMA’s architectural archive is not composed by full collections of specific architects or movements, or even of architectural works for that matter, but instead by singular drawings and models of a diversity of architects and an even greater array of projects. At the time of this writing, MoMA’s website indicates its architecture collection holds 1,040 drawings (which includes collages and other two dimensional representation of architecture) and 272 models.⁶⁴ However, with the notable exception of Mies van der Rohe (whose entire archive of over 18,000 drawings and sketches is housed at the MoMA and is not listed in the collections registry), the work of most

⁶³ Alfred H. Barr, quoted in Henry Russell Hitchcock and Arthur Drexler, eds., *Built in USA: Post-War Architecture* (New York: Simon & Schuster, 1952), 8.

⁶⁴ “MoMA: The Collection, A&D Architectural Drawing,” *MoMA.org*, accessed September 29, 2012, http://www.moma.org/collection/browse_results.php?criteria=0%3ACL%3AI%3A1&page_number=&template_id=6&sort_order=1; “MoMA: The Collection, A&D Architectural Model,” *MoMA.org*, accessed September 29, 2012, http://www.moma.org/collection/browse_results.php?criteria=0%3ACL%3AI%3A2&page_number=&template_id=6&sort_order=1.

architects included in MoMA's collection is represented by a handful of models and drawings.⁶⁵ Neil Denari, Toyo Ito, Álvaro Siza, Coop Himmel(b)lau are just some of the architects whose work is represented in the MoMA's architectural archive by two or three artifacts, each artifact representing a different project. Even architects whose work features prominently in MoMA's holdings are represented by a limited amount of drawings and models, with those artifacts depicting almost as many different projects. Rem Koolhaas' work, for example, is represented in MoMA's archive by thirty-five drawings and models. Of those, twenty are of Koolhaas 1972 graduation project "Exodus, or the Voluntary Prisoners of Architecture" and the remaining fifteen represent fifteen distinct projects, from the 1972 drawing of the "City of the Captive Globe" to the 2006 model of the TVCC building.

The antiquarian practices adopted by MoMA were not limited to a judicious selection of content, but also to a fascination with the collected (architectural) object. Such eminence of the material derives, perhaps, from MoMA's architectural archive being integrated into a museum of art, since it closely resembles the traditional collecting practices of other arts, like sculpture or painting. Unsurprisingly, this condition—and its evolution—has been revealed in the very way MoMA has collected architecture. Until 1947, when drawings were officially included in its architectural archive, the collection of architecture was entirely associated with material construction, consisting only of photographs and models of built work. Construction was thus a decisive precondition for the architecture welcomed into MoMA's early architectural archive. More than the architectural idea at the genesis of construction, it was construction itself that was valued as a legitimization of the idea and a confirmation of the idea's validity as architecture.

⁶⁵ Glenn D Lowry, "Foreword," in *Envisioning Architecture: Drawings from the Museum of Modern Art* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2002), 6.

With the integration of drawings into MoMA's architectural archive in 1947, the fascination of the object only shifted from construction to representation. While the appreciation of architectural ideas certainly increased, the aesthetic expression of those ideas was just as important as the ideas themselves. As architectural drawings were incorporated into MoMA's collection, they were "judged not only by the ideas they stood for but also by the beauty of their draftsmanship and composition."⁶⁶ Construction had lost its hold on MoMA's architecture archive, but the appreciation of architectural ideas was now subjected to a validation produced by the aesthetic qualities of their representation. In fact, architectural drawings became valued as master-works in their own right, almost regardless of the ideas they were to represent as "the collecting effort came to focus not only on works of great architecture but on drawings that were themselves great expressive achievements."⁶⁷

Even as MoMA's Department of Architecture and Design pioneered the model of the modern engaged architecture museum, its architecture collecting practices structured knowledge under the same antiquarian principles employed by the early private collections of architecture.⁶⁸ By adapting these antiquarian principles to a museological context, MoMA's Architecture and Design Department has assembled a remarkable architectural archive that has likewise influenced the public perception and appreciation of architecture. Most importantly, however, the discussion and investigation of architectural work at the MoMA has been inevitably framed and limited by the artifacts contained in its archive, that is, by the juxtapositions created by the very collection. Like its

⁶⁶ McQuaid, "Acquiring Architecture: Building a Modern Collection," 29.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 31.

⁶⁸ MoMA's Department of Architecture and Design activist attitude extends well beyond the instrumentalization of its collection, since the museum has historically served both as a platform connecting clients and select (approved) architects, and as a client for architectural experimentation.

forbearers, MoMA's collection of architecture has been assembled to articulate a particular conception of architecture.⁶⁹

Architectural Narratives

The development of the discipline has been actuated by private collections of architecture, particularly towards specific directions. This is not, however, the mere promotion and elevation of architecture in general, but of specific architectural ideas. Such subjective value judgment is an operating principle of any collection (architectural or otherwise), but in these collections it has been purposefully employed in order to promote specific conceptions of what architecture has been and what it could be. Rather than attempting to reveal architecture's past, these collections have essentially been devices to construct a present and prepare a future. The antiquarian method employed in these early architectural collections reflected a conscious attitude towards the collection and instrumentalization of architecture.

From Inigo Jones to Sir John Soane, early collectors of architecture aspired to elevate the discipline and directly influence both its present and future development. However, early architectural collections were not passive repositories of architectural ideas but were instead active instruments in defining the conditions under which architecture was to be considered and judged. In order to achieve such ambitious objective, these collections established and imposed specific narratives to the architectural archive. Not just their constitution but also their presentation was carefully orchestrated in order to communicate specific narratives and directly influence the progress of the discipline. Rather than a mere consequence of the act of collecting, the construction

⁶⁹ For a comprehensive discussion of the MoMA's promotion of a particular conception of architecture, see Matthews, "The Promotion of Modern Architecture by the Museum of Modern Art in the 1930s." The promotion of a specific conception of modern architecture was so stringent, that when J.J.P. Oud work no longer fitted the standard, his contribution to modern architecture endangered being altogether suppressed from the genealogy disseminated by Philip Johnson at the MoMA. See Adolf Broekhuizen, "Mr. Oud Loses Ornament: Correspondence between Philip Johnson and J.J.P. Oud 1931-55," in *Mart Stam's Trousers* (Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1999), 55-77.

of such narratives was deliberately pursued by collectors of architecture, even often being the main reason for both the establishment and increased accessibility to these architectural collections.

By its very nature, narrative expresses—and inevitably consolidates—the system of values of those who construct it: its epistemic authority, its cultural function, and its social significance.⁷⁰ Like any collection, early architectural collections were inevitably also exercises of power. Narratives were not only embedded in the collection and presented to its (still restricted) audience, but often these narratives resisted the emergence of competing readings and meanings. The most paradigmatic example of such condition—where the collector remains in tight control of the narrative presented by his collection—is revealed in Sir John Soane’s Museum. By mandating that his house-museum should remain as much as possible as he had left it at the time of his passing, Sir John Soane ensured that the narrative he had created would not to be altered or challenged in any significant way. It is especially telling that by its particular terms, the “*Soane Museum Act*” not only safeguarded Soane’s collection from being divided and dispersed, but also from being assimilated by a larger institution, such as the British Museum.⁷¹ Such binding terms for Soane’s donation in trust ensured that the thousands of objects in Sir John Soane’s collection could never be used in support of alternative readings of the architectural archive. It was not just the collection in its entirety that was preserved, but also “its very specific manner and context of display.”⁷² Sir John Soane considered his life work to be the laboriously created architecture narrative present in his house-museum, and accordingly employed all the means at his disposal to ensure its integrity would be sustained. The extent of Soane’s control of the architectural narrative (legitimated by the

⁷⁰ In his seminal book Hayden White argues for a constructivist notion of historical narratives in which reality is reorganized (almost at will) to create narratives See Hayden White, *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987).

⁷¹ John Elsner, “A Collector’s Model of Desire: The House and Museum of Sir John Soane,” in *The Cultures of Collecting*, ed. Roger Cardinal (London: Reaktion Books, 1994), 157.

⁷² *Ibid.*

“*Soane Museum Act*”) went beyond the composition and presentation of the collection, even stipulating the opening schedules of the house-museum after his passing.

While Soane argued such tight control to be a necessity in ensuring his collection zealously fulfilled its primary objective of directing architectural culture and elevating public taste, critics denounced it as a folly that was “dictated solely by selfish vanity.”⁷³ Such poignant accusations criticized the self-serving dimension of Soane’s constructed architectural narratives. Particularly, how Soane’s collection of original architectural artifacts was shrewdly instrumentalized to establish a conspicuous connection between Soane and previous masters.⁷⁴ This constructed association was particularly blatant in the Model Room, where Soane placed several models of antiquity’s finest structures (like the Propylaea in Athens or the Pantheon in Rome) and of his own major works (such as the Bank of England).⁷⁵ Just by “their very placement, these Soanean buildings claim[ed] descent from the antique,” but their form as models further attempted to cast Soane’s work as indistinguishable from classical antiquity in “an outrageous parallelism.”⁷⁶

While the promotion of Soane’s own legacy was a powerful motivation, the opening of his collection in Lincoln Fields was equally motivated by a specific re-orientation of architecture. Beyond promoting his own work, Soane was also promoting a return to classicism as the preferred path for the elevation of the architectural discipline, further articulating how the assemblage of a collection was always a political endeavor.

⁷³ “The Soanean Museum,” *The Civil Engineer and Architect’s Journal*, November 1837, 44.

⁷⁴ The remarkable association between collector and collected was also present in Inigo Jones’ collection, as Jones’ work and drawings have been indelibly equated with Palladio’s work, even being acquired as a single set by Lord Burlington from the Talman estate in 1720.

⁷⁵ The scale models of classical architecture presented both their current condition as ruins and their pristine original form, with the distinction between the actual and ideal condition of ancient structures being expressed by the different materiality of the models, since models of ruins were made of cork while reconstructions used plaster.

⁷⁶ Elsner, “A Collector’s Model of Desire: The House and Museum of Sir John Soane,” 166.

The focus and fragmentation of antiquarian practices were particularly suited for the construction of specific architectural narratives. The implementation of an antiquarian-like selection based on focus and fragmentation effectively operated in a twofold manner, since it revealed a copious amount of compelling material regarding the subject of interest while, simply by exclusion, completely obscured everything else. The focus on a finite set of objects and ideas not only allowed a greater understanding of the material and conceptual elements being collected, but also suggested the importance of those singular elements within the discipline. Fragmentation, however, granted the necessary pliability to the discrete elements of architecture being collected for their reorganization into new relations from which the construction of new meanings was supported. At the cost of contextualization, early architecture collections deployed architecture in a compressed mode where geography and time were both collapsed and conflated.

From Private Collections to Critical Depth

The construction of narratives is an important device for the constitution of meaning from discrete artifacts and the communication of architectural knowledge to different audiences. It is through these narratives that the past is visualized and made to resonate with the more familiar present, allowing audiences to engage with previous architectural ideas. However, a fundamental component in the operativity of the architectural archive rests on the possibility to reconstitute meanings by the re-evaluation and reorganization of different ideas. Narratives should, thus, be flexible, adaptable and responsive to reinterpretation, underscoring architecture “collections’ status as open-ended resources for inquiry.”⁷⁷ By greatly resisting any reconsideration, Soane’s collection and house-museum could only claim a limited operativity in the furthering of the

⁷⁷ Lambert, “The Architecture museum: A Founder’s Perspective,” 309.

discipline. Its closed system of display promoted stagnation rather than advancement for architecture's discourse and practice.

Ultimately, Sir John Soane's Museum was a very particular case and a product of its time. Acknowledging the limitations of its original conception, since the 1980s the museum has adapted its antiquarian ways to the contemporary museological context. By initiating projects aimed at cataloguing and providing greater access to the museum's collection, Sir John Soane Museum has encouraged further architectural research and the reconstitution of its collection as an open-ended resource for inquiry as well as the constitution of multiple meanings. The adaptation of antiquarian principles follows what MoMA's Department of Architecture and Design has already successfully accomplished: the expansion of meaning from a carefully curated collection of architecture. By allowing greater access and alternative readings to their architectural collection, both Soane's Museum and the MoMA's Department of Architecture and Design continue to challenge the limitations of an antiquarian collection. In becoming research based institutions, different meaning and readings of their architectural archive not only coexist but are themselves the validation of a collection's critical depth.

The development of critical depth does not imply the dismissal of constructed architectural narratives, instead it complements and validates them. By democratizing access to the architectural archive, the emergence of alternative readings is effectively institutionalized. Furthermore, it also suggests that the narrative constructed in the galleries of the museum is responsive to the knowledge produced by the constant reassessment of the archive. The accessible archive, thus, prevents narratives to be frozen in history with absolute claims, instead compelling narratives to assume the inherent open-ended nature of the architectural archive. Such architectural archive also overcomes the limitations of antiquarian practices in which elements are seen in great depth but only in isolation, by stimulating new connections to be made and new meaning and knowledge to

be produced. In short, it provides a way for the antiquarian method to be constantly reinvigorated and remain relevant, since as Nietzsche has argued, “antiquarian history degenerates from the moment that it no longer gives a soul and inspiration to the fresh life of the present.”⁷⁸ Simply by opening up the archive to greater scrutiny, antiquarian methods are contemporized, effectively becoming critical tools in unleashing the multitude of conceptions of architecture within the archive. “Critical depth” thus becomes “the culmination of an almost inexorable trajectory from the private, the intimate, and the generative to the public, the expository, and, broadly speaking, the educational.”⁷⁹

The combination of critical depth and narrative has allowed (some) architecture museums to operate in a complementary dual mode: as architectural archives where knowledge is constantly produced and as hosts to architectural narratives where knowing is translated into telling. Given its efficacy in overcoming the shortcomings of limited collections while also addressing the challenges of contemporary museum activity, the critical depth model has been adopted by several museums of architecture, even becoming one of the most prevalent approaches to the constitution and operation of the architectural archive. Even as critical depth has been adopted by a myriad of architecture museums to firmly ground their diverging conceptions of architecture and claims on the discipline, its adoption only reaffirms the primacy of the archive and its instrumentalization in the conception, organization, and intellectual project of the architecture museum and the discipline.

⁷⁸ Friedrich Wilhelm Nietzsche, *The Use and Abuse of History*, 2d rev. ed., The Library of Liberal Arts, No. 11 (Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing, 1957), 20.

⁷⁹ Riley, “Drawn into a Collection: A Context of Practices,” 11.

Encyclopedic Breadth of Enlightenment Museums

The structural and societal implications of the selective attitude towards knowledge expressed by the antiquarian method and early initiatives of collecting (architecture and otherwise) did not go unnoticed. As Tony Bennett has remarked in his inquiry of the social objectives and political implications of the public museum, under the auspices of scientific rationality, a new attitude emerged in which “collections were rearranged in accordance with the principle of *representativeness* rather than that of *rarity*” (italics in the original), with collections “no longer thought of as means for stimulating the curiosity of the few, [but] reconceptualized as means for instructing the many.”⁸⁰ Inclusion rather than exclusion—of both content and audience—guided the emergence of public museums in Revolutionary France. Inclusion also characterized the re-imagined architectural archive where the search for common laws guiding architecture’s development throughout the ages came to prevail over the fascination with singular achievements.

At the turn of the nineteenth century, the connection between the architectural archive, public accessibility and the dissemination of architectural knowledge became not only firmly established but also institutionalized. Influenced by the Enlightenment ideals of democratization of knowledge, between the early 1790s and the late 1820s, discussions and projects regarding the exhibition of architecture abounded. According to the historian of the architecture museum in France, Werner Szambien, prominent French architects and scholars such as Étienne-Louis Boullée, Jean-Nicolas-Louis Durand, Louis-François Cassas, Jacques-Guillaume Legrand, and Léon Dufournoy became increasingly interested in the possibilities for the propagation of architectural knowledge afforded by the new mediums of the printing press and the museum. Energizing the discussion were pragmatic as well as artistic concerns, and a variety of initiatives surfaced entertaining the

⁸⁰ Tony Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics, Culture: Policies and Politics* (London: Routledge, 1995), 39.

establishment of a Parisian museum of architecture.⁸¹ Despite the diversity of voices and approaches to this issue, there was a shared “homogeneity of concerns” that guided all these initiatives: the exhibition of architecture in accordance to the modern principles of specialization and classification.⁸²

The Encyclopedic Public Museum

Following the principles of specialization and classification, several proposals procured the constitution of an encyclopedic architectural archive, often as a clear application of the body of contemporary progressive and liberal ideas to the problematic of architectural knowledge. The application of the encyclopedic method was not limited to the exhibition of architecture but was equally present in most, if not all, specialist museum types (of art, geology, natural history, ...) “within each of which, objects were arranged in a manner calculated to make intelligible a scientific view of the world.”⁸³ While the assertion of their universality was based on an encyclopedic approach of inclusiveness and the accommodation of the largest possible breadth of material, rather than relying on the seemingly transparent yet arbitrary alphabetical organization the public museum (of architecture and otherwise) organized its material within systematic series intended to uncover underlying governing general laws and tendencies.⁸⁴ After 1750, the mark of the progressive collection was its adherence to that standard, as the “taxonomic, aesthetic structure” of

⁸¹ The comparison of architecture had the artistic goal of revealing the common character of architecture, but also to allow students and patrons to quickly survey the available possibilities and choose the most adequate for their needs. Anthony Vidler, “Architecture in the Museum: Didactic Narratives from Boullée to Lenoir,” in *The Writing of the Walls: Architectural Theory in the Late Enlightenment* (Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press, 1987), 165.

⁸² As previously discussed, Werner Szambien’s thorough study presents a comprehensive account of the efforts and debates towards the establishment of a French museum of architecture during the Revolutionary period, while also attempting “to demonstrate the homogeneity of concerns in the age of neo-classicism according to contemporary standards.” See Szambien, *Le Musée d’Architecture*, 10.

⁸³ Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum*, 2.

⁸⁴ For more on the displacement of systematic schemes by an alphabetical organization see Richard Yeo, “Reading Encyclopedias: Science and the Organization of Knowledge in British Dictionaries of Arts and Sciences, 1730-1850,” *Isis* 82, no. 1 (March 1991): 24–49.

the collection came to matter as much as the collection itself.⁸⁵ In the public museum, the encyclopedic “isolated fragments of information” were arranged to create a meaningful whole, not entirely dissimilar to the “discrete, but nonetheless encyclopedic [thematic] dictionaries” of Charles Pancoucke’s *Encyclopédie Méthodique*.⁸⁶ Despite the significant difference of format, the parallel between the encyclopedia and the public museum was both natural and obvious.

With its first publication in 1751, Denis Diderot’s and Jean-Baptiste Le Rond d’Alembert’s *Encyclopédie* early embodied the Enlightenment ambition to create a compendium of all human knowledge.⁸⁷ Throughout the following decades, the establishment of the public museum shared the encyclopedia’s ambitious objectives and complemented its efforts with new discursive practices and forms of engagement. While some semipublic art galleries had already been in existence before, increased public accessibility and didactic organization of displays materialized the idea of the public museum in the second half of the eighteenth century, culminating with the foundation of the *Musée du Louvre* in 1793.⁸⁸ Like the encyclopedia, since its inception the public museum was committed to the Enlightenment project “to emancipate mankind through knowledge, education and science.”⁸⁹ As a new instrument in the Enlightenment’s project of societal advancement through knowledge dissemination, the public museum adopted some of the organizing principles of the encyclopedia: the universality of knowledge and a seemingly neutral organization. By organizing its collection in a progressive taxonomic manner, the public museum realized and epitomized d’Alembert and Diderot’s introductory claims in the *Encyclopédie*’s “Preliminary Discourse,” namely

⁸⁵ Andrew McClellan, *Inventing the Louvre: Art, Politics, and the Origins of the Modern Museum in Eighteenth-Century Paris* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994), 4.

⁸⁶ See Sylvia Lavin, “Re Reading the Encyclopedia: Architectural Theory and the Formation of the Public in Late-Eighteenth-Century France,” *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 53, no. 2 (June 1994): 186.

⁸⁷ Roy Porter, *The Enlightenment*, Studies in European History (Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001), 42.

⁸⁸ See McClellan, *Inventing the Louvre*.

⁸⁹ Porter, *The Enlightenment*, 5.

that only the use of reason could lead to new forms of knowledge that aptly reflected the needs of a new world.⁹⁰ Fundamentally complementary, both the encyclopedia and the public museum were significant instruments in the Enlightenment apparatus for the constitution of a rational public through the democratization of reason and the education of the masses.

In democratizing reason and educating the masses, the public museum expanded the work of the encyclopedia to a much broader base. While the encyclopedia had found its main audience in “the upper professional classes (lawyers, administrators, and office-holders), the higher clergy, aristocratic landowners, and provincial dignitaries,” the public museum was conceived to welcome and elevate the lower classes through an engagement with knowledge and a mingling with the upper classes.⁹¹ While reading the encyclopedia was fundamentally a private affair, visiting the galleries of the museum was a shared experience. Furthermore, the museum not only provided (virtual) universal access to culture and knowledge by placing “objects which had previously been concealed from public view into new open and public contexts,” but also created a public space for the conduction of rational discussion transversal to social statuses or wealth.⁹² Like the encyclopedia, the public museum also advanced the Enlightenment’s ambitious project to document and reorganize the entirety of human knowledge in a single location.⁹³ In the museum’s

⁹⁰ See John Lough, *Essays on the Encyclopédie of Diderot and D’Alembert*, University of Durham Publications (London: Oxford University Press, 1968), 125.

⁹¹ Porter, *The Enlightenment*, 43. and Roger Chartier, *Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988). Despite claims to universal access, and neutrality of publics, several cultural markers have developed within the museum differentiating cultural audiences. See Pierre Bourdieu, “The Historical Genesis of a Pure Aesthetic,” *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 46 (January 1987): 201–210. For a wider discussion on the institutionalization of social markers and the relationship between the individual and society, see Peter L Berger and Thomas Luckmann, *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge* (New York: Anchor Books, 1990).

⁹² Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum*, 93.

⁹³ As Foucault has stated, “the idea of accumulating everything, of establishing a sort of general archive, the will to enclose in one place all times, all epochs, all forms, all tastes,... belongs to our modernity. The museum and the library are heterotopias that are proper to western culture of the nineteenth century.” Michel Foucault, “Of Other Spaces,” trans. Jay Miskowiec, *Diacritics* 16, no. 1 (Spring 1986): 26.

galleries a comprehensive archive of information and knowledge formed the basis for the creation of meaningful series, uncovering general tendencies and principles.

Specialization and Classification of the Architectural Archive

Similar concerns with uncovering and communicating meaningful orders of elements would also guide the Enlightenment conceptions of the architectural archive, as well as early public presentations of architecture. In the *Salon de l'An VII* (1799), J.N.L. Durand exhibited a first “*cahier*” of six prints from his forthcoming “*Recueil et Parallèle des Édifices de tout Genre*,” in which he devised a scientific exploration of the different architectural “species” that would serve as a model for subsequent efforts of architectural exhibition.⁹⁴ With this excerpt of the *Parallèle*, Durand introduced the notion of an encyclopedic breadth to the presentation of architecture. The universality of content was already suggested in the cover of the *Parallèle*, with the corners of the plate illustrated by the four continents included: Europe, Asia, Africa, and America. The breadth of the content was not just geographical but also temporal as both ancient and contemporary buildings populated Durand’s study. Combining a bit of everything, in the *Parallèle* the “ancient architecture of Greece and Egypt; Roman, Chinese, and even Gothic architecture; and that of Renaissance Italy, the Middle East, India, Elizabethan England, and contemporary France succeeded one another in a repertory that is surprising, but not without logic, style, or form.”⁹⁵ Alluding to a neutral organization, the index only identified the typologies of the buildings presented in the volumes, and organized them in alphabetical order. The representation of architecture was also to be as neutral as possible (and equivalent among the different drawings and projects), so that architectural knowledge and ideas could be immediately present and not obscured by the aesthetic qualities of their representation. As Vidler has demonstrated, beyond

⁹⁴ See Sergio Villari, “Scientific Thought and Architectural Language in Durand’s Theoretical Work,” in *J.N.L. Durand (1760-1834): Art and Science of Architecture* (New York: Rizzoli International, 1990), 52–67.

⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 54.

Durand also Ledoux and Boullée argued for the commodity of *recueils* in the bookshelves of amateurs and architects, resulting in a dissemination of paper architecture museums.⁹⁶

Unsurprisingly, these comparative tables of architectural species were perceived as visual equivalents to the encyclopedic discourse present in public museums, that is, transparent platforms for the communication of ideas which could also assist in the identification of general tendencies only perceivable through the close-observation of extensive series inscribed in reference books.

The effect on the architectural archive was immediate. Following the tendency of the newly established typology of the public museum, the modern architectural archive was to distinguish itself from previous practices primarily through the employment of an architectural taxonomy based on the scientific method of specialization and classification. By stressing classification and comparison in a systematic rather than historic manner, the “implied method was that of the natural scientist, not the antiquarian.”⁹⁷ In fact, as Anthony Vidler has argued, the principles of observation of formal discrimination, selection of types, and ordering of species outlined by the French naturalist and encyclopedist Georges-Louis Leclerc, Comte de Buffon in the thirty-six volumes of his seminal *Histoire Naturelle Générale et Particulière*, also applied to architecture.⁹⁸

Durand was mostly preoccupied with the creation of architectural series that could be published and easily reproduced, but a specialized public museum of architecture employing similar principles of classification and representation was also being discussed in Parisian architectural and intellectual circles. While never completed, the original plans devised by Jacques-Guillaume Legrand and Jacques Molinos for the conversion of the Palace of the Louvre into a public

⁹⁶ See Vidler, “The Writing of the Walls.”

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 166.

⁹⁸ The Comte de Buffon emphasized the importance of “neutral observation” by claiming that “it is the business of an historian to describe not to invent; that no gratuitous suppositions are to be admitted in subjects which depend upon fact and observation...” George Louis Leclerc Buffon, *Natural History General and Particular*, Vol. 1, trans. William Smellie (A. Strahan, 1791), 4.

museum contemplated twelve rooms of gallery space for the exhibition of architecture.⁹⁹ In Legrand and Molinos scheme for the Louvre, the public museum was an almost direct materialization of the encyclopedia. Besides architecture and the fine arts, a myriad of departments were to be accommodated: from Anatomy to Zoology. While this ambitious project for a veritable repository of all human knowledge was never really considered, until 1793 it still seemed that the new museum of art at the Louvre would accommodate the exhibition of architecture in its galleries. After all, not only was architecture understood to be an elemental fine art along with painting and sculpture, but there was also a great deal of support for architecture in the deciding committee (where a few architects had seats).¹⁰⁰ After the planned gallery of architecture changed location a few times, it became clear for the attentive observer that the new museum at the Louvre would not include a department of architecture.¹⁰¹ This would have been a significant development for the institutionalization of architectural collections, since up until then, only the academies of architecture and some private individuals were engaged in the collection of all kinds of architectural artifacts, but without any systematic method for organization or public presentation.¹⁰²

Determined to assist in the foundation of a museum squarely dedicated to architecture, Legrand and Molinos in 1794 presented another amazing proposal: to accommodate the architecture museum in the Roman ruins of the *Thermes de Cluny*. According to Legrand, the proposed museum was to present architecture through the exhibition of architectural fragments and ornaments,

⁹⁹ Szambien, *Le Musée d'Architecture*, 31.

¹⁰⁰ *Ibid.*, 33.

¹⁰¹ *Ibid.*, 34.

¹⁰² As Harris has noted, "All over Europe the older academies must have possessed accumulations of architectural artifacts: framed drawings, models" and "were already taking on the character of museums, albeit probably muddled in the manner of display." Harris, "Storehouses of Knowledge: The Origins of the Contemporary Architecture museum," 31, footnote 18.

primarily to the benefit of young draftsman and engravers of architecture.¹⁰³ The proposal to accommodate a “Museum of Architectural Fragments and Ornaments” in one of the enormous halls of the most celebrated ancient monument of Paris suggested another model for the establishment of an architecture museum, reliant on an expansion of the architectural archive. By proposing the architecture museum to be accommodated in a structure which was itself a paradigm of the art of building, the architectural archive was to be extended to reincorporate buildings into its composition. With a monument-museum, the communication of architectural knowledge and ideas was not to be limited to the items exhibited, but to be continued in the exhibition hall itself. In an early attempt at a reconciliation between the representation and the experience of architecture, “[t]he architecture of the museum thus became an integrating part of the architecture museum.”¹⁰⁴

The combination of experience and representation of architecture would be continued in Legrand and Molinos only proposal to actually be realized. Having failed to persuade the ruling authorities to implement any of their proposals for an architecture museum, the two architects decided to take the initiative and establish an architecture museum themselves. In 1799 they began transforming their home into an architecture museum dedicated to (what they considered to be) the most basic element of ancient architecture, the Doric order.¹⁰⁵ Intended to assist young designers to fully appreciate the excellence of ancient Greek architecture, Legrand and Molinos’s *Musée de l’Ordre Dorique* (Museum of the Doric Order) attempted to present different materializations of the Doric order in the most famed Greek monuments. Columns in the courtyard accurately replicated the Parthenon’s intercolumniation, completed with plaster casts of the

¹⁰³ Jacques-Guillaume Legrand, *Essai sur l’Histoire Générale de l’Architecture: Pour servir de Texte Explicatif au Recueil et Parallèle des Édifices de tout Genre, Anciens et Modernes, Remarquables par leur Beauté, leur Grandeur ou leur Singularité* (L. Ch. Soyer, 1809), 219, note 1.

¹⁰⁴ Dominique Poulot, “Architectural Models: The Birth of a Museum of Architecture in France during the Revolution,” *Lotus International* 35 (1982): 35.

¹⁰⁵ Société de l’Histoire de l’Art Français, “Bulletin de la Société de l’Histoire de l’Art Français,” *Bulletin de la Société de l’Histoire de l’Art Français*, 2006, 221.

original metopes of the Greek temple.¹⁰⁶ In the vestibule, four columns (in their natural size) depicted the use of the Doric order in the Athenians Propylaea, Theseion, and Gate of Athena Archegetis, as well as in the Temple of Hera in Paestum, while the ceiling reproduced the vault of the Temple of Diana in Nimes.¹⁰⁷ Completing the ensemble was a terracotta model of the choragic monument to Lysikrates (referred by Legrand and Molinos as the “Athenian Lantern of Demosthenes”). While confounding architectural experience and representation, Legrand and Molinos paid the utmost attention to the precise reproduction of each built articulation of the Doric order. Each measurement of each column was carefully verified by Foucherot, who had measured *in situ* many of these monuments.¹⁰⁸ Only with such degree of precision could the assortment of natural sized reproductions of the Doric order become a substantive taxonomic series, and purport a scientific study of architecture.

The scientific study of architecture was a main concern of Legrand, who, when not designing in partnership with Molinos, occupied himself with writing and translating architectural volumes.¹⁰⁹ In his writings, Legrand presented the same preoccupation with a systematic study of architectural history, particularly in his “*Essai sur l’Histoire Generale de l’Architecture*” in which Legrand analyzed and compared architectural forms through their historical sequencing. Recognizing a similar

¹⁰⁶ The casts were created from the original metopes in the Louvre, which had been confiscated during the Revolution from Marie-Gabriel-Florent-Auguste de Choiseul-Gouffier, a former ambassador to the Ottoman Empire in Athens and a revered Ancient Greece scholar who notoriously built his own house in Paris in imitation of the Greek Erechtheion. Jacques-Guillaume Legrand, *Collection des Chefs-d’Oeuvre de l’Architecture des Différents Peuples, Exécutés en Modèles sous la Direction de L. F. Cassas* (Paris: Leblanc, 1806), 96.

¹⁰⁷ Jacques-Guillaume Legrand and Jacques Molinos, “Lettre Aux Rédacteurs,” *Journal Des Arts, Des Sciences et de La Littérature*, no. 46 (20 Ventôse): 1–2. In Szambien, *Le Musée d’Architecture*, 136-137

¹⁰⁸ Little is known of Foucherot besides his travels through Greece with Fauvel on behalf of Choiseul-Gouffier. Some identify Foucherot as a civil engineer while others as an architect. See C. G. Lowe, “Fauvel’s First Trip through Greece,” *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 5, no. 2 (January 1936): 206.

¹⁰⁹ Allan Braham, *The Architecture of the French Enlightenment* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980), 110–111.

intention to methodically investigate and communicate architecture through the construction of meaningful series in Durand's *Parallèle*, Legrand proposed to Durand the inclusion of his *Essai* as an introductory and explanatory text to the *Parallèle's* taxonomic visual presentation of architecture.¹¹⁰ Consequently, "from the edition of an IX on [1801], the *Parallèle* was published with an additional fifty-two pages of text extracted from Legrand's critical article."¹¹¹ With the addition of the *Essai* to the encyclopedic *Parallèle*, Legrand contributed to expand architecture's archive and reaffirm the significance of substantive series in providing insight to the foundational principles of the discipline.¹¹²

Legrand's commitment to the development of modern resources for a methodic study of architecture would continue with another explanatory text, this time introducing and commenting an early public exhibition of architectural models and picturesque views. Legrand's text "*Collection des Chefs-d'Oeuvre de l'Architecture des Différents Peuples*" (Collection of Masterpieces of Architecture of Different People) would accompany Louis-François Cassas' travelling exhibition of cork and terracotta architecture models, and establish another comparative table of architecture.¹¹³ But while employing the same technique of comparison, the terms of comparison had changed. The earlier *Essai* had analyzed the development of architecture through typological comparisons, but in the "*Collection des Chefs-d'Oeuvre*" Legrand offered some considerations on the development of

¹¹⁰ The correspondence between Legrand and Durand can be found in Legrand, *Essai sur l'Histoire Générale de l'Architecture*, 13–16.

¹¹¹ Villari, "Scientific Thought and Architectural Language in Durand's Theoretical Work," 53. An extended version of the critical text would be later published in book form in 1809.

¹¹² For an appreciation of the symbiotic relation between Durand's images and Legrand's text see Ignasi de Solà-Morales, "The Origins of Modern Eclecticism: The Theories of Architecture in Early Nineteenth Century France," *Perspecta* 23 (January 1987): 120–133.

¹¹³ Legrand offered general observations on Egyptian, Indian, Greek, Etruscan, "Cyclopean," Celtic or Druid, Roman, and Late Empire and a combined total of seventy-four individual monuments. See Legrand, *Collection des Chefs-d'Oeuvre de l'Architecture des Différents Peuples*.

architecture (and its different expressions) according to the social and cultural context of the different cultures.¹¹⁴

Beyond the classification of different architectural expressions according to civilization, Legrand also remarked the inherent potential of Cassas' collection to become a fundamental resource for the dissemination of architectural knowledge. Legrand would speculate that by combining Cassas collection of models and drawings with the public collection of plaster casts and original fragments assembled by fellow architect and professor of architecture Léon Dufourny, an even greater resource for the study and appreciation of architecture would be created. It was not only the first time that the term museum of architecture was ever recorded, Legrand's suggestion would be pursued and completed in the following years as the basis of (yet) another initiative to constitute an encyclopedic museum of architecture in Paris.¹¹⁵

Louis-François Cassas' travelling exhibition of architecture models was in fact the earliest and closest translation of Durand's systematic comparative methodology to the public presentation of architectural types. While the idea to establish a public gallery of architectural models was initially devised in 1794, the collection, which eventually incorporated 745 models of "choice monuments

¹¹⁴ By relying on societal qualifiers to organize architecture and effectively construct an evolutionary narrative for the discipline, both Cassas' exhibition and Legrand's accompanying text revealed an affinity with the prevalent architectural theory of the period: the theory of character. The notion of "character" in architecture was based in a "socially coordinated systems of conventions" that revealed meaning through form, ornamentation and location, implying that buildings were markers of history which revealed the social and cultural context of their production. For a discussion of the theory of character in architecture see Sylvia Lavin, *Quatremère De Quincy and the Invention of a Modern Language of Architecture* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992), 137–147.

¹¹⁵ While Werner Szambien has claimed for Dufourny the distinction of being the author of the first recorded use of the "museum of architecture" in an 1808 report (which is parsed next) discussing the combination of the collection under his custody with Cassas' trove of models, he seems to have overlooked that when Dufourny used the term "a complete museum of architecture" to describe the result he was only reproducing the idea for the merger of the two collections and the use of the term as it had been employed by Legrand in the explanatory text of Cassas gallery published two years prior, in 1806. See Szambien, "Les Origines Du Musée d'Architecture En France," 136., and Legrand, *Collection des Chefs-d'Oeuvre de l'Architecture des Différents Peuples*, xv.

from history restored to their former perfect self,” was only first exhibited in 1806.¹¹⁶ However, unlike the attempt at a neutral, almost aseptic, scientific approach sponsored by Durand in his *Parallèle*, Cassas’ exhibition purposely instrumentalized sentimentality.¹¹⁷ In Cassas’ gallery each model of restored buildings was presented with picturesque engravings of the original site and present-day ruins placed behind them. Cassas did not shy from associating the pure original architectural state of the pristine model with the picturesque drawing of its present ruins. In fact, he considered that by associating the two states of the building, it was possible to eliminate any sense of history by collapsing time, as it was shown at the same instance “what each building once was and what it is now.”¹¹⁸ With its collection, Cassas also addressed the problem of presenting architecture to an architectural lay audience. Rather than plans, elevations, and sections (which required some previous knowledge for the audience to be able to decode the information and visualize the architectural ideas embedded in them), Cassas’ gallery focused on the presentation of clearly understandable scale-models and naturalized views to convey the same ideas. The reasonable selection, the uniformity of display (including a uniformity of scale for all models), and the reception of the exhibition clearly revealed the prevalent guiding elements of Cassas’ archive to be an explicit didactic dimension and an ambition to identify and classify the different expressions of architecture.

The didactic dimension of Cassas’ collection soon received widespread recognition, particularly by the French State, who established a commission to assess its purchase on behalf of the *École d’Architecture* of the *Institut de France* (the precursor of the *École des Beaux-Arts*).¹¹⁹ The

¹¹⁶ Anthony Vidler, “The Paradoxes of Vandalism: Henri Grégoire and the Thermidorian Discourse on Historical Monuments,” in *The Abbé Grégoire and His World*, ed. Jeremy D Popkin and Richard H Popkin, (Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000), 154. Szambien, *Le Musée d’Architecture*, 61.

¹¹⁷ Villari, “Scientific Thought and Architectural Language in Durand’s Theoretical Work,” 56.

¹¹⁸ Legrand, *Collection des Chefs-d’Oeuvre de l’Architecture des Différents Peuples*, xviii.

¹¹⁹ For more on the chronology and institutional evolution of the famed Parisian school, see Jacques, “French Architects and the Prix de Rome.”

commission was composed by J.N.L. Durand, Antoine-Thomas-Laurent Vaudoyer, and Léon Dufourny, three professors of architecture who were to appraise both the intellectual and monetary value of the collection. As “custodian of the architecture collection” of the *École d’Architecture* and director of its gallery (the *Galerie d’architecture*), Dufourny was appointed head of the commission and became responsible for writing the final report of their findings.¹²⁰

The commission’s report was (as expected) overwhelmingly positive about the potential educational benefits to be derived from Cassas’ collection and emphatically advised for its purchase. Supporting its recommendation, the commission cogently argued that the education and elevation of the public to whom Cassas collection was directed was just as important to the advancement of the discipline as the education of architectural students. At the basis of the commission’s recommendation was the latent idea that the advancement of the discipline required both critical discussion and popular dissemination.

Enlightenment ideals were equally pervasive in the reasoning supporting this decision, as the report praised the methodic composition and classification of Cassas’ collection in establishing comparative sequences of architecture and pronounced that its exhibition would generate substantive discussions that would only further benefit the advancement of the discipline. Such rhetoric was unsurprising, since the entire collection was perceived as a progressive device for the rationalization of the study of architecture, which not only employed specialization and classification but also resonated with the most prominent theory of architecture of the period: the theory of character. By employing the prevalent theory of character to establish and present the forward march of history, Cassas’ collection was a remarkable instrument in its own right, occupying the intersection of architectural history and theory. However, the commission (agreeing

¹²⁰ Szambien, *Le Musée d’Architecture*, 59; Szambien, “Les Origines Du Musée d’Architecture En France,” 136.

with Legrand previous assertion) deemed that its combination with the considerable assemblage of architectural plaster casts and other artifacts accumulated in the *Galerie d'architecture* (under Dufourny's supervision) would produce an unprecedented medium for the communication of architectural knowledge: "a complete Museum of Architecture."¹²¹

Although an early use of the term "Museum of Architecture," the commission's definition of such an institution has remarkably continued to endure.¹²² Beyond sponsoring an encyclopedic approach to the archive of architecture, the commission's report clearly identified the three main audiences that have been the focus of these institutions up to today: architecture students, architects, and the general public. For architecture students, the establishment of an architecture museum was to bring numerous advantages that would inherently facilitate the study of architecture. Scale models would provide an immediate and convenient way to study ancient structures and better understand the application of the architectural principles taught by their masters. Furthermore the report claims that "the usual view of these masterpieces was particularly suited to purify [the students'] taste, to ignite their imagination, and to even awake their genius."¹²³ Architects and other artists would find the Museum of Architecture an equally valuable resource. The careful organization of drawings and models would allow architects to more clearly evaluate the translation of drawings into forms and even assess their own designs in comparison, while also allowing artists to paint and draw more accurate historical scenes. While architecture students,

¹²¹ Léon Dufourny, "DOCUMENT XII: Rapport Fait À Son Excellence Le Ministre de l'Intérieur Sur La Collection de Modèles d'Architecture de M. Cassas. Par M. Dufourny Directeur de La Galerie d'Architecture," in *Le Musée d'Architecture*, ed. Werner Szambien (Paris: Picard, 1988), 143. While never mentioned in the report, the use of the term "a complete Museum of Architecture" seems to allude to both the idea and title suggested by Jacques-Guillaume Legrand when he speculated on the union between Cassas' collection of models with the plaster casts and fragments assembled by Dufourny at the *Galerie d'architecture*. See Legrand, *Collection des Chefs-d'Oeuvre de l'Architecture des Différents Peuples*, xv.

¹²² As stated before, both Werner Szambien and John Harris have considered this report to have been the first recorded use of the term "Museum of Architecture," overlooking the earlier use by Legrand in his *Collection des Chefs-d'Oeuvre de l'Architecture des Différents Peuples*. See footnotes 100 and 107.

¹²³ Dufourny, "Rapport Sur La Collection de Modèles d'Architecture de M. Cassas," 140.

architects and artists were already the main audience of Dufourny's *Galerie d'architecture*, the assimilation of Cassas' collection would expand the appeal of the *Galerie d'architecture* to also include the general public. By complementing the existing collection with Cassas' models and naturalized views of ancient structures, the commission (and Dufourny in particular) believed that the collection of the *Galerie* could transcend its limited academic reach and properly disseminate architecture to a much wider audience, effectively becoming a public museum of architecture.

The significance of this transformation was not lost on Dufourny, who dedicated a large portion of the report to explaining how the envisioned "Museum of Architecture" would benefit the general public and how this, in turn, would benefit the advancement of architecture. While the elevation of public taste—a typical Enlightenment contention—is the underlying argument for this section of the report, there is a significant variation from typical Enlightenment claims: beyond the customary cultural enrichment of the population, the elevation of public taste in architecture is here considered to also be directly correlated to the advancement of the discipline. Specifically, Dufourny argues that the education of architectural students and architects is a vain exercise when not accompanied by an education of the public. Without guidance the public would never be able to appreciate the skills and talents of architects, which would negatively impact the development of the discipline. The report attributes the ruling mediocrity of architectural practice to the deficit of interest in architecture in the general public, even claiming that "if the taste of the public was generally enlightened architects would be forced to put more perfection, or at least more severity, in their works . . . [f]or the progress of art is a result of the purity of public taste."¹²⁴ With the architecture museum both populace and cultivated minds could contemplate the progression of architecture through different eras and civilizations, reveling in the excellence of ancient

¹²⁴ Ibid., 141.

architecture and comparatively assessing the architecture of France accordingly.¹²⁵ Fomenting the appreciation of architecture became one of the most important objectives of the proposed institution. It is not only extraordinary that with these considerations the report indicated the fledging power shift of Revolutionary France from the elite to the masses but also how, in essence, the same argument is still used today to promote the elevation of public taste through the initiatives and exhibitions of architecture museums.

The purchase of Cassas' collection was approved and completed by 1813 and several subsequent acquisitions further expanded the already encyclopedic assemblage.¹²⁶ However, various setbacks prevented the ambitious objective of establishing a museum of architecture for students, architects, and the general public from ever being truly accomplished. The death of Dufourny in 1818 was a considerable blow to the ambitious project, but the 1829 move from the "temporary" installations at the *Institut de France* (where Dufourny's *Galerie* had been located) to the still unfinished *Palais des Études* of the *École Nationale Supérieure des Beaux-Arts* would seal the fate of the comprehensive collection of architectural models, drawings, casts, and fragments. For almost two years the sprawling collection was accommodated in the ground floor of the south wing of the *Palais* in some galleries with less than ideal lighting conditions, when in 1831 the division of the comprehensive collection was first suggested. The sprawling architectural archive was not yet fully catalogued, it was difficult to manage and maintain, let alone exhibit, so both the director of the school and the curator of the collection were not particularly eager to maintain its integrity. By 1833 the dispersal of the collection had been decided and planned. Architectural fragments from

¹²⁵ In the original text it is stated that "the observer will be able to track the status of architecture from every people, even different eras, and study its progress since its origin among the Egyptians, until its decline, at the time of the later Roman Empire [after Constantine]."Ibid., 142.

¹²⁶ The most significant later acquisitions were a large number of construction models and samples of materials entrusted by Jean-Baptiste Rondelet between 1808 and 1813, the model of the Colosseum by Carlo Lonchangeli purchased in 1809, and a collection of contemporary monumental and utilitarian constructions donated by the director of Paris' Public Works, Louis Bruyère, in 1817. See Ibid., 73–74.

the collection would be either scattered throughout the school or integrated into the walls of the building, which was still under construction; the models would be relegated to the library on the first floor; the *Galerie d'architecture* was to be divided into a Roman gallery on the South wing and a Greek gallery on the North wing of the building. While these galleries replaced the *Galerie d'architecture*, these were not intended for a systematic presentation of architecture, but instead were dedicated to present antiquity through a picturesque effect that combined architecture, sculpture and painting.¹²⁷ Not only was the collection dispersed, but by being assimilated into new contexts, the presentation of the surviving elements was equally problematic.

Dufourny's ambitious plan to establish a "complete museum of architecture" would never come to fruition, but it would still be seminal in the establishment of the contemporary architecture museum. Beyond its validation of the encyclopedic architectural archive, the *Musée Complet d'Architecture* conferred the presentation of architecture with a public character that had not yet enjoyed. For the first time it was forcefully argued that the presentation of architecture should be extended beyond the confines of the discipline and reach a wider audience. The wider dissemination of architectural ideas was not merely didactic, but also pragmatic, as the development of architecture equally required imagination from architects and appreciation from the general public. Universal public accessibility to the issues, processes and ideas of architecture granted by the public architecture museum thus became a basic tenet for the advancement of the discipline.

Public Accessibility

While the distinct structuring of knowledge derived from the encyclopedic approach of the public architecture museum distinguished it from the early collections of architecture, it was its

¹²⁷ Szambien, *Le Musée d'Architecture*, 81.

inherent public character that fundamentally set it apart from those earlier initiatives.

Enlightenment efforts for the foundation of a museum of architecture dedicated to the general public and composed of public holdings completely contrasted with the restricted audience and private ownership that defined private collections of antiquarian methods. Only by reaching an audience beyond the discipline could the architectural archive fulfill its potential to inform and influence the development of architectural discourse and practice. Only when architecture collections gained a public dimension, did the processes and objectives of the architecture museum become fully formed and operative.

If the organization of the archive of the Enlightenment architecture museum found its precedent in the comprehensive collection of knowledge of the encyclopedia, its public exhibition of architecture found its precedent in the Parisian *salons*. Organized as venues for young artists, recently graduated from the *Académie de Peinture et Sculpture* to present their work and engage with potential patrons, the Parisian *salons* were devised as a crucial component in the reform of the *Académie* system operated by Quatremère de Quincy in 1791.¹²⁸ Namely, the *salons* ensured an important degree of public exposure (and ensuing accountability) to the often opaque *Arts Académies*, while also exposing a general public to the cultural elevations of art. By establishing a point of connection between the public and art, the *salons* inevitably created expectations and habits to both the public exhibition of sculpture and painting, as well as the ensuing discussion.¹²⁹

¹²⁸ The *Académie de Peinture et Sculpture* became the *Académie des Beaux-Arts* when it merged with the *Académie de Musique* and the *Académie d'Architecture* in 1795. In his defense of the salon, Quatremère de Quincy considered free exhibition to be the right of every artist, even comparing it to the freedom of press. See Lavin, *Quatremère De Quincy and the Invention of a Modern Language of Architecture*, 159.

¹²⁹ The establishment of the *salons* has also been credited with the emergence of the art critic in its dual role as an art dilettante and an educator of public taste. See Jürgen Habermas, "Social Structures of the Public Sphere," in *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*, Studies in Contemporary German Social Thought (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1991), 40–41.

The first (semi) public presentations of architecture were also in the context of *salons*, which would indelibly mark architecture's exhibition practices. Among the first to present architecture in the prestigious Parisian *salon* was architect and painter Charles de Wailly. At a time when architecture was not yet accepted as a sanctioned category within the salon, de Wailly subverted conventions and artistic genres by intentionally transforming architecture's representation into more acceptable painterly perspectives. Most notably, at the 1771 *salon* de Wailly presented a painterly architectural perspective of his (and Marie-Joseph Peyre's) projected design for the *Comédie-Française* by inserting figures clothed in togas and dubbing it a history painting.¹³⁰

De Wailly was the exception in instrumentalizing the salon to publicize architectural work, but his sublimation of the public presentation of architecture would become the norm, even as architecture gained official entry into the salon after the French Revolution. Given the normalization and familiarity of audiences to the modes of presentation of sculpture and painting, it seemed almost inevitable that the representations of architecture would undergo a similar treatment. Furthermore, architectural representations were often of a small number and dispersed around the trend-setting event, forcing architecture to be perceived—and inevitably judged—in direct competition with the aesthetic and artistic qualities of the overwhelming presence of the consecrated sculpture and painting.¹³¹ Thus, architectural models were often presented as convoluted sculptures, while drawings were exhibited as alluring paintings. In order for architecture to enter the gallery it had to adapt its representation to the pre-existing conventions of exhibiting art. Such sublimation became intrinsic to architecture's position within the museum in

¹³⁰ Hélène Lipstadt, "Architectural Publications, Competitions, and Exhibitions," in *Architecture and Its Image: Four Centuries of Architectural Representation: Works from the Collection of the Canadian Centre for Architecture*, ed. Eve Blau and Edward Kaufman (Montreal: Canadian Centre for Architecture/Centre Canadien d'Architecture, 1989), 126.

¹³¹ Lipstadt refers how the reviewers of the *salons* lamented first "the relatively small number of works, their dispersion in the Salon, and, when an increasing number was finally shown together, of the consistent lack of public and critical interest in the architectural works on display." *Ibid.*

the nineteenth and twentieth centuries. In discussing the museological objectivization of architecture, Henry Urbach identified the same condition in the modern museum, stating that “architecture was welcomed in the museum gallery so long as it agreed to these, or similar, [art exhibiting] representational conventions and declined, quite simply, to be architecture.”¹³²

Such inadequate model for the appreciation of architecture has generally meant that representations of architecture, rather than being perceived as expressions of (removed) architectural ideas, have been instead interpreted and valued by their inherent aesthetic qualities as either paintings or sculptures. In architecture’s public presentation, underlying ideas and conceptions have been ostensibly flattened to the “mere” appreciation of beautiful images and masterfully conceived models. The difficulty of nineteenth-century salon and twentieth-century museum-visiting public to interpret and understand the latent architectural ideas looming within these models and drawings only further accentuated the growing disconnect between architectural representations in the gallery and the original idea they intended to express. If representation of architecture had initially emancipated architecture from its physical expression, it now risked emptying architecture from its ideas. In a sense, there was a return to a primacy of the object but instead of the original construction, there was now a fetishism of representation.

The Implosion of Meaning in the Architectural Archive

The ambition to collect all human knowledge in one location has only been exacerbated since the Enlightenment. The architecture museum expanded the encyclopedic project of the early modern museum to extremes unimaginable even to the most progressive Enlightenment minds. The contemporary architectural archive not only intends to document, catalogue, archive, and

¹³² Urbach uses the 1932 MoMA “Modern Architecture: International Exhibition” to denounce the arrangement of models as sculptures and imagery as paintings, identifying it as the starting point for the sublimation of architecture in the modern museum. See Henry Urbach, “Exhibition as Atmosphere,” *Log 20: Curating Architecture*, Fall 2010, 13.

present the representations of architecture, but also a diverse array of artifacts that relate to the processes of architectural production. Beyond drawings, models, original fragments, or casts, the architectural archive has come to include correspondence, manuscripts, personal affects, and any other sort of artifact that can offer a glimpse into the creative process of architecture

The veritable explosion of content within the architectural archive can be traced back to Dufourny's ambitious project for the first complete museum of architecture. The report of the commission assessing the acquisition of Cassas' collection of architectural models and drawings is revealing of both the already sizable range of the architectural archive and the genuinely all-encompassing ambition for its development. In the report the commission used different metrics to attempt to quantify the extensive nature of this collection, unprecedented for architecture. In addition to praising the methodic classification and organization of architectural series and enumerating the sheer amount of artifacts that comprised the collection, the commission also included less traditional metrics. Specifically, the commission indicated the "common knowledge that Mr. Cassas ha[d] been working on this endeavor for over 20 years," the considerable distances travelled and the amount of books and other source-material required for such accumulation of architectural knowledge to further convey the collection's considerable encyclopedic breadth. The remarkable range and size of the collection was validated by the same commission by attributing it an extraordinary estimated pecuniary value of 125,910 francs, approximately the equivalent of the earnings of an (average) artist for his entire lifetime.¹³³

While the encyclopedic breadth of Cassas' collection was the basis for such extraordinary sum, the collection's range was to be further expanded by its assimilation into the also comprehensive collection under Dufourny's supervision at the *Galerie d'architecture*. The assessment report

¹³³ Dufourny, "Rapport Sur La Collection de Modèles d'Architecture de M. Cassas," 145.

suggested that Cassas' models and drawings were complementary to the assemblage of natural size plaster casts and fragments already accumulated in the *Galerie*. The combination of both collections would present and define different dimensions of architecture, from the whole established by models and drawings to the scale provided by casts and fragments. The forceful argumentation for the combination of these collections established that architecture's archive was not limited to the documentation of architecture through its traditional representations (like models and drawings), but should also be comprised by other artifacts (like plaster casts and fragments). Underlying in this argumentation was the notion that the communication of architectural knowledge was not reserved to conventional representation, but instead the ideas that animate the discipline were better conveyed by the combination of different artifacts. By combining different expressions of the same (or related) architectural ideas, not only a resilient instrument for the advancement of the discipline was created, but the primacy of the archive as an organizing principle of the discipline was inevitable reinforced.

The expansion of the architectural archive proposed in Dufourny's report would only lay the groundwork for subsequent acquisitions. Following the successful integration of Cassas' collection in 1813, Dufourny, as custodian of collections of the *Galerie d'architecture*, procured to further augment the breadth of its archive. Through both acquisitions and donations, in the following years Dufourny succeeded in expanding the functional and chronological breadth of the *Galerie's* collection. The addition of Jean-Baptiste Rondelet's collection of construction details (in both model and drawing) and samples of materials signaled a qualitative shift to the *Galerie's* collection. With this donation by the author of the *Traité Théorique et Pratique de l'Art de Bâtir* (Theoretical and Practical Treatise on the Art of Building), the *Galerie's* collection developed a new technical dimension. In contrast, the 1817 donation by Louis Bruyère, the Director of Public Works in Paris, conferred contemporaneity to the collection. Bruyère's bequest was comprised by several models of contemporary structures of both monumental and utilitarian architecture of the Napoleonic

Empire. With these acquisitions, the collection of Dufourny's *Galerie* embraced the technical and aesthetic dimensions of architecture, as well as its ancient and modern expressions, but also indicated that the architecture museum relied on an ever-expanding archive to fully document and articulate the idiosyncrasies and intricacies of the discipline.

While Dufourny's efforts to assemble a truly encyclopedic archive of architecture were frustrated with the dispersion of the *Galerie's* collection, the encyclopedic model for the constitution of a well-rounded architectural archive would not just persevere, but be further augmented. In the twentieth century, several architecture institutions were founded that broadened the expanse of the architectural archive to approach a previously unattainable encyclopedic ideal. The Canadian Centre for Architecture (CCA) in Montreal and the Netherlands Architecture Institute (NAi) in Rotterdam stand out as paradigmatic examples of the contemporary encyclopedic approach to the collection of architecture.

Beyond merely collecting representations of architecture such as presentation drawings, the scope of these institutions' archives has come to include "sketches, preliminary designs, working drawings, business and personal correspondence, photographs, models, collections of press clippings, and published articles," which "contribute to the understanding of professional practices, projects and personalities."¹³⁴ Like Dufourny, both the CCA and the NAi have attempted to document, analyze, and present the complexity of architecture through a plethora of artifacts, where a complete insight into the discipline is derived from the different material collected. With the (nearly) indiscriminate inclusion of any material or artifact that either assisted the production

¹³⁴ Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, "Archives and Collections," *NAi*, accessed August 27, 2012, http://en.nai.nl/collection/about_the_collection/item/_rp_kolom2-1_elementId/1_95698. Canadian Centre for Architecture, *CCA: The Canadian Centre for Architecture Today* (Montreal: Canadian Centre for Architecture, 1986), 10.

of architecture or where architectural ideas were developed, the definition of the architectural archive was unequivocally expanded.

Such expansion of breadth of the architectural archive was equally sustained and reflected by the acquisition policies established by these institutions. Specifically, both the CCA and the NAI have pursued the acquisition of full collections, composed by both final and preparatory work, related to the practice of individual architects, architectural firms, and disciplinary institutions. In Montreal, the CCA holds over 150 collections, most notably the entire archives of James Stirling and Peter Eisenman's (until 2008), while in Rotterdam the NAI houses almost 800 separate collections of the most prominent Dutch architects of the past two centuries. The complete and detailed nature of these collections means that for every architect, for every project, there is a sizeable amount of archived material.

The combination of written and graphic records, books, and objects conveys the development of not just specific architectural ideas, but also architects and the entire discipline. Consider, for example, the tremendous breadth of the Peter Eisenman archive (CCA *fonds* AP143) at the CCA, which spans almost 60 years of architectural production (from 1951-2008).¹³⁵ This *fonds* is composed by not only a staggering amount of drawings (which the CCA catalogue lists as "circa 39,294"), models ("circa 1,250"), and textual records ("circa 85.57 linear meters"), but is also complemented by a vast assortment of material.¹³⁶ From videocassettes to panels, from collages to posters, the professional and academic development of Peter Eisenman is documented in an

¹³⁵ Derived from the French expression "*respect des fonds*" expressing one of the major concepts of archival science and theory that records of different provenance should not be intermingled, a *fonds* is a grouping of documents that originate from the same source. Specifically, the organic structure of the *fonds* sets it apart from a collection, since it comprises documents and artifacts that have been accumulated (either produced or collected) by and individual, institution or organization during its everyday activities.

¹³⁶ The entire catalogue and summary description of this *fonds* is available online. See Canadian Centre for Architecture, "AP143: Peter Eisenman Fonds," *CCA Finding Aids*, accessed October 26, 2012, <http://svrdam.cca.qc.ca/search/bs.aspx?langID=1#a=arch&s=380476&d=AP143&p=1&nr=1&nq=1>.

assortment of artifacts related to over 200 projects. While this particular *fonds* is remarkably eclectic and vast, most other collections within both these institutions are composed by a similar wealth of material that represents a rich cross section of the influences, interests and activities of prominent architects and inherently offers substantial insights into the shaping of the discipline.

Naturally, such comprehensive conceptualization of the architectural archive fundamentally diverges from the “critical depth” model sponsored by other institutions like the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) Department of Architecture and Design. The diverging approaches of the “critical depth” and “encyclopedic breadth” models to the archive (and their implications) can be illustrated by MoMA’s and CCA’s collection of Peter Eisenman’s work, specifically the 1970-71 project “House IV.” While in the MoMA archives this project is documented by merely two drawings, the CCA holds a trove of 235 drawings, 15 negatives, 2 film reels, 1 model, 1 CD-Rom, and 0.02 linear meters of documentation. With only two drawings, MoMA’s presentation of House IV is restricted to the transformation of a volume from a pristine cube, but at the CCA the volumetric transformation of House IV is complemented with conceptual sketches, studies for plans and elevations, diagrams for spatial organization, and presentation drawings.

By collecting a trove of drawings, objects, and records, the CCA’s comprehensive archive attempts to document the entire range of underlying architectural ideas of House IV, enabling different insights into the ramifications of Eisenman’s design decisions. Since architectural ideas are formed and developed in a combination of drawings, records, and artifacts, only the combination in its entirety can elucidate the conditions and intentions that generated those original ideas. In this sense, the collection of a beautiful or final drawing (or model) without its preceding counterparts is almost futile, since it does little to convey the intricacy or nuances of the represented architectural idea. Simply by being isolated from the representations where the idea was initially formed and developed, and regardless of its aesthetic quality, the beautiful architectural artifact is inevitably

incomplete and vapid. As Mariet Willinge, the longtime head of collections at the NAI has asserted, the objective of the NAI and similar collections of architecture (such as the CCA) has always been “to document the design process and not to collect individual drawings as pieces of art, so not only the beautiful but the whole archives, with the working drawings and all [other material] around the work of an architect, such as their correspondence with clients etc, are collected.”¹³⁷ Phyllis Lambert, the renowned founder of the CCA also described the architectural archive of the CCA in similar terms. Aiming to provide “complete documentation of the work of an architect,” architectural archives should be “composed of all the elements that give evidence of the personality and practice of an architect, from the whole range of drawings, specifications, models, working tools, travel sketches, account books, as well as the library and works of art collected by the individual architect or firm.”¹³⁸ In short, for both the NAI and the CCA, architectural archives should be as complete as possible containing all the material used to produce architecture and make design possible.

The complete nature of these collections encourages multiple readings of the architectural archive, thus allowing for both knowledge and meaning to not be solidified, but rather remain in constant flux. Given the breadth of material in these collections, any object, idea, project, or architect is constantly subject to possible re-interpretation, where the construction of alternative readings and juxtapositions are nearly limitless. Every single artifact in these encyclopedic architectural archives is inevitably contextualized by a plethora of other objects, drawings and models, particularly as all of these were produced and assisted in the creation, development, and articulation of the same architectural idea. Since instead of establishing and presenting a specific

¹³⁷ Platzer, “Interview with Mariet Willinge,” 52.

¹³⁸ Phyllis Lambert, “The Collections of the Canadian Centre for Architecture,” *Architectural Design* 59, no. 3–4 (1989): 9.

narrative, contemporary architecture museums with encyclopedic archives aim to create the conditions for the emergence of a variety of narratives, the integrity of the collection is valued over the individual artifacts that compose it. The implication of the encyclopedic architectural archive is quite clear: architecture is a multifarious intellectual endeavor animated by ideas that can hardly be abridged to a singular representation.

The result of these comprehensive acquisition policies would have amazed even the most ardent Enlightenment encyclopediste, as the NAI's archive currently accommodates approximately 18,000 linear meters of archival material, and the CCA's collections occupy a 62,000 square feet underground vault.¹³⁹ The increase in size experienced by the new encyclopedic architectural archive was such that the NAI was confronted with a lack of space and had to move its growing models collection offsite, while the CCA had to develop "standards for basic access to very large archives."¹⁴⁰ The considerable breadth of these collections has also warranted them the title of "meta-collections" by the famed former Chief Curator of MoMA's Department of Architecture and Design, Terence Riley.¹⁴¹ Even though Riley never precisely clarifies his use of the term, he still seems to employ it in a manner that belittles the comprehensive scope of these collections with faint praise.

While acknowledging that by having "holdings numbering in the millions of items" these institutions seek to give "intellectual coherence and accessibility to a diverse group of documents," Riley also dismisses these efforts as being consolidations of previous collections "pocketed within

¹³⁹ Ole Bouman, "Why the New NAI?," ed. Monika Platzer, *ICAM Print 4* (February 2012): 22; Helen Malkin, "Building and Gardens: Participants, Chronology, and Specifications," in *Centre Canadien d'Architecture/Canadian Centre for Architecture: Building and Gardens*, ed. Larry Richards (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989), 156.

¹⁴⁰ Gerald Beasley, "Interview with Phylis Lambert," ed. Monika Platzer, *ICAM Print 3* (December 2009): 39; Platzer, "Interview with Mariet Willinge," 50.

¹⁴¹ Riley specifically identifies the NAI's vast collection as a typification of the meta-collection. Riley, "Drawn into a Collection: A Context of Practices," 16.

myriad private, institutional, and governmental archives.”¹⁴² According to this view, it would seem that these institutions only operate as collectors of collections, shallow devices merely serving as passive repositories of unfathomable quantities of architectural drawings and records. Riley’s major concern, however, is that by their very nature these encyclopedic collections lack a critical dimension in any way comparable to the criticality of more selective collecting practices, or as he simply put it, “these meta-collections are less ideological.”¹⁴³ In this reading of “meta-collections,” Riley conceives these institutions as passive repositories where the massive breadth of the encyclopedic architectural archive frustrates any attempt at the construction of meaning.

The concern with the difficulty (or impossibility) to construct meaning from a massive amount of material seems to echo the well-known argument by the French cultural theorist Jean Baudrillard regarding the implosion of meaning in (mass) media. As Baudrillard posited, currently “there is more and more information, and less and less meaning” to indicate the current condition where there is such a saturation of competing signs that it is impossible to establish any sort of meaning.¹⁴⁴ Even though Baudrillard posits three different hypothesis, he favors the idea that the very form of mass information can only absorb content and meaning, creating “inertia, silence and indifference.”¹⁴⁵ Accordingly, the deluge of information only obscures, since rather than leading to the constitution of more meaning, the general tendency of the mass is towards entropy, in an infinite proliferation of signs that effectively renders any sign invisible.¹⁴⁶

¹⁴² Ibid.

¹⁴³ Ibid. This stance should be contextualized with his staunch defense of the contrasting “critical depth” acquisition policy applied by MoMA in general and its Department of Architecture and Design in particular.

¹⁴⁴ Jean Baudrillard, “The Implosion of Meaning in Media,” in *Simulacra and Simulation* (Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994), 79.

¹⁴⁵ Gary Genosko, *McLuhan and Baudrillard: The Masters of Implosion* (London: Routledge, 1999), 94.

¹⁴⁶ Baudrillard illustrated this argument with an example from the relation between Exxon and the American government, as Exxon was requested to submit a complete report of its worldwide activities. “The result is twelve 1,000 page volumes, whose reading alone, not to mention the analysis would exceed a few

While at first glance a similar criticism might be directed towards the encyclopedic architectural archive, a closer examination negates such an assertion. Similarly to the saturation of signs identified by Baudrillard, the encyclopedic architectural archive is composed by an abundance of items. Rather differently, however, items in the encyclopedic architectural archive do not compete with each other, but are instead co-opted into units and interconnections that convey a dense conception of the architectural discipline. In these archives, each individual record, drawing, model, object, or artifact does not articulate a discrete singular idea, but instead offers complementary perspectives to our understanding of architectural ideas that were formed, developed, and can ultimately only be revealed by the combination of these artifacts. These interconnections not only avoid the possibility of an entropic collapse of meaning, but also define and advance the very agency of the encyclopedic architectural archive.

The investigation of interconnections and the construction of juxtapositions activates the encyclopedic architectural archive, preventing institutions like the CCA or the NAI from becoming mere massive repositories of architectural artifacts and knowledge. In fact, encyclopedic institutions occupy a privileged position in the advancement of the architectural discipline, since the breadth of their full collections prevents the meaning of any architectural idea to be solely defined by an association to a single narrative (usually determined at acquisition). Moreover, by continuously uncovering interconnections, these institutions not just insulate previous architectural knowledge from the obsolescence of narratives but are also able to present previous knowledge as applicable to shifting contemporary conditions. In the encyclopedic architectural archive, architectural ideas do not stagnate and wither, but instead are analyzed, transformed, and modeled in order to remain relevant and support multiple narratives of the discipline. Such

years work. Where is the information?" Jean Baudrillard, *Selected Writings*, ed. Mark Poster (Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001), 193.

multivalent approach to architectural knowledge (that enables new knowledge to be produced and previous knowledge to remain valid) is primarily enabled by the breadth of the encyclopedic archive. Thus, unlike the saturation described by Baudrillard, in the architectural archive, it is the multiplication of items that allows for the production of meaning to be sustained.

The search for interconnections not only prevents the sweeping collection of the encyclopedic architecture archive from becoming an amorphous mass of competing signs, but also prevents it from becoming a passive repository of architectural knowledge. Particularly since when attempting to be as complete as possible and closely document the processes of architecture, an encyclopedic “architecture collection is more like an archive than a fine arts collection.”¹⁴⁷ But while archives have usually been established and amassed for administrative purposes—generally as governmental repositories of information with a detached sense of accumulation—the encyclopedic architecture collection assemblage of material is instead motivated by a pursuit of interconnections. Thus, “[a]s a collection rather than a repository, the architecture museum is guided by a [sic] inquiry into the forces that shape architecture and into the intentions of architects, patrons, and clients.”¹⁴⁸ In short, the search for interconnections prevents the encyclopedic architectural archive from becoming overwhelmed by noise (of the saturation of signs) or overwhelmed by silence (of an inert obscure archive).

The constitution of interconnections, therefore, is fundamental for the productive instrumentalization of the encyclopedic architectural archive. It is through interconnections that the archive becomes an open-ended resource for inquiry and continues to produce meaning. Only interconnections allow for a systematic parsing of the slew of material in the encyclopedic archive,

¹⁴⁷ Mirko Zardini, “Exhibiting and Collecting Ideas: A Montreal Perspective,” *Log 20: Curating Architecture*, Fall 2010, 81.

¹⁴⁸ Lambert, “The Architecture museum: A Founder’s Perspective,” 310.

constructing specific readings and translating a wealth of drawings, models, records, and objects into understandable and communicable ideas. Effectively, the interconnections of the encyclopedic archive operate very similarly to the narratives that organize the antiquarian/critical depth architectural archive. Like with narratives, it is through interconnections that ideas are uttered, that the construction of meaningful series is accomplished, and that knowing is translated into telling. The resemblance between interconnections and narratives is such that it could be argued that they are effectively the same instrument, the same interface between the archive and the discipline.

Like with the antiquarian model, narratives effectively allow the dissemination of the architectural knowledge assembled in the encyclopedic archive. By complementing the encyclopedic breadth with narratives that establish easily understood connections between a myriad of objects, institutions like the NAI and the CCA are able to expertly articulate the wealth of architectural ideas documented in their collections. Moreover, while doing so, archived architectural ideas are not just recovered but also reconsidered. It is the combination between narratives and encyclopedic archive that allows these institutions to fulfill their dual ambition of documenting and articulating the complexity of architecture and effectively impact the advancement of the discipline. Given the wealth of architectural ideas and their detailed documentation, there is a staggering potential for the constitution of new interconnections and narratives, that is, a staggering potential for the production of new meaning. The significant concentration of architectural ideas and their activation through narratives allows the encyclopedic archive to document both minute details and broad overviews of the discipline in a complementary manner.

The ability to include multiple narratives has provided the encyclopedic model with a substantial evolution, even allowing it to become a staple in the contemporary architecture museum context. When combining its archival breadth capacity to document and present

architectural ideas in their full expression with the construction and use of narratives, the wealth of architectural knowledge is not only made understandable, but also present and relevant. More importantly, only in the breadth of the encyclopedic archive can the possibility for the application of a scientific method in the examination of the discipline exist. It is the wealth of material that enables the construction of eloquent series to provide greater insight into the complexity and idiosyncrasies of the discipline, and construct meaning, allowing encyclopedic architectural institutions to become influential nodes in the articulation of the discipline. Nodes where the collection and public presentation of architecture conspire for the advancement of the discipline.

Naturally, there are also exceptions that prove the rule. Beyond the predominant models of encyclopedic and critical architecture museums, there are some other outlier institutions that, for different reasons, do not attempt to pursue an in-depth approach. The Storefront for Art and Architecture in New York City, is a notable example of an architecture center that continuously strives to challenge the boundaries of architecture. However, since the Storefront is primarily interested in engaging with contemporary developments (and does not have a collection), it does not pursue an in-depth approach. Likewise, the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art (SFMOMA) also continues to probe the limits of architecture, without engaging in sustained in-depth analysis. Specifically, while SFMOMA has hosted some of the most provocative recent architecture exhibitions, it has continued to treat its collection (and inherently architecture) as purely an artistic expression.

The Emergence of a Third Way

The dual development of the “encyclopedic breadth” and the “critical depth” approaches to the architectural archive not just expresses the primacy of the archive in the advancement of the discipline, but are just two complementary methods to the collection and (public) presentation of architecture. Both these approaches were developed as ways to address the same problem of how

to document and disseminate architectural knowledge, that is, the question of how to constitute and activate the architectural archive. Moreover, while encyclopedic breadth and critical depth have come to signal the two ends of the spectrum within which the majority of architecture museological institutions exist, I would argue that the distance between both is notoriously shrinking. Specifically, there is a noticeable integration of the methods and techniques of both approaches, effectively suggesting the emergence of a composite way to approach the architectural archive. On one hand, critical depth is increasingly resorting to an expansion of its breadth, while conversely encyclopedic breadth is progressively procuring a methodic expansion of its depth. Furthermore, the rapprochement of these two models not only indicates a dialectical opposition, by further supports the assertion that the same conceptual definition is transversal to all materializations of the contemporary architecture museum.

A Dialectical Relationship

For the encyclopedic architectural archive to affect the development of the discipline, it had to apply the antiquarian method of judicious selection and conscious juxtapositions of artifacts in the construction of narratives. By applying narratives for the production of meaning and dissemination of knowledge, the encyclopedic collection was complemented with a powerful instrument of presentation. Through the construction of narratives, the knowledge accumulated in the encyclopedic archive could be uttered and disseminated. As the antiquarian archive revealed its breadth through increased accessibility, the encyclopedic archive revealed its depth with the construction of narratives in order for both to remain operative (rather than merely historical) instruments in architecture's disciplinary apparatus. Both encyclopedic and critical models have relied on techniques and methods of the other in order to overcome the inherent limitations and challenges of their own archives. Effectively, I would argue that institutions of critical depth and encyclopedic breadth have been engaged in a dialectical relationship, which is now culminating in a synthesis of methods that presents a credible qualitative improvement over their initially

contrasting positions. Even if unwittingly, the dialogue established between these institutions has led to a reconciliation of the two constituent elements that form any museum of architecture: collection and presentation.

With its focus on the aesthetics of architectural representations, the critical model has been mainly concerned with issues of presentation. Conversely, by valuing the ideas present in architectural representations, the encyclopedic model has been primarily preoccupied with matters of collection. For the critical model, the latent ideas of an aesthetically pleasing architectural representation have been somewhat negligible, while for the encyclopedic model the aesthetic qualities of the expression of worthy architectural ideas have been almost irrelevant.¹⁴⁹ But in the third way that is currently emerging, both types of architecture museums are addressing the imbalance of their focus and inherently converging towards an alternative model in which the strength of both are combined. In short, encyclopedic breadth architecture institutions are increasingly concerned with the public presentation of architecture (and the construction of depth), while critical depth architecture museums are heeding to the issues of collection (and the exploration of breadth). As these architecture museums have come to fully understand (or actually be reminded), the collection and exhibition of architecture are complementary elements, and concentrating on one in detriment of the other is bound to hinder their ability to produce meaning from the architectural archive.

The expression of the dual development of the encyclopedic and antiquarian architectural archive, as well as their rapprochement, is clearly articulated in the NAI's latest permanent exhibitions: *Stad van Nederland* (literally "City of the Netherlands," but translated by the NAI as

¹⁴⁹ In this dichotomy the two models also express their diverging origins. The critical model antiquarian genesis is betrayed by its emphasis on the material object of representation, while the encyclopedic model reveals its Enlightenment origins by instead valuing the underlying abstract ideas that are represented.

Dutchville) and *Schatkamer (Treasury)*. *Dutchville* presents an encyclopedic conception of the architecture archive, while the *Treasury* reveals an antiquarian approach, but both employ converging techniques, making these exhibitions hybrids of sorts. *Dutchville*'s basic organizing principle may be a comprehensive collection of architectural models, but it is complemented by an experiential and spectacle-focused exhibition practices. Conversely, the *Treasury* is composed by a hundred masterpieces judiciously selected from the NAI's collection, but these have been organized in six meaningful series, or "themes." Basically, each has taken as its starting point one of the two predominant approaches to the architectural archive, and has attempted to overcome their respective difficulties and limitations by being complemented by the opposing approach.

In the tradition established by Casas, Soane, or Johnson and Hitchcock, *Dutchville* presents architecture through a series of scale models of both completed and unrealized projects. *Dutchville*, however, diverges from this time honored tradition by destabilizing the static environment of those past examples and bookending the models gallery with experiential spaces. The unusual presentation devices become as important to construct meaning as the primary sources represented by the collection of models in this permanent exhibition occupying the NAI *Balkonzaal* (Balcony Room). Accordingly, the exhibition is characterized by the theatricality of the array of devices employed in a defamiliarization of both architectural presentations and architectural knowledge. There are light and sound effects continuously looping, doors that open automatically and mysteriously, concealed architectural models only visible through slender apertures, circling lights in mirror-constructed infinite space, and finally amorphous blobs and volumes intimating an unknown future. Quite tellingly, the exhibition was conceived and designed not by architecture scholars or curators, but instead by *Tinker Imagineers*, a creative consultancy and communications agency. With a budget of 698,000 EUR (approximately 1,000,000 USD at the time), the agency was

commissioned to create an “experiential space” with a clear mandate to make the exhibition of models more compelling and engaging for a wide audience.¹⁵⁰

While such theatricality would have already been sufficient to demarcate this exhibition from most other exhibitions of architectural models, what sets *Dutchville* apart is undoubtedly the audio guide system, particularly the format it uses to deliver information on the works exhibited. Instead of a dry read-through by an expert (with impeccable accent) of facts and figures regarding the different objects, information is codified as a conversation between six different “regular” people openly discussing their diverging opinions on these projects. By using an accessible language unhindered by architectural jargon, this unusual delivery method attempted to captivate a wider audience and voice an architectural debate that is inclusive and open-ended. Even as darkness cyclically envelops the gallery and models are momentarily obscured, the conversation of the six (fictional) characters continues to construct interconnections among the different projects. Through this conversation, a meaningful series (in the tradition of encyclopedic exhibitions) is established constructing meaning from the juxtaposition of different elements, be it models or opinions. Effectively, the conversations (that often directly relate different buildings and ideas) narrated by the personal audio player *is* the presentation of the models.¹⁵¹ The audio commentary reinforces the idea of a complex discipline which is perceived and received differently.

But even as *Dutchville* aims to inspire “conflicting feelings” where anyone can explore their “love-hate relationship with the urban environment,” there is a supra-narrative being exactly

¹⁵⁰ In their media package describing the “unconventional display of architecture,” *Tinker Imagineers* state that the NAI wanted to “lower its thresholds and blow its roof off.” Tinker Imagineers, “Experience Space: Dutchville,” 2011.

¹⁵¹ Further supporting the notion that the audio *is* the primary medium of *Dutchville*, Ferry Piekart, the exhibition’s curator, authored all the dialogues of the audio commentary and the audio guide is made available to visitors free of charge.

crafted: everyone is engaged with architecture, whether they realize it or not.¹⁵² It is debatable if these aren't just artifices that distract more than engage.¹⁵³ Nevertheless, despite being clearly based on an encyclopedic approach to the architectural archive, *Dutchville* is mostly remembered by its unconventional narrative and the theatricality of its arrangement.¹⁵⁴ Simply put, this exhibition presents an encyclopedic series of objects in an antiquarian fashion, effectively combining both models.

At the NAI's *Treasury*, a similar combination occurs, even if inversely created. With its other permanent exhibition the NAI presents a collection of antiquarian objects in an encyclopedic fashion. Specifically, the *Treasury* is composed by a hundred of the most prized masterpieces in the NAI's archive, all of which primarily selected by their aesthetic qualities as individual works of art. From Hendrik Petrus Berlage's 1880 Travel Sketchbook to Rem Koolhaas' 1990 study models for the *Kunsthal*, the NAI's vast archive was mined for the most beautiful objects representing the last 200 years of (mostly) Dutch architecture.¹⁵⁵ The selection includes drawings, photographs and models by the most famous names in Dutch architecture: from P.J.H. Cuypers to Mecanoo, from Theo van Doesburg and Cornelis van Eesteren to Rem Koolhaas. All the "treasures" displayed in this

¹⁵² Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, "Dutchville," *NAi*, accessed September 29, 2011, http://en.nai.nl/museum/exhibitions/current/item/_rp_kolom2-1_elementId/1_987780.

¹⁵³ Critical readings and exhaustive reviews of this exhibition have been sorely absent. Given that the reopening of the NAI and the renovation of its building was the focus of most reporting and discussion, the new permanent exhibition was almost completely eclipsed, only being addressed in passing. Nevertheless, even in her brief assessment, the displacement of serious scholarship by light entertainment was still noted by Tracy Metz, the longtime architecture critic of the daily newspaper *NRC Handelsblad*. The other (scarce) mentions of the exhibition that surfaced online, all but reproduced the NAI's original press release. See Tracy Metz, "Vernieuwde NAI Gaat Op de Belevingstoer," *NRC Handelsblad*, June 30, 2011.

¹⁵⁴ While the basic components of the exhibition echo the efforts of the encyclopedic-oriented Casas or Dufourny, their dramatic arrangement and complementary experiential atmosphere is much more akin to Sir John Soane's meticulously orchestrated narratives.

¹⁵⁵ New York based Asymptote, John Hejduk and Daniel Libeskind are the only foreign presences in the *Treasury* selection. However, while both Asymptote and John Hejduk are represented by projects created for the Netherlands (respectively the Beukenhof Crematorium and the Groningen Byehouse/Wallhouse #2), Daniel Libeskind's work is claimed to place "the position of Dutch architecture in perspective" with a conceptual model for an "Extention [sic] to the Victoria and Albert Museum." In reality, Daniel Libeskind's model was most likely purchased with his 1997 blockbuster exhibition "Beyond the Wall" at the NAI.

gallery are valued for the singularity of their expressive qualities as aesthetically pleasing objects, with the architectural ideas they were meant to represent being almost completely disregarded.

The antiquarian practice of judicious selection and approach to each object as an individual masterpiece is the starting point for this exhibition accommodated in the (previously unused) basement of the NAI building. Designed by Rem Koolhaas' Office for Metropolitan Architecture (OMA), the *Treasury* articulates almost a direct spatialization of the antiquarian approach to the architectural archive in which individual objects are valued for their exceptional nature, but also attempt to individually construct meaning. Specifically, the gallery was organized with a central circular area accommodating a combination of several objects, and a perimeter of individual booths displaying singular objects, with both displays being defined by translucent curtains. While the center alludes to the carefully constructed narratives of fascinating objects, the perimeter reveals the antiquarian organizing principle of fragmentation and focus. Along these walls, each object occupies a discrete booth which can also only accommodate one visitor at a time. Here, the exhibition and appreciation of the NAI's treasures is not only limited to one object at a time but it is also individualized. Both object and visitor are removed from their group and placed in a rapport where everything else is blocked out, compelling an individualized and individualizing creation of meaning. By negating any possibility of dialogue among artifacts, these booths appear to further reinforce a conception of the discipline as fragmented and autonomous architectural ideas.

The *Treasury* with its composition of carefully selected discrete fragments of the discipline is counteracted by the use of encyclopedic techniques for the constitution of a multivalent meaning through the construction of eloquent series. The emergence of meaning from the construction of series is first and foremost established by the NAI's own grouping of the "treasures" into six—rather ambiguous and general—themes (experimental, makeable, together, restrained, open, and curious). However, like other antiquarian assemblages, the NAI has attempted to overcome the

limitations of the selection by making the archive of the *Treasury* readily available to the construction of new themes by visitors. Specifically, on its website, the NAI has created a platform in which these treasures cannot just be navigated and organized through different parameters (city, location, theme, search word), but also invites users to compose their own themes and create new readings of these one hundred objects.¹⁵⁶ The online platform goes beyond merely replicating the online catalogues recently created by several selective collections (from the Sir John Soane Museum textual records to the Museum of Modern Art image-based online collection) and adds a wide array of functionality that incentivizes a greater degree of interaction from the cyber-visitor. With a simple registration anyone can create themes and display them at the NAI's online platform for others to peruse.¹⁵⁷ With this tool, the limitations of the *Treasury*'s narrow selection of objects and their discrete nature are thwarted by the alternative readings produced by the public. In short, NAI's *Treasury* displays an antiquarian collection of beautiful objects to which an encyclopedic accessibility and breadth of archive has been applied, thus integrating both approaches.

The integration of the encyclopedic breadth and critical depth approach is clearly articulated in the most recent pair of permanent exhibitions at the NAI. However, these two exhibitions only reflect the tendency towards greater convergence in the contemporary context of architecture museums. Like the diverse array of architecture museological institutions, at first glance, these two permanent exhibitions seem to be separated by their very approach to the public exhibition of architecture. *Dutchville*, like all encyclopedic breadth institutions, relies on meaning to be constituted from the relation between the different objects displayed (in this case, scale models),

¹⁵⁶ The English version of the *Treasury*'s accompanying online platform can be accessed at Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, "Treasures of the NAI," *Treasures of the NAI*, accessed August 26, 2012, <http://schatkamer.nai.nl/en>.

¹⁵⁷ At the time of this writing there were only 5 visitor-created themes, but which already demonstrated a range of diverging approaches and juxtapositions of the available treasures. While one user created a grouping dedicated to *De Stijl* and the work it influenced, another used assembled a collection of large urban planning projects, while another simply selected his favorites. <http://schatkamer.nai.nl/en/sets/>

while in the *Treasury*, as it is the case in critical depth collections, each individual artifact is presented as a discrete work of art. *Dutchville*, therefore, is apparently animated by architectural ideas that only emerge from the comparison of the different architectural models while the *Treasury's* primary focus is on the aesthetic qualities of each artifact on display. In short, *Dutchville* is driven by collecting principles, while the *Treasury* is determined by exhibiting standards.

A closer look, however, reveals how both *Dutchville* and the *Treasury* have assimilated procedures from the other, further integrating collection and exhibition. The collection-focused *Dutchville* was complemented with a greater concern for the actual exhibition and communication through the construction of clear narratives, while the exhibition-centered *Treasury* was supplemented with a greater interest in the inherent possibilities of its collection. Such convergence between encyclopedic breadth and critical depth, between collection and exhibition, also articulates how these exhibitions (and contemporary architecture museums) are actively attempting to engage both the interior and exterior of the discipline and (further) confound the boundaries between research and leisure.

Ultimately, the convergence of encyclopedic and critical expresses not just a renewed approach to the architectural archive, but also supports the thesis that rather than increasingly fragmented, the array of institutions intended on advancing the discipline through collection and exhibition are increasingly consolidated.

Architecture Museum without Walls

The convergence observed in the contemporary practice of architecture museums is not limited to exhibitions in galleries or collections in archives but is increasingly occurring in a territory that has consistently erased the boundaries of contemporary life: the digital realm. Virtual collections are quickly becoming not just a privileged territory for convergence between different approaches

to the architectural archive, but it will be in them that the distance between the two ends of the spectrum (encyclopedic and critical models) will be in time fully resolved.¹⁵⁸

Museums' collections (of architecture or otherwise) are already finding their way to the never-ending repository of the internet and being sublimated to digital signals, the cyber-collection is emerging as an important expression of the architectural archive. Either by simply digitizing their collections, or establishing new programs to further engage their (increasingly) removed audience, architecture museums have already begun to experiment with the possibilities afforded by this new virtual territory. The mere digitization of holdings is already leading to a reconsideration of the architectural archive in the digital realm, since "[t]he Internet now makes it possible to conceive of archives and collections as a vast network of material accessible from anywhere at any time."¹⁵⁹ Effectively, the translation (or migration) of the architectural archive to a digital format will make it much more accessible, albeit translated into visual or textual data.¹⁶⁰

Such democratization of access is already changing the perception and use of the archive, as institutions like the NAI, the CCA, the Sir John Soane Museum, or the MoMA (just to name a few) are actively encouraging the public to explore and interact with their collections in a virtual manner. Institutions that have previously sponsored diverging approaches to the archive are now converging on the reconceptualization of the architectural archive in the digital age, as practically all museums are engaged in projects to catalogue, describe, and digitize their holdings and thus

¹⁵⁸ As Information studies scholar Milton Mueller has indicated, the term convergence can be misleading, since rather than a combination of different modes of technologies, digital convergence "is really a take-over of all forms of media by one technology: digital computers." See Milton Mueller, "Digital Convergence and Its Consequences," *Javnost - The Public* 6, no. 3 (1999): 12.

¹⁵⁹ Zardini, "Exhibiting and Collecting Ideas: A Montreal Perspective," 83.

¹⁶⁰ Accessibility and engagement have also been the primary arguments defending the growing importance of a digital presence for museums. For an overview of the different approaches museums have adopted towards the constitution of virtual surrogates, see Michelle Henning, "New Media," in *A Companion to Museum Studies*, ed. Sharon Macdonald, Blackwell Companions in Cultural Studies 12 (Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 2006), 309.

make the architectural archive more accessible than ever before. Furthermore, there are already some indications that the digital realm will become an even greater leveler, further advancing the notion of convergence beyond merely encyclopedic and critical approaches, but also between (digitized) physical objects and digital-born material, blurring also the distinctions between museum and user-generated readings of the architectural archive.

The opportunities inherent to a sublimation of different material into a common format were most clearly articulated by French art theorist André Malraux in his proposition for a “Museum without Walls.”¹⁶¹ Primarily focusing on the possibilities for individualized interpretations of art derived from the physical emancipation of photographic reproduction, Malraux alludes to a never-ending archive which is not limited to what the “real museums” offer within their walls.¹⁶² Implicit in Malraux’s argument was also the creation of a networked structure of collaboration between different museums. The internet and complementary digital infrastructures are finally allowing for Malraux’s vision to be implemented in a large scale, even as bits of information displace photography as the common medium.

As with most prominent art museums, nascent digital efforts of architecture museums are influencing a reconsideration of the architectural archive. Since the architectural archive progresses towards a common language of 1s and 0s (that compose binary code), an abolition of previous distinctions in contemporary architecture museums is to be expected. In fact, both predominant approaches to the architectural archive that have structured museums and the conceptions of the discipline in the past two hundred years will soon become obsolete, as the architectural archive expands to greater breadths, inevitably demanding greater depths. While the full implications of the

¹⁶¹ André Malraux, *Museum without Walls*. (Garden City: Doubleday, 1967).

¹⁶² For a critical examination of the implications of the sublimation, particularly the end of medium-specificity, suggested by Malraux, see Hal Foster, “The Archive without Museums,” *October* 77 (July 1996): 97–119.

architectural archive's digital convergence cannot yet be fully known or understood, preliminary observations already indicate that the architectural archive will continue to define any efforts for the collection and public presentation of architecture. If originally architectural models and ideas liberated architectural ideas from the temporal and spatial confines imposed by construction, the ongoing digitization of the architectural archive will emancipate architectural ideas from the confines of the archive.

Tomorrow, as today, and as yesterday, the architecture museum will be defined by its relation to the architectural archive. Methods of both encyclopedic and critical approaches are assimilated and complemented in this digital convergence, further revealing the common structural framework of all contemporary architecture museums. In short, beyond accelerating the process of convergence, and demanding a new approach to the architectural archive, the digital realm once again reinforces the centrality of the archive in the definition of any architecture museum. Despite the differences of formats, effectively there is a singular (and increasingly so) conceptual definition of the architecture museum, a definition which still originates from the all-encompassing presence of the architectural archive, be it of individual artifacts, full collections, or digital representations.

2. THE CONSTRUCTION OF DISCOURSE: SOCIETIES OF ARCHITECTURE (1818-1921)

A main exhibition gallery, a spacious auditorium and meeting room, storage space for an archive, a library, a comfortable reading room, offices, and an appropriately tasteful entrance. This could have easily been the competition program for any of the several architecture museums and centers that were founded in the past thirty years, particularly the one published in 1987 for the multiple-commission for the building of the Netherlands Architecture Institute (NAi). However, these programmatic requirements were actually devised over a century earlier, in 1883, for the design competition of a new building for an Amsterdam architectural society.¹⁶³ Beyond the programmatic resemblance between the NAi building on Rotterdam's *Museumpark* and the facilities accommodating nineteenth-century architectural societies, these institutions also shared a common objective and employed similar methods to achieve it. Specifically, like the contemporary institute, these architectural societies aimed at the promotion of architecture through the construction of a dynamic architecture culture, primarily by facilitating (and at times directing) architectural discourse and debate. This situation would indelibly associate the construction of architectural discourse with a vigorous architecture cultural but also with an early museological initiative directed at architecture.

Modeled on the Enlightenment *salons* for polite debate, Dutch architectural societies used intellectual discussion and aesthetic appreciation to develop a growing awareness of architecture and an elevation of the status of the architect. The foundation of architectural societies in the mid 1800s marked an almost epistemological shift in Dutch architecture. For the first time in the

¹⁶³ A comparison reveals the programs to be almost identical, with the greatest distinction being the size of the areas stipulated. See C Muysken and C.T.J. Louis Rieber, "Prijzsvraag," *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 3, no. 44 (November 1, 1883): 280–281; Bernard Colenbrander and Ruud Brouwers, eds., *6 Designs for the Dutch Architectural Institute* (Amsterdam: Dutch Architectural Institute, 1988).

Netherlands, architecture discourse was purposefully fostered and instrumentalized, particularly in separating the abstract act of design and the material act of construction within architectural production.

The increased professionalization of architecture in the Netherlands was equally significant in the growing impulse to document and preserve architectural production in a museological archival setting. The different treatment afforded to these drawings and artifacts not only established a distinction between the budding class of architects from engineers and master-builders, but also allowed the most talented architects to claim a certain primacy over their less gifted peers. In this process, tensions were bound to occur, particularly with the emergence of opposing artistic and disciplinary approaches to architecture.

The emphasis on the intellectual, cultural, and artistic dimension of architecture favored the valuation of architectural processes over products, ideas over construction, and thus became an important instrument for architects. Arguing for conceptualization over materialization, architectural societies dematerialized architecture, allowing it to be recorded, collected and disseminated. Thus, much like a contemporary architecture museum, the construction of an ever expanding disciplinary archive laid at the foundation of these early architectural institutions' entire range of activities. Through design competitions, meetings, lectures, publications and exhibitions, these societies produced architectural discourse. However, these activities also established a particular context where the enunciation of architecture and its engagement with the general public became crucial for the discipline's own advancement, and with it, the foundation of an architecture museum was soon all but inevitable.

Previous Scholarship and other Resources

Previous scholarship on the nineteenth-century architecture societies established in Amsterdam is limited. However, there are two important volumes that present discrete overviews of both societies, albeit in different formats, and a few other volumes that address the architectural context in which these societies emerged.

The history of the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* (Society for the Promotion of Architecture) is the central component of *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap: Bevordering van de Bouwkunst in Nederland, 1775-1880* (Craft, Art, Science: Promotion of Architecture in Netherlands, 1775-1880).¹⁶⁴ This book is the result of Coert Peter Krabbe's doctoral research and traces the emergence of architecture as a discipline and as a profession in the Netherlands.¹⁶⁵ The importance of the foundation of the *Maatschappij* in 1842 in the creation of a Dutch architectural culture and the modern conception of an architect is expressed in the very organization of the book, as it divides the two sections of the book, namely before and after 1842. Organized thematically, Krabbe's thorough research questions for whom and for what the initiatives to advance architecture were taken, while methodically presenting the objectives, methods, and struggles of the society. Although the *Maatschappij* was only dissolved in 1918, Krabbe's study ends in 1880, when the society adopted new statutes that would change its focus irrevocably.

Although comprehensive in describing the activities of the *Maatschappij* and placing them in a wider context, there is still one significant limitation to this work. Namely, the relations of the *Maatschappij* with the other Amsterdam architecture society, the *Genootschap Architectura et*

¹⁶⁴ Coert Peter Krabbe, *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap: Bevordering van de Bouwkunst in Nederland (1775-1880)* (Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg, 1998).

¹⁶⁵ Krabbe conducted his doctoral research at the *Vrije Universiteit* in Amsterdam and defended his doctoral dissertation on May 13, 1997.

Amicitia (Society Architecture and Friendship), are all but ignored since Krabbe considered this society to be “less important than the *Maatschappij* and is therefore only mentioned in passing.”¹⁶⁶

While *Architectura et Amicitia* (or *A et A* as it was commonly known) was all but completely absent from *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap*, its activities and development had already been the subject of another book. Published in 1992, *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia: 1855-1990* was the result of an initiative of the—still existing—society to present its history in book form (intended to become *the* work of reference of the *A et A*'s history).¹⁶⁷ After financial difficulties had prevented the enlistment of the Universities of Amsterdam and Utrecht to the project, the *A et A* decided to proceed on its own and engaged the architecture historian Jeroen Schilt in 1988 (who later was assisted by Jouke van der Werf).¹⁶⁸ The result was a book chronicling the annals of the society, identifying all the important events, activities and facts of the *A et A*, but without placing them within a broader context.

The broad architectural context in which the two societies emerged and later affected, was the topic of Auke van der Woud's book *The Art of Building: From Classicism to Modernity: the Dutch Architectural Debate 1840-1990*, originally published in Dutch in 1997.¹⁶⁹ In *The Art of Building*, Woud presents and analyzes the different positions of the Dutch architectural debate, as well as their origins in the prevalent architectural theories of the time (primarily of French and German

¹⁶⁶ Krabbe, *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap*, 13. While until 1881 when it became a true rival to the *Maatschappij*, *Architectura et Amicitia* was still a much smaller organization, it had nevertheless strong connections to the *Maatschappij*, as most of its members were also associated with the *Maatschappij*.

¹⁶⁷ A thorough study of the *Architectura et Amicitia*'s history was quite necessary, since when the idea was first discussed in 1982, it was widely believed that the society had been founded in 1881 (when the *A et A* dramatically overhauled its statutes) and not in 1855. Jeroen Schilt and Jouke van der Werf, *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia: 1855-1990* (Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1992), 5.

¹⁶⁸ Schilt was among the first to use the recently opened reading room of the NAI, still in the NDB's former premises in the *Droogbak* in Amsterdam to consult the archives of *Architectura et Amicitia*. See Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, “NAi Jaarverslag 1989,” April 1990, bijlage 3: Raadplegen van Archiven en Collecties.

¹⁶⁹ Auke Woud, *The Art of Building: From Classicism to Modernity: The Dutch Architectural Debate 1840-1990* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001). Woud was also the primary advisor for Coert Peter Krabbe's doctoral dissertation

origins which the original Dutch title already indicated as “Truth and Character”). Woud’s work is particularly complementary to the volumes presenting the two architecture societies, however, since it is concerned with broader theoretical debates, only incidentally addressing the museum-like activities of the two architectural societies.

Although these secondary sources provided significant insight into the two Amsterdam architectural societies and their context, research for this (and the next chapter) relied primarily on authoritative primary sources. Nineteenth-century architectural journals are the most important resource in studying the construction of a Dutch architectural discourse and the activities of the two major societies of architecture involved. While the *Maatschappij* published one of the first journals of architecture in the Netherlands, with its efforts, it created a context in which several other architectural periodicals emerged. These journals presented not only the debates of the day, but also provided significant information of the activities of the societies.

Beyond the *Maatschappij*’s own *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* (1842-1881) which in 1881 became the duo of periodicals *Bouwkundig Tijdschrift* (1881-1908) and *Bouwkundig Weekblad* (1881-1927), there were also *De Opmerker* (1866-1919), the *A et A*’s own *Architectura* (1893-1926), and *De Bouwwereld* (1902-1924). A thorough literature review of all these volumes was greatly facilitated by consulting the digitized copies of these architectural journals made available on the website of TU Delft’s library.¹⁷⁰ However, there is one flagrant omission in TU Delft’s extensive collection of digitized historical architectural journals, as *De Bouwwereld* is not included in its holdings. Since it was in *De Bouwwereld* that Willem Leliman (who had actually founded that weekly journal) most forcefully advocated for the establishment of an architecture museum in the Netherlands, reviewing

¹⁷⁰ The digitization of these journals was made possible by a collaboration of four architecture libraries, namely those of the *Monumentenzorg*, the NAI, TU Eindhoven, and TU Delft. “Architectuurtijdschriften,” *TU Delft*, accessed October 11, 2012, <http://tresor.tudelft.nl/tijdschrift/>.

this particular journal was especially germane for this research, and that work was done in the NAI library.

The reports and writings of C.T.J. Louis Rieber were another fundamental resource into understanding how early Dutch architectural societies operated as proto-architecture museums. As the first paid secretary of the *Maatschappij*, Rieber was tasked to write the reports of the society's meetings, competitions, exhibitions and other events (from 1881 onwards). Furthermore, Rieber was also the first chronicler of the society, as to commemorate the first fifty years of the Society for the Promotion of Architecture, he was tasked to write an overview. *De Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst van 1842 tot 1892* was the result of his efforts, in which the first fifty years of activities and organization of the society were dutifully described (corroborated by the accounts found in the architectural journals from the same period).

Together these primary and secondary sources establish the basis for the historical research in this chapter. By emphasizing the vital importance of these nineteenth-century architectural societies in the construction of an architectural discourse, the new approach to this material provides an added perspective to our understanding of the architectural culture of the period. Furthermore, with the exception of the Auke van der Woud's book which was also published in English, all the other sources used in this chapter were consulted in Dutch.

Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst

In the Netherlands, there was one society in particular which was responsible for the creation of architectural discourse: the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* (Society for the

Promotion of Architecture), simply known as the *Maatschappij*.¹⁷¹ Since its foundation in 1842, the *Maatschappij* attempted to promote architecture, elevate its quality, and cultivate the taste of patrons and the general public to a productive appreciation of the discipline's cultural and social dimensions. To a large extent, the issues surrounding the creation of the society were similar to the issues that almost 150 years later would lead to the foundation of the NAI. Moreover, "[t]he *Maatschappij* was the first in the Netherlands to argue in a systematic manner the necessity for a separation between design and implementation of any given building, where design should be the domain of the professional and theoretical savvy architect."¹⁷² Thus, the *Maatschappij* was intended, and positioned itself, as a platform for architectural debate, promoting and advancing architecture by engaging in several activities that would later become a staple of modern architecture museums.

However, the society became characterized by its dual character, in which it promoted architecture in an inclusive manner by being open to any person interested in the discipline, but was in many ways exclusive in its fierce advocacy of the architects' role in society. As a result, by stimulating architectural debate, the *Maatschappij's* activities and policies, for all effects, single handedly created an architectural discourse in the Netherlands, which up until then was all but negligible.

Foundation and Precedents

The initiative to constitute a (new) society dedicated to the promotion of architecture was first taken by architect and journalist Johannes van Straaten, who organized an initial meeting in

¹⁷¹ The *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* has been translated into English as both the "Society for the Promotion of Architecture" and the "Society for the Advancement of Architecture," by several authors. Here the English translation utilized by the NAI is followed, namely as the "Society for the Promotion of Architecture." Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, "Archives and Collections."

¹⁷² Krabbe, *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap*, 116.

December 17, 1841 to discuss this proposal with some friends and fellow architects.¹⁷³ Little over a month later, in January 26, 1842, the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* was officially founded in a rented room at the Odeon building in Amsterdam.¹⁷⁴ It had only taken three meetings for the founders of the society to draft the regulations and statutes of the new organization, envisioning activities and objectives, but also defining membership fees and benefits.

The society had great ambitions for the future of architecture not only in Amsterdam, but also in other provinces. The recent peace with the newly formed Kingdom of Belgium had ushered a renewed optimism, leading Amsterdam's intellectual and cultural elite to become convinced that, with the war over, the arts would again thrive.¹⁷⁵ Moreover, given the king's well known interest in the arts, they believed that the government would take an active role in such renaissance. Nevertheless, there was also pessimism with its present condition. War-time had refocused the priorities of construction on pragmatic concerns, greatly limiting any aesthetic or cultural ambitions for this occupation. In fact, architects were a rarity in the world of construction, as most of the buildings being erected in Amsterdam were designed and supervised by master-builders and engineers. Architecture was perceived as a craft or a science, but not as an artistic endeavor. There was a general discontent among the restricted circle of architects (mostly educated abroad) with the lack of any acceptable artistic consideration of the current building production.

As far as architects were concerned, architectural culture was completely nonexistent, since there was no organized architectural education or scholarship in the Netherlands. The society intended to fill that gap in a way that could actively demonstrate and advocate the intrinsic merits

¹⁷³ C.T.J. Louis Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892* (Amsterdam: Van Munster Zoon, 1892), 19.

¹⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 20. The Odeon building would only remain the Society's first base of operations for a brief period since with the fast growth of members a more ample space was necessary to accommodate all the participants of the society's meetings.

¹⁷⁵ The treaty of London that officially ended the hostilities between both belligerents was signed in 1839.

of ‘fine architecture’ in which the craft of building and the science of engineering were directed to the fulfillment of artistic forms.¹⁷⁶ The time had come to not only improve the design quality of buildings, but also for architects to assert their skills and expertise, establishing a distinction between the refined art of architecture, and other (lower) forms of construction.

Even once the distinction between architects, engineers and master-builders had been firmly established, the architectural archive continued to provide an essential territory for claiming distinctions. At the turn of the twentieth century, with the rise of demand for architectural expertise and the professionalization of architectural practice in the Netherlands, the architectural archive became a fundamental instrument in differentiating both talent and ambition among architects.¹⁷⁷ Since it is original ideas translated into drawings that primarily set architects apart, this condition also resulted in a notable change of attitude towards the archive itself, where the entire process of architectural design—where ideas were created and developed—was to be preserved, and not merely its final drawing. Furthermore, as the most talented and savvy architects stood out, their built work also experienced an increase of notoriety, thus leading to the need and interest to preserve the entire archive in which the development of the architectural idea (from early sketch, to working drawing, to final render) was documented.

The constitution of the *Maatschappij* was openly modeled on the artists association established a couple of years earlier in 1839: the *Maatschappij Arti et Amicitiae* (simply known as *Arti*).¹⁷⁸ The

¹⁷⁶ The expression ‘fine architecture’ (directly translated from the Dutch “*schone architectuur*”) was commonly used by the members of early Dutch architecture societies with a double purpose. Firstly, it served to distinguish architecture designed by architects (with clear artistic and intellectual considerations) from the construction done by master-builders, and secondly to associate architecture with the other more established fine arts (in Dutch “*schone kunsten*”) of painting and sculpture.

¹⁷⁷ For an overview of the professionalization of architecture practice in other countries, see Barrington Kaye, *The Development of the Architectural Profession in Britain: A Sociological Study* (London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1960); Spiro Kostof, ed., *The Architect: Chapters in the History of the Profession* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000).

¹⁷⁸ Woud, *The Art of Building*, 43.

connection between both societies was significant, as several people served in the board of both organizations (often at the same time), and there was a considerable overlap of members.

Unsurprisingly, the *Maatschappij* adopted an organization akin to that of *Arti*, as both were devised as national organizations, with headquarters in Amsterdam and with corresponding members throughout the Netherlands.¹⁷⁹

While the inspiration on *Arti* was openly acknowledged, the founding members of the *Maatschappij* went to great lengths to distance themselves from the inevitable influence of another organization: the *Maatschappij tot Aanmoediging der Bouwkunde* (Society for the Encouragement of Architecture). Operating from 1818 to 1830, the *Maatschappij tot Aanmoediging* was the first society to be founded in Amsterdam dedicated to the promotion and rational discussion of architecture, and its legacy was still very much present in the minds of the founding members of the *Maatschappij*. It would be hard not too, since the *Maatschappij* shared some influential founding members with the extinct society, most notably Johannes van Straaten and the architecture dilettante and entrepreneur D.D. Büchler, who were, respectively president and secretary of the *Maatschappij tot Aanmoediging* when it came to an end. Perhaps due to the direct involvement of such prominent members of the previous society, in the very first meeting in December 1841, it was agreed among the founders of the *Maatschappij* that the new society would not be a continuation of the former.¹⁸⁰

Even as the founding members of the *Maatschappij* attempted to distance the newly founded society from the architectural society which preceded it, the continuity between both seemed to be as inevitable as implicit. Not only were the organizers of the new society given access to the

¹⁷⁹ Some corresponding members also had logistical responsibilities, namely for collecting dues and distributing publications within the different regions.

¹⁸⁰ Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 20.

documentation, registries and archives from the *Maatschappij tot Aanmoediging* by Büchler, but some important projects also transited between both organizations. Most notably, and despite the twelve year interregnum between the end of the *Maatschappij tot Aanmoediging* in 1830 and the founding of the *Maastchappij* in 1842, the last architectural competition devised in 1830 by the *Maatschappij tot Aanmoediging* (and to which no designs had been submitted) for a theater in a city of 200,000 inhabitants, was carried out as the first competition of the *Maastchappij*.¹⁸¹ But the larger indication of the implicit continuity between both organizations was in fact quite explicit, as the self-explanatory name of these societies is practically interchangeable. *Aanmoediging* and *Bevordering* may be different words, but they share the same meaning.¹⁸²

While the founders were right and the *Maastchappij* should not be characterized as a continuation of the preceding association since it engaged with architecture in several new fronts, its influence should also not be minimized. It could, however, be argued that the accumulated experience from the failed *Maatschappij tot Aanmoediging* was fundamental in quickly establishing the new society and ensuring its immediate success. Rather than a continuation, the *Maatschappij* should be understood as an expansion of the previous society, as it refined and expanded some key features of the *Maatschappij tot Aanmoediging*, and in the process made the new society much sharper and more effective. Most notably, the new *Maatschappij* organized competitions, but modified them significantly from its predecessor. Namely, while the old competitions were only for

¹⁸¹ Ibid., 2.

¹⁸² The meaning of these words is so close that both societies' names have been translated to English as "Society for the Promotion of Architecture" by different authors. Namely Krabbe has translated the *Maatschappij tot Aanmoediging der Bouwkunde* as the "Society for the Advancement of Architecture" and the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* as the "Society for the Encouragement of Architecture" in the English summary of his book, while Oxenaar has translated the name of the 1818 society as the "Society for the Encouragement of Architecture" and the name of the 1842 society as the "Society for the Promotion of Architecture." See Krabbe, *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap*, 294. and Aart Oxenaar, "Solutions to a Persistent Dilemma: Nineteenth Century," in *Style: Standard and Signature in Dutch Architecture of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, ed. Bernard Colenbrander (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1993), 26.

large monumental (mostly public) buildings and open to established architects, the new competitions were divided into different categories, ranging from simple design tasks to complex monumental buildings, while also being directed to young emerging talent. The *Maatschappij* not only expanded the scope of competitions, but also intended to engage in other complementary activities for the promotion of architecture. The organization of public lectures and the publication of a journal, which had not previously been under the purview of the first society, allowed the *Maatschappij* to effectively expand the scope of the original *Maatschappij tot Aanmoediging*. Every failure brings success closer, and the accumulated knowledge from the failed *Maatschappij tot Aanmoediging der Bouwkunde* was certainly instrumental in the success of the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst*.

Despite the inherent influences (acknowledged or not) from these Dutch institutions, the founders of the *Maatschappij* intended to emulate in the Netherlands the recent, yet notable, foreign architects association such as the 1834 Royal Institute of British Architects (RIBA) in London or the 1824 *Architekten-Verein* (Architects Club) in Berlin.¹⁸³ Like those associations, the *Maatschappij* was committed to champion architecture by disseminating and normalizing the image of the professional architect. Likewise, the *Maatschappij* would also be particularly active in the early architecture museological activities in the Netherlands.

Membership

The demand for a society dedicated to the discussion and promotion of architecture in those days in Amsterdam is supported by the staggering amount of members it was able to amass in a very short period. After only one year, in 1843, 520 people were already enrolled members of the

¹⁸³ Krabbe, *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap*, 122.

Maatschappij, eventually reaching its highest membership in 1870, when it counted over 1100 members.¹⁸⁴

Continuing the tradition of eighteenth-century societies, the *Maatschappij* employed an open membership policy, welcoming not only architects and dilettantes, but also other people involved in the construction industry, “regardless of rank or position,” with the only condition being that the applicant had to be over sixteen years of age.¹⁸⁵ While being an inclusive organization for both practitioners and “supporters” of architecture, the percentage of members who were not architects or professionally involved with architecture or construction, remained very low.¹⁸⁶ Their contribution to the society also remained very modest with few exceptions even though any member, architect or not, could participate in the discussions of the board.¹⁸⁷

There were several changes to the classes of members as the society evolved, but the greatest distinction among its members was between ordinary and honorary members, which remained mostly unchanged. Ordinary members were Dutch and required to pay dues, while honorary membership was offered to prominent foreign contributors to architectural discourse.

While having to pay dues, ordinary members of the society received some benefits from their financial support. Not only were they granted free entry to the meetings, discussions, lectures, and exhibitions organized by the society, but they could also participate in the *Maatschappij's*

¹⁸⁴ This number becomes even more impressive when it is considered that at its height, the previous *Maatschappij tot Aanmoediging der Bouwkunde* only had 400 members in both the Netherlands and Belgium (then the Southern Provinces of the Netherlands). See *Ibid.*, 116.

¹⁸⁵ Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 40. While anyone over sixteen years old could become a member, only those over twenty-one could actually cast their vote on the society's collective decisions.

¹⁸⁶ Krabbe, *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap*, 117.

¹⁸⁷ Undoubtedly, the most prominent architecture-outsider to contribute to the *Maatschappij* was the insurance broker D.D. Büchler who, despite his reluctance, became the first president of the society.

competitions, while also receiving significant reductions for their subscription of the society's journal, as well as free copies of other books and collections published by the society.

Honorary members were appointed as a way to cultivate and elevate the architectural discourse within the society. Often, the board of the *Maatschappij* (who had the power to appoint honorary members) would invite these prominent figures after lively in-house debates of their contributions to the state of architecture. The honor of the invitation was usually reciprocated by the new members with generous gifts to the society's library. As long time secretary and early chronicler of the *Maatschappij* C.T.J. Louis Rieber put it, "one only needs to glance at the names in the list [of honorary members] to recognize them from the history books of architecture of the first half of this [nineteenth] century." The list mentioned by Rieber includes Thomas Leverton Donaldson (1847), Eugène Emmanuel Viollet-le-Duc, Gottfried Semper (1863), Pierre François Henri Labrouste (1865), Karl Bötticher (1870), and César Daly.¹⁸⁸ The constitution of the *Maatschappij's* international republic of architecture would even welcome honorary members from as far as Portugal and Italy.

But the constitution of a veritable republic of architecture was also accomplished within the borders of the Netherlands. Beginning with several individual correspondent members throughout the Netherlands, by 1850 the *Maatschappij* adapted its model to accommodate semi-independent departments in cities with over twelve members, further reinforcing the national reach of the Amsterdam-based society.¹⁸⁹ From Rotterdam in 1850 to Utrecht in 1870, several new departments were founded, with the most active departments organizing their own meetings and exhibitions, as

¹⁸⁸ Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 44–45.

¹⁸⁹ It was even proposed that the members of these regional branches of the *Maatschappij* would not have to necessarily remain connected to the national society in Amsterdam. See Krabbe, *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap*, 117.

well as contributing with articles for the *Maatschappij's* journal.¹⁹⁰ The full embrace of correspondent members would only come in 1880, when for the first time, members living outside of Amsterdam were appointed to the board of the society.¹⁹¹ With the integration of newly established regional divisions and corresponding members, the society's reach became wider, of a truly national reach, but neither the society, nor architecture, became necessarily more visible to the larger public.

Objectives and Activities

The principal objective of the *Maatschappij* was clearly identified in the name of the society: the promotion of architecture. Such lofty goal was further elaborated in the *Maatschappij's* foundational bylaws, where it was stated in its first article that, "by all available means within its reach [the *Maatschappij*] is to cultivate and promote civil architecture in all its subjects and subdivisions, including water and defense construction."¹⁹² While the declared objective of the society was to raise the profile of architecture, it seemed implicit that it was also committed to raise the status of architects—and of its members in particular—and to establish its market for services.¹⁹³

One of the primary tasks in raising the profile of architecture was to advocate that architecture was an artistic endeavor, an endeavor which merited serious debate and consideration beyond mere technical concerns. For the *Maatschappij*, it became crucial to disseminate the idea that architecture required an intrinsic artistic dimension. Moreover, the promotion of architecture was seen to be particularly germane, since during the preceding decades, building in the Netherlands

¹⁹⁰ The proposal for granting greater autonomy to the regional divisions was initiated by the Rotterdam branch.

¹⁹¹ Even though the earliest proposal for the appointment of non-Amsterdammers to the board of the *Maatschappij* dates back to 1870, that only became possible with the 1880 amendment, after which four seats of the board were reserved for members living outside Amsterdam. T. Sanders, "Verslag van de 41ste Algemeene Vergadering (gehouden Op Donderdag 30 September 1880, in Het Lokaal van de Vereeniging Te s'Gravenhage)," *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* 26, bijlage I (1881): 43–44.

¹⁹² Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 31.

¹⁹³ Woud, *The Art of Building*, 43.

had been primarily approached as a rather pragmatic exercise of functionality and economics, with its cultural and social dimension all but completely disregarded. Since the prevailing view on buildings, and the inevitable prioritization of war time, had not considered aesthetic or artistic reflections to be fundamental to architecture, the majority of construction was by then completed by master-builders (who constructed and designed most of the civil structures) and increasingly by engineers (primarily responsible for public works, including water and defense structures). It was the conviction of the society that the craft of master-builders and the science of engineers could only create buildings, but in order to create architecture, it was necessary to allow the art of the architect to guide both craft and science.

Up until the foundation of the Delft Polytechnic in 1865, there was no formal architecture education in the Netherlands. The majority of Dutch architects had either completed programs in architecture schools abroad (most notably, in France and Germany) from which they imported the latest positions on architecture theory and history, or followed apprenticeships in architecture studios. The self-esteem of architects was so associated with theory, history, and aesthetics that once architecture training was established in the Delft Polytechnic, the program was greatly criticized for its emphasis on technical over artistic and theoretical courses, fearing that architecture could be reduced to mere technology.¹⁹⁴

If architecture was an art, then its practitioners would be expected to exercise an amount of artistic freedom in their designs. This would also favor the specific skills and expertise of the architect (over the master-builder and the engineer), since only the architect was familiar with the history and theory of the discipline, that is, only the architect possessed the necessary knowledge to competently pursue an artistic freedom that remained true to architecture's essential principles

¹⁹⁴ Ibid., 77.

and was not lost in superficial trappings. The intrinsic connection between the promotion of architecture and the elevation of the architect was central to the activities of the society, and its pursuit of the promotion of architecture became “tantamount to giving theoretical knowledge to members and promoting their design skills.”¹⁹⁵

In order to raise the status of architecture, not only a distinction but also a hierarchy needed to be established between architects, master-builders and engineers. The distinction to engineers was almost self-evident, as this class was mostly occupied with the construction of utilitarian structures, primarily dedicated to defense and water management. The distinction to master-builders, however, was more crucial and needed to be much more forcefully stated. Master-builders had long been responsible for the design and construction of structures to which architects now laid claims. Thus, it was necessary to clearly articulate the difference in competences between architects and master-builders, not only in their specific skills and background, but also how these differences would inevitably become expressed in a distinct materialization of architecture. Accordingly, it was claimed that while master-builders were certainly competent at construction, and were able to (seemingly) design in different architectural idioms, they lacked the capacity to critically inquire the values of architecture. Above all, master-builders could crib from any style, but these remained cursory copies that were unable to reveal the truth in architecture and properly articulate its underlying ideas.

This much was argued in the first issue of the *Maatschappij's* journal, where the construction of buildings without fully understanding their “meaning, purpose, origin and development” was compared to a “physician who prescribes medication without understanding its effect,” and that both should be aptly considered “charlatans.”¹⁹⁶ Therefore, it became fundamental for the

¹⁹⁵ Krabbe, *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap*, 121.

¹⁹⁶ I. Warnsinck, “Voorrede,” *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* 1, no. 1 (1843): VI.

Maatschappij to clearly and unequivocally establish the distinction between the intellectual act of architecture and the mere material act of construction. At the foundation of the modern profession of architect in the Netherlands, laid the basic notion that an architect was not a builder.

Further supporting the role of the architect, and the inherent benefits of building with an artistic consideration, was the increasing awareness that architecture played a fundamental role in a cultivated society since it contributed to the edification of the general public. The art of building was not merely an exercise of functional shelter, but rather a cultural endeavor in which the refinement of a society was reflected. It meant that architecture had a cultural depth beyond the thickness of its walls, and the length of its spaces. It was through these latent ideas and concepts that buildings engaged with other architectural objects and whose discourse needed to be both considered and expressed.

The trump up the architect's sleeve was the clear understanding of architectural history and the correct use of architectural theory in the design of new structures. In order to accentuate such decisive trump, it was necessary to further educate and inform the—rather limited—class of architects, but also to make the general public aware of the value of such distinction. In short, the promotion of architecture's intrinsic intellectual and cultural dimension, in which the distinction between architects and master-builder relied, depended on architecture history and theory making a difference. The artistic and cultural added value of the architect's work had to prove its worth in the everyday practice of architecture and construction.¹⁹⁷ As architecture's artistic qualities needed to be reaffirmed, and its status elevated through the rational discussion of its theoretical and cultural depth, it became a real necessity for the *Maatschappij* to nurture and develop what was until then missing: architectural debate and discourse.

¹⁹⁷ Woud, *The Art of Building*, 47.

Relying on the separation and primacy of the abstract act of design and the material act of construction, the emerging discourse would inevitably focus its debates on processes rather than products of architecture. The review and formal analysis of buildings were only as important as their reflection of a correct articulation of latent architectural theories and ideas.

The French theory of “architectural character” and the German conception of “architectural truth” were the two predominant architectural theories presented and discussed by the society. Developed at length by the French architectural theorists Nicolas Le Camus de Mézières and Antoine-Chrysostome Quatremère De Quincy, the notion of “character” in architecture was based in a “socially coordinated systems of conventions” that revealed meaning through form, ornamentation and location, implying that buildings were markers of history which revealed the social and cultural context of their production.¹⁹⁸ The aesthetic concept of truth was most forcefully advocated by the German architect Heinrich Hübsch, who contended that the exterior expression of any building should truthfully express its inner structure and logic, or the higher truth of architecture. Accordingly, architectural truth implied that a building’s construction and decoration should be consistent with one another. While the aesthetic theory of character was related to the senses and feelings, the conception of truth was more closely associated with reason.

By discussing the differences between these competing aesthetic conceptions, as well as probing the depths of style and artistic decisions, architectural debate was to be elevated beyond the pedestrian discussion of technical and constructional advances and enable an appreciation of the formal expression and appropriateness of building designs, all enveloped by the increasing

¹⁹⁸ For a discussion of the theory of character in architecture see Lavin, *Quatremère De Quincy and the Invention of a Modern Language of Architecture*.

awareness of the concrete social task of architecture.¹⁹⁹ The promotion of architecture involved the advancement of the professional architect and the construction of an architectural discourse.

The *Maatschappij's* efforts to promote architecture relied on different instruments, which were identified in the foundational statutes of the organization. The society's instruments involved reinforcing the centrality of the constitution of an archive of architectural ideas, but also further reinforcing a systematic enunciation of the discipline to a wider audience. Without ever uttering the phrase architecture museum, the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* developed an impressive apparatus in the service of architecture, rivaled only by modern architecture museological institutions.

A central component for the promotion of the *Maatschappij's* conception of architecture was the publication of an architectural journal since, inevitably, the construction of any discourse demanded a basic infrastructure for the exchange, documentation and dissemination of ideas. The general intention to establish a periodical was already stated in the foundational charter of the society, but only became detailed when the *Maatschappij* announced its intention to publish *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* and invited its members to contribute articles. Merely a few months later, in August 1842, the first issue of the journal was already being distributed to subscribers.

While *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* may not have been the first journal dedicated to architecture in Dutch, it was certainly the first journal dedicated to Dutch architecture.²⁰⁰ The *Maatschappij's*

¹⁹⁹ It was increasingly pervasive the idea that architecture did not only provide shelter, but also fulfilled a specific social task of expressing the values and refinement of a society. Similarly to the accepted theory of "architectural character," there was a growing popular understanding that only proper architecture could provide a suitable representation of a building's function and social relevance within the city.

²⁰⁰ From 1834 to 1839, the journal *Nederlandsch Bouwkunstig Magazijn en Tijdschrift tot verbetering, nut en voordeel in de bouw-, timmer-, beeldhouwkunst en meubelering, benevens onderscheidene kunsten en ambachten, daarmede in betrekking staande* was published in Dutch, but it primarily consisted of a translation into Dutch of articles published in the English journal *Architectural Magazine and Journal of Improvement in Architecture, Building and Furnishing and the various Arts and Trades connected therewith*. Shortly after the foundation of the *Maatschappij*, P.J. Schooneveld, the publisher of *Nederlandsch Bouwkunstig Magazijn en*

journal would fulfill a decisive role in the creation of a Dutch architectural culture and discourse. It not only introduced the most prominent architectural debates from around Europe to a Dutch audience (primarily through the translation of significant theoretical articles from foreign publications), but it cultivated the use of these theoretical precepts in a critical assessment of Dutch architectural production. Theories of architecture were not only introduced in abstract terms, but were also applied in the review of unrealized projects, recently completed structures and historical monuments in the Netherlands. Moreover, it repeatedly published articles authored by the *Maatschappij's* members, often in response to what they had read in previous issues. Such combination allowed *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* to operate as a crucial node where architectural theory became more tangible, that is, architectural theory was rendered into more concrete terms. It was like the journal operated as a translation device for architectural theory, translating words into the Dutch language, but most importantly, translating concepts and ideas into the Dutch context.

The main editorial lines of the journal and its thematic priorities were clearly detailed in the preface to the first issue by, then secretary of the society and early editor of *Bouwkundige Bijdragen*, Isaac Warnsinck.²⁰¹ While advancements of “construction techniques” merited a specific section, the remaining sections of the journal were, unsurprisingly, to be dedicated to issues more germane to the artistic appreciation of architecture. “[A]rchitectural criticism, architectural history and aesthetics, as well as descriptions and images of old and new buildings,” were the other focal points of the publication, and would take up the bulk of its pages.²⁰² Unsurprisingly, articles submitted by members were evaluated and recommended for publication based on artistic talent and knowledge

Tijdschrift, suggested that the society might adopt his publication as its journal, which the board politely refused. See Krabbe, *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap*, 123.

²⁰¹ Warnsinck, “Voorrede.”

²⁰² Krabbe, *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap*, 122.

of architectural history and theory, since it was considered that buildings that “lack[ed] any character and expression, belong[ed] to the field of human follies.”²⁰³ Naturally, these sections were crucial in the development of the journal, since these served to generate lively debates regarding the merits of Dutch projects, while also further reinforcing the primacy of architectural theory and history in the contemporary design task.

A typical issue of *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* was approximately sixty pages long, of which about a third was dedicated to articles and discussions on history and theory. The influence of foreign architectural theory in stimulating architectural discourse in the Netherlands was set from the journal’s very first volume, as it included the Dutch translation of the entry “Theory and Practice” from the recently published *Baulexikon* (Encyclopedia on the Art of Building) by the German architect and writer C.F. von Ehrenberg, an essay on the application of the architectural theory of character to country manors by the Austria-based Karl Etzel and the translation of the first article of a series presenting an “Overview of the History and Development of Architecture at the Different Nations of the Earth,” appropriately dedicated to Egyptian architecture and also translated from German.²⁰⁴

While initially most contributions on history and theory were translations from foreign articles, soon also the *Maatschappij* members were adding to the discussion. In the first 1865 issue of *Bouwkundige Bijdragen*, the translation of texts by Eugène Viollet-le-Duc and César Daly were

²⁰³ Warnsinck, “Voorrede,” VI.

²⁰⁴ The *Baulexikon* was over 4,000 pages long and was divided into four volume with entries on “the most common technical and artistic expressions” in architecture, while the “Overview of the History and Development of Architecture” was composed by thirteen articles (five published in the first year) which beyond Egyptian architecture also included Greek and Roman architecture. C.F. von Ehrenberg, “Theorie En Praktijk,” *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* 1 (1843): 48–51; Karl Etzel, “Over de Inrigting En Karakter van Landhuizen,” *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* 1 (1843): 1–10; “Overzicht van de Geschiedenis En Ontwikkeling Der Bouwkunst Bij de Verschillende Volken Der Aarde: I. De Egyptische Bouwkunst,” *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* 1 (1843): 25–34.

published side by side with consideration on the status and current condition 'fine architecture' by two of the most vocal architects in the fledgling Dutch architectural discourse, Willem Nicolaas Rose and Johannes Hermanus (Jan) Leliman.²⁰⁵ Combined, these four articles revealed how far architectural discussion in the Netherlands had come since the first issue of the *Maatschappij's* journal, as the writings of celebrated foreign contributors were complemented by an appreciation of their implications by Dutch authors.

The translation of foreign texts on architecture theory, the discussion of its application to the Dutch context, and the dissemination of the most recent understanding of architectural history were the main instruments through which *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* educated its readership on history and theory. However, the underlying presence of architectural theory and history also permeated other sections of the journal, particularly the presentation and analysis of new constructions. Both Dutch and foreign buildings were examined in the journal's "Building Reports," combining drawings (plans, sections and elevations) and a critical assessment of the presented structure in regard to the presence of history and theory in its formal expression (particularly regarding the prevalent theories of architectural 'truth' and 'character'). *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* were completed with technical articles on new construction methods and materials (usually limited to five or six pages per issue) and a section dedicated to current events, which included the *Maatschappij's* announcements, letters to the editor, and recent news from the Netherlands and abroad.

²⁰⁵ Rose was a forceful proponent that the architect was only bound by aesthetic considerations and was not burdened by "political, religious or ethnic ideologies or symbols" while Leliman similarly defended individual artistic freedom, but favored an ahistorical eclectic approach to architecture, in which past architecture was not merely perpetuated or imitated, but interpreted and transformed. See Auke van der Woud, "Post-Classicism, and Classicism in Disguise: The 1850s," in *The Art of Building: From Classicism to Modernity: The Dutch Architectural Debate 1840-1990* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), 27-44.

The benefits of a serialized publication devoted to architecture were expounded in the same preface, namely, the multitude of opinions and voices afforded by the journal format, as well as the possible dialogue created from its serialization. Moreover, the frequency inherent to the publication of a journal allowed for the latest and most pressing issues to be discussed just as they were developing, providing critical and salient contributions to the contemporary design practice. Overall, the constitution of the journal was associated with the dissemination (and inherently documentation) of architectural knowledge.

The importance attributed to the journal by the *Maatschappij* was clear from the numerous contributions to articles by prominent board members of the society, but also by their continuous suggestions to its editorial practices. However, the unquestionable significance of the journal was most clearly expressed in the society's balance sheets, as *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* was by far, and quite consistently, the activity to which the *Maatschappij* allocated the largest portion of its annual budget.²⁰⁶ Published as an illustrated folio with folding lithographs depicting details of buildings and other structures, the costs of publication were simply excessive to the funds provided by subscriptions alone. Therefore, in order to guarantee the publication of the journal at a level deemed adequate, the *Maatschappij* was required to complement the *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* subscription proceeds with funds from the society's general operating budget.

Despite a rather irregular publication schedule of three or four times a year, the influence of *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* in the creation and development of a Dutch architectural discourse can hardly be overestimated. With a steady circulation of approximately one thousand exemplars, the journal was the primary instrument for the dissemination of architectural ideas in both space and time. It not only collected architectural theory from across Europe and distributed to the twelve

²⁰⁶ Krabbe, *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap*, 124.

provinces, but also created a record of different positions within the architectural debate at different periods in time. Thus, beyond dissemination of architectural knowledge, *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* also allowed for the necessary documentation of said knowledge, allowing it to reach later generations of architects.

By focusing on the topics of architectural theory and history, the journal would greatly assist in the society's objective of promoting architecture and elevate the status of the architect knowledgeable of architectural history and adept in architectural theory above the ranks of simple master-builders. Therefore, *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* would foster the development of a Dutch architectural culture in which the intellectual and cultural dimension of architecture were to be fundamental in the appreciation of the built environment. In fact, the "most substantial contribution of the Society to the development of Dutch architecture in the 1842-1880 period was the spread of ideas [on architecture theory and history], and on forms developed based on such concepts."²⁰⁷

Beyond establishing an efficient infrastructure for the dissemination of architectural knowledge, the *Maatschappij* was also preoccupied with the production of architectural knowledge. Architectural discourse, as it was, required an archive, and the society would soon engage in comprehensive surveys of buildings in Amsterdam and beyond. Such endeavor would have inevitable practical and conceptual implications.

On a conceptual level, if *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* served to give architectural theory concrete forms and indicate material expression, the survey of historical buildings would serve to distill concrete forms and material expression into appropriate architectural theories and establish historical lineages. Simply by thoroughly documenting these buildings, the portability of architectural ideas was being confirmed, since even after these monuments had long been

²⁰⁷ Ibid., 175.

destroyed, their underlying architectural concepts and organizing principles, that is, their architectural essence, could still live on. Another (more immediate) result of such endeavors was simply to place architectural history in the center of the nineteenth-century architectural debate, again favoring the architect with a firm grasp of (architectural) history over the construction oriented master-builder.

With the improved economic and commercial context in the Netherlands, Amsterdam was quickly changing, compelling a greater concern with the fate of old historical buildings.²⁰⁸ The first time the documentation of historical monuments was discussed in the *Maatschappij* was during a board meeting on March 3, 1849. After a presentation by art historian, and society member, Joseph Alberdingk Thijm on the “destruction and mutilation of patriotic monuments that possessed artistic or historical value,” it was proposed that the society could assist in the preservation of endangered structures by surveying and elaborating drawings of existing old buildings of artistic and historical significance, publishing lithographic plates of the images of such buildings, and finally, by evaluating proposals for alteration or repair of old monuments.²⁰⁹ By taking on such task, the society not only intended to establish a notable archive of architectural ideas, but also hoped to associate the work of its members with the work of previous generations of respected artists. Remarkably, such association would run both ways, since it implied that not only history was relevant to the contemporary design work of the architect, but also that the work of the architect

²⁰⁸ Throughout the latter half of the nineteenth-century, the city of Amsterdam embarked on an extensive program of demolition works and expansion, culminating with the implementation of Berlage’s famed *Plan Zuid* at the start of the twentieth-century.

²⁰⁹ Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 75. While being a merchant and not directly involved with construction or architectural design, Alberdingk Thijm’s passion for writing and his advocacy for a Catholic revival made him a prominent figure in the architectural debate during that period, primarily arguing for the benefits and logic of Gothic construction. For an introduction to Alberdingk Thijm’s position, see Woud, *The Art of Building*, 31–33.

could directly influence the understanding of history, both through a direct record of existing structures, as well as through proposals for these structures continued presence.

Soon after the initial 1849 discussion, the *Maatschappij* appealed to its members to begin the laborious work of measuring and codifying historical buildings. Its most prominent members would lead by example, as D.D. Büchler authored the first article presenting a historical building in *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* in 1851 with a textual description and color drawing of the 1622 *Huis met de Hoofden* in Amsterdam.²¹⁰ Since the costs for the publication of colored plates of historical buildings were quite high, and as more buildings were surveyed, the establishment of a dedicated publication was proposed in 1852. Two years later, in 1854, the first issue of *Verzameling van Afbeeldingen en Beschrijvingen van Oude Bestaande Gebouwen* (Collection of Images and Descriptions of Old Existing Buildings) was published, in a run that continued for over fifty years. The importance attributed by the *Maatschappij* to the documentation of historical buildings would continue to grow, eventually being recognized by the establishment of a yearly prize distinguishing the best survey of old buildings.

The weight of architectural history in general and of the task of surveying and documenting historical buildings in particular, would also be recognized by other organizations. In 1856, then newly formed society of young architects *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia* (Society Architecture and Friendship) also established a commission to survey and document buildings around Amsterdam that should be preserved or restored, and a majority of those drawings were then offered to the *Maatschappij* to complement their archive.²¹¹

²¹⁰ D.D. Büchler, "Het Huis Met de Hoofden, Te Amsterdam," *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* 6 (1851): 182–188. Also see Krabbe, *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap*, 124.

²¹¹ Schilt and Werf, *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia*, 30. The society *Architectura et Amicitia* (or *A et A*) was founded in an almost complementary manner to the "old" *Maatschappij*, with the biggest difference between both being that the *A et A* restricted its membership to young Amsterdam architects and met with

The most significant practical outcome of the constitution of such extensive architectural archive by the *Maatschappij* was the constitution of a *de facto* comprehensive inventory of monuments that should be considered for preservation. In effect, the efforts of the society in measuring and documenting old buildings would become the basis for the official registration of protected buildings when decades later, in 1878, the governmental department of the *Rijksadviseurs* requested assistance from the society in creating an inventory of monuments considered for preservation and conservation.²¹²

But the constitution of the *Maatschappij's* archive would incorporate not only past buildings, but also contemporary structures and unrealized projects, in a remarkable combination of past, present and future. Beyond the surveys of historical buildings, the society's archive of architecture would be most enlarged by submissions to the society's numerous design competitions. The organization of architectural competitions was a fundamental component, if not the most essential element, in the *Maatschappij's* strategy for the promotion of architecture.²¹³ The primacy of competitions in the society's efforts was clearly stated in its foundational bylaws, as awarding distinctions and prizes for excellence in architectural design through competitions topped the list of means through which the *Maatschappij* pledged to promote the appreciation of architecture. The organization of a competition would become the first official activity endorsed by the society, as in August 1842 it published a competition tender in major newspapers of Amsterdam and Haarlem.²¹⁴

much greater frequency than the old society. The *A et A* would come to rival the *Maatschappij* in later years, which is discussed later in this chapter.

²¹² Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 83.

²¹³ The prominence of competitions within the *Maatschappij's* range of activities is not that surprising, since the organization of design competitions had already been a fundamental instrument in the activities of the earlier *Maatschappij tot Aanmoediging der Bouwkunde*, from which the *Maatschappij* was a clear expansion.

²¹⁴ Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 64.

Throughout its existence, the society prided itself on the organization of several—usually three—competitions every year, organized into three different categories (with the first two being open to any practicing architect in the Netherlands, and the final one restricted to members of the *Maatschappij*). Assignments ranged from simple elements like facades, or the commemorative monuments, to the development of complete projects for monumental (generally public) buildings.²¹⁵ Winning entries were selected by a five-member committee jury, who evaluated the submissions based not only on artistic talent, but also based on how the participating architect applied architectural theory and historical references.²¹⁶ The firm grasp of theory and history was not limited to formal expression in competition entries, as at times, design submissions were to be accompanied by an elaboration of their architectural ideas in the form of written treatises.²¹⁷

Competitions submissions and winning designs were never intended to be built, but had instead a didactic function, displaying the level of artistic sophistication afforded only to architects in responses to new design challenges. Furthermore, by demonstrating the artistic skills of architects, the *Maatschappij* aimed at a gradual development of taste, in which the fundamental value of theory would become self-evident.²¹⁸

The primacy of architectural theory was further reinforced in the celebratory medal awarded since 1881 to competition winners, where architecture was depicted by representations of artistry, practicality and theory. The crest of artistry was on the left; the crest representing the practical component of architecture was placed on the right, and right in the center was the shield representing architectural theory, overlapping the other two.²¹⁹ But the didactic function attributed

²¹⁵ For an extensive list of the different competitions organized by the *Maatschappij* in its first 50 years, see *Ibid.*, 66–72.

²¹⁶ Krabbe, *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap*, 122.

²¹⁷ Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 65.

²¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 66.

²¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 65.

to these architectural competitions was even larger, as competitions were considered, and approached, as a means to study new architectural problems, and develop expertise in particular solutions of function, form, and theory.

Beyond a didactic function, the *Maatschappij's* competitions also fulfilled an important promotional function. Primarily directed at talented young architects, these competitions were, in fact, perceived as an excellent way for young architects to establish a reputation among their peers, and among architecture enthusiasts. Winning entries not only received a pecuniary award, but were also distributed (free of charge) to all members of the society through commemorative lithographic plates, often also being featured in *Bouwkundige Bijdragen*. Such level of promotion was considered to be the greatest benefit derived from the *Maatschappij's* competitions, as it allowed emerging architects to stake their claim in the flourishing debate of the discipline. While competition winners would receive the most attention, all competition entries were guaranteed a certain level of exposure, since all of them were presented in an exhibition open to all members of the *Maatschappij* in the annual general members meeting in Amsterdam.

Since the foundation of the society, exhibitions were acknowledged as a crucial instrument in the promotion of architecture, with the organization of exhibitions being clearly identified as a main objective of the society (even ahead of the constitution of a journal). In fact, exhibitions seemed to be a privileged way to emphasize the artistic dimension of architecture, since the exhibition format further validated architecture's artistic values by presenting architecture production in an avenue traditionally populated by the better established artistic endeavors of painting and sculpture.

However, for the first forty years of the society's existence, elaborate and public architectural exhibitions were only sporadic events. The prohibitive costs associated with organizing them prevented the society from organizing exhibitions on a regular basis, being that the only regular

enunciation of the discipline through this medium was reserved to the rather informal annual presentation of competition entries, and reserved to the society membership.²²⁰

Despite the high costs, a grand exhibition of architecture was organized in 1867 to celebrate the *Maatschappij's* 25th anniversary. Over a thousand objects, artifacts and drawings were presented from August 7 to 25, 1867 in the building of the *Koninklijke Akademie van Beeldende Kunsten* (Royal Academy of Fine Arts) in Amsterdam.²²¹ In order to exhibit such tremendous amount of material, the *Maatschappij* complemented its own archive with some objects from the archive of the former *Maatschappij tot Aanmoediging der Bouwkunde* and generous loans from its regional departments (most notably Rotterdam) and state institutions (like the Ministry of the Interior and the Royal Academy of Arts and Sciences). But the bulk of the exhibited material originated from the private collections of its members, with prominent members like then president of the society A.N. Godefroy and then secretary Johannes Hermanus (Jan) Leliman lending almost 150 images and models.²²² Occupying five downstairs rooms, the majority of the space was dedicated to the presentation of the usual combination of past, present and future of 'fine architecture,' with drawings of old monuments, recently completed projects, unrealized projects and competition winning entries.²²³ While dominated by images of 'fine architecture'—primarily drawings, but also some photographs, lithographs and engravings—the exhibition also included 69 models, and a diversity of assorted gifts honoring the *Maatschappij*. Moreover, while there were some objects illustrating technical advances of construction methods, these accounted for less than one tenth of

²²⁰ Regarding the prohibitive costs of exhibitions, see Krabbe, *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap*, 253, note 22.

²²¹ Dirk Baalman and Erik de Jong, "Museum of Archief: Kanttekeningen Bij de Collecties van Een Nieuw Architectuurinstituut," *Wonen TABK*, no. 11–12 (June 1985): 30.

²²² For the entire inventory and description of objects in the exhibition, see J. H. Leliman, "Tentoonstelling Bij Gelegenheid van Het 25-Jarig Bestaan van de Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst. Lijst Der Voorwerpen, Tentoongesteld in de Zalen Der Koninklijke Akademie van Beeldende Kunsten Te Amsterdam, 7-25 Augustus 1867.," *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* 16, bijlage V (1869): 69–102.

²²³ For a plan of the exhibition galleries, see *Ibid.*, 101–102.

the total number of objects exhibited. In accordance to its other efforts, the commemorative exhibition of the society's 25th anniversary emphasized the central role of architectural theory and history in contemporary architecture.

The primacy of the cultural dimension of architecture was not only overwhelmingly present in the curation of the exhibition, but also underscored in the opening speech by Godefroy. In his opening remarks, besides the customary acknowledgments, Godefroy summarized the society's ambitions for the recognition of 'fine architecture' by declaring that "in a civilized society the laws of beauty should be observed, not being enough for a building to be *effective*, [italics in the original] but it should also display its essence and a degree of beauty and refinement of shape."²²⁴ Godefroy continued by forcefully asserting the fundamental role of history and theory in architecture, as "the principle of the *Maatschappij* is to celebrate *true* beauty in architecture, which should always be accompanied by, and based on, the *correctness of composition*, which to be achieved requires an understanding of what has been done in the *practice of architecture* and the theoretical groundwork for its development."²²⁵ Furthermore, Godefroy also hoped that with this exhibition, "a new awareness might be developed for the artistic value of architectural drawings."²²⁶ In that first evening of August 7, 1867, over 300 members and invited guests listened to the speeches and perused the galleries of the exhibition.

It would take another commemoration of an anniversary of the society for the organization of yet another elaborate exhibition. In 1882, to commemorate the *Maatschappij's* 40th anniversary, an exhibition was organized in the imposing setting of one of the recently completed interior covered

²²⁴ J. H Leliman, "Tentoonstelling Bij Gelegenheid van Het 25-Jarig Bestaan van de Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst. Toespraak van Den Heer A.N. Godefroy, Voorzitter van de Maatschappij, 7 Augustus 1867.," *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* 16, bijlage IV (1869): 65.

²²⁵ *Ibid.*, 66.

²²⁶ *Ibid.*, 67.

courtyards of the *Rijksmuseum* in Amsterdam.²²⁷ Opened on August 28, 1882, the exhibition was organized into six different categories, representing both the artistic-cultural and the technical-practical dimensions of architecture. The cultural ideals of ‘fine architecture’ were articulated by several designs devised specifically for the 1882 exhibition (in a clear promotion of submitting architects); unrealized and recently completed designs by the members of the *Maatschappij* (including detailed drawings and models); and resources for teaching and researching architecture.²²⁸ In contrast, technical and practical components of the discipline were presented in the display of different construction materials and ornamental elements; construction machinery and equipment; as well as supplies and instruments for drawing.

The preparation of the 1882 commemorative exhibition was hardly unanimous, particularly after the board presented on the general members meeting of September 28, 1881 a draft-program attached to a whopping proposed budget of 30.000 guilders, more than double of the expected income of the *Maatschappij* for that year.²²⁹ The statement of one member at the meeting, T.H. van Etteger, neatly summarized the discussion. “The idea of such an exhibition, the speaker finds very well, but if the estimates are true, and he believes that they are, then this undertaking brings great

²²⁷ C.T.J. Louis Rieber, “Verslag van de 45ste Algemeene Vergadering (gehouden Op Donderdag 25 En Vrijdag 26 Mei 1882, in Een Der Lokalen van Het Het Genootschap: Natura Artis Magistra),” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 1, bijlage (1882): 2.

²²⁸ The Delft Polytechnic exhibition entry (number 30) was praised by not only presenting the work of its students, but mainly by exhibiting tools used in the education of its students, “especially photographs and cast models that will provide excellent service for education.” Regarding architecture research, the reviewer for *De Opmerker* was impressed by the works of Prof. Gugel (a professor at the Delft Polytechnic) and by the architects Gebr. van Cleef (from The Hage) and P. Gouda Quint (from Arnhem) since these presented a progression of “Architectural Morphology” and “History of Building Styles.” “De Tentoonstelling Der Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst I.,” *De Opmerker* 17, no. 35 (September 2, 1882): 1. “De Tentoonstelling Der Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst III.,” *De Opmerker* 17, no. 37 (September 16, 1882): 1.

²²⁹ For the original budget and draft-proposal see C.T.J. Louis Rieber, “Verslag van de 44ste Algemeene Vergadering (gehouden Op Woensdag September 28 1881, in Een Der Lokalen van Het Nutsgebouw Te Arnhem),” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 1, bijlage (1881): 32. The *Maatschappij’s* income of 1881 and 1882 was just shy of 12.000 guilders. For an overview of the society’s income, see Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 40.

risk to the Society.”²³⁰ Nevertheless, it was widely agreed that such illustrious exhibition would greatly enhance the visibility of architecture and, inevitably, the prestige of the society. The solution to the financial problem posed would, not unlike many modern architectural institutions, rely on a tighter control of expenses, and a creative pursuit of income. Thus, the ambition of the program was scaled down, among other things, by reducing the number of foreign speakers, while sources of income were expanded by procuring subsidies from both local and state government.²³¹

Each member was granted free entrance and was entitled to five guest tickets. Thus, over 1.000 people visited the exhibition before it closed on October 1st, 1882, a respectable number for the presentation of architecture to a wide public.²³² However, opinions greatly diverged regarding the content of the exhibition, as it received both great praises and some fierce criticism. Namely, the anonymous reviewer of rival publication *De Opmerker* praised how the heterogeneous material was organized to form a tasteful whole, while criticizing how drawings did not take a “place of honor,” but had instead been pushed to the periphery of the space.²³³ The same reviewer would speculate that perhaps the sparse number of submissions could explain the peculiar arrangement of the galleries, since not only some “major names [of Dutch architecture] were missing,” but also some prominent directors of the *Maatschappij* did not have any design for consideration.²³⁴ Regardless of its perceived shortcomings, the exhibition was still considered a success in presenting architecture

²³⁰ Rieber, “Verslag van de 44ste Algemeene Vergadering,” 33.

²³¹ This was not the first time the *Maatschappij* requested funds from the government, since in 1860 it placed an official request for a governmental grant similar to the one enjoyed by the Royal Institute of Engineers. See Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 22.

²³² While there is no official indication of the number of visitors, several accounts seem to consider that just over 1.000 people visited the exhibition. See Presto, “De Tentoonstelling En Ons Woonvertrek,” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 2, no. 39 (September 28, 1882): 399.

²³³ “De Tentoonstelling Der Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst I.”

²³⁴ *Ibid.*, 1.

and establishing a point of balance between artistic and technical considerations, and as the same critic remarked in the final installment of his review, “pleasing everyone is hard.”²³⁵

The *Rijksmuseum* exhibition was significantly different from the celebration of the society’s silver jubilee in 1867, not only in the material exhibited but also on the audience it intended to reach. For this exhibition, the objective was not only the spread of professional knowledge, but also, as Rieber noted in 1892, the “development of a public taste, which more than ever needed to be led in a good direction.”²³⁶ This commemorative exhibition became “exemplary of what the society would propose for a permanent exhibition in their own building,” namely as it intended to develop an exhibition program that could resonate with both a professional and a lay audience.²³⁷ In fact, while the organization of a permanent exhibition was already being considered as early as 1881, the favorable public reception to the 1882 exhibition would finally convince the board of the *Maatschappij* of the pressing need to find suitable accommodations where a permanent exhibition could be organized, as well as house the different activities and divisions of the society, from the library to the offices.²³⁸

The focus on exhibition as a privileged medium for the promotion of architecture would only increase in the following years, as in 1886 the establishment of an annual exhibition of architecture was approved by the society’s members.²³⁹ Initially announced in *Bouwkundig Weekblad* of February 13, 1886 this annual event was to recognize the architectural production of the previous

²³⁵ “De Tentoonstelling Der Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst III.,” 2.

²³⁶ Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 34. For a thorough discussion on the “campaign to educate the public, see Auke van der Woud, “The Campaign to Educate the Public: The Supremacy of the Visual Image,” in *The Art of Building: From Classicism to Modernity: The Dutch Architectural Debate 1840-1990* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001), 113–116.

²³⁷ Baalman and Jong, “Museum of Archief: Kanttekeningen Bij de Collecties van Een Nieuw Architectuurinstituut,” 30.

²³⁸ Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 50.

²³⁹ *Ibid.*, 92.

years by distinguishing the past, present and future of architecture. The annual exhibition served to present an overview of recent work, but also awarded medals for the best recently completed building (silver), the best unrealized project (silver) and the best documentation of an old existing building (bronze).²⁴⁰ The first edition of this annual series was presented at the *Maatschappij's* building from April 11 to May 23, 1886, with 91 entries from over 30 different architects.²⁴¹ About two dozen people were present for the opening remarks, and while the exhibition was certainly modest in size, it was very well received by reviewers, who “greatly recommend[ed] a visit” to its refined presentation of architecture.²⁴²

In its objective of promoting architecture, the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* engaged in a variety of activities and established a range of instruments that were fundamental in the formation of an architectural discourse and culture in the Netherlands. Through the organization of architectural competitions and subsequent exhibition of the results; through the publication of a journal and other volumes; through the organization of discussion meetings, the society established the necessary infrastructure for the production and dissemination of disciplinary discourse and forcefully championed the artistic dimension of ‘fine architecture.’ Moreover, “while the goal [of promoting architecture], at least in civil architecture, remained more or less the same, the means to achieve it changed quite often, either due to changed insights, or to the inevitable pressure of gradually challenging conditions.”²⁴³ Nevertheless, much like the NAI, the

²⁴⁰ Specifically, in accordance with point 3 of the regulation for admissions, the emphasis on recent work restricted admissions to the annual exhibition to buildings completed within the previous ten years and to unrealized projects designed in the previous six years. See C Muysken and C.T.J. Louis Rieber, “Een Jaarlijksche Tentoonstelling,” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 6, no. 7 (February 13, 1886): 37.

²⁴¹ “Catalogus van Tentoonstelling van Bouwkunst in Het Maatschappelijk Gebouw,” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 6, no. 15 (April 10, 1886): 90–91. The conditions and the history of the *Maatschappij's* new building, and how it became proto-architecture museum, will be discussed later in this chapter.

²⁴² “De Tentoonstelling van de Maatschappij Tot Bevordering van Bouwkunst,” *De Opmerker* 21, no. 15 (April 10, 1886): 123.

²⁴³ Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 31.

Maatschappij established different instruments of engagement which operated autonomously, but in the combination of their efforts, architecture found a much more forceful vocal platform into the minds and hearts of a budding class of architects and architecture patrons.

The disciplinary apparatus developed by the society was a true game-changer, completely altering how architecture theory and history were understood and approached in the Netherlands. Specifically, while before the foundation of the *Maatschappij* the use of architecture theory and history was already a way for more educated master-builders to distinguish themselves and “often collectively discuss the issues of architecture, their views were hardly ever recorded in writing. That changed with the establishment of the *Maatschappij*.”²⁴⁴ The mere documentation and dissemination of architectural discourse completely changed the conditions under which architecture was perceived and developed in the second half of the nineteenth-century in the Netherlands. As a clear result of the *Maatschappij*’s efforts, “architecture was more of a topic for public discussion in the 1860s than it had been in the previous decades.”²⁴⁵

1880 Amendment

The increased interest (and improved execution) in architectural exhibitions by the *Maatschappij* in the 1880s was indicative of a fundamental change in the society’s strategy for the promotion of architecture. Specifically, the engagement of the general public was increasingly perceived as a critical component in the advancement of architecture, but also in the political relevance of the society.

The *Maatschappij* was always engaged in critical self-reflection, as it periodically asked its members to weigh in on the strategic direction of the society, which greatly assisted the society in

²⁴⁴ Krabbe, *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap*, 178.

²⁴⁵ Woud, *The Art of Building*, 46.

its development. In 1867, after 25 years of existence, the fundamental question posed to the members regarded not only a reflection of the path taken in the previous 25 years, but also what the members expected from the society in order to perpetuate its prosperity.²⁴⁶ From the voluminous responses, the course of the society was greatly praised, but it was also suggested that a greater prominence should be conceded to the dissemination of professional and technical knowledge.²⁴⁷ While this indication would serve as a guidance for changes to the society's operations (approved in General Assemblies), these were accompanied by a great deal of caution, so that the application of such minor adjustments did not jeopardize the society's unassailable goal for the promotion of 'fine architecture.'

The same type of caution was not taken a few years later, as entire new statutes were approved for the *Maatschappij* that significantly amended the original bylaws of the organization. Initially proposed in 1879, the society's legislative alterations were approved and adopted after a period of consultation, in the two-day long General Assembly of Members in May 1880, going into effect on January 1st, 1881.²⁴⁸ The clearest indication that times were changing was the slight, yet crucial, adjustment made to the first article of the bylaws, which expanded the scope of the primary objective of the society. To the promotion of architecture it was added the representation of the general interests of its practitioners. Thus, the original article stating that "by all available means within its reach [the *Maatschappij*] is to cultivate and promote civil architecture in all its subjects

²⁴⁶ J. H. Leliman, "Verslag van de 24ste Algemeene Vergadering (gehouden Te Amsterdam Den 27 Junij 1866)," *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* 15, bijlage IV (1867): 5–28. and Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 33.

²⁴⁷ The interest in the dissemination of technical knowledge through the society's journals and exhibitions was greatly amplified, since formal education of architecture in the Netherlands was still in its early stages. A degree in architecture was offered in the Delft Polytechnic, but only since 1864 and with very few graduates. While not associated with any school, the *Maatschappij* had continuously lobbied for architectural education reform, since it was still considered to be deficient.

²⁴⁸ For an account of the general assembly discussions see T. Sanders, "Verslag van de 40ste Algemeene Vergadering (gehouden Den 26sten En 27sten Mei 1880, in Een Der Lokalen van Het Kom. Zoolog. Genootschap Natura Artis Magistra Te Amsterdam)," *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* 26, bijlage I (1881): 1–18.

and subdivisions” was replaced by an amendment which now read “the *Maatschappij* aims, to promote the practice and knowledge of architecture and to represent the general interests of its practitioners.”²⁴⁹ While seemingly subtle, and basically just institutionalizing what had been the *de facto* practice of the society of associating the promotion of architecture with the recognition of the work of the architect, this alteration would mark a profound shift to the basic character of the *Maatschappij*, as it became more and more involved with professional issues that did not directly concern the artistic appreciation of ‘fine architecture.’

The shift in the *Maatschappij*’s official policy occurred in a time when the continued reforms and industrialization of Dutch economy were resulting in a substantial economic growth and prosperity.²⁵⁰ Along with the improved economic context, a cultural revival soon followed, with the central government sponsoring the foundation and construction of several new museums. This included not only the foundation of the *Stedelijk Museum* in 1874, but also the construction of a new building for the *Rijksmuseum* designed by Pierre Cuypers and completed in 1885.

The *Maatschappij*’s increased focus on professional matters was a direct reaction to the realization, in an excruciatingly public manner, of the structural limitations inherent to its strategic orientation and efforts. For almost forty years the *Maatschappij* had arduously established the necessary conditions for the emergence of an engaging architectural culture, and yet it seemed that its views on the future of architecture were completely disregarded beyond the interiority of the discipline.²⁵¹ Specifically, during the 1870s the Dutch central government undertook a structural

²⁴⁹ Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 31, 32.

²⁵⁰ For a greater discussion of the improved economic conditions in the Netherlands, see chapter 5 of Ernst Heinrich Kossmann, *The Low Countries, 1780-1940*, Oxford History of Modern Europe (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978).

²⁵¹ In an editorial of the society’s journal in 1881 it was acknowledged that the society had little influence in public affairs, and its opinions were rarely considered. However, this situation was considered to be unsurprising, since the *Maatschappij* had been (up until then) primarily dedicated to architecture insiders

reorganization of the arts with direct implications for the production of architecture, and yet, the *Maatschappij* was completely ignored in these processes.²⁵² The establishment and appointment of the first College of Government Advisors for Historical and Artistic Monuments (*College Rijksadvieers voor de Monumenten van Geschiedenis en Kunst*) in 1874 would mark the first instance of the central government public disregard towards the society, particularly as the College of Advisors was mandated to elaborate policies in the preservation of historical monuments and the construction of new governmental buildings: the past and the future of architecture. Further exposing the fragile position of the society and architects in influencing political decisions, the College of Advisors was entirely composed by non-architects, leaving to laymen and antiquarians to decide on the merits of the invited architectural competitions organized for new state buildings, in which a restricted group of architects and styles were already being favored. Despite representing over a thousand members and having a well-established presence in all twelve provinces, its futile opposition to the College of Advisors had made abundantly clear that the society did not command any sort of political clout. Therefore, “following the conduct of the government [in the 1870s] the *Maatschappij* started from 1880 to be intensively engaged in professional matters.”²⁵³

Since its inception the *Maatschappij* had mostly been concerned with its own membership, directing the bulk of its activities to the improvement of their standing. Naturally, the society’s influence was limited to the extent of the discipline it had been instrumental in establishing. Thus, it was understood that in order to acquire a growing significance, the *Maatschappij* needed to move beyond the dissemination of knowledge to the interiority of the discipline and, in complement, engage with a wide audience, primarily by focusing on developing public taste. Since “the spirit of

and never seriously attempted to engage with the “outside world.” J. R. Kruyff, “Ons Weekblad,” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 1, no. 1 (May 4, 1881): 2.

²⁵² Krabbe, *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap*, 237.

²⁵³ *Ibid.*, 239.

the days demanded publicity,” it was in the best interest of the society to pursue the promotion of architecture in a more public manner.²⁵⁴ It was thus believed that the visibility of such activities would allow the society to regain its position of power and influence in steering the future of architecture. In short, it was understood that in order to become politically relevant, the *Maatschappij* needed to become visible to a wider audience. Only by presenting and elucidating the issues of architecture, could the society enlist the assistance of a growing public in their demand for an architecture with a latent artistic and cultural dimension. Thus, the enunciation of the discipline was now perceived as fundamental for the long term sustainability of both architecture and the *Maatschappij*.

Conditions conspired to affect a significant, even paradoxical, reversal to the *Maatschappij*'s basic approach to architecture. While before it was stipulated that the society was to promote and advance architecture in its entirety, but most of its activities were directed at architects and other professionals, now it was proclaimed that the society was to represent the interests of architects, but its activities were increasingly directed at a wider constituency.

The first instrument to be dramatically revised under the changed mood of engagement was the *Maatschappij*'s journal. In an effort to reach the dual audience (professional and general) now identified for the activities of the society, the *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* was divided into two separate publications: the heavily illustrated *Bouwkundig Tijdschrift* and the more discursive *Bouwkundig Weekblad*.²⁵⁵

²⁵⁴ Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 34.

²⁵⁵ While Krabbe has suggested in passing that the *Bouwkundig Tijdschrift* was primarily intended for people exterior to the discipline and *Bouwkundig Weekblad* directed at architects and other professionals, the eclectic combination of content in both periodicals refutes such assertion.

The *Bouwkundig Tijdschrift* became primarily dedicated to the dissemination of recent projects in the Netherlands as well as technical and construction-related knowledge. While dense technical construction articles clearly targeted a professional audience, the beautifully rendered imagery depicting new buildings was “probably intended for art lovers, as potential clients.”²⁵⁶ The intersection of architecture’s technical and artistic expression in the pages of the *Tijdschrift* was to offer a glimpse of the great strides taken by Dutch architecture as both a discipline and a profession.

While the *Tijdschrift* was narrowly focused on the presentation of projects and technical articles, the *Bouwkundig Weekblad* was much more eclectic in its content, incorporating all the other sections previously included in *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* and then some. Thus, the pages of the *Weekblad* were populated by an assorted array of sections, including main articles addressing current topics, *Maatschappij*’s affairs, competitions, book reviews, discussions of constructive and decorative material, correspondence, and even excerpts of foreign publications.²⁵⁷ While not to the same extent as its sister publication, the use of imagery was equally important for the *Weekblad*. In fact, both publications were “illustrated,” since it was considered that the combination of imagery and text would not only assist in the understanding of architecture’s abstract ideas, but also in making them more palatable to a wider audience.²⁵⁸ Thus, the *Bouwkundig Weekblad* also intended

²⁵⁶ Krabbe, *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap*, 237.

²⁵⁷ In the editorial of the first issue of the *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 16 different sections were identified, namely “I) main articles, addressing current topics; II) Affairs of the *Maatschappij*; III) Domestic announcements, decisions, appointments, ...; IV) Foreign announcements, decisions, appointments, ...; V) Drafting and technical; VI) excerpts from foreign journals and magazines; VII) Correspondence; VIII) Book reviews; IX) Frequently asked questions from the public and colleagues with answers by the editors; X) Competitions (programs, results, discussions); XI) Announcements of exhibitions and museums; XII) Announcements regarding arts and crafts; XIII) Discussion of new constructive and decorative materials; XIV) Announcements of vacancies; XV) Tenders and their outcome; and XVI) Advertisements. See Kruyff, “*Ons Weekblad*,” 3.

²⁵⁸ As Woud has noted, the illustration of architecture drawings was “an indication that communication between architect and public was changing,” as these illustrated drawings became a preferred tool to communicate with the public. This “public-friendly approach entailed two risks,” namely the lack of technical precision of these drawings that increased the probability of mistakes in construction, with a corresponding disjunction between the illustrated building and its actual, often disappointing, execution, and secondly the threat of the architecture discipline being sublimated to the production of beautiful superficial images

to address a professional and general audience, not only advancing architectural debate but also exerting a growing influence in the development of a public taste.

Beyond content, the greatest distinction between both publications was the frequency of their publication and their resulting agency. Specifically, the *Tijdschrift* was only published four times a year, while the *Weekblad*, as its name indicates, was published weekly. Such distinction meant that while the information disseminated in the *Tijdschrift* was stable, the knowledge within the pages of the *Weekblad* was rather fluid. Thus, the *Weekblad* was conceived to re-establish the influence of the *Maatschappij* in directing continuing architectural debates.²⁵⁹ Only by publishing with greater frequency could the society ensure that its voice would not become obsolete simply by taking too much time to be uttered.

By publishing every week, it was not only possible to accompany and interject the ongoing debate, but also more forcefully engage with its audiences. According to the *Weekblad* editors, the weekly format was particularly suitable for the back-and-forth necessary in any conversation. The new publication's commitment to the construction of a (two-way) dialogue with its audience was revealed in the editorial of the first issue of the *Weekblad*, as the more interactive sections of the magazine were subject to considerable elaboration.²⁶⁰ Most notably, the rules of engagement for the sections "Correspondence" and "Frequently Asked Questions and their Answers" were defined, providing some guidelines for the interaction between editors and readership. While the section "Correspondence" was deemed the appropriate forum for artistic discussions, "Frequently Asked

without any architectural substance. Woud, "The Campaign to Educate the Public: The Supremacy of the Visual Image," 115–116.

²⁵⁹ Specifically, it can be argued that the publication of a weekly periodical by the *Maatschappij* was also prompted by the popularity and inherent influence garnered by the architectural journal *De Opmerker*, published weekly since 1866, as in the presentation of the *Bouwkundig Weekblad* it is stated that "in our country a need has been long-felt for an impartially edited periodical to address with seriousness and diligence the current architectural issues." Kruyff, "Ons Weekblad," 3.

²⁶⁰ Kruyff, "Ons Weekblad."

Question and their Answers” was considered most suitable for the clarification of professional and technical questions posed to the editors. Just like the *Tijdschrift*, the *Weekblad* intended to establish a balance between the artistic and professional sides of architecture, between a professional and a general audience.

The publication of both these journals in 1881 marked the first tangible implementation of the new statutes of the *Maatschappij*, mainly in its attempt at engaging with a larger public. Specifically, the publication of the *Bouwkundig Tijdschrift* and the *Bouwkundig Weekblad*, expressed the revision of articles 38 and 39, which had been introduced with great fanfare in the General Assembly of May 1880 by Van Dijk, the original publisher of the *Maatschappij*.²⁶¹ The introduction of this specific revision proposal by the founding publisher of the society was full of symbolic connotations, from the modernization of one of the oldest instruments of the society to the passing of the torch to a new generation of architects and architecture enthusiasts. The reinvigorated approach to the periodicals of the *Maatschappij* forcefully articulated a clear adaptation of the society’s instruments to the challenging conditions and evolving societal attitude towards architecture. Forty years had passed since the foundation of the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst*, and its new strategy of engagement was intent on reaching a wider audience with a sly combination of polemics and publicity.

The New Communal Building

In tending to inspire a public interest in architecture, the construction of a new building to accommodate the *Maatschappij* offices and public activities became a central component of its strategy for public engagement. In an initial period that lasted over two decades, the *Maatschappij*’s “secretariat and editorial offices [of its journal] were accommodated in rented premises, while

²⁶¹ Sanders, “Verslag van de 40ste Algemeene Vergadering,” 16.

board meetings and General Assemblies of Members took place in large rented halls. In 1867 the secretariat and the library moved to a quarters on the *Wijde Kapelsteeg*, which in 1878 became the property of the *Maatschappij*.²⁶² However, included in the expansion of the society's activities and its 1880 reorganization, the board was also mandated to find a more suitable and permanent solution. After seriously considering the purchase of an eighteenth-century mansion widely believed to have great architectural value and that would only require minor alterations to establish suitable accommodations, the board of the *Maatschappij* finally decided to construct its own building.²⁶³

The initial proposal for a new building, included in the 1880 statutory revision of the society by Amsterdam architect J.R. de Kruyff did not necessarily contemplate the construction of a new building.²⁶⁴ Instead, it stipulated that the current building was inadequate and the society not only required more space, but also a 'dignified building' that could operate as a social hub for the society's membership.²⁶⁵ Thus, de Kruyff proposed a building that could accommodate "an artistically decorated hall" for meetings and art lectures, but also the society's library, its ever

²⁶² J. Faber and B. Zwaan, "Inventaris van Het Archief van de Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst 1842-1918" (Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg, Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst, 1988), 6.

²⁶³ The mansion under consideration was located on 103 *Nieuwe Herengracht* and had previously accommodated the *Musée Louis XV*. See Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 49.

²⁶⁴ As Moes has pointed out, the initial proposal explicitly defined the spaces needed for the proper functioning of the proposed communal building, but notably neglected to express any considerations on the building's exterior, thus allowing for the possibility to convert an existing building. See Constance Moes, "Een 'Waardig Gebouw' Voor de Maatschappij," in *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst: Schetsen Uit de Geschiedenis van Het Genootschap*, ed. Erik de Jong, Coert Peter Krabbe, and Tiede J Boersma (Amsterdam: De Sluitsteen A & NP, 1993), 77.

²⁶⁵ The new statutes stated that "[w]ith the reorganization of the *Maatschappij* under the proposed bills, a larger location for the most urgent needs [of the society] shall be included." Sanders, "Verslag van de 41ste Algemeene Vergadering," 41. Throughout the diverse moments of discussion regarding the new accommodations of the society, the future premises were always qualified as a 'dignified' or 'worthy' building. (*waardig gebouw* in the original Dutch) that could aptly express and dignify the *Maatschappij*. Moes later used that expression as a title for her article on the history of the society's new communal building on *Marnixstraat*. Moes, "Een 'Waardig Gebouw' Voor de Maatschappij."

growing archive, a corresponding reading room, and an exhibition space for decorative arts, architectural drawings and competition submissions.²⁶⁶ The combination of these functions was to acknowledge and accommodate the diversity of the *Maatschappij's* membership and their slightly different approach to architecture, namely the distinction between architects and art lovers.

However, the idea that a new building could operate to captivate an audience beyond the membership of the society became the most compelling argument in the proposal for moving the *Maatschappij's* installations and offices. Specifically, how a 'dignified building' could become a fundamental instrument in implementing the strategic shift envisioned in the 1880 amendment by engaging the society's dual audiences: its membership and the general public. The sheer physical presence of its own building, prominently located in Amsterdam, could provide what the *Maatschappij* had identified as its greatest weakness: public visibility. Moreover, a 'dignified building' would present the opportunity for the society to lead the architecture debate by example. Thus, it stood to reason that a new community building for the *Maatschappij* would be the most logical, but also the most effective, way for the society to cogently communicate to a wider audience.²⁶⁷ While its internal spaces would primarily cater to the society's memberships (of architects and art lovers), its external form would most forcefully present the society to a wide public.

Thus, when the new *Maatschappij* building was finally built, it reflected the society's guiding principle of the union between history and contemporary design work, as building fragments and monuments from the Dutch 'Golden Age' "were embedded in the façade of the *Maatschappij's*

²⁶⁶ Sanders, "Verslag van de 41ste Algemeene Vergadering," 46.

²⁶⁷ The construction of its new building also allowed the Society to stake its position in the ongoing "battle of styles" occurring in the Netherlands, namely, its support for the "Dutch Renaissance" as an appropriate national architectural style.

building, in an effort to seamlessly combine past and present.”²⁶⁸ As forcefully articulated by the society’s apparatus of discourse, also in its building the past was to be used as a lesson for the present.

While certainly a symbolic affair, the construction of the *Maatschappij’s* building was also preferred for its inherent practicality. By designing a new building, the *Maatschappij* could better devise the uncommon spaces necessary to accommodate all its functions, translating the objectives and activities of the society to a particular building program. Not only the building program offered a cross-section of the *Maatschappij’s* activities and intentions in the early 1880s, but also did not differ greatly from the building program elaborated for modern architecture museums, most notably, the NAI a century later.²⁶⁹

The program for the *Maatschappij’s* new building was elaborated for a design competition which, out of the hundreds of competitions organized by the society, was the only one to actually lead to construction. Announced in the society’s journal in November 1883, the competition procurement indicated that the new building was to occupy an irregular plot of approximately 280 m² on the *Marnixstraat*, close to the bustling *Leidseplein*. Based on the 1880 statutory revisions, a financial plan and a design sketch by then president of the Society Constantijn Muysken, the tender stipulated the program of the building.²⁷⁰ The main exhibition gallery was to occupy most of the ground floor; the second floor was to be reserved for a spacious meeting room/auditorium, a library and its reading room and an office for the board; while the room dedicated to the preparation of publications and editorial staff would be located in the attic combined with the

²⁶⁸ Baalman and Jong, “Museum of Archief: Kanttekeningen Bij de Collecties van Een Nieuw Architectuurinstituut,” 31.

²⁶⁹ Baalman and Jong already alluded to the striking parallel between both these building programs in *Ibid.*, 30.

²⁷⁰ Moes, “Een ‘Waardig Gebouw’ Voor de Maatschappij,” 80.

archive/paper storage room. The building was completed with circulation and auxiliary spaces, such as an appropriate entrance including a small office, a grand staircase for visitors and members, a private staircase for the offices, the necessary lavatories in all three floors, storage spaces in the basement and attic, and even a small dwelling in the attic for the caretaker. Thirty-seven anonymous submissions responded to the *Maatschappij's* call, a tremendous improvement over the usual three to five submissions to the society's previous competitions.²⁷¹ From those thirty seven submissions, five were invited to revise their plans for a second round, with the proposal "Circle with an Oblique Line," the plan with the largest space for exhibitions, being recommended for implementation.²⁷²

For the design competition, the society referred to the new *Marnixstraat* building as "a building for a permanent exhibition," with the primacy of the exhibition spaces being equally articulated in a tender that required "as much flat wall [space] and floors for exhibition as possible."²⁷³ While such emphasis on exhibition expressed the organization's growing interest in the enunciation of architecture to a wide audience, it also was guided by purely financial assessments. The monetization of the society's permanent exhibition was a central component of the financial calculations necessary for the construction of the new building. Specifically, only by renting out space in its permanent exhibition to different construction material vendors, could the *Maatschappij* repay the mortgage and bonds necessary for the new building's construction. Therefore, the more wall space and room the exhibition galleries had, the more funds it could

²⁷¹ The excitement associated with this particular competition was undoubtedly related with its outcome being actual construction and not merely the public presentation of the plan in the society's annual members meeting.

²⁷² By being invited to a second round, the society awarded each of the five selected entries the sum of 100 guilders upon final submission of the requested drawing documentation, in order to defray the costs of the further development of their proposals. Such pecuniary award was particularly significant since, in those days, the society was engaged in advocating for a greater regulation of design competitions in order to ensure that architects were properly compensated for their work.

²⁷³ Muysken and Rieber, "Prijsvraag," 281.

generate for the society. At the risk of becoming a glorified showroom, the *Maatschappij* attempted to reach a cost-neutral solution, where the new building could generate enough income to pay for itself and its running costs.

The 1882 exhibition at the *Rijksmuseum* had demonstrated the feasibility of this financial model, since the troubled balance sheet of that exhibition had been alleviated with the inclusion of these construction vendors, and the income by them generated. But the *Rijksmuseum* exhibition had also demonstrated how the novelty and materiality of the objects and artifacts dedicated to present the advancements of construction techniques could effectively engage and interest a larger public in architecture, something that artistic ambitions and theoretical considerations were still struggling to accomplish. The direct influence of the 1882 exhibition in the planning of the new building was not only expected, but something that the Society's board counted on. Namely, since the board invited the committee responsible for the 1882 exhibition to apply the same set of logistical and financial instruments to devise a feasible plan for the construction of the new building, a plan that could be agreeable to most *Maatschappij* members and unravel the (mostly financial) impasse that had beset the execution of the new building.²⁷⁴ However, the extension of the mandate of the nominated committee had been calculated long before, since the society's board used the *Rijksmuseum* exhibition to gauge the public interest in an exhibition of decorative arts, construction techniques and architectural drawings, which could indicate the viability of a permanent exhibition and inherently a new communal building.²⁷⁵

²⁷⁴ "De Inwijding van Het Maatschappelijk Gebouw En Algemeene Vergadering," *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 5, no. 20 (May 23, 1885): 126.

²⁷⁵ By welcoming over 1,000 visitors in a month, it was generally believed that the 1882 exhibition indicated a sufficient demand for a permanent exhibition. See, Moes, "Een 'Waardig Gebouw' Voor de Maatschappij," 78.

The elementary pragmatism, and foresight, of the *Maatschappij's* board, was further expressed in an unusual request included in the tender: the proposals were to accommodate the easy conversion of the building into three separate houses. Such peculiar mandate was a clear hedging strategy. Understanding that it would be rather difficult to sell such a specifically tailored building if the necessity ever arose, the board precluded this difficulty by guaranteeing that with only minimal alterations (particularly on its foundations and façade) the building “for a permanent exhibition” could be easily converted into a much more marketable property.

While it gracefully accommodated the possibility for reconversion, the decisive elements in awarding the competition to the entry by Theodoor Gerard Schill and D.H. Haverkamp were their maximization of exhibition spaces and their detailed budget proposals. The strength of this design proposal in terms of implementation was not surprising, since Schill understood better than most the critical importance of the exhibition space and execution budgets in the evaluation of the *Maatschappij's* new building. Having been a signatory of the proposed statutory revision in 1880 and a member of the committee that devised the initial financial plans, “[r]egarding the building Th. G. Schill was a true insider.”²⁷⁶

From January 1884, when Th. G. Schill and D.H. Haverkamp “Circle with an Oblique Line” design proposal was selected for implementation, it took only a little over a year for the new building of the *Maatschappij* to be complete. Thus, on May 20, 1885 the building on 402 *Marnixstraat* was inaugurated in the presence of several dignitaries, including the Mayor of Amsterdam, the Alderman for Public Works and several representatives of other Amsterdam societies of arts. Beyond the customary speeches, the official inauguration of the *Maatschappij's* building was

²⁷⁶ Ibid., 82.

marked by the opening of the permanent exhibition and the first General Assembly in the society's new facilities.²⁷⁷

The initiative of establishing a permanent exhibition of constructive and decorative building components was largely based on the examples of similar endeavors in Vienna and Berlin. However, the (practical) advantages of the assemblage of such collection were validated in the small showroom organized by J. N. Scheltema in Amsterdam, as architects came to rely on it to discover new building elements and techniques. While modest, Scheltema's "*Monsterzaal voor fijne bouwartikelen*" (Hall of samples for fine building products) was perceived as a persuasive argument for the organization of a larger exhibition of building materials at the new installations of the *Maatschappij* which could aptly respond to the latent, yet growing, demand for the introduction of new (mostly foreign) construction elements and materials.²⁷⁸ The building materials and decorative elements that dominated the exhibition halls were thus also an indication of a subtle change to the society's idealization of architecture. Specifically, rather than merely presenting architecture as painting or sculpture, the exhibition of building elements presented a disciplinary specificity of architecture: its inevitable relation to construction and economic systems.

However, architectural history and theory were still fundamental to the identity of the society and its conception of architecture, being also regularly presented in exhibitions. Complementing the material translation of architecture on display on the ground floor, the all-important abstract conceptualization of architecture was commonly presented in the spacious main meeting room on the second floor. When not in used for the biannual General Member Assemblies, the room was

²⁷⁷ 93 members participated in the first assembly in the new building, assuaging reservations regarding the size of the meeting salon. See, "De Inwijding van Het Maatschappelijk Gebouw En Algemeene Vergadering," 128.

²⁷⁸ The practical character of the exhibitions in Vienna and Berlin and Scheltema's collection were particularly praised. See, "Een Permanente Tentoonstelling," *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 1, no. 2 (May 11, 1881): 7-8.

occupied with eclectic exhibitions (approximately four to five a year), including the submissions for the *Maatschappij's* different competitions, antique exotic furniture, castings in copper, Dutch carvings, architects travel sketches and others.²⁷⁹ While submissions for these public showings were considerably modest in numbers, the robustness and appeal of these exhibitions inspired great interest from its visitors. In the first year, the combination of artistic and professional exhibitions of architecture drew a respectable crowd of 2,960 visitors to the *Marnixstraat* building, including both members and non-members of the society.²⁸⁰

As the *Maatschappij* understood the public exhibition of its archive of drawings and models to be fundamental in engaging a wide audience, it also intensified its collecting endeavors by expanding its collection with donations from its members. But the public enunciation of architecture and the communication of its knowledge were not restricted to the exhibition format, but were also furthered by the accommodation of the library and archives in the new building. For the first time, material that was not included in any given exhibition could be consulted and perused in the comfort of a reading room, answering to long-standing and recurrent demands.

While the importance of “a well-stocked architectural library for members” was recognized by successive boards, the logistics of any system to make the library accessible were always considered to be too costly for the society’s coffers.²⁸¹ The necessary funds for a proper functioning of the library, that is, for acquisitions, cataloguing, maintenance, or even monitored access to the library’s collection were never available for allocation. While the society had been dutifully collecting several volumes for its library, access was greatly restricted. Despite their wishes, members of the society were unable to access books, drawings and other resources accumulated by

²⁷⁹ Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 52–53.

²⁸⁰ This was a particularly impressive feat, since in that year the *Maatschappij* had approximately 850 members, which implied that over two thirds of the visitors were non-members of the society. *Ibid.*, 40.

²⁸¹ Moes, “Een ‘Waardig Gebouw’ Voor de Maatschappij,” 77.

the society throughout its four decades of operation, simply due to the lack of an appropriate space. Without adequate access, until the inauguration of the *Marnixstraat* building, the society's library was more akin to a large book repository without any possibility for retrieval and perusal of volumes. While the austere library room at the *Marnixstraat* building was far from the originally envisioned ennobled space, it was still a remarkable improvement from previous accommodations.²⁸² At its new installations, the society's architectural library was organized, accessible and well used. Not only could Amsterdam members browse the library's collection on site, but members from other branches could also borrow books through a shipping system.²⁸³ By focusing on accessibility, the new library became an effective point of contact between the society and its audiences

The reading room associated with the library also serviced the society's ever expanding architectural archive. Like the library, an appropriate accommodation to the *Maatschappij's* sprawling architectural archive was a pragmatic response, namely to the archive's tendency to consistently outgrow its quarters as well as to provide access to the material archived. In the 1850's the archive had grown so large that the board had to permanently rent a room in the hotel *De Ster in de Nes* just for its storage.²⁸⁴ Twenty years later, the proliferation of archival (and library) material was also singled out for the increasingly unsatisfactory working conditions in the *Wijde Kapelsteeg* building.²⁸⁵ Moreover, an appropriate accommodation for the society's archive was also of great symbolic significance. Not only was the archive the bureaucratic center of the society, where all its records were kept, but it was also *the* physical expression of the entirety of the

²⁸² Like most of the *Maatschappij* building, financial difficulties left the library unadorned with only its essential elements and basic furniture. Nevertheless, then president C. Muysken would later make the library more plush by personally paying for more comfortable furniture for the library. See, Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 53.

²⁸³ Moes, "Een 'Waardig Gebouw' Voor de Maatschappij," 88 note 39.

²⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 76.

²⁸⁵ Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 49.

Maatschappij's accomplishments. In the archive, competition submissions, assorted drawings, correspondence, reports, manuscripts, plans, institutional gifts, member's donations and other artifacts summed up the total work of the society. Therefore, the location of the society had always been identified by the location of the archive, that is, the official address of the *Maatschappij* was the location of its archives. For the first four years of its existence, the *Maatschappij's* official home was the bookshelves of its first secretary I. Warnsinck, where its archive was being housed.

Combining under one roof the different components of architectural discourse and adding a few more, the new building was an important instrument in the society's efforts to collect, advance and promote architectural knowledge. Moreover, the inauguration of the *Maatschappij's* new building signaled the clearest expression of its revised strategy of engagement, as reiterated in the speech by then president C.J. Muysken who claimed that "a public building with a meeting room, its library and collections is the only means to constantly engage with an audience, and show that audience that the artistic element is in no way lacking in our society."²⁸⁶

If the society had already been laboriously assembling a veritable archive and expansive collection of architectural knowledge for over forty years, with the construction of the *Marnixstraat* building, the *Maatschappij* fulfilled the second requirement of any museum: public accessibility. As the doors opened to welcome the first visitors to the new building, and to the permanent exhibition, it was the culmination of a long aspiration of the institution: to compile and present the advancements of architecture through technique and theory, in its dual development as a discipline and as a profession.

As expected, the opening of the new building reinvigorated the *Maatschappij*, and the following decade was "marked by enthusiasm and zeal, well-attended meetings and well-attended member-

²⁸⁶ "De Inwijding van Het Maatschappelijk Gebouw En Algemeene Vergadering," 126.

visits to construction sites.”²⁸⁷ However, in the final years of the nineteenth-century the enthusiasm and hope generated by the inauguration of the *Marnixstraat* building began to fade. After merely ten years, visitors to the permanent exhibition decreased dramatically, which was accompanied by an abrupt loss of membership, inevitably placing the society’s treasury under considerable strain. By 1896 membership numbers were devastating, as in the previous year the *Maatschappij* had lost one quarter of its overall members, and over half of its corresponding member registered in its regional branches. Justifications for the massive drop in membership abounded. From the constitution of other professional and local associations to the departure of the influential P.H. Cuypers from the Board, but the writing was on the walls, and the future of the *Maatschappij* seemed bleak. While still the oldest and largest architectural association in the Netherlands, by the turn of the century the *Maatschappij* was “forced to recognize its own moribund state.”²⁸⁸

During that period, the transformation of the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* from a society of architectural study and debate into a professional association of architects was increasingly evident. The introduction of a table of fees for architectural services in 1888, marked the starting point of this transformation which would culminate in 1918 with the *Maatschappij*’s merger with the professional association of architects, the *Bond van Nederlandse Architecten* (Institute of Dutch Architects), or *BNA*.²⁸⁹ The merger between these organizations had already been under review by different joint committees from at least 1911. However, the inclusive membership policy of the *Maatschappij* appeared to the *BNA* to be contrary to their shared purpose of advancing the interests of professional architects. In fact, the society’s inclusive membership had become a liability, particularly as in December 1907, Victor de Stuers openly questioned in

²⁸⁷ Moes, “Een ‘Waardig Gebouw’ Voor de Maatchappij,” 85.

²⁸⁸ Nancy Stieber, “The Criteria of Architectural Expertise,” in *Housing Design and Society in Amsterdam: Reconfiguring Urban Order and Identity, 1900-1920* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998), 173.

²⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 172.

Parliament the competence of the *Maatschappij* in architectural matters by ridiculing its open membership that included “brick-makers and perhaps even cookie-makers.”²⁹⁰ Thus, and not without tremendous struggle, the *Maatschappij* greatly revised its membership qualifications to differentiate between architect-members and others. Inevitably, the *Maatschappij*’s large membership dwindled as draftsmen, surveyors, carpenters, contractors, and amateurs followed the early example of engineers and organized their own professional unions that could represent their interests.²⁹¹ When the merger was completed in 1919 the Society was such a minority partner that merely two years after, in 1921, the *Marnixstraat* building and its array of functions was considered superfluous and unceremoniously sold, leaving the only vestige of this once mighty society in the official title of the new architect’s professional association: the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst Bond van Nederlandse Architecten*.²⁹²

For almost a century the *Maatschappij* worked to advance architecture. In its efforts, the society attempted to establish a conception of architecture as something artistic and technical, creating an inevitable tension between the architectural discipline and profession. Even as the Society attempted to forge an approach to architecture that straddled both theory and technique, the tension between a discipline concerned with a serious intellectual apparatus and a profession concerned with regulations, accreditation, compensation, and plagiarism became simply irreconcilable. While it had been founded to advance the appreciation of artistic expression in architecture, as years went by, the *Maatschappij* became increasingly preoccupied with advancing the professional interests of architects. Slowly, but steadily, the society’s original disciplinary approach to architecture was displaced by a professional one. The focus shifted from a ‘fine

²⁹⁰ “Een Woord van Protest,” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 27, no. 51 (December 21, 1907): 803.

²⁹¹ Krabbe, *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap*, 241.

²⁹² Even today the *BNA* retains in its official title that specific mention to the *Maatschappij*, making the last vestige of that organization.

architecture' of solid underlying theoretical principles to a 'professional' architecture of solid compensation.

The focal shift within the *Maatschappij* was structural and pervasive, implicitly commandeering a different instrumentalization of the society's means of engagement. Thus, the instruments and activities produced by the *Maatschappij*—which had been fundamental in the constitution of a dynamic architectural debate—were recalibrated to focus in the advancement of the profession rather than the discipline. Instead of urging a continued discussion of artistic valiance in architecture, these became mainly preoccupied with pay tables and titles, indicating that architecture more than an art, was really a business. While theoretical and historical discussions retreated in the pages of the journals, the most blatant expression was still in the exhibition halls of the society's building. What had begun as a cunning way to engage a wider audience and fund the expansion of the *Maatschappij* activities—including its new building—had quickly become a symbol of the society's shifting allegiances, and its commercialization of architecture. Once the *Maatschappij* began enforcing distinction and restrictions on membership, the founding principles of the society were irrevocably lost, to which the decline and eventual demise of the institution was certainly associated.

Despite its less auspicious final moments, the *Maatschappij* cannot be considered anything but a success. After all, the society fulfilled its objective of promoting an artistic appreciation of architecture and positioning theoretical and historical considerations at the center of a newly founded architectural discourse. Moreover, the *Maatschappij* was instrumental platform in creating the necessary conditions for the emergence—and continued cultivation—of an architectural culture based on the exchange of ideas. Without the infrastructure organized by the society of journals, competitions, lectures and meetings, the exchange of arguments that defined the search for a Dutch national style in the 1860s most certainly wouldn't have been so widespread or even

possible. While the major contention regarded directly the appropriateness of different styles, and indirectly the artistic freedom granted to the architect, all sides espoused the *Maatschappij's* driving claim that architecture was an artistic endeavor with an important theoretical component.²⁹³

Without the Society's continuous stress on the role of theory and history in 'fine architecture,' it can even be questioned if the issue of appropriateness of styles would have ever been posed in the Netherlands. While the *Maatschappij* excelled at facilitating discussion, it wasn't so successful in directing it, eventually becoming obsolete in the process.

Despite being 140 years apart, the parallel between the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* and the NAI is striking. From their ambitious beginnings to their commercial-oriented endings, the history and development of these institutions is remarkably similar. Both organizations aimed at a general improvement of the appreciation of architecture by recognizing the importance of architectural theory and history in the development of (their) contemporary work, thus reclaiming the centrality of architecture for architects.²⁹⁴ Moreover, while never officially dubbed a museum or an institute, the *Maatschappij* nevertheless operated similarly to contemporary architecture museums by being a platform for the advancement of architecture defined by forms of engagement commonly associated with contemporary institutions in general, and with the NAI in particular. The foundation of an architectural journal, the sponsorship of competitions (to young talent, no less), the organization of lectures and exhibitions were instruments used by both institutions to foster an emergent architecture culture.

²⁹³ For an overview of the battle of styles and context in the Netherlands, see Woud, *The Art of Building*.

²⁹⁴ The original impetus of the NAI was best summarized in its earliest tentative motto, "history as the source of inspiration for the contemporary design task." See Ruud Brouwers, "The NAI - The History of a Design Task," in *The Netherlands Architecture Institute*, trans. Robyn de Jong-Dalziel (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1993), 73.

The parallel of activities and objectives of the *Maatschappij* and the NAI has never been properly acknowledged in the official historiography of the Rotterdam institute, let alone a recognition of the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* as the first example of an architecture museum in the Netherlands and a significant historical precedent to the NAI. However, the connection between both architectural organizations was institutionalized from the first days of the NAI, as the society's surviving archives were the first collection to be catalogued and inventorized in the new institute's archives.²⁹⁵ Thus, despite a great part of the *Maatschappij's* archive having been lost in a fire at the *Marnixstraat* building on March 6, 1914, the remains of the society became part of the foundation of a new institution intent in stimulating, over a century later, a renewed Dutch architecture culture.²⁹⁶

Beyond the *Maatschappij*

One of the greatest testaments to the success of the *Matschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* in stimulating a lively architecture culture in the Netherlands was the constitution of other architectural societies and journals in the Netherlands. The *Maatschappij* activities not only raised the interest in architecture but also established a context in which other initiatives dedicated to architecture could emerge and thrive.

Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia

The *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia* (Society Architecture and Friendship) was the other major architectural society in Amsterdam in the nineteenth-century.²⁹⁷ Founded in August 23,

²⁹⁵ The first inventory of the NAI archive was a proud moment which even merited a foreword by the director of the *Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg* (Department of Heritage and Conservation), L.L.M. van Nispen tot Sevenaer. See Faber and Zwaan, "Inventaris van Het Archief van de Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst 1842-1918," 2.

²⁹⁶ For a concise account of the fire see *Ibid.*, 7.

²⁹⁷ At its foundation, the organization was officially titled *Vereniging Architectura et Amicitiae*, or *Association Architectura et Amicitiae*, only adopting its current title of *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia*, or

1855, in a café on Amsterdam's *Warmoesstraat* by a group of twenty-two young architects, urban planners and draftsmen, the *A et A* (as it became commonly known) was founded "in a period when the 1842 establishment of the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* was awaking an architectural life which had been dormant for a very long time."²⁹⁸ Beyond the improving climate of Dutch architecture, the foundation of the *A et A* was inspired by foreign associations in which young architects had the opportunity to discuss the pressing issues of architecture and present their own ideas to their peers.²⁹⁹ Thus, the main component of the fledging association was the discussion of 'fine architecture' primarily fostered by lectures and the appreciation of the artistic dimension of architecture.

Inevitably, the *Maatschappij's* long shadow in Dutch architecture was present in the formation of the *A et A*, as the founding members not only defined the new association in contrast to its more established counterpart, but also devised the *A et A* to complement the programming and activities of the *Maatschappij*. Specifically, the *A et A* intended to continue the work of the *Maatschappij's* in the elevation of 'fine architecture,' but in a targeted manner specifically tailored to suit the needs and interests of a younger generation of architects. First and foremost, it was agreed that it would be greatly beneficial for fostering debate to meet as often as possible. Thus, in contrast to the *Maatschappij's* (then) yearly meetings, the *A et A* was to meet weekly, on Monday evenings in the founding café on *Warmoesstraat*, "Stad van Breda." Moreover, since the *A et A* was intended to be an association of young architects and for young architects, membership to the association was limited—at least initially—to architecture professionals in contrast to the *Maatschappij* open membership policy. Finally, diverging from the *Maatschappij's* ubiquitous presence in the twelve

Society Architectura et Amicitia, to mark its tremendous growth in membership in 1882. See, Schilt and Werf, *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia*, 58.

²⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 15.

²⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 30.

provinces of the Netherlands (and even beyond), the *A et A* was to remain an Amsterdam organization. Even though the *A et A* membership was never openly stipulated or limited to Amsterdam, the character of the association, namely its reliance on weekly meetings and debates, presented inherent limitations to a potential membership outside the city of the Amstel. While both societies aimed at the advancement of ‘fine architecture,’ they fundamental diverged in the scope of their audiences. The *Maatschappij’s* activities and instruments were primarily devised and directed to appeal to as large spectrum of members as possible, from an art lover in Groningen to a draftsman in Eindhoven, while the *A et A* catered to a much more defined and niche audience: the Amsterdam young architect.³⁰⁰

The admiration and connection to the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* was present from the outset, as the founders of the *A et A* invited several members of the board of the *Maatschappij* to become honorary members of the new association. In return, the board of the *Maatschappij* expressed its sympathy for the new association by donating books to the *A et A* library and agreeing to jury competitions of the association. But the relation between both organizations relied on mutualism, as the *A et A* usually assisted the *Maatschappij* in its initiatives. Thus, in 1856, the *A et A* established a commission to survey and document buildings around Amsterdam that merited preservation and restoration, following the call to action by the *Maatschappij*.³⁰¹ The drawings and descriptions resulting from this *A et A* initiative were later donated to the *Maatschappij* and figured in the long running publication series of the society

³⁰⁰ There were several reasons for the *A et A* to target such a specific membership. Composed by young architects, the new society intended to be much more informal and welcoming than the *Maatschappij*, not only because unlike older architects, “young architects knew each other by name,” but also since young architects “scarcely had work” they could meet more often and remain informed by frequent discussion. J.A. van der Sluys Veer, “Kronyk, Geschiedenis van Het Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia van 1855-1905,” *Architectura: Gedenkboek Uitgegeven Ter Gelegenheid van Het Vyftig Jarig Bestaan van Het Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia* 13 (1905): 14.

³⁰¹ Schilt and Werf, *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia*, 30.

dedicated to the documentation of “Old Existing Buildings.” In 1859 there were calls for an institutionalization of the relation between both associations, while in 1871 there were proposals for the rental of a common room where both organizations could host meetings and events.³⁰² In those early years the two Amsterdam societies of architecture were so close that the *A et A* was often perceived as the Amsterdam branch of the *Maatschappij* for young members.³⁰³ In effect, not only the *A et A* contributed to the activities and publications of its “sister-society,” but most members of the *A et A* were also active members of the *Maatschappij*.

Given the harmony of objectives and general attitude towards architecture between *Architectura et Amicitia* and the *Maatschappij*, it seemed only natural that both organizations procured similar instruments in the promotion of architecture. Thus, while the focus of the *A et A* was the support of a vigorous architecture debate with weekly members’ meetings and lectures, just like the *Maatschappij*, the association also organized architectural competitions for its members and exhibitions of architecture to signal important occasions.

Every year, the *A et A* organized several competitions for its member with an eclectic range of tenders. The competitions organized in 1855, the first year of the association, signaled the breadth envisioned by its founders for the competition program, addressing both architectural practice and theory. On the two ends of the spectrum, there was a competition for the design of a police station, and a competition for a treatise on carved stone. Unfortunately, both competitions would not have a single entry, leading the *A et A* to reduce the scope of its competition program in the following years. While text-based competitions of architectural treatises were completely shelved, the application of architectural theory and history was nevertheless crucial in the judgment of the ensuing competitions of design and sketches of architecture. Tenders for design competitions ranged from

³⁰² Ibid., 34, 44.

³⁰³ Krabbe, *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap*, 118.

simple designs for a bandstand in the park and bookcases for an administration building to complex projects for public buildings like a railway station, a synagogue, a theater, but also a “museum for architectural drawings.”³⁰⁴

At the end of the 500th meeting of the *A et A* (in only twelve years of existence), it was proposed that such distinguished occasion should be celebrated with the organization of a design competition for a “Museum for Architectural Drawings.”³⁰⁵ Even though it was the only competition administered by the *A et A* in 1867, and it awarded an unprecedented pecuniary prize of 75 guilders, no submission was received. Even after the submission deadline was extended for another year, there were still no submissions to this competition. While pioneering, the 1867 organization of a competition for a “Museum for Architectural Drawings” must be placed in context, since at the same time the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* was organizing a polished exhibition of architecture to celebrate its silver jubilee.

Like the *Maatschappij, Architectura et Amicitia* also staged architectural exhibitions to a wide audience. In 1857 the *A et A* organized its first exhibition with a small affair in a room at the artists association *Arti et Amicitiae*, presenting the work of its members J.A. Roseboom, H. Molemans and J.F.J. Margry. Other, equally modest, public displays would soon follow, but more elaborate exhibitions—displaying not just architecture, but also plastic arts and crafts—were organized after the association’s reorganization in 1881.³⁰⁶ Namely, in 1885 a grand exhibition was staged in the

³⁰⁴ For a complete listing of all the competitions organized by the *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia* see Schilt and Werf, *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia*, 223–230.

³⁰⁵ While Leliman’s introduction of the competition (and his generous offer to personally finance the pecuniary prize) is well documented in the hand-written minutes of the *A et A*’s 500th meeting, the actual program and design brief devised for the “Museum for Architectural Drawings” has long been lost and is not available in the society’s archive. See “ARAM 3: “Notulen van Ledenvergaderingen, 22 Oktober 1862 - 2 Februari 1870,” n.d.

³⁰⁶ Unlike the *Maatschappij, Architectura et Amicitia* continued to promote a conception of architecture as primarily an artistic endeavor. Therefore, the *A et A*’s used its exhibitions to further reinforce the association between architecture and other visual arts by presenting them side by side.

Militiezaal salon on the *Singel* canal to celebrate *Architectura et Amicitia*'s 30th anniversary.³⁰⁷ In a *Militiezaal* completely transformed to accommodate four separate rooms, the *A et A* presented new and old architecture, with decorative arts, painting and sculpture. Following the customary dignitaries that attended the opening of the exhibition, an extraordinary 4,000 visitors passed by the halls of the exhibition between August and September. In 1891, the association organized another elaborate celebratory exhibition, this time to commemorate its seventh lustrum, or its 35th anniversary. It was the largest exhibition to be held in the temporary exhibition hall on the *Damrak*, and again presented not only old and new architecture, but also decorative and visual arts.³⁰⁸

While impressive, these exhibitions were dwarfed by the exhibition prepared to commemorate *Architectura et Amicitia*'s 50th anniversary in 1905. Set in the honorific context of the *Stedelijk Museum*, this grand exhibition presented architecture interspersed with sculpture and painting. With "590 contemporary works and 360 old drawings and other artifacts," the exhibition opened on September 16 and intended to offer a glimpse to what Amsterdam looked like at the time of the *A et A* foundation, before the nineteenth-century demolition works.³⁰⁹ Thus, according to leading architect H.P. Berlage, the exhibition was to provide, "an accurate image of the evolving understanding of art, but also an overview of the great change which architecture has undergone in the past years."³¹⁰ By presenting architecture in a museum dedicated to fine arts (albeit modern), the *A et A* was resolutely continuing the tradition initiated by the *Maatschappij* of equating architecture with its companion arts of painting and sculpture. Even after five decades (and unlike

³⁰⁷ "Een Tentoonstelling van Bouwkunst," *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 5, no. 34 (August 29, 1885): 212.

³⁰⁸ Schilt and Werf, *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia*, 68.

³⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 88.

³¹⁰ H. P. Berlage, "Feestrede Uitgesproken Door Den Heer H.P. Berlage," *Architectura: Gedenkboek Uitgegeven Ter Gelegenheid van Het Vyftig Jarig Bestaan van Het Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia* 13 (1905): 4.

its sister society), *Architectura et Amicitia* was still committed to the advancement of an artistic appreciation of architecture.

The *Stedelijk Museum* exhibition was the culmination of the notable ascent of the association in the previous twenty-five years. It denoted not only the centrality of *Architectura et Amicitia* in Dutch architecture culture, but also expressed the significant prestige the *A et A* had garnered in the preceding decades. While for the first twenty-five years of its existence the *A et A* was plagued by a modest membership and a persistent apathy from most of its members, throughout the 1880s and 90s the association experienced a tremendous growth of membership and became a respectable competitor to the then still leading *Maatschappij*.³¹¹

The turning point for *Architectura et Amicitia* arrived in 1881, when the association's board—particularly its president J. L. Springer—launched an evaluation and revision of its structure and processes in intervening in Dutch architecture culture, similar to what the *Maatschappij* had just conducted. In its task of adjusting the organization's structure to improve its standing, the *A et A* board decided to complement the usual member-consultation procedure with contributions from foreign architectural societies and associations. Thus, inquiries were sent out to foreign associations concerning their functioning and activities. Out of 200 questionnaires sent, 89 replies were received.³¹² Such basic action was doubly beneficial for *Architectura et Amicitia*, since not only offered some valuable insights into the operations of its foreign counterparts, but also provided some international notoriety.

However, similarly to the *Maatschappij*, the board of the *A et A* quickly determined that in order to impact the development of Dutch architecture, an engagement with a larger audience was

³¹¹ Krabbe, *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap*, 118.

³¹² Schilt and Werf, *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia*, 54.

necessary, which inevitably required an increased level of publicity. Thus, in late 1881 the weekly architecture journal *De Opmerker* (The Observer) began reporting on the fortnightly members' meetings of *Architectura et Amicitia*. The collaboration between *de Opmerker* and *Architectura et Amicitia* was to become crucial for the increased influence and prestige garnered by the *A et A* in the following years. Primarily, the increased exposure on the pages of a weekly journal allowed the association's ideas and discussions to reach a wider audience, leading to an unprecedented boost in membership.

De Opmerker had been published weekly since April 1866 by the Arnhem architect F.W. van Gendt sporting the official title of "*De Opmerker: Weekly for Architects, Engineers, Manufacturers and Contractors of Public Works.*"³¹³ Similarly to the *Maatschappij's* periodicals, *De Opmerker* reported on both architectural theory and practice, aiming to be a source of information with columns dedicated to architectural criticism, book and exhibitions reviews, biographies of authorities in art and architecture, announcements of competitions and technical advances.³¹⁴

The urge to engage with a wider audience also motivated an unprecedented opening of the *A et A* to a wider membership, creating new member categories and, in effect, ending the restrictions to membership which had notoriously been limited to Amsterdam architects. In 1882, the year after the survey, membership of the association increased almost 50 percent and in the following year more than doubled, reaching a total of 246 members. Such remarkable growth in membership was mainly fostered by the affiliation of the new audiences the association was trying to reach, namely members outside Amsterdam and art-patrons outside the professional circles of architecture.³¹⁵ The growth of membership was so remarkable that in 1882, with the ratification of the amendment

³¹³ The founding publisher of *De Opmerker*, F.W. van Gendt, was not just also a founding member of *Architectura et Amicitia*, but was even the secretary of the association for the first two years. See *Ibid.*, 30.

³¹⁴ "Aan Onze Lezers," *De Opmerker* 1, no. 1 (April 7, 1866): 1.

³¹⁵ Schilt and Werf, *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia*, 56.

to the bylaws of the association, a new title was also adopted. Rather than *Vereniging* (association), the renewed organization was to be titled *Genootschap (society) Architectura et Amicitia*, since this was a much more fitting title for an organization which had already outgrown its origins as a club for young Amsterdam architects.

The increased membership of the *A et A* and its collaboration with *De Opmerker* were inherently interrelated. Not only the society became known to an entire new audience through the pages of the periodical, but it was also the *De Opmerker* reporting on *Architectura et Amicitia* that allowed far and wide members to remain engaged with the society. Recognizing the centrality of the periodical in its strategy of public engagement—both in directing architectural debate and in acquiring a better standing within the cultural milieu—in 1883 *Architectura et Amicitia* institutionalized a partnership with *de De Opmerker* and adopted the periodical as the society's journal.³¹⁶ The agreement entailed editorial control to be ceded to *Architectura et Amicitia*, with the president of the *A et A* to also preside over the editorial board of the journal. The collaboration between *De Opmerker* and the *A et A* lasted a decade, after which they parted ways. In that same year, 1893, the society founded its own weekly journal: *Architectura*.

Combined with the adoption of *De Opmerker* as its official instrument for mass communication, *Architectura et Amicitia* also decided to establish an architectural library open to the public. A large celebration in January 1883 commemorated the inauguration of the *A et A* new architectural library at the *Maison Stoucken* on *Marnixstraat*, adjacent to the plot where the *Maatschappij's* new communal building would be erected in the following year.³¹⁷ More than a library, the rooms rented

³¹⁶ Ibid., 232.

³¹⁷ As it has been previously discussed, by the time the *Architectura et Amicitia* rented the premises of the *Maison Stoucken* for its architectural library, the *Maatschappij* had already purchase the land—and was actively preparing the design competition—for its new communal building in an adjacent plot on *Marnixstraat*.

by the *A et A* at the *Maison Stoucken* also accommodated small exhibitions accessible to the public, presenting the society's competition submissions and various projects of its members.³¹⁸ Much like the *Maatschappij, Architectura et Amicitia* had realized that the establishment of a physical space accessible to the general public was an important device in furthering its strategy of engagement and in increasing its visibility.

With an increased and diversified membership, a journal, a library, an exhibition and a clear mandate for greater engagement, *Architectura et Amicitia* became incredibly similar to the *Maatschappij*, and a rivalry between both associations naturally emerged. In fact, the renewal operated within *Architectura et Amicitia* seemed to have been also motivated by the board's intention to challenge the *Maatschappij's* leadership in Dutch architecture culture. This much was revealed in the words of then president Jan Springer, as in an 1881 meeting of the *A et A* declared that with the reorganization the *A et A* was uniquely positioned to "increase its prestige and more forcefully defend the interests of young architecture practitioners, opposing the autocratic rise and spirit of *Olympus* that appears to govern our larger Sister-societies."³¹⁹ Inevitably the two largest architecture societies in the Netherlands were growing apart, with the institutional relation becoming increasingly strained. The struggle between the *Maatschappij* and *Architectura et Amicitia* became evident in 1884, with the rapprochement between the *A et A* to the *Maatschappij's* Rotterdam department, since this department was at the time considering to secede from the main organization.³²⁰

With the same instruments at their disposal it didn't take long for *Architectura et Amicitia* to achieve its objective and surpass the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* in both prestige

³¹⁸ Schilt and Werf, *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia*, 58.

³¹⁹ As stated by Schilt who even mentions that J.L Springer seemed to forget that he himself was at the time also secretary of the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst*. See *Ibid.*, 54.

³²⁰ *Ibid.*, 60.

and influence. The *A et A*'s 1885 architectural exhibition provided an early indication of that society's ascendancy in architectural and cultural circles since in a month it welcomed 4,000 visitors while the *Maatschappij*'s 1882 also month-long exhibition had *only* been visited by a little over 1,000 people. Even more enlightening was the comparison between the *A et A*'s *Militezaal* exhibition and the opening of the *Maatschappij*'s permanent exhibition, since in a month the *A et A* exhibition was able to attract over 1,000 visitors more than the *Maatschappij*'s permanent exhibition in an entire year.

While the *A et A*'s exhibitions rivaled and surpassed similar initiatives of the *Maatschappij*, the clearest indication of *Architectura et Amicitia*'s recently attained prominence in Dutch architecture—and an inherent indication of the significant shift in the balance between these architectural societies—occurred when the *Maatschappij*'s own journal, the *Bouwkundig Weekblad*, began consistently reporting on the meetings and competitions of its rival association. The reporting of the *A et A*'s activities by the *Bouwkundig Weekblad* had a special significance for *Architectura et Amicitia*'s, since during *A et A*'s early years the board of the *Maatschappij* had refused to announce, or even note, the *A et A*'s lectures and other programs in its journal (then *Bouwkundige Bijdragen*) causing great resentment among the *A et A*'s ranks.³²¹ More recently, *Architectura et Amicitia*'s had continued to be dismissed by the more established *Maatschappij*, as its initiatives for organizational renewal and reputation enhancement had not only been underestimated, but had even been met by blatant indifference. However, as *Architectura et Amicitia* soared to new heights and considerably increased its members-base, the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* entered a steady decline, losing both members and social standing.

³²¹ Ibid., 34.

In only twelve and a half years, the cunning direction of J.L. Springer had managed to revolutionize *Architectura et Amicitia*, and overcome the *Maatschappij* as the leading architectural society in Amsterdam. After their respective reorganizations in the 1880s the means of engagement at the disposal of both societies became comparable. What really separated both organizations was their approach to architecture. While the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* had become increasingly engaged with professional matters, in effect engaging architecture as a profession, *Architectura et Amicitia* maintained its initial orientation of “advancing architecture as an art form,” that is, approaching architecture as a discipline.³²² The two societies’ different approaches to architecture would become further accentuated in 1908, when prominent *A et A* members—such as K.P.C. de Bazel and *A et A* chairman W. Kromhout—established the *Bond van Nederlandse Architecten* (Institute of Dutch Architects, or *BNA*), a professional union of architects.³²³

The constitution of the *BNA* on February 29, 1908, was the realization of old desires born out of discussions within the *A et A* for the creation of an organization that was specifically mandated to advance the interests and protect the rights of architects. But while the majority of *A et A* members supported the professionalization of the discipline, the society itself refused to veer off its course of promoting an appreciation of architecture’s artistic dimension to engage in professional issues. Although this struggle created a crisis over the direction of the society, it was ultimately resolved when prominent members (such as K.P.C. de Bazel and H.P. Berlage) established the *BNA* as a completely separate organization that could still (unofficially) operate in tandem with the *A et A*.³²⁴ Therefore, although not an official initiative of the society, the *BNA* was essentially complementary

³²² Stieber, “The Criteria of Architectural Expertise,” 172.

³²³ While the *BNA* currently translates its title to English as (Royal) Institute of Dutch Architects, several sources have previously translated the organization’s title as League of Dutch Architects.

³²⁴ The complementarity of both organizations was quite noticeable, as most members of the *BNA* (including their founding members) remained also associated and active within the *A et A*.

to the *A et A*, since its handling of architecture as a profession allowed *Architectura et Amicitia* to further focus on the artistic and intellectual dimension of architecture.³²⁵

The distinct approaches to architecture of the *Maatschappij* and *Architectura et Amicitia* articulated a curious development in which the *A et A*'s promotion of theoretical debate and artistic appreciation of architecture was much more devoted to the original 1842 objectives and ambitions of the *Maatschappij* than the *Maatschappij*'s own activities. Moreover, the success of the *A et A* in the early years of the twentieth century—measured by not only its membership numbers but mainly by its tangible influence on the direction of Dutch architecture culture and its context—validated the uniquely inclusive nature of the architectural discipline and discourse. Much like in 1842, the defense of the architectural discipline and the support of a dynamic architectural discourse (influence by history and framed by different theoretical positions) continued to resonate with architects and architectural enthusiasts, as these continued to support the efforts of *Architectura et Amicitia* in its steadfast course and deserted the *Maatschappij* in droves.³²⁶ Such passionate and sustained support for the *A et A*'s objectives and ambitions demonstrated that while professional considerations had a place in architectural discussion, these did not simply displace the disciplinary approach to architecture but complement it. While a profession, architecture was first and foremost a discipline that advanced through a construction of a disciplinary discourse and merited serious intellectual debate.

The course of the *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia* continued to be validated throughout the twentieth-century, and even today. While the *Maatschappij* is long gone, the *A et A* continued to be a

³²⁵ Schilt and Werf, *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia*, 94.

³²⁶ As Stieber has aptly demonstrated, at the start of the twentieth century both societies were attempting to redefine their membership, but while the *Maatschappij* attempted to separate architects from other members based on formal training, *Architectura et Amicitia* did so “solely on the basis of aesthetic talent” by ensuring that its members were artistically accomplished. Stieber, “The Criteria of Architectural Expertise,” 174.

leading voice in the most prominent debates in Dutch architecture of the past century, also becoming an instrumental group in the early initiatives and eventual realization of a museum of architecture in the Netherlands.

Jan Leliman and his son Willem Leliman

While the development of both the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* and the *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia* is indelibly associated to the professional and disciplinary advancement of architecture in the Netherlands, in the progress of both societies and in the path towards an architecture museum in the Netherlands in the nineteenth-century, one single individual was equally influential: Johannes Hermanus (Jan) Leliman (1828-1910). Chief among Leliman's contributions was his early understanding of a clear association between raising public interest in architecture and the constitution of an architecture museum.

At a time when there was no formal architectural education in the Netherlands, Jan Leliman moved abroad in 1849 intent in complementing his architectural training.³²⁷ After spending some time in Brussels and Munich, Leliman ended up in Henri Labrouste's Paris architectural studio in 1852.³²⁸ Working for Labrouste, Leliman learned "to freely interpret and use historic architectural

³²⁷ As Stieber has noted, "Dutch architectural education had been neglected in the nineteenth-century." For several decades the *Maatschappij* and other architects petitioned for the establishment of an architecture academy, since without formal training available in the Netherlands, architects either trained in offices or studied abroad. The first architectural courses were introduced in 1861 in the (then) Royal Academy in Delft, becoming a full degree in architecture in 1864, when the academy became the Delft Polytechnic. While first in the Netherlands, the Delft architecture degree "differed only slightly from the civil engineering curriculum" and was particularly lacking in the teaching of history and theory. Even when architecture became independent from civil engineering in 1901, architecture education in Delft remained largely academic and technical. Other architectural classes had been offered at the Academy of Fine Arts in Amsterdam, but those ceased in 1870. Architecture education only returned to Amsterdam in 1908, when *Architectura et Amicitia* established the Amsterdam Architecture Academy (*Academie van Bouwkunst*) offering evening courses with an emphasis in aesthetic instruction (namely theory and history) to practicing architectural draftsmen, thus complementing their technical education.

³²⁸ Marijke Estourgie-Beijer, "Schoonheid, Waarheid En Karakter: Lelimans Denken over Bouwkunst," in *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst: Schetsen Uit de Geschiedenis van Het Genootschap*, ed. Erik de Jong, Coert Peter Krabbe, and Tiede J Boersma (Amsterdam: De Sluitsteen A & NP, 1993), 51.

types and to put into perspective the issue of a contemporary style.”³²⁹ Without any concern with a particular style, Leliman developed a strong sensibility for an eclectic conception of architecture rooted in history, where the past was instrumentalized and fundamentally transformed to respond to the contemporary design task. Returning to Amsterdam in 1853, Jan Lelilam subsequently became an influential voice in the nascent Dutch architectural discourse. However, Leliman’s position of authority, particularly in the 1860s and 70s, was “based not so much on the quality of his designs and his buildings as on his knowledge and vision as regards both architecture itself and the profession,” as “he propagated his ideas in a remarkable number of lectures and publications, and in his substantial administrative involvement in architectural organizations.”³³⁰

From an early age, Jan Leliman was interested in architecture and sought to be involved with the advancement of the discipline. At 15, he began an apprenticeship with architect J.F. Metzlaar in Rotterdam, and the following year, as soon as he turned 16 and fulfilled the only requirement for membership, Leliman became a member of the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst*.³³¹ While already engaged with the *Maatschappij*, Leliman would be directly involved in the foundation of *Architectura et Amicitia*. Not only was Leliman one of the founding members of the new architecture society, but also, in a story that Leliman would often return to in his speeches, the plan to establish the *A et A* emerged from his own enthusiastic tales of an “architectural life” of young architects in Paris.³³² On his construction site for the new building for the artists association *Arti et Amicitiae* on the *Rokin*, Leliman shared with his young colleagues G.F. Moele Bergveld and F.W. van Gendt (who would respectively become the first president and secretary of the *A et A*) his stories concerning the strong connections developed among a young generation of architects in Paris

³²⁹ Woud, *The Art of Building*, 35.

³³⁰ *Ibid.*, 34.

³³¹ Estourgie-Beijer, “Schoonheid, Waarheid En Karakter: Lelimans Denken over Bouwkunst,” 51.

³³² Sluys Veer, “Kronyk, Geschiedenis van Het Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia van 1855-1905,” 14.

through constant discussion of architectural ideas. Realizing that such community of young architects was missing in the Netherlands, G.F. Moele Bergveld and F.W. van Gendt gathered some friends and established the *Architectura et Amicitia*.³³³

Beyond being a member of both architecture societies from an early date, Jan Leliman would also become deeply involved in the administration of these organizations. In the *Maatschappij*, Leliman would first join the board in 1856 as a commissioner of the society. In 1862 he took over from A.N. Godefroy the position of secretary, while in 1867 he would take over once again from Godefroy, but this time as president of the *Maatschappij*. Leliman's barrage of lectures, publications and assertive contributions at meetings allowed him to quickly move up the ranks of the society, but also to become an influential figure in the development of Dutch architecture culture in the second half of the nineteenth-century. In 1876 Leliman stepped down as chairman of the *Maatschappij*, "but continued to intentionally or unintentionally interfere with all matters of the association."³³⁴ In recognition of his contribution to the society, when he retired from his position of Commissioner of the *Maatschappij* in 1880, he was awarded an honorary membership to the *Maatschappij*.³³⁵ Jan Leliman was the first Dutch architect to be bestowed such honor, since until then, honorary membership had been reserved for foreigners who distinguished themselves in the advancement of architectural debate.

Within *Architectura et Amicitia*, Leliman would be equally influential. While already on the board of the *Maatschappij*, in 1860 Leliman took office as president of the *A et A*. Given the prestigious positions occupied by Leliman in the *Maatschappij* and the *A et A*, it was unsurprising that during the 1860s the understanding between both societies was better than ever.³³⁶ While his

³³³ Schilt and Werf, *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia*, 30.

³³⁴ Krabbe, *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap*, 119.

³³⁵ Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 47.

³³⁶ Schilt and Werf, *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia*, 40.

tenure as president only lasted for three years, upon his departure Leliman was conferred another singular recognition. While mostly symbolic, Leliman was nominated honorary president of *Architectura et Amicitia*, a position that he would hold for 46 years, until his passing in 1910. However, Leliman continued to intervene in the affairs of the society, even becoming the treasurer of the *A et A* between 1878 and 1886.³³⁷

Jan Leliman's contribution to the shaping of architectural discourse was also grounded in his work at the leading architectural publications of the time. Beyond regularly contributing with articles, between 1863 and 1876 Leliman was also an editor for the *Maatschappij's Bouwkundige Bijdragen*, while also becoming an editor of the *De Opmerker* in 1867.³³⁸ However, Leliman was also an accomplished architect, with a prominent, albeit limited, architectural practice. Among his most influential works were not only the 1852 winning entry to a *Maatschappij*-organized competition for a large post office and the construction of the building for the *Maatschappij Arti et Amicitiae* which presented his ahistorical eclectic approach to architecture, but also his continued interest in workers housing.³³⁹

The profound engagement in such breadth of architectural instruments of the nascent disciplinary apparatus provided Leliman with a unique insight onto the discipline. Thus, Leliman was among the first—if not the first—in the Netherlands to fully recognize the momentous opportunity for the advancement of the discipline presented by the exhibition medium. Understanding that drawings were an essential tool for the communication and discussion of architectural ideas, in 1858 Jan Leliman proposed in *Architectura et Amicitia* a “real large exhibition

³³⁷ Estourgie-Beijer, “Schoonheid, Waarheid En Karakter: Lelimans Denken over Bouwkunst,” 53.

³³⁸ *Ibid.*, 51, 53. For a full list of Jan Leliman's architectural designs, lectures and writings, see Sigrid de Jong, *J. H. Leliman (1828-1910): Eclecticisme Als Ontwerpmethode Voor Een Nieuwe Bouwkunst*, Bibliografieën En Oeuvrelijsten van Nederlandse Architecten En Stedebouwkundigen (Rotterdam: Stichting Bonas, 2001), 145–168.

³³⁹ For a full list of Jan Leliman's architectural designs, see Jong, *J. H. Leliman (1828-1910)*, 66–144.

of architectural drawings.”³⁴⁰ Although plans for the exhibition were initially debated within the association, the idea was eventually abandoned due to financial constraints. While Leliman failed to convince his colleagues at the *A et A*, as secretary of the *Maatschappij* he became a forceful proponent of the organization of a grand exhibition to celebrate the society’s 25th anniversary in 1867.³⁴¹ It was only fitting that the first grand architectural exhibition in the Netherlands marked the start of Leliman’s nine year tenure as president of the *Maatschappij*.

While the merits of architectural exhibition in the dissemination of architecture knowledge were widely acknowledged, Leliman also recognized architectural exhibitions as a privileged moment for the enunciation of the discipline to a wider audience. For Leliman, exhibitions of architectural drawings, models, and fragments of buildings were exemplary means to challenge the general public indifference towards architecture. Also in 1867, as the public disinterest in architecture had become a recurrent topic of discussion in *Architectura et Amicitia*’s meetings, Leliman proposed the organization of a design competition for an architecture museum in this society’s 500th meeting.³⁴² Unlike the *Maatschappij*, which was preparing a grand exhibition of architecture for its 25th anniversary, the *A et A* could hardly afford the organization of an actual exhibition. Thus, the young architects of the *A et A* were asked to reflect and contribute to the debate on architectural exhibitions through their designs for a building suited to the installation of such exhibitions. While refused by the board, Leliman also proposed to exceptionally open the competition for a museum “for architectural drawings, models and fragments of buildings” to architects outside *Architectura et Amicitia*.

³⁴⁰ Schilt and Werf, *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia*, 32.

³⁴¹ The exhibition celebrating the *Maatschappij*’s 25th anniversary presented over 1,000 objects and drawings in the building of the Royal Academy of Fine Arts. For a more thorough description and discussion of this exhibition, see the section “*Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst*” earlier in this chapter.

³⁴² Schilt and Werf, *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia*, 40.

By petitioning to open the competition to non-*A et A* members, Leliman attempted to frame the competition for an architecture museum within a larger debate, beyond the limited group of *Architectura et Amicitia*. Specifically, it demonstrated that, for Leliman, proposals for the design of an architecture museum would be a valuable contribution to the ongoing debate regarding the enunciation of the discipline to a larger audience, a debate initiated by the preparations for the *Maatschappij's* 25th anniversary exhibition. Beyond being the first time the issue of an architecture museum was proposed in the Netherlands, it is evident that for Leliman the association between raising public interest in architecture and the constitution of an architecture museum was already established.

While the lack of submissions for the 1867 competition was certainly disappointing, Leliman's enthusiasm for architectural exhibitions did not abate. When the time came to decide how to commemorate the *Maatschappij's* 40th anniversary, Leliman suggested—once again—the organization of a grand architectural exhibition that could present the discipline to a wider audience. Using the example of the architectural exhibition organized to commemorate the 25th anniversary of the *Maatschappij* at the *Militiezaal* fifteen years earlier, Leliman proposed the organization of a “National Exhibition of Architecture” in which the entire breadth of the discipline was to be presented.³⁴³ While not fully convinced, the board considered that it was worth investigating the matter further and requested Leliman to prepare a specific proposal to be presented in the following General Assembly of Members, in September 1881. Despite the serious objections raised regarding the costs associated with such ambitious endeavor, Leliman's proposal

³⁴³“Algemeene Vergadering van de Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst,” *De Opmerker* 16, no. 22, bijvoegsel (May 28, 1881).

garnered the support of several *Maatschappij* members, who believed that “if the implementation was entrusted to capable hands,” it would certainly be a success.³⁴⁴

Beyond the inherent benefits of organizing an architectural exhibition, such public presentation of architecture became also a significant proof of concept of what the society could accomplish. Notoriously, as the *Maatschappij's* 1882 *Rijksmuseum* architectural exhibition accomplished a dignified celebration on a realistic budget, it became the model for the commercial exploration of the society's future building with exhibition space.

The correlation between a wider openness of the discipline to a general audience and an increase of public interest and appreciation of architecture remained a central claim for Leliman. A greater exposure of the public to the ideas and issues of the architectural discipline, Leliman argued, would inevitably result in a much deserved appreciation of the intrinsic qualities of architecture and an increased recognition of the architect's work. Furthermore, Leliman was among the first to assert that only through a greater public engagement could the Amsterdam architectural societies increase their visibility and gain a much needed political relevance. In the initial discussions for the renewal of the *Maatschappij* in 1879, Jan Leliman's central claim that the indifference of the public resulted from the low visibility of the society outside the architectural discipline was remembered and became widely accepted.³⁴⁵

From that single observation, the *Maatschappij* completely restructured its organization and pursued a strategy of public engagement, targeting its activities to not only its members but also the

³⁴⁴ The support for Leliman's proposed exhibition was most clearly voiced by articles in *De Opmerker* and correspondence published by the society's own *Bouwkundig Weekblad*. “Het Veertigjarig Bestaan Der Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst,” *De Opmerker* 16, no. 27 (July 2, 1881); and B. van Dijk, “Correspondentie,” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 1, no. 11 (July 13, 1881): 57.

³⁴⁵ In his account of those initial discussions, Rieber reports how for over 10 years the former president had been cautioning to the general lack of interest of the public. See Rieber, *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*, 34.

general public. Soon after the *Maatschappij's* organizational overhaul was implemented with its 1880 amendment, *Architectura et Amicitia* followed suit. In 1881 the *A et A* initiated its own statutory revision, which once completed also favored public engagement as a way to garner greater visibility and prestige. In short, Jan Leliman's early perception—and warning—that public indifference towards architecture should be confronted by the Amsterdam architectural societies with increased activities directed at a wider audience, greatly informed the 1880s restructuring of Dutch architecture culture.

The 1880s revision of the Amsterdam architectural societies not only ushered an unprecedented era of openness of the architectural discipline to a wide audience, but to achieve it, both societies grounded their activities on communal buildings whose program and spaces resembled a modern architecture museum. Again, Jan Leliman was involved in this process.

When the *Maatschappij* launched a competition in 1883 for its new building, it was the long awaited realization of Leliman's proposed 1867 *A et A* competition for an architecture museum. Even though sixteen years had passed and the context of the debate had substantially changed, the renewed discussion of architectural exhibitions could finally be complemented with the contribution presented by design responses to a building for a permanent exhibition of architecture. However, given the prospect of construction, this competition was practically guaranteed to have a significantly different outcome than its distant precedent. As a member of the committee judging the submissions, Leliman could attest to that. Not only the 1883 competition received a remarkable number of submissions, but the criteria for their evaluation also differed from its earlier counterpart. Design proposals were judged not only on their inherent artistic qualities or by the "beauty, truth and character" of their construction, but were also—even mostly—judged on their response to more pragmatic and quantifiable issues. Rather than the appropriateness of the architectural style, or the character of the design, it was the maximization of

exhibition areas and wall space as well as the proposals' budgets that were most discussed in the jury report evaluating the five designs invited to the second round of the competition.³⁴⁶ More than the idea of an architecture museum, what was being assessed was the realization of an architecture museum.

After the conclusion of the competition, Jan Leliman's invaluable contribution to the entire process would be further recognized. Specifically, Leliman was invited to set the first stone in the construction of the *Maatschappij's* new building on the *Marnixstraat* on May 8, 1884.³⁴⁷ Present at the ceremony with his seven-year old son, Jan Leliman bestowed the honor of placing the first stone of the new building to the young Johannes Hendrik Willem (Willem) Leliman. A sixteenth-century stone with relief ornament was symbolically selected to initiate the construction of the building, laying history in general, but Dutch Renaissance in particular, at the core of the renewed society.³⁴⁸ The occasion was documented in a painting by Bertha Valkenburg, which, upon completion of the building, occupied a place of honor at its entrance. After decades of relentlessly asserting the inherent benefits of architectural exhibitions in the opening of the architectural discipline to a wider audience, Jan Leliman could finally witness the materialization of his continued efforts with the inauguration on May 20, 1885 of the veritable architecture museum that was the *Maatschappij's* new building.

The presence of the young Willem Leliman at the foundation of such early initiative of what was effectively the first architecture museum in the Netherlands may have been purely coincidental, but it turned out to be quite prophetic. As Willem Leliman grew up, he became a formidable proponent

³⁴⁶ Moes, "Een 'Waardig Gebouw' Voor de Maatschappij," 81.

³⁴⁷ "De Inwijding van Het Maatschappelijk Gebouw En Algemeene Vergadering."

³⁴⁸ While the support for Dutch Renaissance was never directly voiced, the implications were obvious to most observers. "Mededeelingen Betreffende de Maatschappij," *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 4, no. 20 (May 15, 1884): 133.

of the establishment of an architecture museum as a fundamental instrument in the study of architecture.

Following on his father's footsteps, Willem Leliman became an architect, also displaying a varied interest in the advancement of architecture culture beyond architectural design. Thus, like his father, Willem Leliman established his position within Dutch architectural discourse through his authorship of several articles and the presentation of numerous lectures. Moreover, in their design practice, father and son also shared some concerns. Both were committed to an architectural design which favored function over historicity, and both were passionate advocates for the improvement of workers' housing.³⁴⁹

It shouldn't come as a surprise that Willem Leliman's calling followed so closely his father's career. After all, when Willem was born in 1878, Jan Leliman decided to give up his architectural practice in order to focus on the education of his son.³⁵⁰ With Jan Leliman's grooming, it was only natural that the young Willem developed an interest in architecture and in his father work at an early age. After placing the first stone in the new *Maatschappij* building when he was seven years old, the young Leliman began copying his father's architectural drawings and sketches.³⁵¹ However, his father's influence would persist even after Willem Leliman completed his architectural training, as he established his architectural office in his parents' house on the *Keizersgracht* (remaining there for 17 years), where his father's designs and extensive library served for inspiration.

³⁴⁹ Jan Leliman was deeply interested with the design of workers housing, winning an 1853 competition from the *Vereeniging ten behoeve der Arbeidersklasse* (Association on behalf of the Working Class) while Willem's design for the workers housing in Treebeek was hailed as groundbreaking. See E. B. F. Pey et al., *J.H.W. Leliman (1878-1921): Architect en Publicist* (Rotterdam: Stichting Bonas, 1997).

³⁵⁰ Jong, *J. H. Leliman (1828-1910)*.

³⁵¹ Several of the young Willem Leliman's copied sketches as a child are found in the NAI's collection as well as his father's original drawings. See NAI archive LELI "Kindertekeningen," numbers t218 and t219

Willem was a gifted and prolific writer, and just as ambitious as his father. Besides contributing regularly to both *De Opmerker* and *Bouwkundig Weekblad*, in a partnership with publisher F. van Rossen, Willem Leliman founded his own architectural periodical in 1902.³⁵² At *De Bouwwereld* (The World of Construction) Willem Leliman not only contributed with articles, but was also head-editor, a position which he retained for almost twenty years, until his untimely death.³⁵³ While Jan Leliman influenced the course of architectural discussion from his positions at architectural societies, his son attempted the same from the pages of his “weekly journal for theory and practice.”

Like his father, Willem Leliman was greatly interested in architectural exhibitions, sharing his enthusiasm for the potential of architectural exhibitions to open the discipline and its discourse to a wider audience.³⁵⁴ The younger Leliman’s involvement with a travelling exhibition presenting Garden-City designs in 1908 gave him firsthand experience of the latent potential of architectural exhibitions.³⁵⁵ However, only after Jan Leliman passed away in 1910 and the *Maatschappij* began its insurmountable decline, did Willem begin his own campaign in support of architectural exhibitions as a place for the reflection and enunciation of architecture to both its interiority and exteriority.

³⁵² With the foundation of Willem Leliman’s *De Bouwwereld*, at the turn of the century there were five major periodicals dedicated to architecture in the Netherlands, namely the two publications published by the *Maatschappij*, the *Bouwkundig Weekblad* (1881) and the *Bouwkundig Tijdschrift* (1881), the *A et A* official publication *Architectura*, the now unaffiliated *De Opmerker* (1886), and Leliman’s *De Bouwwereld* (1902). A comprehensive list of Willem Leliman’s publications is available at Pey et al., *J.H.W. Leliman (1878-1921)*, 94–103.

³⁵³ After a long-illness, Willem Leliman passed away in April 1921 at “the still young age of 42” in his home in Baarn. See “J.H.W. Leliman,” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 42, no. 16 (April 16, 1921): 97–98.

³⁵⁴ J. H. W Leliman, “Iets over Middelbaar Technisch Onderwijs,” *De Bouwwereld* 4, no. 7 (February 15, 1905): 49–51.

³⁵⁵ J. H. W. Leliman, “J. H. W. Leliman B-I De Tuinstadtentoonstelling I,” *De Bouwwereld* 7, no. 49 (December 2, 1908): 389–392; “J. H. W. Leliman B-I De Tuinstadtentoonstelling II,” *De Bouwwereld* 7, no. 50 (December 9, 1908): 397–401; “J. H. W. Leliman B-I De Tuinstadtentoonstelling III,” *De Bouwwereld* 7, no. 51 (December 16, 1908): 405–409.

At first, Willem Leliman addressed the issue in a 1911 *De Bouwwereld* editorial titled *A Museum for Architectural Drawings*.³⁵⁶ In this editorial, Leliman compelled architects to show a greater appreciation for their own drawings and counter the usual dismal fate of architectural drawings that after a brief existence were usually tossed out. Leliman urged his peers by claiming that while they already “miss the drawings of [their] predecessors [they] may, at least with respect to the most important buildings, not repeat the same mistake regarding [their] contemporary works.”³⁵⁷ For Leliman this was particularly important, since the original drawings produced by the architect had a quality that no other representation of the built work could ever have: the direct expression of architectural ideas. Only in these drawings were the architect’s ideas available in their pristine condition before being confronted with the constraints of reality inherent to construction.

In his following published opinion addressing the subject, Leliman’s ideas were greatly refined. In the suitably titled “An Architecture Museum,” Leliman expanded on his earlier ideas and presented a more cogent argument in support of the establishment of an architecture museum.³⁵⁸ Beyond the importance of original drawings, here Leliman established a correlation between the constitution of an architecture museum and the transfer of architectural knowledge.

Leliman began by arguing that an architecture museum could overcome the shortcoming of the temporary nature of current architectural exhibitions (usually associated with anniversaries and other celebrations). Similar to the *Maatschapij’s* communal building, the architecture museum proposed by Willem Leliman would promote the dissemination of architectural knowledge through a permanent exhibition, in which “a large part of the collection was of predominantly technical and

³⁵⁶ J. H. W Leliman, “Een Museum van Bouwkundige Teekeningen,” *De Bouwwereld* 10, no. 35 (August 30, 1911): 273–275.

³⁵⁷ *Ibid.*, 274.

³⁵⁸ J. H. W Leliman, “Een Architektuurmuseum,” *De Bouwwereld* 11, no. 44 (October 30, 1912): 345–347.

constructive interest.”³⁵⁹ While Leliman’s architecture museum would “provisionally be limited to a singular collection of, preferably original, drawings and models,” in order to fulfill its true potential, it would eventually become associated with an institution of architectural education, such as the Delft Polytechnic.³⁶⁰ Such association would not only allow students to directly engage with the accumulated archive of architectural knowledge, but would also increase that very archive by assimilating that institution’s study collection. With the addition of “books, photographs, cast reproductions, lantern plates [or slides] and other such elements” to the drawings collection, “a whole of great significance for architectural study can be merged.”³⁶¹

The museum was to be specifically directed at architecture practitioners, since the lack of interest from the general public on architectural drawings and models was easily understood. After all, architecture drawings were not artworks, but had instead been produced as means to a goal. Thus, Leliman argued that architectural drawings “may be sober, poorly decorated, even unartistic, but for the study of architecture, they hold at least greater documental value than a commercial picture or photo,” since “the reasoning behind many buildings is found in these [working] drawings.”³⁶² In short, the value of an architectural drawing was not in the aesthetic dimension of the actual drawing, but in the ideas represented in it, which the general public did not have the ability to (properly) understand.

Leliman further developed his argument by ascertaining the fundamental value of the architect’s original drawings in the study of architecture. Specifically, he established a contrast between “drawings of completed work” and the “studies in which the architect devised and presented his original designs,” since in these “no limits were imposed to his ideal conception in

³⁵⁹ Ibid., 346.

³⁶⁰ Ibid.

³⁶¹ Ibid.

³⁶² Ibid., 347.

response to the given problem.”³⁶³ Therefore, Leliman argued that in “the development of architecture, the study of ideals [present in drawings] was often more important than the buildings built,” making the “many architectural thoughts [that] remain on paper” particularly deserving to be preserved.³⁶⁴ Leliman concluded with a simple call for action, asking for the cooperation of his fellow architects in establishing this progressive architecture museum through donations or loans of architectural artifacts, concluding with a crucial question: “But who will take the initiative?”³⁶⁵

The architecture museum described by Willem Leliman did not seem so different from what the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* had attempted to accomplish with its own building, twenty-seven years earlier. Such suspicions were confirmed five years later, when Leliman’s name was associated with a first attempt to implement his plan. In April 1917, it was announced on all architectural journals the constitution of a new architectural association in The Hague: the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst* (Institute for Architecture). According to its announcement (which was published *verbatim* in all four journals), the Institute’s stated goal was “to promote an interest in the practice and knowledge of architecture in the broadest sense.”³⁶⁶ Furthermore, it was declared that the promotion of architecture would be accomplished by “publishing periodicals, holding meetings, lectures, exhibitions, organizing excursions, writing contests, publishing award-winning designs and treatises, promoting education, etc.”

³⁶³ Ibid., 346. Leliman also noted the contrast of the ownership of architectural drawings produced for and from construction. Specifically, he indicates that “archives and portfolios of societies are likely to be full of several interesting designs” of surveyed buildings, but those original sketches from which buildings were constructed usually “remained in [the architect’s] possession.”

³⁶⁴ Ibid., 347.

³⁶⁵ Ibid.

³⁶⁶ “Berichten Bouwkunst,” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 38, no. 16 (April 21, 1917): 94. “Een Nieuwe Vereeniging,” *Architectura* 25, no. 17 (April 28, 1917): 135–136. “Een Instituut Voor Bouwkunst,” *De Opmerker* 52, no. 17 (April 28, 1917): 129–130. “Instituut Voor Bouwkunst,” *De Bouwwereld* 16, no. 17 (April 28, 1917): 135.

It was not a coincidence that the goal and instruments of the new association seemed remarkably similar to the *Maatschappij's* original intentions. The first two articles of the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst's* 1917 statutes only modified ever so slightly the wording of the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst's* 1842 foundational charter, without in any way altering the *Maatschappij's* proposed objective or instruments.³⁶⁷ Moreover, the new institute intended to engage with a wide membership similar to the original *Maatschappij*, as it was stated that “[n]ot only those who are practitioners of architecture and the decorative arts themselves can be appointed a member of the institute, but also all of those whom it may be assumed that are really interested in these arts.”³⁶⁸ The revival of the “old *Maatschappij*” was so blatant that the commentator at *De Opmerker* immediately recognized that the “program was very much that of the former *Maatschappij*,” but could not believe that the intention was to merely establish a new *Maatschappij*.³⁶⁹

Such concerns were shared by the members of both architectural associations. The polemic only increased when in a meeting of the *MBVA* (the architects’ professional union into which the *Maatschappij* had been transformed ahead of its merger with the *BNA*) it was passed a motion condemning the foundation of the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst* and strongly discouraging its members from joining the nascent institute. Such motion was based on the assertion that the institute’s goals merely duplicated the goals of the *MBVA* and therefore its establishment would “lead to a fragmentation of forces which can be used for the promotion of architecture.”³⁷⁰ There were also concerns that the institute would favor historical styles and inevitably hinder the development of modern architecture. However, what caused the most apprehension was the preponderance of

³⁶⁷ Instituut voor Bouwkunst, “Statuten van Het Instituut Voor Bouwkunst,” August 16, 1917, NDBK 445.

³⁶⁸ “Een Instituut Voor Bouwkunst,” 129.

³⁶⁹ “Een Instituut Voor Bouwkunst.”

³⁷⁰ “Verslag van de Ledenvergadering Der M.B.V.A. Op Woensdag 14 November 1917 in ‘Café Brinkmann’ Te Haarlem,” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 38, no. 47 (November 24, 1917): 270.

influential laymen and politicians in the new organization. Specifically it was feared that through the institute there could be a return to the 1870s architecture policies, when laymen (rather than architects) juried architectural competitions for state buildings and imposed an “official” building style.

A few days later the board of *Architectura et Amicitia* also “completely agreed with the judgment of the *Maatschappij* in this matter” and discouraged its members from joining the new institute.³⁷¹ The board of the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst* even tried to convince the architectural community of its good intentions in opening the discipline to a wider audience with a letter sent to the editors of the *Bouwkundig Weekblad*, but to no avail.³⁷² The general perception that had taken hold was that the institute was an association of influential laymen and politicians to which some architects of the old guard had been attached, including Willem Leliman.³⁷³

Soon after the announcement of the establishment of the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst*, a state commission was organized to analyze the establishment of a State Architecture Museum (*Rijks Architectuurmuseum*) supported by the government.³⁷⁴ The constitution of this commission resulted from a letter and memorandum sent by *Architectura et Amicitia* to the Minister of the Interior, but it seemed to have gained some urgency with the constitution of the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst*. Even though Leliman’s 1912 article in defense of an architecture museum had been

³⁷¹ “Verslag van de 1400ste Leden Vergadering van Het Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia,” *Architectura* 25, no. 44 (December 1, 1917): 370.

³⁷² S. de Clercq, “Instituut Voor Bouwkunst,” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 38, no. 43 (October 27, 1917): 250–251.

³⁷³ “Verslag van de 1398ste Leden Vergadering van Het Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia,” *Architectura* 25, no. 44 (November 3, 1917): 340.

³⁷⁴ While the official announcement of the Committee for a State Architecture Museum was only made public a few months later, in September 1917 *De Bouwwereld* noted that in the state budget for the following year there were some funds allocated for such a committee. See “Gemengde Berichten: De Staatsbegroting 1918,” *De Bouwwereld* 16, no. 39 (September 26, 1917): 306–307. For the official public announcement, see “Rijksarchitectuurmuseum,” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 39, no. 25 (June 22, 1918): 170.

initially met by apprehension and even ridiculed, the claims presented were compelling enough to have warranted the creation in that same year of a dedicated “Committee for an Architecture Museum” by *Architectura et Amicitia*.³⁷⁵ However, it took nearly six years for the *A et A*’s committee to finally act.³⁷⁶

With the passing of Willem Leliman in 1921 (when he was merely 41 years old), *De Bouwwereld* ceased its reporting—and continued pressure—on the establishment of an architecture museum in the Netherlands. Soon after, the initiatives that had promised so much just a few years earlier were altogether abandoned, and even *Architectura et Amicitia* was forced to adjust to the changing political and disciplinary conditions and re-instate its own “Committee for an Architecture Museum.”³⁷⁷

Nevertheless, Willem Leliman’s 1912 forceful article has been incorporated into the foundational mythology of the NAI, as the initial moment in the lengthy process which would, almost eight decades later, result in the establishment of a proper architecture museum in the Netherlands. According to the NAI’s historiography, this article marked the “earliest time” the idea of an architecture museum was seriously proposed in the Netherlands. The attention given to *Een Architectuurmuseum* has featured prominently in most, if not all, discussions regarding the origins of the NAI. Leliman’s article is not only recurrently recovered as the NAI’s abstract foundational moment at every significant occurrence of the institute, but Willem Leliman himself

³⁷⁵ The ridicule received by Leliman’s proposal was most notably expressed in a verse anonymously sent to *De Bouwwereld* in which the entire endeavor was mocked. *De Bouwwereld*, 1918. For the constitution of *A et A*’s “Committee for an Architecture Museum,” see “Het Architectuurmuseum,” *De Bouwwereld* 13, no. 8 (February 25, 1914): 63.

³⁷⁶ For a comprehensive discussion of the entire process initiated by Leliman’s 1912 article and continued by *A et A*’s committee, see the next chapter of this dissertation “Museum or Institute: From Projective to Reflective and Back Again (1912-1983).”

³⁷⁷ *Architectura et Amicitia*’s Committee for an architecture museum operated from 1912 to 1917, and then again from 1930 to 1934. See Schilt and Werf, *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia*, 221. The work of these committee’s and other early twentieth-century initiatives will be analyzed in the following chapter.

has been enshrined as the visionary who first conceived of an architecture museum.³⁷⁸ In recognition of Willem Leliman's legacy, his name was adopted by the department of the NAI dedicated to the establishment of a community of external supporters: the *Vereniging Leliman: Vrienden van het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut* (Leliman Association: Friends of the NAI).

The positioning of Willem Leliman at the origins of an architecture museum in the Netherlands was initially posited in a 1956 article by Prof. Willem van der Pluym.³⁷⁹ As a member of the *Stichting Architectuur Museum* (Foundation Architecture Museum, or *SAM*) which had been recently formed by *Architectura et Amicitia* and the *BNA*, Van der Pluym's overview of the different initiatives towards the foundation of an architecture museum emphasized the efforts and committees established by the *A et A* and obscured the *Maatschappij's* earlier contribution, even if unwittingly. Since the article *Een Architectuurmuseum* by Willem Leliman had been directly responsible for *Architectura et Amicitia* forming a dedicated committee in 1912, Van der Pluym saw in it an appropriate starting point for his overview.

The use of Leliman's 1912 article in support of the constitution of an architecture museum would be most significantly deployed in 1972, in a speech marking the inauguration of the state supported *Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst* (Dutch Documentation Center for Architecture, or *NDB*) and the transfer of several architectural archives to its custody.³⁸⁰ In his speech, Auke Komter, a board member of the *SAM*, continued the narrative established by Van der

³⁷⁸ Most recently the story of Willem Leliman's 1912 article was rehashed during the speeches marking the inauguration of the NAI's *Schatkamer* / Treasury Box on September 10, 2011.

³⁷⁹ Willem van der Pluym, "Voorgeschiedenis Architectuurmuseum," *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 74, no. 5 (1956): 57–59; and R. de Jong "Nota betreffende het Documentatiecentrum Nederlandse Bouwkunst" 1970, NDBK 28.

³⁸⁰ Auke Komter, "Toespraak Namens Stichting Architectuurmuseum" (Amsterdam, September 28, 1972), SAMU 30. Dirk Baalman and Erik de Jong were early to associate Komter's 1972 speech with the canonization of Willem Leliman in the historiography of the "architecture institute." See Baalman and Jong, "Museum of Archief: Kanttekeningen Bij de Collecties van Een Nieuw Architectuurinstituut," 30.

Pluym's overview fifteen years earlier, positioning once again the Leliman's article at its start and the *NDB* at its end (despite being an archive the *NDB* was widely perceived as being a state architecture museum). Further establishing Willem Leliman's contribution, a press release was issued from the Ministry of Culture restating and disseminating the historical overview presented by Auke Komter in his speech.³⁸¹ While with this speech Leliman's article became firmly established within the historiography of a Dutch architecture museum, it was inevitably amiss on both the beginning and conclusion of such institution.

Willem Leliman's contribution to the debate and public pressure exerted for the establishment of an architecture museum in the Netherlands is unquestionable. However, it would be a significant historical oversight to consider his efforts and his 1912 article removed from the context established by the work of the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* in the previous seven decades and, in particular, the influence of his father, Jan Leliman. After all, with *Een Architectuurmuseum* Willem Leliman not only seemed to be describing the communal building of the *Maatschappij* (that he himself had placed the first stone almost thirty years earlier), but his arguments in support of architectural exhibitions also clearly derived from his father's own opinions on the matter. Just as nineteenth-century Dutch architecture culture did not spontaneously emerge in a vacuum, neither did Willem Leliman's interest in an architecture museum appear without the influence of his father. It should also be noted that Jan Leliman not only indelibly shaped his son's approach to architecture, but had a decisive influence in the strategy adopted by both the *Maatschappij* and *Architectura et Amicitia* to directly engage a wider audience. That is, Jan Leliman's early understanding of architectural exhibitions as significant moments for

³⁸¹ Ministerie van Cultuur, Recreatie en Maatschappelijk Werk, "Persbericht Architectuurmuseum/Nederlands Documentatiecentrum Voor de Bouwkunst," September 15, 1972, SAMU 30.

the enunciation and advancement of the discipline was materialized in both the constitution of the early architecture museum (*sans* title) of the *Maatschappij* as well as the constitution of an architecture museum in the twentieth-century via his son. Therefore, Jan Leliman's legacy merits a slight, yet significant, revision of the NAI's history. Accordingly, Jan Leliman should rightfully displace his son in the institute's official narrative as the original and primary instigator of the establishment of an architecture museum in the Netherlands. While Willem Leliman's accomplishments are certainly noteworthy and merit recognition, it shouldn't be at the expense of a minimization of his own father's work.³⁸²

A Tale of Two Museums

Institutions dedicated to the advancement of architecture were fundamental in the emergence of nineteenth-century architectural discourse in the Netherlands. Before the establishment of the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunsts* in 1842 and (to a lesser extent) the *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia* in 1855, architectural discourse was all but inexistent in the Twelve Provinces. The activities and instruments developed by these Amsterdam architectural societies established the necessary apparatus for the construction, dissemination and continued support of architectural discourse, since the body of knowledge of architecture can only exist when individual and collective experiences are codified, recorded, accumulated and transmitted. In short, architectural discourse did not emerge nor operate in a vacuum, but required the formation of a support infrastructure where knowledge exchange could be organized and documented. By

³⁸² While such revision may seem radical, others have already indicated the need to ground Willem Leliman's article in the context established by the nineteenth-century architectural associations and with a bigger recognition of Jan Leliman's ultimately decisive contribution through a "history of the collection." See Baalman and Jong, "Museum of Archief: Kanttekeningen Bij de Collecties van Een Nieuw Architectuurinstituut." and Mariet Willinge, "The Collection, Backbone of the NAI," in *The Netherlands Architecture Institute*, trans. Robyn de Jong-Dalziel (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1998), 13–19.

creating and supporting such operational framework, the *Maatschappij* and *Architectura et Amicitia* were early facilitators of architectural discourse in the Netherlands. Through lectures, meetings, design competitions, publications and exhibitions a vigorous architecture culture was created.

Member meetings and assemblies presented opportunities for architectural theories and ideas to be publicly discussed, while the publication of periodicals allowed those discussions to reach well beyond the salons where they were first voiced. Together, these instruments established a basic mode of inclusive engagement which facilitated debate even as engagement of a general public remained problematic for both the *Maatschappij* and the *A et A* before their institutional reorganization in the early 1880s. The design competitions organized by these institutions offered another opportunity for further debate, as ideas and theories were translated into designs and projects. Design competitions became a favored place for experimentation, where new knowledge was produced through the application of abstract architectural theories to specific design exercises, that is, where theory and practice colluded. The apparatus of discourse was complemented with public lectures and exhibitions, which also presented important moments for the enunciation of architecture to a wider audience beyond the confines of the discipline. Combined, these instruments formed a resilient framework sustaining the nascent Dutch architecture culture in the nineteenth-century, an architecture culture based on the dissemination of knowledge among architects and, to a lesser extent, the Dutch public as well as the constitution of a growing archive.

The creation of an architectural archive was an essential component in the development of nineteenth-century architectural societies, as well as in the formation of a disciplinary discourse. Only by recording and accumulating knowledge could architectural discourse reach the entire discipline and stimulate the necessary debate for its advancement. In contrast to the inherent limitations of verbal communication, through the archive, architectural knowledge crossed time and space and engaged the entire discipline, effectively grounding architectural production in

theory and history. Unsurprisingly, from the early years of the *Maatschappij* in the 1840s to Willem Leliman's "Een Architektuurmuseum" article in 1912, there was a constant emphasis on the fundamental importance of an archive where architectural knowledge could be unified and accessed. The accumulation of knowledge in the archive allowed for a continuous furthering of the discipline, stimulating the reconfiguration and re-appropriation of previous knowledge, together with the exchange of ideas. By preserving comprehensive collections of architectural drawings where ideas were produced beyond the previously collected final renderings, these archives were equally instrumental in redefining architecture's perception. Fostered by the increased demand for architectural expertise and consequent professionalization of Dutch architects, the architectural archive hosted by these societies also allowed a disciplinary understanding of architecture. Similar to modern architecture museums, the archive established by nineteenth-century architectural societies was instrumentalized in a didactic and pedagogic manner, both to the interior and exterior of the discipline.

While never holding that title, both the *Maatschappij* and *Architectura et Amicitia* operated as early architecture museums, supporting many of the activities that have come to be associated with contemporary architectural museological institutions. Much like their contemporary counterparts, these associations used design competitions, lectures, publications, and exhibitions to not only foster architectural debate, but also engage with a wide audience. The *Maatschappij*, particularly with the construction of its own building in the 1880s, operated in a manner similar to the NAI, meriting greater recognition in the history of the Rotterdam institute. Like the NAI, the *Maatschappij* was primarily established to foment a greater artistic appreciation of the discipline, at a time when architecture was perceived as a purely material endeavor resulting from prescribed formulas. The creation of both the *Maatschappij* in the nineteenth-century and the NAI over a century later, intended not only to promote architecture but, primarily, to elevate the quality of architecture. From their outset, both organizations identified similar instruments of engagement to

achieve their common objective: publications, lectures, competitions, and exhibitions. Moreover, in both the *Maatschappij* and the NAI these instruments were (mostly) open to all, but undoubtedly directed at architecture's practitioners, as architecture theory and history laid at the foundation of these institutions' activities. In both the 1840s and the 1980s, architectural history and theory were instrumentalized to elicit a greater appreciation for architecture from the general public, and to allow architects to reclaim a dominant position within architectural production. Moreover, the engagement of history and theory presented architecture as a critical cultural endeavor. Both then and now, it fostered a renewed understanding of architecture as a discipline that exists beyond mere pragmatic and functional concerns and merits serious intellectual consideration and inspires artistic appreciation.

Since the objectives, policies and instruments of the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* were so clearly analogous to the organization and operation of modern architecture museums, the society should be fully recognized as an early (and influential) architecture museological initiative in the Netherlands. Bluntly, the 1956 oversight of Prof. Willem van der Pluym, which was only amplified and solidified in 1972, should be corrected. Furthermore, the close parallel and connection between the *Maatschappij* and its modern peer should merit a revisionist exercise of the NAI's historiography. In a long overdue revision of the NAI's history it should not only be recognized the *Maatschappij's* precocious efforts but also Jan Leliman's original contribution to the establishment of an architecture museum in the Netherlands. Despite the NAI's current foundational mythology, it should be obvious by now that the history of the institute goes further back. Well beyond 1912 and to a different Leliman, both of which are worthy of recognition and should be remembered.

Beyond the striking parallel with the NAI's own trajectory, the historical arch of the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* also presents a cautionary tale of the fine balance

between the architectural discipline and the architectural profession. The downfall of the *Maatschappij* was undoubtedly related to its focal shift, when professional matters displaced artistic appreciation as the main concern of the society. Becoming increasingly preoccupied with the professional dimension of architecture resulted in an inevitable depreciation of its artistic dimension. It indicated that more than an art with intellectual depth and cultural meaning, for the *Maatschappij* architecture was now merely a business (and in the process eroding the distinction it had worked so hard to achieve in its first fifty years of existence). The commercialization of the discipline began in its own exhibition halls, as what had been a cunning way to fund its operations became the main reason for its existence. Also in its demise, the NAI follows the trajectory defined by the *Maatschappij* a century earlier: the promotion of commercial rather than cultural interests. Perhaps, had Secretary Zijlstra been aware of the historical rise and demise of the *Maatschappij*, he hadn't been so eager to categorize architecture as a 'creative industry' in 2011 and endanger the advances accomplished by the NAI in its twenty-five years of existence.

3. MUSEUM OR INSTITUTE: FROM PROJECTIVE TO REFLECTIVE AND BACK AGAIN (1912-1983)

“It was not called the Netherlands Architecture *Museum*, but the Netherlands Architecture *Institute*.”³⁸³ While seemingly only a subtle question of semantics, the distinction between *museum* and *institute* emphasized by former Minister of Welfare, Health and Culture, Leendert Cornelis (Elco) Brinkman was indicative of much more than a mere folly of naming. Instead, it revealed a crucial distinction that structured the debate to establish an architecture museum in the Netherlands throughout the twentieth century, that is, the distinction between two competing visions of not just the establishment and operation of such an institution but also of architecture as a discipline.

Throughout the decades of debate and discussion in the Netherlands regarding the establishment of an architecture museum, the terms “architecture museum” and “architecture institute” became fundamentally charged with specific meanings, signaling two diverging approaches to architecture and its archive in what I have identified as “reflective” and “projective” museological institutions. Hence, “architecture museum” came to be associated with a purely “reflective” institution, entirely focused on a documentation of history, dutifully constructing an architectural archive in which previous architectural knowledge was seldom challenged. Conversely, “architecture institute” came to define a “projective” type of institution, in which the architectural archive was to be constantly activated by and confronted with contemporary architectural ideas. In short, the term architecture museum came to be used to describe an institution steeped in the past and with little to no ambition to engage with the present, while the term architecture institute came to signify an architectural institution that was primarily intent on

³⁸³ Elco Brinkman, interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo, audio, April 26, 2011.

engaging with the discipline's present and instrumentalizing its past to inform and frame its activities.

Such a distinct conception of the architecture museum (as a museum or an institute) also comprised and revealed a fundamentally divergent approach to architecture. Proponents of the architecture museum conceived of architecture as just another art form that could only be appreciated by its aesthetic dimension. By insisting that the public exhibition of architecture should conform to the already normalized conventions of the public presentation of other fine arts—particularly painting and sculpture—proponents of the architecture museum attempted (even if unwittingly) to suppress the specificity of architecture. In contrast, proponents of the architecture institute intended to celebrate the specificity of architecture, namely its combination of aesthetic delight and utilitarian function. Thus, advocates of the architecture institute claimed that architecture could only be presented by emphasizing its specificity and developing new methods for its public presentation. In broad terms, the architecture museum attempted to conform architecture to existing modes of public presentation, while the architecture institute intended to adapt the existing modes of presentation to the specificity of the discipline.

The specificity of architecture—especially as it was defined by the architecture institute proponents—relied on the intrinsic connection of the discipline to not just cultural, but also economic, technical, and social systems. Architecture, after all, was the most public of all arts and its museum should also be expressive of that condition. The very structure of a museological institution dedicated to architecture was to reflect the inclusive nature of the discipline and foster engagement among a budding class of architectural professionals and a wider public. Hence, it was contended that the architecture institute was to go further than the mere temple for the adoration of beautiful drawings (which the architecture museum was bound to be), and instead become an inclusive forum for the advancement of the discipline through the discussion of architectural ideas.

Inevitably, these diverging curatorial approaches to architecture also reflected differing attitudes towards the archive of the discipline. At its most visible, such a distinction articulated how the opposing curatorial practices favored and valued different elements to compose the discipline's archive. While the archive of an architecture museum was composed by elements valued by the aesthetic expression of their representation, within the architecture institute the disciplinary archive also comprised elements that depicted important ideas in the development of the discipline, regardless of the aesthetic quality of their representation.

The two approaches to the architecture museum also reflected two leading theories framing the architecture debate at the turn of the twentieth-century. By favoring an approach to the architectural discipline that emphasized the centrality of ideas and technique over any particular stylistic formal expression, the projective faction sided with Gottfried Semper's thesis of architecture's material determinism.³⁸⁴ In contrast, the focus on architecture's aesthetic and artistic expression central in the reflective architecture museum seemed to be reminiscent of Alois Riegl's assertions regarding the *kunstwollen* (artistic volition, or literally the "will to art") in defense of aesthetic autonomy.³⁸⁵ Much like the ongoing architectural debate, the opposition between

³⁸⁴ Semper thesis culminated in his *magnum opus* based on the tectonic qualities of architecture and the expression of "purpose, material and technique." Semper's ideas would have a direct influence in Dutch architecture culture through the architect H.P. Berlage, who had been his student in Zurich and became an influential figure in the Netherlands at the turn of the twentieth-century. Gottfried Semper, *Style in the Technical and Tectonic Arts, or, Practical Aesthetics*, trans. Harry Francis Mallgrave and Michael Robinson (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2004).

³⁸⁵ Riegl rejected Semper's material determinism with the concept of *kunstwollen*, as the unseen force driving the evolution of style in both high and low art. Riegl applied (and developed) the concept of *kunstwollen* more fully in his examination of late Roman art, with a section dedicated to architecture. See Alois Riegl, "The Architecture," in *Late Roman Art Industry*, trans. Rolf Winkes, *Archaeologica* 36 (Roma: G. Bretschneider, 1985), 19–50.

reflective and projective architecture museums was often presented as an opposition between artistic will and technical skill.³⁸⁶

A similar—if not altogether the same—divide separated the two dominant Amsterdam societies of architecture at the start of the twentieth-century. Specifically, while the *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia* (often referred simply as *A et A*) advocated a definition of architecture based on aesthetic and artistic considerations, the older *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* (commonly known as *Maatschappij*) emphasized architecture's unique technical and constructive dimensions. Ultimately, the debate regarding the establishment of an architecture museum in the Netherlands throughout the first half of the twentieth-century also echoed the confrontation between artistic will and technical skill that was still animating architectural debate in the Netherlands and beyond. Often, the reflective museum was defended for its inherently artistic approach to architecture, while its projective counterpart was promoted for its engagement with the discipline's unique technical dimension.

Given the technical-artistic dichotomy framing the architecture museum debate, the projective architecture institute became particularly associated with an advancement of architecture as a profession and (accordingly) primarily dedicated to architecture professionals. Conversely, the reflective architecture museum was promoted as a central instrument in furthering the appreciation of architecture as an art form, and thus directed at a more general audience.

Beyond an ideological or conceptual divide, practical considerations also guided the opposition between both factions. Chief among those pragmatic justifications was the location for the proposed architecture museum or institute. While Amsterdam was widely considered more amiable to an

³⁸⁶ For a comprehensive discussion of the debate between Semper and Riegl, see Harry Francis Mallgrave, *Gottfried Semper: Architect of the Nineteenth Century, A Personal and Intellectual Biography* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996), 372–381.

architecture museum, it was equally agreed that an architecture institute would be better suited in Delft. In fact, it often seemed that the only issue in which there was a complete agreement among both factions was that if an architecture institute was to be established, it would be located in Delft, but if an architecture museum was favored, it was to be located in Amsterdam. In practical terms, the struggle between both factions was translated into a paralysis where neither an architecture museum nor an architecture institute could be established in the Netherlands for several decades.³⁸⁷

Despite more or less concrete attempts to overcome this situation, the paralysis was only broken in 1971 with the establishment of the *Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst* (Netherlands Documentation Center for Architecture, or *NDB*) in Amsterdam. The first actual museological institution dedicated to architecture in the Netherlands was both a result and an apt expression of the context created by the relentless campaign waged to establish a reflective architecture museum. When the *NDB* was founded, the discussion regarding the establishment of a museological institution for architecture was entirely controlled by the faction supporting the establishment of an architecture museum. The hegemony of this faction's position allowed it to fundamentally define the expectations for a museological institution of architecture, most importantly, defining it as a reflective institution primarily concerned with the documentation of past architectural knowledge. Presented as an architecture museum, but in fact a state-supported

³⁸⁷ Other conditions, such as a lack of governmental support, also assisted to the mounting difficulty to establish in the Netherlands a museological institution for architecture, but the struggle between both factions was often the most obstructive element. In a few instances the opposition to the establishment of an architecture institute was directly responsible for the derailment of the efforts to establish such an institution. Undoubtedly the clearest episode of such obstructionism occurred in 1928, when the *A et A* and *BNA* developed a scheme to accommodate an architecture museum in Amsterdam's *Zuiderkerk* in order to block the advancement of the establishment of an architecture institute in Delft. This episode will be discussed at length later in this chapter

archive (almost) entirely dedicated to the documentation of the discipline, the *NDB* was a clear institutionalization of the dominant conceptualization of an architecture museum.

However, the institutionalization of such a narrow definition of an architecture museum was to be short-lived. As members of the *NDB* and architectural circles came to realize that the architectural archive, and the institution hosting it, had the potential to be much more than a mirror of the discipline, they began to advocate a more interventive architecture museum. Effectively, the idea that the *NDB* could be transformed from a reflective architecture museum to a projective architecture institute gained remarkable currency and encountered very little opposition.

The intention to develop the *NDB* into a more interventive organization was in fact a return to the origins of the architecture museum in the Netherlands. It echoed not only the tradition established by the first Amsterdam architecture societies (particularly the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst*), but also Willem Leliman's 1912 article that had most clearly launched the architecture museum to public debate, in which he had supported the edification of an organization remarkably akin to an architecture institute. The historical arc of a museological institution dedicated to architecture in the Netherlands followed a specific path that not only informed its eventual constitution as the Netherlands Architecture Institute, but also paralleled, as I will argue, the development of the architecture museum typology: from projective, to reflective, and back again.

Reflective Museum, Projective Institute

Museological institutions dedicated to architecture hold today a distinct position within the cultural-museological landscape. Rather than just presenting and reflecting on work produced by the architectural discipline, most of these institutions aspire at being themselves productive instruments in advancing the discipline, either by challenging traditional boundaries of architecture

or by engaging with an increasingly larger public. Thus, these institutions have outgrown their origins in the public art gallery and have developed in particular directions, addressing specific concerns which directly reflect the very nature of the subject they exhibit: architecture.

In retooling the museum for the public presentation of architecture, there has been a fundamental shift in the very character of museological institutions. Although not always immediately perceived, the most significant development has been the emergence of what I have termed “reflective” and “projective” museological institutions. While a reflective institution refers to the architecture museum which aims to reflect the past developments of the discipline, a projective institution describes an architecture institute intent on actively projecting the future of architecture. The historical evolution of the architecture museum as a cultural institution has been defined by a move from reflective to projective institutions. While the divide between both types of institutions is revealed on a variety of levels, it stems primarily from a fundamentally diverging approach to the architectural archive and, consequently, from a diverging attitude towards the progress of the discipline.

Reflective museological institutions are primarily preoccupied with seemingly operating as passive mirrors of the architectural discipline. The focus of these architecture museums has been to document the development of architecture in an unobtrusive manner, in which the collection of previous knowledge was contained, enshrined, and never confronted. Conversely, projective museological institutions are first and foremost concerned with advancing architecture, primarily through discussion. Rather than merely reflecting the discipline’s past, projective institutions intend to project the discipline’s future through direct engagement in which the collection of previous knowledge is valued for its contribution to the production of new knowledge. While reflective institutions are structured around the containment of the archive, projective institutions pursue the opposite strategy of engagement.

The ability of the reflective architectural archive to produce knowledge and meaning for the discipline is therefore limited to the archive and curation of its contents. With this process, the reflective archive elevates the status of the included objects and ideas to elements worthy of admiration. However, by removing these objects and ideas from the ever-developing disciplinary discussion and attributing them a finite meaning, the reflective architectural archive becomes a place where time stops and ideas embedded are frozen to static considerations that quickly become obsolete.³⁸⁸

Conversely, the projective architectural archive produces new knowledge and meaning not only by its selection process, but also by allowing its contents to remain present in disciplinary discussion. In a projective museological institution, the architectural archive is granted an essential agency in order to produce new knowledge through continuous recombination and juxtaposition of its contents. By continuously challenging the status of the ideas in the archive, these remain present and relevant for the advancement of the discipline and become the basis for the production of new knowledge. While the reflective approach to the architecture archive is static, the projective approach is dynamic. In short, while within the reflective museum the agency of the discipline's archive was greatly limited, a forceful agency was conferred to the archive by the projective institution.

Such a diverging approach to the architectural archive expresses a fundamentally disparate understanding and valuation of progress. By aspiring to contain past knowledge and make it

³⁸⁸ As Paula Young Lee has neatly summarized both Georges Bataille and Theodor W. Adorno position regarding respectively the relation between museums and slaughterhouses and the proximity between museums and mausoleums, "sometimes described as time machines, museums are, to the contrary, the inverse: inside their walls, time stops and decay vanishes." Paula Young Lee, "Still Life, After Death," ed. Cynthia Davidson, *Log 20* (Fall 2010): 139. See Theodor W. Adorno, "Valéry Proust Museum," in *Prisms*, trans. Samuel Weber and Shierry Weber, *Studies in Contemporary German Social Thought* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1981), 173–185.

impervious, the reflective museological institution explicitly favors tradition over progress, while by creating an archive in which past knowledge is constantly challenged the projective museological institution expresses its partiality towards progress. By being a repository of ideas, the reflective archive all but ensures that past knowledge will eventually be flattened into a mere pastiche of what it once was. As previous ideas become increasingly disconnected from contemporary discussion, they also become less present and less relevant, eventually being devalued from ever-present signal to mere background noise.

However, such inherent devaluation of knowledge within the reflective architectural archive is not necessarily problematic for proponents of reflective institutions, given the very composition of the reflective archive. Since reflective institutions have traditionally valued architecture for the aesthetic qualities of its representation, their archives are mostly composed of beautiful artifacts, regardless of the architectural ideas in them embedded. Therefore, when the embedded ideas in these beautiful drawings lose their currency within disciplinary discussion, it does not constitute a problem since they were never considered to begin with. Likewise, the sudden loss of some aesthetic qualities in architectural representation would be equally trifling within the projective architectural archive, since originally those had also not been of any great significance.

The binary opposition between reflective and projective institutions effectively replicated in the architectural context the often irreconcilable dual mandate of the public museum: “that of the elite temple of the arts, and that of a utilitarian instrument for democratic education.”³⁸⁹ While initially—true to its Enlightenment origins—the public museum had aspired to be an inclusive forum for public discussion, the inherent hierarchy established by the museum between active producers and passive consumers of knowledge, transformed the institution into a temple for contemplation. The

³⁸⁹ Eilean Hooper-Greenhill, “The Museum in the Disciplinary Society,” in *Museum Studies in Material Culture*, ed. Susan M. Pearce (London: Leicester University Press, 1989), 63.

production of “a monologic discourse dominated by the authoritative cultural voice of the museum,” was a necessary component for the construction of temples for the admiration of art, since for the museum to commandeer admiration, its narrative could not be challenged.³⁹⁰ As Duncan Cameron, who most drew attention to this tension, noted “the temple is where the victors rest” but “the forum is where the battles are fought.”³⁹¹ While the temple was described as “product,” the forum was “process.” Therefore, by imposing a strict hierarchy between museum and audience, the reflective museological institution ensured rest for its victors, while the projective museological institution flattening of hierarchical divisions continuously procured new battles to be fought and rehabilitated the original Enlightenment ideal of the museum as a forum for discussion.

The significant divergence between reflective and projective museological institutions also became established in the designation of these institutions. Given their focus on the aesthetic appreciation of architecture and singular interest in documenting the past of the discipline, reflective museological institutions can be simply referred to as architecture museums. The title “museum” also indicating the close affinity of these institutions with the collecting policies and curatorial strategies of public art museums. Since projective architectural museological institutions do not share the same operating affinity with art museums, they can be designated as architecture institutes (regardless of the naming conventions adopted by different projective institutions). In fact, the title “institute” was particularly germane since it suggests a degree of operativity and agency that is not traditionally found in most museums of fine arts.

³⁹⁰ Bennett, *The Birth of the Museum*, 103.

³⁹¹ Duncan F. Cameron, “The Museum, a Temple or the Forum,” *Curator: The Museum Journal* 14, no. 1 (March 1971): 21.

Given their focus on aesthetic considerations and the passive documentation of architecture's progress, reflective architecture museums, are a direct implementation of the public art museum model to the architectural context. The lack of adaptation to the specificity of architecture in these institutions is most clearly revealed by the sublimation of architecture to the normalized modes of public presentation of art, particularly, painting and sculpture. Conversely, projective architecture institutes completely adapted the organization and presentation of the art museum to architecture's particular expression, even to architecture's character. Within architecture institutes, architecture is not approached merely through its aesthetic dimension, but is also investigated and advanced in accordance to its technical, social, and economic aspects. Beyond the greater breadth of their approach to architecture, projective architecture institutes also explore different formats for the enunciation of the discipline, formats that are better suited for the dissemination of architectural ideas to a wider audience. While the museum is particularly adept to the public presentation of art, the institute becomes more suitable for the exhibition of architecture.

Ultimately, the projective architecture institute was not only the most suitable for the public exhibition of architecture, but also materialized the character of architecture. Like architecture, the projective architecture institute was a contested space where different visions were accommodated and challenged.

After Willem Leliman

The establishment of a space for architectural discussion was precisely what Willem Leliman described in his 1912 article *Een Architectuurmuseum (An Architecture Museum)*.³⁹² However, while the 1912 article was identified by virtually all subsequent initiatives intent on establishing an

³⁹² Leliman, "Een Architectuurmuseum." A comprehensive discussion of this article can be found in chapter 2, "The Construction of Discourse: Amsterdam Societies of Architecture (1818-1921)"

architecture museum in the Netherlands as the genesis for their efforts, they did not share Leliman's conviction regarding the architecture museum. In fact, several of these different initiatives—from private to public committees—adopted Leliman's claim for the establishment of an architecture museum but blatantly ignored the specifics of his contention. While adopting the article's categorical title *An Architecture Museum*, these subsequent initiatives interpreted it in a self-serving manner without any significant regard for the specifics of Leliman's proposal. While Leliman prescribed an operative architecture museum which was to function as a spirited forum for discussion and advancement of the discipline, subsequent debate would constantly define and frame the architecture museum as a much more passive instrument, laboriously documenting the history of architecture. The efforts to establish an architecture museum of historical propensity would culminate in the first iteration of an architecture museum being materialized in an archival institution: the *Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst* (the Netherlands Documentation Center for Architecture, or *NDB*). The opposition between Leliman's original proposal of an architecture museum as a model for discussion and the subsequent conversation defining the museum as a reflection of history would continue for almost eighty years until the foundation of the NAI in 1988, through which that divide was finally bridged.

The Committees of the *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia*

The subversion of Willem Leliman's ideas and contentions for an architecture museum began almost as soon as they were printed in *De Bouwwereld*. Indeed, in 1912, and little over a month after Leliman's article had been published, *Architectura et Amicitia* (organized an internal committee to investigate the possibility of an architecture museum which already contemplated the museum of architecture in a stark contrast to Leliman's earlier considerations. The "committee for the establishment of an architecture museum" was officially constituted during the *A et A's* 1320th General Members Meeting on December 4, 1912, after several members had (informally) argued that the most influential society of architecture in that period had to take a public position on

Leliman's proposal.³⁹³ J.H. de Groot, Jon. Ingenohl, and Willem van der Pluym were appointed to this provisional exploratory committee, which was mandated to examine the possibilities and propose specific actions for the establishment of an architecture museum in the Netherlands.

The discussions of the committee were structured around three main questions. What is the objective of an architecture museum? What will such museum hold? And finally, what must be done to establish a museum of architecture? The answers to these questions were presented to the members of *Architectura et Amicitia* on February 12, 1913, in the society's 1324th General Members Meeting in a report authored by the committee. Specifically, the report stated that "the purpose of an Architecture Museum [was], in the broadest sense, to assist in the elevation of architecture" and that "an architecture museum will mostly hold an assemblage of [architecture] designs, original drawings and scale models, but could also include reproductions which may contribute to establish a complete and representative overview of the history of architecture, in particular that of the Netherlands."³⁹⁴ In response to the third question regarding the course of action to establish an architecture museum, the committee argued that it was necessary to "persuade the central government to establish and maintain an Architecture Museum in the capital, in connection to the pending plans for the reorganization of the *Rijksakademie van Beeldende Kunsten* [Royal Academy of Fine Arts], in which architecture may become an independent department soon."³⁹⁵ Specifically, the committee suggested that it would be possible to accommodate a "Museum of Architecture" without great expense if the proposed museum could simply occupy an annex of the new building being erected for the *Rijksakademie*. While the answers to the first two questions seemed almost

³⁹³ "Verslag van de 1320ste Gewone Leden Vergadering van Het Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia," *Architectura* 20, no. 49 (December 7, 1912): 416.

³⁹⁴ Commissie tot Stichting van een Architectuur Museum, "Rapport Inzake Een Architectuur-Museum," February 4, 1913, NDBK 444. While most of the original documents pre-1955 are still at the *Rijksprentenkabinet* in Amsterdam, the NAI archives hold copies of all documents related to the "Establishment of an Architecture Museum."

³⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

inevitable and would receive unanimous agreement, the answer to the last question would prove to be much more controversial, particularly when the *A et A* attempted to garner support from the other societies of architecture.³⁹⁶

The involvement of other organizations dedicated to architecture, specifically the old society *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* and the professional organization *Bond van Nederlandse Architecten* (Institute of Dutch Architects, or simply *BNA*), was considered fundamental in order to devise a unified proposal for an architecture museum. Thus, the *A et A*'s exploratory committee had also been tasked to engage the other societies, procure their (political and financial) support and devise a coordinated plan to transform Leliman's idea into a reality. In early November 1913, *Architectura et Amicitia* officially invited the *Maatschappij* and the *BNA* to the "committee for the establishment of an architecture museum" by nominating two delegates each to join the *A et A* members who transited from the original exploratory committee.³⁹⁷ The committee was completed by three members from outside the discipline, whose invitation was already indicative of how *Architectura et Amicitia* was to shape the proceedings.

It took the *A et A*'s committee almost nine months to contact the other societies, but as soon as its preliminary report was presented, both J.H. de Groot and Willem van der Pluym contacted the director of the *Rijksakademie* and made him privy to their plans. While officially there were no committee meetings during the *interregnum*, over the course of those nine months, the three men

³⁹⁶ Considering that his duty was fulfilled, Jon. Ingenohl resigned from the committee after the presentation of the committee preliminary report on the 1324th General Members Meeting and did not join the two other members of the exploratory committee in subsequent initiatives. "Verslag van de 1324ste Gewone Leden Vergadering van Het Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia," *Architectura* 21, no. 6 (December 7, 1912): 38.

³⁹⁷ The *Maatschappij* appointed architects Jan Stuyt and Jacob Frederik (Jaap) Klinkhamer, while the *BNA* nominated architects Joseph Cuypers (son of famed architect Pierre Cuypers) and Petrus Johannes Houtzagers. The committee was completed by Hajo Brugmans, a history professor at the University of Amsterdam; Hendrik Teding van Berkhout, director of the *Rijksprentenkabinet* (Royal Prints and Drawings Collection); and Antonius Johannes (Antoon) der Kinderen, director of the *Rijksakademie*.

exchanged correspondence and participated in meetings, ironing out *A et A's* plan for an architecture museum.³⁹⁸

The newly expanded committee first met on February 18, 1914, at the *Rijksakademie*, in which the three questions and answers of the initial report were presented as the starting point for the proceedings. The ensuing discussion was mostly focused on the third question and answer, that is, the exact course of action to establish a museum of architecture planned by *Architectura et Amicitia*. Specifically, both Klinkhamer and Stuyt (the two *Maatschappij* delegates) expressed serious reservations regarding the establishment of the proposed architecture museum in the future premises of the *Rijksakademie*. Another point of contention was the type of collection and institution that was being proposed by the *A et A*, since for Klinkhamer and Stuyt the lack of clear educational guidelines for the future collection made the proposed institution susceptible to becoming a simple storage for architectural artifacts. Given the strong objections of the *Maatschappij* duo, the meeting was adjourned by requesting that, before the following meeting, all members reflected and better defined what they meant by “architecture museum.”³⁹⁹

Tension among committee members was already palpable in the first meeting, but when they reconvened a month later on March 21, 1914, spirited discussion turned to overt acrimony. What had already been intimated during the first meeting became patent in the second: the committee was divided into two competing views of what an architecture museum should be. One faction, composed by the two *Maatschappij* delegates, argued that an architecture museum should be an active instrument for the discipline with a study collection from which new knowledge could be

³⁹⁸ While most correspondence between these men is available at the NAI archive, the letters dated February 20 and March 17, 1913 are particularly expressive of the ongoing conversation and the arrangement of meetings. NAI archive, “NDBK 444,” 1919, NAI archief NDBK, NAI.

³⁹⁹ Antoon der Kinderen in Willem van der Pluym, “Verslag van de Vergadering van de Commissie Tot Stichting van Een Architectuur-Museum, Gehouden Op 18 Februari 1914 in Het Gebouw Op Ryks Akademie van Beeldende Kunst Te Amsterdam,” February 18, 1914, 13, NDBK 444.

derived. Their position only garnered some sympathy from Hajo Brugmans, who as a professor of history appreciated the educational potential of a museum of architecture as a proto-projective institution. Conversely, the opposing faction, composed by the *Architectura et Amicitia's* representatives and the other guest members exterior to the discipline, maintained that an architecture museum should be strictly concerned with documenting the discipline and offering an appreciation of its aesthetic qualities. The remaining members, the *BNA* envoys, attempted to remain neutral by merely stating that regardless of its format, they supported the establishment of an architecture museum.

The dispute was wide-ranging—from location to audience to collection—but the combination of the different arguments amounted to a clear opposition between two competing views for the proposed architecture museum: comprehensive and educational. While the *Architectura et Amicitia* faction proposed a museum that simply *reflected* the progress of the discipline, the *Maatschappij* delegates argued for a museum that beyond reflection, *projected* the development of the discipline by actively engaging in discussion and promoting the exchange of architectural knowledge. Fundamentally, one was only concerned with the past of the discipline, while the other was clearly focused on its future.

The contrast between both views was further revealed when the discussion addressed the collection of the proposed architecture museum, since the very nature of the proposed institution was defined by its collection. Fittingly, the *A et A* faction favored a collection composed of “the most beautiful drawings of artistic value and not pure technical merit” selected according to their inherent aesthetic qualities.⁴⁰⁰ In contrast, the *Maatschappij* duo advocated for a collection of

⁴⁰⁰ Hendrik Teding van Berkhout in Willem van der Pluym, “Verslag Der 2de Vergadering van de Commissie Tot Stichting van Een Architectuur-Museum, Gehouden Op 21 Maart 1914 in Het Gebouw Op Ryks Akademie van Beeldende Kunst Te Amsterdam,” March 21, 1914, 11, NDBK 444.

architectural artifacts valued by the architectural ideas represented in them. While for the reflective architecture museum proposed by *Architectura et Amicitia* the public exhibition of beautiful architectural drawings would be sufficient, its projective counterpart endorsed by the *Maatschappij* would go further and beyond to engage with architectural ideas, regardless of the beauty of their representation. As the proposed models for the architecture museum diverged, so did their audiences. While a reflective museum of antiquarian orientation would be most appealing to a general public, a professional audience would be most interest in a projective museum with a study collection.

Ultimately, the only consensus among the committee members regarded the location of the museum, but even this was contingent on the type of architecture museum to be established. Should the museum be established in an art-historical model for the enjoyment of the aesthetic qualities of architectural drawings by the masses (favored by *Architectura et Amicitia*), it could only be located in Amsterdam. Alternatively, if it was decided that the architecture museum was to accommodate a study collection of architectural artifacts of both aesthetic and technical merit (as endorsed by the *Maatschappij*), it would be located in Delft. Such basic agreement relied on the tacit understanding that Amsterdam, with its growing network of art museums, was the most suited location for an artistic appreciation of architecture, while Delft, with the only architecture school in the Netherlands, was a more appropriate location for a technical museum of architecture.⁴⁰¹

At the foundation of the disagreement also laid a divergence of opinions regarding the agency to be conferred to the future architecture museum. Should it be an active platform for the exchange of architectural knowledge? Or a passive repository of beautiful architectural representations? Also, implicit in these competing proposals for an architecture museum were diverging approaches to

⁴⁰¹ Jacob Frederik Klinkhamer in *Ibid.*, 12.

the architectural discipline itself. While the “reflective faction” approached architecture as just one more fine art, the “projective faction” exalted the unique qualities of architecture, particularly as being a combination of artistic sensitivity and technical knowledge. Given the foundational quality of this divergence, a rapprochement between the opposing proposals became simply unresolvable, and the committee reached an impasse after the first two meetings.

Since there was such difficulty in reaching an agreement, Stuyt and Klinkhamer reported back to the *Maatschappij* following the second committee meeting. The report presented on May 5, 1914, to the board of the *Maatschappij* was quite damning, since it essentially denounced the committee proceedings as an evident farce.⁴⁰² According to Klinkhamer and Stuyt, crucial decisions like the location and the type of collection of the proposed architecture museum had already been made. The insistence of the committee in uncritically adopting the stipulations previously decided by the *Architectura et Amicitia* internal exploratory committee overly conditioned the proceedings and rendered them futile. The *Maatschappij* delegates also believed that these types of decisions could only be made after the proper examination, afforded precisely by the wider discussion generated in a committee where all architecture societies were represented.

Beyond the premature and conditioned nature of the decisions, Klinkhamer and Stuyt vehemently criticized the proposed affiliation of the architecture museum with the *Rijksakademie*. Not just because this implied a clear association with other fine arts, but primarily because the *Rijksakademie* had not yet any type of educational program for architecture, and it was not entirely clear if it would ever have one. While commended, the plan to establish an architecture museum dedicated to a large audience was equally questioned. Since there was no funding for the purchase

⁴⁰² A copy of the report is included in the *Maatschappij's* preliminary recommendation, and in Willem van der Pluym's own overview of the process published a few weeks later. See “Praeadvies van Het Hoofdbestuur in Zake Het Architectuur-Museum,” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 35, no. 16 (April 17, 1915): 106–109. and Willem van der Pluym, “Het Architectuurmuseum,” *Architectura* 23, no. 18 (May 1, 1915): 103.

and commission of the necessary casts and reproductions, it was thought to be overly ambitious and an unrealistic objective for a fledgling architecture museum.

The loudest criticism in the report was reserved for what Klinkhamer considered to be the surprising absence of Willem Leliman from the committee, since as acknowledged by *Architectura et Amicitia*, it was from his article that “the premises for this entire effort were initiated.”⁴⁰³ While claiming such absence to be surprising, Klinkhamer proceeded by quoting Leliman’s original article at great length and, not so subtly, intimate that the absence of “the father of the idea” was due to the clear subversion of his vision by the committee organized by *Architectura et Amicitia*.⁴⁰⁴ Indeed, Leliman had described his original vision of an architecture museum as a “versatile architecture museum not solely defined artistically, but with a large part of its collection predominantly of technical and constructive interest” with a clear educational orientation which could be further potentiated if, as Leliman posited, it was associated (at least initially) with an educational institution like the Polytechnic in Delft.⁴⁰⁵ Easily accessible to a growing student body, the architecture museum would operate as a remarkable platform for the exchange of architectural knowledge and directly influence the development of the discipline.

Unlike the *A et A* faction, which endorsed a passively reflective architecture museum, the *Maatschappij* delegates fully subscribed to Leliman’s proposal of an actively projective institution. Thus, the report concluded with the recommendation for the *Maatschappij* board to support what amounted to a slight refinement of Leliman’s proposal: a modest architecture museum (to be expanded later as possible) with a study collection dedicated primarily at students and architects

⁴⁰³ Klinkhamer quoted in “Praeadvies van Het Hoofdbestuur in Zake Het Architectuur-Museum,” 107.

⁴⁰⁴ In *Ibid.*, 108.

⁴⁰⁵ Willem Leliman quoted verbatim by Klinkhamer in his report included in the *Maatschappij’s* preliminary recommendation. See Leliman, “Een Architectuurmuseum,” 346 and “Praeadvies van Het Hoofdbestuur in Zake Het Architectuur-Museum,” 108.

located in Delft. However, the committee organized by *Architectura et Amicitia* declared these points to be completely off-limits and not subject to discussion. In fact, *Maatschappij* delegates were even reminded that it had been clearly stated in their invitation for the committee that the discussion would be restricted to matters relating to the establishment of a public architecture museum of artistic quality located in the *Rijksakademie* building in Amsterdam.⁴⁰⁶ In this way, the committee had attempted to limit the parameters for discussion rather narrowly and conform them to their own intentions. However, by attempting to only entertain the discussion of accessory issues, the committee was decried as a blatant manipulation thinly veiled as cooperation.

It only took a couple of meetings for the *Maatschappij* duo to understand the true intent of the committee meetings: to validate the deliberations previously made in *Architectura et Amicitia's* internal committee as a consensual determination of all architecture societies. Such realization was particularly frustrating for Stuyt who resigned from his duties in the “Committee for the Foundation of an Architecture Museum” shortly after submitting the report, but not before penning a spirited article in defense of a projective architecture museum.⁴⁰⁷

Titled *Architecture Exhibition*, Stuyt's article presented a compelling argument for the specificity of architecture to be celebrated in exhibitions instead of being simply sublimated into painting and sculpture.⁴⁰⁸ Specifically, it was argued that architecture should be exhibited in galleries by itself and not among paintings or sculptures, since these combined exhibitions compelled architecture to be considered by the same standards as the prevalent fine arts. Stuyt posited that while such combinations had been expected to introduce the public to the appreciation of architecture, it was

⁴⁰⁶ Willem van der Pluym quoted in Pluym, “Verslag van 2de Vergadering van de Commissie Tot Stichting van Een Architectuur-Museum,” 12–13.

⁴⁰⁷ “Officieel Gedeelte,” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 35, no. 7 (February 15, 1915): 47.

⁴⁰⁸ Jan Stuyt, “Bouwkunst-Tentoonstelling,” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 34, no. 49 (December 5, 1914): 511–514.

having the opposite result and further alienating a lay audience from the discipline. Moreover, under the current practice, architecture was being valued merely by the aesthetic quality of its representations instead of being appreciated by the architectural ideas presented.

Since buildings could hardly be placed inside a gallery, it was “difficult to imagine an architecture exhibition without architectural drawings,” but drawings could easily be complemented with scale models of buildings and construction details, as well as photographs of completed buildings.⁴⁰⁹ According to Stuyt, a well-conceived architectural exhibition composed by an array of artifacts and representations would be able to plainly articulate the developments of the discipline to a wide public. In his opinion, an exhibition entirely conceived to present the unique qualities of the architectural discipline would certainly become a “powerful instrument of propaganda” for the appreciation of architecture and appeal to both a professional and a general audience.⁴¹⁰ Without ever mentioning any of the discussions within the committee, Stuyt concluded with a pointed remark: “Let us hope that we are [moving] in that direction soon and that the boards of the architectural societies can recognize that!”⁴¹¹

While enigmatic for most, Stuyt’s remark (and the entire article for that matter) could easily be construed as a severe critique to the position defended by *Architectura et Amicitia* during the committee meetings, specifically its intransigence in conceiving the future architecture museum as a fine arts museum organized according to antiquarian principles. Such intransigence by the *A et A*’s delegates can be directly traced back to the original meeting in which the first (internal) committee of that architecture society was originally established. In that meeting, society members argued for the establishment of an architecture museum not because of an ambition to further advance the

⁴⁰⁹ Ibid., 513. Stuyt was alluding to an international exhibition of architecture which had been planned to open in Amsterdam in 1915, but was unfortunately cancelled due to the start of the hostilities of World War I.

⁴¹⁰ Stuyt, “Bouwkunst-Tentoonstelling,” 513.

⁴¹¹ Ibid., 514.

discipline, but in order to protect the discipline's heritage.⁴¹² Specifically, the gathered *A et A* members discussed the "importance of drawings to the field of architecture, as well as how designs, models and studies are [continuously] lost because the fate of these materials have not been of anyone's interest."⁴¹³

Beyond investigating the possibility of establishing an architecture museum (that could assist in the collection and preservation of drawings and other artifacts that would otherwise be lost), the newly empowered working-group was also tasked to ensure that *Architectura et Amicitia* would have the opportunity to define its position on this matter and, most importantly, that its position would be properly considered. Following this mandate, and in order to ensure that the *A et A* retained its hegemony in Dutch architecture, the society's representatives had some compelling, albeit self-serving, reasons to insist in an architecture museum primarily concerned with the discipline's past. Given that the society only enjoyed a significant presence and influence within Amsterdam, it was natural for the *A et A* to argue that the future architecture museum should be located within the capital city, allowing it to continue to influence the proposed museum long after its establishment. Besides being concerned with its location, the *A et A* was also preoccupied that the new proposed museum (and certainly as it had been imagined by Leliman in his article) would compete with the architectural society in directing the development of the discipline. If the future architecture museum could become a truly projective organization, leveraging its collection of architectural knowledge to inform and direct the conversation within the discipline, it would not just be another platform for debate, but a formidable contender to *Architectura et Amicitia's* prominence within Dutch architectural culture.

⁴¹² Willem Leliman had also previously expressed a significant concern with the preservation and valuation of architectural drawings, but not as an end in itself. See Leliman, "Een Museum van Bouwkundige Teekeningen."

⁴¹³ "Verslag van de 1320ste Vergadering van Het Architectura et Amicitia," 416.

Since the initial idea articulated by Leliman was contrary to all these stipulations, it was in the *A et A*'s best interest to position itself early on in the debate. This way the *A et A* could frame the discussion and attempt to direct the process of establishing an architecture museum in the Netherlands, even if at the cost of subverting Leliman's original intentions and sublimating architecture. Ultimately, *Architectura et Amicitia* was simply protecting its interests when it advocated so vigorously for an artistic rather than a specialized architecture museum.

The Institute that Never Was

It was increasingly clear that the result of the proceedings of the "Committee for the Foundation of an Architecture Museum," even as it expanded to accommodate representatives of all architectural societies, was limited by the conditions previously predetermined by the *A et A*. Moreover, it seemed all but inevitable that a reflective architecture museum would be the recommendation of the committee, and no architectural society would be able (or willing) to mount an organized opposition and/or pursue any type of alternative arrangement. However, unbeknownst to *Architectura et Amicitia*, a select group of architects and distinguished individuals was quietly preparing a viable alternative to the reflective vision of an architecture museum being planned by the *A et A*-controlled committee.

In late April 1917, the architectural community was taken by surprise when a competing vision for an architecture museum was publicly announced across the pages of all four architectural journals in the Netherlands.⁴¹⁴ Sporting the title *Instituut voor Bouwkunst* (Institute for Architecture) and based in The Hague, the fledgling organization aimed to direct the discipline primarily through engagement. In fact, the new institute's commitment to the engagement of the discipline even seemed to supplant the importance attributed to the constitution of a collection of

⁴¹⁴ "Berichten Bouwkunst." "Een Nieuwe Vereeniging." "Een Instituut Voor Bouwkunst." "Instituut Voor Bouwkunst."

architectural artifacts. Exhibitions were just one among several instruments identified by the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst* in achieving its objectives, since the constitution of a collection was only as significant as its ability to further assist in the development of the discipline. The new institute proposed not just to collect and exhibit architectural artifacts, but also to publish periodicals, important designs and treatises, as well as to organize public discussions and lectures and to closely cooperate with educational institutions.

By aiming at the advancement of architecture through the constitution of a platform for discussion, the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst* offered an alternative to the reflective museum being planned within the “Committee for the Foundation of an Architecture Museum.” Unlike the *A et A*’s proposal, the new institute had a clear educational objective and intended to actively engage with the discipline.

In its initial announcement and in its organizing statutes (approved by Royal Decree of August 16, 1917, number 5), the new architectural organization was strikingly similar to the museum described by Willem Leliman in *Een Architectuurmuseum*. Beyond the clear educational objective, the new institute also intended to present and analyze architecture through a combination of its artistic, technical, and constructive dimensions. Such a combination fitted closely to what Leliman had described (and advocated) as a “versatile architecture museum.”⁴¹⁵ Other elements of Leliman’s description were not directly adopted by the new institute, as it lacked a direct institutional association with an academic organization. But even then, Leliman’s intentions were retained in the organization and statutes of the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst*, as its list of early signatories was populated with professors from Amsterdam, Delft, Haarlem, and as far as Utrecht.⁴¹⁶ The close

⁴¹⁵ Leliman, “Een Architectuurmuseum,” 346.

⁴¹⁶ The contingent of professors involved with the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst* included faculty members of the University of Amsterdam, the School of Applied Arts in Haarlem, the Delft Polytechnic School and the

parallel between the projective architecture museum described in Leliman's article and the progressive institute being established in The Hague was both obvious and unsurprising, since Leliman was named as one of the instigators of the new institute.

The influence of other early contributors was equally patent in the progressive orientation of the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst*. Jan Stuyt, one of the original members of the *Architectura et Amicitia* extended committee, was equally influential in the establishment and program of the new institute. Stuyt's ideas on architecture exhibitions and how these should function as an interface between the interior and exterior of the discipline were particularly manifest in the new institute's constitution.⁴¹⁷ Even though the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst* never had the opportunity to organize any exhibitions, it was strongly suggested by its announcement and statutes that in the new institute, exhibitions would not be used to sublimate architecture into painting or sculpture, but were instead to operate as forceful instruments in presenting architecture's specificity. Moreover, it was Stuyt's contention that by presenting both architecture's artistic and technical dimensions, exhibitions of architecture could also bring together architects and the general public in a greater appreciation of the discipline. In the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst*, however, not just exhibitions but the entire institute was to operate as a fundamental interface between architects and the general public.

Another original member of *Architectura et Amicitia's* extended "Committee for the Foundation of an Architecture Museum" was equally (if not more) instrumental in the

University of Utrecht. See Instituut voor Bouwkunst, "Lijst Der Personen Die in Eerste Instantie Reeds Toetraden Tot Het Instituut Voor Bouwkunst," August 16, 1917, NDBK 445.

⁴¹⁷ While Stuyt's position regarding architecture exhibitions has already been discussed at greater length, at this point it should suffice to consider how Stuyt believed that when properly organized to emphasize the specificity of architecture, architectural exhibitions could serve as powerful instruments for fostering the appreciation of architecture and to bring architects and the general public together. Stuyt, "Bouwkunst-Tentoonstelling."

establishment of the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst*. Hajo Brugmans, a professor of history at the University of Amsterdam was the first (and only) president of the progressive institute. Brugmans influenced the fledgling architectural organization to squarely focus on the educational potential of an architecture institution, even defining it as the institute's *raison d'être*. Previously, Brugmans had advocated for the "architecture museum to be a public foundation, a self-standing organization," outside academic education but with close ties to it.⁴¹⁸ Therefore, rather than being located in Amsterdam or Delft and being associated with any one academic institution, the new institute was based in The Hague (a central point in the *Randstad*, the conurbation of the four largest cities in the Netherlands) and cooperated with academic institutions from Rotterdam to Utrecht. For Brugmans, the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst* was to operate as a central node in a network of distributed architectural knowledge.

Just like Leliman and Stuyt, Brugmans had been disappointed and disconcerted with the lack of educational ambitions of the architecture museum being planned by the *Architectura et Amicitia* controlled committee. Instead of being limited to exhibit beautifully pleasing architectural drawings, the new institute was to present architecture in the full splendor of its artistic, technical, and constructive dimensions. Effectively, the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst* was almost the complete antithesis of the *Architectura et Amicitia*-advocated artistic architecture museum.

While the new *Instituut voor Bouwkunst*'s potential to establish a progressive direction for the architecture museum was quickly acknowledged, it was also remarked how its program was conspicuously similar to the oldest society of architecture, the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der*

⁴¹⁸ Brugmans admired the example of the *Instituut voor Hersenonderzoek* (Institute for Brain Research) in Amsterdam which was a self-standing institution but worked in close collaboration with several academic institutions. Brugmans quoted in Pluym, "Verslag van 2de Vergadering van de Commissie Tot Stichting van Een Architectuur-Museum," 8.

Bouwkunst.⁴¹⁹ Paradoxically, the constitution of a progressive alternative to the artistic architecture museum being prepared by *Architectura et Amicitia* and its committee implied the rediscovery of one of the oldest architecture societies in the Netherlands.⁴²⁰

While promising, the new institute never had the opportunity to prove its worth. Despite the strong initial support by architects, professors, and politicians, the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst* was not able to attract a significant membership. As an independent organization, the new institute relied on membership fees to fund its activities, but its inability to gain an expressive (and sufficient) number of supporters entailed that the institute was equally unable to mobilize the necessary funds to organize any activity. While the founders of the new institute had initially believed the eight months between the announcement of the institute and the beginning of its activities to be sufficient for assembling a sizeable membership, they did not account for the fierce opposition mounted by the existing architectural societies. Through a campaign of disinformation and organized boycott, *Architectura et Amicitia* and the professional association *MBVA* greatly limited the new institute's ability to garner the necessary supporters (and funds) for its ambitious plans.⁴²¹ Lacking supporters and funds, the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst's* ambitious plans were irrevocably compromised. While attempting to project a future for the discipline, the institute was itself deprived of a future.

Still hoping to be able to interest sufficient supporters, the board of the institute attempted to project an image of normalcy by following the announced plan (and schedule) for the establishment

⁴¹⁹ "Een Instituut Voor Bouwkunst," 130.

⁴²⁰As it has already been addressed on chapter 2, Willem Leliman's ideal of a progressive architecture museum was modeled to a great extent on the old *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst*, particularly its enthusiastic beginnings, but also by his father's (Jan Leliman) ideas.

⁴²¹ The *Maatschappij* was the first to recommend its members to refrain from becoming a member of the new *Instituut voor Bouwkunst*, to which the other societies quickly followed suit. See "Verslag van de Ledenvergadering Der M.B.V.A. Op Woensdag 14 November 1917 in 'Café Brinkmann' Te Haarlem."

of the institute. As it was privately sending letters in droves reminding prospective members of their invitation to join their organization, it was publicly launching open competitions for the official stamp and letterhead of the organization.⁴²² Eventually the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst* became untenable, with its board and scarce supporters conceding their inability to establish a progressive instrument for the shaping of architectural culture in the Netherlands.

Even without ever organizing anything to directly affect the development of the discipline, the tentative establishment of the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst* had a significant impact in the conception of an architecture museum in the Netherlands. Beyond presenting a progressive alternative to the idea of an architecture museum, the organization briefly formed in The Hague also established the proper designation for a projective architectural institution. Reflective institutions addressing architecture's artistic and aesthetic issues could simply be referred to as a museum, but that title was no longer sufficient to aptly classify projective architectural organizations. By surpassing the documenting functions of a museum and actively engaging with the discipline, projective architectural institutions warranted the title of "Institute." In the Netherlands, the dichotomy between reflective and projective architectural institutions, between past and future, became clarified as an opposition between museums and institutes.

With the capitulation of *the Instituut voor Bouwkunst*, the possibility of a 'projective' alternative to the 'reflective' architecture museum being planned by the committee was equally lost. In fact, the failure of the tentative institute implied that the reflective conception of the architecture museum became not just predominant but, effectively, the only possibility for any future proposal for an architecture museum in the Netherlands. With this failure the reflective model remained

⁴²² Signed by the Secretary of the institute, the form letters were sent to prospective members from January 1918 onwards. See J.W Frederiks, "Inschrijven Brief," January 20, 1918, NDBK 445. For the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst* design competition see "Prijsvraag van Het Instituut Voor Bouwkunst," *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 39, no. 16 (April 20, 1918): 99.

unchallenged and was able to define the collective expectations for an architecture museum in the following decades. The preoccupation with the past and an antiquarian approach to the architecture museum became virtually unquestioned. Throughout the twentieth century the idea of the architecture museum was so connected to the idea of preserving the past that, when in 1971 the first working architecture museum was founded, it was actually an archive dedicated to the preservation of Dutch architectural heritage.⁴²³

The 1918 Commission for a State Architecture Museum

Even as the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst's* failure condemned the projective model for an architecture museum to oblivion, its short-lived existence still influenced the procedures within the *Architectura et Amicitia*-controlled "Committee for the Foundation of an Architecture Museum." The surprising foundation of a competing vision for an architecture museum compelled the usually secretive committee to disclose its progress and accelerate its plans. Similarly to what had previously occurred when the committee's deliberations had been publicly questioned by the *Maatschappij's* preliminary recommendation, members of the committee authored articles presenting their progress, advocating their position, and reveling in their own accomplishments.⁴²⁴ With these texts it was "hoped that a great deal of sympathy for the new institution [could] be awoken in a great number of people."⁴²⁵

⁴²³ While lacking suitable premises to accommodate exhibitions, the *Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst* (Dutch Documentation Center for Architecture, commonly known as *NDB*), was widely perceived and heralded as an architecture museum when it was founded in 1971. See Kees Broos, "Signalement van Het NDB," *Museumjournaal*, no. 1 (March 1975): 2–8. In 1988 the *NDB* was one of the merging institutions in forming the *Nederlands Architectuurinstituut*.

⁴²⁴ The most revealing of the articles were signed by then current chairman of the committee, Tedink van Berkhout. See Jhr. H. Teding van Berkhout and Willem van der Pluym, "Architectuurmuseum," *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 39, no. 27 (July 6, 1918): 157–158., and Jhr. H. Teding van Berkhout, "'S Rijks Architectuurmuseum," *Wendingen* 1, no. 12 (December 1918): 43–44.

⁴²⁵ Teding van Berkhout, "'S Rijks Architectuurmuseum," 43.

The grandest self-praise in these articles was reserved to the committee's ability to interest the government in their plan for the establishment of an architecture museum, but even this seemed to be associated with the pressure levied by the announcement of the foundation of the *Instituut voor Bouwkunst*. A mere two months after this announcement, the committee was able to secure funding in the state budget for the following year to support "travel and accommodation expenses of members of a commission to study and devise detailed plans for the establishment of a State Architecture Museum (*Rijks Architectuur-Museum*)."⁴²⁶ The appointment of the newly established government-supported "Commission for a State Architecture Museum" was the result of a memorandum sent by the "Committee for the Foundation of an Architecture Museum" to the Minister of Interior, J.B. Kan.⁴²⁷ While the memorandum had been sent on August 9, 1916, it took the threat of the foundation of a credible alternative to the architecture museum in it proposed for something to be actually done.

The reflective nature of the proposed architecture museum, its focus on architecture's past, and its artistic orientation were pervasive throughout the memorandum text. Notably, it was declared that "the museum will not only offer a complete and representative overview of the history of architecture from an artistic perspective, in the first place in the Netherlands, but also ensure the preservation of several artistic treasures."⁴²⁸ The documentation of history and the preservation of Dutch architectural heritage were thus identified as the practical functions of the proposed architecture museum, but these were also to be subject to the reigning artistic character of the

⁴²⁶ "Gemengde Berichten: De Staatsbegroting 1918," 307.

⁴²⁷ The full memorandum is available in the NAI archives, but large excerpts were also published by then chairman of the Committee, Teding van Berkhout. See Jhr. H. Teding van Berkhout and Willem van der Pluym, "'S Ryks Architectuur-Museum: Memorie van Toelichting by Het Verzoekschrift van 9 Augustus 1916," August 9, 1916, NDBK 444. and Teding van Berkhout, "'S Rijks Architectuurmuseum."

⁴²⁸ Teding van Berkhout and Pluym, "'S Ryks Architectuur-Museum: Memorie," 3.

proposed museum.⁴²⁹ Artistic and art-historical value was the single criteria for the inclusion of any object to its collection, with even construction sketches, drawings, and documents being assessed by their artistic qualities rather than the architectural ideas represented in them. Given the recommendation for a reflective type of architecture museum, it was also claimed that the committee had “reached a consensus” regarding the location of the future architecture museum in Amsterdam.⁴³⁰ According to the committee’s assessment, in the capital city the architecture museum would not only be centrally located and easily accessible, but would also benefit from the presence of large public collections of other arts.⁴³¹

Another subtext of the memorandum was the notion that architecture should be considered just another art form, and its museum should not differ in any way from museums dedicated to other arts. The potential of the architecture museum to advance the discipline was minimized, instead being emphasized that the museum was to be “a true public art institution for the benefit of all the people, just like the state museums of painting, sculpture, graphic arts, and crafts.”⁴³² While acknowledging that beyond aesthetics, architecture was also composed of technical and constructional concerns, these concerns would only interest architects and would therefore be better suited to technical libraries, even perhaps associated with academic institutions such as the Delft Polytechnic. Nevertheless, just as the alternative to establish a study collection of architecture was mentioned, it was also discouraged. Specifically, it was argued that “when the architecture

⁴²⁹ Concerns with the poor conditions of irreplaceable Dutch architectural heritage would be one of the reasons to compel the State to establish the *Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor Bouwkunst* (Dutch Documentation Center for Architecture) in 1971.

⁴³⁰ Teding van Berkhout and Pluym, “’S Ryks Architectuur-Museum: Memorie,” 4.

⁴³¹ A similar argument would be made in 1985 to resist the establishment of the Netherlands Architecture Institute in Rotterdam. See Jan Kassies, “Over Cultuurspreiding En Cultuurvorming,” *Wonen TABK*, no. 11–12 (June 1985): 44–45.

⁴³² Teding van Berkhout and Pluym, “’S Ryks Architectuur-Museum: Memorie,” 2–3.

museum is established as a state institution, the possibility that similar competing collections can be established while not entirely made impossible, it is reduced to a very minimum.”⁴³³

The main purpose of the memorandum was to interest the central government in founding the architecture museum as a state institution. The committee thus argued that governmental support was fundamental in establishing the level of centralization necessary for the creation of a strong collection of architecture. Moreover, the state was “requested to facilitate suitable premises [for the future architecture museum] in the new building of the *Rijksakademie van Beeldende Kunsten* (Royal Academy of Fine Arts), where the collection [would] be prepared, carefully managed and propagated while making it accessible to a wider public.”⁴³⁴ While the state would be responsible for the premises and financial support of the architecture museum, the collective of architectural societies pledged to assemble the museum’s artistic collection of architectural objects. The collection of material could begin immediately, since until the architecture museum settled on its permanent location the drawings and other objects collected could be stored and managed at the *Rijksprentenkabinet* (Royal Prints and Drawings Collection) under the care of its director, Teding van Berkhout, who was also an influential member of the committee.

As it had been strongly anticipated by the first *Maatschappij* delegates (Jan Stuyt and Jaap Klinkhamer), despite almost four years of meetings, the final memorandum produced by the “Committee for the Foundation of an Architecture Museum” did not diverge in any significant manner from the original deliberations by the *Architectura et Amicitia*’s own internal committee. In short, the memorandum recommended that the collection of architectural objects (primarily

⁴³³ Ibid., 5.

⁴³⁴ Jhr. H. Teding van Berkhout, “Brief Aan de Minister van Binnenlandse Zaken,” August 9, 1916, NDBK 444.

drawings) of “artistic and art-historical significance” be accommodated in an architecture museum to be located in the *Rijksadademie*’s new building in Amsterdam.

Upon reception of the memorandum in September 1916, Minister of the Interior J.B. Kan initiated a consultation with several governmental departments in order to analyze the feasibility of the committee’s recommendations and plan. The greatest opposition to the plan emerged from the Supervisory Board of the *Rijksakademie*, who strongly opposed the possibility of accommodating an independent museum (of architecture or otherwise) in that institution’s premises.⁴³⁵ Even as this substantial setback resulted in the resignation of the director of the *Rijksakademie* from the committee, it did not deter the committee from continuing to pursue its plan.⁴³⁶ In the following months the committee continued to develop its proposal, particularly by detailing the program of the proposed architecture museum.⁴³⁷ At the same time, the committee also intensified its lobbying efforts with government, as both the chairman and the secretary of the committee met with influential public officials (who were evaluating their proposal) and garnered their backing for the architecture museum. The support of M.I. Duparc, the Head of the Department of Arts and Sciences, and the interest of the Minister of the Interior in particular, were instrumental in presenting the issue to both legislative bodies of the States-General.⁴³⁸ The parliamentary discussion approved the

⁴³⁵ See Commissie van Toezicht op de Ryks Akademie van Beeldende Kunsten, “Brief Aan de Minister van Binnenlandse Zaken,” September 7, 1916, NDBK 444.

⁴³⁶ After a few months discussing how to handle the consequences of the Supervisory Board’s opposition, Antoon der Kinderen finally announced his resignation to Teding van Berkhout, who had taken over his functions as chairman of the committee. See A. J. der Kinderen, “Ontslag Brief van Stichting Voor Architectuur Museum,” December 15, 1916, NDBK 444.

⁴³⁷ The committee’s detailed program for the proposed museum, envisioned 500 m² of well-lit exhibition area (in one or more floors); a 30 m² room/office for its only curator; a 50 m² study room for visitors; 30 m² of storage space to be combined with a shipping area of 50 m² in in the basement; and a small vestibule with a cloakroom for visitors. It is remarkable how the program devised by the committee for the architecture museum resembled the program for the communal building of the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* which included exactly the same functions, albeit with a considerably smaller exhibition hall. See “Concept-Programma Architectuur-Museum,” January 24, 1917, NDBK 444.

⁴³⁸ Teding van Berkhout, “’S Rijks Architectuurmuseum,” 44.

constitution of a formal governmental commission for the establishment of a “State Commission for the Establishment of an Architecture Museum” by allocating funds in the 1918 state budget for its expenses.

The new government-sponsored “Commission for a State Architecture Museum” was officially constituted on June 18, 1918, (by royal decree number 46) and was mandated to “gather information regarding whether the creation of a State Architecture Museum is desirable, and if so, elaborate detailed plans for such museum.”⁴³⁹ Already anticipating the certain constitution of the state commission, *Architectura et Amicitia* had dissolved its own committee a month earlier, on May 15, 1918.⁴⁴⁰ From the disbanded *A et A*-organized committee, both its chairman, Hendrik Teding van Berkhout, and its secretary Willem van der Pluym retained their positions in the new state commission. Besides them, also the *Maatschappij* and *BNA* delegates, respectively Dirk Frederik Slothouwer and Joseph Cuypers transited to the new commission.⁴⁴¹ The expertise of the old members was complemented by the new members completing the state commission. Hendrik Jorden (Henri) Evers, a professor of architecture at the Delft Polytechnic, and Willem Vogelsang, a professor of art history at the Utrecht University, offered a pedagogic and artistic assessment, while the public interest was represented by Johan Melchior (Jan) van der Mey, an architect and “aesthetic advisor” to the city of Amsterdam, and Jan Kalf, the director of the State Department for Conservation and Preservation (at the time *Rijks Bureau voor de Monumentenzorg*). Effectively, from its objective to its composition the committee remained the same; simply now its activities were funded by the state budget and validated by the inclusion of distinguished public officials.

⁴³⁹ “Koninklijk Besluit Nummer 5,” August 16, 1917, NDBK 444.

⁴⁴⁰ Jhr. H. Teding van Berkhout, “Nota Betreffende Plannen Voor Een Museum Voor Bouwkunde” (Amsterdam, August 1950), 2, NDBK 445.

⁴⁴¹ From the core members of the *Architectura et Amicitia*-organized committee, only the “inconvenient” Hajo Brugmans was conspicuously absent from the new state commission.

Almost a year later, the state commission's work was completed and its final report was submitted to the Minister of Interior. Inevitably, the commission found "the foundation of a State Architecture Museum to be desirable," in a nineteen page final report detailing "what [they] considered should be the program of this museum, and how in their opinion the institution was to be founded."⁴⁴² Throughout the report, the continuation of previous ideas and refinement of others was as blatant as it was unsurprising.

As in previous committees, the state commission considered that a future state architecture museum was to be directed at a wide audience, and the only way to achieve that was by concentrating on presenting architectural objects of aesthetic and art-historical value. Only by presenting the aesthetic dimension of architecture could it then be understood by the masses as more than mere shelter, that is, as an art of equal aesthetic import as the fine arts of painting and sculpture. But while these other arts were already represented in the state's museum system (most notably in the *Rijksmuseum*), the aesthetic expression of architecture was still remarkably absent.⁴⁴³ This was particularly significant since architecture was described as a "communal art," inherently engaged and available to the entire society, and yet not really appreciated as such.

The arguments for the necessity of the government's support to the museum were also not novel. Thus, the foundation of a government-supported architecture museum was expected to also resolve some essential practical concerns. Specifically it was suggested that only an architecture museum would allow for a much needed centralization of architectural artifacts and "guarantee the preservation and overall accessibility to [these] significant cultural treasures."⁴⁴⁴ Furthermore, it was claimed that only the government's support would guarantee a continued accessibility to the

⁴⁴² Jhr. H. Teding van Berkhout and Willem van der Pluym, "Rapport van de Ryks-Commissie Tot Voorbereiding van de Stichting van Een Ryks-Architectuur-Museum," April 4, 1919, 1, NDBK 445.

⁴⁴³ *Ibid.*, 5.

⁴⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 6.

architectural objects collected, as well as the necessary level of centralization to prevent other competing collections from ever being established.

Regarding the program and content of the recommended architecture museum, the perpetuation of earlier ideas was equally present. Like the committees before, the state commission recommended the establishment of an architecture museum squarely focused on the history and the aesthetic qualities of the discipline. Hence, in order to “offer a complete and representative picture of the history of architecture from an aesthetic and art historical perspective,” original material was to be procured whenever possible, but reproductions and secondary material were to be used to fill in the gaps in the collection.⁴⁴⁵ However, both original architectural sketches, drawings, models, and small building fragments, as well as the complementary casts, survey drawings, and photographs were to be selected in accordance with their aesthetic qualities and art-historical significance.⁴⁴⁶

The state commission also repeated the recommendation of the previous committees concerning the location of the architecture museum. Given the artistic character of the proposed architecture museum, Amsterdam was presented as its only viable location. Amsterdam not only ensured that the museum would be accessible to the greatest amount of people, but its artistic context populated by other museums and institutions created an exceptional cultural and artistic context in which the new architecture museum could thrive.

⁴⁴⁵ Ibid., 8. The secondary material, or “reproductions” to be included in the future collection were limited to photographs, survey drawings (measured) and cast models of realized works. These were to be treated differently from the originals and further establish the distinction between original primary material produced by the architect and secondary material produced from architecture’s built expression. While seemingly subtle, such distinction served to further emphasize the artistic character of architecture and identify architects with artists whose work can be studied and reproduced but never replaced.

⁴⁴⁶ Ibid. It was further recommended that the museum should also collect objects from arts closely related to architecture, such as building sculptures, mosaics, and even furniture.

Despite the fact that the report merely presented a rehash of earlier ideas, it also articulated the inevitable development of some positions. Most significantly, the possible incorporation of contemporary architecture in the museum's collection was, for the first time, considered. But even then, the presence of history was all too pervasive. For the state commission the inclusion of contemporary architecture was bound to be difficult and subjective, but it was necessary in order to offer visitors a clear connection between the architectural history being exhibited and their own environment.⁴⁴⁷ In short, contemporary architecture was only to be presented as the culmination of the art-historical lineage being constructed by the architecture museum. Similarly, just as contemporary architecture was to be presented in order to ground history, foreign architecture was to be presented in order "to widen the look and ascertain how the Netherlands measures [in architecture] compared to other countries" and position Dutch architecture in a wider context.⁴⁴⁸

The inclusion of contemporary and foreign architecture enabled the commission to boldly claim that neither time nor geographical restrictions were to be imposed on the museum's collection. However, it was equally adamant about the stringent "quality restrictions" to be enforced on the collection. Again it was restated that "it should never be forgotten that objects are only to be valued by their aesthetic and art-historical qualities" and only those qualities were to be taken in consideration when assembling the collection, be it of contemporary or historical, foreign or Dutch architecture.⁴⁴⁹ With this stipulation, the commission prevented technical innovations in architecture from being enshrined in the museum and ensured that architecture would continue to be perceived as an aesthetic endeavor.

⁴⁴⁷ Ibid., 10.

⁴⁴⁸ Ibid., 10–11.

⁴⁴⁹ Ibid., 11.

Despite submitting its final report and handing the process for review to the Minister of Interior and the Department of Museum Affairs, the commission did not consider its work to be complete. Instead, it reserved to itself the right to give further opinions and recommendations as the process developed, particularly regarding the selection of the architecture museum's permanent location.

After two different committees and a state commission, the same basic ideas that had been devised by *Architectura et Amicitia* to subvert Leliman's vision of an architecture museum were still framing and dominating the conversation on an architecture museum. Several years had gone by, and Leliman's appeal for an architecture museum addressing the discipline's unique combination of technical and aesthetic dimensions, focused on projecting its future through education, seemed to be more distant than ever, as the state commission firmly reiterated the *A et A*'s initial proposal for a museum solely focused on architecture's artistic qualities and with a clear preoccupation with the past.

For the state commission—just as it had been for the *A et A*-controlled committee—the constitution of an architecture museum was not just an imperative, but also a matter of great urgency. Such urgency was particularly evident as the state commission strongly encouraged the government to initiate the collection of architectural objects as soon as possible, even without finding a suitable and permanent accommodation for the future architecture museum. Although the recommendation went unheeded, the collection of the future architecture museum was finally initiated in 1923 with the donation of several objects from an architectural exhibition in Amsterdam. Such a donation effectively established a virtual architecture museum, an institution with a collection but no space to either present it or even store it.

The 1923 Jubilee Architectural Exhibition

The 1923 commemoration of Queen Wilhelmina's Silver Jubilee inspired a group of scholars and architects to organize an architectural exhibition. The exhibition's "aim [was] to clearly present

the developmental history of the architects' art" through an overview of Dutch architecture of the previous twenty-five years.⁴⁵⁰ The pretext of a Jubilee celebration served for the organizing committee led by Jan Six (a professor of aesthetics and art history at the University of Amsterdam) to approach the government to request financial support for their endeavor.⁴⁵¹ In requesting the government's assistance, Six suggested that the drawings and models exhibited could, at the end of the event, be donated to initiate the collection of the much discussed future architecture museum.

Titled the "Jubilee Architectural Exhibition 1898-1923," the exhibition was on display between September 8 and 28, 1923, in the newly completed administration building of the Amsterdam public transportation company *Gemeentetram* in the *Stadhouderskade*. Divided into four floors, the exhibition took over fifty-two rooms, with no immediately discernible structure or organization. The breadth of the work presented was tremendous, ranging from the travel sketches of Jan Leliman (Willem Leliman's father), to the "triumvirate of Berlage, Kromhout and De Bazel," to the work of Amsterdam's Public Housing Department.⁴⁵² But even in this multitude of architectural expression, the predominance of the exhibition's historical approach was still inescapable, with one reviewer even commenting that "from the nature of this exhibition some old parade horses have been trotted out."⁴⁵³ Although a sizable amount of work was exhibited, there were some very notable absences, particularly the most innovative architects working in the Netherlands at the start of the twentieth century. It seemed that all those who had been attempting to develop a

⁴⁵⁰ "Bouwkunst-Tentoonstelling," *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 44, no. 25 (June 23, 1923): 273.

⁴⁵¹ The exhibition committee was composed by Jan Six, N. Lansdorp, A. R. Hulshof, Paul J. de Jongh, Evert Kuipers, and Jan de Meyer, but none of them had taken part of, or been associated with, any of the previous efforts to establish an architecture museum. *Ibid.* Regarding the request for state financial support see Jan Boterenbrood, "Naar Aanleiding van Een Jubileums-Bouwkunst Tentoonstelling in Amsterdam," *Architectura* 27, no. 29 (September 15, 1923): 178-180.

⁴⁵² "Bouwkunst-Tentoonstelling 1898-1923 Te Amsterdam (II)," *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 44, no. 38 (September 22, 1923): 397.

⁴⁵³ "Jubileum's Tentoonstelling Bouwkunst 1898-1923," *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 44, no. 36 (September 8, 1923): 380.

modern idiom for architecture were not represented in this exhibition, from the expressionists of the Amsterdam School to the Rotterdam rationalists. The absences of “de Klerk, Staal, Wijdeveld, Vorkink, van der Mey, Limburg, Oud, Gratama and Versteeg” were particularly lamented, with one reviewer claiming “better others were absent than that these were missing.”⁴⁵⁴

While the 1923 exhibition was not affiliated with any architectural society or any of the various committees debating the foundation of an architecture museum, it still closely reflected the ambitions and recommendations of these groups regarding architectural exhibitions. Rather than instigating discussion and presenting the increasingly diverging attitudes towards architecture, the architectural exhibition presented an uncontested space where the committee’s construction of history would go unchallenged. Such dogmatic approach to architecture exhibitions revealed how *Architectura et Amicitia* had successfully framed public perception and expectations regarding a future architecture museum.⁴⁵⁵

While still unaffiliated with any group, Jan Six, the main organizer of the 1923 Jubilee exhibition continued to express his thoughts on the future architecture museum, further exposing how the *A et A*’s ideas had effectively framed this discussion. In close alignment with previous committees, he associated the establishment of the future architecture museum with the halt of “the senseless destruction of the accumulated treasures of the past” and claimed that more than the technical qualities revealed by architectural plans and sections, the core of the architecture museum should be original architectural sketches where the artistic virtuosity of architects was most present.⁴⁵⁶

⁴⁵⁴ “Bouwkunst-Tentoonstelling 1898-1923 Te Amsterdam (I),” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 44, no. 37 (September 15, 1923): 388.

⁴⁵⁵ Beyond initiating the architecture museum’s collection, the 1923 Jubilee exhibition also made evident the lack of suitable space for the public exhibition of architecture in Amsterdam, thus subtly advocating for the foundation of a proper architecture museum in the city.

⁴⁵⁶ Jan Six, “De Kern Voor Een Museum van Bouwkunst, Door Jhr. Dr. J. Six,” *Architectura* 29 (February 14, 1925): 65–67.

Given that the Jubilee exhibition had effectively initiated the collection of the future state architecture museum, Jan Six felt particularly legitimized to express his opinions on this matter.

However, Six's authority on this matter was not unanimously recognized, particularly since the Jubilee's exhibition had clearly suppressed or ignored some of the most exciting architectural expressions emerging in the Netherlands in the previous twenty-five years. Not only had those contemporary expressions been ignored, but their historical precedents had been whitewashed or co-opted into an altogether different (and linear) construction of history in the 1923 overview of Dutch architecture. Hence, Willem Kromhout, one of the leading Dutch architects and a former president of the *A et A*, responded to Six's argument in a lengthy article spread over three issues of an architectural weekly. While Kromhout went to great lengths to present an inclusive overview of Dutch architecture in order to claim that the "core of the Central Museum of Architecture should consist of several nuclei" of architectural expression from which a new architectural approach was already emerging, his comments on the format of the architecture museum were most critical.⁴⁵⁷

After the Jubilee exhibition the plethora of drawings and models exhibited had been transferred to the care of the state and placed in storage at the *Rijksprentenkabinet*.⁴⁵⁸ Kromhout acknowledged in this "undoubtedly a beginning of a museum, but given the manner of how it was established, [he] could not rejoice."⁴⁵⁹ Despite the 1919 state commission report specifically recommending the appointment of a director to organize the architectural collection, by 1923 no one had yet been appointed. Given this hierarchical void, the Jubilee exhibition objects were entrusted to the

⁴⁵⁷ Willem Kromhout, "De Kern Voor Een Museum van Bouwkunst, Door W. Kromhout (III)," *Architectura* 29 (March 14, 1925): 103.

⁴⁵⁸ Some architects had not agreed to the donation of their work from the Jubilee exhibition and immediately reclaimed those objects from the *Rijksprentenkabinet*, most notably H.P. Berlage. See H. P. Berlage, "Brief Aan Den Directeur van Het Prentenkabinet Rijksmuseum Amsterdam," November 15, 1923, NDBK 445.

⁴⁵⁹ Kromhout, "De Kern Voor Een Museum van Bouwkunst, Door W. Kromhout (III)," 103.

Rijksprentenkabinet since its director, Teding van Berkhout, had earlier offered to store and manage the fledgling state architecture collection in the *Rijksprentenkabinet's* premises until the future architecture museum had found permanent accommodations. The “temporary storage in a few rooms of the *Rijksprentenkabinet* used until the funding for a proper display case is found” was decried since everyone was aware of “how permanent temporary [conditions] could be in the Netherlands.”⁴⁶⁰ Kromhout further questioned the willingness of any architect to donate material and objects if these were just going to be stored in a backroom rather than being put on display for everyone to see. Accordingly, for him, architects had to “oppose this disparaging situation in which the opportunity to ‘store’ [was] already sufficient” for the state to claim interest in architecture.⁴⁶¹

As the passionate rhetoric should indicate, Kromhout had a vested interest in the fate of the architecture museum. His own work had been donated following the Jubilee architectural exhibition and was now in the *Rijksprentenkabinet's* care. The assembly of a collection was certainly the beginning of an architecture museum, but this had become not just insufficient, but also unjustifiable for Kromhout. He felt that if the state must intervene with the establishment of an architecture museum, it had to do it properly and allow the budding collection to be accessible in the galleries of the museum.

While never directly stating it, Kromhout's public position revealed a definite affinity with the projective faction, particularly since he claimed for an inclusive reading of history and for an appreciation of architecture beyond its artistic expression. However, Kromhout's public stance was above all political and pragmatic. Having his work in a museum for everyone to admire would

⁴⁶⁰ Ibid., 104. Kromhout goes on to jokingly remark that 100 years after his writing, “in 2025, our descendants will find in a lost corner of the *Rijksmuseum* some architectural drawings, which they will not understand how they got there!”

⁴⁶¹ Ibid.

certainly improve his public visibility and assist in garnering new commissions, inevitably a significant improvement from having his drawings and models linger in a state depository.

An Architecture Museum in the *Zuiderkerk*

Similar concerns were also preoccupying the State Advisory Board on Museum Affairs (*Rijkscommissie van Advies in Zake de Musea*). In the late 1920s this advisory board was the latest state agency to be responsible for the process of the architecture museum and was intent on bringing it to fruition.⁴⁶² However, given that there was no space for the museum in Amsterdam, the advisory board did not share the same certainty as the previous state commission regarding the composition and the location of the future state architecture museum. Such reservations were particularly germane, since if the architecture museum was established in Delft it could not only become more influential in developing the discipline, but also be financially supported by the Delft Polytechnic (and effectively become a reality). In order to resolve this matter, the advisory board organized a joint consultation with representatives of the two existing architecture societies (*Architectura et Amicitia* and the *BNA* represented respectively by Jan Gratama and Jan de Bie Leuveling Tjeenk), the current custodian of the collection (Teding van Berhout), and an influential professor of the Delft Polytechnic (Marinus Jan Granpré Molière).⁴⁶³ The advisory board was

⁴⁶² After the “State Commission for the Foundation of a State Architecture Museum” submitted its report in 1919, the process of the architecture museum was transferred to the State Commission for Museums (*Rijkscommissie voor het Museumwezen*) which completed its evaluation with a report submitted in June 1921. This report mostly refined the 1919 recommendation by also proposing that the future “State Museum of Architecture” should be established in Amsterdam and seek the “understanding of the essence of architecture by collecting and exhibiting architectural artistic sketches, designs, drawings, models and casts,” but that it should also be “associated with a study collection.” See Teding van Berkhout, “Nota Betreffende Plannen Voor Een Museum Voor Bouwkunde,” 2.

⁴⁶³ While Teding van Berkhout had also been the chairman of the earlier “State Commission for the Establishment of an Architecture Museum, he was only invited to the consultation meeting in the capacity of “Director of the Rijksprentenkabinet, and not as chairman of the still not dissolved “State Commission For an Architectural Museum.” *Ibid.*, 3.

interested in discussing the consultants' opinion regarding the nature, composition, and location of the future architecture museum.⁴⁶⁴

The discussion was long, but with the consultation party divided, no consensus was reached regarding either location or composition of the future architecture museum. Some (like Teding van Berkhout and the societies' representatives) restated their opinion that the museum should be established in Amsterdam, while others (like Granpré Molière and some members of the board) advocated that Delft was a much more suitable location.⁴⁶⁵ Neither side was successful in that exchange, as the discussion did not lead to any concrete resolution regarding the location of the museum.

While the advisory board could not unanimously decide on the location or composition of the future state architecture museum, it had very clear ideas on the nature of the institution. At the start of the meeting the chairman of the advisory board, Johan Huizinga, had announced that the advisory board conceived the architecture museum as “essentially an archive in which documents related to the construction of important buildings would be kept.”⁴⁶⁶ However, given the aesthetic-pedagogic orientation of the institution and its mandate to organize special exhibitions, it was to retain the title of “museum.” Much like the possibility of locating the museum in Delft (which had not even been contemplated in the previous state commissions), this vision of the institution came as a surprise to most involved, particularly since it challenged the definition of the museum

⁴⁶⁴ Rijkscommissie van Advies in Zake der Musea, “Uitnodiging Voor Een Vergadering,” January 24, 1928, NDBK 445.

⁴⁶⁵ Supporters of Amsterdam presented the same reasoning that had first been devised fifteen years earlier to substantiate their position. But to the arguments of Amsterdam's superior existing cultural context and the possibility to attract a wider audience in the capital, Delft supporters responded by claiming the greater agency afforded to the museum in Delft and, most significantly, with the possibility of the Delft Polytechnic supporting the financial burden of the proposed architecture museum. Rijkscommissie van Advies in Zake der Musea, “Notulen van de Vergadering 4 Februari 1928,” March 26, 1928, 1–3, NDBK 445.

⁴⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 3.

Architectura et Amicitia had cunningly constructed since 1912 and reverted it to Leliman's original ideas.

While no binding decision resulted from this consultation meeting (nor from the advisory board's recommendation), the ideas and plans being discussed alerted the *A et A* to the increasingly compelling efforts of the committee organized by the Delft Polytechnic (led by architect and professor J.A.G. van der Steur) in lobbying for the establishment of the architecture museum in Delft. Facing mounting competition, *Architectura et Amicitia* responded by devising a detailed plan to accommodate the architecture museum in the vacant *Zuiderkerk* in Amsterdam.⁴⁶⁷

It only took a couple of months for the *A et A*, together with the *BNA* to devise the plan. By July 1928, the *Zuiderkerk's* rental had already been secured and scheduled to begin in the first of May of the following year. By September, the *BNA* and *Architectura et Amicitia* had already devised a full budget, estimating the cost of the endeavor at 100,000 guilders to establish the museum and an annual budget of 20,000 guilders for salaries and accommodations after that.⁴⁶⁸ Accompanying the budget, also a detailed building program was developed, indicating that the "church-space" was to accommodate the main exhibition areas with "cabinets for the storage of drawings, photos and assorted material, vitrines and pedestals for models," complemented by a study room for visitors, an archive room, as well as a room for the curator, another for his assistant, and a housing unit for the custodian.⁴⁶⁹

⁴⁶⁷ Henri Tino Zwiers, "Zuiderkerk Als Architectuurmuseum," *Bouwkundig Weekblad Architectura* 39, no. 27 (November 17, 1928): 361.

⁴⁶⁸ The initial funding was to be supported by the State (50,000 guilders), by the Municipality of Amsterdam (25,000 guilders), by the Province of *Noord-Holland* (10,000 guilders) and the *BNA* (the remaining 15,000 guilders) J. de Bie Leuveling Tjeek, "Oprichting Vereenigen: Financiële Basis, Enz.," September 1928, SAMU 94.

⁴⁶⁹ There were at least four versions of this document, but the basic programmatic organization of the planned museum remained the same. See J. de Bie Leuveling Tjeek, "Vierde Schema Voor Het Architectuurmuseum in de Zuiderkerk Te Amsterdam," February 1929, SAMU 94. The parallel with the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst's* building was, once again, striking.

These fully developed preparations to establish the architecture museum in Amsterdam took everyone by surprise, including the officials at the Ministry of Education, Arts and Sciences, who only heard about this proposal through the pages of a daily newspaper.⁴⁷⁰ The dissatisfaction with the secretive proposal was further amplified, as conversations to establish the architecture museum in Delft between the Ministry and the Polytechnic were already in advanced stages.⁴⁷¹ However, by securing the political support of the city of Amsterdam and the financial support of some prominent citizens and architects, supporters of the *Zuiderkerk* plan were able to persuade the government and thwart all of Delft Polytechnic's ambitions and claims to accommodate the new museum.⁴⁷² While *Architectura et Amicitia* had been able to repair the situation, it had been a close call. Thus, in order to arrest the *A et A*'s waning ability to influence the architecture museum process, the architectural society decide to re-found its own "Committee for an Architecture Museum" with then president of *Architectura et Amicitia*, Jan de Meyer, acting as its chairman.

An Architecture Museum in the *Rijksprentenkabinet*

Having averted the establishment of the architecture museum in Delft, and almost two decades since the first proposal to establish an architecture museum, attention was back on Amsterdam to present some tangible progress. While the *Zuiderkerk* plan would remain just a plan, the budding collection of architectural objects at the *Rijksprentenkabinet* continued to expand through donations of material. Despite the concerns that not enough was being made to ensure that the collection being amassed would ever be exhibited, the assembly of this collection was still considered by many as the seedling from which an architecture museum would eventually grow.

⁴⁷⁰ "Een Architectuurmuseum Te Amsterdam: Plannen van Den B.N.A. Voor de Zuiderkerk," *Algemeen Handelsblad*, November 23, 1928. and Ministerie Onderwijs, Kunsten en Wetenschap, "Brief Aan J. de Bie Leuveling Tjeek," November 28, 1928, SAMU 94.

⁴⁷¹ In the correspondence between the Advisory Board and the Board of Trustees of the Delft Polytechnic, the desire of both parties to establish the architecture museum in Delft is quite explicit. The entire exchange is available at the NAI archives. NAI archive, "NDBK s1," 1928, NAI archief NDBK, NAI.

⁴⁷² Schilt and Werf, *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia*, 122.

The most significant donation came from the widow of notorious architect K.P.C de Bazel, who donated the entire estate of her late husband, constituting the first complete archive of the yet unfounded museum.⁴⁷³ By accepting the generosity of Mrs. de Bazel and other donors, the state was considered to have a moral obligation to ensure that the material donated would not languish indefinitely in storage. This much was asserted by Jan Six when claiming credit for the Jubilee architectural exhibition for both the origins of the future architecture museum and the significant donation of de Bazel's work. Six even declared that the architecture museum did not require a grandiose building, but a beautiful old house along one of Amsterdam's canals would suffice as long as it was spacious enough to accommodate simple exhibitions of the growing collection.⁴⁷⁴

The pressure to establish a proper architecture museum was finally mounting. Beyond a moral obligation, donations of material to the architectural collection began to also include contractual obligations stipulating that the material donated would revert back to its donors if an architecture museum was not established within a reasonable timeframe. In 1934, Teding van Berkhout and van der Pluym further pressed the government with a letter reminding the Minister of Education, Arts and Sciences that there was a growing collection of architecture stored away in the *Rijksprentenkabinet* that should be made accessible through public exhibitions (even proposing a cooperation with the city of Amsterdam to organize an exhibition space in a school).⁴⁷⁵

⁴⁷³ The breadth of the "K.P.C. de Bazel Archive" was quite substantial, as its first inventory identified 145 different projects covering almost thirty years of architectural production (from 1895 to 1923) and ranging from single family houses to furniture, lamps and even a tapestry designed by K.P.C. de Bazel. Rijksprentenkabinet, "Inventarisatie van Het Werk van Architect K.P.C. de Bazel," 1951, NDBK 445.

⁴⁷⁴ Jan Six, "De Bazel's Werk in Het Toekomstig Museum van Bouwkunst," *Architectura* 29 (August 15, 1925): 295.

⁴⁷⁵ The missive was signed by both Teding van Berkhout and van der Pluym as chairman and secretary of the "State Commission for an Architecture Museum" which the authors claimed had not been disbanded despite having submitted its report fifteen years earlier. Jhr. H. Teding van Berkhout and Willem van der Pluym, "Brief Aan Den Minister van Onderwijs, Kunsten En Wetenschappen," October 13, 1934, NDBK 445.

The reorganization of the *Rijksmuseum* in which the *Rijksprentenkabinet* came under direct control of the museum's head-director presented a tremendous opportunity to organize a *de facto* architecture museum in the *Rijksmuseum*.⁴⁷⁶ Even though it did not (yet) have any space to exhibit the burgeoning architecture collection, the title "architecture museum" was adopted and material for the collection was actively procured. Most notably, between December 13, 1934, and January 10, 1936, a curator of the *Rijksmuseum*, J. Lauweriks, sent several letters identifying himself as "curator of the Dutch Architecture Museum" (*Nederlandsch Architectuur-Museum*) conducting all kinds of business on behalf of the institution. Lauweriks replied to correspondence, accepted donations, requested free subscriptions and a copy of Amsterdam's expansion plan for the museum's library, and even signed for receipts as curator of the architecture museum.⁴⁷⁷ The organization of the architecture museum's holdings did not stop with the architectural objects in its custody. During the same period Lauweriks also compiled an inventory of architectural publications "on loan from the Museum of Architecture [placed] in the Library of the *Rijksmuseum*," seemingly in preparation for an architecture museum autonomous from its umbrella institution.⁴⁷⁸

Lauweriks' activities on behalf of the Dutch Architecture Museum were already noteworthy, but what truly indicated that the architecture museum was on a discernible path to becoming a reality was that his position and personal appointment had been directly instructed by the Secretary-

⁴⁷⁶ Correspondence indicates that the minister forwarded Teding van Berkhout's letter to the head-director of *Rijksmuseum* and discussed with him the matter of the architecture collection. Hendrik Pieter Marchant, "Brief over Huisvesting Architectuur Collectie," October 26, 1934, NDBK 445.

⁴⁷⁷ Several letters authored by Lauweriks in which he identifies himself as the curator of the Dutch Architecture Museum are available in the NAI archives of the *Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst*, including J. Lauweriks, "Brief Aan Mevr. de Bazel-Osschot," December 13, 1934, NDBK 445; J. Lauweriks, "Brief Aan Den Directeur van Den Publieke Werken Te Amsterdam," February 12, 1935, NDBK 445.

⁴⁷⁸ J. Lauweriks, "Bruikleen van Het Architectuur Museum Ter Plaatsing in de Bibliotheek van Het Ryksmuseum," January 21, 1935, NDBK 445.

General of the Ministry Education, Arts and Sciences, Gerrit van Poelje.⁴⁷⁹ Such a direct intervention with the management of the architectural collection by an important public official indicated that the government was finally serious about the establishment of a proper architecture museum. Throughout the 1930s it became widely perceived that the foundation of the architecture museum in Amsterdam was both inevitable and eminent, given the newfound government's urgency and the groundwork performed by Lauweriks (who for the first time organized the assemblage of architectural drawings and assorted objects into a catalogued collection and expanded the library of publications).

The general optimism regarding the foundation of an architecture museum was also expressed in the donation of a bust of famed architect Willem Kromhout in 1940, expressly intended to be placed in the future architecture museum. In a ceremony to commemorate Kromhout's seventy-sixth birthday, the Committee honoring Kromhout's contribution to Dutch architecture (*Comité ter Huldiging van Kromhout*) presented the bust to the Minister of Education, Arts and Sciences, G. Bolkenstein, who accepted it in behalf of the government.⁴⁸⁰

However, despite all these encouraging indications and such an explicit political backing, the architecture museum would not become a reality. Even though internal conditions for the establishment of the museum had been finally aligned, momentous external factors prevented its actual realization. By 1939, hostilities had broken out in Europe, driving the old continent to its second armed conflict of the twentieth century. While the Netherlands had attempted to remain neutral in the confrontation (as it had successfully done during World War I), the invasion by Nazi forces initiated in May 10, 1940 (one day after the Kromhout ceremony) made that an impossibility.

⁴⁷⁹ Gerrit van Poelje, "Brief Aan Jhr. H. Teding van Berkhout En Prof. W. van Der Pluym," October 26, 1934, NDBK 445.

⁴⁸⁰ B. T. Boeyinga, "Het Borstbeeld van Kromhout En Het Architectuur Museum," *Bouwkundig Weekblad Architectura* 61, no. 24 (June 15, 1940): 194.

Unable to defend itself, the country was occupied by the German Nazi regime throughout the remainder of the war, with the establishment of an architecture museum (quite naturally) not figuring as a pressing matter for the occupation forces. Only in 1945, as World War II was coming to an end, were the Allied Forces able to finally liberate all the Dutch provinces. But even as hostilities came to a close, in the aftermath of the armed conflict the foundation of new museums was not a priority in a country reeling from five years of foreign occupation and the tremendous sacrifice inflicted on its people by the horrors of war. It would take several years before the establishment of an architecture museum would become—once again—a rallying issue for an architectural discipline still focused on assisting in the recovery of a battered nation.

Three decades earlier, Willem Leliman's 1912 article *Een Architektuurmuseum* had prompted the potential and significance of an architecture museum for the development of the discipline to become widely recognized within architectural circles. However, while the significance of an architecture museum went undisputed, the actual realization of such an ambitious endeavor greatly diverged among different parties. Thus, the first half of the twentieth century was marked by different initiatives, by diverging ambitions, by assorted plans, but ultimately by numerous false starts. But while these different initiatives were never able to actually establish a proper architecture museum, they were still significant steps in furthering the discussion and shaping the direction of what was ultimately a long process in establishing an architecture museum in the Netherlands. Another constant throughout the first decades of the twentieth century was the *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia's* tenacious effort to condition the discussion, control the process and promote a specific vision for the architecture museum. This vision not only subverted Willem Leliman's original idea, but also informed the discussion and inevitably defined public perception and expectations of what an architecture museum should be.

While Willem Leliman—enunciating his father’s ideas—imagined an architecture museum in which architecture’s technical and aesthetic dimensions were documented, exhibited, and debated, *Architectura et Amicitia* was intent in establishing a museum in which only the aesthetic qualities of architecture were considered. While Leliman had argued for a museum which could actively engage with the discipline and advance architecture through discussion, the *A et A*’s several committees devised an architecture museum that merely recorded the (past) achievements of the discipline.

The competing visions for an architecture museum were fundamentally divergent, presenting a dichotomy in the approach to the collection and exhibition of architecture that continued to define the architecture museum throughout the twentieth century, both in the Netherlands and across the globe. Specifically, the *Architectura et Amicitia* endeavor was expressive of an architecture museum of a reflective nature, while Leliman envisioned a projective institution, which could fully engage with the discipline. Ultimately, the divergence of the approaches advocated by Willem Leliman and the *A et A* committees revealed a differing attitude towards the architecture archive and the agency allowed to this essential component of the architecture museum. Specifically, while the reflective museum was satisfied with the construction of a passive archive, the projective museum was defined by the engagement of its archive in contemporary discussion.

But beyond the agency (or lack thereof) of the competing visions’ archives, these divergent approaches also reflected a distinct understanding of the discipline. By obstinately focusing on an aesthetic museum dedicated to the past, the *A et A*’s revealed in its position a latent sublimation of architecture to the fine arts of painting and sculpture, implying that the appreciation of architecture was restricted to its aesthetic qualities. Effectively, this vision espoused by *Architectura et Amicitia* likened the architecture museum to museums dedicated to fine arts. Conversely, Leliman detailed a museum animated by the specific quality of architecture, that is, an architecture museum which did not reduce architecture to the basic common denominator with other arts but instead presented

the rich complexity of the discipline in its entirety. Leliman's projective museum documented and presented the aesthetic, technical, and constructive dimensions of the discipline, thus emphasizing the singularity of architecture within the cultural context.

In this dichotomy, while the *A et A*'s reflective institution was appropriately designated a "museum," the title of "institute" became much better suited for the intervenient organization envisioned by Leliman. Thus, in this dichotomy, the title "institute" became charged, or associated with an institution that not only cared for the past through the constitution of an archive, but also forcefully instrumentalized that archive in the pursuit of new knowledge. An institution that was not limited to be a mere repository of the past, but that leveraged the past to construct a future. An institution intended to be far more operative than a museum that went further and beyond the expected tasks of a museum. An institution that embraced the specificity of architecture and presented it to both a professional and a general audience. *Architectura et Amicitia*'s efforts, however, were quite successful in conditioning the discussion and ensuring that it would take several decades before this projective alternative for the architecture museum was fully considered.

Institutionalizing an Architectural Archive

It had been almost forty years since the *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia* had first discussed the foundation of an architecture museum. Even as during that time the society had been able to define the terms of the discussion, in 1950 the establishment of an architecture museum seemed just as difficult and improbable as it had been in 1912. Moreover, with the advent of World War II, not only had the process not moved any further, but it had actually regressed since discussion and interest increasingly waned.

Reviving the Discussion in the Postwar Years

Intent on counteracting the natural tendency towards forgetfulness and rekindling interest in the issue, Teding van Berkhout, the long-serving director of the *Rijksprentenkabinet*, produced a memorandum on the architecture museum. The document was divided into two separate sections. The first section was comprised by an overview of different efforts to establish an architecture museum in the Netherlands since 1912, while the second section was composed by a call to arms to re-establish a new association with the same purpose of all those previous initiatives: the establishment of an architecture museum in the Netherlands.

Far from being neutral and merely describing what had been previously done and indicating possible paths for the future, the 1950 memorandum was highly charged. The predisposition of Teding van Berkhout's account was particularly discernible in the manner the overview of past accomplishments was selectively abridged, omitting not just Leliman's original article, but also most of the different efforts to establish a projective architecture museum based on the ideas presented in that article. In short, the different early efforts to establish an architecture institute in the Netherlands were obscured by omission in the memorandum.⁴⁸¹ While such an omission could have easily been construed as a simple inadvertent oversight, that idea was quickly dispelled and the intent of the document was revealed.⁴⁸²

Teding van Berkhout hoped with this memorandum to rekindle the ambition to establish a reflective architecture museum in Amsterdam. But while the "State Commission for an Architecture Museum" formed in 1918 had never been dissolved, it was hardly capable of doing much anymore, since "half of its members [were] deceased, and the other half (Berkhout, Kalff, van der Pluym and

⁴⁸¹ For Teding van Berkhout, the history of the architecture museum in the Netherlands started with the *Architectura et Amicitia*'s internal committee establish in December 1912. Teding van Berkhout, "Nota Betreffende Plannen Voor Een Museum Voor Bouwkunde," 1.

⁴⁸² The concern with the possibility of a "projective" architecture museum being favored and rekindling the Delft-Amsterdam discussion from 1928 is even used to justify keeping the Association of Engineers away from this new initiative to establish an architecture museum. *Ibid.*, 6.

Vogelsang) [were] not doing much better.”⁴⁸³ Instead, the memorandum was intended for a new generation of architects and individuals, to appeal and entrust their youthful energy to carry on *Architectura et Amicitia*'s effort and adapt it to a new postwar social and political context.

Since the architecture museum had been first suggested by Willem Leliman over four decades earlier in the pages of *De Bouwwereld*, significant changes had occurred in Dutch architectural practice. Throughout World War I, as the Netherlands remained neutral in the armed conflict, new architectural expressions emerged in the country. The avant-garde neo-plastic group *De Stijl* emerged as a significant force in artistic debate, but the dichotomy between the Amsterdam expressionism and Rotterdam rationalism seemed to frame the architectural conversation.⁴⁸⁴ As the Amsterdam school “emphasized the irrational and the knowledge of this acquired through visionary conceptualization,” Rotterdam architects like J.J.P. Oud “stressed the importance of reason and of knowledge acquired through analysis.”⁴⁸⁵ The struggle between projective and reflective architecture museum also articulated the opposition between expressionism's greater concern with aesthetic considerations and rationalism's expression of method and reason.

Despite the great advances (and recognition) achieved by Dutch architecture in the decades before World War II, in the aftermath of the conflict, the reconstruction effort was focused on quantity rather than quality. Accordingly, the Dutch state “pushed through a high-powered

⁴⁸³ Ibid., 4.

⁴⁸⁴ The polarity between both emerging architecture expressions was perhaps best captured by an outsider who was intent on bridging both positions in his own work. After meeting with both groups, the German architect Erich Mendelsohn famously asserted that “the analyst—Rotterdam—dismisses the vision. Visionary Amsterdam understands nothing of cool realism.” Erich Mendelsohn, *Briefe Eines Architekten*, Neuausg, Birkhäuser Architektur Bibliothek (Basel: Birkhäuser Verlag, 1991), 56.

⁴⁸⁵ S. Umberto Barbieri and Leen van Duin, eds., *A Hundred Years of Dutch Architecture 1901-2000: Trends, Highlights* (Amsterdam: Uitgeverij SUN, 2003), 25.

centralization of authority” to address the issue of postwar reconstruction and the pressing concern of housing shortage.⁴⁸⁶

Architecture education and professionalization had also made significant strides in that period. Upon the 1919 completion of its merger with the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst*, the *BNA* had become the main professional organization for architects in the Netherlands. Among the *BNA*'s greatest achievements was the regulation of the profession and the protection of the title of architect, which now required formal training in the discipline. University level training was still carried out in the (now named) Delft Institute of Technology (*Technische Hogeschool*), but another academic track to the profession was becoming increasingly popular in the Amsterdam Academy of Architecture (*Academie van Bouwkunst*).⁴⁸⁷ Beyond pedagogic differences between the two schools, there was also a divide similar to the one existing in architectural practice. The Delft institute remained associated with a technical education while in the Amsterdam academy the emphasis was on aesthetic instruction. Regardless of their differences, in the postwar, both schools were experiencing significant academic growth, with class sizes in Amsterdam growing ten-fold and its educational model being adopted by other academies across the Netherlands.⁴⁸⁸ Thus, in the early 1950s, access to architectural education and to the profession had become much more widespread, but more importantly, much more structured.

⁴⁸⁶ The situation was so grave that in the Netherlands “housing shortage [was] labelled ‘public enemy number one’ in the fifties.” Hans van Dijk, *Twentieth-Century Architecture in the Netherlands* (Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1999), 100.

⁴⁸⁷ Established in 1908 by the *A et A*, the Amsterdam Academy of Architecture initially operated as a night school for draftsmen, combining practical training in architectural offices during the day with academic and artistic training in the academy during the evening. This model of architecture education (officially titled *Voorbereidend Hoger Beroepsonderwijs*, or VHBO) is still a staple of Dutch architecture today.

⁴⁸⁸ Dave Wendt, “Bekwame Architecten bij alles Gebouwd Wordt, 1946-1967,” in *Academie van Bouwkunst Amsterdam 1908-2008* (Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2008), 106–145.

Although the context of Dutch architecture culture had greatly changed, the connection of Teding van Berkhout's memorandum to previous initiatives was all too pervasive. It was readily admitted that the two national commissions (the 1918 State Commission for an Architecture Museum and the subsequent 1921 State Commission for Museums) had essentially restated the arguments of the private commission instituted in 1912 within *Architectura et Amicitia*. But the continuity of earlier ideas was not just professed, it was also further reinforced by claiming that the findings of those commissions, and the reasons by them indicated to establish an architecture museum in Amsterdam, still remained germane three decades later.⁴⁸⁹ The lineage of the new foundation was set, as the connection to the original 1912 *Architectura et Amicitia* internal committee was so clearly determined in this pre-foundational memorandum. The parallel with the early efforts of the *A et A* was further established as Teding van Berkhout requested the architectural societies to unite in a "Dutch Architecture Museum Foundation" (*Stichting Nederlandsch Museum voor Bouwkunst*) in order to devise a detailed plan, and lobby, for the establishment of an architecture museum. Furthermore, the committee was to be composed by "members of the architects' societies and some people from outside the architectural world" in another blatant remake of the *A et A*-promoted 1914 Committee for an Architecture Museum.⁴⁹⁰

Before it could engage the government in the process, the proposed Foundation was to resolve several fundamental issues of the future architecture museum, namely collection, accommodations, and funding. The accommodations of the architecture museum was considered to be a crucial matter, since it was argued that this issue needed to be perfectly resolved before the Foundation could even approach the government with its intentions. Thus, it was suggested that the Foundation could negotiate with the Municipality of Amsterdam the rent-free occupancy (or even a

⁴⁸⁹ Teding van Berkhout, "Nota Betreffende Plannen Voor Een Museum Voor Bouwkunde," 5.

⁴⁹⁰ Ibid.

donation) of the city-owned warehouses in *Waterlooplein*, adjacent to the Academy of Architecture (*Academie van Bouwkunst*).⁴⁹¹ In order to compose the collection of the future architecture museum, it was claimed that the Foundation should reclaim from the government the assemblage of material still being stored at the *Rijksprentenkabinet*.⁴⁹² Finally, regarding funding, it was argued that the architecture museum should not rely on contributions (while these could still be accepted). Instead, the museum should be able to secure, and be primarily funded by, ongoing grants since “these are more likely to provide continuity.”⁴⁹³ However, the museum was not restricted to grants awarded by public institutions like the central government, the Department of Monuments and Preservation, the city of Amsterdam, or the province of *Noord-Holland*, but was encouraged to obtain additional sources of funding from private societies like the Royal Antiquarian Society, as well as from large industrial and commercial organizations.

While the plan in this memorandum seemingly described a completely private foundation that could establish and operate an architecture museum, it was still believed that there was significant benefits in making the architecture museum a state institution. Hence, as with previous efforts, the plan was a fundamental preparatory work, but ultimately its realization depended on the government’s political and, most importantly, financial support. This time, however, the plan specified a degree of preparation that was purposely intended to ensure a proper development once the government became involved. Simply put, if the preparation was flawless, the government could not do anything but establish the much longed architecture museum. It took five years, but

⁴⁹¹ This arrangement was eventually proposed to the city of Amsterdam, and the *Arsenaal* warehouses on *Waterlooplein* became the first official address of the newly established architecture museum (the *Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst*) in 1971. See Auke Komter, “Nota Architectuurmuseum,” December 1967, 3, SAMU 94.

⁴⁹² According to Teding van Berkhout this should not be difficult, since the contracts regulating the donation of architecture material accepted by the government did not prevent the transfer of the material to a proper architecture museum. Teding van Berkhout, “Nota Betreffende Plannen Voor Een Museum Voor Bouwkunde,” 5.

⁴⁹³ *Ibid.*, 6.

once the “Architecture Museum Foundation” (*Stichting Architectuurmuseum*, or simply *SAM*) was established in 1955, it looked very much like the “Dutch Architecture Museum Foundation” described by Teding van Berkhout in this 1950 memorandum.

The 1950 memorandum had the intended effect and interested a new generation to continue the efforts to establish an architecture museum in the Netherlands, spearheaded for so long by Teding van Berkhout and Willem van der Pluym. In 1952, the first steps towards the establishment of the *SAM* were taken, as the *BNA* and the *A et A* began conversations to discuss a possible collaboration in that foundation. The discussions focused on how the two societies could conceivably re-activate and adapt an organization they had jointly established in 1923 to become a forceful instrument in the establishment of an architecture museum (akin to the organization described by Teding van Berkhout).⁴⁹⁴

The *Tentoonstellingsraad voor Bouwkunst en Verwante Kunsten* (Exhibition Council for Architecture and Related Arts)

While in 1950 the Exhibition Council for Architecture and Related Arts (*Tentoonstellingsraad voor Bouwkunst en Verwante Kunsten*) existed only on paper, its earlier achievements in the organization of (primarily international) exhibitions of architecture and related arts emerged as an important reminder of a past successful collaboration between the *A et A* and the *BNA*. In fact, it became widely understood that a simple adaptation of the focus of this organization would suffice to lay the groundwork for their new joint-goal of establishing an architecture museum.

The Exhibition Council had been established in 1923 as a collaboration between architecture and applied arts societies in an attempt to better coordinate the public exhibition of architecture and its related arts. The Council was composed by the two major architectural societies (the *BNA*

⁴⁹⁴ Komter, “Toespraak Namens Stichting Architectuurmuseum,” 6.

and the *A et A*) in combination with the Rotterdam-based architectural association *Vereeniging “De Opbouw”* (“The Construction/Build-Up” Association), the *Nederlandsche Vereeniging voor Ambachts- en Nijverheidskunst* (Dutch Association For Arts and Crafts, or simply *VANK*), and the *Nederlandsche Kring van Beeldhouwers* (Dutch Circle of Sculptors). As the very name of the Exhibition Council—and its membership—indicated, architecture was the majority partner in this organization, which was also reflected in the contributions expected from the partnering associations and the composition of its board. Moreover, as the *BNA* and the *A et A* combined contributed to the majority of the Exhibition Council’s fixed budget and were represented in the board by six out of thirteen members (with J. de Bie Leuveling Tjeenk, the *BNA* chairman, also acting as the Exhibition Council chairman), their influence in the organization’s management was unequivocal.⁴⁹⁵

As the first articles in its foundational charter indicated, the main purpose of the Exhibition Council was to “organize and realize exhibitions for Architecture in association with these related arts.”⁴⁹⁶ The periodic exhibitions were to be pure art demonstrations without any commercial goals. The exhibitions were intended to “present the general value of the Dutch in the field of architecture and related arts” and included “architecture, sculpture, decorative painting and the graphic arts,” but also, when suitable, “all the other groups of arts and crafts.”⁴⁹⁷ But while the main objective was to organize and realize these exhibitions in the Netherlands (once every three years, alternating between Amsterdam and Rotterdam), the Exhibition Council became most renowned for its

⁴⁹⁵ While the *BNA* and the *A et A* contributed with 200 guilders each, the contributions of the remaining associations combined accounted for the remaining 350 guilders of the Exhibition Council’s yearly operating budget. Additional funds would be procured for the realization of activities. See article 19 of J. de Bie Leuveling Tjeek and J Luthmann, “Reglement van Den Tentoonstellingraad Voor Bouwkunst En Verwante Kunsten,” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 44, no. 12 (March 24, 1923): 129.

⁴⁹⁶ Article 1 of *Ibid.*, 127.

⁴⁹⁷ Article 5 of *Ibid.*

secondary objective of organizing several Dutch national entries in international exhibitions and expositions in the field of architecture and related arts.

The first commission of the newly formed Exhibition Council was the Dutch national entry for the famed 1925 *Exposition Internationale des Arts Décoratifs et Industriels Modernes* (International Exposition of Modern Industrial and Decorative Arts), and became representative of the council's efforts in the organization of exhibitions of architecture and related arts. Given the council's lack of any type of track record, the commission to organize the Dutch entry for the illustrious Parisian exposition was only awarded after a great deal of lobbying.⁴⁹⁸ From the moment it was awarded the commission, the Exhibition Council began organizing and programming the Dutch entry. The focus of the entry was naturally architecture, with the "most important works [being] presented with both drawings and photographs" and, when space allowed, small models.⁴⁹⁹ This included the work of architects like H.P. Berlage, W.M. Dudok, M. de Klerk, and (the recently deceased) K.P.C. de Bazel, all of whose entries were awarded the distinction of the *Diplôme de Grand Prix*.⁵⁰⁰

The most visible contribution, however, was the commission to design and build the Dutch Pavilion. But rather than an open competition, it was decided by the Exhibition Council to directly award the commission to Jan Frederik Staal, an architect associated with the Amsterdam School. Described as "an excellent piece of architecture, in which the most beautiful principles of contemporary Dutch architecture [were] revealed," the pavilion presented a balanced synthesis of

⁴⁹⁸ J. de Bie Leuveling Tjeek and B. T. Boeyinga, "Verslag van Den Tentoonstellingraad Voor Bouwkunst En Verwante Kunsten over Het Jaar 1924," *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 46, no. 25 (June 20, 1925): 341.

⁴⁹⁹ J. de Bie Leuveling Tjeek and B. T. Boeyinga, "De Nederlandsche Afdeeling Op de Internationale Tentoonstelling van Moderne Decoratieve En Industriele Kunst Te Parijs in 1925," *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 45, no. 38 (September 20, 1924): 371–372.

⁵⁰⁰ "De Onderscheidingen Op de Parijsche Tentoonstelling," *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 46, no. 44 (October 31, 1925): 518.

architecture and all the related arts in its formal expression.⁵⁰¹ Despite having very limited exhibition space, the pavilion presented all the related arts, with furniture and toys, building sculpture, wall decoration, stained glass and mosaic, textile art, ceramics and glasswork, metal work, books, and graphic arts all being exhibited and incorporated in Staal's pavilion. However, the way the commission was awarded raised several questions, forcing the chairman of the council to publicly respond to the accusation of the whole endeavor being controlled by "a small group of [unnamed] architects, mainly members of the *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia*."⁵⁰²

Following the success of its first exhibition in Paris, the Exhibition Council went on to organize a remarkable number of Dutch entries to other international exhibitions, including the 1933 Milan Triennale and the World Expositions in Brussels in 1935 and in Paris in 1937.⁵⁰³ Beyond the Dutch participations in international expositions, the council also organized the *A et A's* 1935 Jubilee exhibition at the *Stedelijk Museum* in Amsterdam, which like the international exhibition was also a public presentation of the state of Dutch architecture and the related arts.⁵⁰⁴ For all these exhibitions, photography became the favored medium to present architecture for the Exhibition Council. Thus, it assembled an impressive architectural photography collection of over 1200 photographs between 1925 and 1935. But beyond the actual content of the photographs, the manner in which the photos were staged was of equal, if not greater, significance. These "photographs were meant to establish an ideal image: they emphasized artistic and esthetic

⁵⁰¹ J. P. M., "De Tentoonstelling Te Parijs in 1925 (II)," *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 46, no. 19 (May 9, 1925): 273.

⁵⁰² J. de Bie Leuveling Tjeek, "De Nederlandsche Afdeeling Op de Tentoonstelling Te Parijs in 1925," *Architectura* 29 (January 3, 1925): 10.

⁵⁰³ Introductory text of NAI archive, "Inventory TENT (Tentoonstellingraad Voor Bouwkunst En Verwante Kunsten)," 1994, NAI archief TENT, NAI.

⁵⁰⁴ "Architectuur- En Kunstnijverheidstentoonstelling November 1935," *Bouwkundig Weekblad Architectura* 56, no. 35 (August 31, 1935): 364.

architectural expressions.”⁵⁰⁵ Devoid of any people, the photos presented a “clean, static image [of architecture] that revealed little of the use of the buildings and interiors, but everything about their artistic, aesthetic appearance.”⁵⁰⁶ With its focus on the aesthetic and artistic dimension of architecture, the Exhibition Council’s collection of architectural photography was inherently expressive of the *A et A*’s longstanding ambition of establishing an architecture museum dedicated precisely to those dimensions of the discipline.

Even as success mounted, a controversy in 1938 regarding the Dutch entry to the New York World Exposition in 1939 revealed the fragilities of the Exhibition Council’s organization simply due to the fact that five different associations had to agree in its board.⁵⁰⁷ Thus, in order to concede greater autonomy to the Exhibition Council, in 1939 it was granted a new legal status as an association (*vereniging*).⁵⁰⁸ However, despite its new legal status, the Exhibition Council was doomed “to exist only on paper,” not only because World War II broke out a few months later, but also because combined exhibitions of architecture and related arts fell out of favor within architectural and artistic circles.⁵⁰⁹

While the Exhibition Council existed only on paper, during the early 1950s conversation between the *A et A* and the *BNA* to organize a new foundation for an architecture museum, it became a reminder of the success of their previous joint-venture organizing exhibitions. In order to

⁵⁰⁵ “Foto’s Tentoonstellingsraad Op Het Geheugen van Nederland,” *NAi*, accessed March 4, 2013, http://www.nai.nl/toolbar/nieuws/item/_rp_kolom2-1_elementId/1_1211515.

⁵⁰⁶ Petra van der Ree, “Foto’s van de Tentoonstellingsraad Onder de Scanner,” *NAi Blog*, December 15, 2009, http://www.nai.nl/toolbar/blog/item/_rp_kolom2-1_elementId/1_605742.

⁵⁰⁷ A dispute between the World Exposition committee and the Exhibition Council regarding the conditions of the artists’ participation compelled the Exhibition Council to forbid all Dutch artists to “directly or indirectly cooperate with the 1939 World Exposition in New York,” to which the BNA board was compelled to respond and stake its position in the matter. See “De Tentoonstellingsraad Verbiedt Den Nederlandschen Kunstenaars Elke Medewerking Aan de Wereld Tentoonstelling New York 1939,” *Bouwkundig Weekblad Architectura* 59, no. 27 (July 2, 1938): 225.

⁵⁰⁸ “Programma Voor de BNA Ledenvergadering Te Zwolle Op 23 Juni 1939,” *Bouwkundig Weekblad Architectura* 60, no. 24 (June 17, 1939).

⁵⁰⁹ Komter, “Toespraak Namens Stichting Architectuurmuseum,” 6.

adapt their previous collaboration to the new goal of establishing an architecture museum, all it took was a narrowing of the scope of the Exhibition Council to focus entirely on the exhibitions of architecture. Thus, when considering the objectives of the Exhibition Council and those of the proposed Architecture Museum Foundation, it was concluded that they were in accord and that their “union seemed viable: The Exhibition Council was dissolved in July 1955, and the Architecture Museum Foundation [SAM] was established on September 5, 1955.”⁵¹⁰

The *Stichting Architectuurmuseum* (Architecture Museum Foundation)

The foundational charter of the *Stichting Architectuurmuseum* (Architecture Museum Foundation, or simply *SAM*) clearly identified the new foundation’s simple objective: “to collect, preserve, maintain and make available to interested parties, drawings, documents and other original material, photographs, models, books and engravings significant for the knowledge of Dutch architecture.”⁵¹¹ However, the means to achieve such ambitious goals were not identified in the same foundational document. Instead, the statutes of the newly established *SAM* described at great length the considerable influence of the *BNA* over the new foundation. It was the *BNA*’s prerogative to appoint the members of the *SAM*’s executive board and Board of Trustees, as well as approval of any change to the foundation’s statutes, while the *SAM* was required to submit a yearly report of its activities and management of its funds to the *BNA* every March 1st.⁵¹²

Conversely, the rights and obligations of the *Architectura et Amicitia* in the “Architecture Museum Foundation” were surprisingly absent from these original stipulations. Despite not being explicitly contemplated in the *SAM*’s original statutes, there was an implicit agreement between the

⁵¹⁰ Ibid.

⁵¹¹ Article 2 of *Stichting Architectuurmuseum*, “Statuten van de *Stichting Architectuurmuseum*,” September 5, 1955, 1, SAMU 28.

⁵¹² Article 4 (Board), article 6 (Board of Trustees), article 8 (Reporting) and article 9 (Change of statutes and Dissolution) of *Stichting Architectuurmuseum*, “Statuten van de *Stichting Architectuurmuseum*,” September 5, 1955.

A et A and the *BNA* allowing the old architecture society to also appoint its own members to the directing bodies of the new foundation. Since half the members of both the executive board and the board of trustees of the *SAM* and its chairman, Auke Komter, were appointed by the *A et A*, the leadership of the foundation was entirely composed by representatives of the *A et A* and the *BNA*. If any doubts persisted regarding the connection between the *SAM* and previous *A et A* efforts to establish an architecture museum, these were shattered with the appointment of Willem van der Pluym to the *SAM*'s Board of Trustees (a position he held until his passing in 1960).⁵¹³ With this appointment, van der Pluym presented the most explicit line of continuity between the several initiatives of the *A et A* to establish a reflective architecture museum in Amsterdam. Van der Pluym had been involved in all the *A et A* initiatives regarding the architecture museum from the very start.⁵¹⁴ He had been one of the original members of the 1912 *A et A*'s first internal committee where most of the arguments to subvert Willem Leliman's aspirations for a projective architecture museum had been first devised.

Leliman's vision to establish a projective architecture museum was further subverted in the 1950s. After almost half a century of (failed) initiatives, the contest between the competing visions for an architecture museum was also increasingly disputed in the arena of history. Not content with already controlling the discussion, supporters of a reflective architecture museum were also intent in controlling the historical narrative. Hence, Teding van Berkhout's 1950 memorandum was not just responsible for the foundation of *SAM* but also set the stage for the subsequent erasure of Leliman's original claim for a projective architecture museum. In Teding van Berkhout's text (and subsequent accounts of the architecture museum history), Leliman's article was only included after

⁵¹³ Article 11 of *Ibid.*, 5–6.

⁵¹⁴ To commemorate the resurgence of a new organized effort to establish an architecture museum, van der Pluym authored a text recounting the "prehistory of the architecture museum," that is, the events and the sequence of committees and commissions starting with Leliman's 1912 article and ending with the state commission report of 1919. See Pluym, "Voorgeschiedenis Architectuurmuseum."

being scrubbed of any ideas that did not conform to the intentions of establishing an artistic architecture museum.⁵¹⁵

Furthermore, events that articulated the existence of a competing vision for the architecture museum were, more often than not, simply omitted. The most curious and illustrative case of selective exclusion of history was the omission of the ultimately unsuccessful 1928 proposal to establish an architecture museum in Amsterdam's *Zuiderkerk*. This plan had not only been one of plans that most closely came to fruition but had also been also spearheaded by the *BNA* and the *A et A*. Nevertheless, it was completely absent from Teding van Berkhout's memorandum and all subsequent "historical accounts" to originate from the *SAM*, lest it become a reminder that it had only been organized in order to prevent the architecture museum to be established in Delft, be associated with the Delft Polytechnic, and take on a "projective" character.⁵¹⁶

In 1967, twelve years after its foundation, the *SAM* finally approached the central government to elicit its full support in establishing an architecture museum. By submitting a "memorandum on the architecture museum" in late 1967 to the Ministry of Culture (at the time officially titled Ministry of Culture, Recreation and Social Work, or simply Ministry of *CRM*), the *SAM* reenacted the same strategy pursued by its predecessors half a century earlier, namely the memorandum submitted by the *A et A*-controlled "Committee for the Foundation of an Architecture Museum" in 1916.⁵¹⁷ The parallel between both documents is remarkable, further asserting the continuity of the

⁵¹⁵ While often this was achieved by merely alluding to the title of Leliman's article, a more sophisticated misrepresentation of Leliman's text was achieved by cherry-picking passages of Leliman's article and removing them from their wider context. A favorite passage referred to Leliman's observation regarding the different appreciation and value of a painting and a drawing of architecture. See Fons Asselbergs, "Een Nederlands Architectuurmuseum," *Spiegel Historiael* 10, no. 10 (October 1975): 514–521.

⁵¹⁶ See Teding van Berkhout, "Nota Betreffende Plannen Voor Een Museum Voor Bouwkunde." Komter, "Toespraak Namens Stichting Architectuurmuseum." and Stichting Architectuurmuseum, "Geschiedenis van Het Architectuurmuseum," 1975, SAMU 94.

⁵¹⁷ See Komter, "Nota Architectuurmuseum," and Teding van Berkhout and Pluym, "'S Ryks Architectuur-Museum: Memorie."

ideas first uttered at the start of the twentieth-century. Like its 1916 forerunner, the 1967 memorandum advocated the establishment in Amsterdam of a “reflective” architecture museum of national character supported by the State.

Beyond sharing their general appeal, the specifics and reasoning of both plans described in these documents were also consistent. Both memorandums claimed Amsterdam to be the most suitable location for the foundation of an architecture museum, while also suggesting that it would be best accommodated in the premises of an academic institution.⁵¹⁸ But while in 1916 the *Rijksakademie* had been considered, in 1967 it was suggested that the *Academie van Bouwkunst* (Academy of Architecture) could fulfill that role.⁵¹⁹ Both documents claimed that the architecture museum should be managed by the State by employing the same argumentation of the national character of the institution and the centralization of the material collected. Finally, and most importantly, both plans forcefully proposed that the architecture museum should be a reflective institution in which the documentation and preservation of architectural history was the primary objective.

Much like the earlier 1916 memorandum, throughout the 1967 reiteration the concern with the preservation of history was ubiquitous and accompanied by a renewed sense of urgency. Hence, it was stated that the need for an architecture museum was greater than ever, since architectural “collections have already suffered from serious neglect, lack of oversight and removals, and if there [was] not an intervention soon, we can expect the worst.”⁵²⁰ The solution was simple: to promptly

⁵¹⁸ In the 1967 memorandum, Komter engages in the already usual revision of history by stating that interest in the architecture museum had only traditionally existed in Amsterdam. Komter, “Nota Architectuurmuseum,” 2.

⁵¹⁹ The suggestion to accommodate the proposed museum of architecture in the warehouses adjacent to the *Academie van Bouwkunst* is reminiscent of Teding van Berkhout’s 1950 memorandum, and is further evidence of the SAM’s continuation of earlier efforts.

⁵²⁰ Komter, “Nota Architectuurmuseum,” 1.

“unite the collections in a specially allocated building to save them from ruin.”⁵²¹ But in portraying a similarly bleak image of the state of Dutch architectural heritage, the *SAM*’s memorandum went even beyond its predecessor. In addition to the loss to degradation of a wealth of architectural drawings and archives, it was also claimed that with the establishment of architecture museums abroad there was a “danger arising that works of internationally renowned Dutch architects would encounter [abroad] more interest than in [their own] country.”⁵²² In short, in the late 1960s Dutch architectural archives also faced the imminent threat of being poached by foreign institutions (which the *SAM* was adamant in preventing).

Ultimately, the major distinction regarding the appeal to protect Dutch architectural legacy was that while in 1916 it was merely alluded to the possibility that some unspecified architectural drawings might be lost, in 1967 the *SAM* actually particularized that it held in its possession a substantial amount of architectural archives that required urgent attention. These included “not only the beautiful drawings of Berlage and de Klerk, but also the entire archive of de Bazel and part of Cuypers collection” which, since the *SAM* did not have any type of accommodations, was deteriorating from being stored in “improvised spaces in attics.”⁵²³ The idea that irreplaceable Dutch architectural heritage and particularly valuable archive material was rotting away in attics throughout Amsterdam was the convincing argument for enlisting the government’s broad support.

Another significant distinction which should also be credited for the disparate results from both memorandums was the addition in 1967 of a specific plan for the accommodation of the new architecture museum within the governmental hierarchy.⁵²⁴ The true innovation of the 1967

⁵²¹ Ibid.

⁵²² Ibid.

⁵²³ Ibid., 2.

⁵²⁴ While the 1967 plan also included a detailed proposed operating budget for the architecture museum that had been missing from the 1916 memorandum, several other proposals like the 1919 State Commission’s report and the 1928 *Zuiderkerk* plan had also previously included detailed budgets.

proposal was that rather than creating a new organization for the architecture museum, it was suggested that the “management of the institution would fall under the *Rijksdiens voor de Monumentenzorg*” (State Department for Preservation of Monuments, also known simply as *Monumentenzorg* or *RDMZ*).⁵²⁵ This way, it would only be necessary to expand the workforce of the *Monumentenzorg*, and allocate the appropriate funding. The involvement of the *Monumentenzorg* was another indication of the reflective character of the architecture museum envisioned by the *SAM*. Just as Teding van Bekhout had estimated in his 1950 memorandum, the findings of earlier committees were still suitable for the *SAM*, and when combined with the presentation of a specific plan for the foundation of an architecture museum, it garnered the ever so fundamental governmental support.

Even though the *SAM*'s detailed proposal allowed the Ministry of Culture to analyze the feasibility of the endeavor, the government's greater receptivity to this latest proposal was also prodded by the different social-political contexts of 1916 and 1967. Upon receiving the *SAM*'s memorandum, the Ministry of Culture consulted with other state institutions and officials, including the Preservation Council (*Monumentenraad*) of the *Monumentenzorg*; the Department of Visual Arts and Architecture of the Council for Art (*Raad voor de Kunst, Afdeling Beeldende Kunsten en Bouwkunst*); and W.A. Schouten, the Director-General of Public Housing and Building Industry (*Directeur-Generaal van de Volkshuisvesting en Bouwnijverheid*). Unanimously they “advised in favor of the establishment of an architecture museum managed by the Ministry of Culture, specifically, through the *Monumentenzorg*,” that is, they advised in favor of accepting the *SAM*'s proposal.⁵²⁶

⁵²⁵ Komter, “Nota Architectuurmuseum,” 3.

⁵²⁶ Werkgroep WVC-VROM, “Ontwerp Voor Een Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedenbouw,” November 23, 1984, 4, NDBK 398.

With such an emphatic response from the consulted state departments, the “government was prepared to be responsible for housing the collections and for the salaries of the staff.”⁵²⁷

While the *SAM*'s proposal was being analyzed by the central government, the city of Amsterdam formalized its allocation of the seventeenth-century warehouses on *Waterlooplein* (commonly referred to as the *Arsenaal*) adjacent to the Academy of Architecture to accommodate the future architecture museum.⁵²⁸ Thus, in 1970 the *Arsenaal* was designated a national monument (*Rijksmonument*) and underwent the necessary repairs to accommodate the future organization. While this resolved the issue of the architecture museum's accommodations, it still left unresolved the problem of the operation of the museum's activities.

The *Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst* (Netherlands Documentation Center for Architecture)

While the *Monumentenzorg* took possession of the *Arsenaal* building in January 1, 1970, and supervised the refurbishment for over a year, only once that was complete did it officially establish the *Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst* (Netherlands Documentation Center for Architecture, or simply *NDB*) with the appointment of its first (and for a while sole) employee.⁵²⁹ Starting on May 1, 1971, Fons Asselbergs, a young art historian, was appointed manager of collections of the future museum and was tasked to organize the necessary preparations for a smooth transition of the archives from the *SAM* to the *NDB*.

Asselbergs, who was also an expert in the budding discipline of archival practice, initiated his tenure at the *NDB* by gathering at the *Arsenaal* the relevant archival material already in the

⁵²⁷ *Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst*, “The Museum of Architecture in Amsterdam,” 1984, 1, NDBK 455.

⁵²⁸ The *SAM* had been first informed of this decision (in principle) by a letter from W. Polak, the Amsterdam Alderman to the Arts, which was also included in the memorandum submitted to the central government. Komter, “Nota Architectuurmuseum.”

⁵²⁹ Asselbergs in Broos, “Signalement van Het NDB,” 5.

government's stewardship in its sprawling apparatus of departments and organizations. Among those institutions visited by Asselbergs, the *Rijksprentenkabinet* within the *Rijksmuseum* became along with the *SAM* a major source of material. Since the *Rijksprentenkabinet* still held a wealth of architectural drawings, objects, and archives which had been donated to the government throughout the years for the collection of the future architecture museum, Asselbergs routinely hauled plastic bags full of architectural drawings across Amsterdam in a transport bicycle (*bakfiets*) from the *Rijksmuseum* to the *Arsenaal*.⁵³⁰ The archives collected from the *Rijksmuseum*, specifically the archives of Pierre Cuypers and K.P.C. de Bazel, were among the very first to be accounted for and officially to enter the collection of the newly-founded documentation center.⁵³¹ Through this initial centralization effort, the *NDB* (that is, Fons Asselbergs) tapped into a variety of sources of architectural archives, with a plethora of drawings, objects, and documents substantially enlarging its collection. By the end of 1971, there were already twenty-seven monographic archives (from an already respectable range of architects including H.P. Berlage, M. de Klerk, W. Kromhout, G. Rietveld, and J.J.P. Oud), and eight institutional archives in the *NDB*'s care. The centralization of architectural material was just the first step in the long and arduous endeavor of establishing the *NDB*'s collection by organizing, cataloguing, and managing the wealth of architectural material scattered throughout Amsterdam and beyond.

Among the material being cared for by the *NDB*, the large majority of the archives belonged to the *SAM*. Thus, the two organizations formalized their institutional relationship with an agreement of understanding signed on September 28, 1972. The contract stipulated the conditions for the transfer of the Architecture Museum Foundation's archives to the Dutch State, represented by the

⁵³⁰ Ruud Brouwers, interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo, audio, January 5, 2011.

⁵³¹ See "Kort Verslag Bespreking Drs. Den Blauwen Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam," November 13, 1969, NDBK 122.

Ministry of Culture on behalf of the *NDB*.⁵³² Since the *SAM*'s collections were already "located at the former *Arsenaal* at *Waterlooplein* 69-71 in Amsterdam and [were] managed by the Netherlands Documentation Center for Architecture," the agreement primarily stipulated the conditions under which those archives were to be formally donated to the Dutch State. However, the agreement did not only stipulate an official change of ownership, which in practice had already occurred (since the *NDB* was already the caretaker for these collections), but also covered any future donations from the *SAM* to the State, since these would also be bound by the terms of this contract.⁵³³

The basic stipulations of the contract mostly defined the responsibilities of the State in caring for these collections and the safeguard of *SAM*'s rights over these collections. Therefore, it was agreed that the State was responsible to adequately maintain and manage the collections, make them publicly accessible, and ensure that they did not disappear, neither were denigrated nor rented (but could be loaned only with express written consent of the *SAM*).⁵³⁴ Well aware of the failure of previous attempts to establish an architecture museum despite the government's acceptance of donations (which ended up languishing in storage for several decades), the *SAM* negotiated the inclusion of certain terms to prevent that situation from being repeated with its collections. For example, in the event of the Architectural Documentation Center (a function fulfilled by the *NDB*) closing or becoming unable to care for the collections, the *SAM* reserved the right to

⁵³² "Contract Tussen de Stichting Architectuurmuseum En de Staat Der Nederlanden Voor de Overdracht van de Collecties Naar Het Nederlands Documentatiecentrum Voor de Bouwkunst," September 28, 1972, VNAI 1984, 1912-1975. The *SAM* was represented by its chairman Auke Komter and board member Theodoor Lunsingh Scheurleer, a professor of Art History in Leiden, while the Dutch State was represented by State Secretary Hendrik Johan Lubert (Henk) Vonhoff for the Ministry of Culture.

⁵³³ Article 5 of *Ibid.*, 3.

⁵³⁴ Article 3 of *Ibid.*

retrieve the collections donated and offer them to another organization (of its choosing) for stewardship.⁵³⁵

Unlike the rather discreet start of operations at the *NDB* in 1971, the signing of the cooperation agreement in 1972 between the *SAM* and the Ministry of Culture was widely publicized. There was great pomp in a ceremony filled with speeches from several officials and documented by the press.⁵³⁶ While the speeches varied, they all expressed the same underlying aspiration for the future of the *NDB* and characterized it as the latest—and final—chapter in the long struggle to establish an architecture museum in the Netherlands. Beyond the commemoration of the firming of the agreement formalizing the terms of the partnership between the *SAM* and the *NDB*, the occasion also served for the Ministry of Culture and the *Monumentenzorg* to publicly present the *NDB* as the Dutch Architecture Museum.⁵³⁷

While the September 1972 cooperation agreement was the first legally binding contract between the *SAM* and the government, the changing conditions resulting from the *NDB*'s foundation had already been reflected in the complete rewrite of the *SAM*'s statutes ratified a month earlier. By rewriting its statutes, the *SAM* not only acknowledged the establishment of the *NDB* but also involved the documentation center in its own organization. The *NDB*'s presence in particular and

⁵³⁵ If this clause was activated, it was agreed that the exact conditions of the process would be settled by an outside arbiter. See Article 4 of *Ibid*.

⁵³⁶ Speeches were made by the Head Director of the *Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg*, C. A. van Swigchem; the Amsterdam Alderman for Traffic and Monuments Preservation, E. A. G. Brautigam; as well as the men who actually signed the cooperation agreement, namely State Secretary of Culture, Recreation and Social Work, Hendrik Johan Lubert (Henk) Vonhoff; and the Chairman of the *SAM*, Auke Komter. While Komter presented a selectively abridged historical overview of the several efforts to establish the architecture museum, State Secretary Vonhoff concluded his speech by presenting Komter with a medal “for his merit towards public art collections.” Copies of the speeches can be found in the archive “SAMU 30: ‘Stukken Betreffende de Overdracht van de Archieven Aan de Staat Der Nederlanden, 1972,’” n.d.

⁵³⁷ The press release sent out by the Ministry of Culture was titled “Architecture Museum/Netherlands Documentation Center for Architecture” and offered the same abridged story of the architecture museum pronounced by Komter. Ministerie van Cultuur, Recreatie en Maatschappelijk Werk, “Persbericht Architectuurmuseum/Nederlands Documentatiecentrum Voor de Bouwkunst.”

the government's influence in general within the *SAM* was most clearly expressed in the revised articles addressing the objectives and the constitution of the board of the foundation.

Regarding the *SAM*'s objectives it was stated that beyond the collection and preservation of architectural objects, it was the *SAM*'s aim to advance general interest in architecture by making its collections publicly accessible through a documentation center of Dutch architecture.⁵³⁸ The following clause specified that the “in the pursuit of its objectives, the foundation [would] work closely with the leadership of the central government and the recently established *NDB*.”⁵³⁹ Namely, the *SAM*'s collections were to be stored, maintained, catalogued, and preserved at the *NDB*, since the documentation center was to “serve as the main collector and workplace for the activities envisaged by the foundation.”⁵⁴⁰

If the revised objectives already indicated a close collaboration between the *SAM* and the government, this proximity was emphatically confirmed with the adjustments to the constitution of the *SAM*'s board. While originally the nominations of the board were the sole province of the *BNA* (even as in reality *Architectura et Amicitia* nominated half of the board), the new 1972 statutes stipulated that a third of the board was to be nominated by several public institutions. Specifically, the board of the *SAM* was now to include one delegate each from the staff of the *NDB*, the *Monumentenzorg*, the Museum Day Association (*Vereniging Museumdag*), and the Municipality of Amsterdam. The new rules stipulating the composition of the *SAM*'s board both increased the foundation's autonomy from its founding architectural societies (particularly from the *BNA*) and deepened the foundation's affiliation with the central government and the *NDB*. Fons Asselbergs,

⁵³⁸ Article 2 (Objectives) of Stichting Architectuurmuseum, “Statuten van de Stichting Architectuurmuseum,” August 24, 1972, SAMU 29. It was further stipulated that beyond drawings, models, and documentation, the *SAM* would also include “audio and video material” in its collecting endeavors.

⁵³⁹ Article 2, section D of *Ibid.*, 1.

⁵⁴⁰ *Ibid.*

for example, was no longer just the director and manager of the *NDB* but also became the secretary of the *SAM*. Even though the September 1972 agreement of understanding formalized the terms of the partnership between *SAM* and *NDB*, the revised *SAM* statutes illustrated how the organizations were effectively intertwined.

While in its 1967 memorandum the *SAM* had indicated that once the state organization (*NDB*) was established the foundation would have accomplished its goal of stimulating the establishment of an architecture museum and would thus be dissolved, in effect, with the foundation of the *NDB*, the *SAM* found a renewed *raison-d'être*. Rather than simply folding (a blunder of previous similar efforts), the *SAM* was adapted to operate in tandem with the *NDB*. As a private institution, the *SAM* had access to funding opportunities which were simply not available to the *NDB* as a public organization. Unlike the *NDB*, the *SAM* could accept monetary donations, apply for a variety of grants (both public and private) and collect membership fees, while also (theoretically) being less hindered by bureaucratic and hierarchical impediments. In practice, the “devisión [sic] between the *NDB* and the *SAM* [was] such that the arrangement of the archives and their documentation and study [laid] within the sphere of the *NDB*, while the collecting of archives, the mounting of exhibitions and the publication of related catalogues [was] carried on by the *SAM*.”⁵⁴¹ In short, the *NDB* was the collections department, while the *SAM* operated as the presentation department of the architecture museum.

With its focus on storing, managing, and preserving architectural archives, the established architecture museum (in the form of the *NDB*) had become exactly what *Architectura et Amicitia* had advocated and lobbied for in the previous seventy years. It was a truly “reflective” architecture museum, not only entirely focused on the documentation of history, but also without much

⁵⁴¹ Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst, “The Museum of Architecture in Amsterdam,” 2.

aspiration to directly engage and influence the development of the discipline. Even though it was presented as an architecture museum, the *NDB* was much better represented by its official title of “Documentation Center.” Its primary goal was not the production of architectural exhibitions but rather the constitution (and preservation) of an architectural archive. In fact, the constitution of an architectural archive and the protection of its material was privileged to such extent that it was even claimed that “loans and exhibitions [would] only be done sporadically.”⁵⁴² As an increasingly formidable repository and archive of Dutch architecture, the main outlet for the *NDB*’s work quickly became academic research.

Beyond having successfully conditioned the first Dutch architecture museum to be entirely dedicated to the documentation of the discipline’s history, by having the *SAM* operate as the presentation department of the architecture museum, *Architectura et Amicitia* was effectively able to also greatly influence the public engagement of the *NDB*. Through its control of the *SAM*, the *A et A* ensured that the newly established architecture museum did not compete with its own core activities and efforts at directing the discussion within the discipline. Short of establishing its own architecture museum, the working arrangement between the *NDB* and the *SAM* was the most efficient way for the *A et A* to fully accomplish its objectives of instigating the establishment of a reflective architecture museum in Amsterdam and remain influential in its development and operations.

The working arrangement between the *NDB* and the *SAM* was equally advantageous for the state organization. The *SAM*’s support was particularly important during the *NDB*’s early period, since the Ministry of Culture had only become interested in the architecture museum as a way to protect Dutch architectural heritage from all but certain destruction and had also “decided to do a

⁵⁴² Broos, “Signalement van Het NDB,” 6.

minimum investment, a *really* minimum investment.”⁵⁴³ By “outsourcing” the organization of exhibitions, the publication of catalogues, and the procurement of archives to the *SAM*, the *NDB* could focus its rather limited budget and manpower on the preservation and inventorization of the archives, the function clearly favored by the government in the constitution of the *NDB*. While the *NDB* may have been publicly heralded as the Dutch architecture museum by the Ministry of Culture, the reality was that a proper architecture museum only existed in the mutual beneficial collaboration of the *NDB* and the *SAM*. Both organizations even operated out of the same building, the *Arsenaal* on *Waterlooplein*.

The first major exhibition of the *NDB-SAM* tandem-operation was organized in 1973. The exposition presented a monographic retrospective of the Amsterdam school architect, Michel de Klerk. Titled “Michel de Klerk and the Amsterdam School: Architecture, Drawings and Documents,” the exhibition was open to the public for a month, between September 12 and October 12, 1973.⁵⁴⁴ However, since the conditions of the *Arsenaal* were not adequate for the accommodation of this major exhibition, the exhibition was forced to be installed in another location, namely the exhibition space of another Amsterdam foundation dedicated to architecture, the *Stichting Wonen* (Living/Housing Foundation).⁵⁴⁵

With the failed attempt to organize the Michel de Klerk exhibition in the *Arsenaal*, it became clear that in order to be able to accommodate any future exhibitions, the building would require some substantial (and costly) repairs. Thus, by 1974 the bicephalous organization was temporarily moved to a nineteenth century Dutch neo-renaissance building on the *Droogbak* that had formerly accommodated the governmental administration. Since this massive government-owned building

⁵⁴³ Bernard Colenbrander, interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo, audio, January 12, 2011.

⁵⁴⁴ An exhibition catalogue was also published. See Fons Asselbergs, *M. de Klerk en de Amsterdamse School: Architectuur, Tekeningen, Documentatie* (Amsterdam, 1973).

⁵⁴⁵ Stichting Architectuurmuseum, “Geschiedenis van Het Architectuurmuseum,” 4.

(commonly referred to simply as *Droogbak*) was vacant at the time, the *NDB* was relocated to the second floor of the building. In the *Droogbak* building, spaces were prepared not only for storing and processing the collections and for holding exhibitions, but also to accommodate a library, a photo library, the archives, study rooms, and a film screening room with a technical cabin. The initial plan estimated that six years would be sufficient for the renovation work of the *Arsenaal* building to be completed and that by 1981 the *NDB* would be able to permanently return to *Waterlooplein*.⁵⁴⁶

Given that the *BNA* already had concrete plans to move its offices to *Waterlooplein* and that the Academy of Architecture was already there located, the return of the *NDB* was considered to be both significant and symbolic.⁵⁴⁷ With the *NDB*'s return, *Waterlooplein* was expected to become an important cluster of architectural institutions, as it would combine in the same location three important branches of architectural debate in the Netherlands: education, profession and museum.

The *NDB*'s move to the *Droogbak* was funded by the Ministry of Culture and was indicative of a slight improvement in the amount of resources allocated by the *Monumentenzorg* to the *NDB*. Hence, Fons Asselbergs was joined by Dick van Woerkom in the *NDB*.⁵⁴⁸ Van Woerkom was an architect who had been a board member of the *SAM* for a few years and was well regarded and respected in architectural circles by instilling his work with both practical and theoretical meaning.⁵⁴⁹ Being well versed in the theoretical and practical issues confronting Dutch architecture, van Woerkom's expertise neatly complemented Asselbergs's background in art history and archival

⁵⁴⁶ Fons Asselbergs in Broos, "Signalement van Het NDB," 8.

⁵⁴⁷ Willinge, "The Collection, Backbone of the NAI," 15.

⁵⁴⁸ Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst, "Overzichten van Medewerkers," 1980, NDBK 67.

⁵⁴⁹ Dick van Woerkom was also known for his regular opinion column in the *BNA* journal, the successor of the *Bouwkundige Weekblad Architectura*, and before establishing his own office, had worked for Auke Komter, the *SAM*'s chairman long standing chairman.

processes. Moreover, while Fons Asselbergs had first been engaged with *NDB* and then also the *SAM*, Dick van Woerkom took the opposite route, as from the *SAM* he became also involved with the *NDB*. As the interconnection between both organizations was deepened, the barriers between both were also increasingly confounded.⁵⁵⁰

While Dick van Woerkom effectively doubled the *NDB*'s staff, the documentation center was still remarkably understaffed. In order to remedy that situation, the *NDB* established partnerships with several academic institutions (and professors) across the Netherlands.⁵⁵¹ Through this connection to universities and schools in Amsterdam, Utrecht, Groningen, Leiden, and Nijmegen, the *NDB* welcomed several art and architectural history students as interns. The student-interns were crucial for the early operations of the *NDB*, since they carried out the menial and lengthy work of cataloguing and indexing all the archives. In return, student-interns had unfettered (and unregulated) access to the *NDB*'s archives and thus had the possibility to be the first to produce some authoritative work on the most influential architects in the Netherlands.⁵⁵² The lack of clear rules dictating procedures at the *NDB* resulted in what has been described as a "creative chaos," but even in chaos, there was some order, and each student-intern was responsible for a specific archive (usually associated with their academic work). After their internship most students returned to

⁵⁵⁰ The promiscuity between the *SAM* and the *NDB* in this period was such that until 2000 the archives of these two organizations were one and the same, only being separated in that year due to the different legal status derived from the official ownership of the *SAM* and *NDB* archives. However, even then, it was considered that given the interconnectedness of these archives it was still difficult to stipulate what documents belonged to which. See Frans Neggers, "Voorwoord," in *Inventaris Op Het Archief van de NDB (archieff NDBK)*, 2000, 3.

⁵⁵¹ Fons Asselbergs in Broos, "Signalement van Het NDB," 5.

⁵⁵² Unfettered access meant just that, since there were no strict rules regarding the handling of the archival material, and everybody did what they pleased with the paper. Students often ate and even smoked while consulting the material. Mariet Willinge, interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo, audio, January 11, 2011; Alfred Marks, interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo, audio, January 19, 2011.

their schools and universities but some remained associated with the *NDB*.⁵⁵³ Beyond supplying the *NDB* with inexpensive staff, the connection to academic institutions also ensured that “many researchers found their way to the *NDB*.”⁵⁵⁴

With such influx of researchers, the study of architectural history in the Netherlands was greatly stimulated, and the *NDB* was able to organize four large architectural exhibitions for the 1975 European Architectural Heritage Year (commonly referred to as *Monumentenjaar* in the Netherlands).⁵⁵⁵ The main concern of the four exhibitions was to present to a wide audience a crucial period in the development of Dutch architecture, namely the fifty years between 1880 and 1930. The exhibition “H.P. Berlage, Construction Master” was dedicated to the grandfather figure of Dutch modern architecture and was installed in The Hague’s Municipal Museum, one of Berlage’s last commissions.⁵⁵⁶ In the *Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller* in Otterlo, the exhibition “Americana: 1880-1930” explored the links between American and Dutch Architecture at the turn of the twentieth century.⁵⁵⁷ The exhibition “Amsterdam School: 1910-1930” analyzed in Amsterdam’s *Stedelijk Museum* the work of that group.⁵⁵⁸ The fourth exhibition, “Architectura, 1893-1913,” was installed in the *NDB*’s *Droogbak* building and presented the architectural society *Architectura et Amicitia*

⁵⁵³ Bernard Colenbrander, for example, started as an intern in 1980 (working on the J.J.P. Oud archive) and by 1982 he had a full-time contract with the *NDB*. Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst, “Overzichten van Medewerkers.”

⁵⁵⁴ Frans Neggers, “Inleiding,” in *Inventaris Op Het Archief van de NDB (archiefnDBK)*, 2000, 3. The other way the *NDB* overcame its chronic understaffing was by implementing a Temporary Workplace Program (*Tijdelijke Arbeidsplaatsenregeling*, or *TAP*) through which the documentation center filled several positions.

⁵⁵⁵ In the initial January 1975 public announcement of the *SAM*’s exhibition program for the 1975 *Monumentenjaar*, there was no plan for an exhibition to be installed at the *Droogbak* building, so only the three other exhibitions were presented. Stichting Architectuurmuseum, “Brief Aan Redactie Wonen TABK,” January 1975, VNAI 1984, 1912-1975.

⁵⁵⁶ P. Singelenberg et al., *H.P. Berlage, Bouwmeester 1856-1934: Tentoonstelling* (Den Haag: Haags Gemeentemuseum, 1975).

⁵⁵⁷ Fons Asselbergs, *Nederlandse Architectuur 1880-1930 Americana: Tentoonstelling* (Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller, 1975).

⁵⁵⁸ Ellinoor Bergvelt and Stedelijk Museum, *Amsterdamse School, 1910-1930: Tentoonstelling* (Amsterdam: Stedelijk Museum, 1975).

through the work of five of its most admired members.⁵⁵⁹ Open to the public between August and November of 1975, the exhibitions generated a terrific response from the general public, which was quantified in a respectable number of visitors and the absolute staggering print runs of the catalogues.⁵⁶⁰ Thus, the *NDB*'s 1975 exhibition program was considered a success, particularly since it demonstrated that there was a growing interest in the general public in architecture and architectural history and garnered some important visibility to the documentation center.

Beyond exhibitions, the *NDB* was occupied with the preparation of publications. But while the publication of exhibition catalogues was the domain of the *SAM*, the *NDB* was primarily focused on the production of publications even more closely related to its collections. Specifically, the *NDB* aimed to produce three types of publications: indexes, inventories, and cahiers.⁵⁶¹ "Indexes" were a simple, yet time consuming (and ambitious) series. This series was comprised by indexes of historical architectural journals and magazines, starting from the small (and short lived) "*8*" and "*De Stijl*" journals, to the larger periodicals like "*Bouwkundig Weekblad*." The "inventories" series was equally simple and time consuming, since it referred to the production of detailed inventories of the archives in the *NDB*'s custody. While both indexes and inventories were a direct documentation of the *NDB*'s holdings and were intended to assist visitors in consulting the archive, the "cahiers" series was the outlet for the new knowledge produced from the primary material found in the archive. "Cahiers of the *NDB*," as it was officially titled, was a thematic series presenting both the work of architects' and also specific moments in the history of Dutch

⁵⁵⁹ Manfred Bock and Stichting Architectuurmuseum, *Architectura, 1893-1918: Tentoonstelling* (Amsterdam: Architectuurmuseum, 1975).

⁵⁶⁰ 35.000 copies of the four catalogues combined were sold, in a time when any other serious volume on architecture could not sell over 3.000 copies in the Netherlands. W. M. Lookman, "Architectuurmuseum Zou Geschiedenis van Opdracht En Ontwerp in Beeld Moeten Brengen," *Het Financieele Dagblad*, August 11, 1978.

⁵⁶¹ Fons Asselbergs in Broos, "Signalement van Het NDB," 6.

architecture.⁵⁶² This was perhaps the most crucial element in the *NDB*'s strategy for publications, since the volumes in this series transformed the raw information in the *NDB*'s archives into new architectural knowledge. In essence, the cahiers were envisioned as an important outlet for the research realized in the documentation center. These volumes were not only the most likely to have a wide appeal, but also presented and validated the work in the archives.

While the *NDB*'s means of engagement were still very much steeped in history, Fons Asselbergs intimated that he was hoping for much more, as he revealed his ambition for the documentation center. Asselbergs hoped that the *NDB* would not only live up to its promise of becoming a true architecture museum and regularly organize and host architectural exhibitions but also that the *NDB* could become dynamic center for a decisive engagement with contemporary architecture. Rather than a permanent exhibition, Asselbergs argued that the *NDB* could present temporary exhibitions of its own collection, complemented by "exhibitions of foreign architecture and exhibitions about contemporary issues."⁵⁶³ It was increasingly clear that the *NDB* as an architecture museum had the potential to go far beyond the mere documentation of the history of the discipline and become a leading element in organizing discussion and advancing architectural culture. Asselbergs hoped that the *NDB* could expand its scope and move from a *reflective* documentation center to a *projective* architecture institute. The success of the 1975 quartet of architectural exhibitions had already evidenced the demand for an architecture museum which could engage with a wider public by regularly organizing architecture exhibitions, thus validating Asselbergs'

⁵⁶² The first volume in the "cahiers" series was titled Amsterdam and Berlage's Exchange: Contemporary Criticism (*Amsterdam en de Beurs van Berlage: Reacties van Tijdgenoten*) by Utrecht-based architectural historian A.W. Reinink.

⁵⁶³ Fons Asselbergs in Broos, "Signalement van Het NDB," 7.

ambitions. Accordingly, similar opinions and expectations were starting to be voiced within architectural circles.⁵⁶⁴

However, the state hierarchy did not share the same opinion and did not support the growing ambition to transform the *NDB* into a projective architecture institute or even into a fully-fledged reflective architecture museum. In response to the *NDB*'s (and Asselbergs') mounting ambitions, the *Monumentenzorg* issued a policy-paper reprimanding the documentation center for overstepping its mandate.⁵⁶⁵ Despite the success of the exhibitions, and the visibility they garnered for both the *NDB* and the *SAM*, the *Monumentenzorg* considered that the organization of exhibitions was beyond the *NDB*'s scope. In fact, the *Monumentenzorg*'s management believed that the means of engagement of the documentation center should be limited to publications that could facilitate and stimulate the use of the *NDB*'s archival information by other parties. The drawings, models, and other objects in the *NDB*'s archive could certainly be used for exhibitions—and these could even be hosted in the *NDB*'s own exhibition space—but that should be left to other organizations, not the documentation center.⁵⁶⁶

Instead of exhibitions, it was argued that the *NDB* should be (re)focusing on its original purpose (and mandate) of conservation and management, documentation, research, and information of architectural archives.⁵⁶⁷ The establishment of the *NDB* and the *Monumentenzorg*'s unconventional association with the *SAM*, it was reminded, had been primarily motivated by the *Monumentenzorg*'s goal to update the list of its protected monuments with the inclusion of remarkable building (from

⁵⁶⁴ See S. Umberto Barbieri, "De Trieste Geschiedenis van de Stichting Architectuurmuseum," *Vrij Nederland*, December 9, 1978., where besides presenting a similar argument, Barbieri also quotes Ed Taverne expressing the same view.

⁵⁶⁵ Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg, "Nota Betreffende de Plaats En Taak van Het NDB Binnen de Organisatie van de RDMZ," September 1977, NDBK 33.

⁵⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 3–4.

⁵⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 2.

the Amsterdam School to *De Stijl*) from the start of the twentieth century, also commonly referred to as “young monuments.”⁵⁶⁸ By partnering with the *SAM*, the *Monumentenzorg* had intended to have access to that foundation’s trove of archives of early twentieth-century Dutch architecture, which was expected to greatly assist in the updating of the list of protected monuments.⁵⁶⁹ The documentation of architecture was considered the core competency of the *NDB*, and it should not be distracted with attempting to engage with a wide audience. With this policy paper, the utterly reflective character assigned by the *Monumentenzorg* to the *NDB* could not have been more explicitly articulated.

In complete disagreement with the *Monumentenzorg*’s policy for the documentation center and the constant pressure from his superiors to cut back on museological activities, Fons Asselbergs resigned in 1978 from his positions in both the *NDB* and the *SAM*.⁵⁷⁰ Despite Dick van Woerkom stepping up as manager of the *NDB*, Asselbergs’ resignation was a crucial setback for the documentation center.⁵⁷¹ For several years Asselbergs had been able to ingeniously defuse the tension between the *SAM* and the *Monumentenzorg* regarding their diverging intentions for the *NDB*, but without him, the conflict between these institutions festered.⁵⁷² The disagreement was based on their different aims for the *NDB*, since “the *SAM* wanted to have a real museum but the

⁵⁶⁸ Since in the Netherlands in order to become protected monuments buildings need to be at least fifty years old, by the 1970s, several remarkable buildings of the start of the century could finally be designated national monuments.

⁵⁶⁹ Almost 150 years after one of the initiatives of the architectural society *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst* had become the basis for the first listing of national monuments and effectively initiated the *Monumentenzorg*, the state preservation services relied once again on an embryonic architecture museum to compile information on the monuments that should be protected.

⁵⁷⁰ Ten years later, in 1988, Fons Asselbergs would be appropriately vindicated, as he returned to the architecture museum as a member of the first board of the newly established NAI. See Hans Andersson, “Samenstelling Bestuur Stichting Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw,” August 1988, BSTU 1988.

⁵⁷¹ Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst, “Overzichten van Medewerkers.”

⁵⁷² Lookman, “Architectuurmuseum Zou Geschiedenis van Opdracht En Ontwerp in Beeld Moeten Brengen.”

Monumentenzorg wanted to have only a documentation center."⁵⁷³ In support of its claim for an architecture museum the *SAM* argued that the foundation of the museum had been the major condition for the donation of its archives to the State. Unmoved, the *Monumentenzorg* responded that it was only interested (and only needed) a documentation center, and since it was bearing the entire costs of the *NDB*'s activities, the documentation center would remain just that, a documentation center. The dispute between the *SAM* and the *Monumentenzorg* "went on, and on, but at a certain moment it became a real problem."⁵⁷⁴

As the *Monumentenzorg* had already implied, it was not only an institutional problem (that the operation of a museum was not among the *Monumentenzorg* goals), it was also a funding problem. The *Monumentenzorg*'s budget was allocated to the documentation and protection to Dutch monuments and it did not have sufficient funds for the organization of exhibitions and the publication of catalogues as well. These were costly endeavors, so costly that the production of exhibitions and the publication of catalogues had almost completely drained the *SAM*'s coffers. Despite being mostly run by volunteers, by 1978 the *SAM* could not keep up with its financial obligations and was effectively bankrupt. The fragile financial condition of the *SAM* meant the private foundation "was powerless in opposing the *Monumentenzorg*'s" entrenched position.⁵⁷⁵ Thus, along with Asselbergs, Auke Komter, the long serving chairman of the *SAM*, became another casualty of the conflict between the Architecture Museum Foundation and the *Monumentenzorg*, as he also resigned in December 1978 from his position at the *SAM*.⁵⁷⁶ In order to celebrate Komter's

⁵⁷³ Willinge, interview.

⁵⁷⁴ Ibid.

⁵⁷⁵ Barbieri, "De Trieste Geschiedenis van de Stichting Architectuurmuseum."

⁵⁷⁶ Max van Rooy, "Auke Komter Neemt Afscheid van de Stichting Architectuurmuseum," *NRC Handelsblad*, December 15, 1978. In order to celebrate Komter's contribution to Dutch architectural culture not only as chairman of the *SAM*, but also as director of the Amsterdam Academy of Architecture and his prolific architectural practice, the *NDB* organized an exhibition presenting an overview of his work as a designer,

twenty-five year service to the *SAM*, the foundation organized a farewell exhibition to its former chairman by presenting an overview of his work in the *Droogbak* building, one of the first monographic exhibitions about a living architect organized by the *SAM*.⁵⁷⁷

Without Asselbergs and Komter, the *SAM*'s board pleaded for financial assistance from the *BNA* in the following year. While the architectural society *A et A* had been much closer to the *SAM*, it did not possess the same financial resources as its organizational partner in the foundation of the *SAM*. As a professional organization, the *BNA* received dues from all the architects in the Netherlands, providing it with a strong financial footing, which could not be matched by the *A et A* and its dwindling membership. Despite having been hardly interested in the *SAM*'s activities until then, the *BNA* pledged a substantial amount to provide a much needed cash influx for the ailing *SAM*. However, with the *BNA*'s largess there were also some stringent conditions. Specifically, the "*BNA* offered the *SAM*'s board the sum of 50,000 guilders plus 30,000 guilders for secretarial facilities, in exchange for the offices of president and secretary/treasurer of the *SAM*," which were to be occupied respectively by the chairman and director of the *BNA*.⁵⁷⁸ Given that those positions had just been vacated by Komter and Asselbergs, the *SAM* did not have too many problems in accepting those demands. The *BNA*'s friendly takeover of the *SAM* became tense when the conditions for the previously agreed "bailout" came to also include the nomination of half of the *SAM*'s board by the *BNA*, nudging *Architectura et Amicitia* completely out of the board.

⁵⁷⁷ "NDBK 274: 'Stukken Betreffende de Tentoonstellingen "Auke Komter - Architect" En "Jan Wils - Olympisch Stadion," 1978-1979.," n.d.

⁵⁷⁸ S. Umberto Barbieri, "Architectuurmuseum: Het Ongeboren Kind van de BNA," *Plan*, no. 6 (June 1979): 10. With this article, Barbieri first made public (and strongly criticized), the deal being brokered between the *BNA* and the *SAM*, inciting a formal response from the *BNA* board in an open letter to *Plan*'s editors, accusing both Barbieri and the editorial staff of failing to follow due process and presenting a one-sided story. The *BNA*'s open letter, as well as the response from the editorial staff of *Plan*, were subsequently published in the periodical in September 1979. "Architectuurmuseum," *Plan* 10, no. 9 (September 1979): 6–10.

The *BNA*'s control of the *SAM* was formalized with the change of the statutes of the Architecture Museum Foundation in early 1980. Beyond the amendments to the constitution of the board, the new statutes also revealed a certain distancing from the government and the *NDB*. The unequivocal language used in the previous statutes to indicate the strong interdependence between the *SAM* and the *NDB* was in the 1980 statutes replaced by a single indication that "in pursuing its objectives, the *SAM* was to work closely with the State's leadership" in the context of "a Statute of Cooperation between the *NDB* and the foundation."⁵⁷⁹ Even more revealing of the increasing tension between the *SAM* and the government (through the *Monumentenzorg*) was Article 15 of the Statutes, stipulating the conditions for the dissolution of the foundation. No longer was the extinction of the Architecture Museum Foundation possible when it had succeeded in its objectives with the foundation of an architecture museum, since now the dissolution of the foundation could also occur if "albeit unhelped, it was concluded that this objective [could] not be attained."⁵⁸⁰ For the first time the *SAM* was now contemplating the increasingly real prospect of never being able to establish an architecture museum. If the *Monumentenzorg* remained steadfast in its position and the conflict between it and the *SAM* proved to be insurmountable, the whole endeavor to establish an architecture museum could come to an abrupt end.

Even though the *BNA* intervention was intended to stabilize the *SAM*'s position and reinforce its credibility, it ended up having the opposite effect. The *BNA*'s aggressive engagement of the *SAM* further antagonized the *Monumentenzorg* and the *NDB* leadership, which also began attempting to distance itself from the troubled foundation.⁵⁸¹ The estrangement between both organizations was

⁵⁷⁹ Article 2 of Stichting Architectuurmuseum, "Statuten van de Stichting Architectuurmuseum," February 26, 1980, 1, SAMU 29.

⁵⁸⁰ Article 15 of *Ibid.*, 7.

⁵⁸¹ Some letters from the *NDB*'s manager of the to the *SAM*'s new secretary express quite clearly the growing problems between both organizations. See "NDBK 338: 'Brieven van de Beheerder van Het NDB Aan Het Bestuur van de SAM Betreffende de Problemen Tussen de Stichting En Het NDB, Concept. 1980,'" n.d.

particularly unfortunate since State officials were beginning to revert their position and were increasingly committed to the establishment of an architecture museum based on the *NDB*'s work. Nevertheless, the financial difficulties and the institutional upheaval in the private foundation seemed to imply that for the *Monumentenzorg* and the government the role of the *SAM* in a future solution for the architecture museum had to be greatly diminished.

As the government began to realize the variety of potential benefits resulting from allowing the *NDB* to enlarge its scope, it did not take long for its intention to found a proper architecture museum to be publicly announced.⁵⁸² In a speech on September 22, 1983, the Deputy Director-General for Cultural Affairs, J. Riezenkamp, on behalf of the Minister of Welfare, Health and Culture, Leendert Cornelis (Elco) Brinkman, publicly announced that the government was now ready to support the foundation of an architecture museum and was about to initiate the preparatory discussions and work with its partners, including the *SAM*.

From Museum to Institute

Throughout the twentieth century, the discussion to establish an architecture museum in the Netherlands was stimulated by two opposing views of how an architecture museum should be organized and operate. The opposition between a reflective and a projective architectural museological institution was expressed in diverging approaches to collections, audiences, and location. However, the fundamental divergence from which all other originated was their distinct approach to the architectural archive and, inevitably, to the discipline. While supporters of a reflective architecture museum advocated the foundation of an institution that passively reflected

⁵⁸² A changing international context for architecture museums and a revised approach to architecture history were instrumental in the government's shift of approach to architecture museum in general and the *NDB* in particular. This matter will be more thoroughly discussed in the following chapter "Towards an Architecture Museum."

the historical progress of architecture, the projective architecture institute was posited to not merely reflect, but also project the development of architecture. While the reflective museum was to document and preserve history, the projective institute was to engage in discussion and promote the exchange of architectural knowledge. Ultimately, the reflective museum was primarily preoccupied with the past of the discipline, while the other was clearly focused on its future.

Although both approaches relied on the constitution of the architectural archive to validate their claims, the character of such a fundamental instrument was greatly divergent. The composition, agency, and objectives of the archive within the reflective museum and the projective institute were fundamentally distinct. While the architecture museum favored the constitution of an archive composed of aesthetically pleasing architectural representations regardless of the merit of their ideas, the architecture institute intended to establish an archive of documents and artifacts that represented significant architectural ideas regardless of the beauty of their representation. The contrasting approach to the disciplinary archive revealed a different understanding of the architectural discipline, but also marked the different objectives of the two types of architectural museological institutions. Specifically, the emphasis of the reflective museum on the aesthetic dimension of architecture (particularly its representation) affirmed the notion that architecture was simply another autonomous art form, while the projective institute's preoccupation with architectural ideas and the aesthetic, technical, and social dimensions of architecture, asserted the specificity of architecture, particularly in its combination of aesthetic delight and utilitarian function.

Beyond their composition, the suggested archive for the reflective architecture museum and the projective architecture institute also indicated a difference in the primary objectives of these institutions. Given that the architecture museum's main purpose was to document and preserve architectural history and heritage, it favored the construction of an archive in which previous

knowledge was enshrined and remained greatly unchallenged. Conversely, since the chief objective of the architecture institute was to further the development of architectural design, it clearly advocated an archive fully engaged with the discipline and constantly reconsidered. The differing intensity of engagement implied that within the architecture museum the agency of the discipline's archive was greatly limited, but a forceful agency was conferred to the archive by the architecture institute. Thus, while in the museum the archive was static and fixed, in the institute the archive was dynamic and ever changing.

The dispute between both factions was not entirely ideological, but also practical, particularly regarding the location of the future architecture museum or institute.⁵⁸³ Since it was agreed that Amsterdam was more adequate for the establishment of an architecture museum and Delft for the establishment of an architecture institute, those that desired the future institution to be located in Amsterdam supported an architecture museum, and those hopeful to have it established in Delft supported an architecture institute. As the discussion proceeded, the intense propaganda and political maneuvering of the supporters of the reflective architecture museum ensured the capitulation of the opposing faction advocating the establishment of a projective institute. Unopposed, the reflective architecture museum model became the only viable option for the establishment of an architectural museological institution in the Netherlands and was able to shape the collective expectations for an architecture museum throughout several decades.

The overbearing control of the reflective approach to an architecture museum was only materialized in 1971, with the constitution of the *NDB* in Amsterdam, whose main (and often only) concern was the preservation of Dutch architectural history through the constitution of a

⁵⁸³ The dispute regarding location was revived several decades later, even employing similar arguments, when in the mid-1980s it was first indicated that the then proposed Netherlands Architecture Institute was to be established in Rotterdam. See chapter 4.

comprehensive disciplinary archive. However, without an outlet to stimulate the exchange of architectural knowledge and the constitution of new knowledge, the archive remained a self-contained entity without any significant influence over the advancement of the discipline. By then, it was increasingly (and widely) understood that an architecture museum could be a fundamental instrument in advancing the discipline. Therefore, the architecture museum should be more than a documentation center and instead be organized as an architecture institute. In the early 1980s, state officials, architecture professionals, and art historians were finally fully realizing what had already been so clear for both Jan and Willem Leliman over a century earlier: architecture was best served by an architecture museum whose exhibitions could engage a wider audience in architecture and operate as an exceptional tool for the advancement of the discipline.

Jan Leliman's son, Willem Leliman, had first codified these ideas when he penned the 1912 article *Een Architectuurmuseum* mounting a cogent argument for the same type of projective, active, and instrumental architecture museum that his father had attempted to establish in the old Amsterdam societies of architecture. However, despite the younger Leliman's description of a museum in which the exhibition of architecture—in all its dimensions—allowed for past knowledge to be unlocked from the discipline's archive and thus remain present, relevant, and active in the development of the discipline, efforts to establish an architecture museum in the Netherlands—primarily directed by the architectural society *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia*—subverted those ideas and conditioned the discussion to a museum of architecture dedicated to the documentation of history and the presentation of architecture as merely an aesthetic discipline. While the younger Leliman had clearly proposed a projective museum, in subsequent discussions, the architecture museum was sublimated to a purely reflective device. The conditioning of the discussion was so successful that when an architectural archive was first organized and institutionalized in the Netherlands, it was presented as an architecture museum. Sixty years of

proselytization for a reflective architecture museum had culminated in the blurring of the distinction between the architecture museum and the disciplinary archive.

The foundation of the *Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst* in 1971 was an important step in the long march towards the establishment of an architecture museum in the Netherlands, but it was one that still came short from achieving what Jan Leliman had envisioned and what his son described in his 1912 article. That would soon be corrected, as by 1983 there was an increasingly widespread consensus that an architecture museum should not be a mere reflective mirror of the discipline dedicated to contemplation, but should instead become a forceful projective instrument for its advancement through discussion. Rather than an artistic architecture museum, to develop a wide appreciation of architecture, an architecture institute was unequivocally demanded.

4. TOWARDS AN ARCHITECTURE INSTITUTE (1978-1983)

While travelling in a train to Utrecht to attend yet another preparatory meeting for the merger of the *Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst* (Dutch Documentation Center for Architecture, or *NDB*) and the *Stichting Wonen* (Living/Housing Foundation) for the establishment of an architecture institute in the Netherlands, the deputy director of the *NDB*, Mariet Willinge and *Stichting Wonen*'s policy director Ruud Brouwers reached an agreement: the two organizations would come together, but they “would be separated by a glass wall in the middle.”⁵⁸⁴ As Willinge and Brouwers reassured other passengers overhearing their conversation that this agreement did not pertain an estranged marriage but a new institution for architecture, they actually defined the intellectual basis of the Netherlands Architecture Institute. Specifically, this informal agreement established the dialectical opposition between historians (*NDB*) and architects (*Stichting Wonen*)—between the past and the future of Dutch architecture—that was at the core of the new projective architecture institute.

Such an agreement—and the very foundation of the new institute—reflected the changing perception regarding the role of architecture history within architecture culture, but also resonated the conceptual framework with which the Italian historian and critic Manfredo Tafuri had disrupted the normative institutions of both historical and design practice. Using a structuralist-Marxist framework, Tafuri famously authored a poignant critique of the dominant mode of historical practice characterized by an unabashed instrumentalization of history to validate contemporary design approaches, a practice he termed “operative criticism.”⁵⁸⁵ Beyond denouncing it as an

⁵⁸⁴ Willinge, interview; Brouwers, interview.

⁵⁸⁵ The concept of “operative criticism” is a central component of Tafuri’s legacy and incited tremendous discussion within architectural and historical circles. Tafuri first defined the term at great length in Manfredo Tafuri, “Operative Criticism,” in *Theories and History of Architecture* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), 141–170.

irresponsible historical practice, Tafuri decried operative criticism as architectural practice merely posing as history, further lamenting its effect of creating an ever-growing insularity and self-referential condition in architecture. In opposition to such operativity, Tafuri proposed the development of a criticality that could challenge the “false historical consciousness at the core of architectural theory” and oppose the discipline’s self-prescribed autonomy and subsequent irrelevancy.⁵⁸⁶

Instead of neatly conforming the past to contemporary constructions, architecture history was to operate in a mode of constant subversion in which historical research would “raise questions instead of provide answers, multiply problems rather than offer single solutions.”⁵⁸⁷ For Tafuri, architecture history should advance the discipline, not by justifying what was already being done, but by uncovering the contradictions and incongruities of the past and using them to pose new questions to be addressed by architectural practice. For that end, the architect and historian were to establish a productive dialectical relation, “almost to the point of constant opposition.”⁵⁸⁸

While the tide was already turning for architecture history, the publication of Tafuri’s “*Teorie e Storia dell’Architettura*” (*Theories and History of Architecture*) forced a complete a reevaluation of architecture’s history and design practice, leading to nothing short of a paradigm shift in architecture history.⁵⁸⁹ Accordingly, this chapter argues that Tafuri’s conception of architecture

⁵⁸⁶ Andrew Leach, “Choosing History: Tafuri, Criticality and the Limits of Architecture,” *The Journal of Architecture* 10, no. 3 (2005): 237.

⁵⁸⁷ Mark Wigley, “Post-Operative History,” *ANY 25-26: Becoming Manfredo Tafuri*, 2000, 48.

⁵⁸⁸ Manfredo Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*, 1st U.S. ed (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), 64.

⁵⁸⁹ The indication that history was experiencing a veritable renaissance in architectural culture was widely revealed, not only on the historicism of a particular strain of postmodern architecture culminated with the 1980 Venice Biennale “Presence of the Past,” but also on the establishment of the first doctoral programs of architecture in the United States. For more see John Harwood, “How Useful? The Stakes of Architectural History, Theory, and Criticism at MIT, 1945-1976,” in *A Second Modernism: MIT, Architecture, and the “Techno-Social” Moment*, ed. Arindam Dutta, 2013, 106–143. The recognition of Tafuri’s explicit influence was perhaps best registered in the collection of essays assembled in a special double-issue of the publication *ANY: Architecture New York* to honor his passing. See Ignasi de Solà-Morales and Cynthia Davidson, eds., *Being Manfredo Tafuri*, *ANY Magazine* 25-26, 2000.

history—particularly regarding its operativity and criticality—was also the basis for a fundamental paradigm shift in the emerging field of architecture museums. Although in different ways, the foundation of projective architecture institutes like the Netherlands Architecture Institute, the Canadian Centre for Architecture (CCA), and the *Deutsches Architekturmuseum* (German Architecture Museum, or *DAM*) not only resonated with, but actually institutionalized, Tafuri's theoretical constructions. The organization of a dialectical confrontation between architecture and history, between the past and the future of architecture, became the primary objective of this new genre of architecture museum.

While all three institutions emerged during the same period and responded to the same international context, the NAI benefited from being established only after its Canadian and German counterparts. The few years that separated the official foundation of the *DAM* (1978) and the CCA (1979) from the NAI (1988) offered the founders of the Dutch institute significant hindsight into the establishment and institutionalization of not just one, but two, progressive architecture institutions, a type of institution that did not even exist until then. The observation of these institutions' foundation and early development greatly informed the preparation of the new Dutch architecture institute, both in its theoretical positioning and in its concrete approach to everyday operations, from the development of its criticality to the benefits of a new building.

Insight into the establishment, positioning, and operations of these institutions was directly obtained primarily under the auspices of the newly established International Confederation of Architecture Museums (ICAM), of which the *NDB*, the CCA, and the *DAM* were founding members. As the ICAM established a platform for exchange among the emerging class of museological institutions dedicated to architecture, it became a significant resource in the preparation of the NAI by providing the Dutch delegation direct access not just to the CCA and the *DAM*, but also to an ever-growing number of other architectural institutions. Although international examples would

have always been important references in the establishment of a Dutch architecture institute, their impact was greatly magnified as the constitution of both the ICAM and the NAI came at a moment when Dutch architecture culture was particularly receptive to the ideas and examples from abroad.

The idea to found a projective architecture institute rather than a reflective museum in the Netherlands indicated a momentous shift in the very conception of an architecture museum. With a growing appreciation for such a “modern conception” of an architecture museum, one that focused on the multiplicity of history to project the future of Dutch architecture, previous notions of the appropriateness of a reflective museum were entirely displaced and concrete plans for the establishment of the new institute were produced. Spurred by the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Culture (*Ministerie van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid en Cultuur*, or *WVC*) and the Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment (*Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting, Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieu*, commonly referred to as *VRM*), the new architecture institute was to be forged from the merger of three existing organizations: the architectural activist *Stichting Wonen*, the history-focused *NDB*, and its partner shell-organization *Stichting Architectuurmuseum (SAM, Architecture Museum Foundation)*.⁵⁹⁰

After lengthy preparations and without ever explicitly referring to Tafuri, the NAI’s foundation effectively institutionalized in the Netherlands a true reflection of Tafuri’s conceptual constructions of criticality. This much was revealed as the Dutch institute assembled a comprehensive

⁵⁹⁰ In order to provide a certain consistency, the term “Ministry of Culture” is recurrently used in this dissertation in reference to the State Ministry responsible for culture at any given moment in the Netherlands, unless when otherwise noted. Throughout the twentieth century, as culture became an issue under ministerial administration in the Netherlands, it has been under the purview of the Ministry of Education, Arts and Sciences (*Ministerie van Onderwijs, Kunsten en Wetenschappen*) between 1918 and 1965, the Ministry of Culture, Recreation and Social Services (*Ministerie van Cultuur, Recreatie en Maatschappelijk Werk*) between 1965 and 1982, the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Culture (*Ministerie van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid en Cultuur*) between 1982 and 1994, and finally the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (*Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap*) since 1994.

architecture archive and encouraged a constant reassessment of history, as it established a platform for discussion and revealed new paths for architecture practice, but most importantly, as it institutionalized a productive dialectical confrontation between architects and historians. While initially with a glass wall between them, at the end of the 1980s *SAM*, *NDB*, and *Stichting Wonen* were finally moving towards a Dutch architecture institute.

National Conditions and International Context

The wide support for the foundation of a projective architecture institute in the Netherlands indicated a significant reversal in the previously predominant conception of an architecture museum. The limitations of the reflective model employed by the *NDB* were becoming abundantly clear, and there was a growing aspiration among staff and management to develop the documentation center into a progressive architecture institute. While there were early signs that the Dutch documentation center had the potential to be more than a passive repository of architectural knowledge, a full realization only came about with the confrontation with the international development of museums in other countries. Thus, the decision to establish a projective architecture institute in the Netherlands was not just a significant reversal of past policies, but also resulted from a combination of increasingly visible national conditions and an ever-expanding—and quickly changing—international context for architecture museums. While the quality of Dutch architecture was increasingly being questioned, across Europe and beyond a new crop of architecture museums and institutes were founded to foster a greater appreciation of architecture, and allow the discipline to engage with a wider audience.

Searching Architectural Quality

Beyond stimulating a greater appreciation of the discipline and assisting in the preservation of architectural knowledge, the proposed architecture institute was intended to “offer an indispensable contribution to the development of an awareness for [architectural] quality among

the general public.”⁵⁹¹ This was a significant point for the Ministry of Culture, since even though “quality was a very fluid term with a lot of interpretations,” it was increasingly perceived—and agreed—that “the quality of the built environment was fading away.”⁵⁹² Thus, the ability of the architecture institute to foster an improvement in the quality of Dutch architecture was crucial to garner the government’s support for its establishment. While not intending to become an arbiter of taste or pass judgment on what constituted quality in architecture, the government intended to create the necessary conditions for greater architecture quality to emerge, to which the architecture institute would be a crucial instrument.⁵⁹³

The observed lack of quality in Dutch architecture and urban centers was easily traced back to the basic approach to architecture in the postwar period. In response to the housing shortage caused by World War II, the Dutch government had funded and developed large-scale projects of satellite dormitory cities in which the pragmatic issues such as the amount of housing units, maximization of infrastructure and distance to existing cities were the driving concerns. The result of these “rationalizations of the building process was, according to critics, monotonous suburbs with almost the same blocks of flats and terraced houses everywhere in the Netherlands.”⁵⁹⁴ In creating entire new towns, the focus of the government had been quantity rather than quality, and it was now time to address that imbalance.⁵⁹⁵

⁵⁹¹ N. A. den Haan-Groen and R. R. de Haas, “Advies van de Rijkscommissie Voor de Musea Aan de Minister van WVC over Oprichting van Een Architectuurinstituut 1989,” December 16, 1982, 18, SAMU 94.

⁵⁹² Brinkman, interview.

⁵⁹³ J. Riezenkamp, “Toespraak van de Plv. Directeur-Generaal Culturele Zaken, Drs. J. Riezenkamp Namens de Minister van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur, Mr. Drs. L.C. Brinkman Ter Gelegenheid van de Opening Biennale Jonge Nederlandse Architecten Bij Het Nederlands Documentatiecentrum Te Amsterdam Op 22 September 1983 Om 11.30 Uur.,” September 22, 1983, 3, NDBK 235.

⁵⁹⁴ Hans Ibelings, *20th Century Architecture in the Netherlands* (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1995), 111.

⁵⁹⁵ This approach to architecture resulted in the construction of a substantial number of new housing units, in an unprecedented volume, with *Stichting Wonen* having calculated in 1986 that “over 70 per cent of the built environment in the Netherlands had been created since World War II. By the year 2000 that figure had reached over 75 per cent.” Bart Lootsma, “The Second Modernity of Dutch Architecture,” in *SuperDutch: New Architecture in the Netherlands* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2000), 9–11.

Furthermore, following the impetus towards the rationalization of processes in the 1950s and 60s, the 1970s were also marked by a further removal of architects from the process of construction. Under the guise of building community consensus, residents' committees, local politicians, and a myriad of consultants increasingly displaced architects in the design process. The resulting architectural expression was deliberately designed to be of "small scale in character, with an emphasis on the individual house, even if it formed part of a larger development."⁵⁹⁶ As a myriad of proto-humanist structures of fragmented geometries were built around introspective cul-de-sacs, an architecture of dubious quality came to dominate cityscapes across the Netherlands.⁵⁹⁷

However, the development of a resilient institutional framework to foster the emergence of architectural quality in the Netherlands was not only motivated by the recent past, but also by the near future of Dutch architecture. As Dutch society was transitioning from a welfare state to a neo-liberal economy in the early 1980s, policies of privatization and deregulation were looming over architecture and spatial planning which exacerbated the urgency in promoting architectural quality. Specifically, the "privatization of public housing and the shift towards providing buildings for administrative or other public functions simply by renting office space" implied the loss of "two exceptionally powerful policy instruments, the one quantitative and the other qualitative, to promote architectonic quality."⁵⁹⁸ As the government was relinquishing these important policy instruments, it intended to "ensure a high-quality architectural climate [was] established" through the support of institutions such as the proposed architecture institute, effectively shifting the

⁵⁹⁶ Ibid., 12.

⁵⁹⁷ In 2004, in association with an exhibition at the NAI, Martien de Vletter authored a fundamental volume analyzing the conditions and specificity of 1970s Dutch architectural expression in social, cultural and formal terms, through a combination of critical essays and documentation of representative projects from that period. See Martien de Vletter, *The Critical Seventies: Architecture and Urban Planning in the Netherlands 1968-1982* (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 2004).

⁵⁹⁸ Ole Bouman, "The Rise and Fall of SuperDutch," *Volume*, no. 5 (2005): 27.

government's policy from "a position of action and prescription to one of persuasion and influence."⁵⁹⁹

The urgency to improve the quality of Dutch architecture was also increasingly noticeable, as "a greater awareness of quality" was demanded by "developments in publications and public opinion in recent years."⁶⁰⁰ Specifically, in 1977, in an attempt to constitute a list of "Top 10" buildings in Rotterdam and launch the basis for an architectural guide of the city, the Architecture Section of the Rotterdam Arts Council (*Rotterdamse Kunststichting, sectie Architectuur*) introduced the *Keurmeesterproject* (inspection project). For this "inspection project," three foreign architectural critics were invited to review twenty-two postwar buildings in Rotterdam, with the compilation of their lists also offering an assessment of the state of architecture in that city. With some notable exceptions, the critics were appalled. While diverging in their specific analysis of the city's architecture, Kenneth Frampton, Stanislaw von Moos, and Francesco Dal Co agreed in their negative assessment regarding the small scale and introspection expressed by most of the selected buildings.⁶⁰¹ According to the foreign critics, the legacy of early modern works such as the *Van Nelle Fabriek* and *De Kiefhoek* had been almost but lost in the architectural practices that dominated the Netherlands in the post-war period.⁶⁰² With this high-profile episode the dismal state of Dutch architecture was embarrassingly, and very publicly, exposed.

⁵⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 28.

⁶⁰⁰ Haan-Groen and Haas, "Advies van de Rijkscommissie Voor de Musea Aan de Minister van WVC over Oprichting van Een Architectuurinstituut 1989," 18.

⁶⁰¹ Given difficulties in the accurate translation of the critics' essays, the full assessment of the three foreign critics was only published in September 1979 in a *Wonen TABK* special double-issue dedicated to the *Keurmeesterproject*, accompanying a symposium in September 26 to which the three critics were the most noted absences. See "Keurmeestersproject," *Wonen TABK*, no. 16–17 (September 1979).

⁶⁰² To commemorate the thirty years of the initiative, in 2007 the project was re-enacted as "Reviewing Rotterdam" by asking three foreign critics (Michael Speaks, Angelika Schnell, and Jaime Salazar) to evaluate twenty-five buildings built since the first *Keurmeesterproject* in 1977. See Wijnand Galema and Piet Vollaard, eds., *Rotterdam Herzien: Dertig Jaar Architectuur 1977 - 2007* (Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2007).

Suddenly, it was evident that previous approaches to architecture were completely depleted and a radical shift was necessary to recover the previous standing of Dutch architecture. Establishing the proposed architecture institute was just the first step in the government's renewed support for the discipline, institutionalizing its new approach to architecture as not just an economic, but also a cultural and social activity.

Learning from Abroad

The visit of the three foreign critics to Rotterdam in 1977 did not only reveal the troubles afflicting Dutch architecture, but also a possible course of action to address those ailments. At the root of problem was a structural disconnect between Dutch architectural culture and international architectural circles. Thus, while multifaceted, the response to the now uncomfortably visible crisis of architectural quality relied on instigating a sustained confrontation between Dutch architecture and its international counterparts. From the commission of new public buildings to the definition of the new architecture institute, after a long period of self-imposed isolation, Dutch architecture was now intent in experiencing a renewed openness to international influences.

The same section which had organized the 1977 *Keurmeesterproject* rehearsed in 1982 the first open response to the concerns raised by it. In celebration of the first decade of the Rotterdam Arts Council, the Architecture Section directed by architects Carel Weeber and Umberto Barbieri organized a cultural event with the specific purpose of enhancing the "cultural dimension of building in the Netherlands today."⁶⁰³ This "resulted in the AIR festival '*De Kop van Zuid*', a cultural milestone in Rotterdam's resurrection as capital city of international architecture."⁶⁰⁴ While the

⁶⁰³ Umberto Barbieri, *De Kop van Zuid: Ontwerp En Onderzoek*, Architecture International Rotterdam (Rotterdam: Rotterdamse Kunststichting Uitgeverij, 1982), 12.

⁶⁰⁴ Ed Taverne and Cor Wagenaar, "Between Elite and Mass: 010 and the Rise of the Architecture Industry in the Netherlands," in *20 Jaar 010: 1983-2003*, ed. Hans Oldewarris and Peter de Winter (Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2003), 52.

architectural festival was comprised by a wide range of activities—from symposia and debates to publications and exhibitions—its central element was the invitation of internationally renowned foreign architects to formulate proposals for the vacant docklands on the southern bank of the *Maas* River around *De Kop van Zuid*.

The invitation of Aldo Rossi, O.M. Ungers, J.P. Kleihues, Derek Walker, and Richard Meier (who dropped out and never submitted any proposal) to produce eloquent visions for the future development of Rotterdam marked a turning point in Dutch architecture by challenging the existing condition in which “the process counted for more than the resulting urban image.”⁶⁰⁵ Moreover, by presciently fomenting the connection between Dutch and international architecture, the festival marked the start of a period in which “imported luminaires” reinvigorated Dutch architectural culture, and was thus true to its name of “Architecture International Rotterdam.”⁶⁰⁶ Beyond successfully engaging the general public with architecture and drawing large crowds to its activities, the first AIR is mostly remembered for instrumentalizing foreign architects to confront the vacuum in which Dutch architecture and urban planning existed.⁶⁰⁷

⁶⁰⁵ Hans van Dijk, “Urban Restructuring,” in *Twentieth-Century Architecture in the Netherlands* (Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1999), 168.

⁶⁰⁶ Another significant outcome of AIR was the foundation of 010 Publishers, a Rotterdam publishing house (010 directly references the telephone area code of the city) dedicated to architecture and urban planning. While all AIR publications were published by the Rotterdam Arts Council, they were produced by the two founders of the publishers, Hans Oldewarris and Peter de Winter, thus instigating them to establish their own publishers. Once the festival was over, and 010 Publishers was officially founded on April 1983, all of the publications produced for AIR were passed to the newly formed 010 Publishers, which included volumes on Giuseppe Terragni, harbor architecture, the *Internationale Bauausstellung* in Berlin, and the festival publication combining historical research with the four design proposals for the Kop van der Zuid. Hans Oldewarris and Peter de Winter, “Introduction,” in *20 Jaar 010: 1983-2003* (Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2003), 12.

⁶⁰⁷ While still unpublished, David Mohny has been researching the impact of AIR in Dutch architecture, namely with “Rising on AIR: The Role of Architecture International Rotterdam (AIR) in Elevating Public and Professional Expectations about Design in the Netherlands.” See David Mohny, “The Rise of Rotterdam: The First Decade of AIR,” *Hunch: The Berlage Institute Report*, no. 14 (Summer 2010): 116–125.

In order to overcome the vacuum in Dutch architecture, local politicians adopted a similar response and invited leading foreign architects to design municipal buildings across the Netherlands. This response was particularly embraced by aldermen affiliated with the *PvdA* (*Partij van de Arbeid*, the Dutch Labour Party) from Maastricht in the South to Groningen in the North. By awarding commissions to foreign architects, local city councils attempted to not only affect the quality of the architecture being built, but also modify the existing dynamics of architectural design in the Netherlands. Beyond merely improving the quality of architecture and the built environment of their cities, these commissions intended to establish a dialogue between local and foreign architects and thus challenge Dutch architects to develop similar high-standards in their designs. By the end of the 1980s, the number of foreign architects working in the Netherlands amounted to a full-on invasion.⁶⁰⁸

Across the Netherlands, no one embodied this response better than Adri Duivesteijn, the alderman for urban renewal and urban planning in The Hague. Very explicitly, Duivesteijn intended to elevate urban renewal projects and the construction of new municipal buildings to the level of cultural activities (even if sometimes that meant a certain incongruity of commissions). After having already commissioned the Portuguese Álvaro Siza Vieira to design a couple of social housing buildings in the *Schilderswijk* neighborhood,⁶⁰⁹ Duivesteijn approached the Spanish Ricardo Bofill for

⁶⁰⁸ The term “invasion” was originally employed by Bernard Colenbrander in an article discussing the impact of foreign architects in the country. In the same article for the second issue of the “Architecture in the Netherlands Yearbook,” Colenbrander provides a list of foreign architects who “have been asked for a plan, or have landed commissions or have already completed buildings” in the previous years, namely: “Helmut Jahn in Amsterdam and Rotterdam, Josef Paul Kleihues in Groningen, Alvaro Siza in The Hague, Ricardo Bofill in The Hague, Charles Vandenhove in Maastricht and The Hague, Lucien Kroll in Haarlem and The Hague, Richard Meier in The Hague, Skidmore Owings and Merrill in The Hague, Norman Foster in The Hague, Rob Krier in The Hague, Giancarlo DeCarlo in The Hague, Alessandro Mendini in Groningen, Luigi Snozzi in Rotterdam, Maastricht and Scheveningen, Robert Stem in Voorschoten and as temporary front runner Aldo Rossi, with projects in Maastricht, The Hague, Rotterdam and Zaanstad. See Bernard Colenbrander, “The Attractiveness of Strangers,” in *Architecture in the Netherlands: Yearbook 1988-1989* (Deventer: Van Loghum Slaterus, 1989), 11.

another housing project.⁶⁰⁹ At the same time, Duivesteijn also invited the Italian Aldo Rossi to devise a masterplan for the site of the former municipal abattoir and the Berlin-based Luxembourgian Robert Krier to design and direct the master plan for *De Resident* area.⁶¹⁰ Duivesteijn's crowning accomplishment was the organization of a limited international competition for the design of a new building for The Hague's city hall, awarded to the American Richard Meier, which operated as a magnet to the redevelopment of the entire *Spui* area.

Despite the initial resistance by some Dutch architects, the intense dialogue between foreign and Dutch architects stimulated by the influx of foreign architectural expertise was beneficial for Dutch architecture. As Dutch architectural offices acted as local supervising architects for internationally renowned designers, the level of architectural discourse and practice in the Netherlands was reinvigorated. Even though not all projects designed by foreign architects were completed nor successful, Dutch architecture still gained from their contribution.

The outward reach of Dutch architecture was further established when some of its most promising young practitioners moved abroad to complete their education. Ben van Berkel's time in London at the Architectural Association (AA) and later in Zurich at Santiago Calatrava's studio became merely the most visible expression of that condition.⁶¹¹

International Confederation of Architecture Museums (ICAM)

The increasing exchange between Dutch architecture and its international counterparts was not limited to architecture practice but was also revealed in the *NDB's* shift towards a projective architecture institute. Arguably, the most significant element in the *NDB's* growing awareness of the

⁶⁰⁹ Hans van Dijk, "Architecture: Formal Morality," in *Architecture in the Netherlands: Yearbook 1987-1988* (Deventer: Van Loghum Slaterus, 1988), 7.

⁶¹⁰ Dijk, "Urban Restructuring," 168.

⁶¹¹ Ben van Berkel graduated with Honours from the AA in 1987, following in the footsteps of Rem Koolhaas, who studied at the Architectural Association between 1968 and 1972.

conditions and objectives of other architecture museums beyond the Dutch borders was the establishment of the International Confederation of Architecture Museums (ICAM) in 1979 with the *NDB* and the *Monumentenzorg* among its founding members.

According to Juhani Pallasmaa, who organized the first ICAM conference in Helsinki, the idea to establish an organization of architecture museums emerged during the ceremonious opening of the Pompidou Center in Paris on January, 1977. During informal conversations among attendees, it became evident that several new museums of architecture were being launched in various countries, and that it “would probably be beneficial for both the established and emerging museums to meet and possibly have an organization of sorts for future contact and collaborations.”⁶¹² Upon securing funding for a first conference, the organizing committee of the Museum of Finnish Architecture (MFA) identified fifty architecture institutions that were either in existence or being planned, and invited them to participate in the first “International Conference of Architecture Museums.”

Of the fifty institutions invited, only twenty-five (from fifteen countries) attended the first Conference in Helsinki, including the *NDB* and the *Monumentenzorg* respectively represented by Dick van Woerkom and by Rob de Jong.⁶¹³ In the five days of the meeting (August 20 to 25, 1979) the participating institutions established the foundations for the budding organization. After unanimously agreeing that “further cooperation between the institutions should be pursued and that international conferences between architecture museums and other related institutions should continue to be organized,” the delegates debated and ratified the ICAM’s mission statement, charter, and statutes, which have remained in effect (with very little changes) ever since.⁶¹⁴ Also the name of

⁶¹² Juhani Pallasmaa, “ICAM 30 Years, The Founding of a Confederation,” *ICAM Print* 3 (December 2009): 4.

⁶¹³ ICAM, “ICAM 1 List of Attendees,” August 1979, NDBK 311.

⁶¹⁴ Pallasmaa, “ICAM 30 Years, The Founding of a Confederation,” 4.

the organization was settled, with the title “Confederation” being adopted in order to better describe the loose-knit character of its member-institutions.⁶¹⁵ Even as they were only formalized in subsequent years, other strategic decisions for the future of the organization were also initiated at the ICAM’s opening conference, namely the affiliation with the International Council of Museums (ICOM), the existing network of museums and museum professionals, and the collaboration with the International Council on Archives (ICA), which already had a working group investigating standards for the handling and storage of architectural records.

The ICAM’s first meeting also established the model for subsequent conferences, namely with a series of working sessions, presentation of papers and discussions on “the issues of managing collections, preserving architectural records and organizing exhibitions,” complemented by an official address positioning the host institution within the framework of its national structures, and concluded with “a general assembly to discuss organizational matters and vote on new members and board positions.”⁶¹⁶

More importantly, that first conference in Helsinki firmly established the ICAM as a fundamental instrument for knowledge-exchange among architecture museums. As an open forum where the different representatives shared their experience and insight to the working conditions and ambitions of their institutions, ICAM “offered a lot of expertise and a future network of great value.”⁶¹⁷ Beyond lectures and panel discussions, “the networking that took place between the members of ICAM” created and strengthened a community both on an institutional and personal level, helping institutions to learn and grow from one another’s experience.⁶¹⁸

⁶¹⁵ ICAM, “ICAM Charter,” August 22, 1979, 1.

⁶¹⁶ Giral, “International Confederation of Architectural Museums, A History,” 8, 12.

⁶¹⁷ Elisabeth Seip and Dietmar Steiner, “ICAM Conferences, A Retrospective View,” *ICAM Print* 3 (December 2009): 16.

⁶¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 27.

With the establishment of the ICAM, the *NDB's* exchange with the international community was greatly accelerated. Effectively, through the ICAM, the dominant conception of an architecture in the Netherlands was confronted with the different reality beyond its borders. Thus, the *NDB's*—and the *Monumentenzorg's*—view on the architecture museum was greatly expanded, since the most progressive institutions at the ICAM were not intent on passively reflecting the discipline, but rather actively engaging with its development.

The parallel thinking of the ICAM's discussions and the evolution of the *NDB's* conception of an architecture museum was soon revealed. As the idea of establishing an architecture institute in the Netherlands began to form, the activities and discussions at ICAM became particularly enthusing, since “the contact with other museums was a constant source of inspiration” and informed the development of the proposed institute.⁶¹⁹ In 1982 the *NDB* produced a policy memorandum to forcefully advocate the constitution of an architecture institute “in which incentives can be developed to build better environments,” which closely paralleled the first article of the ICAM's charter “to raise the quality of the built environment.”⁶²⁰ The remaining articles of the ICAM charter were equally expressed in the policy memorandum in one form or another, including the ambition to “stimulate and receive public response in the appreciation and understanding of architecture;” to “foster critical attitude towards architecture;” to “monitor and record the whereabouts of architectural records and aid in their preservation;” and to “to exchange information by means of publications, exhibitions, films and other media.”⁶²¹

The parallelism between the ICAM charter and the proposed Dutch architecture institute was further expressed, as ICAM's stated purpose (identified in its charter article 6) to “expand

⁶¹⁹ Platzer, “Interview with Mariet Willinge,” 48.

⁶²⁰ Dick van Woerkom, “Nota Het Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedenbouw (NIAS),” April 18, 1982, 4, NDBK 35. ICAM, “ICAM Charter,” 1.

⁶²¹ ICAM, “ICAM Charter,” 1., articles 2, 3, 5, and 7.

understanding of cultural continuity and its environmental context through the knowledge of history as a source of information and inspiration in the field of architectural practice,” was adapted to the institute’s early motto defined of “history as the source of inspiration for the contemporary design task.”⁶²² Beyond a simple passive repository, the *NDB* had the potential to become a much more active institution in shaping the discipline by becoming a proper architecture institute. But if the ICAM-sponsored exchange with other architecture museums informed the development of a new institute, it also validated Fons Asselbergs original intention to transform the *NDB* from a removed archive to an engaged museum.⁶²³

The parallel thinking and mutual influence of the *NDB* and the ICAM was unsurprising, since the documentation center and its manager were active members of the international organization since its inception. In ICAM’s second meeting in London 1981, Dick van Woerkom was appointed co-chair of the newly constituted “Committee for the Location of Architectural Records” with Catha Rambushch of the Avery Study Centre for American Architecture at Columbia University.⁶²⁴ Since this committee intended to “compile an international catalog of architectural records” through the combination of national inventories, van Woerkom’s appointment recognized the *NDB*’s had

⁶²² Ibid. Brouwers, “The NAI - The History of a Design Task,” 72.

⁶²³ Fons Asselbergs intention to transform the *NDB* from an architecture archive only concerned with documentation and collection of architecture into a proper architecture museum also engaged with the presentation and dissemination of architecture was at the origin of his dispute with the *Monumentenzorg*’s management. Along with his own political ambitions, these problems with the *Monumentenzorg* and his deteriorating relationship with Van Woerkom were decisive factors in Asselbergs’ resignation from the *NDB*. For more on this episode, see the previous chapter of this dissertation.

⁶²⁴ Three new committees were established in the London meeting, and the other two were the “Committee for Standards for the Care of Architectural Records,” chaired by Dorothy Ahlgren (Canada) and Susan Stein (USA) and the “Committee for Cooperation in Exhibitions, with John Zukowsky (USA) and Jean Dethier (France) as chairpersons. John Harris, “Report of ICAM 2 Conference Proceedings,” April 1981, 4, NAI Archive: NDBK 312: “Stukken betreffende het congres ICAM II gehouden in 1981 in Londen, 1980-1981.”

significant expertise from their experience in composing a national inventory of Dutch architectural records (or documents).⁶²⁵

The *NDB*'s presence and involvement with ICAM became more visible in 1984, as the documentation center hosted in Amsterdam the organization's third conference after initial plans to organize the conference in Moscow failed in the previous year. Under the tutelage of the *NDB*, ICAM 3 was primarily focused on the cataloguing of architectural collections and the introduction of new techniques in architectural archives. For the first time, "an entire day was dedicated to a variety of approaches to cataloguing and creating data bases of architectural information" with several demonstrations of the use of electronic media for organizing and retrieving material.⁶²⁶

More telling, however, was how in Amsterdam it was first introduced the idea of creating a code of ethics for the acquisition of architectural drawings and documents that could regulate how ICAM member institutions were to respect one another interests regarding drawing collections. The issue became a priority in the ICAM's agenda, as members were increasingly concerned that "rich institutions in one part of the world could buy drawings and drawing collections related to buildings in other parts of the world."⁶²⁷ The concern that Dutch architectural archives could be purchased by foreign institutions had been a main argument for establishing the *NDB* and garnering governmental support in the early 1970s, but it was also an increasing preoccupation of the documentation center.⁶²⁸ As early *NDB* collaborator Bernard Colenbrander remarked, "to collect

⁶²⁵ ICAM, "Project Document on Architectural Records," December 1981, 2, NAI Archive: NDBK 312: "Stukken betreffende het congres ICAM II gehouden in 1981 in Londen, 1980-1981."

⁶²⁶ Giral, "International Confederation of Architectural Museums, A History," 15.

⁶²⁷ Jöran Lindvall, "13 Years with the ICAM Board," *ICAM Print* 3 (December 2009): 29.

⁶²⁸ In the first Draft for a Dutch Institute for Architecture and Urbanism the same argument was used, namely that "several foreign architecture museums are interested in purchasing material from Dutch architects," but the establishment of a "Dutch architecture museum would be able to counteract the force pulling this material abroad." Werkgroep WVC-VROM, "Ontwerp Voor Een Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedenbouw," December 1, 1984, 5, NDBK 399.

material in the Netherlands was a kind of a trend at the time,” specifically to purchase singular “beautiful drawings” which threatened the integrity of the archives.⁶²⁹

The ability to place the *NDB*'s concern on the ICAM's agenda was particularly important, since the documentation center was involved in an ongoing dispute with the “Getty [Center] and the CCA, because both had bought J.J.P. Oud material at auction and in some cases [the *NDB*] even suspected that the origin of this material was theft.”⁶³⁰ The ICAM's Code of Ethics was debated in subsequent meetings, being first accepted at ICAM 5 hosted by the CCA in Montreal in 1989 (October 1 to 6). However, it was “quite clear that some institutions with great financial resources were not quite satisfied with this decision and that some poor European institutions found that the Code of Ethics was far too weak [sic].”⁶³¹

However, before the end of the Amsterdam meeting, the *NDB*'s—and the future Dutch architecture institute's—commitment to and presence in ICAM was further strengthened with the appointment of not just Dick van Woerkom, but also Ruud Brouwers (of *Stichting Wonen*) to the Executive Committee of the organization.⁶³² The engagement of both organizations continued in subsequent years, as Ruud Brouwers was both editor of the newsletter *ICAM News* and treasurer of

⁶²⁹ Colenbrander, interview.

⁶³⁰ Even though the suspicions of theft were particularly compelling (since Oud only had an office in his home), the *NDB* was unsuccessful with this dispute with the CCA holding in its collections almost two hundred drawings of Dutch provenance, including not only drawings by J.J.P. Oud, but also the Amsterdam School, Mart Stam, H.P. Berlage and Theo van Doesburg. Canadian Centre for Architecture, “The Collections,” in *Centre Canadien d'Architecture: Les Débuts, 1979-1984* (Montreal: Canadian Centre for Architecture, 1984), 120. Colenbrander, however, recalls how the attempted purchase of J.J.P. Oud's drawings and models by Heinrich Klotz, director of the *Deutsches Architektur Museum* (German Architecture Museum, or *DAM*) was thwarted. Colenbrander, interview.

⁶³¹ Lindvall, “13 Years with the ICAM Board,” 29. The Code of Ethics has since then been revisited, namely in ICAM 11 hosted by the *Architekturzentrum Wien* (Architecture Center Vienna) in Vienna in 2002

⁶³² ICAM, “ICAM 3 Report of Conference Proceedings,” September 1984, NDBK 300. The list of members of the ICAM Committee in the commemorative ICAM Print 3 not only erroneously states that Brouwers was a member of that Committee since 1982, but also misspelled Van Woerkom's name.

the organization between 1989 and 1997, and Mariet Willinge, the second in command at the *NDB*, still is ICAM's longest serving Secretary General, a position she has held since 1998.

As the ICAM became increasingly established, so did the idea to merge the existing *NDB* with *Stichting Wonen* and create a modern architecture institute in the Netherlands. Thus, the foundation of the ICAM occurred at a crucial point in the establishment of a Dutch architecture institute and quickly became a fundamental resource for its instigators. Through the ICAM, representatives of the *NDB*, *SAM*, and *Stichting Wonen* learned about the experiences of other architecture museums, informing their merger discussions and plans for the future institute. While the exchange within the ICAM structure was greatly valued, the insight into the difficulties and ambitions of newly founded architecture museums and their approach to the discipline was most compelling. Following the general mood within Dutch architectural circles at the time, also the constitution of the Dutch architecture institute was to be subject to foreign influences.

A Benchmarking Exercise

The dynamic international context of architecture museums in general, and the insights provided by ICAM conferences and contacts had a tremendous influence in the preparation of the future Netherlands Architecture Institute. Among the clearest expressions of that influence was the publication in June 1985 of a special double issue of the journal *Wonen TABK* by *Stichting Wonen*, one of the institutions being merged to form the new institute. This special double issue was dedicated to presenting and assessing a variety architecture museums across Europe and the United States, and comment on the state of the process in the Netherlands.⁶³³ Thus, the practices and objectives of architecture museums in England, Finland, France, Switzerland, Germany, and the

⁶³³ Specifically, beyond establishing an international benchmark, this issue of *Wonen TA/BK* was also used to garner support for *Stichting Wonen*'s position in resistance to the establishment of the architecture museum in Rotterdam, as it will be discussed in the subsequent section "The Amsterdam-Rotterdam dispute."

United States were analyzed and compiled in a comprehensive benchmarking exercise. Through the observations of these foreign examples, it becomes clear that issues of staffing, funding, policies, objectives and activities were some of the major concerns in the preparatory discussions. Moreover, a close analysis of these observations also reveals how the Dutch institute was modeled on several of these institutions, combining features from different international reference-institutions.

While conventional narrative has essentially established the Dutch architecture institute to have been modeled extensively on the *Deutsches Architekturmuseum (DAM)*, the most visible architecture museum of the period, this issue of *Wonen TABK* proves this an oversimplification.⁶³⁴ Instead, it suggests the institute to have been modeled not only on the *DAM*, but also on other architecture museums and institutions like the RIBA (Royal Institute of British Architects) in London, or the *Suomen Rakennustaide Museo* (Museum of Finnish Architecture, MFA) in Helsinki. Several themes and considerations that became central to the Dutch institute's organization and policies were already present (and common) in many of the examined institutions, from the importance of reaching a wide audience to the support of talented young architects. However, this analysis served primarily to highlight specific issues in the organization and everyday functioning of an architecture museum, which would be greatly considered in the foundation of the NAI.

For example, the review of both German examples (Bauhaus Archive in Berlin and the *DAM* in Frankfurt) commented on the institutions' buildings. While Berlin served as a cautionary tale of inadequate conditions which created several obstacles to ambitious exhibitions and that could exhaust the resources of any organization, Frankfurt showed how a remarkable building could

⁶³⁴ Several have professed this misconception, most clearly and notably Bart Lootsma, "Forgotten Worlds, Possible Worlds," in *The Art of Architecture Exhibitions*, ed. Kristin Feireiss (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 2001), 16–24.

articulate the concept of an institution and enhance almost immediately its notoriety. The positive influence of captivating regular patrons was also explicit in Berlin. A welcoming atmosphere with an inviting cafeteria and a tasteful library appealed to visitors and compelled them to become “supporting members” with yearly fees.⁶³⁵ Such system would eventually be implemented in Rotterdam as the Leliman Association, which would even refine the model to establish a class system of members, donors, patrons and special patrons. Likewise, the *DAM*’s emphasis on models for the articulation of architecture to a wide audience (in stark contrast with several other museums that only collected drawings and/or photographs) set another important example for the Dutch institute. While not limiting its architectural archive to models, the NAI also paid close attention to the “visual presentation of architecture.”⁶³⁶ Beyond its new building, the *DAM*’s engagement with international debate was also identified as another main reason for the German museum’s early success. This too would become a leading focus at the NAI, albeit in a significantly different format.⁶³⁷

While the *DAM*’s international orientation did not privilege German architecture in any way, the NAI adopted an international engagement more akin, yet more forceful, to the approach of the MFA in Helsinki. Much like its Finnish counterpart, the NAI promoted international architecture locally and local architecture abroad. Moreover, like the Helsinki museum, the NAI would go on to produce a television series and publish a Yearbook of national architecture, both intended for architecture to reach a wider audience.⁶³⁸ Most strikingly, however, the very organization model—a

⁶³⁵ Ruud Brouwers, “Berlijn: Bauhaus Archiv,” *Wonen TABK*, no. 11–12 (June 1985): 23.

⁶³⁶ Werkgroep NAI, “Schets Beleidsplan Architectuur-Instituut,” September 1986, 3, NAI archief: NDBK 420: “Schets Beleidsplan Architectuur-Instituut, 1986.” The parallel between the visual criticism employed by the *DAM* and the NAI, and how it resonated some of Tafuri’s theoretical constructs regarding architecture history is further elaborated and discussed in a subsequent section of this chapter. See “Criticality in the Architecture Institute.”

⁶³⁷ Marc Dubois, “Frankfurt: Deutsches Architektur Museum,” *Wonen TABK*, no. 11–12 (June 1985): 26.”

⁶³⁸ In the autumn of 1993, a series of eight television shows entitled “*Architectuur in Nederland*” was produced by the institute and aired on Dutch national television, while *Architecture in the Netherlands*

foundation run by a board with daily operations being managed by a museum director—and the funding arrangement—with the state being responsible for the larger portion and the rest originating from the host city and ticket proceeds—eventually used by the Dutch institute, were in fact reminiscent of the Finnish Museum.⁶³⁹ Essentially, the MFA became a significant reference to the NAI regarding the most pragmatic considerations, namely organization, funding and basic operations.

If the Finnish Museum demonstrated how an architecture museum could be almost fully funded by the central government and remain independent, the *Institut Français d'Architecture* offered a stark contrast. By being closely associated with the political structures, the *IFA*'s fate was always volatile. The uncertainty of each election cycle endangered the funding and staffing of the *IFA*, which paralyzed the institute for several months at a time and prevented it from adopting a truly critical stance regarding the architectural and heritage policies of the government.⁶⁴⁰ Conversely, the Basel *Architekturmuseum* and the RIBA Drawings Collection and Library enjoyed complete political independence, as their funding was secured from private contributions.⁶⁴¹ Both would influence the NAI in different ways: the Basel museum through its production of exhibitions that challenged both the boundaries of architecture and the 'exhibition' medium; and the RIBA through its archival policy and management of complete archives.

Archival and acquisition policies diverged considerably among the analyzed architecture museums and institutes. It ranged from a complete lack of archives, to collections composed by only

Yearbook has been published every year since 1988. Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, "NAi Jaarverslag 1993," 1994, 74–75.

⁶³⁹ Carel van Bruggen, "Helsinki: Suomen Rakennustaitteen Museo," *Wonen TABK*, no. 11–12 (June 1985): 17.

⁶⁴⁰ Hans van Dijk, "Paris: Institut Francais d'Architecture," *Wonen TABK*, no. 11–12 (June 1985): 19.

⁶⁴¹ Bernard Colenbrander, "Londen: RIBA - Drawings Collection En British Architectural Library," *Wonen TABK*, no. 11–12 (June 1985): 14; Dorothy Huber, "Bazel: Architekturmuseum," *Wonen TABK*, no. 11–12 (June 1985): 20.

photographs and drawings, to collections composed by discrete representative projects, to collections of comprehensive archives. Following the practice established by the *NDB*, the NAI would adopt the latter, engaging in a 'process-driven' approach to architecture, of which its collection of comprehensive archives was a central element. Given the NAI's focus on comprehensive archives and research on ways to make them culturally productive, the absence of the similar minded Canadian Centre for Architecture in Montreal from this comparative analysis becomes even more noticeable. Perhaps due to logistical difficulties, or perhaps simply because the center was not yet open to the general public, the CCA was not included in this double issue of *Wonen TABK*.

However, just like the institutions discussed included in this comparative analysis, the CCA was equally, if not more, influential in the preparation and development of the Netherlands Architecture Institute. Both institutions not only adopted similar archival policies, but were also committed to the idea that architecture is a public concern, which must be positioned within a broader societal context, or "the cultural dimension of architecture."⁶⁴² Moreover, the CCA was the only architecture institute or museum to be directly referred in the preparatory material of the Dutch institute, as it was presented as "the only example of a full and complete formulation of an architecture institute to date."⁶⁴³

Beyond any particular example, the international context in general where several architecture museums were being established was also constantly identified as an important incentive for the

⁶⁴² The intellectual positioning and general approach to the discipline sponsored by the Canadian center was shared by the Dutch institute. The connection between these institutions intellectual project and Tafuri's conception of architecture's history's expression of criticality will be argued in the following section "Criticality in the Architecture Institute."

⁶⁴³ Werkgroep NAI, "Brochure Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur, Stedebouw En Landschaaparchitectuur," May 1987, 2, NDBK 414. While used internally, the section on the CCA was not present in the final iteration of this document.

establishment of a Dutch architecture institute. This was presented as both a challenge and an opportunity, since it both threatened the poaching of Dutch architectural heritage by foreign museums and validated a growing interest in architecture as a cultural expression.⁶⁴⁴

In the preparatory work towards a Dutch architecture institute, there was not just a clear guidance from international examples, but also a continuous concern with engaging the international community. Such concern was revealed in a variety of manners, including the description of the director's profile which particularly emphasized the position's role in developing international relations with other museums and be an active participant within the ICAM.⁶⁴⁵ The proposed institute's international orientation was further exposed in its first policy plan. As this document included the objectives and activities of the institute's functions for the subsequent five and ten years, most of them involved some sort of international engagement. This was particularly noticeable in "presentation activities," as exhibitions made in the institute were to be used first to "establish international contacts," and later be "fully included in the international circuit" of travelling exhibitions, while the institute's journal was to "expand its international subscriber base."⁶⁴⁶ Even discussions regarding the official title of the institute were revealing of the institute's concern with international engagement from the very start. Specifically, while in the first joint preparatory talk all three merging partners rejected the title 'museum' for 'institute,' it was suggested that whatever the final title was, its "abbreviation should be workable in English."⁶⁴⁷

⁶⁴⁴ Werkgroep WVC-VROM, "Ontwerp Voor Een Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedenbouw," December 1, 1984, 5; Elco Brinkman, "Speech by the Minister for Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs at the Opening of the Third International Conference of Architectural Museums," September 18, 1984, 3, NDBK 391. The threat of foreign museums acquiring Dutch material that was unappreciated in the Netherlands had already been used by the SAM to convince the government to establish the NDB in 1971

⁶⁴⁵ Werkgroep NAI, "Functieomschrijving Directeur Architectuur Instituut," November 21, 1986, 2, NDBK 414.

⁶⁴⁶ Werkgroep NAI, "Schets Beleidsplan Architectuur-Instituut," September 1986, 6, NDBK 420.

⁶⁴⁷ Werkgroep WVC-VROM, "Verslag van Het Overlegt over Een Op Te Richten Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedenbouw," March 29, 1984, 6, NDBK 391.

While all the institutions analyzed in *Women TABK's* benchmarking exercise (and all the institutions in ICAM) contributed to the definition of the NAI's practical edification, the newly established Canadian Centre for Architecture in Montreal (1979) and the German Architecture Museum in Frankfurt (1978) became the two most important models in shaping the conceptual framework of the new Dutch institute. As progressive and ambitious institutions that intended to go further and beyond the traditional role of museums, these two institutions became paradigmatic examples for the establishment of the proposed Dutch institute, and together with the NAI became privileged articulation of the institutionalization of a changing theoretical conception of architectural and historical practice in the fledgling class of architecture museums.

Criticality in the Architecture Institute

At the end of the 1970s there was a noticeable surge in the ranks of architecture museums worldwide. Although institutions like the Sir John Soane Museum (1813) in London or the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) Department of Architecture and Design (1932) in New York were already well-established, the ranks of architecture museums had previously been limited at best.⁶⁴⁸ Such proliferation of new museological institutions dedicated to architecture was a direct reflection of a renewed appreciation of history within both architectural discourse and practice.⁶⁴⁹ But beyond

⁶⁴⁸ In discussing the growing amount of architecture museums since the mid-1970s, Bergdoll emphasizes the doubling of the number of institutions affiliated with the International Confederation of Architecture Museums (ICAM) between 1975 and 1995, singling out the foundation of the "Canadian Centre for Architecture in Montreal (1979), the Deutsches Architekturmuseum in Frankfurt (1979), the Architekturmuseum in Basel (1984), the Netherlands Architecture Institute in Rotterdam (1988), and the Heinz Architectural Center in Pittsburgh (1990)," as well as specialized departments in other museums, such as "the Centre Georges Pompidou and the Musee d'Orsay in Paris." Barry Bergdoll, "Curating History," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 57, no. 3 (September 1998): 257.

⁶⁴⁹ Indications that the both architectural discourse and practice were reassessing the role of history included the organization of a Teaching Seminar by the American Institute of Architects-Association of Collegiate Schools of Architecture (AIA-ACSA) regarding "The History, Theory and Criticism of Architecture," the subsequent establishment of the first doctoral program in architecture focused on history at the Massachusetts Institute of Technology (MIT), as well as a growing interest in the historical forms by an entire new generation of architects perhaps most clearly proclaimed by Robert Venturi with the publication of

greatly increasing the ranks of architecture museums, the late 1970s also witnessed the emergence of a new genre of architecture museum, one based on a new approach to the discipline. This shift was particularly significant, since it changed the very conception of the architecture museum and effectively institutionalized a revised position of history within architecture culture, as it was defined by the Italian architectural historian and critic Manfredo Tafuri in 1968.⁶⁵⁰ Through the application of Tafuri's ideas, architecture museums moved away from operative models and pursued a new form of criticality for architecture.

From Operative to Critical History

Tafuri was arguably the greatest contributor to the complete revision of the processes of architecture history and its renewed relevance within architecture culture.⁶⁵¹ Although like other influential architectural writers Tafuri criticized the eclipse of history from the dominant modern architectural discourse, unlike his peers, he was equally critical of the manner in which historical

"Complexity and Contradiction." See AIA-ACSA Teacher Seminar, *The History, Theory, and Criticism of Architecture: Papers*, ed. Marcus Whiffen (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1965); Harwood, "How Useful? The Stakes of Architectural History, Theory, and Criticism at MIT, 1945-1976"; Robert Venturi, *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*, *The Museum of Modern Art Papers on Architecture* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1977).

⁶⁵⁰ The critique of the methods and processes of architectural history and the definition of a new approach to architecture and history was a lifelong project for Tafuri. While a prolific writer, Tafuri's most notable contributions to this discussion were Manfredo Tafuri, *Teorie E Storia dell'Architettura* (Bari: Laterza, 1968); Manfredo Tafuri, *Progetto E Utopia: Architettura E Sviluppo Capitalistico* (Roma-Bari: Laterza, 1973); Manfredo Tafuri, *La Sfera E Il Labirinto: Avanguardie E Architettura Da Piranesi Agli Anni '70* (Torino: G. Einaudi, 1980), respectively published in English as Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*; Manfredo Tafuri, *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development*, trans. Barbara Luigia La Penta (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1976); Manfredo Tafuri, *The Sphere and the Labyrinth: Avant-Gardes and Architecture from Piranesi to the 1970s*, trans. Robert Connolly and Pellegrino d' Acierno (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987). For a comprehensive list of writings by Tafuri and on the Italian critic, see Andrew Leach, *Manfredo Tafuri: Choosing History* (Ghent: A&S Books, Department of Architecture & Urban Planning, Ghent University, 2007), 275-323.

⁶⁵¹ The opening salvo of Tafuri's lifelong project was presented with the 1968 publication of the book *Teoria e Storia dell'Architettura (Theories and History of Architecture)*, described by Mark Wigley as a "Molotov cocktail" to normative architectural historical practice. Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*.

practice had been reinstated into architectural discourse. He considered this to have ensured historical practice to be not only dependent on, but also greatly conditioned by design practice.⁶⁵²

Tafuri had identified in the historical analysis of his predecessors (such as Nikolaus Pevsner, Sigfried Giedion, Bruno Zevi, and Leonardo Benevolo, whom he specifically named) an inherent order utilized to construct a singular narrative that served little more than to validate contemporary design positions of (modern) architects. Such singular construction presented history as a trajectory not merely leading up to the present condition, but indicating the inevitability of the propositions and positions sustained by architects, “with the historical material carefully selected in order to match this purpose.”⁶⁵³ Such practice that “attempts to affect, not simply to explain, the evolution of architecture” through a “selective historical-diachronic-account” in which the “stages of evolution make the historian's desired development the next logical step” was styled by Tafuri as “operative criticism.”⁶⁵⁴ The suppression of “heterogeneous elements and conflicting layers of detail involved in any architectural project” resulted in an “illusion of a seamless, unified past” used to “promote an equally monolithic future.”⁶⁵⁵ Thus, operative criticism

⁶⁵² Nikolaus Pevsner was the first to associate the eclipse of history from modern architectural discourse with Walter Gropius' decision to exclude history classes from the Bauhaus curriculum. Pevsner's argument was later re-stated by Reyner Banham and Tafuri, who dedicated an entire chapter of “Theories and History of Architecture” to its discussion. See Nikolaus Pevsner, “Modern Architecture and the Historian or the Return of Historicism,” *RIBA Journal* 48, no. 4 (April 1961): 230–240; Manfredo Tafuri, “Modern Architecture and the Eclipse of History,” in *Theories and History of Architecture* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), 11–78.

⁶⁵³ Titia Rixt Hoekstra, “Building versus Bildung: Manfredo Tafuri and the Construction of a Historical Discipline” (Doctoral Dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, 2005), 21.

⁶⁵⁴ Mary McLeod, “On Criticism [Criticism of Place: A Symposium],” *Places* 4, no. 1 (1987): 4–5. In Tafuri's own words, “what is meant by operative criticism is an analysis of architecture (or of the arts in general) that, instead of an abstract survey, has as its objective the planning of a precise poetical tendency, anticipated in its structures and derived from historical analyses programmatically distorted and finalised.” Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*, 141.

⁶⁵⁵ Wigley, “Post-Operative History,” 48.

turned the historian into “a mouthpiece for espousing values pursued in other ways by the architect.”⁶⁵⁶ Beyond a mere use, this practice constituted an abuse of history.

In contrast to the prevailing mode of “operative criticism,” Tafuri proposed an alternative type of historical practice where the simplification of history was displaced by a revelation and acceptance of history’s “internal contradictions and its plurality, stressing its dialectical sides, and exalting it for what it really is.”⁶⁵⁷ In such an “inoperative criticism” or “critical historiography,” history was to be perceived as “a continuous *contestation of the present*, even as a threat, if you like, to the tranquillising myths wherein the anxieties and doubts of modern architects find peace” (italics in the original).⁶⁵⁸ Critical historiography called for a “polemical multiplication of historiographies, each of which undermines the idea of singular, unified, self-consistent structure” by recognizing ambiguity of any project or issue.⁶⁵⁹ The historian was to observe his or her subject and dispassionately identify the “twists and turns that point to deeper complication” without “imposing [any] conceptual schemes on the evidence.”⁶⁶⁰ By accentuating the contradictions of history, the historian was to offer the “architect an endless vista of new and unsolved problems, available for conscious choice and freed from the weight of myth.”⁶⁶¹ In short, for Tafuri, historical research was intended to “raise questions instead of provide answers, multiply problems rather

⁶⁵⁶ Leach, *Manfredo Tafuri*, 126. Tafuri perceived the two activities as interchangeable, since both could be understood as attempts at persuasion, either of a particular version of history by the historian or of a particular type of building by the architect.

⁶⁵⁷ Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*, 233. Tafuri dedicates a chapter of “Theories and History of Architecture” to define each position. See Tafuri, “Operative Criticism”; Manfredo Tafuri, “The Tasks of Criticism,” in *Theories and History of Architecture* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), 227–237.

⁶⁵⁸ Since unlike with “operative criticism” Tafuri does not provide a specific name for his alternative model of architecture history, the tentative title “inoperative criticism” or “critical historiography” proposed by Andrew Leach has been here adopted. See Andrew Leach, “Instrumentality and Criticality,” in *Manfredo Tafuri: Choosing History* (Ghent: A&S Books, Department of Architecture & Urban Planning, Ghent University, 2007), 115–138. Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*, 233.

⁶⁵⁹ Wigley, “Post-Operative History,” 48.

⁶⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 52.

⁶⁶¹ Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*, 229.

than offer singular solutions.”⁶⁶² Thus, Tafuri advocated for a mode of scholarly subversion, where research would take on “the mantle of radical disruption” while also becoming “fully aware of the artificiality of its own operations.”⁶⁶³

Despite denouncing operative criticism in historical practice, Tafuri was not opposed to operativity as such. He not only attempted to “define a different mode of operation,” but also conceded that operativity had a place in architectural practice.⁶⁶⁴ Most notably, Tafuri argued for the “critical value of image” in architecture, particularly as images were manipulated and juxtaposed in order to make critical judgments.⁶⁶⁵ According to Tafuri, despite intending to inform architectural actions, visual criticism still retained the capacity for criticality, thus making it an acceptable form of operative criticism.

Given that simplifications bound tightly together architecture and history, Tafuri considered that “the critical effect of history could only be guaranteed if it was radically divorced from architectural practice.”⁶⁶⁶ Thus, while recognizing that they occupied a place within architecture culture, historians had nevertheless to assume a detached position. Instead of complacency and collusion, the architect and the historian were to face in a dialectical confrontation, “almost to the point of constant opposition.”⁶⁶⁷ In this confrontation the historian “becomes the architect’s conscience,” the voice “that unsettles the project and its reliance on tidy lessons drawn from history

⁶⁶² Wigley, “Post-Operative History,” 48.

⁶⁶³ Ibid.; Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*, 230.

⁶⁶⁴ As Mark Wigley has pointed out, the most common misunderstanding regarding Tafuri’s project is the notion that he was against operative criticism, when “from the beginning, he repeatedly insists that the problem with writers like Giedion and Zevi is not the operative nature of their work but the failure of the operation.” Wigley, “Post-Operative History,” 50.

⁶⁶⁵ In the last section of his discussion of “operative criticism,” Tafuri briefly praised the critical value of images, which along with typological criticism were considered the only two acceptable exceptions of practices based in operative criticism since these revealed their organizing structure and maintained a critical distance from their affect. See Tafuri, “Operative Criticism,” 156–163.

⁶⁶⁶ Hoekstra, “Building Versus Bildung,” 110.

⁶⁶⁷ Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*, 64.

or upon clean abstractions of the surrounding worlds” by holding the architect accountable to his or her uses of history.⁶⁶⁸

Beyond the deep split between history/criticism and design, Tafuri also recognized a distinction between the two dominant types of architecture historians, namely the “historian-architect and the art-historian specialized in architecture.”⁶⁶⁹ While the “first group modelled their history on the concerns of the present; the second group simply extended the methodology of art history to architecture” and both presented deficiencies according to Tafuri’s proposed mode of historical practice. By extending the methodology of art history to architecture, art historians specialized in architecture were directing architecture culture towards the formal and cultural, rather than the social and technical. Conversely, while historian-architects were better equipped to understand the social and technical dimensions of architecture, by exploring the past to validate the future, they relied on self-referential architecture theory without much grounding in present or past societal conditions. While denouncing both approaches, these came to frame Tafuri’s own historical practice as a historian deeply involved with architecture, yet intent on separating historical and architectural practice.⁶⁷⁰

By engaging in operative criticism, both types of architecture historians were not only deliberately constructing a singular, forward trajectory of history, but they were also inherently moving architecture towards a greater insularity from society and contributing to its growing irrelevancy to the world at large. According to Tafuri, since “operative criticism obfuscates the disciplinary clarity potentially claimed by both architecture and history,” it reinforces the “isolating shield of architectural theory” by failing to offer a consideration of the context in which past

⁶⁶⁸ Leach, *Manfredo Tafuri*, 130.

⁶⁶⁹ Leach, “Choosing History,” 235.

⁶⁷⁰ Hoekstra, “Building Versus Bildung,” 72.

architecture originated.⁶⁷¹ Thus, for Tafuri, the “task of history is the recovery, as far as possible, of the original functions and ideologies that, in the course of time, define and delimit the role and meaning of architecture.”⁶⁷²

It was rather uncommon for an architectural historian to pay such close attention to the grounding—and inquire so deeply into the status—of the discipline, particularly since “architectural history did not have an autonomous disciplinary structure: it did not possess its own professional and scientific instruments.”⁶⁷³ But that was precisely what Tafuri intended to remedy as he “conducted a sustained exploration of the disciplinary limitations of architecture and history, and by extension an exploration of architectural and historical practices.”⁶⁷⁴ As Tafuri challenged the normative mode of historical practice, he “deeply shocked the world of architectural historians,” who perceived in this criticism an attack to their historical practice.⁶⁷⁵ Tafuri’s methodological and disciplinary explorations as well as his poignant critique of operative criticism, “continued to animate discussions of method and politics in architectural discourse for decades.”⁶⁷⁶ However, the “complexity of his position almost always exceed that of those who appealed reverently to it” and the “reception of the work was thoroughly operative.”⁶⁷⁷

The impact of Tafuri’s polemics was particularly remarkable in the United States, as his positions were famously introduced to American academic and architectural circles by Peter

⁶⁷¹ Andrew Leach, “Choosing History: A Study of Manfredo Tafuri’s Theorisation of Architectural History and Architectural History Research” (Doctoral Dissertation, Universiteit Gent, 2006), 88.

⁶⁷² Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*, 228.

⁶⁷³ Hoekstra, “Building Versus Bildung,” 16.

⁶⁷⁴ Leach, “Choosing History,” 235.

⁶⁷⁵ Hoekstra, “Building Versus Bildung,” 23. Bruno Zevi, who was among the current historians singled out by Tafuri in his criticism, responded with an incensed article in a local journal, stating that “without a method for making choices, history becomes an arbitrary sequence of events, perhaps brilliant and sparkling, but certainly incapable of inspiring and promoting.”

⁶⁷⁶ Harwood, “How Useful? The Stakes of Architectural History, Theory, and Criticism at MIT, 1945-1976,” 108.

⁶⁷⁷ Wigley, “Post-Operative History,” 49.

Eisenman's Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies (IAUS), particularly through its journal, *Oppositions*.⁶⁷⁸ As Tafuri's texts were translated to English and published in the pages of *Oppositions*, his positions faced an altogether different foe, that of misappropriation and misrepresentation.⁶⁷⁹ Nevertheless, the contact with Tafuri served to establish "the groundwork to connections with the newest trends in continental European thought" as he "introduced most of the French writers who subsequently dominated theory in the United States."⁶⁸⁰ Tafuri's theoretical constructs had a lasting impact in the understanding of architecture history and theory, with even contemporary assessments of the discipline relying on the framework established by the Italian critic.⁶⁸¹

In the Netherlands, Tafuri's conception of history as an instrument of critique also had a considerable reception and impact. In fact, in a fortuitous turn of events, it was "a fastidiously cyclostyled copy [of *Teorie e Storia*] prepared by Dutch students for circulation in one of the Dutch Schools of Architecture" that inspired the English translation of the text from its original Italian.⁶⁸²

⁶⁷⁸ As Harwood has remarked, *Oppositions* offered a clear editorial statement regarding its publishing strategy, which explicitly identified the journal with Tafuri's critique. Harwood, "How Useful? The Stakes of Architectural History, Theory, and Criticism at MIT, 1945-1976," 107., footnote 12. Furthermore, beyond translating and publishing Tafuri's writings in *Oppositions*, the IAUS also invited and published several of his close colleagues, such as Giorgio Ciucci, Francesco Dal Co, Franco Rella, Georges Teyssot, and Massimo Cacciari.

⁶⁷⁹ Perhaps the most well-known subversion of Tafuri's positions came as "Eisenman twisted Tafuri's arguments, about the autonomy of history and criticism from practice, to favor a view of architecture as autonomous from everything else." For an overview and discussion of the misappropriation of Tafuri's positions by American architects, theorists, and historians, see Diane Y. Ghirardo, "Manfredo Tafuri and Architecture Theory in the U.S., 1970-2000," *Perspecta* 33 (January 1, 2002): 38-47.

⁶⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 44. As Jean-Louis Cohen has demonstrated, Tafuri's *Teorie e Storia* was also first to introduce several French thinkers (such as Roland Barthes and Michel Foucault) to architecture culture, thus establishing a connection to intellectual sources that would later become central for architecture theory. See Jean-Louis Cohen, *La Coupure entre Architectes et Intellectuels, ou les Enseignements de l'Italophilie* (Paris: Ecole d'Architecture Paris-Villemin, 1984).

⁶⁸¹ For a comprehensive overview of how the recent architectural critical and historical thought has developed (both by extension and rejection) from Tafuri's earlier positions, see George Baird, "'Criticality' and Its Discontents," *Harvard Design Magazine*, no. 21 (October 2004): 16-21.

⁶⁸² Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*, xi. According to Ed Taverne, these were primarily "translated and reworked by Barbieri, Boekraad and Kees Vollemans," who also "launch[ed] a full-scale

Tafuri's arrival to Dutch academic institutions in the 1970s "coincided with the rise of the student movement and their call for didactic reform at the universities."⁶⁸³ In this intellectual context, the critical analysis espoused by Tafuri became "what may be described as the key ingredient of a 'new architectural culture,'" since it helped "to transform the history of architecture as taught in the Netherlands, from art-historical meanderings devoid of theory into a society-conscious social science."⁶⁸⁴ But while Tafuri's arguments and methods were embraced by students who required architecture and history to become more socially engaged, they were also met with the "conservatism of many art historians, who proved resistant to virtually any innovation," leading to "an increasingly deepening rift between art and architectural history" in the Netherlands.⁶⁸⁵ The rift between architecture and art history would only widen with the foundation of the *NDB* in 1971.

With the *NDB*'s foundation, there was a clear and growing interest by art historians in the study of Dutch architecture history. As some art historians became specialized in architecture and engaged historical practice in a manner similar to Tafuri, the rift between art and architecture history only deepened. The separation between art and architecture history in the Netherlands became most visible with the foundation of the *NAi* in 1988, as it sought to distance itself from previous art history-derived models for the research of architecture and approached history and architecture in a way reminiscent to Tafuri's prescription.

Given Tafuri's pervasive influence in architecture culture throughout the 1970s (in the Netherlands and elsewhere), I posit that his particular conception of architecture history became a

publishing offensive in the professional journals and the more left-wing weeklies such as *De Groene Amsterdammer* and *Vrij Nederland*." Taverne and Wagenaar, "Between Elite and Mass: 010 and the Rise of the Architecture Industry in the Netherlands," 46, 48.

⁶⁸³ Hoekstra, "Building Versus Bildung," 36.

⁶⁸⁴ Taverne and Wagenaar, "Between Elite and Mass: 010 and the Rise of the Architecture Industry in the Netherlands," 46. For an overview of the different projects and positions at Delft's Technical University inspired by Tafuri's critique see the section of this essay between pages 46 and 51.

⁶⁸⁵ Hoekstra, "Building Versus Bildung," 36.

fundamental organizing principle in newly established architecture museums, institutes, and centers. Specifically, I argue that new progressive architecture institutes not only institutionalized Tafuri's conception of the discipline, but they sought to organize the dialectical confrontation between architects and historians at the heart of Tafuri's construction.

In defining the autonomy between history and architecture, between 'critical' and 'operative,' Tafuri defined the temporal territories for both practices. While 'critical' history was to look back and engage with the past, 'operative' architecture was to look forward and engage with the future.⁶⁸⁶ This clear separation was intended to avoid history from being projected onto the future and for architecture to self-servingly construct its past. Such separation also ensured that there was a preemptive gap between history (and subsequently criticism) and architecture that provided the necessary critical distance between both practices. But while their research territories remained clearly separate, "both 'operative' and 'critical' figures start from a 'present moment'" and are activated by operating in the present.⁶⁸⁷ Given that the present not only informed the understanding of past history and the shaping of future architecture but was also where the dialectical confrontation between architecture and history took place, the present became a most pivotal construction in Tafuri's conception of a renewed approach to architecture, that is, in regulating the relation between architecture and history.

Merely by hosting an architecture archive, architecture museums had an important role in Tafuri's scheme of dialectical opposition between architecture and history. As the Italian historian proposed a strategy of continuous dialectical opposition, he implied that this was to occur "within the bounds of architectural culture, broadly defined."⁶⁸⁸ Specifically, Tafuri suggested that in order

⁶⁸⁶ Leach, *Manfredo Tafuri*, 125.

⁶⁸⁷ Leach, "Choosing History," 235–236.

⁶⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 236.

for historians and architects to engage in fruitful discussion, it was necessary to define their shared territory, which was based on not just both occupying the present moment, but also that “they both invest heavily in architecture’s history, either as material or as legacy.”⁶⁸⁹ Thus, the architectural archive within the architecture museum constituted the common language between architects and historians and was a crucial prerequisite for the organization of any fruitful interaction between them. As the architectural archive became not only a vestige of previous approaches to architecture history, but a central component in the new approach as well, once again the museum’s position within architecture culture was based on the archive. But while some architecture museums were satisfied with their role as custodians of the shared language and territory of architecture culture, others were intent on becoming facilitators of the type of productive discussion described by Tafuri.

The organization of a dialectical confrontation between architecture and history, between the past and the future of architecture, became the primary objective of this new genre of architecture museum. Rather than merely hosting an architectural archive or constructing singular readings of architecture’s past, new progressive architecture museums were determined to engage with architecture and project its future. These progressive museum’s engagement of both architecture and history, past and future, effectively staged Tafuri’s conception of the present moment where architects and historians were to interact. By staging the confrontation between ‘critical’ and ‘operative’ practices, these new institutions ultimately institutionalized Tafuri’s critical framework and employed it to advance the discipline.

⁶⁸⁹ Leach, “Choosing History: A Study of Manfredo Tafuri’s Theorisation of Architectural History and Architectural History Research,” 67. Leach also refers that although “redundant to point out that both architectural historians and architects — as practitioners or theoreticians — are interested in architecture, yet their coexistence within architectural culture is predicated on their capacity for fruitful interaction.”

Even if unwittingly, the rhetoric employed by institutions like the *DAM*, the *CCA*, and the *NAi* reveals the specter of Tafuri's dialectical opposition in their organization. The *DAM*, for instance, claimed to "assum[e] the task of providing a forum for controversial discussions about the priority of social, technical or aesthetic factors in building" and monitor the level of architectural discourse, while the *CCA* presented itself as the first institution to "function both as an architectural study centre and as a museum," intent on "instituting a mechanism for interchange between the academic and architectural communities."⁶⁹⁰ In a similar fashion, the *NAi* was first defined as an institute "from which the built environment could be studied" and "from which incentives could be given to better build environments."⁶⁹¹ The combination of these two objectives was dubbed "platform-function" and was intended to "stimulate discussion and opinion regarding developments in architecture and urban planning and act as 'center' for those involved in this field."⁶⁹² While slightly different, all these pronouncements were evident applications of Tafuri's scheme of continuous dialectical opposition between architects and historians.

Within these progressive architecture institutions, the definition of such "shared territory" and the organization of intellectual confrontations between architects and historians was not merely a fundamental organizing principle, but was also a defining one. In fact, it was due to this combination of history and architecture that these institutions renounced the limited title of

⁶⁹⁰ Volker Fischer, "The German Museum of Architecture," trans. David Porter, *International Journal of Museum Management and Curatorship* 5, no. 1 (March 1986): 21. Canadian Centre for Architecture, *Centre Canadien d'Architecture: Les Débuts, 1979-1984* (Montréal: Canadian Centre for Architecture, 1984), 109, 110.

⁶⁹¹ Woerkmom, "Nota Het Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedenbouw (NIAS)," 4.

⁶⁹² Werkgroep WVC-VROM, "Ontwerp Voor Een Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedenbouw," December 1, 1984, 9.

“museum” and adopted other titles that could better describe the expanse of their activities and their renewed approach to architecture and history, such as institutes or centers.⁶⁹³

The indirect application of Tafuri’s theoretical apparatus to the new progressive architecture institutions was further revealed as these institutions also strived to establish a direct connection between the interior and the exterior of the architecture discipline.⁶⁹⁴ Simply by making architecture discussion more inclusive, these institutions inherently hindered the growing insularity of the architectural discipline identified by Tafuri. Other architecture museums, regardless of their intellectual model, certainly already ensured a degree of societal engagement by ensuring public accessibility. The difference, however, was that new architecture institutes went further and beyond to include the general public in the discussions. While in architecture museums the public was limited to a passive role of observer, in new architecture institutes, the public was encouraged to participate in the continuing discussion.

By requiring architects and historians to also engage with a lay public, architecture institutes forced a grounding of discussions in the present moment of not just architecture but also society. While these debates were crucial for the advancement of architecture, they were only as important as their ability to be demystified and explained to a lay audience. Beyond arcane and abstract constructions, research and discussions within architecture institutes were intended to also be applied in the improvement of both urban fabrics and architectural objects in the world at large.⁶⁹⁵

⁶⁹³ The *DAM* remained as the exception that confirmed the rule, but as it will later be discussed, the title museum was perhaps apt for the Frankfurt-based institution, since there was a latent antiquarian quality to its operations.

⁶⁹⁴ Tafuri addresses the problematic of the communication between the interior and exterior of the discipline in a full chapter of *Teorie e Storia* in which he further decries not merely the insularity of the discipline, but also the lack of consideration that has been given to the enunciation of the discipline. See Manfredo Tafuri, “Architecture as Metalanguage: The Critical Value of the Image,” in *Theories and History of Architecture* (New York: Harper & Row, 1976), 103–139.

⁶⁹⁵ The same sort of connection between architecture and real world (eschewing the trappings of architectural theory) was emphasized in the construction of post-critical positions within the discipline, most

As the reality of the urban fabric in Frankfurt, Montreal, and Rotterdam was both a starting and ending point for debates, these discussions remained grounded in the present moment and were prompted to be expressed in actual construction. In short, the obscurity cast upon architectural ideas, issues, and processes that promoted the discipline's insularity was continuously frustrated by the inclusiveness of the discussion promoted by new architecture institutes.

Much like the organization of discussion between architects and historians, the commitment to a continuous societal engagement was a central element of both the new architecture institutes and the conception of architecture culture as devised by Manfredo Tafuri. The Italian critic's claims that "architecture realizes the impossibility of finding its own reasons exclusively in itself" were echoed once again in the rhetoric employed by the new architecture institutes.⁶⁹⁶ While CCA founder Phyllis Lambert asserted that "architectural research has a profound cultural influence, and that scholars have a social responsibility of the highest order," the *DAM* attempted to initiate an inclusive discussion on architecture by developing a visual criticism directed at visitors who had never before been confronted with an architectural drawing.⁶⁹⁷ Similarly, the NAI professed its ambition to initiate an inclusive conversation of how architecture both is shaped by and shapes society not "merely from the angle of the discipline itself but also open to the relationships with other disciplines and current thought in general."⁶⁹⁸ By forcefully establishing a public setting, with a public audience, and where the present condition was the shared language and territory of

notably by Robert Somol and Sarah Whiting, and Michael Speaks. See Robert E Somol and Sarah Whiting, "Notes Around the Doppler Effect and Other Moods of Modernism," in *The New Architectural Pragmatism: A Harvard Design Magazine Reader*, ed. William S Saunders, Harvard Design Magazine Readers 5 (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007), 22–33. Michael Speaks, "Design Intelligence: Or Thinking After the End of Metaphysics," *Architectural Design* 72, no. 5 (October 2002): 4–9.

⁶⁹⁶ Tafuri, *Theories and History of Architecture*, 80–82.

⁶⁹⁷ Lambert, "The Architectural Museum: A Founder's Perspective," 309. Heinrich Klotz, "The Museum of Architecture, Frankfurt-Am-Main," *Transactions / Royal Institute of British Architects* 4, no. 1 (1985): 26.

⁶⁹⁸ Hans van Dijk and Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, *NAi Beleidsplan 1993-1996: 2nd Edition* (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1993), 21.

architects, historians and general public, these institutes also became the most direct manner through which the issues, processes and concerns of the architectural discipline engaged with society.

Even though Tafuri insisted that “architecture demands engagement with political, social, and economic systems and institutions, [while] criticism requires distance,” it was in the confrontation of architecture and criticism that architecture institutes began to address “the real problem [of] how to project a criticism capable of constantly putting itself into crisis by putting into crisis the real.”⁶⁹⁹ Effectively, the new architecture institutes and centers not merely responded to and institutionalized Tafuri’s “prophylactic gap between history / criticism and design,” they went even further to establish “new forms of research that take the risk of actively working on both sides of the gap.”⁷⁰⁰ By engaging with both the past and the future of the discipline, progressive architecture institutes were moving from a reflective to a projective model, but by minding the gap between architecture and history, these institutions were also the materialization and institutionalization of Tafuri’s theoretical prescription for a productive architecture culture.

Newly established museums that prided themselves on their progressive character (such as the CCA, the DAM, and the NAI), adopted an approach to architecture’s past, present and future analogous to Tafuri’s theoretical constructions. Such ambitions were revealed in different manners, from the definition of the architectural archive as an open-ended resource for constant enquiry, to the construction of a direct system of visual criticism. But despite their different approaches, as

⁶⁹⁹ Ghirardo, “Manfredo Tafuri and Architecture Theory in the U.S., 1970-2000,” 46. Manfredo Tafuri, “Introduction: The Historical Project,” in *The Sphere and the Labyrinth: Avant-Gardes and Architecture from Piranesi to the 1970s*, trans. Robert Connolly and Pellegrino d’Acierno (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987), 9.

⁷⁰⁰ In describing the new types of research that bot maintained Tafuri’s gap between history and architecture while operating on both sides of the gap, Wigley dubbed this type of research as “post-operative criticism.” Wigley, “Post-Operative History,” 53.

these progressive institutions attempted to significantly shift the framework for the appreciation of architecture, Tafuri's presence was all but evident in their intellectual positioning.

Deutsches Architekturmuseum (German Architecture Museum, or DAM)

The *DAM* was among the first institutions to implicitly apply Tafuri's ideas to the architecture museum by defining as one of its main objectives the organization of a continuous debate between architects and historians. The *DAM's* focus on the organization of architectural debate was only supplanted by its commitment to reach a wider audience, a combination which made the *DAM* a pioneer of a new genre of architecture museum. In the words of Heinrich Klotz, the *DAM's* founder and first director, while the "old architecture museums were really national archives—of plans, drawings, designs—and for lack of space most of them had almost no possibility to display their material publicly," the new genre of architecture museum aimed to "exhibit architectural documents" in order to disseminate architectural knowledge and increase architectural debate.⁷⁰¹ But while the German museum institutionalized some elements of Tafuri's position, others were completely eschewed, revealing a lingering antiquarian approach to the architectural archive to that existed right underneath the veneer of progressive change.

The foundation of the German Architecture Museum was the realization of the vision of a single individual, the professor of architecture history Heinrich Klotz.⁷⁰² According to the museum's foundational mythology, Klotz first thought of establishing an architecture museum while he awaited to interview Mies Van der Rohe in his Chicago office. It was there that Klotz realized that the entirety of the models, drawings, and other material produced in developing architectural ideas

⁷⁰¹ Charles Jencks and Heinrich Klotz, "In the Steps of Vasari: Charles Jencks Interviews Heinrich Klotz," *Architectural Design* 55, no. 3 (1985): 11.

⁷⁰² Klotz concluded a Ph.D. in art history in 1963 and received his habilitation (the highest academic degree in Germany which allows a scholar to supervise doctoral research) five years later, both from the University of Göttingen. See Torsten Schmiedeknecht, "Heinrich Klotz and Postmodernism in Germany," *Architectural Design* 71, no. 6 (2001): 79.

were routinely being trashed upon the projects' completion. While for most architects this material was perceived as functional documents necessary to communicate with contractors, clients, and local authorities, for historians like Klotz, the same material represented the actual work of the architect and where the story of particular architecture ideas were documented. However, since these drawings and models were being unceremoniously discarded, very little was preserved, particularly of recent architectural production.

Intent on preserving this window to the design process of recent architecture, Klotz decided to assemble a collection of drawings, sketches, and most importantly, models of recent architecture. By 1972, he began "looking for people who were interested in setting up an architecture museum that would be not just a national archive of plans but a museum with the explicit aim of exhibiting and collecting international architecture."⁷⁰³ Klotz peddled his idea to municipalities across Germany, including Berlin, Stuttgart and Munich, but to no avail.

Undeterred, Klotz decided to demonstrate the utility of an architecture museum focused on exhibition and discussion by organizing a series of symposia and workshops in Berlin.⁷⁰⁴ Although these meetings were widely considered productive and garnered greater visibility for architecture, Klotz still did not have much support for the realization of his vision for an architecture museum until a change in Frankfurt's local government in 1977 gave Klotz "another set of politicians to try and sell [his] idea for a museum to."⁷⁰⁵ The new Frankfurt authorities were much more receptive to the idea of an architecture museum, particularly since Klotz cunningly suggested that a major

⁷⁰³ Heinrich Klotz, "The Founding of the German Architecture Museum," *Architectural Design* 55, no. 3 (1985): 5.

⁷⁰⁴ Both the week-long symposium (Against the Pathos of Functionalism) in 1974 and the ten-day workshop (Integral Building) one year later were hosted at the International Design Centre. For these events, Klotz invited leading international (postmodern) architects like Robert Venturi, Aldo Rossi, Vittorio Gregotti, O.M. Ungers, and Charles Moore to debate the state of architecture and produce specific proposals for the city of Berlin.

⁷⁰⁵ Klotz, "The Founding of the German Architecture Museum," 6.

program for arts and culture—of which the architecture museum would be one component—would confer a high profile to the administration.

Instead of concentrating all the components of this program for art and culture in a large building, it was agreed to locate them in a row of nineteenth-century villas lining the banks of the river Main. The adaptation of existing buildings to accommodate the museums not only allowed the renovation of a derelict section of the city, but it also served Klotz's own purposes since he was a fierce advocate of postmodern architecture as the most suitable architectural expression to embed new construction within existing historical cities.⁷⁰⁶

Given Klotz's expertise, he retained a position of leadership in the development process and organized the invited competitions for the renovation of the different villas, with the *museumsufer* (museum embankment) becoming a significant locus of postmodern architecture.⁷⁰⁷ With so much construction, the realization of Frankfurt's ambitious cultural program was perceived by Klotz as a chance to define a new direction for architectural practice in the city where the architecture museum operated as a platform for the discussion of architecture that "monitor[ed] the level of the architectural discourse."⁷⁰⁸

⁷⁰⁶ Klotz had already been responsible for Charles Moore, James Stirling, and O.M. Ungers commissions to intervene in the restoration of Marburg's historical center, precisely by connecting new buildings to the neighborhood's existing historical structures.

⁷⁰⁷ Klotz, "The Museum of Architecture, Frankfurt-Am-Main," 24. Among the museums along the north and south banks of the river Main, the earliest, and most clearly postmodern, include the new addition to the Museum of Applied Art (*Museum für Angewandte Kunst*) designed by Richard Meier, the German Film Museum (*Deutsches Filmmuseum*) expanded by Helge Bofinger, the Rothschild Palace converted to the Jewish Museum Frankfurt (*Jüdisches Museum Frankfurt*) by Ante von Kostelac, the old Carmelite Monastery adapted to accommodate the Archaeological Museum (*Archäologisches Museum*, formerly the Museum of Pre- and Early History) by Josef Paul Kleihues, the Museum of Modern Art (*Museum für Moderne Kunst*) by Hans Hollein, and the German Architecture Museum (*Deutsches Architekturmuseum*) designed by O. M. Ungers.

⁷⁰⁸ Barry Bergdoll, "Prototypes and Archetypes: Deutsches Architekturmuseum, Frankfurt, West Germany," *Architectural Record* 172, no. 9 (August 1984): 106.

While the German Museum of Architecture was officially constituted with the approval of the Frankfurt City Council in 1979 (which also nominated Klotz as its director), Klotz had already approached Oswald Mathias Ungers to informally award him the commission for the design of the new museum. As early as 1978, Ungers produced the first conceptual sketches for the new building and developed the “house within the house” concept which closely aligned with Klotz’s ambition for the museum and vision for architecture. The idea that architecture was “not only function but fiction as well” was not just the basic premise of Klotz’s lifelong intellectual project for the cultural standing of architecture but also the underlying concept for Ungers’ building.⁷⁰⁹

Ungers did not disappoint Klotz’s expectations and created a “manifesto of triumphant postmodernism by developing a unique concept for the architecture museum.”⁷¹⁰ With the “house within the house” concept, Ungers used the existing building but created an interior structure that alluded to the origins of architecture in the primitive hut. While this device was “intended to be purely and simply the symbol of Architecture,” it also expressed the museum’s program of establishing a connection between contemporary design and past architectural knowledge.⁷¹¹ It created “a kind of dialectical approach to the old shell and the new interior - to battle against the problem, but to find a compromise,” illustrating a story of architecture and becoming more than a mere container of generic and utilitarian spaces.⁷¹² With this building, the *DAM* forcefully expressed its central claim that architecture could not be reduced to mere structure, function, and costs, but

⁷⁰⁹ Heinrich Klotz, “Preface,” in *The History of Postmodern Architecture* (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1988), xiii. The proximity of Klotz and Ungers’ position on architecture was one of the main reasons Klotz awarded the commission for the architecture museum to the Cologne-based architect. The other reasons were the great admiration Klotz nurtured—both professionally and personally—for Ungers, and his belief that even though Ungers had influenced an entire generation of architects, he was still the victim of unwarranted criticism and merited a high-profile commission. Jencks and Klotz, “In the Steps of Vasari,” 13.

⁷¹⁰ Bergdoll, “Prototypes and Archetypes,” 106.

⁷¹¹ Fischer, “The German Museum of Architecture,” 20.

⁷¹² Klotz, “The Museum of Architecture, Frankfurt-Am-Main,” 24.

was effectively a cultural manifestation of society. On June 1, 1984, the *DAM* was presented to the world, as its building was formally opened by the German Federal Minister of Building.

With the completion of its building, the *DAM* garnered tremendous international attention and quickly became a respected leading institution in the budding circle of architecture museums. Klotz, however, was already famed in those circles, since according to Phyllis Lambert, at the first ICAM meeting in Helsinki, Klotz was “the kingmaker.”⁷¹³ He was mostly known for the institutionalization of an archival policy at the *DAM* that greatly diverged from other architecture institutions by focusing almost exclusively in acquiring material of contemporary architects. Most importantly, instead of soliciting the donation of material, Klotz offered to purchase it directly from the architects.

Supported by the generous public funding allocated to assemble the museum’s basic collection, Klotz directly contacted several internationally renowned architects and purchased drawings and models of the most representative project in their *oeuvre*.⁷¹⁴ When Klotz began the collection in 1977—two years before the museum was officially created—“conditions were relatively favourable.”⁷¹⁵ Since architecture drawings were not yet considered to have any inherent artistic value, and thus any market value, Klotz was able to purchase drawings and models of several internationally renowned architects. However, as the practice of purchasing drawings from living architects became normalized, other architecture museums (particularly new institutions that were also building their collections) were required to also purchase contemporary material rather than having it donated to them. Between 1977 and 1985, prices for contemporary architectural

⁷¹³ Beasley, “Interview with Phyllis Lambert,” 36. Klotz would also become a Vice-President of the ICAM between 1981 and 1984, when the *DAM* was inaugurated and the definition of a Code of Ethics became an important item in the ICAM’s agenda.

⁷¹⁴ The *DAM* had a yearly budget of 650,000 German marks in the first five years allocated to assemble the museum’s basic collection. Dubois, “Frankfurt: Deutsches Architektur Museum,” 25–26.

⁷¹⁵ Klotz, “The Founding of the German Architecture Museum,” 7.

drawings and sketches rose so steeply that “public institutions [were] finding it hard to keep up.”⁷¹⁶ The *DAM* not only facilitated an appreciation for the architectural drawing but also facilitated a market for it.⁷¹⁷ As a result, Klotz was criticized by some for creating market that did not previously exist, a market which posed tremendous difficulties for institutions that did not possess the same financial resources of its larger counterparts.

By focusing on contemporary architecture, the *DAM* was hailed as “the first and only museum devoted exclusively to recording the developing art of architecture.”⁷¹⁸ But it was also a shrewd investment, since Klotz understood that “the documents of the major [architectural] achievements of today would be the historical archives of tomorrow.”⁷¹⁹ Such observation could be understood as a direct translation of Tafuri’s assertion regarding the pivotal character of the present moment, namely how it was up to the historian to “remind the architect that their actions in the present become the future’s historical burdens.”⁷²⁰ Additionally, the pre-emptive purchase of contemporary material also allowed the *DAM* to assemble a collection of international scope without running afoul of the ICAM Code of Ethics regarding the division of full archives and the respect for national heritage. Such international scope was significant, since it allowed the *DAM* to “provide the basis for an international overview of high quality work” and thus facilitate a close comparison of contemporary international architecture.⁷²¹ With its archival policy, the *DAM* effectively compelled other architecture museums to pay closer attention to, and engage with, contemporary architectural developments.

⁷¹⁶ Ibid.

⁷¹⁷ Bergdoll specifically states that by “focusing in fact on postwar architecture—the *DAM* has been a major factor in the recent boom for architectural drawings.” Bergdoll, “Prototypes and Archetypes,” 106.

⁷¹⁸ “Editorial,” *Architectural Design* 55, no. 3 (1985): 1.

⁷¹⁹ Dubois, “Frankfurt: Deutsches Architektur Museum,” 25–26.

⁷²⁰ Leach, *Manfredo Tafuri*, 131.

⁷²¹ Klotz, “The Founding of the German Architecture Museum,” 7.

Even though the *DAM*'s remarkable collection ranged from drawings and paintings to collages and models, for Klotz, models and sketches were the most important elements, since those were easily appreciated by a lay audience. This was particularly important, since the *DAM* aimed "to exhibit architectural documents in order to demonstrate and popularise [sic] ideas which are of value," that is, exhibition rather than documentation was the *DAM*'s major objective.⁷²² When the museum opened its doors in 1984, its collection included over 250 original models of significant recent projects, allowing Klotz to boast the model collection as "probably the most important record of current international architecture."⁷²³

Although Klotz claimed the original objective of the German museum to be the documentation of the architectural design process and of the evolution of ideas, there was a latent antiquarian character pervasive in the *DAM*'s approach of the discipline. From the importance attributed to the aesthetic qualities of the architectural drawing to the selection of the architectural material collected (in both content and format, that is, on both the selection of projects and the selection of material representative of those projects), the *DAM* recuperated the antiquarian construction of specific narratives and fascination with original objects.

The sense of loss that had first motivated Klotz to think about the assemblage of a collection of contemporary architecture was not entirely related to the loss of architectural knowledge, but also to the loss of master architects. For Klotz—much like for earlier architecture antiquarians—the collection of original artifacts not only documented and disseminated an idea, but also presented an unmediated connection to the master-architect who produced it. Since the architect did not directly

⁷²² Jencks and Klotz, "In the Steps of Vasari," 11.

⁷²³ Klotz, "The Founding of the German Architecture Museum," 7. In 1984 the collection already included Aldo Rossi's cemetery in Modena, Charles Moore's Kresge College in Santa Cruz, Rem Koolhaas' competition entry for Parc de la Villette, and O.M. Ungers' design for the *DAM*, but by 1986, the number of models in the collection had risen to 250 to 700. Fischer, "The German Museum of Architecture," 22.

work on buildings but on their representation, original material like “the models, the drawings and the signs of life of a great architect [were] first-hand information.”⁷²⁴ Quite tellingly, Klotz’s sense of loss first emerged in Mies van der Rohe’s office shortly after the passing of the modern master since “there was evidence of his work all over his office still,” and “those things he [had] directly worked with were being thrown out, and that depressed [Klotz].”⁷²⁵ Having just missed the opportunity to directly converse with the late master, Klotz was left to engage in a dialogue with his work, which would later define the *DAM*’s approach to the discipline. Within the German museum archive, the personal connection to architects became just as valued as the ingenuity of their work.⁷²⁶

The selection of the work hosted within the *DAM*’s archive was another indication of the antiquarian nature of its approach. While the breadth of the archive allowed the comparison of international projects by a variety of architects, this comparison was inherently conditioned by both the questionable selection of architects and the even more problematic selection of their “representative” projects. This limited the appreciation of an architect’s work to a specific individual project, thus preventing any understanding of the nuances and development of these architects thinking of the discipline.

Such limiting approach to the architectural archive seemingly ran afoul of Tafuri’s requirement for criticism to be constructed from and “reveal the multiple meanings and contradictions hidden . . . behind the apparent organicity with which architecture presents itself.”⁷²⁷ This type of architectural criticism, or critical historical practice, was not what Klotz and the *DAM* were

⁷²⁴ Jencks and Klotz, “In the Steps of Vasari,” 9.

⁷²⁵ Klotz, “The Founding of the German Architecture Museum,” 5. Jencks and Klotz, “In the Steps of Vasari,” 9.

⁷²⁶ It has even been stated that with the *DAM*, “for the first time in the history of Germany there was an institution dedicated to promoting contemporary architecture and – most importantly – architects.” Schmiedeknecht, “Heinrich Klotz and Postmodernism in Germany,” 82.

⁷²⁷ Tafuri, “The Tasks of Criticism,” 229.

attempting to institutionalize. Instead, the German museum intended to engage in critical assessment through the composition of visual criticism, a practice which Tafuri had briefly outlined as one of the “two ‘acceptable’ forms of critically operative practice.”⁷²⁸ Specifically, Tafuri considered that despite remaining operative, the manipulation and juxtaposition of images could also produce critical assessments of the present by accentuating “representational discontinuity” and expose “the ambiguous meeting of the structure of the work and the arbitrariness of its interpretation.”⁷²⁹ In short, Tafuri considered that given the obvious episodic and artificial condition of images in the representation of reality, their organizing structure and agenda were intrinsically exposed.

The adoption of visual criticism might have derived from the specificity of the *DAM*, since unlike other architecture museums, this museum’s archive was limited to architecture’s recent past and present. Furthermore, the use of images in the production of a critical conscience within the galleries of the *DAM* could also be integrated into the museum’s exhibition strategy. Thus, with its first exhibitions consisting entirely of plans, models, and photographs while avoiding “extensive textual explanations,” the German museum “engage[d] visitors in a very visual manner.”⁷³⁰

In practice, however, the overt use of imagery seemed to be less concerned with achieving a critical assessment and more interested in aesthetic sensations. In employing the aesthetic qualities of a project’s representation as a decisive criteria for selection, the *DAM* inherently diminished architecture’s social and constructive dimension, to focus almost entirely on its artistic and cultural

⁷²⁸ Leach, “Choosing History,” 237.

⁷²⁹ Tafuri, “Operative Criticism,” 157.

⁷³⁰ Dubois, “Frankfurt: Deutsches Architektur Museum,” 26. Klotz, “The Museum of Architecture, Frankfurt-Am-Main,” 26.

presence.⁷³¹ Effectively, the *DAM* approached the architectural archive not so much as an archive but more as a fine arts collection. Such approach to architecture and its disciplinary archive should not come as a surprise, given Klotz's background as an art historian and the initial intention to establish the architecture museum as a department of the local Museum of Modern Art (*Museum für Moderne Kunst*), recreating in Frankfurt the well-known example of the MoMA in New York.

By selecting which architects and which projects were "representative" of recent architectural developments, Klotz intended to establish a canon of contemporary architecture that fitted with his construction of the discipline. Even before the establishment of the German Architecture Museum, Klotz had been a relentless supporter of postmodern architecture expression in general and a fierce advocate for select few architects in particular. Klotz's position and promotion only gained further visibility with his directorship of the *DAM*, making him "inextricably linked to the development of postmodern architecture in Germany [as] he used every possible medium to promote his vision."⁷³² In a sense, the CCA and the *DAM* were travelling in opposite directions, as the CCA was attempting to assert an institutional legitimacy to what was essentially a private collection, while the *DAM* under the guise of a public institution was effectively constructing a collection personalized by the taste of its director.

There was an obvious disjunction at the *DAM* between the practice of singular narrative and the rhetoric of inclusive discussion. While on the surface the organization of a dialectical confrontation signaled the *DAM*'s affinity to Manfredo Tafuri's renewed conception of architecture culture, the systems through which that discussion was enabled exposed more conservative art-historical models at the core of the museum. Once the systems of control operating within the museum were

⁷³¹ According to Klotz, the drawings in the *DAM*'s collection, particularly from Rossi and Ungers, "made it possible to talk once again of the autonomous architectural drawing." Klotz, "The Founding of the German Architecture Museum," 7.

⁷³² Schmiedeknecht, "Heinrich Klotz and Postmodernism in Germany," 79.

exposed, it was clear that rather than revealing the contradictions of architecture's past these served to smooth over such idiosyncrasies and validate a predetermined narrative, positioning the DAM much closer to Bruno Zevi's highly selective operative criticism than Tafuri's critical historical practice. While purporting to be critical, it was ultimately uncritical.

The German museum's inaugural exhibition was quite revealing of its uncritical condition and of its unreserved support for postmodern architecture. Titled *Die Revision der Moderne: Postmoderne Architektur 1960-1980* (*The Revision of Modernism: Postmodern Architecture 1960-1980*), the exhibition was a forceful presentation of postmodern architectural virtuosity. The "largest and most comprehensive display of postmodern architecture ever assembled" featured the work of 34 architects, including Robert Venturi, Hans Hollein, SITE, Leon and Rob Krier, Frank Gehry, Michael Graves, Charles Moore, Rem Koolhaas, and O.M. Ungers.⁷³³ But even then, the exhibition was understood to endorse a particular vision of postmodern architecture, with an explicit preference towards architects favored by Klotz, as Charles Jencks remarked.⁷³⁴ Effectively, in a self-reinforcing loop, the contents of Klotz's archive influenced his view on history, but his view on history also defined the contents of the archive. While "Klotz set out to define the museum as a platform for the continuing debate on the nature of architecture and its place in history," the framework under which the discipline was to be assessed was already skewed, since Klotz openly

⁷³³ Bob Gutman and Colin Amery, "Two Architecture Museums: Washington Classic, Frankfurt First," *Architects' Journal* 180, no. 32 (August 1984): 38.

⁷³⁴ In a tense exchange, Jencks accused Klotz of intentional distortions in his survey of postmodern architecture, particularly associating the absence of James Stirling from that exhibition as the result of Stirling's refusal to sell his drawings to Klotz. Jencks and Klotz, "In the Steps of Vasari," 14. Jencks accusation, however, was rather disingenuous, since the two men were rivals "for the throne of the guru of the history of postmodern architecture" (being that the main difference between Jencks and Klotz postulation of postmodern architecture hinged on Klotz's assertion that postmodernism should be understood as a progression of modernism, while for Jencks there was a clear break between the two architectural expressions) Schmiedeknecht, "Heinrich Klotz and Postmodernism in Germany," 81.

instrumentalized the museum to shape tastes and opinions rather than use it to foster inclusive, critical discussion.⁷³⁵

The *Revision of the Modern* became the institution's most famous exhibition and, just as its building, defined the German Architecture Museum as an avid promoter of architecture culture.⁷³⁶ However, it also revealed the museum's latent attitude towards historical practice and criticism. While being among the first of a new genre of architecture museums focused on discussion and exhibition, the *DAM* did not fully adopt the entire theoretical apparatus devised by Tafuri for architecture culture. In fact, by resisting the multiple readings of history and the continual dialectic confrontation between design and historical design practice, the German museum did not truly adopt Tafuri's theoretical framework. Instead, by engaging in promotion thinly veiled as critical discussion, the *DAM* merely continued previous practices of presenting architecture as an artistic endeavor, despite its claims to supporting progressive, inclusive discussion.

Canadian Centre for Architecture / Centre Canadien d'Architecture (CCA)

If in Frankfurt Tafuri's influence was restricted to empty discourse, in other architecture institutes Tafuri's presence was more pervasive. The CCA in Montreal was among them, as it explicitly adopted an approach to architecture and historical practices that resonated with Tafuri's conception of criticality. From its objectives to its archival policies, the CCA articulated what a modern architecture museum should be, particularly as it defined an ambitious, and rather unique, goal to operate both as an architecture museum and a study center. Beyond organizing a dialectical

⁷³⁵ Bergdoll, "Prototypes and Archetypes," 106.

⁷³⁶ Upon welcoming over 100,000 visitors in the four months it was installed in Frankfurt (greatly surpassing the initial attendance projections estimated at 20,000 visitors), the exhibition was deemed a tremendous success and subsequently travelled to Paris and Chicago. Klotz, "The Museum of Architecture, Frankfurt-Am-Main," 26.

confrontation between architecture and history, the CCA was committed to ensuring that such discussion was unconditioned by and untethered from any singular narrative or reading of history.

The center's objective to establish "a new form of cultural institution dedicated to the idea that architecture is a public concern" and its intentions to use architectural scholarship to further a public understanding of the discipline not only institutionalized Tafuri's conception of history but also resonated with the proponents of a Dutch architecture institute.⁷³⁷ Effectively, the CCA became a particularly paradigmatic reference to the NAI, since the Canadian center's unique objective and scope had required it "to invent a *modus operandi*" for what at its founding was "virtually a new institutional type."⁷³⁸

Despite its original institutional construction, the origins of the CCA are found in the private collection of architectural prints, drawings, and books of its strong-minded founder, Phyllis Lambert, with the history of the institution often being confounded with her own biography.⁷³⁹ Effectively, the CCA has been described as the "result of a certain set of circumstances primarily having to do with Phyllis Lambert's role: Phyllis being an architect and from Montreal, Phyllis having the will and the means, Phyllis directing a complex operation and infusing the institution with her temperament and ideals."⁷⁴⁰

Prior to establishing the CCA, Lambert was already famous in architectural circles for persuading her father, Samuel Bronfman, founder of the Seagram distilling empire, to award the commission for Seagram's new corporate headquarters in New York City to Ludwig Mies van der

⁷³⁷ Zardini, "Exhibiting and Collecting Ideas: A Montreal Perspective," 78.

⁷³⁸ Canadian Centre for Architecture, "The First Five Years," in *Centre Canadien d'Architecture: Les Débuts, 1979-1984* (Montréal: Canadian Centre for Architecture, 1984), 110.

⁷³⁹ Lambert, "The Architectural Museum: A Founder's Perspective," 308.

⁷⁴⁰ Chantal Pontbriand and George Baird, "Interview with Peter Rose," in *Centre Canadien d'Architecture/Canadian Centre for Architecture: Building and Gardens*, ed. Larry Richards (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989), 69.

Rohe and Philip Johnson.⁷⁴¹ Working on the Seagram building stirred in Lambert a passion for architecture that would become a life-long commitment.

After completing her architectural studies at Yale University and at the Illinois Institute of Technology (IIT), Lambert established her architecture office in Los Angeles, only moving back to her native Montreal in 1971. It did not take long for Lambert's ideals regarding the civic duty of architecture to be materialized in architectural activism as a few years later Lambert became personally engaged with the local preservationist movement.⁷⁴² The establishment of the CCA a few years later emerged from Lambert's same commitment to architecture and public service.⁷⁴³ While her earlier preservationist activism focused solely on the virtues of architecture's past, the CCA already alluded to Tafuri's conception of history by revealing architecture's past contradictions and employing them in a "*continuous contestation of the present*" (italics in the original) and in a broadening of future possibilities for the discipline.⁷⁴⁴

Although formally incorporated in 1979, the CCA's history can be traced back as far as 1959 when Lambert purchased several drawings at an auction of the Fatio collection. Through several other acquisitions, Lambert's collection of architectural prints and drawings was tremendously expanded in subsequent years.⁷⁴⁵ By the time the CCA was founded, Lambert had accrued

⁷⁴¹ The history of Lambert's decisive intervention in awarding that commission to Mies van der Rohe and Johnson, as well as her role in the design of the building as the project's Director of Planning is recounted by Lambert in a recent publication. See Phyllis Lambert, *Building Seagram* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013).

⁷⁴² Phyllis Lambert was the director of the *Groupe de Recherche sur les Bâtiments en Pierre Grise de Montréal* (Research Group on Grey Stone Buildings of Montreal) which produced a series of inventories of grey stone buildings in the city that were published by Quebec's Ministry of Cultural Affairs. Lambert was also instrumental in the foundation of another preservationist group, Heritage Montreal. Martin Drouin, *Le Combat du Patrimoine à Montréal (1973-2003)* (Presses de l'Université du Québec, 2005).

⁷⁴³ Lambert's lifelong defense of architecture's cultural standing inspired in 2007 the production of the documentary *Citizen Lambert: Joan of Architecture*. See "Observation on a Documentary," *Log 15* (Winter 2009): 16.

⁷⁴⁴ Tafuri, "The Tasks of Criticism," 233.

⁷⁴⁵ These included a 1727 album for Ockham Park by British architect Nicholas Hawksmoor acquired in 1964, a late sixteenth-century perspective view of the Belvedere Courtyard of the Vatican Palace in Rome

approximately 2,000 sheets of drawings and prints, mostly composed of pre-twentieth-century prints and drawings.

Lambert's interest in architectural photography was also reflected in her collection. Having understood early on the instrumentality of the medium in documenting and presenting architecture, Lambert became not just an avid collector but also an amateur photographer.⁷⁴⁶ By 1979, her architectural photography collection was populated by almost 6,000 photographic prints, but beyond its remarkable quantity, the collection was already of a unique quality. Covering the entire history of photography, the photography collection was distinguished for its focus on both content and format, since it procured not merely good architecture in photography, but also good photography of architecture.⁷⁴⁷

Equally impressive was the breadth of Lambert's architectural library. While already substantial, the 1978 acquisition of approximately 10,000 volumes from the London architecture book dealer Ben Weinreb, conferred an entire new dimension to the library.⁷⁴⁸ With such a remarkable acquisition, it seemed clear that Lambert's collection of books, prints, and drawings would not remain private for much longer. Soon, Lambert initiated the process of making her collection not just accessible and public but also a powerful instrument for the construction of architectural discourse.

then attributed to Sallustio Peruzzi acquired in 1966, and a major group of nineteenth-century drawings—the Rohault de Fleury archive—purchased in 1972. Canadian Centre for Architecture, "The Collections," 118, 119.

⁷⁴⁶ In 1972, Lambert began photographing Montreal architecture with Richard Pare, the famed British architecture photographer and another trusted ally. Moreover, her work with the *Groupe de Recherche sur les Bâtiments en Pierre Grise de Montréal* had also included a photographic study of the Grey Stone Buildings. Caroline Roux, "Interview: Phyllis Lambert," *Blueprint*, no. 279 (June 2009): 54.

⁷⁴⁷ Canadian Centre for Architecture, "The Collections," 122.

⁷⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 116.

In September 1978, Lambert commissioned a report to investigate the terms under which her private collection could become public.⁷⁴⁹ Based on the findings of the report “On Founding an Architectural Study Centre,” it was decided “to form an independent institution that would develop affiliations as appropriate.”⁷⁵⁰ This was formally “accepted by the CCA Board of Directors at its first meeting in September 1979,” thus establishing the Canadian Centre for Architecture.⁷⁵¹ Lambert was both President of the Board and Director of the new institution which intended to be a “study center and museum devoted to the art of architecture past and present, with the three-fold conviction that architecture, as part of the social and natural environment, is a public concern, that architectural research has a profound cultural influence, and that scholars have a social responsibility of the highest order.”⁷⁵² In short, the CCA intended to deepen the connections between collections of architecture, architectural scholarship, and public interpretation of the discipline. Such laudable purpose suggested, once again, how the CCA reflected Tafuri’s articulation of architecture history in both the primacy of historical research and its ability to analyze beyond the object and challenge architectural theory’s growing insularity.

The conversion of Lambert’s private collection into an institutional collection was soon reflected in the actual composition of the collection. Among the first decisions of the nascent center was the acquisition of the full architectural archive of the recently deceased Ernest Cormier, one of the most notable Canadian (and Montreal) architects of the first half of the twentieth century. The importance of the acquisition was reflected as the CCA established a new department of archives.⁷⁵³

⁷⁴⁹ With this report Lambert intended to better understand the consequences to the collection of different possible types of operation and affiliation, namely by being affiliated with a university, or a museum, by being incorporated within a governmental agency, or by operating with an independent body of trustees.

⁷⁵⁰ Canadian Centre for Architecture, “The First Five Years,” 110.

⁷⁵¹ In that same month, the CCA was granted Letters Patent under seal of the office of the Minister of Consumer and Corporate Affairs of Canada and incorporated according to Part II of the Canada Corporations Act for non-profit corporations. *Ibid.*

⁷⁵² Lambert, “The Architectural Museum: A Founder’s Perspective,” 309.

⁷⁵³ Canadian Centre for Architecture, “The Collections,” 120.

With the collection of comprehensive archives, the CCA revealed its ambition to fully transform a closed private collection into an open reputable institution for the study of architecture. It also signaled the displacement of prevailing antiquarian practices that prevented a multiplicity of readings of architecture's past, and with it, an explicit indication of the CCA's subscription to Tafuri's conception of criticality for architecture.

While formally constituted, the CCA was still not very public or influential. In its first years, the center worked primarily out of Lambert's architectural office in Montreal, with the book collection stored offsite and the photography collection in New York City. The entire small staff of the center worked out of Lambert's office, which also housed the drawings and prints collection.⁷⁵⁴ Since these conditions were far from ideal, adequate premises were required in order for the CCA to achieve its ambitious objectives and initiate an effective public program.

In late 1980, a first plan was devised for the CCA to temporarily occupy a former Hudson's Bay Company warehouse in downtown Montreal. This plan was soon abandoned, since the warehouse's limited space was inadequate to accommodate the expected long-term growth of the institution and, most importantly for Lambert, imposed a spatial hierarchy of functions which precluded the collections to be perceived as a whole and thus betraying the CCA's intellectual construction based on an egalitarian interrelationship among different collections and among the museum and study center functions.⁷⁵⁵

⁷⁵⁴ Even though books and photographs were not stored at the office, the library staff responsible for acquiring books, the curator, and an assistant responsible for the photography collection still worked out of Lambert's Montreal office. Phyllis Lambert, "Design Imperatives," in *Centre Canadien d'Architecture/Canadian Centre for Architecture: Building and Gardens*, ed. Larry Richards (Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989), 55.

⁷⁵⁵ According to Lambert, the limited space of the warehouse imposed a design solution which granted a primacy to the museum function over the study center. This occurred not merely by imposing a division of these functions and the collections by floor, but also by inherently defining primary and secondary spaces, which Lambert considered to be problematic. *Ibid.*, 56.

Compelled to procure an alternative solution for its premises, the CCA decided to occupy the historical 1874 Shaughnessy Mansion and its surrounding 1.3 acres site.⁷⁵⁶ This was considered an appropriate solution, since the plentiful space of the estate could accommodate any future growth of the institution, and the renovation of the mansion closely aligned with Lambert's commitment to the preservation of historical Montreal architecture.

In September 1983, the commission to renovate and expand the historical mansion to accommodate the Canadian Centre for Architecture was awarded to local architect Peter Rose. This was intended to infuse the project with a certain sensibility towards Montreal's architectural and urban character but also so that Lambert could personally collaborate with the project and "direct the building programme along with the development of the institution."⁷⁵⁷ This process, however, proved to be much more complicated than initially anticipated by either Rose or Lambert.⁷⁵⁸

If designing a building without an apparent structural expression or hierarchical order was already a challenge, to do so while incorporating—and respecting—an existing building became all the more taxing. However, the "process of design itself in turn clarified operating goals and procedures" so that the final form of the building reflected not just the abstract original architectural concept of non-hierarchical interconnectedness but also the CCA's growing knowledge into the everyday operations of an architectural museum and study center.⁷⁵⁹ To that end, the

⁷⁵⁶ Lambert had purchased the Shaughnessy Mansion in 1974 to prevent its demolition after the surrounding 1.3 acre site had already been cleared in 1972.

⁷⁵⁷ Lambert, "Design Imperatives," 58. The NAI would later pursue a similar solution, as the functions, spaces, and character of its new building in Rotterdam's Museum Park were devised together with the institutional definition of the architecture institute. For a comprehensive account of the NAI's establishment, see the next chapter.

⁷⁵⁸ While this process took longer than originally anticipated, it was an crucial step in the validation of the CCA's institutional ambitions, since it allowed the Canadian Museums Association to recognize the CCA as a museum (January 1984), and paved the way for the March 1984 designation by the Department of Communications of Canada as "Class A Institution" for the purposes of the Act on the Import and Export of Cultural Properties. Canadian Centre for Architecture, *CCA: The Canadian Centre for Architecture Today*, 3.

⁷⁵⁹ Lambert, "Design Imperatives," 56.

historical Shaughnessy Mansion, restored to its Victorian splendor, remained at the center of the composition, with Rose's intervention employing the same residential scale to envelop the mansion on three sides and create a variety of spaces for the CCA's different functions.⁷⁶⁰

Besides creating a new entrance to the CCA ensemble, Rose's design also established two underground floors occupied by the storage vaults holding the CCA's entire collection of prints and drawings, photography, and archives, in which the CCA's ambition to fashion unity from diversity was aptly reflected.⁷⁶¹ Thus, the design of the new addition was driven by CCA's ambition of the intellectual cross-pollination of the different fields and elements that that inform and establish the field of architecture. Such cross-pollination reflected the particular approach to the discipline championed by Lambert's center, where the different collections "fit into a comprehensive approach that reflects how architects think and work."⁷⁶²

Such an ambitious approach to the architectural archive is reflected in the center's archival policy to collect not just drawings and documentation pertaining to specific projects but entire archives of figures seminal to the discipline. The comprehensive nature of these archives was intended to offer a better understanding of the development of architectural ideas, their conditions and intentions, and thus reveal the forces that shape the architecture discipline and provide an

⁷⁶⁰ The Shaughnessy Mansion at the center of the composition accommodates a restaurant, administrative offices, and meeting rooms; the west-wing houses the bookstore, a 250-seat auditorium, and a gallery for temporary exhibitions that doubles as a small lecture hall; the east wing houses the library's general reading room, the rare documents cabinet, and the offices for the scholars in residence; while the main volume accommodates the museum function of the institution through a series of galleries of varying sizes, of both formal and informal character. There is also a curatorial level accommodating most of the support structures of the museum and study center, including the offices of librarians and curators of all the collections and the conservation laboratory. Canadian Centre for Architecture, *CCA: The Canadian Centre for Architecture Today*, 7.

⁷⁶¹ The CCA's holdings include "such diverse things as books, photographs, and engravings; maps and plans; architectural records, drawings, and sketchbooks; manuscripts; commercial product catalogs; personal correspondence, journals, and archives; ephemera; and even toys." Kurt Walter Forster, "Puzzling the Pieces," in *En Chantier: The Collections of the CCA, 1989-1999* (Montreal: Canadian Centre for Architecture, 1999), 13.

⁷⁶² Canadian Centre for Architecture, "The Collections," 114.

open-ended resource for scholarly inquiry. Thus, as an architecture museum and study center, the comprehensiveness of the archive was particularly esteemed by the CCA as it conferred to the collection an unquestionable value for research and education.⁷⁶³

The open-ended character of the archive also indicated a clear break with existing practice and an affinity to Tafuri's ideas. As the Italian historian asserted that a truly critical historical practice would require the acknowledgment of multiple readings of history and the uncovering of architecture history's breaks, difficulties, tensions, and discontinuities, an architectural archive of comprehensive composition was required. Only with a comprehensive archive could the historian "let the subject do the talking—by exposing all the multilayered detail to be found in the archives—and patiently watch for the complications, the twists and turns that point to deeper complications."⁷⁶⁴ Only in the intended neutrality of a comprehensive archive could the historian find material evidence without any "sign of force, of willful organization, whether it be force by neglect or force by imposing conceptual schemes."⁷⁶⁵ In agreement with Tafuri, Lambert and the CCA understood that the basis for any discussion in architecture's present rested in the shared territory of architecture's past, and if that basis was compromised by predetermined readings or conditioned by particular agendas and selections, then so would the ensuing discussion. The comprehensive scope of its archive became a defining quality of the CCA's specific approach to architecture, facilitating both a fruitful interaction between not just architects and historians but also the engagement with a wide audience.

⁷⁶³ While the comprehensive character of the CCA's archive has become one of its most esteemed qualities, it has not always been this way. In its first few years, the CCA focused its attention and efforts in its collections of renderings and photographs. The CCA's archives only gained a renewed appreciation upon the acquisition of the archives of international architects such as James Stirling and Aldo Rossi.

⁷⁶⁴ Wigley, "Post-Operative History," 58.

⁷⁶⁵ Ibid.

With “the official opening of its new building on May 7, 1989, the CCA [initiated] an on-going public program.”⁷⁶⁶ The work performed at the study center and the variety of exhibitions hosted in the museum galleries in subsequent years only reinforced the center’s reputation as an original producer of architectural discourse and influencer of opinions.⁷⁶⁷ Among the center’s most famed exhibitions are its opening show “Architecture and Its Image: Four Centuries of Architectural Representation” (May 7 to August 7, 1989), which examined the complex and often difficult relationship between the architectural object and its representation; the monographic exhibition “Cities of Artificial Excavation: The Work of Peter Eisenman, 1978-1988” (March 2 to June 19, 1994), which questioned the presence of the idea of site “as a locus of possibilities” in Eisenman’s work and criticism of the discipline; the also monographic “Herzog & de Meuron: Archaeology of the Mind” (October 23, 2002 to April 6, 2003), which examined the influences and working methods of the Swiss duo’s architectural production; and “Actions: What You Can Do With the City” (November 26, 2008 to April 19, 2009), which proposed a series of individual actions on the city that could provoke meaningful bottom-up change for the urban environment.⁷⁶⁸

⁷⁶⁶ In that same year, the CCA hosted in Montreal both the annual meeting of the Society of Architectural Historians (SAH) between April 12 and 16 and the fifth conference of the International Confederation of Architecture Museums (ICAM) from October 1 to 6. SAH members had an exclusive preview of the CCA’s new building and of its opening exhibitions, since the building was only officially inaugurated in the following month. In 1989, Phyllis Lambert was both the local chairperson for the SAH and President of ICAM. Phyllis Lambert, “The Canadian Centre for Architecture,” *Society of Architectural Historians. Newsletter* 33, no. 1 (February 1989): 4.

⁷⁶⁷ Even before the opening of its new building, the CCA had already been engaged in the public dissemination of its collections through institutional collaborations for the production of exhibitions, seminars, and publications. Perhaps the most notable of the CCA’s early interventions in architectural discourse was the center’s first international exhibition “Photography and Architecture: 1839-1939” which travelled to Cologne, Chicago, New York, Paris, and Ottawa. The exhibition and the accompanying volume investigated the “the history of architecture seen through photography, and the history of photography through architecture,” while also presenting the fledgling institution and its collection to the museum establishment. Canadian Centre for Architecture, *Photography and Architecture, 1839-1939*, ed. Richard Pare (Montreal: Canadian Centre for Architecture/Centre Canadien d’Architecture, 1982).

⁷⁶⁸ The scholarship and disciplinary advancement of these exhibitions was documented in their catalogues. See Eve Blau and Edward Kaufman, eds., *Architecture and Its Image: Four Centuries of Architectural Representation: Works from the Collection of the Canadian Centre for Architecture*, Canadian Centre for Architecture Documents of Contemporary Architecture (Montreal: Canadian Centre for

Beyond having contributed to a reconsideration of the architectural discipline at different levels, these exhibitions also produced significant advances to the medium of the architecture exhibition. “Cities of Artificial Excavation,” for example, pioneered the use of architectural installation for the dissemination of architectural knowledge, as Peter Eisenman was given free reign over the main galleries, while “Archaeology of the Mind” was instrumental in changing the status of the architectural exhibition catalogue by positioning the accompanying volume as a complementary, yet autonomous, tool for scholarship, and “Actions” engaged its public in a truly interactive dialogue through its accompanying website where the audience could propose additional actions to change the city. Moreover, these exhibitions in particular, but the CCA’s diverse exhibitions program in general, presented the broad engagement of the discipline that continues to direct the activities of the center, where exhibitions are not merely “of architecture,” but increasingly “for/about/on architecture.”⁷⁶⁹

The societal engagement implicit—if not explicit—in the architectural installations and manifestations produced within the galleries of the CCA was also reminiscent of Tafuri’s denouncement of the growing insularity of architecture discussion. Architecture exhibitions acted not just as preferred outlets to the scholarly research and informed discussion being conducted at the study center, but also grounded architecture in contemporary reality, reaching for “matters beyond architecture itself” to challenge architecture’s “growing ideological insularity.”⁷⁷⁰

Architecture, 1989). Jean-François Bédard, ed., *Cities of Artificial Excavation: The Work of Peter Eisenman, 1978-1988* (New York: Rizzoli International, 1994). Philip Ursprung, ed., *Herzog & de Meuron: Natural History* (Baden: Lars Müller Publishers, 2002). Mirko Zardini and Giovanna Borasi, eds., *Actions: What You Can Do With the City* (Montreal: Canadian Centre for Architecture, 2008).

⁷⁶⁹ Mirko Zardini, “A Project for Two Buildings,” ed. Monika Platzer, *ICAM Print 4* (February 2012): 30.

⁷⁷⁰ Andrew Leach, “History in the Age of Historical Representation,” in *Manfredo Tafuri: Choosing History* (Ghent: A&S Books, Department of Architecture & Urban Planning, Ghent University, 2007), 105.

Such broad approach to study and dissemination of architecture was admired by many, including the proponents of a Dutch architecture institute. Like Lambert, they too were interested in establishing a projective—and progressive—institute from a fairly removed architecture collection. Even though one was private and the other was public, both collections had mostly an indirect engagement with the discipline as resources of artifacts and drawings presented in exhibitions in collaborating venues, or as resources of archival material used in the production of other institutions' exhibitions.⁷⁷¹

Beyond sharing a similar past, the CCA and the NAI also shared a similar future, as both were intent on institutionalizing a progressive approach to architecture history that was in many ways reminiscent of Tafuri's theoretical constructs. The commitment of both institutions to rigorous scholarship and methodical research as the foundation of a renewed criticality for architecture was most clearly expressed in their common approach to the architectural archive. Both the CCA and the NAI intended to document the process of design through the accumulation of comprehensive archives and to use those archives for the advancement of architectural scholarship. Just as the CCA had intended to reinforce the connection between architectural collections, scholarship, and public dissemination, proponents of the Dutch architecture institute envisioned a similar objective to their own institution.⁷⁷² Given such close parallels between the conditions and ambitions of the NAI, it was only sensible for the organizations preparing the future Dutch institute to consider the CCA's recent experience in their own discussions.

⁷⁷¹ Even when the *NDB* organized exhibitions in the *Droogbak* building, these tended to be modest, since the space available was not suited for the installation of architecture exhibitions.

⁷⁷² Despite adopting the title "Centre," the establishment of a projective institution for the advancement of architecture was the materialization of a type of institution that had been referred to in the Netherlands as an architecture institute. Moreover, the CCA originally dubbed its study program as the "Architectural Study Institute at the CCA." See Phyllis Lambert, "The Canadian Centre for Architecture: Collections and Programs," *ARQ: Architecture/Quebec*, no. 47 (February 1989): 11.

Despite the similarities, in the Netherlands the founders of the NAI were also “very aware of the differences” between the proposed institute and its foreign reference institutions.⁷⁷³ Specifically, there were conditions available to the CCA that were not consistent with the Dutch context. A substantial distinction was the funding model employed by the CCA, since the “lavish endowment” established by Phyllis Lambert was rather distinct from the conventional model employed by Dutch museums, all but entirely dependent on public funding.⁷⁷⁴ Thus, while the CCA has been primarily concerned with “how the stock market performs,” the yet unnamed Dutch architecture institute would have to contend with the changing political fortunes of public funding for culture.⁷⁷⁵

The greatest distinction between the two institutions also directly emerged from their diverging funding models and concerned the CCA and the NAI’s level of autonomy from—and accountability to—political structures. While the CCA was the realization of Phyllis Lambert’s vision, who as a private individual could unilaterally decide everything, the future NAI was a collective project that needed to satisfy all involved parties, from merging organizations to funding Ministries. In fact, after overcoming some difficulties, the establishment of the Dutch architecture institute became a paradigmatic example of the Dutch “polder-model” consensus-building tradition in which different interests were taken into consideration and a satisfactory compromise is achieved.

Nederlands Architectuurinstituut / Netherlands Architecture Institute (NAI)

⁷⁷³ Colenbrander, interview.

⁷⁷⁴ For the foundation of the CCA, Phyllis Lambert donated 750,000 shares of her family’s Seagram Company to the center. Elizabeth Crinion, “Montreal Opens Its Architecture Museum,” *Blueprint*, no. 60 (September 1989): 10.

⁷⁷⁵ According to Steffen Bøddeker, the CCA Director of Communications, despite being well-endowed, the CCA is also “grateful for the additional funding it receives” from private and corporate sponsors in support of its general activities and of specific projects. Richard Carr, “Phyllis Lambert and the Canadian Centre for Architecture,” *Studio International*, September 22, 2008, <http://www.studiointernational.com/index.php/phyllis-lambert-and-the-canadian-centre-for-architecture>.

Despite its unique funding model and monocratic leadership, the CCA was still a significant reference to the Dutch institute, even identified during the preparatory talks as “the only example of a full and complete formulation of an architecture institute to date.”⁷⁷⁶ The Dutch delegation confirmed their amazement with the CCA, when attending ICAM 5 in Montreal in 1989.⁷⁷⁷ As Ruud Brouwers, Bernard Colenbrander, and others were guided around the CCA’s new building, they could finally observe firsthand the materialization of the Canadian center’s ambitious project, which similarly to the NAI, intended to create a new type of architecture institution. In the course of the days of the conference (October 1 to 6, 1989), the representatives of the newly founded NAI had the opportunity to examine the remarkable conditions available in the Canadian center.

While the collection of “Architectural Archives” (already numbering “more than a quarter million items”) at the core of the CCA was certainly remarkable and the “archive facilities . . . left a lasting impression on those who took part at the conference,” it failed to astound the NAI’s delegation since the NAI’s own comprehensive archive also included “all the elements that [gave] evidence of the personality and the practice of an architect.”⁷⁷⁸ Instead, the attention of the NAI representatives was drawn to the provisions created to host and foster the intellectual debate between architects and historians, particularly the study center.⁷⁷⁹ If the collection established the basic shared territory for fruitful discussion, the study center was the most significant function in

⁷⁷⁶ Werkgroep NAI, “Brochure Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur, Stedebouw En Landschaaparchitectuur,” 2.

⁷⁷⁷ The Dutch delegation was composed by eight staff members of the NAI, who visited “the Canadian Centre for Architecture (CCA) in Montreal, a new museum of architecture whose design is similar to that of the Netherlands Architecture Institute.” Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, “NAI Jaarverslag 1989,” 18.

⁷⁷⁸ Lambert, “The Canadian Centre for Architecture,” 3. Seip and Steiner, “ICAM Conferences, A Retrospective View,” 19. As the conference focused “on the conservation and preservation of works of art on paper,” the CCA’s state of the art conservation laboratory was another element of note from the Canadian center.

⁷⁷⁹ Bernard Colenbrander recalls the group’s amazement particularly with the conditions created in the study center. Colenbrander, interview.

producing architecture scholarship and activating the dialectical confrontation between architects and historians.

Given that both the CCA and the NAI had modeled their organizations in a shared intellectual project, there was tremendous interest in the Dutch institute regarding the translation of their similar ambitions and program into built form. Upon the delegation's return to the Netherlands, Ruud Brouwers was asked by the NAI's board to present a slide show of their trip to Montreal, which so impressed the board that they decided to send Hans Andersson on a fact-finding mission to Canada. There, he was to learn more about the materialization of the CCA and the NAI's common objective to foster exchange among architects, historians, and the general public.⁷⁸⁰

In the process of forming the Netherlands Architecture Institute, the establishment, organization, and support of an inclusive architectural debate became a crucial proposition. After all, the *NDB* already possessed a towering architectural archive, but it had thus far failed to frequently engage it in a meaningful way. As the notion that a continuous confrontation between architects and historians could not just activate the *NDB*'s architectural archive but also foster a greater societal engagement with architecture became prevalent, the institutionalization of a dialectical opposition between history and architecture became a key argument and intention for the foundation of a progressive architecture institute.

In pursuing this objective (and developing the documentation center into a fully-fledged architecture institute), the historians of the *NDB* found in the architects of the activist organization *Stichting Wonen* (Living/Housing Foundation) a deserving partner and the other half of Tafuri's

⁷⁸⁰ C. Hofstede, "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 19 Oktober 1989," October 23, 1989, 2, BSTU 1989. Although Andersson's primary objective was to gather information that could offer guidance to the architect of the NAI's new building, in the board's discussion it was also mentioned that the trip to Canada was equally a well-deserved reward for Andersson's hard work in establishing the NAI.

prescription for a productive dialectical confrontation. If the *NDB* had been entirely preoccupied with the past, *Stichting Wonen* had been primarily concerned with the future. Any institutionalization of a dialectical confrontation between past and future, history and architecture, in the Netherlands would inevitably have to include these two organizations, as they came to increasingly engage in the present moment.

Since its inception in 1946, *Stichting Wonen* had been presenting the future of architecture to a wide public. Originally titled *Stichting Goed Wonen* (Good Living/Housing Foundation), this organization had initially been constituted by Dutch manufacturers of household goods and furniture to promote a modern way of living to the Dutch public.⁷⁸¹ This was also an idealistic task, since beyond demonstrating how modern furniture design could bring a new level of comfort to the home, *Stichting Goed Wonen* also presented modern architecture as a way for reorganizing society based on ideas for communal living.

After almost twenty-five years of introducing the Dutch public to modern living, *Stichting Goed Wonen* was becoming a victim of its own success and thus increasingly obsolete. In 1969 the board decided to adapt the foundation to the new societal context in the Netherlands and redefined the foundation as a lifestyle organization. In order to indicate its shift of orientation, the foundation changed its name to simply *Stichting Wonen* and renamed its monthly periodical to *Wonen*.⁷⁸² The changes did not have the desired effect, as the foundation continued its decline in the following years.

In 1972, however, *Stichting Wonen's* fortune was reversed and the organization found a new purpose from without. In that year, Ruud Brouwers approached the foundation's board with a

⁷⁸¹ Among the founding industries was the upholstery company De Ploeg and other modern corporations that fabricated chairs and tables based on modern ideas.

⁷⁸² In both the title of the magazine and of the institution, the word *Goed* (Good) was dropped.

proposal to merge his own architectural magazine *TABK (Tijdschrift voor Architectuur en Beeldende Kunsten*, or Magazine for Architecture and Visual Arts) with the foundation's own *Wonen*.⁷⁸³ This arrangement dramatically altered the profile of the foundation, which now found an important outlet and a substantial audience in the newly established bi-weekly magazine *Wonen TABK*.

The new magazine began publication in 1973, and under Brouwers' leadership became a central element in the effort to resist the controversial modern urban renewal of Amsterdam in the first half of the 1970s, and with it, so did *Stichting Wonen*.⁷⁸⁴ Rallied by Brouwers and the magazine, the foundation's store on the *Leidestraat* became a center of operations for coordinating popular opposition to the urban renewal projects. Paradoxically, the organization which had first been established to support the dissemination of modern interior and architecture was now actively opposing the application of modern urban principles to Amsterdam.⁷⁸⁵ Such inversion was only possible since the decline of the foundation had turned it into a shell organization, without a direction, an objective, or most significantly, an audience. *Wonen TABK*, however, changed all that by compelling *Stichting Wonen* back to architectural activism, even if newly complex objectives.

⁷⁸³ While in her account of the history of *Archis* Emily King has claimed that *Wonen TABK* was the result of "an amalgamation of two already long running titles *Goed Wonen* and *Het Katholiek Bouwblad*," in reality the *Roomsche Katholiek Bouwblad* (Roman Catholic Building Journal, the official title of the publication) founded in 1929 to which *Wonen TABK* and *Archis* trace their beginnings had already been reestablished in a secularization process in 1960 as the *Tijdschrift voor Architectuur en Beeldende Kunsten Bouwblad*, becoming simply *TABK* in 1968. Emily King, "Media Archis," *032c*, no. 7 (Summer 2004): 90–95. Brouwers had been the editor of the magazine since 1968, but in the early 1970s he took control of the periodical in order to prevent the *Telegraaf* newspaper conglomerate from acquiring it. After Brouwers had already collected the listings of all 3,000 subscribers, he was able to negotiate with the publishing company the purchase of the name *TABK* for the sum of 2,000 guilders and effectively move the magazine from Limburg to Amsterdam. Brouwers, interview.

⁷⁸⁴ While the 1970s the foundation and its magazine were greatly confounded, in 1980 a new editorial charter ensured the editorial independence of *Wonen TABK* from *Stichting Wonen*, in what became a model for the relation between the *Nederlands Architectuurinstituut* and its own journal, *Archis*.

⁷⁸⁵ According to Brouwers, it was "really amazing, since [*Stichting Wonen*] had been a movement to 'sell' the extensions of the city, the openness, but at that moment, it was the heart of an organization to defend traditional streets, traditional dwellings, and traditional parts of the city. It was completely inverted." Brouwers, interview.

In order to affect real change, both foundation and magazine had to engage with a much wider constituency, thus “*Wonen TABK* decisively changed from a professional platform into a broadly oriented cultural periodical, seeking structural collaboration with disciplines beyond architecture and urban planning.”⁷⁸⁶ By 1979, once the battles for urban renewal had subsided, the foundation stated objective was “the awakening of an understanding of the cultural aspects of the design of the built environment” to the widest possible audience.⁷⁸⁷

The revelation of the cultural aspects of architecture and urban planning was an uphill battle. Dutch architecture in the 1970s was greatly defined by consultation procedures in which the appreciation of the cultural dimension of architecture was hardly ever considered, but *Stichting Wonen* had intended to change that.⁷⁸⁸ At the start of the 1980s, *Stichting Wonen* was continuing its pattern of engaged architectural activism in raising awareness to the cultural attributes of architecture and supporting the emergence of new architectural expressions.

The *NDB* and *Stichting Wonen* earliest collaboration occurred when the *NDB* first experimented with museological activities, as in 1973 the *NDB*'s inaugural exhibition took refuge in the *Stichting Wonen*'s space on *Leidsestraat* after its own accommodations had been deemed inadequate.⁷⁸⁹ However, it was the shared territory of the sprawling archive in the documentation center that would bring the two organizations together beyond sporadic collaboration. As *Stichting Wonen* made use of the archival material hosted at the documentation center, the relation between the two

⁷⁸⁶ Vletter, *The Critical Seventies*, 46.

⁷⁸⁷ Baalman and Jong, “Museum of Archief: Kanttekeningen Bij de Collecties van Een Nieuw Architectuurinstituut,” 40.

⁷⁸⁸ *Stichting Wonen*'s efforts did not go unnoticed, and in 1979 it was awarded the Rotterdam-Maaskant Prize for its work on revealing the cultural dimension of architecture and urban planning. Since Brouwers was specially mentioned in the Rotterdam-Maaskant Prize, the foundation board offered him half of the monetary prize, which he used to travel across Latin America for a year. Before departing, Brouwers however, recommended Hans van Dijk to take his place as editor of *Wonen TABK*. Brouwers, interview.

⁷⁸⁹ Stichting Architectuurmuseum, “Geschiedenis van Het Architectuurmuseum,” 4.

organizations continued to develop. Their relation reached a turning point in 1981 when both had the same idea: to organize an exhibition on the prolific Dutch architectural office “Van den Broek en Bakema” to honor Jaap Bakema’s recent death.⁷⁹⁰ This exhibition (which *Stichting Wonen* ended up organizing) revealed to both organizations how useful it could be to work more closely together. The architectural archive at the *NDB* was supporting Tafuri’s assertions, as it fulfilled its function as a shared territory from which a productive discussion between architects and historians could emerge.

At the same time, the cooperation between the *NDB* and *Stichting Wonen* was growing beyond merely institutional, with the staff of both organizations informally socializing. As Mariet Willinge, then deputy manager of the *NDB*, has put it, “we were friends, and we worked together, organized things together.”⁷⁹¹

The shared territory of the *NDB*’s growing architectural archive had literally brought the two organizations so close that by the end of 1981 the idea of joint-accommodations for the two organizations was floated. Beyond the implementation of an alternative methodological approach to architecture culture, this was also a pragmatic and practical proposal. Both institutions had grown increasingly dissatisfied with their current facilities, as the storefront occupied by *Stichting Wonen* was considered small and the *NDB*’s *Droogbak* building did not have climate control or any other amenities necessary for an archive.⁷⁹² Together, Dick van Woerkom and Ruud Brouwers, the directors of the *NDB* and *Stichting Wonen*, walked “around Amsterdam looking for a space to

⁷⁹⁰ Willinge, interview.

⁷⁹¹ Ibid.

⁷⁹² When the documentation center moved to the second floor of the *Droogbak* building, it was initially intended to be merely a temporary arrangement while the *Arsenaal* building on *Waterlooplein* was being renovated. Given that the accommodation of the *NDB* at the *Droogbak* was to be temporary, no significant investments were made in retrofitting the nineteenth-century office building to suitably house an archive, making those premises ill-suited for both the conservation and exhibition of archival material and the need for a new building all the more pressing. Platzer, “Interview with Mariet Willinge,” 50.

occupy together,” something “suitable to accommodate the two institutions together but as separate institutions, that is, as *Stichting Wonen* and as *NDB*.”⁷⁹³ But by sharing their premises, the two organizations also intended to concentrate their resources, affording both greater capability and visibility, a reorganization that was also endorsed by the Ministry of Culture.⁷⁹⁴

Even though the *NDB* and *Stichting Wonen* never found an adequate space to jointly occupy, the connection between these organizations was nevertheless intensifying on two distinct levels: on a staff and a governmental level. The growing agreement of these organizations’ complementarity was translated into two policy papers reflecting a remarkable alignment of intents of both bottom-up and top-down initiatives to officially recognize the potential synergy between the *NDB* and the *Stichting Wonen*.

The first of the two documents appeared on April 18, 1982, as a policy memorandum authored by the *NDB*’s manager, Dick van Woerkom.⁷⁹⁵ In this memorandum, van Woerkom not only strongly advocated for the combination of the documentation center under his management with *Stichting Wonen*, but also announced in no uncertain terms that this operation should result in a projective architecture institute rather than a reflective architecture museum. Considering that the “built environment is already such a museum” of architecture, van Woerkom proposed instead an architecture institute “in which the built environment can be studied” and “in which incentives can be developed to build better environments.”⁷⁹⁶ With this document the architecture institute

⁷⁹³ Brouwers, interview. and Willinge, interview.

⁷⁹⁴ The library was often mentioned as the most visible potential benefit of the centralization of resources. While the *NDB* possessed an extensive library and no librarian, *Stichting Wonen* had a small library but with good system of newspaper clippings and a librarian on staff. Moreover, by consolidating their libraries, the resulting combined—albeit still limited—budget could be better managed to further extend the collection of a single library simply by avoiding the duplication of titles.

⁷⁹⁵ Woerkom, “Nota Het Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedenbouw (NIAS).”

⁷⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 4. Dick van Woerkom would even state that the example of an enormous museum full of hierarchies and bureaucracies should be a natural deterrent for the constitution of an architecture museum and a clear argument for the establishment of a much more agile (and less costly) architecture institute with a

defined a methodological basis for rigorous historical study of architecture and how this could advance the discipline.

According to the memorandum, the Dutch Institute for Architecture and Urban Planning, or *NIAS* (from its Dutch title *Nederlands Instituut voor Architectuur en Stedenbouw*) did not need to be created from scratch, since the Ministry of Culture already had two policy institutions that it could use as the building blocks for the proposed institute: the *NDB* and the *Stichting Wonen*.⁷⁹⁷ The combination of these two institutions would ensure the study and development of architecture and the built environment, the two main objectives of the proposed *NIAS*. With its biweekly magazine and constant production of architectural exhibitions and other manifestations, the *Stichting Wonen* was considered the ideal partnering organization for the dissemination of the knowledge within the *NDB*'s vast archives. Together, it was claimed, the *NDB* and *Stichting Wonen* “covered the entire range expected from an ‘architecture museum’ in the modern conception” but could also maximize resources and governmental funding by “jointly using functional services such as exhibition space, workshops, photo services, [and] library.”⁷⁹⁸ The proposed architecture institute was to be located in “the city which already hosts the elements of this *NIAS*,” the city of Amsterdam.⁷⁹⁹ Specifically, van Woerkom argued that the new institute would not find a better place to thrive than the *Beurs*

limited staff. In the “political conclusions” section of the memorandum he mused that the architecture institute should be “as much as possible only the facilitator of social processes in both areas [of architecture and urban planning] to private parties, minimizing its role as executor of these processes, a truly neo-liberal thought!” much more aligned with the current government’s political orientation.

⁷⁹⁷ Ibid.

⁷⁹⁸ The complementarity of the two organizations was such that it was argued that the *NIAS* as whole would be greater than the sum of its parts. To express how the combination of both organizations would create a single institute instead of the previously discussed joint accommodation, Dick van Woerkom resorted to the equation “(1 + 1 = 1, and not 2).” Ibid., 6 and 7.

⁷⁹⁹ Ibid., 10.

van Berlage (Berlage's Exchange), an influential building in the history of Dutch modern architecture, right in the center of Amsterdam.⁸⁰⁰

With the merger of “these two fraternal twins into an architecture institute” it was necessary to also consider the implications for the *SAM*.⁸⁰¹ Accordingly, Dick van Woerkom argued that since the establishment of an architecture institute would fulfill the *SAM*'s original 1955 objectives, it could thus be dissolved. However, instead of merely closing, it was suggested rather presciently that the *SAM* could become a “club of friends and direct private contributions, to this new *NIAS*.”⁸⁰²

While the two merging organizations were already under the tutelage of the Ministry of Culture, van Woerkom argued that since architecture and urban planning occupied the intersection between technology and art, industry and culture, the proposed institute could find wider support (and funding) in other ministries, namely in the Ministry of Housing and in the Ministry of Transport.⁸⁰³ In return for their financial and political support, the ministries involved could be represented in the directing bodies of the new institute (the Advisory Council and the Scientific Committee), thus ensuring that their policies were also reflected in the activities of the *NIAS*. The garnering of wide political and financial support from the government was the main objective of this policy paper, so it was only fitting that it was concluded by questioning the discrepancy in the current governmental support between architecture and other cultural fields. Rather than questioning the largess towards the “theater world” and the “museum of literature,” the two final questions were intended to reveal how inadequate and disproportional the current governmental funding for architecture was, and—

⁸⁰⁰ This was another prescient suggestion from Dick van Woerkom, since a few years later the *Beurs* hosted some exhibitions organized by the *Stichting Wonen-NDB* partnership, and the city of Amsterdam offered the building to the future architecture institute in order to see it established in that city.

⁸⁰¹ Woerkom, “Nota Het Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedenbouw (*NIAS*),” 8.

⁸⁰² *Ibid.* This suggestion was carried out in 1988, when with the official foundation of the *Nederlands Architectuurinstituut* the *SAM* was transformed into the Leliman Association, which later adopted the title Association Friends of the *NAi* (*De Vereniging Vrienden van het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut*).

⁸⁰³ *Ibid.*, 9.

naturally—demand much greater support going forward, starting with unambiguous support for the establishment of the proposed architecture institute.

While embryonic and only offering general guidelines to the possible merger between the *NDB* and the *Stichting Wonen*, this policy memorandum enunciated the swelling opinion and sentiment of both institutions' staff and leadership. Moreover, it also laid out the basic guidelines for much of the subsequent discussion and negotiation in establishing a Dutch architecture institute as several of the issues and solutions presented in this memorandum were eventually adopted with the foundation of the NAI in 1988.⁸⁰⁴

Soon after the *NDB*'s memorandum authored by Dick van Woerkom began to circulate within the Ministry of Culture, the State Committee for Museums (*Rijkscommissie voor de Musea*) decided to weigh in on the matter and began a consultation process to assess the feasibility and importance of establishing an architecture museum or institute in the Netherlands.⁸⁰⁵ Similar to van Woerkom's memorandum, the State Committee's recommendation presented a clear image of what that advisory body "wanted to have as a new, not architecture museum but, architectural institute."⁸⁰⁶

Headed by Jean Leering, the long-serving director of the Van Abbe Museum in Eindhoven and former *SAM* board member, the sub-committee responsible for the recommendation consulted with

⁸⁰⁴ Beyond the already signaled discussions regarding the proposal to accommodate the new institute in the *Beurs van Berlage* and the transformation of the *SAM* into an association of "friends" of the future institute, van Woerkom also first contemplated the logistical and legal difficulties that were to arise with the combination of the benefits and pension plans enjoyed by the civil servants of the *NDB* and the employees at the private *Stichting Wonen*.

⁸⁰⁵ This was the second time this advisory body was considering this issue, since in 1928 the same body (albeit with a slightly different name) had already deliberated in favor of the establishment of a projective architecture institute in Delft. See section "An architecture museum in the *Zuiderkerk*" in chapter 3.

⁸⁰⁶ Willinge, interview. While the State Committee for Museums frequently referred to the proposed institution as an architecture museum, it was in fact recommending the establishment of a projective architecture institute which "besides a museum [was] also a forum for the discussion of opinions on issues relating to: architecture, urban design, landscape design, urban planning, land use and spatial planning." *Ibid.*, 7.

several interested parties throughout 1982.⁸⁰⁷ These included the Ministry of Housing and the Ministry of Culture, *Stichting Wonen*, the *SAM*, the *Monumentenzorg* and the *NDB*, but also other organizations, like the architect's professional organization *BNA (Bond van Nederlandse Architecten)* and the State agency *Direktie Kunsten* (Directorate of Arts).⁸⁰⁸

Upon conclusion of the extensive consultation procedures, the State Committee for Museums submitted its recommendation to Minister of Culture, Elco Brinkman, on December 16, 1982. In rather unambiguous terms, the recommendation stipulated that “a permanent museological focus on ‘architecture’ [was] of the greatest importance for the development of ‘architecture’ in the Netherlands.”⁸⁰⁹ Therefore, the State Committee endorsed the establishment of an architecture institute created from the bundling of existing initiatives which could develop museological tasks on architecture under the joint purview of the Ministry of Housing and the Ministry of Culture.

The recommendation was structured around four critical questions for which the committee offered its informed assessment. The first two questions attempted to establish the context for an architectural museum by (respectively) assessing the interest in architecture present in Dutch society and investigating the suitability of a museological approach in the dissemination of architecture. The third and fourth questions were complementary and were intended to present an evaluation of the current and future condition of architectural exhibitions. While the third question

⁸⁰⁷ Beyond its chairman, the sub-committee was composed of R.R. de Haas and R.J. Willink, respectively the director and a senior advisor of the State Department of Visual Arts (Rijksdienst Beeldende Kunst); C.J.A.C. Peeters and Auke van der Woud, both professors of architecture history associated with Amsterdam universities, and the art historian I.L. Szénássy.

⁸⁰⁸ At the time of the consultation process in 1982, the *BNA* controlled the *SAM* as a result of its 1979 financial assistance to the ailing Architecture Museum Foundation. See chapter 3.

⁸⁰⁹ Haan-Groen and Haas, “Advies van de Rijkscommissie Voor de Musea Aan de Minister van WVC over Oprichting van Een Architectuurinstituut 1989,” 2.

interrogated the adequacy of the existing apparatus for architectural exhibitions, the fourth estimated the potential consequences of the establishment of an architecture museum.

According to the committee findings, there was an unquestionable swelling of popular interest in architecture and its public presentation in the Netherlands and abroad.⁸¹⁰ However, the organization of architecture exhibitions in the Netherlands was still sporadic and almost entirely left to private initiative, something that should be corrected with an architecture institute.

For that, the committee identified the four main tasks of an architecture institute as being “the development, conservation, and management of the collection (with inventories and documentation); the public presentation of the collection (and temporary exhibitions); the dissemination of architecture (through educational activities, publications, lectures, ...); and the provision of support services (in support of the activities of third parties).”⁸¹¹ While acknowledging that these functions were already being performed separately by the *NDB* and *Stichting Wonen*, the committee argued that a close coordination of their activities would create in the proposed architecture institute a much more assertive instrument in the advancement of architecture than the two organizations could ever achieve independently. Beyond enhancing efficiency and visibility, the new architecture institute was deemed a “necessary improvement to the existing situation” since it would also encourage greater public attention to architecture.⁸¹²

The committee’s identification of the main tasks of the proposed architecture institute could also be used to summarize how both the current condition of the *NDB* and *Stichting Wonen* and the

⁸¹⁰ In support of this assertion, the committee presented the success of the 1975 quartet of architectural exhibitions for the *Monumentenjaar* (European Architectural Heritage Year) and the “increasing number of magazines, newspaper columns, articles and special symposia.” Internationally, the growing interest in architecture and the suitability of exhibitions for its dissemination was indicated by the first ICAM (International Confederation of Architecture Museums) conference held in Helsinki in 1979. *Ibid.*, 4 and 6.

⁸¹¹ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁸¹² *Ibid.*, 10.

future condition of the proposed architecture museum qualified in Tafuri's theoretical framework. While the *NDB* was already tending to the necessary shared territory of architecture culture (archive), *Stichting Wonen* was already fostering a greater societal engagement for the discipline (through exhibitions and other forms of dissemination), but together they could finally organize a dialectical confrontation that could further propel the advancement of the discipline (the whole was greater than the sum of its parts). With the architecture institute, these three main components of Tafuri's critical model for architecture were to be integrated into an institution that occupied the present moment to bridge past and future.

The idea of using the *NDB* and *Stichting Wonen* as the basic components of a future architecture institute was further elaborated in response to the fourth and final question. If previous responses were general and abstract, the last response presented a "brief practical exercise" outlining a specific plan for the implementation of its recommendation to merge the separate organizations into one architecture institute.⁸¹³ These practical considerations included "spatial accommodations," staff and funding arrangements, as well as a proposal for resolving the current problematic dualistic power structure of the *NDB* (controlled by both the *SAM* and the *Monumentenzorg*) by allowing the *NDB* to both manage and own its collections.

The most significant proposal, however, addressed the governance of the institute, to which the committee offered two alternatives without indicating a preference for either. Namely, the new institute could either be an independent foundation represented in its board by the Ministries involved, or it could simply be an organization dependent on a State agency.⁸¹⁴ While both

⁸¹³ *Ibid.*, 12.

⁸¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 16.

alternatives had advantages and disadvantages, both were expected to accommodate an advisory council through which other groups could also be represented within the institute.⁸¹⁵

The State Committee was unequivocal in its recommendation and forcefully urged the establishment of an architecture institute, considering it to be “an act of the greatest cultural significance” and closely aligned with the conclusion of the *NDB*'s earlier policy memorandum.⁸¹⁶ In fact, these two policy documents were utterly complementary, making that at “around the same time, there was an official policy paper by the government and a policy memorandum done by the workers [of the *NDB*],” revealing a remarkable alignment of intentions.⁸¹⁷ Such agreement constituted a unique opportunity that should be seized, since any further postponement of the initiative to establish an architecture museum could endanger its realization entirely.⁸¹⁸ The same belief was expressed by the *SAM*, as it published a brochure to entice potential donors with the suggestive title, “Architecture Museum: Now or Never...!”⁸¹⁹

The favorable conditions and wide agreement for the establishment of an architecture institute culminated in the joint organization by *Stichting Wonen*, *NDB* and *SAM* of the 1983 Biennale of Young Dutch Architects. This event not only served as a testing ground for their cooperation, but also as a preview of the proposed institute's approach to architecture and commitment to inclusive discussion and public engagement. Like the proposed institute the first Biennale intended to

⁸¹⁵ According to the State Committee for Museums, the advantages and disadvantages of both models originated from the different power balance between public and private initiative. The option to establish an independent foundation, would facilitate the joint funding from both involved ministries as well as private donations, but would have a more tenuous connection to the government policies. Conversely, the alternative of establishing the museum as a governmental dependency, had the disadvantage of being associated with only one governmental department, but the advantage of becoming a direct instrument for governmental policies. *Ibid.*

⁸¹⁶ *Ibid.*, 18.

⁸¹⁷ Willinge, interview.

⁸¹⁸ Haan-Groen and Haas, “Advies van de Rijkscommissie Voor de Musea Aan de Minister van WVC over Oprichting van Een Architectuurinstituut 1989,” 18.

⁸¹⁹ Stichting Architectuurmuseum, “Architectuur Museum, Nu of Nooit...!,” 1980, SAMU 78.

establish a platform for public discussion, the presentation of architectural ideas (both old and new) and the support of an emerging architectural talent. Moreover, the Biennale presented the architectural exhibition and inclusive discussions as favored mediums for the dissemination of architecture discipline and its engagement with a wider public. The parallel between the Biennale and the institute was merely confirmed by the suggestion that the three institutions responsible for its organization were the perfect components for the architecture institute, with their complementary functions and objectives.⁸²⁰

While a preview of what was to come, the 1983 Biennale was also the culmination of a decisive shift in the *NDB* (under the influence of *Stichting Wonen*) primarily expressed in its exhibitions. Slowly but surely, the *NDB* had been shifting its exhibition program from solely addressing historical reflection, like the 1978 exhibition “Dutch Public Housing in the Period 1900-1940” or the 1977 “Palladio,” to presenting the most innovative foreign architects like the monographic exhibitions “Eisenman-Hejduk” in 1981 and “Tadao Ando” in 1982.⁸²¹ While still understaffed, the documentation center was progressively becoming a fundamental instrument within Dutch architectural culture apparatus. The 1977 policy paper in which the *NDB*'s hierarchical superiors, the State Preservation Department (*Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg*, also known as *Monumentenzorg* or *RDMZ*), had reprimanded the center for organizing exhibitions and not focusing enough on its core competency of managing architectural archives seemed to be only a distant memory.⁸²²

⁸²⁰ Beyond this suggestion, Riezenkamp even stated that “perhaps this joint venture for the architecture Biennale has been a taste of the many good things that are to come.” Riezenkamp, “Toespraak van de Plv. Directeur-Generaal Culturele Zaken, Drs. J. Riezenkamp,” 5.

⁸²¹ For a complete overview of the 93 exhibitions organized by the *NDB* between 1973 and 1988, see NAI archive, “Inventory NDBK (Nederlands Documentatiecentrum Voor de Bouwkunst),” 2000, 58–60, NAI archief NDBK, NAI.

⁸²² Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg, “Nota Betreffende de Plaats En Taak van Het NDB Binnen de Organisatie van de RDMZ,” September 1977, NAI archief: NDBK 33: “Nota betreffende de Plaats en Taak van

In those six years there had been a significant reversal of the State hierarchy's position regarding the *NDB's* museological activities: from a forceful reprimand to an enthusiastic support. This reversal was most forcefully (and publicly) expressed when then Minister of Culture, Leendert Cornelis (Elco) Brinkman, was scheduled to present the welcome speech to an exhibition installed in the *Droogbak*, the *NDB's* building. While Minister Brinkman was unexpectedly unavailable to be at the opening, the speech delivered on his behalf by his Deputy Director-General for Cultural Affairs, J. Riezenkamp, went further than an explicit endorsement of the *NDB's* exhibition activities.⁸²³ In his speech, Riezenkamp announced the governmental plans to not just institutionalize, but expand the *NDB's* museological activities by establishing a projective architecture institute.

This was quite significant, since it revealed a decisive shift in the government's attitude towards architecture. Historically, architecture and its affairs had fallen under the purview of the Ministry of Housing, but the involvement of the Ministry of Culture indicated that beyond an industry to be managed, architecture was also a cultural expression to be appreciated.⁸²⁴

het *NDB* binnen de organisatie van de RDMZ, 1977." For a complete discussion of the *NDB's* situation and a contextualization of the reprimand issued by the *Monumentenzorg*, see the section "The *Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst* (Netherlands Documentation Center for Architecture)" in the previous chapter.

⁸²³ Riezenkamp, "Toespraak van de Plv. Directeur-Generaal Culturele Zaken, Drs. J. Riezenkamp."

⁸²⁴ At the time, the official title for the Ministry of Housing was the Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment (*Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting, Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieu*, commonly referred to as *VROM*), while the Ministry of Culture had just recently been identified as the Ministry Health, Welfare and Culture (*Ministerie van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid en Cultuur*, or *WVC*) after its merger with the Ministry of Health and Environment in the previous year. The rearrangement of cabinet positions and ministries is quite common in Dutch politics as ministries are regularly merged and rearranged creating ever new ministerial organizations. In order to provide a certain consistency, the term "Ministry of Culture" is recurrently used in this dissertation in reference to the State Ministry responsible for culture at any given moment in the Netherlands, unless when otherwise noted. Throughout the twentieth century, as culture in the Netherlands became an issue under ministerial administration, it has been under the purview of the Ministry of Education, Arts and Sciences (*Ministerie van Onderwijs, Kunsten en Wetenschappen*) between 1918 and 1965, the Ministry of Culture, Recreation and Social Services (*Ministerie van Cultuur, Recreatie en Maatschappelijk Werk*) between 1965 and 1982, the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Culture (*Ministerie van Welzijn,*

The opening of the first “Biennale of Young Dutch Architects” was an appropriate occasion for such momentous announcement since, much like the announced architecture institute, this exhibition and accompanying events were intended to actively shape the discipline’s present and prepare its future. Open to the public between September 27 and November 7, the 1983 Biennale intended to “have an active role in the debate about architectural quality and the position of the design disciplines with culture and society” by presenting the work of twenty-one young architects and offices (including Benthem & Crouwel, John Körmeling, Sjoerd Soeters, Jo Coenen, and Frans van Dongen with Kees Oosterhuis).⁸²⁵ If the parallel between the Biennale and the future institute was not already evident, Riezenkamp made a point of establishing it.

Like the future institute, the Biennale also intended to stimulate an appreciation of architecture among the general public. However, there were already clear indications of a swelling public interest in the discipline. Earlier that year, the *NDB* had repeated its 1975 undertaking and organized several concurrent architectural exhibitions in different museums across the Netherlands. The five exhibitions dedicated to the “*Nieuwe Bouwen*” (a Dutch variant of modern architecture centered on functionalism), had been generally praised as an astounding success.⁸²⁶ As

Volksgesondheid en Cultuur) between 1982 and 1994, and finally the Ministry of Education, Culture and Science (*Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap*) since 1994.

⁸²⁵ Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst, Stichting Architectuurmuseum, and Stichting Wonen, “Bijlage van Persbericht,” August 17, 1983, 2, NDBK 235.

⁸²⁶ Each of the five exhibitions addressed “a different aspect of the *Nieuwe Bouwen*, from its prior history to its latter days. Wim Beeren et al., *Het Nieuwe Bouwen: Voorgeschiedenis / Previous History* (Delft: Delft University Press, 1982), 5. To the quartet of venues used in 1975, a fifth museum was added in the 1983 series, namely the Museum Boymans-van Beuningen in Rotterdam. The exhibition in the Rotterdam museum was titled “The *Nieuwe Bouwen* in Rotterdam, 1920-1960” and explored the expression of the *Nieuwe Bouwen* in that city. The Stedelijk Museum in Amsterdam hosted “The *Nieuwe Bouwen* in Amsterdam, 1920-1960,” a similar exhibition to its Rotterdam counterpart, but which obviously focused on the presence of that architectural movement in the city by the Amstel. In The Hague Municipal Museum the focus was on the relation between the *Nieuwe Bouwen* and the artistic movement *De Stijl* with the exhibition “Neo-Plasticism in Architecture: *De Stijl*.” While these three exhibitions presented the Dutch connections of the *Nieuwe Bouwen*, the exhibitions at the *NDB*’s premises on the *Droogbak* in Amsterdam and at the Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller in Otterlo contextualized the movement. While in the *Droogbak* the conditions for the emergence of the movement were analyzed with the exhibition “The *Nieuwe Bouwen*: Previous History,” in

Riezenkamp reminded his audience at the opening of the Biennale, these five exhibitions had drawn large crowds, but so had the activities of the Department of Architecture of the Rotterdam Art Foundation (*Afdeling Architectuur van de Rotterdamse Kunststichting*) in the previous year. The success of these initiatives only attested to the general public's growing interest in all matters regarding architecture and the built environment.⁸²⁷

If a greater engagement of architecture with society was an explicit objective of the first Biennale, the organization of an inclusive discussion between architects and historians was its most significant implicit goal. Almost two months before the opening of the exhibition, on July 13, 1983, the curators of the Biennale, Hans van Dijk, Hans Tupker, and Dick van Woerkom (of *Stichting Wonen, SAM, and NDB* respectively), had organized a symposium with architecture professors Dick Apon and Max Risselada (from the universities of Eindhoven and Delft respectively) and Jos Bosman as "active historian."⁸²⁸ The discussion contemplated several contemporary issues of Dutch architecture, from the territory claimed by the Biennale to the *BNA's* duplicity, but most importantly, it established a new model for the advancement of architecture in the Netherlands.⁸²⁹

At the Biennale, as in the first pleas to establish an architecture institute, the organization of a continued dialectical confrontation between architectural and historical practice was a favored—and particularly compelling—argument in support of the establishment of the NAI. The focus of the discussion in this central component of Tafuri's theoretical model was not due to any dismissal of

Otterlo the movement was placed in its international context with the exhibition "The Nieuwe Bouwen International / CIAM: Housing and Town Planning."

⁸²⁷ Riezenkamp, "Toespraak van de Plv. Directeur-Generaal Culturele Zaken, Drs. J. Riezenkamp," 3.

⁸²⁸ Hans van Dijk, "Groepsgesprek Biennale Jonge Nederlandse Architecten 1983," July 13, 1983, 1, *NDBK* 235. Having previously been a student assistant under both Alexander Tzonis and Geert Bekaert, Jos Bosman was at the time associated with the *NDB* as a scientific collaborator.

⁸²⁹ An abridged transcript of the symposium discussion was later published in the special issue of *Wonen TABK* dedicated to the first "Biennale of Young Dutch Architects." Hans van Dijk, "Deze Generatie Wil Weer Oplossingen Zoeken Voor Het Weena En Het Amsterdamse Stadhuis," *Wonen TABK*, no. 17–18 (September 1983): 56–58.

both an unbiased architectural archive and societal engagement, but simply resulted from an understanding that these were already present in Dutch architecture culture in the form of the *NDB* and the *Stichting Wonen*.⁸³⁰ The organization of a sustained discussion was the missing, connecting element that could further potentiate the two other elements and was no longer to be neglected.

Soon after the conclusion of this architectural manifestation, the Ministries of Culture and Housing acted upon the State Committee for Museums' recommendation and invited the *NDB*, *Stichting Wonen*, and *SAM* to cooperate in the development of a specific plan for the foundation of the architecture institute. The basis of the three institutions'—and of the new architecture institute—was thus launched.

Histories and Theory of Architecture Institutes

During the 1970s, the conceptual model defined by architecture historian and critic Manfredo Tafuri came to dominate discussion within architecture circles.⁸³¹ Tafuri's radical new approach to the discipline challenged the predominant model of historical practice by revealing its shortcomings and denouncing its instrumentalization as a means to legitimize architectural practice. Tafuri's "aim was to effect a complete change, away from history of instrumental architecture" and replace it by an historical practice of critical independence and sound methods.⁸³² To that end, the Italian critic prescribed several conditions that were to be met, from which three soared above all others as structural components to his theoretical apparatus: the construction of a

⁸³⁰ This focus also resulted in the need to overturn the notion that had been implanted through almost sixty years of discussion that the reflective model was the only viable realization of an architecture museum in the Netherlands. For more on this discussion see the previous chapter "Museum or Institute: From Projective to Reflective and Back Again (1912-1983)."

⁸³¹ While *Storie e Teoria dell'Architettura* was originally published in Italian in 1968, the translation of the work into several other languages (namely, French, Dutch, and English) was greatly responsible for the dissemination of Tafuri's polemics and its delayed consideration in international architecture circles.

⁸³² Ignasi de Solà-Morales, "History and History of Architecture," *ANY 25-26: Becoming Manfredo Tafuri*, 2000, 8.

territory shared by both historians and architects, the continued and constant dialectical discussion between architecture and history, and the engagement of architecture theory with society.

While distinct, the three conditions were interdependent. Only an unrestricted, common territory of architecture's past shared by architects and historians could ensure the emergence of a properly productive dialectical opposition between both factions; only a structured interaction between architecture and history could produce the needed criticality to challenge "the false historical consciousness at the core of architectural theory" and a first step towards the "dissolution of architecture's self-referentiality" and greater engagement with society.⁸³³

The progressive quality of Tafuri's theoretical construction was particularly compelling to a fledgling group of newly established architecture museums, which recognized in this critical model an opportunity to become pivotal instruments in the advancement of architecture. Since at the core of Tafuri's argument was the continuous dialectical opposition between architects and historians, these new museological institutions defined as their primary objective to facilitate and host such opposition. Unencumbered by established methods and intent on staking a claim at the forefront of architecture culture, new museums like the *DAM* (German Architecture Museum), the CCA (Canadian Centre for Architecture) and the NAI (Netherlands Architecture Institute) were eager to adopt Tafuri's bold new ideas and organize discussions. In doing so, these fledgling institutions signaled a paradigm shift in the nascent field of architecture museums, entirely similar to paradigm shift provoked by Tafuri in the relation between architecture and history. By organizing inclusive discussion, these museums rejected the, up until then, predominantly reflective character of architecture museums and adopted a projective mode of operation. This signaled a paradigm shift

⁸³³ Leach, "Choosing History," 237.

in which architecture museums were no longer mere passive mirrors of the discipline but could become fundamental instruments for the advancement of the architectural discipline.

Naturally, other concepts then pervasive in architecture were also influential in shaping the pursuits of these museums. Perhaps chief among them was the adaptation of postmodern ideals then favored by swelling ranks of architects, as these museums were equally intent to communicate in a meaningful manner to both the interiority and exteriority of the architectural discipline. Nevertheless, Tafuri's revised conception of architectural and historical practices remained at the core of the intellectual project adopted by these newly established institutions, since more than any other conception, it allowed the architecture museum to be repositioned at the very center of architecture culture.

Tafuri's ideas, however, were assimilated in different manners by these new architecture museological institutions, which also established a progression in the assimilation of Tafuri's conception to the museum contexts. Although the three institutions shared a commitment to engage architecture culture with society at large and to organize inclusive discussion, they diverged in their approach to the architectural archive. While the *DAM* adopted an overly selective approach to architecture's shared territory of history (which inevitably conditioned discussion), the *CCA* and the *NAi* were intent on assembling intentionally comprehensive archives that could (as much as possible) ensure that the shared territory of architecture's past was unblemished by any willful organization or predetermined narrative.

Beyond a similar approach to the architectural archive, the Canadian center and the Dutch institute shared an ambition to forcefully combine rigorous, advanced architectural scholarship with a wide public dissemination of the discipline. Also in this pursuit, there was an obvious reference to Tafuri, since the Italian critic's lifelong project to define proper systematic methodological bases for an analytical-historical practice laid at the foundation of the *CCA*'s and the

NAi's efforts to integrate study centers at the core of their institutions. As Tafuri attempted to develop a set of practices akin to a scientific method for architectural history (comprised by unbiased observation, critical analysis, and dutiful documentation, with clear awareness of methodological practices), the two institutions seemed intent on institutionalizing such progressive methods. Through their study centers, the two institutions intended to approach and elevate architecture research as a methodic scientific pursuit where subjective taste was displaced by objective analysis.

Although responding to different conditions and emerging from different contexts, there was a clear intellectual (and inherently operational) affinity between the CCA and the NAi, as both attempted to seamlessly combine architectural study centers and museums. The mirroring of the NAi's principles, objectives, and processes in the CCA was clearly recognized by the founders of the NAi, who became acquainted with the Canadian center's project through the exchange of ideas and insights facilitated by the foundation of the International Confederation of Architecture Museums (ICAM).⁸³⁴ Since its inception, ICAM was a fundamental platform for both networking and the exchange of knowledge and insights between the growing ranks of architecture museums, providing access to the proponents of the not yet founded NAi to other architecture museums and institutes. Through continued engaged in ICAM discussions and events, the proponents of the NAi came to better define their own ambitions and validate their decisions regarding the future architecture institute.

⁸³⁴ While neither of the two institutions were yet founded, they were both represented in the inaugural ICMA meeting in Helsinki, Finland. The CCA was represented by its founder Phyllis Lambert and the NAi was represented by the *NDB*, the architectural archive that preceded the Dutch institute. While the CCA was founded in the month after the meeting (September 1979), it took nine more years before the NAi was officially established.

The exposure to both Tafuri's ideas and to the developments of the most varied architecture museums and institutes came at a particular time in Dutch architecture. As the crisis of Dutch architecture had become increasingly harder to ignore, a particular proclivity to learn from foreign experience emerged within Dutch architecture culture.⁸³⁵ From practice to discourse, Dutch architectural circles were looking beyond its borders for solutions to its woes.

While it is hard to overestimate the impact of Tafuri's ideas, of the ICAM discussions, and of the particular exchange with the CCA and the *DAM* in shaping the *NAi*, ultimately contact with these ideas only served to precipitate a transformation already latent within the *NDB*. As Tafuri's theoretical framework provided intellectual legitimacy and contact with newly established progressive architecture institutions contributed the necessary operational expertise, the Dutch documentation center could now confidently move from a reflective architecture archive towards a projective architecture institute.

⁸³⁵ The crisis of architecture identified by Tafuri may have been a mere abstract construct for some, but in the Netherlands it had become all but too visible. The crisis became particularly difficult to ignore after the stark, and very public, assessment of architecture in Rotterdam by three international architecture critics. See "Keurmeestersproject."

5. A PUBLIC SPHERE FOR ARCHITECTURE: CREATING THE *NEDERLANDS* *ARCHITECTUURINSTITUUT* (1984-1994)

The establishment of a new organization, let alone one as innovative and ambitious as an architecture institute, was not an easy task. Nevertheless, the natural complementarity of *Stichting Wonen* (Living/Housing Foundation), the *Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst* (Netherlands Documentation Center for Architecture, or simply *NDB*), and the *Stichting Architectuurmuseum* (Architecture Museum Foundation, or *SAM*) combined with their common belief in the project, enabled the three merging organizations (and their ministerial handlers) to reach a wide agreement within a few preparatory discussions.

However, the decision by the Minister of Culture to locate the new institute in Rotterdam rather than Amsterdam (favored by all three merging institutions) shattered the previously established consensus and risked the entire endeavor. Even though the eighteen-month long conflict was widely characterized by reports at the time (and since then by the NAI's official history) as a dispute regarding the location of the institute, it was in fact largely an artificial conflict leveraged by *Stichting Wonen* to ensure that the government would also financially support the construction of a new building for the institute in Rotterdam.

The construction of a new building was perceived by *Stichting Wonen* and *SAM* as a fundamental condition for the viability and visibility of the new architecture institute. If the merger of statutes and staff and the preparation of policy and organizational plans created the new institute on paper, the construction of its building on Rotterdam's *Museumpark* announced the NAI to the world and made it into a real institution. As such, the design of its new building became the first architectural manifestation of the new institute, even before it was officially founded. Through a multiple-commission, the NAI used the new building to present an overview of different

architectural practices and select what they considered to be the most suitable to accommodate and articulate the fledgling architecture institute.⁸³⁶ Although Rem Koolhaas' proposal was favored by most critics, the NAI's newly appointed Board of Trustees selected the design by Jo Coenen for its new building.

The completion of the new building marked the start of the third and last phase in the formation of the Netherlands Architecture Institute. The first phase was the formative period of the institute. Between 1984 and 1988, the three merging institutions discussed and agreed on the format, organization, methods, and objectives, of a new architecture institute. While there was a complete agreement among the three institutions, struggles regarding the location and the state's support provided to the new institute forced the process to take longer than initially anticipated. The impasse between the Ministries supporting (and financing) the foundation of the new institute and the merging institutions (particularly *Stichting Wonen*) was only overcome with the mediation of an arbitration specialist. When an acceptable compromise was reached, an organizational expert was appointed to ensure that the establishment of the new institute would not suffer any further significant delays

The NAI's second phase comprised the interim period between its foundation in 1988 and the completion of its new building in 1993. During this period, the institute's main challenge was the combination and integration of the three merging organizations into a single coherent institute. This task was particularly demanding since the institute was actually divided between Amsterdam and Rotterdam. The NAI's new Collections Department (the adaptation of the *NDB* in the new

⁸³⁶ The multiple-commission was a procedure to commission architectural designs regulated by the Royal Institute of Dutch Architects (*BNA*). Unlike the more common architectural competitions, the multiple-commission did not have a jury nor a winner. Instead, every proposal was evaluated by an independent assessing committee in a report without indicating any order of merit. For more on the NAI's multiple commission, see section "The Multiple Commission" of this chapter.

organization) remained in the *NDB's* former premises on the *Droogbak* until the new building was completed, while the Presentation Department (which was based on *Stichting Wonen*) moved to a rented premises on Rotterdam's *Westersingel*. Nevertheless, this was approached as a trial period in which the institute explored different possibilities and opportunities, "experimenting and studying which [approaches] offer[ed] a good perspective on the future."⁸³⁷

The third phase of the institute was to begin in 1993, with the completion of the NAI's new building on *Museumpark*. This was to be the final period in the establishment of the institute as a fundamental instrument in the Dutch architectural culture by providing an institutional infrastructure fostering the advance of the discipline through popular dissemination and critical discussion. To that end, this last period was to bring the consolidation of the institute's activities and the development of a sophisticated system of means of engagement to reach a wide audience and disseminate the institute's message further and longer. With a cohesive structure and a new building, the NAI was now prepared to assist in what would become a veritable renaissance of Dutch architectural culture.

By drawing attention and reflecting on the cultural dimension of architecture, the NAI was instrumental in altering the public perception of architecture. With the newly established institute, the old dream of establishing an architecture museum in the Netherlands was finally realized. Almost hundred and fifty years after the foundation of the old *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst*, there was a new institution in the Netherlands that aspired to advance architecture by stimulating an inclusive architectural debate and by presenting the discipline to a wide audience.

⁸³⁷ Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, *NAi Beleidsplan/Policy Plan 1993-1996* (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1991), 11.

Following the “Polder-Model”

The preparation towards a Dutch architecture institute was developed through a series of talks, discussions and policy papers. These discussions were organized by the workgroup created from the collaboration between the Ministry of Health, Welfare and Culture (*Ministerie van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid en Cultuur*, or *WVC*) and the Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning and the Environment (*Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting, Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieu*, commonly referred to as *VROM*). Even before the Deputy Director-General for Cultural Affairs, J. Riezenkamp announced the government’s intention to establish a projective architecture institute in the 1983 Biennale of Young Dutch Architects, the two ministries had already contracted an “agreement of understanding” regarding the foundation of such an institution.⁸³⁸

The Informative Period

The agreement (first drafted in March 23, 1983 and approved a few months later) between the two ministries formalized their collaboration and identified their objectives for the proposed architecture institute. The agreement was intended to define the conditions for the “establishment of a Foundation that aims for documentation, information and presentation about Dutch architecture and urbanism,” namely by defining the statutes and regulations of the foundation.⁸³⁹ This foundation was to be titled *Stichting voor de Gebouwde Omgeving: Het Nederlands Architectuur Museum* (Foundation for the Built environment: The Dutch Architecture Museum), or for short *SNAM*, and was to be located in Amsterdam.⁸⁴⁰

⁸³⁸ The two ministries had first discussed a possible collaboration in May 1981 and then a year later in May 1982, but only formalized their “agreement of understanding” in a meeting in July 1983. Ministerie van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid en Cultuur and Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting, Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieu, “Convenant Tussen de Ministerie van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur En de Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting, Ruimtelijke Ordening En Milieu,” March 23, 1983, NDBK 391.

⁸³⁹ *Ibid.*, 1.

⁸⁴⁰ The location of the proposed foundation was particularly significant, since the location of the future architecture institute would be a major source of conflict after the 1984 preparatory talks with the merging

The main objective of the foundation was to promote and protect Dutch architecture and urbanism, and the means to achieve it were very clearly defined in its statutes. Thus, the *SNAM* was to acquire, assemble, and manage “collections of plans, drawings and other written or documented information on Dutch buildings.”⁸⁴¹ It was also expected to study this material and ensure that it was accessible by producing “descriptions, inventories and catalogues.”⁸⁴² Just like the *NDB*, the *SNAM* was to be the custodian, but not the owner, of the collections. Ownership would be retained by the Dutch State, but the collections would be on permanent loan to the new foundation.⁸⁴³

Beyond collecting architectural knowledge, it was also the responsibility of the proposed foundation to disseminate it. Thus, it was stipulated that the *SNAM* was likewise mandated to exhibit the collection, organize educational activities for different audiences, publish the results of its research, and assist governmental services and third parties in retrieving information from its collections.⁸⁴⁴ It was the addition of this objective to disseminate the knowledge gathered in the architectural archive that most clearly distinguished the proposed *SNAM* from the existing *NDB* while also responding to the requests made by the *NDB* workers and the State Committee for Museums in their 1982 memorandums.⁸⁴⁵

The proposed *SNAM* statutes also defined the structure of the organization. Unsurprisingly, the two ministries retained a considerable level of control over the organization. Specifically, while the director would be responsible for everyday operations, the strategic direction of the *SNAM* was to

partners. Article 1.1 of Werkgroep WVC-VROM, “Statuten van de Stichting Voor de Gebouwde Omgeving: Het Nederlands Architectuur Museum (SNAM),” March 23, 1983, 1, NDBK 391.

⁸⁴¹ Ibid., 1 Article 4.

⁸⁴² Ibid. Article 4.

⁸⁴³ It was also indicated that any new acquisitions made by the *SNAM* were to become the property of the Dutch state and fall under the purview of the same loan agreement. Article 6 of Ibid., 2.

⁸⁴⁴ Article 4 of Ibid., 1.

⁸⁴⁵ An extensive discussion of the *NDB* workers and the State Committee for Museums memorandums can be found in the previous chapter of this dissertation, “Towards an Architecture Institute (1978-1983).”

be defined by the Board of Trustees and the Advisory Council, both of which were to be composed of appointees of both ministries, while the director would be selected in the agreement of both directing bodies.⁸⁴⁶ The level of governmental control envisioned by this document would prove to be greatly problematic for the merging partners, since it prevented the sort of political autonomy by them deemed necessary for the proper operation of the institute.⁸⁴⁷

While the *SNAM* statutes had to be adjusted once the discussion was enlarged to include the *Stichting Wonen*, the *NDB*, and the *SAM*, there was still a clear connection between this document and the statutes adopted five years later in the establishment of the Netherlands Architecture Institute, as some of the ideas and directions first codified in the 1983 document were also present there.

The successful collaboration between the three institutions (*Stichting Wonen*, *NDB*, and *SAM*) in organizing the first Biennale of Young Dutch Architects in September 1983, gave further evidence to the *WVC-VROM* workgroup (the title given to the collaboration between the two ministries) that the new architecture institute could be formed by a merger of these institutions. Thus, the *WVC-VROM* workgroup informally queried the three organizations in the following months regarding their willingness to participate in the architecture institute project.⁸⁴⁸ Given the interest of all three organizations, the workgroup planned a first round of formal conversations in the end of the year.

⁸⁴⁶ Articles 7, 19 and 20 of Werkgroep WVC-VROM, "Statuten van de SNAM," 2, 5.

⁸⁴⁷ The *Stichting Wonen* was the most vociferous in this regard. See Ruud Brouwers, "Voorbereiding Bespreking Op 29/03/84 in Rijkswijk over 'Architectuurinstituut,'" March 28, 1984, NDBK 391.

⁸⁴⁸ Werkgroep WVC-VROM, "Notitie Ten Behoeve van de Gesprekken Tussen VWVC-VROM Werkgroep En NDB, SAM En Stichting Wonen over Het Toekomstig Architectuur-Instituut," November 11, 1983, 2, NDBK 391.

On December 15, 1983, the *WVC-VROM* workgroup—led by Jan Jesserun—met separately with the three institutions in the *NDB* offices at the *Droogbak*.⁸⁴⁹ All three conversations were based on a discussion of the preliminary *SNAM* statutes structured around four questions: “Can your institution accept the principles set forth by the workgroup? Do you have any criticism? Is your institution, in principle, interested to participate? What would be the conditions for your institution to be integrated into the new organization?”⁸⁵⁰ As expected, all three institutions were quite enthusiastic about being a part of the proposed architectural institute, and were more interested in better understanding—and offering their opinion on—the preliminary statutes, than make any sort of demands.

What was of most, and equal, concern to *Stichting Wonen*, *NDB*, and *SAM* was the excessive level of governmental control of the proposed institute indicated by these preliminary statutes. As chairman, Jesserun had to assure the organizations that the “institute would not be a mouthpiece for the government” and would have the necessary political independence to define its own policies.⁸⁵¹ Instead, the government would be a “preferential shareholder,” but not directly interfere with the policies of the institute. Another concern shared by the three institutions was the definition of the title “Museum” for the new institution, since this might indicate a limited scope of action. This concern was equally assuaged by the workgroup by stating that the new institute would indeed accommodate the museum functions as stipulated by ICOM (International Council of

⁸⁴⁹ The remaining members of the *WVC-VROM* workgroup were Tj. Dijkstra, C. Cramer, W. G. M. Cerutti and G.W. van Herwaarden.

⁸⁵⁰ Werkgroep *WVC-VROM*, “Verslag van Het Gesprek van de Werkgroep *WVC-VROM* Met Het Nederlands Documentatiecentrum Voor de Bouwkunst (*NDB*) over de Oprichting van Een Architectuurinstituut,” December 15, 1983, 1, *NDBK* 391.

⁸⁵¹ Werkgroep *WVC-VROM*, “Verslag van Het Gesprek van de Werkgroep *WVC-VROM* Met Het Stichting Architectuurmuseum (*SAM*) over de Oprichting van Een Architectuurinstituut,” December 15, 1983, *NDBK* 391.

Museums) but would also operate beyond that scope, by accommodating the discussion functions identified by the State Committee for Museums in a projective architecture institute.⁸⁵²

Beyond revealing a common set of concerns, the individual meetings also focused on particular issues regarding each institution's contribution to the proposed architecture institute. The conversation with the *NDB* focused primarily on the status of the architectural archive within the new institute, the one with *Stichting Wonen* revolved around how the new organization would engage with the profession and the discipline, while the discussion with the *SAM* was greatly devoted to the new institute's ability to acquire new material through donations.⁸⁵³ With these meetings, there was now a formal interest of these three organizations to merge and create the new institute. Thus, a new discussion was agreed, one in which participants from the three merging institutions and the inter-ministerial workgroup would (formally) meet for the first time.

The first joint meeting was scheduled for March 29, 1984, and in preparation for it, the *WVC-VROM* workgroup produced and distributed among the participants a new document titled "Outline for the Establishment of the Dutch Institute for Architecture and Urban Planning."⁸⁵⁴ Based on the preliminary *SNAM* statutes, the "Outline" also incorporated the ideas and criticism conveyed by the different institutions in the first round of talks. Among the most visible alterations was the new title by which the proposed institution was referred, namely *Nederlands Instituut voor Architectuur en Stedenbouw* (Dutch Institute for Architecture and Urban Planning, or *NIAS*). The "Outline" became a

⁸⁵² Specifically, the workgroup assured the three institutions that the new institute would not only organize exhibitions, but also operate as a platform for discussion. Werkgroep WVC-VROM, "Verslag van Het Gesprek van de Werkgroep WVC-VROM Met Het Stichting Wonen over de Oprichting van Een Architectuurinstituut," December 15, 1983, 3, NDBK 407.

⁸⁵³ There was a particular moment of tension in the discussion with the *SAM*, when the workgroup directly asked if the *SAM* "would be willing to be extinguished with the foundation of the new institute?" Werkgroep WVC-VROM, "Verslag van Het Gesprek Met Het *SAM*," 3.

⁸⁵⁴ Werkgroep WVC-VROM, "Hoofdlijnen M.b.t. Een Op Te Richten Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedenbouw (*NIAS*)," March 1, 1984, NDBK 391.

fundamental instrument for the subsequent multilateral talks, since it established the basis for discussion and was revised after each meeting to reflect the agreements achieved in those meetings. Accordingly, most of each joint meeting was used to comment and implement changes to that foundational document. As already indicated by its name, the “Outline” provided the basic blueprint for the establishment of a Dutch architecture institute by addressing a variety of issues ranging from the internal organization of the institute, its objectives and tasks, to the institute’s relation to external institutions like the government and the *Monumentenzorg*.⁸⁵⁵ Even though the “Outline” was a fundamental step, it was agreed by all parties that it was also a preliminary one and should therefore be used to present a general sense of direction, rather than binding future discussions and actions to the specifics of its text.⁸⁵⁶ The “Outline” was last discussed on a joint meeting on June 6, 1984, from which a final version of the document was produced and adopted by all parties.⁸⁵⁷

Subsequently, the “Outline” was submitted to the two ministers for their review, leading to the formal agreement among the two ministers to formally establish the architecture institute. Their decision was publicly announced by Minister Brinkman a few days later when he addressed the international delegates attending the third ICAM conference in Amsterdam.⁸⁵⁸

⁸⁵⁵ The entire range of issues addressed by the “outline” was comprised by seventeen points, namely: the intentions of the government for the new institute, the position of the institute, the objective of the institute, the tasks of the institute, object / subject, official name, legal status, departments, appointments, personnel, continuity, contribution of the participants, external supporters, organizational structure, position of the *Monumentenzorg*, accommodations, and subsequent procedure. Werkgroep WVC-VROM, “Hoofdlijnen M.b.t. Een Op Te Richten Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw (NIAS) (Definitieve Versie),” July 1, 1984, NDBK 391.

⁸⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 1.

⁸⁵⁷ *Ibid.* The three previous versions of the “Outline” were dated March 1, April 24, and May 24, 1984. All four versions that compose the entire progression of this document are available in the NAI archive. See “NDBK 391: ‘Verslagen Met Bijlagen van de Vergaderingen van de Werkgroep, 1984-1985,’” n.d.

⁸⁵⁸ The agreement to establish “a new national Institute for Architecture and Town-Planning” was decided in the ministers meeting of September 14, 1984, with its public announcement being made on September 18, 1984. Brinkman, “Speech by the Minister for Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs at the Opening of the Third International Conference of Architectural Museums.”

In the first joint meeting of all the three merging institutions and the two ministries, it had also been decided to organize smaller workgroups that could investigate, discuss and come to a compromise regarding central issues for the new institute. The *WVC-VROM* workgroup initially suggested the creation of five sub-workgroups: A) “Policy Plan,” to define the institute’s policies; B) “*Status Aparte*,” to discuss the special status enjoyed by the institute; C) “Collection,” to develop a plan for the architectural archive; D) “External Support,” to suggest a model for connecting with external donors; and E) “Organization,” to define the structure of the institute. To these five groups, it was later added a sixth one, sub-workgroup F) “B-3 Status” to investigate the conditions of the legal status intended for the institute.⁸⁵⁹

While most sub-workgroups were to include representatives of all five institutions, some of them were to be composed only by some of the parties. In some cases this resulted from the particular expertise of the involved organizations, like sub-workgroup D regarding “external support” which was proposed to be formed by the *SAM* and eventually *Stichting Wonen*, given that from the five parties, only these had any actual experience in procuring external support.⁸⁶⁰ In other cases, the limited composition of the sub-workgroup served to already articulate the ambitions of the proposed institute, which was most clearly expressed in the formation of sub-workgroup A responsible for “Policy Plan” which was proposed to be composed solely of the three merging institutions and therefore already underscoring the desire for the future institute’s political

⁸⁵⁹ The B-3 status referred to an article of the law ABP Pension Fund (*Algemeen Burgerlijk Pensioenfonds*).

⁸⁶⁰ Stichting Architectuurmuseum, “Verslag van de Bijeenkomst Met de Interdepartementale Werkgroep Inzake de Totstandkoming van Een ‘Architectuurmuseum,’” March 29, 1984, NDBK 391.

independence.⁸⁶¹ The final reports of all six sub-workgroups were assessed and discussed in the joint meeting of October 5, 1984.⁸⁶²

The final meeting among the five parties took place in November 30, 1984, in which a new document was produced (and agreed) that codified the conclusions of the yearlong preparatory talks, the white paper “Design for a Netherlands Institute for Architecture and Urban Planning.”⁸⁶³ Effectively, the white paper was a combination of the final version of the “Outline” document with the final reports of the six sub-workgroups, and attempted to clearly present the compromise achieved by the different parties.⁸⁶⁴

As an elaboration of the “Outline,” the new white paper addressed all the issues of the earlier document, but also clarified the positions of the merging partners and the inter-ministerial workgroup. For example, it stated that the new institute was not creating (or requesting from the Ministries) anything new, but was rather an effort in consolidating the existing publicly-funded institutions engaged with architecture.⁸⁶⁵ In a similar manner, the white paper clarified that

⁸⁶¹ While the initial intention was to allow the policy of the future institute to be discussed (and decided) entirely by the three merging partners, the actual composition of sub-workgroup A also included M. Veldkamp and C. Cramer from the inter-ministerial workgroup. Mariet Willinge, “Brief Aan Mevr. Drs. C. Cramer,” April 9, 1984, NDBK 391. The final composition of all six sub-workgroups can be found in “Deelnemerslijst Werkgroepen Architectuur Instituut,” n.d., NDBK 391.

⁸⁶² The different sub-workgroups met with greater frequency than that of the joint meetings, since it only depended on the individual availability of their members. Reports of all the procedures and meetings of the different sub-workgroups are available in the NAI archive, namely in the NDBK archives number 392 to 397. See “NDBK 392: ‘Subwerkgroep A: Beleidsplan,’” 1984; “NDBK 393: ‘Subwerkgroep B: “Status Aparte,”” 1984; “NDBK 394: ‘Subwerkgroep C: Collectie + Wat Daar Mee Verband Houdt,’” 1984; “NDBK 395: ‘Subwerkgroep D: Externe Ondersteuning,’” 1984; “NDBK 396: ‘Subwerkgroep E: Organisatie,’” 1984; “NDBK 397: ‘Subwerkgroep F: B-3 Status,’” 1984.

⁸⁶³ Werkgroep WVC-VROM, “Ontwerp Voor Een Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedenbouw,” December 1, 1984.

⁸⁶⁴ There were five joint meetings in total throughout 1984, namely on March 29, May 2, June 6, October 10, and November 30.

⁸⁶⁵ Werkgroep WVC-VROM, “Ontwerp Voor Een Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedenbouw,” December 1, 1984, 1.

although the future institute would be entirely supported by the two ministries involved, it was not “intended for the Institute to be a voice of and for the government.”⁸⁶⁶

Beyond presenting the compromises reached on legal, financial and staffing issues, a great deal of the white paper was dedicated to define the objectives of the institute and identify the tasks to achieve them. Thus, the new institute intended to “collect, preserve, and make accessible collections in the field of Dutch architecture and urban planning, and promote knowledge of and interest in the cultural dimension of the built environment.”⁸⁶⁷ It was further specified that under “promote knowledge” it should also be understood the promotion of quality of architectural practice. For that end, eight tasks were identified, namely: collections, library, research, presentation, education, publications, platform-function, and services.

In general terms, the eight functions could be divided among the objective to preserve and promote Dutch architecture. Namely, collections, library, research and services would be primarily used for the preservation of Dutch architecture, while presentation, education, publications, and platform-function would be primarily dedicated to the promotion of Dutch architecture.⁸⁶⁸ Regarding “collections,” it was stated that the new institute would be responsible for the acquisition and management of Dutch architectural heritage, as well as making it accessible to the public. For that, the institute would undertake “research,” and organize “services” for other institutions or individuals who might want to access the collections for their own projects. A complement to the collections the “library” was a direct complement of the “collections,” since it provided supporting material for “research.” The “presentation” function referred to the institute’s task to disseminate

⁸⁶⁶ Ibid., 8.

⁸⁶⁷ Ibid.

⁸⁶⁸ Eventually, that would be a division institutionalized between the NAI’s Collections and Presentation departments, which were also initially perceived as being the continuation of, respectively, the *NDB* and *Stichting Wonen*.

architectural knowledge, primarily through exhibitions. Architectural knowledge was also to be disseminated through “publications” and “education” activities. Finally, the “platform-function” referred to the institute’s ability to stimulate debate and discuss contemporary developments of the discipline, by, for example, organizing events like symposia and conferences.⁸⁶⁹

Special attention was given in the white paper to the elaboration of a policy for collections, exhibitions, and the creation of an association of “Friends of the Institute”. Such attention was to be expected, after all, the continuity of the three organizations was found in these three elements of the new institute. Although not yet directly stated, it seemed already clear that in the future organization the *NDB* would become the collections department, the *Stichting Wonen* the presentation department responsible for exhibitions, and the *SAM* would be transformed into an association of “Friends of the Institute.”

The combination of all eight functions ensured that the future institute would not only care about the discipline’s past, but also engage with architecture’s present, that is, beyond an architecture museum, it would be an architecture institute. In fact, the name of the institute was also addressed in the white paper, since even though the exact name had not yet been decided, it was already decided that the title “museum” would be too reductive and thus the title “institute” would be most appropriate.⁸⁷⁰

⁸⁶⁹ It was specifically stated that the institute was to stimulate discussion and “act as ‘center’ for those involved in this field.” Werkgroep WVC-VROM, “Ontwerp Voor Een Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedenbouw,” December 1, 1984, 9.

⁸⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 11. The white paper was completed with the inclusion of the tentative statutes for the institute. While the structure remained the same, there were several changes between these statutes and their earlier iteration as statutes for the SNAM. Most of the changes were important clarifications and refinement of the earlier document. For example, the organizational structure of the institute remained the same, with a Board of Trustees and an Advisory Council. However, while the appointment of the seven members of the Board and seventeen members of the Council remained under the purview of the two supervising ministers, it was greatly limited by specific determinations. Thus, it was stipulated that the Board of Trustees would be composed by the director of the institute, the Rijksbouwmeester (the Chief Government Architect), the Head of the Monumentenzorg, as well as two architects and two individuals from academia, research, or museum

Soon after its completion in December 1, 1984, the white paper was submitted to Minister Brinkman and Minister Winsemius for their review. However, just as the three merging institutions believed to be moving from the informative to the formative stage of the process, the controversy generated by the decision to locate the institute in Rotterdam rather than Amsterdam ground the entire process to an abrupt halt.

The Amsterdam-Rotterdam Dispute

On December 18, 1984, Minister Brinkman sent a letter to the Dutch House of Representatives (*Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal*) as well as to the three merging institutions (*NDB, SAM* and *Stichting Wonen*) informing of his decision to locate the new architecture institute in Rotterdam.⁸⁷¹ While slightly different, both letters indicated that the decision to locate the institute in Rotterdam resulted from the national character of the institution and the Ministry's policy to distribute cultural institutions across the country (or at least the *Randstad*). Even though Rotterdam had been chosen, Brinkman made a point of acknowledging the validity of the arguments presented by the three merging partners in favor of Amsterdam, but that ultimately, it was more important to address the country's regional cultural inequality. For Brinkman, the establishment of the new architecture institute was a good way to mitigate the disparity between the State's funding for cultural activities in both cities. Brinkman supported his argument with hard figures, namely by contrasting the approximately 89.9 million guilders given to Amsterdam every year to the paltry 7.1 million guilders yearly allocated to Rotterdam by the Directorate General for Cultural Affairs.⁸⁷²

affairs. It was similarly defined that the members of the Advisory Council (Raad van Advies) would have to be selected from a variety of professional organizations, ranging from the Royal Institute of Dutch Architects (Bond van Nederlandse Architecten, or BNA) to the Association of Dutch Art Historians (Vereniging van Nederlandse Kunsthistorici) and the Leliman Association of "Friends of the Institute" (Vereniging Leliman). Ultimately, the statutes were a translation into legal writing of the white paper's definition of the institute.

⁸⁷¹ Elco Brinkman, "Brief Aan de Stichting Wonen," December 18, 1984, NDBK 407; Elco Brinkman, "Brief van de Minister van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur Aan de Voorzitter van de Tweede Kamer Der Staten-Generaal," December 18, 1984, NDBK 407.

⁸⁷² Brinkman, "Brief Aan de Stichting Wonen," 3.

Brinkman also claimed that the decision could be entirely political, since the technical analysis of the two possible locations conducted by the Government's Building Agency (*Rijksgebouwendienst*) in the previous October had rendered a technical draw. Specifically, the minister claimed that the analysis had concluded that both the world-renowned early twentieth-century building *Beurs van Berlage* (Berlage's Stock Exchange) in Amsterdam and the old Municipal Library in Rotterdam's *Botersloot* to have similar conditions and costs in the accommodation of the future institute.⁸⁷³

The decision came somewhat as a shock to the three merging institutions. After all, merely a couple of weeks prior they had submitted the white paper "Design for a Netherlands Institute for Architecture and Urban Planning" summarizing their year-long consultation, in which it was clearly manifested the five parties agreement to house the new institute in Amsterdam's *Beurs van Berlage*. In fact, there was a clear assumption that the missing approval by Minister Brinkman was a mere formality, since subsequent steps were already indicated regarding the preparation of the *Beurs van Berlage* for the architecture institute.⁸⁷⁴

But while the realization that their intention to remain in Amsterdam was not simply rubber-stamped by Minister Brinkman, it certainly was not a surprise. In the first joint meeting, there seemed to exist already some apprehension regarding the future location of the architecture institute, particularly as L. Dében from *Stichting Wonen* expressed his concern "that the decision on

⁸⁷³ Rijksgebouwendienst, "Alternative Analyse Inzake de Locatiekeuze Voor Een Op Te Richten Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw," October 1984, VNAI 1984, 1984.

⁸⁷⁴ Werkgroep WVC-VROM, "Ontwerp Voor Een Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedenbouw," December 1, 1984, 42.

the location [of the institute] is being taken somewhere else,” completing that if that would be the case, the three institutions should “develop a consultation strategy to influence that decision.”⁸⁷⁵

In the following days, the municipality of Amsterdam officially offered the *Beurs van Berlage* to the Ministry of Culture for the accommodation of the future architecture institute.⁸⁷⁶ This generous offer constituted the first expression of interest by Amsterdam towards the institute and came several months after Rotterdam had already submitted its own proposal to the Ministry. Already in September 1983, as soon as it was revealed the government’s interest in establishing an architecture institute, Joop Linthorst, the Rotterdam alderman for culture, requested a study from the Rotterdam Arts Council (*Rotterdam Kunststichting*, or RKS) to investigate the possibility of hosting the institute in the city by the Maas. The report was completed in January 1984, with three main arguments supporting Rotterdam as the location of the future architecture institute. Firstly, Rotterdam didn’t have at the time any state national museum; secondly, the city enjoyed a ‘favorable architectural climate;’ and thirdly that the new institute could be accommodated in Rotterdam’s old Municipal Library.⁸⁷⁷

The arguments presented by the Arts Council were so compelling, that even the *NDB* was persuaded by them. Soon after the report was presented, the documentation center produced its own comparative analysis between Amsterdam and Rotterdam for the location of the future architecture institute.⁸⁷⁸ In this comparison, Rotterdam came ahead mainly due to its ‘favorable architectural climate.’ The conclusion was reached after contrasting Rotterdam’s overall dynamic

⁸⁷⁵ Werkgroep WVC-VROM, “Verslag van Het Overlegt over Een Op Te Richten Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedenbouw,” 12.

⁸⁷⁶ Gemeente Amsterdam, “Brief Aan de Minister van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur,” April 4, 1984, NDBK 407.

⁸⁷⁷ Rotterdamse Kunststichting, sectie Architectuur, “Rapportage Betreffende de Vestiging van Een Architectuurmuseum in Rotterdam” (Rotterdamse Kunststichting, sectie Architectuur, January 1984).

⁸⁷⁸ Dick van Woerkom, “Amsterdam of Rotterdam?,” December 1983, NDBK 391.

atmosphere for architecture—filled with exhibitions and other events and supported by the cultural policies of an enthusiastic local government—with Amsterdam’s dreariness—where there was hardly any architectural exhibition of note and the local authorities awarded only meager paltry subsidies to the discipline. While Rotterdam was considered better suited for the establishment of the architecture institute, Amsterdam presented a strong cultural context. Thus, the distinction between both cities was framed as a strategic decision for the architecture institute, a decision between reaching out to other artistic expressions in Amsterdam, or fully benefiting from possible synergies within the discipline in Rotterdam.

As the proposals from the two cities were made public, a fierce public discussion took place in the pages of newspapers and magazines. Even though other cities like Delft, Hilversum, Zoetermeer, and Maastricht had also expressed their interest in hosting the architecture institute, the focus of the discussion was entirely on the two larger cities in the Netherlands. As some defended the virtues of Amsterdam and others the benefits of Rotterdam, the “battle for the Netherlands Architecture Institute” was full of platitudes based on the national narrative of the rivalry between the two cities.⁸⁷⁹ But if in discussion across general media it seemed that Amsterdam had the upper hand and would eventually claim the architecture institute, concerns that the architecture institute could end up in Rotterdam were revived by Minister Brinkman’s speech to the ICAM delegates in September 1984. Beyond announcing the official decision to establish “a new national Institute for Architecture and Town-Planning,” Brinkman also stated that “it [was] still uncertain where this

⁸⁷⁹ A variety of articles from national newspapers can be found in the NAI archives, in which the basic narrative of the longstanding rivalry between the two cities is the predominant theme. See “VNAI 1984, 1984: ‘Documentatie En Persknipsels over Locatiekeuze Voor Een Op Te Richten Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw. 1984.’” 1984. In her book on the emergence of Rotterdam as a cultural metropolis, Patricia van Ulzen has titled the section discussing the decision to locate the architecture institute in Rotterdam as “The Battle for the Netherlands Architecture Institute.” Patricia van Ulzen, “The Battle for the Netherlands Architecture Institute,” in *Imagine a Metropolis: Rotterdam’s Creative Class, 1970-2000* (Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2007), 171–172.

institute [would] be set up,” but that it was his “intention to decide on the museum's location before the end of the year.”⁸⁸⁰ Quickly, the *NDB* and *Stichting Wonen*—which had organized the international conference—tried to garner international support for their plight and asked ICAM delegates if they would be willing to sign a declaration asking for the future architecture institute to be located in the *Beurs van Berlage*.⁸⁸¹ Since most ICAM delegates refused to adhere to the initiative by claiming that this was strictly an internal matter of the Netherlands, the three institutions decided to enlist the support of a variety of Dutch cultural institutions.

Shortly after, *Stichting Wonen* requested a meeting to debate the issue with representatives of the Minister of Culture. In this meeting, *Stichting Wonen* presented its arguments in support of Amsterdam, namely the benefits of staying in Amsterdam rather than moving, the different cultural climates of both cities, the benefits of centralizing over decentralizing, as well as questioning what could the old Rotterdam library really offer that was not surpassed by the *Beurs van Berlage*.⁸⁸² Still unsatisfied with the Ministry’s response, *Stichting Wonen* collaborated with the *SAM* and the *NDB* in writing an official joint missive to Minister Brinkman expressing in no uncertain terms their shared desire to establish the institute in the *Beurs van Berlage*.⁸⁸³

At the same time, the *NDB* re-evaluated the two cities. Its assessment now favored Amsterdam, mainly due to the different conditions of the two buildings when considering the daily operations of the archive. If the *Beurs van Berlage* in Amsterdam was praised for being spacious (perhaps even too spacious) and with good light, the old Municipal Library in Rotterdam failed to impress. The

⁸⁸⁰ Brinkman, “Speech by the Minister for Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs at the Opening of the Third International Conference of Architectural Museums,” 4.

⁸⁸¹ Hans van Dijk, interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo, audio, February 1, 2011.

⁸⁸² Ruud Brouwers, “Punten Uit Gesprek over Vestigingsplaats Instituut En Aangekondigde Ombuiging '85,” October 4, 1984, NDBK 407.

⁸⁸³ Stichting Architectuurmuseum, Stichting Wonen, and Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst, “Brief Aan Minister Brinkman Inzake Vestigingsplaats/Huisvesting Nederlands Architectuur Instituut,” October 12, 1984, NDBK 407.

lack of conditions in the Rotterdam building was such that it even motivated the unusual remark that “in no time it will be necessary [to provide] psychiatric help” for the archive workers.⁸⁸⁴

Another appeal to establish the architecture institute in Amsterdam came from Jan Jesserun. On behalf of the *WVC-VROM* workgroup, Jesserun sent a confidential document urging Minister Brinkman to accept the merging partners’ arguments for the new institute to “remain” in Amsterdam and be housed in the *Beurs van Berlage*. Specifically, Jesserun restated all the major arguments of their position, namely that the archives still officially belonged to the *SAM* allowing it to block the transfer of that material to Rotterdam, that the three merging organizations were already embedded in important networks of culture and education in Amsterdam, that all the workers lived in the capital city, and, most importantly, that the “*Beurs van Berlage* in Amsterdam offered a better value for money both quantitatively and qualitatively than the Rotterdam library.”⁸⁸⁵ For all this, it was the *WVC-VROM* workgroup’s official recommendation that the minister accepted “the offer of the municipality of Amsterdam [to accommodate the institute in] the *Beurs van Berlage*.”⁸⁸⁶ A final plea was made by the three institutions in a meeting on December 12, 1984, but to no avail. In the following week, Minister Brinkman announced his official decision to establish the architecture institute in Rotterdam.

The decision to establish the new institute in Rotterdam was immediately contested. *Stichting Wonen* denounced the decision in the following days with an official letter to the minister, while it

⁸⁸⁴ Dick van Woerkom, “Standplaats Amsterdam of Rotterdam? In Het Gebouw Te Rotterdam,” October 1984, 2, NDBK 407.

⁸⁸⁵ In terms of quantity, Jesserun referred that given the large size of the building it might be possible to further consolidate other cultural institutions in the *Beurs van Berlage*, while in terms of quality it was referred how the *Beurs* was a masterpiece of early twentieth-century architecture. Jan Jesserun, “Brief Aan de Minister van WVC, de Minister van VROM En de Staatssecretaris van VROM Inzake Vestigingsplaats Architectuurinstituut,” October 19, 1984, 3–4, NDBK 407.

⁸⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 4.

took the *SAM* a full month to do the same.⁸⁸⁷ Unlike *Stichting Wonen* and the *SAM*, which were private foundations, the *NDB* as a public agency was unable to contest the minister's decision. By mid-January, *Stichting Wonen* expressed its discontent by radicalizing its position and officially abandoning the entire consultation process.⁸⁸⁸ Disgruntled not just with the decision but mostly with the minister's lack of dialogue, *Stichting Wonen* also initiated a campaign to coerce a reversal of the decision. As *Stichting Wonen's* policy coordinator, Ruud Brouwers wrote letters to several politicians not only refuting the claims of the decision but also suggesting that the minister had withheld some information from the House of Representatives.⁸⁸⁹ Brouwers also urged other institutions to write their own letters to the minister and the House of Representatives (particularly G.M.P. Cornelissen, the chairperson of the House Permanent Committee of Welfare and Culture, *Kamer Vaste Commissie Welzijn en Cultuur*) in support of *Stichting Wonen's* cause. Letters poured into the House of Representatives, from the Amsterdam Academy of Architecture (*Academie van Bouwkunst*) to the Amsterdam Tourist Office.⁸⁹⁰

Perhaps the most original form of protest came with *Stichting Wonen's* invitation to the members of the House Permanent Committee on Welfare and Culture to visit the *Beurs van Berlage* and experience firsthand "an outstanding example of early modern architecture" in which the architecture institute would certainly thrive.⁸⁹¹ Other protest actions included the organization of

⁸⁸⁷ Stichting Wonen, "Communique: Bestuur Stichting Wonen Acht Beslissing van Minister Brinkman over Vestigingsplaats Architectuurinstituut Onjuist," December 20, 1984, NDBK 407; Stichting Architectuurmuseum, "Brief Aan de Minister van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur," January 23, 1985, NDBK 407.

⁸⁸⁸ Stichting Wonen, "Brief Aan de Minister van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur," January 17, 1985, NDBK 407.

⁸⁸⁹ Stichting Wonen, "Brief Aan de Voorzitter van de Vaste Kamercommissie Voor Welzijn En Cultuur," January 18, 1985, NDBK 407.

⁸⁹⁰ Several of these letters can be found in the NAI archives. See "NDBK 407: 'Stukken Betreffende de Keuze van de Plaats En Huisvesting van Het Nieuwe Architectuurinstituut, 1984-1985,'" n.d.

⁸⁹¹ Stichting Wonen, "Uitnodiging Voor Een Bezoek Aan de Koopmansbeurs van Berlage in Amsterdam," February 13, 1985, NDBK 407.

an architectural competition to adapt the *Beurs van Berlage* to accommodate the new institute, accompanied by an exhibition of the results and a meeting to discuss "the desire of the institutions involved in the creation of this new institute to have the *Berlage* building accommodate it."⁸⁹²

The final act of opposition from *Stichting Wonen* to the merger came in the publication of a special double issue of its journal *Wonen TABK* titled "Architecture Museum / Architecture Museums."⁸⁹³ Beyond presenting a benchmarking exercise of international architecture museums and institutes, this *Wonen TABK* special issue had an explicit purpose to assert *Stichting Wonen's* position in the (architectural) public opinion and pressure the minister into a rapprochement under new terms. To that end, the issue included several articles and opinions forcefully arguing for establishing the architecture institute in Amsterdam, while discussing the historical and current conditions for the endeavor, as well as its inherent benefits and necessity.⁸⁹⁴

In the meantime, the *SAM* had followed *Stichting Wonen's* lead and also officially resigned from the merger process. Just as with *Stichting Wonen*, the lack of dialogue from the ministry was identified as the main culprit for the *SAM's* decision to "no longer be considered a part of the consultation and merger process," which would result in "expected and appropriate consequences."⁸⁹⁵

⁸⁹² Kassies, "Over Cultuurspreiding En Cultuurvorming," 44.

⁸⁹³ For an extensive discussion of the contents of this special issues of *Wonen TABK*, see the previous chapter "Towards and Architecture Institute (1978-1983)."

⁸⁹⁴ Arguably the most poignant criticism to the decision of locating the new architecture institute in Rotterdam was offered by Jan Kassies, the director of the Institute for Theater Research (*Instituut voor Theateronderzoek*). Kassies, "Over Cultuurspreiding En Cultuurvorming."

⁸⁹⁵ It was specifically mentioned that since the minister had not responded to *SAM's* first letter of objection to the decision (dated January 23, 1985), its board had decided that the necessary conditions to continue participating in the preparations of the future architecture institute were no longer present. Moreover, while not directly stated, it was suggested that the "expected and appropriate consequences" referred to *SAM's* ownership of several of the collections under the *NDB's* custody that could block their relocation to Rotterdam. Stichting Architectuurmuseum, "Brief Aan de Minister van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur," May 3, 1985, NDBK 407.

With the *SAM*'s official resignation from the merger process, the confrontation between merging partners and the Ministry of Culture seemed to have reached a peak, as Minister Brinkman was asked to explain his decision to the House Permanent Committee of Welfare and Culture in a special session in May 15, 1985.⁸⁹⁶ The minister's decision was greatly criticized, particularly since the white paper summarizing the consultation talks produced six months earlier had never even been submitted to the members of the committee. Minister Brinkman responded to the criticism by not only restating the reasons for his decision, but also including additional ones. Beyond the distribution of cultural funds and Rotterdam's favorable architectural climate, Minister Brinkman also cited the support system for architecture already in place in Rotterdam, particularly with the Maaskant Prize and the *Prix de Rome*, but also the presence of influential international architectural offices, like Rem Koolhaas' Office for Metropolitan Architecture (OMA). Furthermore, the minister also dispelled the notion that the *SAM*'s refusal to participate might leave the new institute without collections, since the 1972 agreement for the transfer of the *SAM*'s collections to the state was still valid. While unconvinced, the members of the committee decided to offer a vote of confidence and reluctantly supported Minister Brinkman's resolution.

However, it got worse, before it got better. Instead of public resistance, the *SAM* and *Stichting Wonen* decided to coordinate their opposition to the minister's plan, and even through contact between the *WVC-VROM* workgroup and their coalition had been resumed, the conflict still escalated in the subsequent months. By December, the *SAM* had officially informed the ministry that it would prevent the move of its collections to Rotterdam, through legal action if necessary, while *Stichting Wonen* requested the subsidy for which it was entitled from the Ministry of Culture.⁸⁹⁷ This

⁸⁹⁶ Kamercommissie Welzijn en Cultuur, "Verslag Mondeling Overleg Kamercommissie Welzijn En Cultuur Met Minister Brinkman," May 15, 1985, NDBK 407.

⁸⁹⁷ Stichting Architectuurmuseum, "Brief Aan de Minister van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur," December 9, 1985, SGWO s23.

was particularly problematic for the minister since *Stichting Wonen's* regular subsidy was supposed to be part of the subsidy for the future architecture institute. In response, the inter-ministerial group attempted to bring the two organizations back to the negotiation table by presenting them Rem Koolhaas' plan for the renovation of Rotterdam's old library to accommodate the institute.⁸⁹⁸ That was not enough, since with or without the Koolhaas plan, the two organizations considered that the old library was simply not adequate for the institute and refused the overture. When the carrot did not work, the ministry tried the stick and threatened to block the renewal of *Stichting Wonen's* annual subsidy. Since this would have been a tremendous blow for the foundation, *Stichting Wonen* threatened the ministry with legal action.⁸⁹⁹

During the Committee session Minister Brinkman had posited that "if there [was] no agreement there [would] be no architecture museum," which was now agonizingly clear. A year had gone by since *Stichting Wonen* had abandoned the consultation process and the architecture institute seemed increasingly improbable. As the current struggle had proven to be greatly detrimental to all parties, a rapprochement between the opposing parties seemed unavoidable.⁹⁰⁰ At the start of 1986, as the conflict reached its peak, Piet Sanders, a retired professor of civil law specialized in arbitration (and the son of an architect), brokered such rapprochement. After a series of mediation talks, Sanders was able to reach a compromise with *SAM*, *Stichting Wonen* and the Ministry of

⁸⁹⁸ Koolhaas was engaged by the Rotterdam Municipality to draw a plan with a dual purpose. Firstly, to dispel *Stichting Wonen* and *SAM's* concerns regarding the suitability of the old Rotterdam library to accommodate the new institute and secondly to demonstrate their unmitigated support if the institute would be established in Rotterdam. The model for Rem Koolhaas / OMA plan for Rotterdam's old Municipal Library is currently in the NAI archives. See NAI archief: MAQV928 and NAI archive, "Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur," *NAi*, accessed June 11, 2013, <http://zoeken.nai.nl/CIS/object/862>.

⁸⁹⁹ The entire correspondence between *Stichting Wonen*, its legal counseling and the Ministry of culture is available in the archives, but this letter from *Stichting Wonen* offers an overview of the escalation of the situation. *Stichting Wonen*, "Brief Aan de Minister van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur," January 21, 1986, SGWO s23.

⁹⁰⁰ Kamercommissie Welzijn en Cultuur, "Verslag Mondeling Overleg Kamercommissie Welzijn En Cultuur Met Minister Brinkman," 5.

Culture. Both institutions would collaborate in the establishment of the new architecture institute in Rotterdam once the Ministry offered assurances that the institute would not be accommodated (even temporarily) in the old library and that there would be funding for a new building.⁹⁰¹ The reconciliation was officially completed in by June 1986, as after eighteen months of stalemate both sides agreed to resume collaborating in the process of establishing the architecture institute, this time in a brand new building in Rotterdam.⁹⁰²

While seemingly the conflict between the merging partners and the Minister of Culture had threatened the establishment of the architecture institute, in reality the new architecture institute had never been in danger. According to Brouwers, the organized protest was conceived to “place pressure for the construction of a new building” in Rotterdam to house the institute. It was even “a kind of double-play,” since Brouwers good relation with Jan Jesserun from the *WVC-VROM* workgroup and Joop Linthorst from the city of Rotterdam made both “aware of the fact that [*Stichting Wonen*] was willing to go to Rotterdam,” but that it could not express it openly. Instead, *Stichting Wonen* leveraged the controversy to impose one important condition: “a new building [for the institute] in Rotterdam.”⁹⁰³ Ultimately, for Brouwers, “the whole game of the antagonism between Rotterdam and Amsterdam was more or less fake,” and *Stichting Wonen* “used it to get funding for a new building,” since “that was the point of the so-called activism.”⁹⁰⁴

Organizing the Architecture Institute: Steering Committee and Working Group

⁹⁰¹ Elco Brinkman, “Brief Aan de Bestuur van de Stichting Wonen,” June 20, 1986, SGWO s23. At the same time there were the first reports in the media that the new architecture institute would be accommodated in a new building in the proximity of the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen. Several articles are available in the NAI archive “SGWO s23: ‘Architectuur Instituut Vanaf 1-1-1986; W.V.C. Correspondentie V.a. 1985,’” 1988, including Herman Moscoviter, “Eis van Amsterdammers: ‘Bouw Naast Boymans Architectuurmuseum,’” *Vrije Volk*, December 14, 1985. and “Rotterdam Krijgt Nieuw Architectuurmuseum,” *Algemeen Dagblad*, January 5, 1985.

⁹⁰² Brinkman, “Brief Aan de Bestuur van de Stichting Wonen.”

⁹⁰³ Brouwers, interview.

⁹⁰⁴ Ibid.

Beyond the new building, it was also agreed that the consultation talks would be resumed based on the white paper produced by all five parties in December 1984 and directed by a Steering Committee under the guidance of an independent consultant. Intent on not wasting any more time, the resumed workgroup secured the services of the organization expert Hans Andersson of the Utrecht consulting firm Andersson, Elffers & Felix, who immediately began developing a plan to direct the formation of the institute. Andersson's efforts went further and beyond those of a mere project leader, with his dedication and enthusiasm being recognized as he later became the first director of the institute.

From the mediation meeting, it had been agreed that there were two major tasks that needed to be accomplished, namely the institutional organization of the architecture institute, and the planning involved with erecting its new building in Rotterdam.⁹⁰⁵ To direct both tasks, a Steering Committee was constituted, being composed of one member of each of the five organizations, namely "J. Jessurun, chairman, R. Bekker [*VROM*], R. Brouwers [*Stichting Wonen*], N.H.M. Tummers [*SAM*], M.J.H. Willinge [*NDB*], C. Cramer [*WVC*]" and the project leader, Hans Andersson.⁹⁰⁶ The Steering Committee operated as Board of Directors for the entire process, as it was mandated to "monitor the progress of the project, review the (interim) results of the project and contribute to the various aspects of implementing the project."⁹⁰⁷

Given the Steering Committee's responsibilities, it was officially constituted with a legally binding contract stipulating its duties and rights. The first articles defined the objectives and constitution of the Steering Committee as well as of its project leader, but perhaps the most

⁹⁰⁵ Jan Jessurun, "Brief Betreft NDB/Architectuur-Instituut," July 14, 1986, NDBK 417.

⁹⁰⁶ Article 1 of Elco Brinkman, "Besluit Stuurgroep," August 26, 1986, NDBK 417. While the affiliation of each member of the Steering Committee with the different institutions involved in the process is never mentioned, the division was clear since all five institutions were represented by one member.

⁹⁰⁷ Article 3 in *Ibid.*

important stipulation was in the final article of the contract. This article stated that “when a difference of opinion on the conception and implementation of the project [of the architecture institute], the Minister of Culture shall enter into consultation with the administrations of the partners involved in the project.”⁹⁰⁸ This clause was particularly significant, since it legally stipulated the relation of the committee to the Minister of Culture, and prevented the minister from taking any unilateral action like the previous decision to locate the institute in Rotterdam which had already delayed the projects by eighteen months.

Even before the Steering Committee was officially invested, a Working Group was established in the first meeting organized by Hans Andersson on July 17, 1986. If the Steering Committee was responsible for directing the process, the Working Group was mandated to actually develop the instruments necessary for the institutional creation of the architecture institute and its new building. When compared to the Steering Committee, the composition of the Working Group was both enlarged and contracted, since there were more members in this group but these were all affiliated with the three merging institutions with the exception of Jan Jessurun as chairman and Hans Andersson as project leader.⁹⁰⁹ Besides an overlapping membership, there was also a hierarchical relation between both groups, as the Steering Committee supervised and directed the efforts of the Working Group (even as all individuals of the Steering Committee were also members of the Working Group).

Beyond organizing the two groups, in his initial work Andersson also delineated the necessary steps (organized in phases) and responsibilities to realize the project. In the “conception of the institute,” further development was necessary regarding its “policy plan, legal form, organizational

⁹⁰⁸ Article 5 in *Ibid.*

⁹⁰⁹ Mariet Willinge, Ruud Brouwers, and Nic Tummers, the three members of the Steering Committee affiliated with the three merging institutions, were also among the members of the Working Group.

structure, staffing, and funding.”⁹¹⁰ But before that, it was also necessary to properly define the “merger of the existing *Stichting Wonen*, the *SAM* and the *NDB*” through the “formalization of the Statutes [of the new institute], the formation of the new Board, the recruitment, selection and appointment of a Director, and the actual transfer and appointment of staff.”⁹¹¹ Regarding the “accommodation of the architecture institute,” it was necessary to consider the possibility of “temporary premises,” but also “the (possible) preparation and implementation of the construction project” for which it would be indispensable to further investigate “the location, the program of requirements, and the financing” of a new building in “cooperation with the municipality of Rotterdam.”⁹¹²

With clear planning goals and calendar, Working Group and Steering Committee met several times throughout the following months in Andersson’s office in Utrecht. By September of that year, there was already an agreement on the institute’s first Policy Plan. In this document, the institute defined its approach to architecture in its three functions, namely: the “prudent management of the collection (the treasury),” the conduct of “independent investigations, interpreting and forming opinions [of the archive] (the study room),” and finally the “visual presentation [of architecture] (the reception room).”⁹¹³ The combination of these function was intended to “allow architecture’s conceptions, desires, dream, ideas and technical achievements to become public in the broadest sense,” as well as “promote buildings as a cultural expression.”⁹¹⁴ With its three functions of archive, study and presentation, the architecture institute intended to contribute to the

⁹¹⁰ Point II, Hans Andersson, “Brief Aan de Minister van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur,” July 25, 1987, SGWO s23.

⁹¹¹ Point III, *Ibid.*

⁹¹² Point I and IV, *Ibid.*

⁹¹³ Werkgroep NAI, “Schets Beleidsplan Architectuur-Instituut,” 3.

⁹¹⁴ *Ibid.*

“development of [architectural] design through the stimulation of discussion and interest,” not only from professionals, but also from clients and the general public.⁹¹⁵

Beyond an abstract conception of the institute, the Policy Plan also addressed its practical construction by identifying the objectives and activities of the three functions (and their respective tasks) in the subsequent five and ten years. As expected, the first five years were mostly dedicated to the establishment of the three functions (particularly since they were expected to be accommodated in a brand new building), while the following five were intended for consolidation and expansion. For example, for the first five years, the archive was to be dedicated to the reorganization of its holdings and establishment of connections to local archives and agencies, while the following five years the identification and acquisition of noticeable absences in the archive was to be a priority.⁹¹⁶ A similar progression was defined for publications, which as a part of the Presentation Department were to be entirely composed by catalogues of the institute’s exhibitions in the first five years, but in the following five years were to also include architectural guides to Dutch cities.

The policy plan became a foundational document for the development of the architecture institute. From it, the Working Group delineated throughout the following year the organizational structure and the activities of the architecture institute. The organizational structure defined three equal departments within the institute and under the Director’s purview, namely the “Collections Department,” the “Presentation Department,” and the “General Affairs Department.” Also under the Director, but with relative autonomy, was the journal *Archis*, which constituted a fourth department. The Board of Trustees was the only element above the Director, with the power to nominate and assess the Director’s performance. The organizational structure was completed with

⁹¹⁵ Ibid.

⁹¹⁶ Ibid.

the Association of Friends of the institute, the Leliman Association, which was only indirectly affiliated with the institute through a seat at the Board.

Although all the departments shared the same objective to promote a greater understanding of architecture, they all achieved it in different ways. As its name already indicates, the Collections Department was responsible for the management and conservation of the institute's considerable architectural archive, as well as making it available to other departments (namely the presentation department) and third parties.⁹¹⁷ The Presentation Department was considered the public function of the institute, since it engaged the public in general and specific audiences with the activities of the institute. This included the production of research, the preparation of exhibitions and publications, the implementation of educational activities and the organization of events, all "aimed at promoting discussion and opinion on architecture and urban design and stimulate design practice."⁹¹⁸ The General Affairs Department was responsible for the everyday operations of the institute, from financial administration to the management of contracted services (like catering and cleaning).⁹¹⁹ The editorial office of the journal *Archis* comprised the fourth department of the institute. While still within the institute's structure, the journal enjoyed a special independent status since its relation with the director and Board of the institute was regulated by an editorial charter.⁹²⁰ This charter was created in order to ensure that the journal had the necessary critical autonomy to be able to independently discuss the institute's activities and developments. Finally, the Leliman Association, of Friends of the Institute, was only loosely associated with the institute, and its main objective was to stimulate a greater public interest and knowledge in the activities of

⁹¹⁷ The Collections Department was composed by the "archives and collections, the library and documentation, and the conservation laboratory." Werkgroep NAI, "Organisatie Architectuur Instituut," August 1988, 3, NDBK 422.

⁹¹⁸ *Ibid.*, 6.

⁹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 8.

⁹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 11.

the institute, as well as supporting the institute by raising funds and procuring donations of architectural material.⁹²¹

Even though the merger of the *SAM*, *NDB*, and *Stichting Wonen* was to create a unified architecture institute, there was a clear continuity of the different institutions in the different departments of the institute. Specifically, the *SAM* became the Leliman Association, the *NDB* the Collections Department, and the *Stichting Wonen* the Presentation Department with its journal also becoming the only independent department of the institute.

Confident that the instruments produced in the previous eighteen months conferred a solid base for the new institute, Hans Andersson (along with the Steering Committee) initiated the process of officially—and legally—establishing the Dutch architecture institute in the early months of 1988. For that, it was necessary to agree on the statutes that would actually stipulate the foundation and activity of the institute. The statutes were greatly based on the statutes included in the white paper in December 1984, although with some notable alterations.⁹²² Regarding objectives, it mostly remained the same, as it was stated that the institute and its foundation aimed “to collect, preserve and make accessible collections, archives, library and documentation in the field of Dutch architecture and urban planning and promote knowledge of and interest in the cultural dimension of the built environment and thus stimulate of the architecture professional community.”⁹²³ The section identifying the tasks also remained greatly the same, if not for the

⁹²¹ Stichting Architectuurmuseum, “Structuur En Inrichting van de Leliman Vereniging,” November 11, 1987, NDBK 415. Since the Leliman Association was only indirectly associated with the institute, it was not contemplated by the Organizational Structure document.

⁹²² The influence of the 1983 statutes is clearly noticeable in the text of the new statutes, but there were also other sources of inspiration, like the Statutes of the Stichting Fonds van Beeldende Kunsten (Foundation Fund of Visual Arts). See S.J.J Wiersema, “Brief Aan de Stuurgroep En Projectleden Nederlands Architectuur Instituut,” March 22, 1988, NDBK 424.

⁹²³ Article 2 of Hans Andersson, “Oprichting Akte van de Stichting Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw,” August 17, 1988, 2, NDBK 424.

addition of a clause stating that beyond the collection, research and public presentation of architecture the institute also intended to “design and build a suitable building to house its collections, archives, library and documentation, and from which its activities are managed.”⁹²⁴ Other crucial distinctions appeared in the introduction to the statutes, which now included an abridged history of the process (in which the period between December 1984 and May 1986 was left unaddressed), and in their final section, which now contemplated the procedures to follow in the event of “dissolution and liquidation” of the institute (which was a scenario to consider, since the it was about to embark in the financially delicate process of building construction).⁹²⁵

With these statutes, the Foundation Netherlands Institute for Architecture and Urban Planning (*Stichting Nederlands Instituut voor Architectuur en Stedebouw*, or *SNIAS*) with seat in Rotterdam was officially created on August 17, 1988 by Hans Andersson in a notary’s office in Amsterdam.⁹²⁶ With the same Act, Hans Andersson officially became the first director of the new Dutch architecture institute. On December 30, 1988, two official acts announced the termination of both *Stichting Wonen* and the *NDB* and their merger with the newly established Foundation Netherlands Institute for Architecture and Urban Planning.⁹²⁷ The Architecture Museum Foundation would

⁹²⁴ Ibid.

⁹²⁵ Introduction and article 25 in Ibid., 1, 6. Another section missing from these statutes was the one stipulating the Advisory Council, since this body had been eliminated as a result of the simplification of the organizational structure of the architecture institute.

⁹²⁶ While in the various drafts of this document the foundation was titled *Stichting Nederlands Architectuur Instituut* (Foundation Netherlands Architecture Institute), concerns over a copyright claim by the *Instituut voor Architectuur* (Institute for Architecture) of Utrecht compelled the reversal to the original long form name of Foundation Netherlands Institute for Architecture and Urban Planning (*Stichting Nederlands Instituut voor Architectuur en Stedebouw*). See Hans Andersson, “Brief Aan de Stichting Instituut Voor Architectuur,” April 7, 1988, NDBK 415.

⁹²⁷ While *Stichting Wonen* was a private foundation and a properly notarized act of merger was necessary, as a public department of the Monumentenzorg, the *NDB*’s merger was signaled by an agreement of the Ministry of Culture to transfer the main staff of the documentation center to the newly established architecture institute. Arthur Wortmann and Adri Duivesteijn, “Fusie Opdracht Stichting Wonen En Stichting Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw,” December 30, 1988, BSTU 1989; Hans Andersson and E.T. van Wijk, “Detacheringsovereenkomst,” December 30, 1988, BSTU 1989.

follow suit a few months later, on September 29, 1989 with an act regulating the donation to the Dutch state of the *SAM*'s collections and stipulating its termination.⁹²⁸

Building a New Building

Along with the merger of the three existing institutions, the construction of the institute's new building was perceived as an equally crucial operation towards the establishment of the new institute.⁹²⁹ If the merger was to create the NAI on paper, the physical expression of the new building in one of Rotterdam's most prominent sites was to announce the new institute to the general public.

Given that the construction of a new building had been the fundamental condition for *Stichting Wonen* and *SAM* to rejoin the negotiation establishing the new architecture institute (after an eighteen months hiatus), it was unsurprising that the first order of business in the resumed negotiations (now led by Hans Andersson) was to "further research into the possibilities of new building - in cooperation with the municipality of Rotterdam - regarding location, program of requirements, [and] financing."⁹³⁰ In fact, the entire process to build a new building for the NAI would begin long before the NAI was officially constituted as an organization.

The Multiple Commission

⁹²⁸ Nic Tummers, Dirk van der Veer, and Jan Jessurun, "Schenking Akte Tussen de Stichting Architectuurmuseum En de Staat Der Nederlanden," September 29, 1989. Since the *SAM* collections were officially donated to the Dutch state, another act stipulated the conditions of the relation between the state and the new Netherlands Architecture Institute regarding the care of those architecture collections. Jan Jessurun, Pieter Cornelis Beelaerts van Blokland, and Hong Seng Yap, "Beheer Akte Tussen de Staat Der Nederlanden En de Stichting Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw," September 29, 1989.

⁹²⁹ The parity between both operations was constantly emphasized in all public communications addressing the procedure towards the foundation of the future institute. See Hans Andersson, "Persbericht Nederlands Architectuur Instituut," November 1987, SGWO s23.

⁹³⁰ Andersson, "Brief Aan de Minister van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur."

Even before the Steering Committee (that would guide the preparatory process towards the constitution of the NAI) was officially vested, the Working Group began defining the procedure to be followed for the construction of the future institute's new building. When the Steering Committee was officially constituted in the end of August 1986, the Working Group submitted its "Memorandum for Procedure and Contract for the New Building of the Architecture Institute." The memorandum had taken only one month to complete and was the first document produced by the newly established Working Group, completed even before any preliminary policy plan for the institute.⁹³¹ The priority attributed to the construction of the new building could not have been more clearly expressed.

The memorandum not only defined the procedure to be followed in order to "realize as soon as possible the new premises of the intended architecture institute in Rotterdam," but also established the goal to "express the ambitions of the institute" by approaching the building commission as an "architectural manifestation."⁹³² Therefore, it was argued that the "selection of an architect [for the building] was an efficient manner to take the pulse of architecture and the public's interest."⁹³³ In order to both assess the current condition of architecture and raise public interest, it was determined the organization of a "multiple-commission" for the new building as the most appropriate method.⁹³⁴

⁹³¹ It would be another month before the Working Group presented the draft for the NAI's first policy plan. See Werkgroep NAI, "Schets Beleidsplan Architectuur-Instituut."

⁹³² Werkgroep NAI, "Notitie Procedure En Opdracht Nieuwbouw Architectuurinstituut," August 1986, 1, SGWO s23.

⁹³³ Ibid.

⁹³⁴ Before identifying the "multiple commission" as the appropriate method for assigning the NAI's new building commission, four alternatives are presented in the memorandum. While the simplest and cheapest procedure, a direct commission for the new building was dismissed since it constrained the choice and spectacle of the process. An open competition was equally dismissed for the opposite reason, since it did not ensure that the most interesting architects would participate and further distanced the client from steering the process. The last alternative dismissed was a combination of open competition and multiple commission, which was considered to be too costly and too complicated and not providing any assurances of a good result. Ibid., 3-4.

The multiple-commission was a procedure regulated by the Royal Institute of Dutch Architects (*BNA*), which unlike a regular architectural competition did not have a jury nor a winner. Instead, the entire process was supervised by an independent assessing committee, which also evaluated every proposal in a report (submitted to the client) without indicating any order of merit.⁹³⁵ Given that the assessment of the committee was merely advisory and non-binding, the multiple-commission ensured that the NAI Steering Committee had the necessary freedom to select the architect or proposal that best suited their interests.

The ability to control the architectural level of the proposals through the invitations of particular architects was particularly appealing to the NAI Steering Committee's ambition to approach the design and construction of the new building as an "architectural manifestation." Therefore, it was stipulated that the multiple-commission would be organized with six invited architects, namely four Dutch and two foreign.⁹³⁶ The memorandum concluded with a cost-projection for the multiple-commission and the planning for the entire endeavor, from discussion to building completion.⁹³⁷ Since "the institute [intended] to open its doors in 1991," it was reasoned that the "building commission should be addressed immediately" and be put in motion "within [the following] few months."⁹³⁸

Upon the acceptance of the multiple-commission model by the Steering Committee, the Working Group began preparing the organization of the procedure. The most crucial (and time-

⁹³⁵ Every proposal would be "assessed separately in terms of vision (the specific nature of the building and the way it fits in, in town planning terms), the realization of the programme of requirements, the engineering and technical aspects, and of costs." Colenbrander and Brouwers, *6 Designs for the Dutch Architectural Institute*, 3.

⁹³⁶ Werkgroep NAI, "Notitie Procedure En Opdracht Nieuwbouw Architectuurinstituut," 4. The stipulation that the multiple-commission would only include two foreign architects was decided by the Ministry of Culture as a measure to stimulate Dutch architecture. Brouwers, "The NAI - The History of a Design Task," 73.

⁹³⁷ It was calculated that the multiple-commission would be roughly three times more expensive than a direct commission. Werkgroep NAI, "Notitie Procedure En Opdracht Nieuwbouw Architectuurinstituut," 4.

⁹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 1.

consuming) element of the entire process was the formulation of the program for the new building, since the NAI's Steering Committee decided to discuss and define in tandem the new building program and the policies of the institute, thus jointly defining organization and building.⁹³⁹ It was believed that not only there were inherent benefits of concurrently defining the intellectual project and physical expression of the new institute, but it was also much more expeditious. This meant that the building program effectively was the translation of an abstract, not yet fully defined idea of an architecture institute to a concrete, physical reality. Resulting from the combined formulation of policy and program, three "keywords" were provided to the architects regarding "the way in which the institute was going to function as a cohesive whole:" treasury, study room, and reception room.⁹⁴⁰

While yet without physical form, the program quantified, qualified, and ultimately translated into spatial terms, the NAI's intentions, ambitions, and activities. Given the character of the design task and the uncertainty associated with defining an organization that did not yet exist, the formulation of the program of requirements took (unsurprisingly) longer than originally anticipated.⁹⁴¹

⁹³⁹ Other contemporary architecture institutes had followed a similar path for their implementation, most notably the Canadian Centre for Architecture in Montreal.

⁹⁴⁰ The "treasury" was defined as "the acquisition, careful management and preparation of archives and collections;" study room" referred to "the independent research, interpretation and formation of opinions;" while "reception room" (which has also been translated as "festive hall") indicated "the visual presentation, publication and organization of discussion of architecture, town planning and landscape architecture," or "the intention of making the public enjoy architecture." Colenbrander and Brouwers, *6 Designs for the Dutch Architectural Institute*, 4; Brouwers, "The NAI - The History of a Design Task," 72.

⁹⁴¹ While the initial planning devised by the Workgroup contemplated only four months (concurrent with the multiple commission) for the formulation of the preliminary program of requirements, by taking over approximately fourteen months to complete, the building program took over three times longer than initially scheduled to prepare. Even when considering that this time discrepancy also accounts for the decision to provide a definitive program of requirements to the multiple-commission (rather than preliminary), there is still a clear discrepancy from the originally planned eight months allocated for the formulation of both preliminary and definitive program of requirements. See *Werkgroep NAI, "Notitie Procedure En Opdracht Nieuwbouw Architectuurstuut,"* 5.

In October 1987, after almost a year of discussions and collaboration with the Government's Building Agency (*Rijksgebouwendienst*), the Working Group finally submitted the program for the new building to be used in the multiple-commission.⁹⁴² In the introduction to the programmatic breakdown of the building the future architecture institute was described as a combination of "archival institution, library and reading room, research and study center, and a museum in contemporary sense of the word."⁹⁴³ This was taken to mean that the new building of the institute was to be "an inviting (nice, comfortable, intriguing) place for learning, enjoyment, discussion, criticism, [and] exchange in the fields of architecture, urban planning and landscape architecture."⁹⁴⁴

The architectural expression of the new building was expected to respond to both its function as a modern museum and to its specific location in Rotterdam. Since, as most modern museum premises, the new NAI building was to be composed of both public and private areas, the architects were challenged to use the "paradox of privacy and openness as a catalyst for [their] designs."⁹⁴⁵ The visual and formal relations to existing urban elements established by the building's site at the edge of Rotterdam's *Museumpark* was also presented as an important catalyst for design,

⁹⁴² The collaboration with the *Rijksgebouwendienst* also provided expertise in the organization of multiple-commissions, with the NAI's Steering Committee consulting the organizational procedure of previous multiple-commissions organized by that state agency, namely the refurbishment and expansion of the House of Representatives own chambers in 1980. See *Rijksgebouwendienst*, "Meervoudige Opdracht Bouw/Verbouw Tweede Kamer 'S-Gravenhage," December 1978, SGWO s23.

⁹⁴³ *Werkgroep NAI*, "Meervoudige Opdracht Architectuur Instituut," October 19, 1987, 2, SGWO s23.

⁹⁴⁴ There was also a latent ambition in the program, since it was referred that the building should aim to achieve and express a complete composition, but this "should not prevent [the possibility] of an expansion to take place in a harmonious manner." *Ibid.*

⁹⁴⁵ *Ibid.* It was further described that "approximately two-thirds of the total space in the structure was to be occupied by 'service' areas," leaving the remaining one-third to accommodate the public areas of the institute.

particularly its visual and formal relation to the surrounding urban elements, since “the building is entirely surrounded by public areas” it would “need to have a frontal façade” all around.⁹⁴⁶

While the introduction defined the general guidelines for the design, the bulk of the document was dedicated to the specification of the new building’s approximately 8,000m² of program in minute detail. The program was not only broken down into seven main categories of spaces, but each single space was defined in terms of its qualities, required surface area (often even suggesting dimensions), and minimum free height.⁹⁴⁷ The four exhibition spaces, for example, were first described as “open spaces, in which wall sections and structures (eg 1:1 building fragments), cabinets and audio-visual equipment can be placed” equipped with “technical flooring systems, climate and lighting control, and security,” but were subsequently defined in greater detail.⁹⁴⁸ The “Permanent Exhibition Hall” was specified as having at least 75 meters linear wall space, 5 meters of free height, 300 m² (12x25m) and enough open room to accommodate the exhibition of structures. The two smaller galleries (exhibition spaces B and C) were described in equal detail, but the large exhibition hall was further detailed, with even the size of the entrance to the 750m² main hall being stipulated.⁹⁴⁹ Complementing the detailed description of each individual space and

⁹⁴⁶ The site was of particular importance to both the NAI and the city of Rotterdam (which had donated it for the construction of the institute), with members of the NAI’s Steering Committee, including Hans Andersson, actively participating in the urban planning and design decisions for the area. See Hans Andersson, “Voortgang Project Architectuur Instituut: (t.b.v. Agendapunt 3 Stuurgroep Vergadering 5-9-1986),” August 28, 1986, BSTU 1988. It was thus remarked that the NAI’s new building would not only be freestanding, but should also be approachable from all sides. Werkgroep NAI, “Meervoudige Opdract Architectuur Instituut,” 3.

⁹⁴⁷ The seven categories of space were “entrance, exhibitions, workplaces, auditorium, archives and collections, library and documentation, and other service areas.” All of these categories were further broken down into sub-categories of space, as in the case of “exhibitions” which was composed of spaces for a permanent exhibition, as well as a large exhibition hall and two smaller galleries, or even “entrance” which was stipulated to accommodate not only an entry hall, but also a bookstore and a café. See Werkgroep NAI, “Meervoudige Opdract Architectuur Instituut,” 4.

⁹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 9.

⁹⁴⁹ Beyond the regular specification of wall dimensions, wall length and surface area that was used for most spaces, the program for the main hall also stipulated the inclusion of a 10 meter free height for a portion of the hall (suggested as a void at the center) for the exhibition of larger objects, with the remaining area requiring a minimum of 5 meter free height. *Ibid.*, 10.

function, the building program also included a “relations scheme” indicating the required proximity between different spaces.⁹⁵⁰

The detailed description of the building program might have seemed rather restrictive to the creativity of the architects involved, but was in fact a deliberate strategy. Rather than “develop the program of requirements with the designer,” the NAI’s Steering Committee in charge of organizing the multiple-commission believed that “the more precisely the programme [was] formulated beforehand to give a picture of the use—not of the form—the greater the inspiration it [could] form for the architect.”⁹⁵¹ Instead of a constraint, the detailed description of the building’s program was expected to become a source of creativity for the architects involved and a way for the Steering Committee to define the NAI as an institution.

With the building program in hand, on October 26, 1987, the ministers of Culture (*WVC*) and Housing (*VROM*) officially informed the Dutch House of Representatives (*Tweede Kamer*) that they would be allocating funds from their budgets for the construction of the new NAI building in Rotterdam.⁹⁵² The ministries patronage of the construction process would begin with financing the multiple-commission.

The multiple-commission budget included not only the architects’ and the assessing committee’s fees and the usual logistical expenses, but also the costs of producing an exhibition and publishing a catalogue.⁹⁵³ From the very start, the NAI’s Steering Committee and Working Group

⁹⁵⁰ The relations between spaces were categorized in a gradient of “closely linked” and “preferably together,” with the spaces without such indication as being considered unrelated. *Ibid.*, 5.

⁹⁵¹ Brouwers, “The NAI - The History of a Design Task,” 71–72.

⁹⁵² Andersson, “Persbericht Nederlands Architectuur Instituut.”

⁹⁵³ Werkgroep NAI, “Voor Begroting Kosten Meervoudige Opdracht Architectuurinstituut,” December 1988, SGWO s23.

approached the organization of the multiple-commission as an architectural manifestation that would set the tone for the architecture institute's future endeavors.

Stichting Wonen and *SAM*'s earlier insistence in the construction of a new building as *the* indispensable condition to continue negotiating the constitution of the new architecture institute was also motivated by their early understanding that the entire process and the resulting building would become the most symbolic and visible endeavor ever organized by the NAI. With a new building, the NAI would not only have adequate premises to thrive, but also to begin its operations with a forceful claim on the state of architecture that could immediately raise the institute's public profile.⁹⁵⁴ The entire process culminating in the construction of a new building was to announce the NAI to the Dutch and international architectural circles, while already positioning it within the Dutch cultural landscape.

With this symbolic—and most crucial—activity, the NAI took the first step towards creating and establishing a new public sphere for architecture in the Netherlands even before the institute was officially formed. Therefore, the intended return of the multiple-commission was not only the construction of the best possible building to accommodate and express the nascent institute, but also to raise awareness about the state of architecture in the Netherlands.

To that end, the architects invited to the multiple-commission were selected with great care. Specifically, the multiple-commission was intended to present a cross-section of the different strands of Dutch contemporary architecture. While there as growing interest in the promotion of new architectural talent, the multiple-commission was to represent the full spectrum of current

⁹⁵⁴ The importance of the construction of a new building in raising the profile of other contemporary architecture institutes had previously been established by the experience of the CCA in Montreal, but even more clearly, by the German Architecture Museum (*DAM* from its German acronym) in Frankfurt.

architecture by including “both younger and older architects” represented.⁹⁵⁵ Thus, there was a “deliberate representation of various movements or tendencies,” . . . “ranging from technical functionalism to eclectic monumentalism.”⁹⁵⁶ The final list of invited architects was composed of the Dutch Jo Coenen, Benthem & Crouwel, Hubert-Jan Henket, Rem Koolhaas and Wim Quist, completed by the Swiss Luigi Snozzi.⁹⁵⁷

According to Bernard Colenbrander, within the selecting committee “everyone thought that these were the ‘top architects’ in the 1980s.”⁹⁵⁸ Wim Quist was particularly admired for “a pragmatic slant and an attitude” responsive to “the programme of requirements” where rational analysis of the task was resolved with “clear-cut architectural ideas of forms,” but also “because of his experience with museums.”⁹⁵⁹ The young architecture office Benthem & Crouwel shared “a business-like approach to architecture,” but with a formal expression where the tight integration between architecture and technology was celebrated, in a markedly “high-tech profile.”⁹⁶⁰ Rather

⁹⁵⁵ Brouwers, “The NAI - The History of a Design Task,” 73. The situation of young architects was an important topic in cultural politics,” and that concern had already been expressed in the organization of the first Biennale of Young Dutch Architects in 1983, and would soon be codified as a driving issue of the first national architecture policy, or architectuurnota. Colenbrander, interview.

⁹⁵⁶ Brouwers, “The NAI - The History of a Design Task,” 73. In the most comprehensive published account of the entire process, Brouwers has also reminisced that “strikingly enough there was no representative of the so-called Forum group in the Netherlands (called after the journal Forum), also called structuralism, while its opposite, rationalism (Carel Weeber and his followers) turned out to be equally unrepresented. However, Colenbrander recalls that during the discussions to elaborate the list of invited architects, the structuralist master Aldo van Eyck was seriously considered, but given his standing and profile it was believed that “it wasn’t suitable to have him in a competition in which he would be measured against others.” Colenbrander, interview.

⁹⁵⁷ Originally it had been decided to invite four Dutch and two foreign architects to the multiple-commission, but since the Anglo-Swedish Ralph Erskine declined to participate and was replaced by the Dutch Hubert-Jan Henket, eventually only one foreign architect (the Swiss Luigi Snozzi) participated in the multiple commission. Brouwers, “The NAI - The History of a Design Task,” 73.

⁹⁵⁸ Colenbrander, interview. While these were considered to be the best architects, the list also reflected some personal preferences, namely with Hubert-Jan Henket’s last minute invitation being championed by then *Rijksbouwmeester* Frans van Gool, and Lui Snozzi’s invitation being suggested by Bernard Colenbrander, who “was a fan and knew his work.”

⁹⁵⁹ Colenbrander and Brouwers, *6 Designs for the Dutch Architectural Institute*, 8; Colenbrander, interview.

⁹⁶⁰ Colenbrander, interview.

than expressing technology, Jo Coenen's work attempted to reveal the *genius loci*, the significance and history of a site, making him not only the representative of the Eindhoven School, but also being "considered the postmodern guy" in the multiple-commission.⁹⁶¹ Rem Koolhaas' Office for Metropolitan Architecture (OMA) had been gaining international recognition with several high ranked competition entries, and had just completed the *Nederlands Dans Theater* to further critical acclaim and was recognized for his interest in "the tasteless and formless" of the juxtaposition of "typologies and activities."⁹⁶² The assortment of Dutch architects was completed with Hubert-Jan Henket, who was selected as a "as a last minute replacement" to the Anglo-Swedish architect Ralph Erskine, and whose work expressed a level of sobriety and restraint that could rival that Erskine.⁹⁶³ The Swiss Luigi Snozzi was the sixth and final invited architect. Snozzi was primarily valued for his late modernist approach to architecture in which "abstract and geometric forms only [had] a relative significance for him," while taking particular care in the relationship created with different elements in the city.

As expected, the six proposals for the NAI's new building were just as eclectic as the approaches espoused by the invited architects. Jo Coenen based his proposal in the three components of the institute, proposing a building that clearly articulated the "study room," the "treasury," and the "reception room/festive hall," which he dubbed "an openwork multidimensional structure."⁹⁶⁴ Specifically, the treasury was materialized as a curved band along the main street defining the site, attached midway to the simple rectangular slab of the study room (and offices) which served as the

⁹⁶¹ Ibid.

⁹⁶² Colenbrander and Brouwers, *6 Designs for the Dutch Architectural Institute*, 8.

⁹⁶³ Ralph Erskine, declined to participate in the NAI's multiple-commission due to his old age and to the recent passing of his wife. Brouwers, "The NAI - The History of a Design Task," 73; Colenbrander, interview.

⁹⁶⁴ Architect's statement in Colenbrander and Brouwers, *6 Designs for the Dutch Architectural Institute*, 9.

nexus of the building, since it also connected to the adjacent squared volume accommodating the exhibition spaces of the “reception room.”

Bentham and Crouwel pursued a similar strategy of separation of volumes, but without such a clear formal expression. In their proposal, different components (such as the auditorium, reading room, offices and workspaces) were stacked up as separate volumes, with the office block in one side and the workspaces block on the other establishing an interior covered courtyard where the exhibition spaces were to be located. The treasury was devised as the functional and symbolic base of the building, with the structure of the singular canopy of the building expressing the office’s penchant towards technological determinism.

An interior covered courtyard was also Hubert-Jan Henket’s solution for the exhibition spaces, which similarly resulted from the space created between two bands. Henket’s composition, however, was much more clearly expressed, since the two bands connected on one side, creating a wedge shaped structure. While the building was organized in a linear fashion as a singular structure, different functions occupied different parts of the wedge, with one long side accommodating the archives, the other the workspaces, offices and study spaces, while public spaces like the restaurant and the auditorium were located at the rounded apex of the wedge.

Rem Koolhaas proposal was also of a remarkable formal clarity, namely a triangular building with a slanted roof with a protruding black tower.⁹⁶⁵ Within the triangular form, the building was organized from the center, with archives and collections occupying the protruding black tower, surrounded by a compact rectangular core of private functions (such as workspaces, study rooms

⁹⁶⁵ The triangular shaped Netherlands Architecture Institute would be located at one end of the axis, while the other end was also marked by an architectural object, since in his situation model Koolhaas placed his own design for the not yet commissioned *Kunsthal*, which he ended up completing 1992. See the photo of the model in *Ibid.*, 46.

and offices) which overlooked the more public triangular periphery occupied by exhibition spaces (on two sides) and the library (on the other side). The tension between the compact core and the surrounding expansive gallery space characterized the project, and was traced by Koolhaas to his particular vision regarding the exhibition of architectural artifacts.⁹⁶⁶

In contrast to Koolhaas iconic composition, Wim Quist proposed a much more restrained and simple building. Quist's proposal was defined as a vertical slab along the major thoroughfare combined with a horizontal square slab. While forming a single L-shaped volume, the formal distinction between the two composing masses expressed the functions within, with a clear separation between the private, back-end functions accommodated in the vertical slab (mostly occupied by archives, collections, and offices) and the public functions in the horizontal volume, where the discrete exhibition galleries were organized around a central entrance. Although unassuming, Quist's proposal distinguished itself for the attention to the pragmatic concerns of a museum, most clearly with the planning of possible future expansions of the institute.

Symbolism, rather than pragmatism, defined Snozzi's proposal. Snozzi's project was formalized as a semicircular building surrounded by water on all sides except its straight edge, thus marking the culmination of the *Museumpark's* green axis. Despite resulting in a diverging formal expression, Snozzi adopted a functional strategy similar to Quist, as the building's semicircular vertical slab was equally occupied by the private functions of the institute and its lower covered courtyard was to accommodate exhibition spaces.

Assessing the Proposals

⁹⁶⁶ From all the entrants, Koolhaas was the only one to offer a concept for the particularities of the exhibition of architectural artifacts, asserting that "in contrast to 'real' paintings and sculptures, which often gain from lots of space, architectural products benefit from intimacy and isolation, the intimacy of the brain which first dared to put these ideas down on paper." The large columnar hall derived from this observation. *Ibid.*, 48.

All six proposals were unveiled and presented to the public in a large exhibition at the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen in Rotterdam, nearby the site of the future architecture institute. Since from the very start the multiple-commission was intended to become a significant “architectural manifestation,” participating architects “were contractually obligated to provide” not only the necessary drawings for the appreciation of their proposals by the independent assessing committee, but also had “to visualize their designs” through material specifically intended for their public exhibition” (mostly composed of original colored drawings and models).⁹⁶⁷ The submission material was curated into an exhibition by Brouwers and Colenbrander in collaboration with Lily Hermans (who also designed the exhibition) throughout June 1988.⁹⁶⁸ On July 9, 1988, the exhibition “Six Designs for the Dutch Architectural Institute” (*Zes Ontwerpen voor het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut*) was opened with great pomp by the sponsoring ministers of Culture and Housing (respectively Minister Brinkman and Minister Nijpels).⁹⁶⁹ The exhibition was a crucial element in the NAI’s strategy to transform the construction of its building into a veritable “architectural manifestation,” as it was intended “to awaken public interest in architecture and design ideas, which [was] a goal of the NAI.”⁹⁷⁰

By all accounts, the exhibition served its purpose, since for almost two months (between July 9 and August 28, 1988), the multiple-commission exhibition attracted a “high number of visitors,” which was not only “stimulated by a substantial amount of press reports,” but also “confirmed the

⁹⁶⁷ The deliverables for the multiple-commission consisted of a “situation drawing (1:500), an axonometry (1:200) or exterior perspective, floor plans, sections and elevations (1:100), a model, and a minimum set of working drawing and design notes for a situation model (then made by the Steering Committee).” All the material submitted for appreciation became the property of the Dutch state and is available in the NAI archive. See C. van Beek, “Inventaris Op Het Archief van de Meervoudige Opdracht Architectuur Instituut (archief MOAI),” October 1992.

⁹⁶⁸ Preparatory material produced by Lily Hermans while designing the exhibition (such as working drawings, plans and details) can be found in the NAI’s archive. See *Ibid.*, 29.

⁹⁶⁹ *Ibid.*, 1.

⁹⁷⁰ Brouwers, “The NAI - The History of a Design Task,” 72.

growing interest in the Netherlands for architecture in general and thus legitimized the existence of the new institute.”⁹⁷¹ Further fostering a lively public discussion, the exhibition was complemented by an “equally well attended” lecture series where all participating architects presented and discussed their proposals for the NAI’s new building.⁹⁷² Beyond stimulating an interest in architecture and introducing the new institute to the general public, the exhibition and lectures were also intended to ascertain the public’s preference from the six proposals. Thus, an audience survey was conducted associated with the exhibition, which “showed a strong preference [from the public] for Coenen’s design.”⁹⁷³

Based on the same material made available to the public, that is “the exhibited material and catalog,” the *NDB* and *Stichting Wonen* staff also issued their assessment and advice on the six proposals.⁹⁷⁴ The staff’s assessment considered the “use value” and their “overall judgment” of the proposals, but since they did not have access to any additional information, “financial consequences [were] therefore not included in the assessment.”⁹⁷⁵ The assessment of the proposals “use value” resulted from evaluating the everyday use of “seven aspects of the plans: the entrance, exhibition spaces, workshops, auditorium, library and documentation, archives and collections, other

⁹⁷¹ Beek, “Inventaris Op Het Archief MOAI,” 2.

⁹⁷² Ibid. Three lectures were organized in the Museum Boijmans Van Beuningen on August 11, 18 and 25, 1988, in which two proposals were presented at a time by their architects and discussed (Snozzi and Quist on August 11, Koolhaas and Henket on August 18, and Benthem & Crouwel and Jo Coenen on August 25). Bernard Colenbrander authored a review of the six presentations for the Steering Committee and the NAI Board. Hans Andersson, “Lezingencylus ‘Zes Ontwerpen Voor Het Nederlands Architectuur Instituut,’” July 1988, BSTU 1989; Bernard Colenbrander, “Samenvatting Lezingen Architecten Meervoudige Opdracht Architectuurinstituut,” September 1988, BSTU 1989. Before the last lecture, the new chairman of the NAI Board, P.A.C. Beelaerts van Blokland offered some closing remarks. See Hans Andersson, “Suggesties Speech Jhr. Drs. P.A.C. Beelaerts van Blokland Ten Gunste van Speciale Ontvangst in Boymans-van Beuningen,” August 1988, BSTU 1988.

⁹⁷³ Beek, “Inventaris Op Het Archief MOAI,” 2.

⁹⁷⁴ “Medewerkersadvies Architectenkeuze,” August 1988, 1, SGWO s23. Fourteen members of staff participated in the assessment. Given that the staff did not have access to any further material, “financial consequences could therefore not be included in the assessment.”

⁹⁷⁵ Ibid. Fourteen members of staff participated in the assessment. Given that the staff did not have access to any further material, “financial consequences could therefore not be included in the assessment.”

premises,” while the “overall judgment” expressed the staff’s preference regarding which proposal they would like to see built. It was warned that the two opinions “did not need to be consistent,” and in fact they weren’t.⁹⁷⁶ Despite its dismal scores in usability, Koolhaas proposal was preferred by almost half of all participants in the survey to be built.⁹⁷⁷

Koolhaas proposal was praised as “a powerful architectural statement” with a “refined urban response” and “all in all, a definite expression of [their] time.”⁹⁷⁸ While ranked second with only half the votes attributed to Koolhaas, the quality of Jo Coenen’s design was equally recognized, particularly “the intelligent arrangement of the components of the institute simultaneously festive and intriguing whole,” which would be “pleasant for visitors and employees.”⁹⁷⁹ Therefore, and since Jo Coenen’s proposal had also taken the second place on the “use-value” ranking, the “staff advise[d] the Board to give Koolhaas or Coenen the commission to design the Netherlands Architecture Institute.”⁹⁸⁰

Architectural critics seemed to agree with the future NAI staff, as press coverage from the exhibition and analysis of the six proposals indicated Coenen’s and Koolhaas’ proposals to be the frontrunners in the multiple-commission. But while the quality of both designs was generally praised, “in general the design by Rem Koolhaas emerged as favorite.”⁹⁸¹ Janny Rodermond in *De Architect* and Hans van Dijk in *Archis* were among those who appreciated the qualities of both proposals, but ultimately perceived Koolhaas design as superior.⁹⁸² Rodermond used the motto of

⁹⁷⁶ The “use value” ranking was as follows: 1. Quist 2. Coenen 3. Snozzi 4. Benthem/Crouwel 5. Koolhaas 6. Henket, while the “overall judgement” ranking was as follows: 1. Koolhaas 2. Coenen 3. Snozzi 4. Quist 5. Benthem/Crouwel 6. Henket. *Ibid.*, 7, 1.

⁹⁷⁷ Koolhaas proposal received the double of the votes of the second placed Jo Coenen’s proposal. *Ibid.*, 7.

⁹⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 1.

⁹⁷⁹ *Ibid.*

⁹⁸⁰ *Ibid.*, 2.

⁹⁸¹ Brouwers, “The NAI - The History of a Design Task,” 73.

⁹⁸² Janny Rodermond and Hans van Dijk organized their article according to her assessment, namely with an “increasing level of appreciation,” both ending with Coenen and Koolhaas (in that order). Janny

the future institute (“to connect the rich sources of (recent) history with the adventure of contemporary and future designing tasks”) for her comparison of the two proposal by indicating that while “Coenen’s design approaches this slogan mainly from the history [side],” Koolhaas design is “specifically focused on an adventurous future.”⁹⁸³ That was a significant advantage for Koolhaas’ proposal, since according to Rodermond, it was “a fine building for a stimulating architecture institute, that can place new [architectural] developments in the archive, and not just evoke and facilitate discussion.”⁹⁸⁴

While considering that both designs “show[ed] how architecture is capable of overcoming inertia” and praising Coenen’s proposal as “a beautiful, very interesting design, that adds subtlety to the site” by “marking an urban boundary, and knowing how to transcend” it, Hans van Dijk was even more vocal in his praise for Koolhaas proposal.⁹⁸⁵ Despite some functional issues, Van Dijk praised how the overall “program was smoothly incorporated into a very strong spatial and visual concept, which was unprecedented, even in the earlier work of Koolhaas himself.”⁹⁸⁶ Furthermore, he deemed Koolhaas’ overall design to be “reminiscent of [Mies van der Rohe’s] Berlin *Nationalgalerie*, Philip Johnson’s Glass House and even [Le Corbusier’s] Chapel in Ronchamp,” while the interior was “an unexpected reincarnation of Villa Savoye’s ramps combined with the *silk and stone* [italics in the original] aesthetics of Mies van der Rohe and Lily Reich.”⁹⁸⁷ The association of this proposal for an architecture institute with some of the most important masterpieces of modern architecture constituted the most ringing endorsement possible, if ever there was one.

Rodermond, “Zes Ontwerpen Voor Een Architectuurinstituut,” *De Architect* 19, no. 7–8 (August 1988): 29–41; Hans van Dijk, “Zes Architecturen Op Zoek Naar Een Opdrachtgever: De Ontwerpen Voor Het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut,” *Archis*, no. 7 (July 1988): 8–21.

⁹⁸³ Rodermond, “Zes Ontwerpen Voor Een Architectuurinstituut,” 38.

⁹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 40.

⁹⁸⁵ Dijk, “Zes Architecturen Op Zoek Naar Een Opdrachtgever,” 9.

⁹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*

⁹⁸⁷ *Ibid.*

The preference towards Koolhaas' and Coenen's proposals was not limited to the staff, the public, and the critics, since also the independent assessing committee charged with evaluating the six proposals seemed partial towards these two designs.⁹⁸⁸ Although the assessing committee was procedurally prevented from indicating any order of merit in their report assessing the six proposals—and the report was never made public—it “leaked out that the designs by Jo Coenen and Rem Koolhaas/OMA received the most positive recommendations.”⁹⁸⁹ Moreover, it was disclosed that the assessing committee's report concluded with “an appeal for the client,” the NAI Board, to particularly “consider the image value [of the proposals] in its decision, an aspect which [had been] especially praised in the plans of Koolhaas and Coenen.”⁹⁹⁰

Beyond the independent assessing committee's report, the staff's advice, or public opinion, several other assessments were also produced to be taken into consideration in the final decision. These included an urban planning assessment from Rotterdam's Urban Planning Office (*Stadsontwikkeling Rotterdam*), an evaluation of the organization and fulfillment of the program of requirements by the *Rijksgebouwendienst*, a financial assessment performed by the consulting company Aronsohn, and most importantly, the Steering Committee's own recommendation.⁹⁹¹

The Steering Committee had been overseeing the establishment of the new Netherlands Architecture Institute since mid-1986 (when the merger talks were resumed after an eighteen

⁹⁸⁸ The independent assessing committee was originally composed of two architects (Jan Dirk Peereboom Voller and Alexander Bodon) a professor of Civil Engineering (Dick Dicke), and the director of the Van Gogh Museum (Ronald de Leeuw). Voller acted as chairman, while Hans van der Cammen, and urban planner associated with the University of Amsterdam, also joined the assessing committee and acted as secretary. The committee made its deliberations after the proposals were privately presented in the Y-Tech building (an old warehouse along the Ij in Amsterdam), on June 3, 1988, and completed its report a month later, on July 6. Beek, “Inventaris Op Het Archief MOAI,” 6.

⁹⁸⁹ Brouwers, “The NAI - The History of a Design Task,” 73. The Steering Committee and the NAI's first board regarded the assessing committee's report as a private recommendation to the client and decided that it would not be publicized. The report is also not available in any of the NAI's archives.

⁹⁹⁰ Hans van Dijk, “Redactioneel: Coenen, Een Verrassende Keuze,” *Archis*, no. 11 (November 1988): 9.

⁹⁹¹ See Stuurgroep NAI, “Overdracht Taken Stuurgroep - Bestuur Architectuurinstituut: Takenlijst Bestuur AI, Beginperiode,” July 28, 1988, 1, SGWO s23.

month hiatus), including the process of the multiple-commission thus far.⁹⁹² It had overseen the launch of the multiple-commission and the selection of the invited architects, it had supervised the regular development of the multiple-commission, and it had prepared the context for an informed final decision by requesting and coordinating the multitude of assessments of the competing proposals.

Despite directing the entire process, the final decision regarding which architect would be awarded the final commission to design and build the new NAI was reserved for the institute's first Board. Therefore, given the insight provided by its involvement in the process, the Steering Committee produced a final assessment titled "Advice from the Steering Committee to the Board on the Choice of Architecture from Multiple-Commission."⁹⁹³ Since there were multiple assessments of the proposals, the Steering Committee began by stating that "the opinion of the Steering Committee [was] not to be considered alongside the other analyses also presented to the Board," . . . "but above."⁹⁹⁴ Such lofty position was claimed since the Steering Committee's advice "bundled together the information provided by the arguments established by other parties and from it identify an architect whose proposal is most eligible for the development of a final design."⁹⁹⁵ This supra-assessment was based on the analysis of four distinct aspects, namely: 1) the "signature" which considered how the proposals articulated and presented the NAI; 2) the "urban qualities" which incorporated the report from Rotterdam's Urban Planning Office and assessed the proposals regarding their relation to existing urban elements and how they maintained the existing urban plans; 3) the "actual implementation" which included the assessment from the *Rijksgebouwendienst*

⁹⁹² As previously discussed, the basic mandate of the NAI's Steering Committee was to direct the foundation of the new architecture institute through the organization of the new institution and the construction of its building. See Andersson, "Brief Aan de Minister van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur."

⁹⁹³ Stuurgroep NAI, "Keuze Architect Meervoudige Opdracht, Advies van Stuurgroep Aan Het Bestuur," September 5, 1988, BSTU 1988.

⁹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 1.

⁹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*

and analyzed the fulfillment of the program of requirements and considered the use of the spaces by the staff; and 4) the “costs” which was based on the financial analysis done by Aronsohn and considered not only the costs of construction, but also the costs for maintaining and operating the different proposals.⁹⁹⁶

Much like the report from the independent assessing committee, the Steering Committee’s advice was not intended to define a hierarchy of preference for the proposals. However, the detailed assessments of each proposal/aspect revealed an implicit (and at times explicit) admiration for both Coenen’s and Koolhaas’ designs. Analyzing the proposals “signature,” the Steering Committee identified the designs by Coenen, Koolhaas, and Snozzi as having “distinctive expressive design,” although with different emphasis on “homogeneity (Snozzi), differentiation (Coenen) and a combination of both (Koolhaas).⁹⁹⁷ Regarding the “urban qualities” of the proposals. Koolhaas’ design was considered to have a clear advantage over all others.⁹⁹⁸ The Koolhaas design was not only preferred by the Rotterdam Urban Planning Office, but by the Steering Committee as well, since it was considered that “Koolhaas resolved the [urban] problem with artifice” not only by using the sloping roof and transparency of the walls to integrate the proposed *Museumpark* axis, but also by positioning the main entrance on the street side.⁹⁹⁹ The “actual implementation” of the program of requirements presented in Koolhaas design was not perceived as favorably, since the location of the main depot in the basement was criticized for being too exposed to the possible risk

⁹⁹⁶ Ibid., 1–2.

⁹⁹⁷ Ibid., 4. The evaluation of this aspect (signature) was arguably where the Steering committee’s preferences were more clearly revealed, since it was the only (sub)assessment that did not rely on reports produced by other parties.

⁹⁹⁸ Although Snozzi and Coenen’s designs were considered to have admirable urban qualities, their implementation implied the costly endeavor of moving a major sewage collector found on the site. The other proposals by Benthem & Crouwel, Henket and Quist were considered to conflict with the overall urban plan devised for the area. Ibid., 5–6.

⁹⁹⁹ Ibid. The preference of the Rotterdam Urban Planning Office for Rem Koolhaas’ design was so obvious that the Steering Committee’s even criticized its report for “unequivocally advocat[ing] a particular design” and going beyond technical and urban considerations.

of flooding, while the exhibition spaces “were “unbalanced and with an awkward shape that [would] need to be filled in with each [exhibition] at a considerable investment.”¹⁰⁰⁰ Coenen’s design did fare a little better, since criticism was primarily directed at the constricted size of the spaces and the disconnection between functions, which could be more easily addressed.¹⁰⁰¹ Finally, regarding the “costs” of each proposal, both Koolhaas’ and Coenen’s proposals scored poorly. With construction costs estimated at respectively 19.2 and 22.1 million guilders, Koolhaas and Coenen designs were the fourth and fifth most expensive plans (only surmounted by Snozzi’s plan with an estimated cost of 24.3 million guilders).

While the conclusion of the report provided a neutral comparison between the different proposals through a summary table of generic pluses (positive), minuses (negative), and zeros (neutral), the specific detailed assessments provided in Steering Committee’s ‘advice’ revealed its latent predilection for the designs by Coenen and (even slightly more) by Koolhaas. Nevertheless, the Steering Committee was conflicted, since despite their visual and formal qualities, these two proposals also involved some risks and were above budget, which contrasted with Quist’s proposal that presented its functional arrangements and being within budget as its greatest assets.¹⁰⁰²

After having worked so hard and so long for the establishment of an architecture institute in the Netherlands, it was quite understandable that the Steering Committee would favor architectural proposals that could serve as built “signature” for the new institute. The ‘advice on the selection of architect’ was the last official act of the Steering Committee before handing over the reins to the newly vested Board. The final decision was now in the hands of the NAI’s first Board.

A Difficult Decision

¹⁰⁰⁰ Ibid., 10.

¹⁰⁰¹ It is worth noting that all but Quist’s design were considered to have both quantitative and qualitative issues with the organization of the program of requirements.

¹⁰⁰² Hans Andersson, “Stuurgroep/Overige Actuele Zaken,” August 26, 1988, BSTU 1988.

As the exhibition of the six designs at the Museum Boijmans van Beuningen was coming to a close, the Netherlands Architecture Institute—or, more precisely, its controlling foundation—was finally established. With the establishment of the Foundation Netherlands Institute for Architecture and Urban Planning (*Stichting Nederlands Instituut voor Architectuur en Stedebouw*, or *SNIAS*) on August 17, 1988, the first Board of the Netherlands Architecture Institute was officially vested.¹⁰⁰³

The most pressing issue for the incoming Board to tackle was the commission and construction of the institute's new building. The importance and urgency of the issue was revealed in both the institute's founding statutes (in which it was established as a primary task of the institute) and on the list of issues prepared by the Steering Committee for the new Board (where it was the first issue on the list).¹⁰⁰⁴ The discussion for this decision was scheduled to take place in the first Board meeting on August 22, 1988, but since there were still a couple of vacant positions on the Board and the Steering Committee had not yet finalized its 'advice on the selection of architect,' the decision ended up being postponed to the subsequent meeting.¹⁰⁰⁵

When the Board reconvened for its second meeting, it was already complete and the advice from the Steering Committee was already available. The discussion began with several procedural questions, including a reminder that despite all the different assessments the Board was

¹⁰⁰³ See Andersson, "Oprichting Akte van de Stichting Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw." The first board was formed by the former Minister of Housing Pieter Beelaerts van Blokland (chairman), the renowned designer Benno Premsela (vice-chairman), the regional planner Yap Hong Seng (secretary), the alderman for urban renewal and planning in The Hague Adri Duivesteijn (treasurer), the founding director of the *NDB* and current alderman for urban planning in Amersfoort Fons Asselbergs, the Director of the Netherlands Film Museum Hoos Blotkamp-de Roos, the former chairman of the Society of Archivists in the Netherlands Ig Caminada, the architect Fons Verheyen, with Ton Idsinga, the Head of the Department of Architecture of the Ministry of Culture as observer for his Ministry. Andersson, "Samenstelling Bestuur Stichting Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw."

¹⁰⁰⁴ Andersson, "Oprichting Akte van de Stichting Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw," 2; Stuurgroep NAI, "Overdracht Taken Stuurgroep - Bestuur Architectuurinstituut: Takenlijst Bestuur AI, Beginperiode," 1. The list of tasks was prepared by the Steering Committee in order to ensure a smooth transition between the Committee and the incoming board.

¹⁰⁰⁵ M. André de la Porte, "Verslag van de Eerste Bestuursvergadering van 22 Augustus 1988," August 23, 1988, 1, BSTU 1988.

“theoretically free to choose one of the six entrants” and the objective to only conclude the meeting once “a pre-selection of two or three architects, who are best suited to the ‘essence’ of the Architectural Institute,” was achieved.¹⁰⁰⁶ Given the importance attributed to the formal expression of the building, it seemed that once again Coenen and Koolhaas’ designs were ahead of the competition. That was merely confirmed once all the members of the Board voiced their opinions, since, “generally speaking, [they] agree[d] with the Steering Committee’s advice to invite Koolhaas, Coenen and Quist for a [detailed] explanation of their design in the [following] Board meeting.”¹⁰⁰⁷ The feelings of the Board towards the three proposals were best summed up by one of the members who stated that “the Koolhaas design arouses admiration, but may not be technically feasible; Coenen’s building is the most beautiful, but the cost and the pond are problematic; [and] Quist’s building may be the best in terms of functionality, but is boring.”¹⁰⁰⁸ Ultimately, all three architects were invited to present their designs in the following Board meeting, even though some Board members already believed Koolhaas and Coenen to be the only two finalists.¹⁰⁰⁹

Given the urgency of the decision to award the commission, the Board reconvened for a third meeting less than two weeks after the second.¹⁰¹⁰ If the second meeting had already been dominated by the discussion regarding the selection of an architect for the new building, the third meeting was entirely devoted to it. After presenting their designs with models, slides, drawings and other material, all three architects (separately) addressed the major criticism of their proposals.¹⁰¹¹

¹⁰⁰⁶ M.W.E. Lahr, “Verslag van de Tweede Bestuursvergadering van 13 September 1988,” September 15, 1988, 5, BSTU 1988.

¹⁰⁰⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁰⁸ Ibid., 6.

¹⁰⁰⁹ The times for the architects presentations were also set, namely “Quist at 8:00, Koolhaas at 9:00, and Coenen at 10:00, on 22 September 1988.” Ibid.

¹⁰¹⁰ Once this decision was made, the board convened in its usual frequency of meeting once every four to six weeks.

¹⁰¹¹ In preparation for this meeting, all three architects had been given copies of the financial and technical assessment of (only) their proposals by Aronsohn and the *Rijksgebouwendienst*. M.W.E. Lahr, “Verslag van de Derde Bestuursvergadering van 22 September 1988,” September 26, 1988, 1, BSTU 1988.

While Quist claimed that “the architectural image [of his proposal] was not closed, but in development” and that “if selected he would start from scratch,” both Koolhaas and Coenen contested the cost estimates performed by Aronsohn and demonstrated willingness to adapt their design to fit the budget.¹⁰¹² Quist’s arguments not only failed to convince the Board, but they were in fact detrimental, since the Board could not accept to start the design process from scratch. Thus, for the remainder of the day, the Board discussed the other two designs.

The Board was divided in their support for the two proposals. Generally, the perception was that Koolhaas had presented “a creative, more innovative design,” while Coenen’s design, although more conservative by “using existing architectural resources,” it “interpret[ed] them in a very creative manner.”¹⁰¹³ In short, while “Koolhaas explore[d] boundaries, Coenen use[d] the existing.”¹⁰¹⁴ The dichotomy between conservative tradition (Coenen) and innovative progress (Koolhaas) was also framed as being a confrontation between past and future, between a temple and a forum, and that ultimately, the choice should be based on what would be most evocative of the NAI’s activities and ambitions.¹⁰¹⁵ Therefore, while for some Board members, Koolhaas inability “to let go of his concept” was “an advantage for Coenen,” for others, Koolhaas concept expressed a “creativity for finding solutions that defines limits and shifts [them], and that [was] precisely what [was] essential in a new building for the Architecture Institute.”¹⁰¹⁶

¹⁰¹² Koolhaas was also questioned on the technical feasibility of his proposal, namely how the forest of columns would be built in the soft land of the site, while Coenen refuted the claims that by spreading the different function his design was highly inefficient. *Ibid.*, 2–3.

¹⁰¹³ *Ibid.*, 5.

¹⁰¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 7.

¹⁰¹⁵ Specifically, this argument is used to criticize Coenen’s proposal, being stated that “Coenen’s design finds a perfect urban integration, but also radiates something conservative and gives the idea of a temple. In an Architecture Institute should correctly the ‘future’ sit.” *Ibid.*, 4.

¹⁰¹⁶ *Ibid.*

Despite lengthy discussions throughout the entire day, the official conclusion was that “there was no selection—formally—among the three architects, and—really—between Koolhaas and Coenen.”¹⁰¹⁷ Therefore, the Board decided to meet again in ten days, to reach a final decision.¹⁰¹⁸ Since in their presentations both “Koolhaas and Coenen ha[d] shown to have a different opinion from Aronsohn” (the cost estimator), “it was also decided to request a more detailed financial assessment of the two proposals, by organizing a confrontation between “Aronsohn and the architects” on their estimates, focusing on both the “initial investment and (the indications of) operating costs.”¹⁰¹⁹

At the start of the following meeting, it was reported that the confrontation of estimates had resulted in both Coenen and Koolhaas willingness to adjust their proposals to conform to budgetary constraints and recent cutbacks. Therefore, although “Koolhaas design, due to its compactness, would be cheaper [to operate and maintain] than the design by Jo Coenen,” it was concluded that “both proposals [were] comparable regarding the cost aspect.”¹⁰²⁰ It is also considered both designs to be comparable in terms of “the flexibility of both buildings, including the archives as well as [possible] expansion, the use value, future value and image value are compared.”¹⁰²¹ Since financially and technically both designs seemed to be so similarly considered, it is unclear what exactly was the decisive factor influencing the Board’s decision.¹⁰²² However, “after several rounds

¹⁰¹⁷ Ibid., 9.

¹⁰¹⁸ Some members opposed this delay, since they “wondered what this ten day delay would be serving” and that it might show that the “board [had] a decisiveness problem.” Ibid., 8.

¹⁰¹⁹ Ibid., 7.

¹⁰²⁰ Perhaps it would have been more accurate to conclude that the cost difference between both designs was negligible. M. André de la Porte, “Verslag van de Vierde Bestuursvergadering van 2 Oktober 1988,” October 5, 1988, 2, BSTU 1988.

¹⁰²¹ Ibid.

¹⁰²² While Brouwers believes that “the useability [sic], the expression and the references to the history of architecture in Jo Coenen's design, the latter linking up with a motif in the policy plan of the NAI, were decisive factors for choosing it above the conceptual power which was acknowledge in the design by Rem Koolhaas and his OMA,” there is no support for that assumption in the reports of the meetings. Brouwers, “The NAI - The History of a Design Task,” 74.

of discussions, the Board chose architect Jo Coenen to make the final design.”¹⁰²³ Although the Board believed Coenen’s proposal to “present the most promising starting points for a final design,” it was still cautioned that “due to functional and cost requirements, profound changes will be necessary from the preliminary design.”¹⁰²⁴ The Board’s decision was announced in a press release in the following day.

The Board’s decision to award the final commission to Coenen took most observers by surprise, since “architecture magazines had unanimously considered Rem Koolhaas design to have better prospects of realization.”¹⁰²⁵ Inevitably, there was a backlash over the surprise decision in favor of Coenen, primarily by early supporters of Rem Koolhaas proposal. But if Hans van Dijk admitted disappointment with the choice, he still acknowledged the quality of Coenen’s proposal and praised the NAI Board for taking a risk and “choosing to realize sound architectural quality and not have merely operated as an efficient accountant.”¹⁰²⁶

Conversely, Janny Rodermond penned a scathing critic of the entire selection procedure and its baffling result. Rodermond criticized not only the process, but also denounced the “short and rather vague press release” for containing information that was “at least incomplete, if not outright wrong.”¹⁰²⁷ Without a transparent “review on actual data [that was] largely missing from the

¹⁰²³ André de la Porte, “Verslag van de Vierde Bestuursvergadering van 2 Oktober 1988,” 2.

¹⁰²⁴ Ibid.

¹⁰²⁵ Wim J. van Heuvel, “Opinie: Jo Coenen Wint Meervoudige Opdracht Architectuurmuseum,” *Architectuur/Bouwen* 4, no. 10 (October 1988): 5.

¹⁰²⁶ Dijk, “Coenen, Een Verrassende Keuze.”

¹⁰²⁷ Janny Rodermond, “Architectenkeuze Architectuurinstituut: Ondoorzichtige Besluitvorming,” *De Architect* 19, no. 11 (November 1988): 32. The lack of information (or misinformation) was particularly egregious for Rodermond, since the board’s decision to consider both proposals financially comparable had been based on the interpretation that both went over the initial budget for over one million guilders although Koolhaas proposal was still three million guilders cheaper than Coenen’s. Furthermore, Rodermond raised some concerns that Coenen had had an unfair advantage by having contracted his own financial consultant which provided a much more favorable—and cheaper—estimate for the construction of Coenen’s design (which the board accepted without much scrutiny) and did not include the costs of the pond or the necessary moving of the sewage collector.

report,” it only remained “a fairly vague text on the architectural and urban qualities of the plans, supplemented with comments about flexibility, utility and actual construction.”¹⁰²⁸ Thus, Rodermond considered that by not presenting a clear justification for “rejecting Koolhaas proposal which had been extensively acclaimed by the press,” the “ambiguities and unclear motivation of [the Board’s] decision” brought nothing to the “new Board, but a very bad start.”¹⁰²⁹ Rodermond concluded her tirade by recalling that the success of the winning proposal would be greatly dependent on the NAI Board’s next (major) decision of the Board: the appointment of a director for the fledgling institute. The new director would be faced with “perhaps the most difficult phase of the multiple-commission: guide the transformation of a provisional design into a [fully] resolved construction.”¹⁰³⁰

Appointing a Director

The search for a new director had been a fundamental issue in the preparation of the new architecture institute, only comparable to the construction of the new building and the institutional definition of the new institute. However, the appointment of a director was contingent on these other two foundational tasks, since only once those tasks were properly outlined could the profile of the desired director be more precisely established. While initially the merging organizations had “decided not to appoint a director from among their own ranks in order to strengthen the future institute at the top and mark the new unity,” the first director of the Netherlands Architecture Institute was still an insider, appointed after an unsatisfactory search for a director.¹⁰³¹ Adri Duivesteijn, a former alderman in The Hague, had been a member of the first NAI Board of Trustees

¹⁰²⁸ Ibid.

¹⁰²⁹ Rodermond claimed that since “the reasons . . . remain[ed] guesswork,” it was legitimate to ask if the decision was the result of the board’s deliberation, or of someone “being on the ball.” Ibid., 33.

¹⁰³⁰ Ibid.

¹⁰³¹ Brouwers, “The NAI - The History of a Design Task,” 71.

(nominated by the Ministry of Housing) but in September 1989 was officially appointed the first director of the institute.

As early as 1986, when the merging organizations unanimously agreed with Hans Andersson that an outside director would be most beneficial for the future unity of the institute, the position of director was first outlined by the NAI Working Group. In this “position description,” the director was first defined as having “the general leadership of the organization of the Architecture Institute” and “answering to the Board.”¹⁰³² Most of the description was rather standard and appropriately broad, indicating that the director would be “responsible for creating the conditions for an effective functioning of the institute” towards its objective of collecting, documenting, and researching Dutch architecture and that he or she would have to have “a vision . . . aimed at promoting knowledge of and interest in architecture, urban planning, and landscape architecture.” Other requirements, however, were much more specific to the NAI’s intellectual and pragmatic ambitions, namely that the future director would be expected to “maintain connections with architecture museums abroad” by “playing a [central] role in the international organization of museums architecture, the ICAM,” and most importantly, he or she would have to “be able to maintain a good relationship” with the institute’s audiences, the architectural profession, and “subsidy providers.”¹⁰³³

Throughout the following year, the search for the NAI’s first director was effectively placed on hold, as the institute’s building and organization were increasingly specified. But by August 1988, as the new institute was officially founded, an advertisement was published in all major Dutch newspapers for the position of “Director of the NAI.”¹⁰³⁴ While the advertisement merely abridged

¹⁰³² Werkgroep NAI, “Functieomschrijving Directeur Architectuur Instituut,” 1.

¹⁰³³ *Ibid.*, 2, 3.

¹⁰³⁴ The process to appoint a director for the NAI was outlined by the Steering Committee a couple of weeks prior, indicating that the new director was expected to be instated by December 1988. See Stuurgroep NAI, “Sollicitatieprocedure Directeur,” July 28, 1988, SGWO s23. Besides the *Volkskrant*, the *NRC Handelsblad*, and *Vrij Nederland*, the advertisement was also placed in *Archis*, *Stichting Wonen*’s former architecture

the 1986 definition of the director position (to be suitable for a print advertisement) and indicated that, it also marked the start of the NAI's active search for its first director.¹⁰³⁵

Response to the advertisement, however, was quite underwhelming, as by the Board's second meeting on September 13, 1988, only seventeen people had requested additional information and only two applications had been submitted.¹⁰³⁶ Ten days later, by the third Board's meeting, the situation had not significantly improved. Only twenty-two people had requested information on the position of which merely one had responded seriously.¹⁰³⁷ The lack of serious candidates was becoming so worrisome that rather than remain passive in the process, the Board was asked to actively contact suitable candidates, with "the names of V. Moos, Dijkstra, Heeting, Taverne, V. D. Staay, Schrover, [and] Leering being mentioned."¹⁰³⁸ In its fourth meeting, the Board agreed to "respond to the applications received" within the following week, and "invite the [selected] candidates for a first interview after the next Board meeting."¹⁰³⁹ Upon its first applicant interview, the Board was not impressed and even internally lamented the "minimum number of candidates."¹⁰⁴⁰ The search for the NAI's director was far from over.

journal that would soon integrate the NAI. See Hans Andersson, "Concept-Advertentietekst," August 19, 1988, 2, BSTU 1988.

¹⁰³⁵ In preparation for the pending appointment, the relationship between the NAI's Board and director was also officially defined, using as "base model" the current practice of "large private companies." It was stipulated that "while for the everyday management, [the director] has a high degree of independence, with regard to essential and strategic decisions for the organization, those fall under the responsibility of the Supervisory Board." Hans Andersson, "Verhouding Tussen Bestuur En Directie Architectuurinstituut," November 1988, BSTU 1988.

¹⁰³⁶ Lahr, "Verslag van de Tweede Bestuursvergadering van 13 September 1988," 4-5. Despite the low response, it was still planned to conclude the "application submission procedure by October 1, 1988," and "begin the selection process by inviting suitable candidates."

¹⁰³⁷ Lahr, "Verslag van de Derde Bestuursvergadering van 22 September 1988," 1.

¹⁰³⁸ *Ibid.*, 9.

¹⁰³⁹ André de la Porte, "Verslag van de Vierde Bestuursvergadering van 2 Oktober 1988," 3. Ton Idsinga, the observer for the Ministry of Culture in the board, also mentioned that "should one of the candidates not be known to the Minister [of Culture], he would be discreetly present at the later stage interviews."

¹⁰⁴⁰ M. André de la Porte, "Verslag van de Vijfde Bestuursvergadering van 18 Oktober 1988," October 24, 1988, 4, BSTU 1988; C. Hofstede, "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 15 November 1988," November 20, 1988, 4, BSTU 1988.

Given that the initial round of open applications had not produced any suitable candidate, in the following months informal exploratory contacts were made with several highly regarded members of Dutch architecture culture in a second (closed) application round. Among those considered, was the celebrated professor of architecture history from the University of Groningen, Ed Taverne. Taverne was initially interested in the position, but his interest was contingent on his ability to remain engaged (“naturally, on a more limited capacity”) with “university education (and research),” which he believed would have some inherent benefits.¹⁰⁴¹ Along with Taverne, other candidates were interviewed by the selection committee, but without any significant developments.¹⁰⁴²

A year had passed since the Board had initiated its search for the institute’s first appointed director, thus in the Board meeting of September 20, 1989, the chairman “announced [that he was putting] forward Adri Duivesteijn for the position of Director of the Netherlands Architecture Institute.”¹⁰⁴³ Once the rest of the Board was informed that “the staff and the trust committee [had] responded positively to the endorsement of a candidate that did not meet the original profile in terms of experience and knowledge,” the Board “decided unanimously to appoint Adri Duivesteijn as director,” an appointment which was also welcomed by the Minister of Culture.¹⁰⁴⁴ Thus, it was

¹⁰⁴¹ Ed Taverne, “Brief Aan Het Bestuur van de Stichting Nederlands Instituut Voor Stedebouw En Architectuur,” March 8, 1989, BSTU 1989.

¹⁰⁴² The selection committee was composed by the Board’s chairman Pieter Beelaerts van Blokland, the Board members Fons Asselbergs and Ig Caminada, as well as the project manager (and interim director of the NAI) Hans Andersson. The selection committee usually met before the Board’s meeting and then reported on their progress to the entire board in every meeting, but without any indication that a resolution was imminent. Mostly it was continuously stated that “interviews with candidates were ongoing.” C. Hofstede, “Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 18 April 1989,” April 20, 1989, 2, BSTU 1989. Hans Andersson, “Brief Aan de Selectiecommissie van Het Bestuur,” January 27, 1989, BSTU 1989.

¹⁰⁴³ Adri Duivesteijn had concluded his tenure on the Board at the previous meeting, so he was not present for this meeting. C. Hofstede, “Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 20 September 1989,” September 22, 1989, 4, BSTU 1989.

¹⁰⁴⁴ When asked by the Board chairman, the observer on behalf of the Minister of Culture, Ton Idsinga, confirmed that the “Minister of Culture views regarding this [appointment] were positive.” Ibid.

also agreed that Duivesteijn would be vested on November 15, 1988. The next time he participated in a Board meeting, it was already as the new director of the Netherlands Architecture Institute.¹⁰⁴⁵

According to the Board's press release, Adri Duivesteijn was "appointed due to his merits in the field of architecture and urban planning in conjunction with management skills gained that he developed as alderman in The Hague in the period from 1980 to 1989."¹⁰⁴⁶ In that regard, the Board particularly emphasized that Duivesteijn had been the recipient of the Berlage Prize in 1987. Despite the board's reasoning, as the news of the appointment was made public in several major newspapers, controversy over the decision erupted. "Duivesteijn's appointment surprised The Hague politicians and architects" alike, but it was received with both optimistic enthusiasm and skeptic caution.¹⁰⁴⁷ The mixed feeling of the architecture community was perhaps best expressed by Aldo van Eyck, who praised Duivesteijn's dynamism and interest in architecture (particularly unusual for a politician) but also cautioned that his knowledge of architecture was nevertheless quite limited.

As The Hague's alderman for urban renewal and urban planning between 1980 and 1989, Duivesteijn had approached the city's urban renewal as a cultural endeavor. To that end, he had been among the first local politician to invite acclaimed foreign architects to intervene in The Hague. However, according to Van Eyck, "Duivesteijn [had] left in The Hague a trail of misery by again and again making the wrong choice" since from "all the architects he chose for The Hague only Alvaro Siza was good."¹⁰⁴⁸ Even more damning, Duivesteijn's architectural vision for The

¹⁰⁴⁵ According to the NAI statutes, the director of the institute had a seat at the board.

¹⁰⁴⁶ Hans Andersson, "Persbericht Benoeming Directeur Nederlands Architectuur Instituut," September 21, 1989, BSTU 1989.

¹⁰⁴⁷ "Benoeming van Duivesteijn Verrast Haagse Politici En de Architecten," *NRC Handelsblad*, September 22, 1989.

¹⁰⁴⁸ Casper Postmaa and Ben Maandag, "Directeur Architectuur Instituut Meteen Al Omstreden," *Haagsche Courant*, September 22, 1989. Duivesteijn's commission of Alvaro Siza to work in The Hague was

Hague had been (previously) criticized for being almost entirely guided by “star appeal” in detriment of architectural coherency, since for the same commission he had invited first Norman Foster and then Rob Krier, leaving “himself open to the serious suspicion that he was only after big shots, without having much notion of the nature of their work.”¹⁰⁴⁹ Furthermore, “Duivesteijn’s name [was] inextricably linked to the plans for a new city hall and library in The Hague and the resulting administrative problems in The Hague city council” when the financial risks of those constructions were deemed far too great.¹⁰⁵⁰

Despite Duivesteijn’s real and perceived shortcomings in regard to architecture, Van Eyck still believed that the architecture community should “give him the benefit of the doubt,” since “if he [could] make a wise use of his dynamism and enthusiasm, then it might be alright.”¹⁰⁵¹ Others were more enthusiastic with the appointment, like architect Pi de Bruin, who believed Duivesteijn to be “an excellent candidate” and that the “controversy [of his appointment] was the best recommendation possible,” since “in The Hague he [had] demonstrated that we wanted to take a stab at [complacency], sticking his neck out and showing guts,” making him ideal for the position.¹⁰⁵²

Duivesteijn’s appointment was also indicative of the strategic intentions defined for the new institute by its Board. By choosing a “politician with a passion for architecture” over an architect, an urban planner, an architecture scholar, or even an architecture critic, the Board intended to (also) suggest that at the Netherlands Architecture Institute, architecture was not the sole domain of

entirely fortuitous, since he “got to know the work of Alvaro Siza during his holidays in Portugal and decided that he wanted to have him working in his city.” Colenbrander, “The Attractiveness of Strangers,” 12.

¹⁰⁴⁹ Bernard Colenbrander, “The Attractiveness of Strangers,” in *Architecture in the Netherlands: Yearbook 1988-1989* (Deventer: Van Loghum Slaterus, 1989), 12.

¹⁰⁵⁰ “Adri Duivesteijn Directeur Architectuurinstituut Rotterdam,” *Het Vrije Volk*, September 22, 1989.

¹⁰⁵¹ Postmaa and Maandag, “Directeur Architectuur Instituut Meteen Al Omstreden.”

¹⁰⁵² *Ibid.*

architecture insiders but also of the general public since “architecture [was] still the expression of an opinion on politics and society.”¹⁰⁵³

The criticism of his own limited knowledge of architecture provided Duivesteijn with an opportunity to further identify the inclusive type of discussion to be fostered at the NAI and its expected outcome. Specifically, Duivesteijn denounced the current “crazy” situation in which “several hundreds of aldermen of urban planning across [the Netherlands] consider their work to be purely management” and “directors of housing corporations that do not know which architects work for them” and thus completely neglect the cultural and social dimension of architecture.¹⁰⁵⁴ The NAI could be an important instrument in addressing this situation as a center of architecture knowledge to inform—if not educate—these institutional patrons of architecture who, for better or worse, were shaping the Netherlands. Although “for a long time architecture [had] been an issue that you could not discuss because it was elitist,” the foundation of the NAI was about to change all that.¹⁰⁵⁵

Beyond an ideological opening of the discipline to a wider constituency, Duivesteijn (and the Board) defended the pragmatic benefits of his appointment by claiming that at this early stage of the NAI in which “the institution is still under construction, in which there were still mergers to be completed and a building to be built,” Duivesteijn’s management skills were more suitable than the theoretical and practical qualities of other candidates.¹⁰⁵⁶ Thus, although not possessing the profile that had been initially intended for the NAI director, Duivesteijn was still very much considered a

¹⁰⁵³ Janny Rodermond, “Duivesteijn: Architectuur Te Lang Het Exclusieve Domein van Architecten,” *Architect* 20, no. 11 (November 1989): 42.

¹⁰⁵⁴ *Ibid.*, 45.

¹⁰⁵⁵ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁵⁶ *Ibid.*, 42. The construction of the new building, for example, was considered to be Duivesteijn’s “first task” since it was “an important condition for the merger to take a substantive form” and affirm itself in the Dutch cultural landscape.

fundamental element for the institute's success. Furthermore, as he had previously done in The Hague, at the NAI Duivesteijn intended to endorse architecture "in both form and content as a cultural act in itself."¹⁰⁵⁷

The Netherlands Architecture Institute

Duivesteijn's personal vision of architecture as a cultural act was particularly well aligned with the objectives defined for the NAI by its constituting (and merging) organizations. Both the engagement of a wider audience and the promotion of the cultural dimension of architecture were identified as two of the main objectives of the new Netherlands Architecture Institute in all the different iterations of what would later become the institute's Policy Plan.

Throughout the merger process, the Policy Plan was a central document in defining the intentions, objectives, activities, and components of the new institute. From the initial 1984 document "Outline for the Establishment of the Dutch Institute for Architecture and Urban Planning," the first "Draft Policy Plan" for the institute was developed by the Working Group in September 1986.¹⁰⁵⁸

As other (deemed more pressing) issues were resolved and the institute was officially founded, the Policy Plan was to be further defined, and (if need be) revised. To that end, in November 1988, the NAI Board discussed the main policy guidelines of the Draft Policy Plan, specifically those pertaining to the two constituting departments of the NAI: the Collections and Presentations Department.¹⁰⁵⁹ Among the points of discussion were the Collections Department's acquisition policy (specifically how it should prioritize its resources) and the Presentation Department's policy

¹⁰⁵⁷ Ibid.

¹⁰⁵⁸ Werkgroep WVC-VROM, "Ontwerp Voor Een Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedenbouw," December 1, 1984; Werkgroep NAI, "Schets Beleidsplan Architectuur-Instituut."

¹⁰⁵⁹ Hofstede, "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 15 November 1988."

of inclusive discussion (specifically how it should engage with the general public and provide a platform for underrepresented architectural expressions).¹⁰⁶⁰ Unsurprisingly, the discussion contemplated the specific actions to be taken by the two departments in order to materialize the institute's ambition to engage a wide audience and present architecture (in its broadest sense) as a cultural expression.

While the discussion focused on several points that would later become central to the identity of the NAI (such as the importance of targeting different audiences or of developing an international orientation), proposals of the "Draft Policy Plan" were accepted for the time being, as the "preliminary discussion was concluded with the understanding that in due time, with the new director, the broad lines of the institute's policy [would] be returned" for discussion.¹⁰⁶¹ The Policy Plan discussion would only be resumed in 1991, as the institute's director and management team completed the first official policy plan of the institute (for the period 1993-1996).

Nevertheless, given the acquiescence of the Board, the two departments continued to define and prepare their own establishment, and inherently that of the NAI. These two departments effectively corresponded to the assimilation of the two main merging partners of the new institute. Namely, the *NDB* had become the Collections Department, while the *Stichting Wonen* had become the Presentation Department. The third merging organization, the *Stichting Architectuurmuseum* (Architecture Museum Foundation, or *SAM*) was also reconfigured with the foundation of the NAI, but instead of being incorporated into the structure of the new institute, it became the semi-autonomous Leliman Association, Friends of the NAI (*Vereniging Leliman, Vrienden van de NAI*).

¹⁰⁶⁰ Hans Andersson, "Leidraad Discussie Beleidsplan Ten Gunste van Bestuur," November 15, 1988, BSTU 1989.

¹⁰⁶¹ At this point, the Board still believed that a new director would be appointed in the coming months, but in reality it would take almost another year before Adri Duivesteijn was nominated. Hofstede, "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 15 November 1988," 3.

The Collections and the Presentation Departments were the materialization of two main objectives of the institute, namely to document and disseminate architecture knowledge. While the two departments could remain somewhat autonomous within the NAI's organization, the third objective of the institute, that is, to study and research architecture, was to be found in their intersection and inherently ensure that the new institute was more than the sum of its (merging) parts.

Collections Department / *Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst*

In the new Netherlands Architecture Institute, the archive remained a crucial element of the entire organization. Thus, as the *NDB* became the Archives and Collections Department of the new architecture institute, its objectives and methods remained largely unchanged. The Collections Department was tasked with one of the three main functions required of the new institute, namely the centralization, conservation, and protection of the Dutch architectural archive as well as the documentation of the heritage and knowledge contained within the archive. This granted the Collections Department the designation of "Treasury" (*schatkamer*) of the NAI, an image which was used in the preparation of both the first policy plans and building program of the institute's new building.¹⁰⁶²

In order to complete its function as the "Treasury" of Dutch architecture, the Collections Department was composed by three sections, namely "the archives and collections; the library and documentation; [and] the conservation workshop."¹⁰⁶³ As already suggested by their titles, the three sections were primarily distinguished by their tasks. Thus, "archives and collections" was tasked with the acquisition and management of archives and collections of Dutch architecture and

¹⁰⁶² One of the last permanent exhibitions produced by the NAI recovered the title "Treasury/*Schatkamer*" to present one hundred of the most important artifacts of the NAI's archives.

¹⁰⁶³ Werkgroep NAI, "Organisatie Architectuur Instituut," August 1988, 3.

urban planning; the “library and documentation” was intended to collect, manage and make accessible a library and documentation on architecture and urban planning from 1800 (including not only books and magazines, but also videos, photos and slides, as well as “reading lists, bibliographies, and composition and acquisition lists” for the archives) that could be used to conduct research and facilitate access to the material in the archive; and the “conservation workshop” was designated to preserve and restore the archives and artifacts in the collections and make them presentable for exhibitions.¹⁰⁶⁴ In short, the three sections of the Collections Department were meant to respectively collect, restore, and make accessible the archives of the institute.

The Collections Department managed a variety of archives related to Dutch architecture, namely: archives of architects and architectural firms, archives of institutions and companies, loose pieces (archives of less than ten sheets or regarding only a single building or project), archives of events (multiple-commissions, competitions and exhibitions), collections and documentation.¹⁰⁶⁵ All these archives were alphabetically organized through the name of the involved architect or institution. Like its predecessor, the Collections Department preferred to collect comprehensive archives rather than singular artifacts.¹⁰⁶⁶ Therefore, beyond the expected drawings, models and documents of both completed buildings and unrealized projects, the NAI’s archives were also populated by furniture, personal affects, correspondence, and the contents of the libraries of several architects (which were often incorporated in the NAI’s own library). By 1989, when the *SAM* was extinguished and the ownership of its collections was officially transferred to the Dutch State,

¹⁰⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 4.

¹⁰⁶⁵ NAI Afdeling Collectie, “Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw Afdeling Collectie: Overzicht van de Archieven En Verzamelingen,” June 16, 1989, 2, BSTU 1989.

¹⁰⁶⁶ For a greater discussion on the diverging approaches between the critical depth of collections composed of select artifacts and the encyclopedic breadth of comprehensive collections, see chapter 1 “Architecture in the Gallery: the Museum and the Archive.”

the Collections Department had in its care 428 archives and collections. A substantial increase from the 38 collections the *SAM* had transferred to the *NDB*'s care in 1972.¹⁰⁶⁷

Although the objectives and methods of the Collections Department remained largely a continuation of the work done by the *NDB* in the previous fifteen years, within the organization of the new institute and with the new conditions to be afforded by a new building, the Collections Department also intended to expand and modernize its operations.

Perhaps the most significant change was in acquisitions policy. Due to the limited space and lack of conditions in the *Droogbak*, the *NDB* had not been "actively procuring" archives for its collection, "except in cases where an archive [was] threatened with destruction or disappearance."¹⁰⁶⁸ However, with the prospect of a new building and larger direct financial support from the Dutch state, the Collections Department aimed to acquire archives from "periods and/or areas where gaps exist[ed] within the collections" (such as "traditional movements, urban design and planning, urban renewal, construction technology, and the nineteenth-century") through the development of cooperation and agreements with other Dutch archival institutions.¹⁰⁶⁹ Thus, in 1989, the first year of the new institute's operation, the previously unwritten guidelines for the NAI's acquisition policy were officially systemized and made public.¹⁰⁷⁰ Upon the completion of this policy, the Collections Department engaged the State Archives and the Central Register for Private Archives in a productive dialogue regarding the alignment of acquisition activities.¹⁰⁷¹

¹⁰⁶⁷ Hans Andersson, "Suggesties Speech Voor Overdracht Archieven/Collecties SAM-Staat En Staat-Nederlands Architectuurinstituut," September 29, 1989, 1, BSTU 1989. From the 428 archives under the care of NAI, 146 were previously owned by the *SAM* and 282 by the Dutch State, but after the transfer, all the archives were owned by the Dutch State and managed by the NAI.

¹⁰⁶⁸ Ruud Brouwers and Mariet Willinge, "Activiteiten Architectuurinstituut: 1989-1992," October 13, 1988, 6, NDBK 422.

¹⁰⁶⁹ *Ibid.*

¹⁰⁷⁰ Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, "NAi Jaarverslag 1989," 6.

¹⁰⁷¹ In that same year, the Collections Department also completed twenty-eight separate ranging from a single drawing of the City Hall in Gemert to eighty tubes of drawings and several boxes comprising 12 meters

The new building—and particularly the moving of the archives under the institute’s care from Amsterdam to Rotterdam—also provided not only the opportunity, but the necessity to intensify the efforts of cataloguing and inventorizing the holdings in the NAI’s archive. Therefore, the Collections Department was required to develop a standardized description for the different objects and documents in the institute’s collection, but also a “basic plan for a computerized management and administration” that could displace the card catalogue indexing system by a complete automation of the collections and archives.¹⁰⁷²

The modernization of the archives’ management and retrieval system was considered especially necessary in order to make the contents of the archive more accessible and stimulate further research on Dutch architectural history. The “library and documentation” section was to be the frontend to the archives backend operations. Although the archive’s reading room was only open two days a week, throughout 1988 and 1989, it had retrieved over 4000 different items from the archives for a variety of research projects, from doctoral dissertations to exhibitions, from publications to radio broadcasts.¹⁰⁷³ The archives of Berlage, de Bazel, Cuypers, and Rietveld were among the most requested material and although the overwhelming majority of researchers were from Amsterdam, researchers from as far as Philadelphia and Montreal consulted the NAI’s archives in those years.

While officially under the purview of the Collections Department, the library and documentation section was intended to become the privileged interface between the Presentation

of linear archive of the work of architect H. Kammer. See Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, “NAi Jaarverslag 1989”, bijlage 2: Aanwinsten 1989.

¹⁰⁷² Brouwers and Willinge, “Activiteiten Architectuurinstituut: 1989-1992,” 6. The plan for the automation of the archives also contemplated an experiment with reproduction using microfiches and videodisc, which was intended to allow the development of a destruction policy.

¹⁰⁷³ Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, “NAi Jaarverslag 1989”, bijlage 3: Raadplegen van Archiven en Collecties.

and Collections departments, as it was in the research initiated by exhibitions and publications and made possible by the archives and collections that the two main departments of the new institute directly engaged with one another. It was through research for exhibitions and publications that the Presentation Department could direct new acquisitions for the archives and collections, and it was through archival research by the Collections Department that new knowledge and new readings of the archives were produced that stimulated exhibitions and publications.¹⁰⁷⁴

If the archive's reading room was where NAI curators and other scholars had access to the archives, the library provided the necessary resources to contextualize the material in the archives. The symbolism of research as the intersection between collection and presentation, between the *NDB* and *Stichting Wonen*, was aptly expressed as the libraries of the two institutions were merged to create the NAI's library at the end of 1988.¹⁰⁷⁵ The new library combined the complimentary resources of both libraries like *Stichting Wonen's* comprehensive clippings' collection and the *NDB's* wealth of books. The new library also allowed for some efficiency with the elimination of redundant duplication of books and periodicals. Upon the libraries merger, the resulting NAI library focused its efforts in complementing the collection of volumes with the acquisition of "internationally oriented books and periodicals" and paying more attention to "spatial and urban planning, urban design and landscape architecture."¹⁰⁷⁶ The use of the new library surpassed all estimates made, and by the end of the first year it was decided to enlarge the opening hours and hire additional staff for the library.¹⁰⁷⁷

¹⁰⁷⁴ Werkgroep NAI, "Schets Beleidsplan Architectuur-Instituut," 10-11.

¹⁰⁷⁵ Hans Andersson, "Persbericht: Samengaan Bibliotheken Stichting Wonen En Nederlands Documentatiecentrum Voor de Bouwkunst," December 1988, BSTU 1988.

¹⁰⁷⁶ Brouwers and Willinge, "Activiteiten Architectuurinstituut: 1989-1992," 7.

¹⁰⁷⁷ Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, "NAi Jaarverslag 1989," 8. The Collections Department already had the biggest staff in the new institute, as it employed "1 head [of department], 1 architectural historian, 3 archivists, 1.7 archive/depot employees, 2 librarians/documentation specialists, 1 library and documentation employee, [and] 1 conservator." Werkgroep NAI, "Organisatie Architectuur Instituut," August 1988, 4.

The third section of the Collections Department, the conservation workshop, was tasked with establishing a conservation and restoration program for the institute. Its tasks included not only the preventive care of “preserving the archives and collections of the institute,” but also the active intervention in “the restoration of special items of the collection” as well as “preparing and making drawings presentable for exhibitions.”¹⁰⁷⁸

The Collections Department was considered, as Mariet Willinge wrote a few years later, the “backbone of the NAI.”¹⁰⁷⁹ The growing architectural archive under the care of the Collections Department provided both legitimacy and authority to the institute and its activities by grounding them in the historical context of previous ideas. The architectural knowledge and ideas contained in the archive were not only a crucial component but also the starting point of the NAI’s activities and objective to directly engage the discipline, as already indicated by the institute’s early motto of “history as a source of inspiration for the contemporary design task.”¹⁰⁸⁰ While the Collections Department was responsible for the collection and preservation of the archives that provide the basic material for discussion, another department was responsible for the organization of an inclusive architectural discussion that could foster the dissemination and appreciation of architecture among different audiences.

Presentation Department and Journal / *Stichting Wonen*

If the *NDB* was incorporated within the new architecture institute as its Collections Department, *Stichting Wonen* was incorporated as the institute’s Presentation Department. As its name already indicated, the Presentation Department was responsible for the dissemination of the architectural

¹⁰⁷⁸ Werkgroep NAI, “Organisatie Architectuur Instituut,” August 1988, 4.

¹⁰⁷⁹ Willinge, “The Collection, Backbone of the NAI.”

¹⁰⁸⁰ Brouwers, “The NAI - The History of a Design Task,” 72.

knowledge collected (and produced) at the NAI to a broad audience.¹⁰⁸¹ The department was composed by the “Head of the Department, three researchers, one and a half educational assistants, two curators, and one project assistant.”¹⁰⁸² But rather than merely disseminating neutral views on architecture and its history, the Presentation Department intended to also provide an interpretation of the architectural ideas presented, so that the reception of architecture knowledge could not just inform but also stimulate opinions. Therefore, “research, interpretation, criticism, and opinions” were just as important for the Presentation Department as the variety of instruments at its disposal.¹⁰⁸³

In order to produce exhibitions, architectural events (including symposia, lectures, and special events), publications, and educational activities, the department had to develop a close connection to (applied) research and the study of architecture, both by initiating its own research and by “maintain[ing] connections with researchers from universities and skilled designers and authors.”¹⁰⁸⁴ This was the basis of the inclusive type of discussion intended by the NAI, allowing the Presentation Department to claim its activities to be “contrary to one-sidedness and [instead] based on open-minded, curiosity, unbound by time or place.”¹⁰⁸⁵

Inclusiveness was the operative word for the Presentation Department. Its comprehensive scope was not exhausted in the inclusion of different (and underrepresented) views on architecture, but also engaged (following the NAI’s general stance) architecture in the broadest

¹⁰⁸¹ The original title awarded to the Presentation Department was even more descriptive, as in the first definition of the NAI’s organization it was titled “Research and Dissemination Department.” See Werkgroep NAI, “Organisatie Architectuur Instituut,” December 2, 1986, SGWO s23.

¹⁰⁸² Werkgroep NAI, “Functieyperingen,” October 1988, 5, BSTU 1988.

¹⁰⁸³ Ruud Brouwers, “Nadere Uitwerking van Het Doel En de Uitgangspunten van Het Architectuurinstituut Voor de Afdeling Presentatie (Tentoonstellingen, Publikaties, Toegepast Onderzoek, Manifestaties, Educatie, Dienstverlening),” November 14, 1988, 1, BSTU 1989.

¹⁰⁸⁴ Brouwers and Willinge, “Activiteiten Architectuurinstituut: 1989-1992,” 2.

¹⁰⁸⁵ Brouwers, “Nadere Uitwerking van Het Doel En de Uitgangspunten van Het Architectuurinstituut Voor de Afdeling Presentatie,” 1.

sense possible, from interior to landscape design, from urban planning to architectural practice. Also the ideas and knowledge researched and presented by the department included not only realized buildings, but also focused on other expressions of architectural knowledge such as “architecture as text or drawing.”¹⁰⁸⁶ But perhaps the most instrumental expression of the Presentation Department’s (and the NAI’s) “broad and inclusive policy” was revealed in its opposition to the trappings (perceived) “elitist superiority” in architecture and instead target its activities to a much wider constituency.¹⁰⁸⁷

Directly related to the department’s inclusive approach was its objective of a comprehensive understanding of architecture’s different dimensions. This approach to architecture was another defining characteristic of the nascent institute, particularly the enunciation of the connection between architecture’s history and its contemporary moment (which was even expressed in the institute’s motto of “history as a source of inspiration for the contemporary design task”).¹⁰⁸⁸ Thus, the Presentation Department was to present architecture “as a continuous development” rather than divided by arbitrary periodization.¹⁰⁸⁹ The study and presentation of the broad field of architecture (which included “architecture, interior and landscape, urban development, housing, urban renewal, preservation and spatial planning”) was to be equally approached and understood as a unified development, in which the field was “not to be compartmentalized but connected together by a shared history of ideas.”¹⁰⁹⁰ A similar holistic approach was devoted to the presentation of Dutch and international architecture, since the department’s activities intended to not only uncover the latent connections between Dutch architecture and international

¹⁰⁸⁶ Ibid.

¹⁰⁸⁷ Ibid., 2.

¹⁰⁸⁸ Brouwers, “The NAI - The History of a Design Task,” 72.

¹⁰⁸⁹ Brouwers and Willinge, “Activiteiten Architectuurinstituut: 1989-1992,” 4.

¹⁰⁹⁰ Ibid.

developments, but also cultivate “a simultaneous national and international orientation” for the institute.¹⁰⁹¹

In order to complete such ambitious objectives, the Presentations Department had a variety of instruments at its disposal. While exhibitions were the most visible output for the department, all forms of dissemination were under its purview, including publications, educational activities, and architectural manifestations.

Exhibitions were considered “the storefront of the institute” and thus were decisive in defining the public’s perception of the new institute.¹⁰⁹² As such, great care was placed in producing exhibitions that depicted architecture as a cultural expression of society in a manner that was visually appealing and accessible to different audiences. An “interpretation or perspective” on the presented material was also to be included in exhibitions.¹⁰⁹³ Beyond introducing the NAI to its audiences, exhibitions were also central elements in introducing the new architecture institute to its international counterparts. The Presentations Department was a central element in cultivating connections with other (foreign) architecture museums and institutes, both by producing exhibitions that could travel abroad and hosting foreign exhibitions.

The exhibition program for 1989, the first year of the institute, reflected all the department’s intentions. The first exhibition in the NAI’s temporary premises in Rotterdam’s *Westersingel*, for instance, was specifically designed to introduce the new institute through its building and its architect to both domestic and foreign audiences.¹⁰⁹⁴ “Jo Coenen, Architecture and Urban Planning

¹⁰⁹¹ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹² Werkgroep NAI, “Schets Beleidsplan Architectuur-Instituut,” 12.

¹⁰⁹³ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹⁴ This was actually the NAI’s second exhibition on Jo Coenen and his design for the institute, since the very first exhibition of the newly established NAI (and its Presentation Department) was titled “Sketches for the Architecture Institute” (*Schetsen voor het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut*) was organized in *Stichting Wonen*’s former exhibition space on Amsterdam’s *Leidsestraat* in the first months of 1989, while the NAI’s

(*Jo Coenen Architectuur en Stedebouw*), was devised as travelling exhibition “dedicated to Jo Coenen’s work and ideas” in which “the design for the new building of the Netherlands Architecture Institute in Rotterdam” was presented “along with twenty-three other projects.”¹⁰⁹⁵ After inaugurating the NAI’s new temporary space in Rotterdam, the exhibition travelled to Graz, Stuttgart, and Zurich.¹⁰⁹⁶

If Jo Coenen’s exhibition was to present Dutch architecture (and the NAI) abroad, the exhibition “Imre Makovecz, Hungarian Architect; An Architecture of Memory” (*Imre Makovecz, Hongaars architect; Een Architectuur van de Herinnering*) was intended to expose the Dutch public (and architects) to a foreign practice. Beyond presenting the organic architecture of Makovecz, and how “the work of this contemporary architect [was] strongly linked to the Hungarian past, land, people and folk architecture,” by hosting this exhibition prepared by the “the Hungarian Museum of Architecture in Budapest,” the NAI was for the first time included in the touring schedule of architecture exhibitions, a significant step in enhancing the new institute’s international recognition.¹⁰⁹⁷

In the entrance space to this exhibition, a modest showing was installed of some original drawings from the NAI’s nineteenth-century collection. The work of architect Abraham Nicolaas Godefroy (a former president of the *Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst*) served not only as an introduction to the depth of the NAI’s archive, but also as a reference point to Makovecz’ work. With the juxtaposition of the two exhibitions (in a manner similar to the “Deconstructivist

temporary premises in Rotterdam were still being prepared. Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, “NAI Jaarverslag 1989,” 11.

¹⁰⁹⁵ Ibid.

¹⁰⁹⁶ The symbolism of the inauguration of the NAI’s temporary premises in Rotterdam was further established by occurring in that year’s Architecture Day (*Dag van de Architectuur*, on July 1, 1989) and by having the Minister of Culture, Elco Brinkman, conducting the opening festivities. Ibid.

¹⁰⁹⁷ Ibid., 12.

Architecture” exhibition curated by Mark Wigley at the MoMA in the previous year), an implicit connection was established between Dutch nineteenth-century architectural practice and the work of a Hungarian architect, revealing shared concerns and ideas that crossed borders and centuries.

Public events were equally important in both defining the new architecture institute and engaging with its different audiences. In fact, architecture manifestations such as symposia and lectures were considered a privileged platform not merely architectural discussion, but also for “developing a direct confrontation between the (history and) discipline of architecture and urban planning and the [general] public.”¹⁰⁹⁸ These events were particularly valued for enabling two-way dialogue, in which the public did not merely receive the institute’s ideas on architecture as with exhibitions but had an active part in shaping them.

Beyond singular lectures and public discussions, NAI-produced architectural manifestations also included a combination of different media, as they combined lectures and symposia with exhibitions and publications. By providing a variety of approaches to the same topic, architectural manifestations were also intended to advance architectural knowledge on to specific themes. Another implicit objective of the proposed architectural events was to provide opportunities for “teachable moments” when the direct engagement and participation of the public would make their understanding and education of architectural ideas easier.¹⁰⁹⁹

Within this framework, “annual qualitative architectural reviews” and the “introduction of the work of young designers” were considered the most substantial public events of the new institute, and those that could provide the most engaging debate. But even though these events were mainly dedicated to the presentation and discussion of “current issues” and “the ideas of a young

¹⁰⁹⁸ Werkgroep NAI, “Schets Beleidsplan Architectuur-Instituut,” 13.

¹⁰⁹⁹ Ibid.

generation of designers,” the principles of inclusion and comprehensive approach to architecture present in the NAI exhibitions were applied to the architectural manifestations organized by the institute.¹¹⁰⁰

The 1989 Biennale of Young Dutch Architects, the first organized by the newly established NAI, was perhaps the first event that gave a new expression to the institute’s intentions regarding its program of public events.¹¹⁰¹ Titled “Follies for Floriade” (*Follies voor de Floriade*), the 1989 Biennale served as the framework for a competition to select (from ten invited participants) three follies to be built in the 1992 Floriade in the city of Zoetermeer through an exhibition of “three models and design sketches” of all entries.¹¹⁰² While the ten entries were presented and discussed in a symposium, they were also contextualized by an exhibition of “three centuries of folly architecture as a feature in the history of gardening and landscape design.”¹¹⁰³

As with the other early NAI exhibitions, the 1989 Biennale of Young Dutch Architects attempted to forcefully ascertain the connection between architecture’s history and contemporary design practice, as well as present a broad approach to architecture by emphasizing the intrinsic and historical connection between landscape design and architectural practice. Furthermore, the overview of three centuries of folly architecture also served to position the practice of young Dutch designers within not only historic, but also foreign examples, as the exhibition was composed

¹¹⁰⁰ Ibid.

¹¹⁰¹ The Biennale of Young Dutch Architects was also especially cherished by the NAI, since the first Biennale in 1983 had been at the genesis of the idea to merge the three organizing institutions into an architecture institute.

¹¹⁰² Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, “NAi Jaarverslag 1989,” 12. Floriade is an international expo dedicated to flowers and gardening held every ten years in a different Dutch city. The next Floriade will be held in 2022 in Almere. For more on the Floriade, see Andrew C. Theokas, “The Dutch Floriades,” in *Grounds for Review: The Garden Festival in Urban Planning and Design* (Liverpool University Press, 2004), 96–139. Derived from the French “folie,” or foolishness, folly in architecture generally refers to a nonfunctional building used to decorate and enhance a garden or a natural landscape.

¹¹⁰³ Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, “NAi Jaarverslag 1989,” 12.

mostly of “works on loan from museums and libraries from England, France, [and] East Germany.”¹¹⁰⁴

Another crucial resource available to the Presentation Department was the ability to produce educational projects. As expected, these projects “distinguish[ed] themselves from other public activities by emphasizing educational effects.”¹¹⁰⁵ Unlike its preceding institutions, educating school children was one of the innovative components of the NAI’s agenda. The institute’s educational activities were particularly characterized by three aspects, namely by “fostering attention in education for architecture an urban planning,” by organizing “activities for audiences who do not have extensive knowledge about architecture and urban planning,” and by “providing a more or less continuous supply of informational material for parties interested in orienting themselves in the field of architecture and urban planning.”¹¹⁰⁶

A central component of the institute’s educational strategy was based on providing engaging material to elementary and high school teachers to facilitate the inclusion of the study and discussion of architecture and urban planning into their teaching curriculums. Therefore, the institute was to work in close collaboration with institutions and individuals, primarily from “the world of education,” such as “teachers, school counselling institutions, educational centers,” and “educational institutions.”¹¹⁰⁷ Together, they could develop and produce didactic material such as “educational publications, lesson plans,” but also experiment with new instruments, such as “(traveling) exhibitions” composed by “panels that are easy to reproduce and can be simultaneously presented in several schools” and “audiovisual programs” that explore and instrumentalize the ability of “video to bridge time-space dimensions as a tool for teaching how to look at

¹¹⁰⁴ Ibid.

¹¹⁰⁵ Werkgroep NAI, “Schets Beleidsplan Architectuur-Instituut,” 15.

¹¹⁰⁶ Brouwers and Willinge, “Activiteiten Architectuurinstituut: 1989-1992,” 4.

¹¹⁰⁷ Werkgroep NAI, “Schets Beleidsplan Architectuur-Instituut,” 17.

architecture.”¹¹⁰⁸ With this didactic material, the NAI intended to not only institutionalize architectural education in school curriculums, but also interest the public in architectural discussion from an early age.

Besides the younger generations, the NAI educational projects were also directed at other audiences that had not been previously interested in architecture.¹¹⁰⁹ Given that these audiences had no previous knowledge of the architectural discipline, the NAI attempted to interest them by using “current affairs” and “the ‘stock’ of existing architecture and urban planning” (that they were already familiar with and encountered everyday) as the starting points for its educational activities.¹¹¹⁰ Specifically, it was preferred to “start from concrete aspects of the everyday environment,” from which it would be easier to reveal how buildings and cities were formal expressions of overarching ideas and processes that animate the architectural discipline and practice. Didactic considerations and a general appeal to a lay audience were just as important in defining the themes for the NAI’s educational projects as the readings defined by curators and historians.

One of the most original and exemplary educational projects was the “Architecture Walks” (*Architectuurwandelingen*) series, which was comprised of “guides with descriptions and illustrations of walking tours of significant buildings and projects of Dutch architectural history.”¹¹¹¹ Although originally devised to provide further information to a general audience on their urban environment, these architectural guides also formed the basis for the material used in a series of

¹¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 16.

¹¹⁰⁹ This broad audience was to be reached both directly and indirectly through partnerships with other public pedagogic institutions such as “museums and libraries.” Ibid., 17.

¹¹¹⁰ Ibid., 16.

¹¹¹¹ Brouwers and Willinge, “Activiteiten Architectuurinstituut: 1989-1992,” 4.

architectural tours organized for high school field trips. The first guides were published as part of special issues of *Archis*, the institute's architectural journal.¹¹¹²

Although both content and format were particularly important for the institute's educational activities, it was claimed that "education does not own a [specific] medium" and that educational projects were to rely instead on a variety of instruments and media. Thus, NAI-produced educational activities used a "combination of different media to reach several different groups and achieve a maximum effect by the efficient use of resources," including "publications, audiovisual productions, exhibitions, guest lectures and tours."¹¹¹³

The principle of employing a variety of media to achieve maximum effect and reach an audience as broad as possible was not restricted to educational projects but was also the basic operating method of the Presentation Department. The department's original configuration (as it was instituted when the NAI began operations in 1989) envisaged a deliberate centralization of different forms of public engagement in order to develop synergies, so that "as much as possible a chain of activities [could] take place: Exhibition > Catalog > Lectures > Discussions > Educational Activities."¹¹¹⁴

The first exhibition on Jo Coenen ("Jo Coenen, Architecture and Urban Planning") in the NAI's exhibition space in Rotterdam's *Westersingel* was considered to be particularly suitable for the deployment of different media to engage with a general audience, since the exhibition could be

¹¹¹² In December 1988, the first architectural guide was dedicated to the city of Groningen, followed by other dedicated to Antwerp in May 1989 and Maastricht in July 1989. Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, "NAI Jaarverslag 1989," 14.

¹¹¹³ Werkgroep NAI, "Schets Beleidsplan Architectuur-Instituut," 16; Brouwers and Willinge, "Activiteiten Architectuurinstituut: 1989-1992," 4.

¹¹¹⁴ Brouwers, "Nadere Uitwerking van Het Doel En de Uitgangspunten van Het Architectuurinstituut Voor de Afdeling Presentatie," 2.

easily complemented “with a [walking] tour and an introductory publication.”¹¹¹⁵ With the Presentation Department, the architectural knowledge assembled within the archive and the new knowledge produced by research at the study center could be disseminated in a variety of media, which when combined could make the reach and dissemination of the institute’s message inherently more effective and forceful.

From the very start of the institute, the publication of new volumes on architecture was a greatly valued instrument in the Presentation Department’s (and the NAI’s) strategy of public engagement, even being claimed that “more than with any other (sub) task, publications should be kept in a cross connection between all functions of the institute.”¹¹¹⁶ Therefore, the NAI’s publishing activities were also to become an(other) expression of the institute’s policy of inclusive engagement by catering to different audiences through a diversity of publications, ranging from “specialized scientific volumes to introductory publications.”¹¹¹⁷ The majority, if not all, publications sponsored by the institute would originate from the activities at the institute, be it an exhibition, a symposium, research completed at the study center, or even publications specifically produced for educational activities.

However, the NAI was only to initiate or stimulate these publications and thus be merely responsible for content. In order to actually shape that content into a published volume and resolve the logistical issues of publication and distribution, the NAI was to resort to collaborations and agreements with different publishers. In those early days of the institute, this was considered the most efficient solution for the NAI’s objectives, since most publications were to be either exhibition catalogues or volumes created to support further research by cataloguing the archival material

¹¹¹⁵ Brouwers and Willinge, “Activiteiten Architectuurinstituut: 1989-1992,” 20.

¹¹¹⁶ Werkgroep NAI, “Schets Beleidsplan Architectuur-Instituut,” 15.

¹¹¹⁷ Ibid.

available in the institute, complemented by a few series of periodical publications such as the *Architecture in the Netherlands Yearbook* series and a collection of monographs of contemporary (post-1945) Dutch architects.

The first, and arguably one of the most successful, publishing initiatives of the nascent institute was the bilingual (Dutch and English) *Architecture in the Netherlands Yearbook* (*Architectuur in Nederland Jaarboek*). While the first volume of the *Yearbook* (*Architecture in the Netherlands Yearbook 1987-1988*) was published a few months before the NAI was officially established, the institute was already credited for its production.¹¹¹⁸ The first volume established the model for subsequent years, as it presented and reviewed the most significant new projects in the Netherlands (or by Dutch architects), discussed the main architectural debates of the year, and documented the yearly array of distinct architectural activities in Dutch architectural culture with a comprehensive listing of events, exhibitions, prizes, competitions, and books.¹¹¹⁹ The *Yearbook* was a perfect expression of the institute's ambitions to enlarge the audience for architecture, as it was well received and appreciated by both architectural circles and the general public.¹¹²⁰

Another notable early collaboration resulted in the publication of the equally bilingual series *Monographs of Dutch Architects*. While *010 Publishers* took the initiative, the series "document[ing] the built work of architects who had clearly influenced the course of Dutch architecture," was

¹¹¹⁸ The *Yearbook* series, however, finds its origins well within *Stichting Wonen*, the predecessor to the Presentation Department. According to Hans van Dijk, the first editor of the *Yearbook* (and longtime editor of *Archis*), and Ruud Brouwers, the first director of the Presentation Department, the *Yearbook* resulted from a combination of two of *Stichting Wonen's* projects, namely the series of annual exhibitions reviewing the best architecture in the Netherlands (first produced in 1984 with *Architectuur '84*) and the intention to publish a yearly compilation of the best texts published by *Archis* translated into English. Hans van Dijk, interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo, audio, January 11, 2011; Brouwers, interview.

¹¹¹⁹ See Hans van Dijk, ed., *Architecture in the Netherlands: Yearbook 1987-1988* (Deventer: Van Loghum Slaterus, 1988).

¹¹²⁰ It is widely understood in Dutch architectural circles that the *Yearbook* is still the only architecture book to enjoy commercial success in both specialized and general bookstores in the Netherlands.

financed by the Prince Bernhard Cultural Foundation (*Prins Bernhard Cultuurfonds*) and developed in collaboration with the NAI.¹¹²¹ The first volume of the series presented the work of Wim Quist, one of the architects previously invited to the NAI's multiple-commission.¹¹²² By adopting an accessible "coffee table book" format filled with photographs and complemented by an introductory critical essay, the series of Monographs intended to appeal to both an architectural and a general audience, much like the *Yearbook* series.

Conversely to the flexible model adopted by the NAI for the publication of books, the architectural journal *Archis* was entirely produced within the institute. Although completely produced internally, *Archis* "occupied a special position" since "it was not a mouthpiece of the institute" but instead "fulfill[ed] a critical role of informing and providing opinions [on Dutch architecture] from an independent editorial position."¹¹²³

The importance conferred to the editorial autonomy of the journal—considered indispensable for the journal to be critical—was such that it was consecrated in the founding statutes of the institute.¹¹²⁴ The journal's special statute was also recognized in the institute's organization, since it was conceived, from the very start, as an independent department within the institute only accountable to the director through its own editor-in-chief and only regarding financial and staffing

¹¹²¹ Oldewarris and Winter, "Introduction," 14. While photographs and essays were commissioned to different photographers and architecture critics, the editors of the series remained the same, namely Wim Crowel, Wessel Reinink and the NAI's own Hans van Dijk and Bernard Colenbrander. Founded as a result of the initial AIR (Architecture International Rotterdam) festivals in the early 1980s, 010 Publishers was the first publishing company in Rotterdam specialized in architecture.

¹¹²² Other architects presented in this series included Cees Dam, Herman Hetzberger, Benthem Crowel, Jo Coenen, Koen van Velsen, Mecanoo, Sjoerd Soeters, and Wiel Arets.

¹¹²³ Werkgroep NAI, "Schets Beleidsplan Architectuur-Instituut," 11.

¹¹²⁴ Andersson, "Oprichting Akte van de Stichting Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw," 4, article 14, paragraph 1. From the very first merger negotiations, *Stichting Wonen* was adamant in insisting that the journal should be an independent organ so that it would be able to criticize the policies of the institute and the government, when necessary. Hans Andersson, "Voortgang Project Architectuur Instituut," November 27, 1986, 3, BSTU 1988.

issues.¹¹²⁵ The relation between *Archis* editorial staff and the NAI's director and Board was stipulated by an editorial charter, ensuring an editorial independence for *Archis* that merely continued the independence already enjoyed by the magazine when it was a part of *Stichting Wonen* (itself also stipulated by an editorial charter).

Despite the special statute enjoyed by *Archis*, as the editorial offices were still "located in the same building as the institute to develop the necessary internal connections," there were still some significant synergies created between the journal and the institute's other departments.¹¹²⁶ Specifically, at times, *Archis* coordinated the content of its issues with the activities, events and manifestations produced or sponsored by the institute. To mark the opening of the NAI's first exhibition in its temporary premises ("Jo Coenen, Architecture and Urban Planning"), for instance, *Archis* dedicated several pages of its issue to present an overview and reflection on Jo Coenen's recent work, as well as an in-depth interview with the architect.¹¹²⁷ Beyond exhibitions, other activities organized by the NAI also benefited from a close coordination with *Archis*. The maps used for the educational project of recreational "Architecture Walks" were not only distributed with the journal, but *Archis* also used those issues to present and reflect on the particular architectural expression of the selected city and "discuss the [general] rapid development of architecture and urban planning in the Netherlands."¹¹²⁸

Beyond creating a greater public awareness to the NAI's activities, the articles published in *Archis* also served to complement the institute's exhibition and events by providing additional context and critical insight into the material, ideas, projects, and people presented at the institute.

¹¹²⁵ All the editors and staff of *Archis* were employed by the institute.

¹¹²⁶ Werkgroep NAI, "Schets Beleidsplan Architectuur-Instituut," 14.

¹¹²⁷ Hans van Dijk, "Geografie En Eclecticisme: Het Recente Werk van Jo Coenen," *Archis*, no. 7 (July 1989): 10–28; Hans van Dijk, "Coenen. Een Vraaggesprek Met Jo Coenen," *Archis*, no. 7 (July 1989): 29–33.

¹¹²⁸ Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, "NAI Jaarverslag 1989," 14.

Both in support of the institute's activities and in all its other articles and issues, *Archis* employed a strict "editorial policy where the reporting of current events (exhibitions, unbuilt and realized projects, books) should be subject to intellectual insights, being 'enriched' by adding, whenever possible, interpretations and arguments."¹¹²⁹ It was through the publication of "profound and critical reflections" that *Archis* distinguished itself from other Dutch architecture periodicals.¹¹³⁰

Although such a stance continued the model previously developed when *Archis* was still a part of *Stichting Wonen*, it also neatly corresponded with the Presentation Department's objective to always provide an intelligent analysis of the material and ideas being presented to the public. Further reflecting the Presentation Department goals, *Archis* was equally intent on expanding its audience and readership, primarily through a strategy of internationalization. While initially the magazine intended to become the standard for Dutch speaking architectural journals and gain substantially increase its readership in Belgium, upon the foundation of the NAI its most ambitious plan was to publish an international edition of the magazine entirely in English. Titled *Archis Quarterly*, the international edition would be published every quarter and be composed of "80 percent of contributions that have previously appeared in *Archis* and 20 percent of contributions specially written for the international edition."¹¹³¹

The profile of the international edition was to be, quite naturally, similar to the original Dutch. However, "*Archis Quarterly* aim[ed] to develop an international appeal and play a role in the disciplinary discussion that increasingly transcends territorial and cultural boundaries."¹¹³² However, in order to engage with broader discussions regarding the contemporary condition of architectural discourse and practice, the new *Archis Quarterly* was to "present and inform/form

¹¹²⁹ Ibid.

¹¹³⁰ Ibid.

¹¹³¹ NAI Afdeling Presentatie, "Internationalisering Archis: Archis Quarterly," April 1989, 1, BSTU 1989.

¹¹³² Ibid., 4.

opinions about architecture, urban design, visual arts” (including “history and theory”) with “a strong (but not exclusive) emphasis on the developments occurring in Dutch [architecture] culture.”¹¹³³ Thus, the international edition of *Archis* intended to both “make internationally accessible thoughts on these subjects by Dutch speaking authors and researchers,” as well as “publish reflections of notable foreign authors especially (but not exclusively) on developments in Dutch architecture culture.”¹¹³⁴ In this sense, *Archis Quarterly* intended to be the Dutch counterpart to “the English *The Architectural Review*, the French *AMC*, and the Italian *Casabella*.”¹¹³⁵

While *Archis Quarterly* never moved past an exploratory phase and was never published, the groundwork done in its preparation would still later assist the *Archis* strategy of internationalization. Namely, *Archis* adopted the model proposed for *Achis Quarterly* of using Dutch issues to engage and discuss broader themes in architecture, but combined both Dutch and English in the same edition.¹¹³⁶

Although a separate department, *Archis* still maintained a close connection with the institute’s Presentation Department. After all, the Presentation Department was the institutionalization of *Stichting Wonen* within the NAI’s organization, and *Archis* had been a part of *Stichting Wonen* until the merger.¹¹³⁷ With the foundation of the Netherlands Architecture Institute, the biggest challenge

¹¹³³ Ibid.

¹¹³⁴ Ibid. The implicit trade-off of the international scope aimed by *Archis Quarterly* was that it would come “at the expense of information and opinion that are only of regional importance,” and that the subscribers of the current *Archis* would “likewise be deprived since a part of that journal would be mainstreamed for English translations.” Ibid., 2.

¹¹³⁵ NAI Afdeling Presentatie, “Internationalisering Archis: Archis Quarterly,” 4. *Archis Quarterly*’s profile was also defined by negation, since it was stated that the magazine was not intended to compete with “international top journals ‘without borders,’” nor was it to be “a ‘little magazine’ or an ‘author’s magazine’ with an architectural-cultural program” such as “*Lotus International*, *Daidalos*, *Assemblage* or *Wiederhall*.”

¹¹³⁶ The first issue of the new bilingual *Archis* was published in January 1993, the same year the NAI’s new building opened to the public.

¹¹³⁷ It also helped that Ruud Brouwers, the former editor-in-chief of *Wonen TABK*, *Archis*’ predecessor, was the Head of the Presentation Department, and that the editor-in-chief of *Archis* was Hans van Dijk, who had ran the magazine since Brouwers’ departure.

for both *Archis* and the Presentation Department was not only how to continue the work that had been previously done by *Stichting Wonen* in organizing architectural discussion, but how to build on that legacy by leveraging the possible synergies with the Collections Department into more than the sum of the *NDB* and *Stichting Wonen*.

Leliman Association / *Stichting Architectuurmuseum*

If the *NDB* and *Stichting Wonen* were clearly represented in the organizational structure of the new Netherlands Architecture Institute, the same was not true for the Architecture Museum Foundation (*Stichting Architectuur Museum*, or *SAM*). The different treatment afforded to the *SAM* in regard to the other two merging organizations derived from the simple fact that with the foundation of the NAI, the *SAM*'s original objective (to advocate and assist in the establishment of an architecture museum in the Netherlands) was effectively fulfilled. Furthermore, although the *SAM* still owned most—if not all—the architectural archives under the *NDB*'s care (which would be transferred to the NAI), it was a shell organization staffed entirely by volunteers. However, rather than merely disband the organization, it was decided to direct the *SAM*'s drive and expertise towards the establishment of a new organization that could support the activities of the new institute of architecture. Instead of becoming an internal department of the new institute, the *SAM* was to become an external organization with a privileged relation to the institute, an association of "Friends of the NAI."¹¹³⁸

While the new association would continue the *SAM*'s work in assisting the acquisition of architectural archives for the NAI, it would also organize activities to stimulate interest in the new architecture institute. To honor the architect and writer who had (speciously) been identified as the

¹¹³⁸ Auke Komter, the first and longtime chairman of the *SAM* is widely credited for the idea of transforming the Architecture Museum Foundation into an association of friends of the institute. Andersson, "Suggesties Speech Voor Overdracht Archieven/Collecties SAM-Staat En Staat-Nederlands Architectuurinstituut," 4.

original advocate for an architecture museum in the Netherlands, the new association adopted the title “Leliman Association, Friends of the NAI.” The honorific title of the association was settled in November 1987, along with the early definition of the association structure and organization provided by its draft statutes.¹¹³⁹

As identified in these draft statutes, the association’s goals were “to support the objectives of the Institute for Architecture in Rotterdam [sic],” as well as to “stimulate interest and understanding of the [general] public in architecture,” and “(in general) promote the purpose of the association and the institute.”¹¹⁴⁰ To that end, the Leliman Association would not only “organize architectural events and excursions; hold meetings, lectures, [and] discussions; publish a members bulletin and other publications;” but also “maintain contact with the [architecture] institute and with other institutions in the field of architecture; maintain contact with other ‘associations of friends’ inside and outside the Netherlands, particularly architecture museums; regularly award a Leliman fellowship for research in the field of architecture;” and, finally, in collaboration with the NAI, “acquire [archival] material and recruit sponsors for the institute.”¹¹⁴¹

While the association draft statutes were first discussed in February 1988, it was “agreed that the SAM would wait until the Board of the new institute was appointed” to continue the discussion.¹¹⁴² Thus, the draft statutes were only presented to the NAI Board in its December 1988

¹¹³⁹ The draft statutes of the Leliman Association were based on the statutes of the existing Association of Friends of the National Museum “From Musical Box to Street Organ” (*Stichting Vrienden van het Nationaal Museum van Speeldoos tot Pierement*) established in Utrecht. The National Museum “From Musical Box to Street Organ” has since then adopted the title Museum Speelklok. “Statuten van de Stichting Vrienden van Het Nationaal Museum van Speeldoos Tot Pierement,” August 10, 1971, BSTU 1988.

¹¹⁴⁰ Stichting Architectuurmuseum, “Structuur En Inrichting van de Leliman Vereniging,” 1, article 3 “Objectives of the Association.”

¹¹⁴¹ *Ibid.*, article 4 “Methods and Activities.”

¹¹⁴² Stichting Architectuurmuseum, “Verslag van de Bijeenkomst Dato 15 Februari 1989 Met de Heer Andersson Wnd. Directeur Ned. Architectuur Instituut En de SAM Inzake de Lelimanvereniging,” February 17, 1989, 1, BSTU 1989.

meeting. But if the objectives of the association (and the decision to honor Leliman on the association's title) were immediately and unanimously accepted, the means and activities to achieve those objectives were cause of some concern.¹¹⁴³ Specifically, the Board was concerned that the association's methods and activities currently indicated some "duplication of activities" with NAI's own work and could instead focus on "donations, bequests and sponsorship."¹¹⁴⁴ Furthermore, the Board considered that the relationship between the institute and the association required further clarification, since the draft statutes indicated that the Leliman Association would be "involved in the policy and activities of the institute" without much greater detail.¹¹⁴⁵ These were particularly sensitive points for the new NAI, since the lack of a clear definition of the relation between the *SAM* and the *NDB* and had been a major source of tensions in the management of the documentation center almost a decade earlier and had facilitated the wearisome overlap between both organizations. Given the Board's initial concerns, a more detailed proposal for an agreement between the NAI and the Leliman Association would be organized in the subsequent months.

By February 1989, a new—more agreeable—iteration of the Leliman Association's statutes was completed by Hans Andersson and presented to the *SAM*. As requested by the NAI Board, the association's new statutes now focused (almost exclusively) on the acquisition of donations and funds for the institute and previous references of the active involvement of the Leliman Association in the definition of the NAI's policies and activities were removed. Thus, the objective of the association now stated that "[t]he association aims to stimulate interest in the activities and gather funds, which will be used for the activities of the Foundation Dutch Institute for Architecture and Urban Planning, established in Rotterdam," primarily by "procuring donations, bequests and

¹¹⁴³ C. Hofstede, "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 13 December 1988," December 21, 1988, 4, BSTU 1989.

¹¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 5.

¹¹⁴⁵ Stichting Architectuurmuseum, "Structuur En Inrichting van de Leliman Vereniging," 1, article 3 "Objectives of the Association."

sponsorships.”¹¹⁴⁶ The activities of the Leliman association were now limited to “the organization of architectural excursions; the regular award of a Leliman fellowship for research in the field of architecture; and “the organization of collections for donations and sponsorships.”¹¹⁴⁷ Beyond the exclusion of the production of publications, the organization of lecture, meetings, and architectural manifestations and the establishment of a network of contacts with other institutions dedicated to architecture, the revised statutes ensured that there would not be any duplication of activities with the NAI by indicating that all activities would be “organized in consultation with the Netherlands Architecture Institute.”¹¹⁴⁸ This meant that the association’s “annual program would be approved by the management / Board,” in order to “prevent any duplicate activities and thus problems.”¹¹⁴⁹

After some discussion, the *SAM* representatives were convinced by most of Hans Andersson and Fons Asselbergs arguments and acquiesced to the Board’s proposal.¹¹⁵⁰ Only minor details needed to be resolved, so by June 1989, Hans Andersson announced to the Board that a final agreement had been reached with the *SAM* and thus the “foundation’s liquidation [would] officially occur in late September as well as the official transfer of ownership of its archives to the Netherlands Architecture Institute.”¹¹⁵¹ The liquidation of the Architecture Museum Foundation was publicly announced in an invitation sent by the foundation Board for the “official transfer of the [*SAM*’s]

¹¹⁴⁶ Hans Andersson, “Voorstel Voor de Statuten Ten Behoeve van de Oprichting van de Stichting Leliman, Vrienden van Het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut,” February 3, 1989, 1, BSTU 1989, article 2 “Objective.”

¹¹⁴⁷ *Ibid.*, article 3 “Activities.”

¹¹⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, article 3 “Activities.”

¹¹⁴⁹ Stichting Architectuurmuseum, “Verslag van de Bijeenkomst Dato 15 Februari 1989 Met de Heer Andersson Wnd. Directeur Ned. Architectuur Instituut En de *SAM* Inzake de Lelimanvereniging,” 5. C. Hofstede, “Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 1ste Maart 1989,” March 10, 1989, 2, BSTU 1989.

¹¹⁵⁰ The discussion was mostly focused on what type of organization the Leliman Association would be, namely if it would be completely independent or associated with the NAI. The last change that caused the greatest resistance among the *SAM* members was the decision to have the association established in Rotterdam (where the NAI was located) rather than Amsterdam (where the *SAM* had been located), but even that was eventually agreed by the *SAM* representatives. Stichting Architectuurmuseum, “Verslag van de Bijeenkomst Dato 15 Februari 1989 Met de Heer Andersson Wnd. Directeur Ned. Architectuur Instituut En de *SAM* Inzake de Lelimanvereniging,” 5.

¹¹⁵¹ C. Hofstede, “Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 20 Juni 1989,” June 23, 1989, 1, BSTU 1989.

collections [to the Dutch State] and the presentation of the first Leliman fellowship on Friday, September 29, 1989.”¹¹⁵² Two days before the *SAM* was officially terminated, the Leliman Association was established as an independent, yet connected, organization to the Netherlands Architecture Institute.¹¹⁵³

Consolidating the Institute

The organization of the three merging institutions (*NDB*, *Stichting Wonen*, and *SAM*) into three separate components—dominated by the first two—would mark the start of the NAI’s operations. Although a separation remained between the Collections and the Presentation Department, the distance (both figuratively and literally) between the two would only be shortened with the completion of the institute’s new building on *Museumpark*. However, the NAI’s two largest departments got further apart before getting closer.

While *Stichting Wonen* had initially completely opposed any temporary move to Rotterdam, with the new building on-track to be completed, it was agreed that the institute should begin its operations in Rotterdam as soon as possible. While it was ill advised for the institute’s archives to be moved without a proper inventory, the institute’s other functions could be easily be moved to Rotterdam. Therefore, by the end of 1988, the NAI working group had prepared a plan to share the premises offered by the city of Rotterdam to the Goethe Institute to install a cultural center in the city’s *Westersingel*. This arrangement was favorably considered, since although the NAI could only

¹¹⁵² The invitation was signed by Nic Tummers, the *SAM*’s last chairman, and Dirk van der Veer, the foundation’s last secretary. Nic Tummers and Dirk van der Veer, “Uitnodiging Overdracht van de *SAM* Collecties,” September 15, 1989, BSTU 1989.

¹¹⁵³ Hans Andersson, “Oprichting Akte van de Vereniging Leliman, Vrienden van Het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut,” September 27, 1989, BSTU 1989. The most direct connection was established within the management of two organizations, namely between the two boards, since the statutes of the Leliman Association stipulated that the director of the NAI would always be the secretary of the association’s board. The other elements of the first board of the Leliman Association were “Nic Tummers, Fons Asselbergs, R. Bijhouwer, C.O.A. Schimmelpenninck van der Oije, B. Rebel, Th. Dubbeling and D.C. Upon.” Hofstede, “Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 20 September 1989,” 1.

occupy a third of the building, it would also be entitled to use the approximately 860m² former printing workshop in the back of the building and transform into exhibition galleries.¹¹⁵⁴ By mid-1989, as soon as the necessary renovation was completed, Westersingel 10 in Rotterdam became the new official address of the Netherlands Architecture Institute, housing the institute's administration, management, and Presentation Department.¹¹⁵⁵ For the four years (1989-1993) between the start of the institute and the inauguration of its new building, the division between the Collections and Presentation Departments was not merely functional but also geographical as the Collections Department remained in Amsterdam and the Presentation Department occupied the institute's temporary location in Rotterdam.¹¹⁵⁶

During this consolidation period, the biggest challenge facing the institute was the combination of the different merging institutions and their services into a coherent organization. This was considered by the institute as "a trial period in which the institute [was] exploring its possibilities on every level, experimenting and studying which angles offer a good perspective on the future."¹¹⁵⁷ However, the divide between the institute's different departments would only be bridged with the completion of the NAI's new building in Rotterdam's *Museumpark*. Only upon the completion of Jo Coenen's building was the NAI able to, for the first time, concentrate all its departments in the same

¹¹⁵⁴ Werkgroep NAI, "Mogelijke Tijdelijk-Vaste Vestiging (1989 Tot 1992) Architectuurinstituut in Deel van Voormalige Drukkerij Plantijn, Westersingel 9a/b, 10, Rotterdam," December 1988, 1, BSTU 1988.

¹¹⁵⁵ Although *Archis* and the institute's library were relocated to the *NDB's* former premises in the *Droogbak* (still occupied by the NAI's Collections Department) in January 1989, it was originally planned for these components of the new institute to also move to Rotterdam as soon as possible. Hofstede, "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 13 December 1988," 4.

¹¹⁵⁶ The separation of the Collections Department in Amsterdam and the Presentation Department in Rotterdam unwittingly temporarily established the solution argued by some when debating in which city the new institute should be located, namely the calls to "divide the forthcoming institute into an Amsterdam department for the past and a Rotterdam department for the future!" Ulzen, "The Battle for the Netherlands Architecture Institute," 172.

¹¹⁵⁷ Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, *NAI Beleidsplan/Policy Plan 1993-1996*, 11.

location and allow for a closer form of collaboration between them, thus making the new building fundamental for the envisioned operation of the new institute.

In anticipation of the opening of the new building, the first official Policy Plan of the institute was prepared and published in 1991 for the period of 1993-1996. The new Policy Plan was a refinement of the draft Policy Plan that had guided the institute's operations during its initial period and was entirely supervised by the NAI's first director, Adri Duivesteyn. To that end, this policy plan revised the structure of the institute while reaffirming its objectives and identifying its means of engagement and audiences.

The reorganization contemplated two different types of departments, namely those that directly engaged with the architectural discipline and by producing content drove the program of the institute and those departments that supported the activities of the first group. If the first group included the Presentation and Collections Departments, the latter group included the Departments of General Affairs and Public Relations. The biggest change, however, was found within the Presentation Department. Renamed the Museum Presentation Department, this department was now exclusively focused on the production of exhibitions and the organization of educational projects. The organization of other projects, such as "events, manifestations, symposia, [and] excursions" became the responsibility of a separate department, aptly titled Special Projects Department.¹¹⁵⁸ Similarly, the publishing activities also became an independent organizational support unit. Titled NAI Publishers, the publishing arm of the institute was tasked to organize the publications of the institute's variety of activities and carry out the Publications Plan of the different departments. The establishment of these two new departments reflected the growing ambitions of

¹¹⁵⁸ Ibid., 69.

the institute in both the organization of architectural events and the production of publications, since the expansion of those activities now merited a fully dedicated staff and budget.

The Special Projects Department was to organize three categories of special projects: theme projects, targeted projects, and occasional projects. Theme projects were “long-term projects focused on a theme to be determined once every two years,” which aimed at “an orchestration of activities of the entire institution” and thus involved all the NAI’s departments.¹¹⁵⁹ Conversely, targeted projects were of short or medium term and had a specific orientation and purpose that did not require interdepartmental collaboration. Finally, occasional projects were “small, short-term projects focusing on singular events that responded to current events.”¹¹⁶⁰ Given the topicality of these events, the Special Projects Department was to coordinate with the curatorial staff and journal editors to remain informed about occurrences of the day (such as contests, controversial issues, and policy decisions).

All three categories of projects aimed to either at “stimulate the debate on architecture and urbanism” or facilitate the “transfer of knowledge and stimulate enthusiasm for architecture and urbanism.”¹¹⁶¹ Theme projects took primarily the form of discussion meetings, symposia and conferences and were intended to advance the discipline through the confrontation of different perspectives. Although designed to engage “the architectural and design community, architectural critics and academia,” it was considered that a public “meaningful exchange” of the cultural dimension of architecture would also be beneficial for “how the media and the public think and speak about architecture.”¹¹⁶² Targeted projects were intended to expand the knowledge and

¹¹⁵⁹ Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, “Activiteitenplan Nederlands Architectuurinstituut 1993-1996,” June 30, 1991, 29, NAI Jaarverslag.

¹¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 28.

¹¹⁶² *Ibid.*

framework of people unfamiliar with architecture so that they could begin to develop their own ideas on architecture. Primarily developed as study trips (both in the Netherlands and abroad), these projects were devised for a specific target audience, namely public officials and directors of large housing corporations who had the power to both decide and influence what was actually built in the Netherlands, but whose knowledge of architecture was usually limited to functional and financial considerations.

While considered a support department, NAI Publishers was an equally ambitious venture that was a substantial development from the Presentation Department's original publication arrangement. With the establishment of NAI Publishers, the institute could control the entire publishing process from content to typeset, from graphic design to distribution, avoiding the negotiation of partnerships and cooperation for any given publication project.

But beyond logistical control, NAI Publishers was created with the specific goal of carrying out the institute's publication policy, that is, to "to build up a list of publications which is partly linked to or parallel to other activities of the institute."¹¹⁶³ Thus, all the different departments of the institute—from Special Projects to the Collections Department—could produce publications of their activities through the new publishers without having to engage the Museum Presentation Department. In fact, NAI Publishers aimed to collaborate with the Collections Department to "provide access in book form to the institute's own collection," which would attempt to present different areas of the collection in a balanced manner by engaging with different subjects and target groups, as well as different types of publications.¹¹⁶⁴ The publishers were also intended to

¹¹⁶³ Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, *NAi Beleidsplan/Policy Plan 1993-1996*, 53.

¹¹⁶⁴ *Ibid.* There was a variety of publications, namely "survey publications (giving a broad description of the total collection); reproductions (presentation of high points from the archives, even if not thematic); thematic catalogues (complete, itemized description of the material relevant to a particular theme); collection catalogues (item by item description of all components of a particular collection); inventories (systematically subdivided whole of descriptions of the parts of the constituent elements of an archive); source publications

collaborate with the Museum Presentation Department by “record[ing] the material presented in exhibition form in a catalogue or other ‘accompanying publication’” that could combine and complement “the visual image of the exhibition” with text and additional “illustrational material.”¹¹⁶⁵ Collaboration with Special Projects could take different forms, but they mostly created publications that could “nurture and stimulate the architectural debate, and to offer information and insight” concerning architecture to different segments of the public.¹¹⁶⁶

Beyond these internal collaborations, the NAI Publishers also intended to “document contemporary architecture, town planning and landscape architecture in a serial fashion” and “to enable publication of interesting texts by others which would otherwise have little chance of publication.”¹¹⁶⁷ The combination of these different publications was expected to establish the NAI Publishers as an important force in the dissemination of architectural knowledge and in fostering the appreciation of the discipline.

Another significant addition heralded by the Policy Plan was the constitution of the NAI’s Study Center within the Collections Department. Like the Publishers and Special Projects, the establishment of the Study Center reflected the institute’s growing ambition and was devised as a fundamental outlet for the Collections Department. The Study Center not only intended to foster a closer connection between the archives and the other departments of the NAI but also to operate as

(integral reproduction of a selection of original documents or parts of them related to a particular theme); bibliographies (annotated bibliography concerning a particular subject); reproductions.”

¹¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 55. These publications could take the “form of an exhibition catalogue in the classical sense, a survey of the work, a collection of essays, a folder or a leaflet.”

¹¹⁶⁶ Ibid. Beyond Special Projects, these publications could also be associated with educational projects.

¹¹⁶⁷ Ibid. These included the Architecture in the Netherlands Yearbook and Contemporary Dutch Architects series as well as doctoral dissertations, other academic studies, and relevant initiatives.

a crucial instrument in creating partnerships with other research institutions (both Dutch and foreign).¹¹⁶⁸

The Study Center was to provide the necessary working conditions to conduct serious architectural research on the material stored within the archives. While the Study Center was to provide the conditions for internal research, such as “applied archival research for an exhibition, publication and/or any other activity of the NAI” and “research with the sole intention of widening the knowledge about the collection,” it was primarily devised to engage outside scholars and institutions with the institute’s archives by accommodating “research initiated and/or funded by third parties on one or more fields of interest of the NAI.”¹¹⁶⁹ The Study Center intended to accommodate researchers from both national and foreign academic institutions, as well as private foundations and from different levels of government. These visiting researchers were expected to maintain regular contact with the NAI’s own staff and to be consulted on the NAI’s activities, particularly those (mainly publications and exhibitions) pertaining to the dissemination of their research results. The Study Center was intended as the place where the knowledge within the institute’s archive was explored and new readings were done, not only advancing the discipline, but also providing content for the institute’s activities.

Besides outlining the institute’s new organization, the Policy Plan also reiterated the NAI’s commitment to the organization of an inclusive architectural discussion, namely by identifying the different audiences and means of engagement of the institute. With the new Policy Plan, the NAI was to not only to consolidate the merger of its forming institutions and go beyond their scope but was also to go beyond their established public and fundamentally expand architecture’s traditional

¹¹⁶⁸ According to several accounts (including Bernard Colenbrander, Adri Duivesteijn, and Mariet Willinge), the NAI’s Study Center was inspired in the model used by the Getty Center in Los Angeles and the Canadian Centre for Architecture in Montreal.

¹¹⁶⁹ Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, “Activiteitenplan Nederlands Architectuurinstituut 1993-1996,” 9.

audience. Architecture, the most public of all artistic endeavors, was thus to be freed from the trappings of its own interiority and dedicated jargon, to forcefully reach a wider audience and rightfully reclaim its central position in society. Although the NAI increased its audiences in conventional ways by engaging both a younger and wider public, it also began to redefine its audience from mere user to a more engaged, critical participant in architecture.

The amplification of the NAI's and, inevitably, architecture's audiences was not only established but vigorously emphasized in the institute's first policy plan of the institute. An entire chapter of the Policy Plan was dedicated to identifying "clients and target groups" of the institution, while also indicating how the NAI's activities were to forcefully reach and impact these different groups.¹¹⁷⁰ Specifically, four main target audiences were identified: the design community, scholars, the general public, and decision makers. The identification of these target groups reiterated the NAI's resolute commitment to establishing a platform for the interchange between architecture and society. The target audiences were not only evenly divided between insiders (design community and scholars) and outsiders (general public and decision makers) to the architectural discipline, but it was also sustained that there were no priorities among these groups.

While the aspirations for the traditional architectural audiences (primarily architects, architectural historians, and students) consisted mostly of a continuation and expansion of activities, the institute had much more ambitious plans for its wider audiences. Specifically, it planned to have a significant, yet indirect, impact in the development of the Dutch built environment by stimulating and broadening the knowledge of decision-makers involved with

¹¹⁷⁰ The document also defines the distinction between clients and target groups. Namely, clients were considered "those who on their own initiative want to make use of the services" of the NAI, while target groups were established as those to which "the NAI actively directs its activities." Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, *NAI Beleidsplan/Policy Plan 1993-1996*, 28.

construction.¹¹⁷¹ The NAI hoped to assist these influential individuals in forming opinions regarding architecture. It intended to inform, even educate, them on the cultural and aesthetic concerns of the discipline, offering a renewed perception of architecture as a fundamental cultural activity whose value was not exhausted in the more concrete and pragmatic dimensions of costs and functionality.

Despite aspiring to reach everyone within the general public, the NAI singled out the two groups at the fringes. On the one hand, the segment of the population which already had cultural interests was to be stimulated to also dedicate its attention to architecture. On the other hand, a new generation—from schoolchildren to adolescents—was to become for the first time engaged with architecture through educational programs. The basic aim in addressing the general public was to enable it to value architecture and urban planning as “important and natural parts of culture and society.”¹¹⁷² While the specific approach to different groups diverged, the strategic principle remained the same: to broaden the reach of architecture.

The new consolidated NAI intended to broaden the reach of the discipline through an assertive strategy of engagement designed to not only expose the public to the built expression of quality architecture, but also to communicate and include the broader audience in the issues and conversations within the discipline. To that end, the institute established a sophisticated system of means of engagement with seven different means devised, namely: “archives and collections, library and documentation, study centre, exhibitions, publications, a journal and special projects.”¹¹⁷³ The system was just as eclectic as the audiences it intended to reach, and while each

¹¹⁷¹ The definition of decision-makers included public officials, such as municipal and national politicians, as well as directors and investors of private housing associations and building companies

¹¹⁷² Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, *NAi Beleidsplan/Policy Plan 1993-1996*, 29.

¹¹⁷³ *Ibid.*, 30. The Leliman Association, Friends of the NAI, which anyone could join, also supported the activities of the institute, but was almost completely autonomous.

department had different functions and operated with fundamentally different instruments, their efforts and activities were not only complementary, but they could be directed at different groups. Moreover, while independent, the different departments would find a stronger voice when they collaborated, making the dissemination and reach of the institute's message inherently more effective and forceful.

Overall, the institute's policy plan defined the individual mandates and responsibilities of its different departments, but also outlined and institutionalized the possible synergies between them. After a first period dedicated to the institute's formation and a second period in which the institute was divided between Amsterdam and Rotterdam, the third stage of the institute was reached. With the NAI's activities and departments consolidated and having "developed its means and resources, [the institute could] therefore function at full strength" while also presenting "a fully integrated front to the outside world."¹¹⁷⁴ The new, consolidated Netherlands Architecture Institute started its operations with the official inauguration of the institute's new building on October 29, 1993.

A Cultural Infrastructure for Dutch Architecture

After a long and arduous process, the Netherlands Architecture Institute was finally founded as the result of a cooperative effort among three merging institutions and an inter-ministerial workgroup. The lengthy process of consultation and formation was all but inevitable, as the NAI followed the time-honored Dutch tradition of consensus building and forged a compromise among (often) competing interests.

The story of the NAI is largely the story of a new institution created from the merger of three existing organizations that had previously worked on the promotion of architecture from distinct

¹¹⁷⁴ Ibid., 11.

approaches. The assimilation of the *NDB*, *Stichting Wonen*, and the *SAM* into a new cohesive institute was also drawn out, but ultimately resulted in the initial ambition that the new NAI was to be more than the sum of its parts.

Beyond focusing on existing architectural audiences, the institute has continuously attempted to open up—the all too often restricted—architectural conversation to new publics. As different audiences were brought together to appreciate and discuss architecture through exhibitions, publications, and architectural manifestations, the NAI has continuously disseminated and promoted architecture. Within the NAI, architectural knowledge was not merely collected, but also forcefully instrumentalized to inform and educate the public on architecture's cultural dimension.

By forcing the discipline to be enunciated, the NAI has continuously attempted to connect the interior and exterior of the discipline, reinforcing the latent connection between architecture and society. Through a combination of different departments and means of engagement, the NAI engaged the general public with the architectural discipline, constantly exploring the past, creating the present, and speculating the future of architecture.

6. GROWING PAINS: THE ECONOMICS OF ARCHITECTURE CULTURE (1994-2012)

In 1994, the NAI Board initiated its search for a replacement to the institute's first director, Adri Duivesteijn. In describing the position, the advertisement for the position stated that "the director must be capable of providing high-quality leadership with respect to the programming and public approach, and of managing and rendering the collection accessible."¹¹⁷⁵ Although not explicitly, this advertisement was already charged with a fundamentally diverging strategy for the institute. It signaled that the NAI would be increasingly focusing on popular dissemination rather than critical discussion of architecture. This episode became the opening salvo of a protracted transformation of the institute, one which was only concluded almost twenty years later.

While in the first few years the NAI had privileged fostering open, inclusive discussion, the advertisement signaled how in the future the NAI would be focusing on the public presentation of architecture. Enthusiasm with this new direction, however, was not shared by the institute's staff, as the disjunction between the NAI's future and its (short) past continued to be revealed. As a result, the fledgling institute faced its first, and arguably most defining, crisis of leadership and identity.

It was no accident that the institute faced these trying challenges when it did, since not only are moments of transition particularly fraught with challenges and uncertainty, but this was also the first major renewal of NAI's key people, both inside and outside the organization. This was a crucial test for the institute, particularly to the resilience of its organizational culture and structure, a test made only more challenging by the exceedingly long search for the NAI's second director.

¹¹⁷⁵ "Announcement of Position NAI Director," *Archis*, May 1994. The advertisement continued by stating that "he or she must have well-honed communication skills and a network of relations in the national and international worlds of architecture, art and business."

During this period, the realities of funding and operating an architecture institute also exposed the gaps between abstract plans and concrete action in new organizations. This became particularly visible, as changes to the NAI's funding model revealed the institute's political independence to be an unsustainable illusion. Accordingly, the NAI was compelled to define its policies and strategies based not only in its own cultural, social, or political objectives, but also in the government's economic agenda for architecture. Although at first the government's influence was a subtle interference with the institute's activities, little by little, the promotion of economic interest displaced the appreciation of architecture's cultural dimension as the institute's main purpose. Inevitably, this situation further compromised the originally envisioned engagement of both critical discussion and popular presentation to advance architecture as a professional field and as a discipline.

The conflation between economic and cultural interests, however, was also instrumentalized by the NAI to reconsider its position in fostering a thriving architecture culture in the Netherlands. In that regard, the NAI became a crucial element in revealing and defining a shared architectural response emerging in the Netherlands at the end of the twentieth-century. In promoting and defining this new, progressive, pragmatic (even projective) architecture and indelibly associating it with the Netherlands, the NAI may have achieved the peak of its achievements. The NAI's actions not only increased the visibility and profile of Dutch architecture in general, but also presented promotion as a fresh, uncritical architecture discourse.¹¹⁷⁶ Rather than being limited by its new

¹¹⁷⁶ The word "fresh" became particularly charged in this period in Dutch architecture culture, since it was a point of contention between Roemer van Toorn and Michael Speaks in a public debate about the true innovation of the architecture practiced in the Netherlands in the late 1990s. See Roemer van Toorn, "Fresh Conservatism and Beyond," *Archis*, no. 11 (November 1997): 15–22; Michael Speaks, "Just There Modernism: A Fresh New Approach," in *Nine + One: Ten Young Dutch Architectural Offices* (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1997), 18–25. The word "fresh" was further charged as the NAI associated it with publications of its biannual NAI Prize for young Dutch architects, namely the volumes *Fresh Facts* (2002) and *Fresher Facts* (2004). See Véronique Patteeuw, ed., *Fresh Facts: The Best Buildings by Young Architects in the Netherlands* (Rotterdam:

proximity and responsibility to economic systems, the institute attempted to co-opt those systems towards a renewed understanding of architecture.

At times, the NAI also adopted unusual tactics in support of Dutch architecture, most notably in 1995, with direct financial support to Rem Koolhaas' financially troubled practice.¹¹⁷⁷ Although this controversial operation stretched the institute's own mandate and disregarded its own internal policies, it provided a significant return to Dutch architecture. Rem Koolhaas not only became internationally renowned, but an entire new generation of architects in the Netherlands and abroad was shaped by his work, thus establishing a vast network of influence and recognition to Dutch architecture.

The influence of market driven policies and strategies at the NAI, eventually became an overbearing ideological economic determinism. By privileging economic over cultural interests, the institute became entirely prevented from engaging with difficult and unpopular issues, or even considering any architectural expressions that did not conform to the official narrative. Furthermore, other activities of the institute that did not demonstrate immediate and palpable economic return were also terminated or greatly defunded. The demise into thinly veiled propaganda endangered the cultural standing of the institute and all but sealed its fate.

After being a fundamental element in the development and promotion of Dutch architecture culture since its foundation in 1988, the NAI was forced to close. In its place, a new institute dedicated to the 'creative industries' opened on the first day of 2013. Ultimately, the final period of

NAi Publishers, 2002); Véronique Patteeuw, ed., *Fresher Facts: The Best Buildings by Young Architects in the Netherlands* (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 2004).

¹¹⁷⁷ The operation has remained an open secret within the institute until now, as this is the first time such unorthodox operation has ever been openly discussed.

the NAI's history revealed in its growing pains what Rem Koolhaas has bluntly stated: "architecture can never be [truly] critical as it always has to support someone else's interests."¹¹⁷⁸

A Loss of Direction

Upon the completion of the NAI's new building, Adri Duivesteijn stepped down from its position within the institute. The appointment of a new director proved to be problematic, as there was a disjunction between the expectations created by the new institute and the Board's intentions. The management crisis was only solved with the appointment of an interim director, who attempted to clarify the strategic direction of the institute by commissioning three architectural critics (Bouman, Colenbrander, and Reijndorp) to write scenarios for the institute.

"If even the NAI itself does not know what it is or what it intends to propose, who in the hell should know?"¹¹⁷⁹ It was in this very blunt manner that Bernard Colenbrander introduced his criticism of the NAI's operations in 1995. Colenbrander's frank assessment was the starting point for one of three scenarios "considering the NAI's [future] place and role" commissioned by the institute's Board.¹¹⁸⁰ Along with Colenbrander, Ole Bouman and Arnold Reijndorp were the two other architectural critics engaged in this exercise, primarily intended to "gather ideas, visions, and criticism" that could assist in "reviewing and tightening the policies" of the institute in order to shape "the policy in the future."¹¹⁸¹ The scenarios were thus expected to "form the basis for an internal discussion within the institute" and for a wider "public debate with some target audiences of the NAI."¹¹⁸²

¹¹⁷⁸ *Rem Koolhaas OMA Profile*, Dutch Profiles (Rotterdam: Dutch Design Fashion Architecture, 2010), <http://www.dutchprofiles.com/profile/362/rem-koolhaas-oma>.

¹¹⁷⁹ Bernard Colenbrander, "De Akelige Galm van Een Hol Vat: Perspectieven Voor Het NAI," March 1995, 2, BSTU 1995.

¹¹⁸⁰ Hein van Haaren, "Brief Aan Arnold Reijndorp (tevens Verzonden Aan Bernard Colenbrander En Ole Bouman)," March 3, 1995, 1, BSTU 1995.

¹¹⁸¹ *Ibid.*

¹¹⁸² *Ibid.*

The different perspectives espoused by the three critics were immediately revealed in the titles of their scenarios.¹¹⁸³ Titled *The Grim Echo of a Hollow Vessel: Perspectives for the NAI*, Colenbrander's scenario was both the most critical and the most comprehensive of the three. Although following a similar, yet less caustic, reading of the institute, Reijndorp's scenario was more optimistic, which was reflected in its title *A Pleasant Prospect: A Possible Future for the NAI*. Bouman's approach to the issue was also conceded in the title to his scenario, as its focus on the wider challenges of the architecture discipline was immediately revealed in the title *Architecture at a Crossroads: From "The Cultural Dimension of Architecture" to Architecture as a Dimension of Culture*.

Although approaching the issue from different perspectives and in altogether different manners, the three critics identified the institute's lack of direction as its primary, structural problem. Both Colenbrander and Reijndorp isolated the inadequate (or complete lack of) connection between the institute's different departments as *the* fundamental problem preventing the NAI from achieving its potential. For Reijndorp, this disconnection was even outwardly expressed in the institute's building, since the "exhibition function and the preservation function" were clearly articulated in their respective built volumes of the "box and the banana," but "the tower," the third component of the building that connected the other two, was "less clear,"

¹¹⁸³ The different tone and approach in identifying the same structural problem is most likely the result of the three critics' different connection to the institute. Having been involved with the institute since its very beginning, Bernard Colenbrander was the proverbial insider. He had been an intern at the *NDB* in the 1970s, remaining associated with the documentation center throughout the establishment of the institute, eventually moving to Rotterdam with the Presentation Department in 1988 and working as a senior-curator in that department ever since. Conversely, the urban sociology professor Arnold Reijndorp's extensive contact with the institute had been mostly as an external specialized user by attending lectures, using the library, and working with the Dutch *Europaan*. In between those two extremes was Ole Bouman, who after making a name for himself as the architecture critic of the generalist magazine *De Groene Amsterdammer* had been recently hired for the editorial staff of the institute's autonomous journal, *Archis*.

undecided between “offices or a study center.”¹¹⁸⁴ Colenbrander presented a similar indictment, pointing instead at the organizational void within an institute that “goes directly from very broad goals to the specific level of program component.”¹¹⁸⁵ The ambiguity of the institute’s direction was equally remarked on by Bouman, who noted that the NAI’s basic objective “to improve the architectural climate” although laudable was difficult to be adequately translated into a specific representation, since it is “open to many different interpretations.”¹¹⁸⁶

The solution prescribed by both Colenbrander and Reijndorp required the NAI to overcome the growing disjunction between its original plans and their actual realization by forcefully transcending its role as a museum and becoming an architecture institute guided by a clear intellectual orientation.¹¹⁸⁷ While Colenbrander railed that “in the formulation of the NAI’s organizational structure, the intellectual direction of the institute was nowhere to be found in particular (!),” Reijndorp claimed that given its archival and preservation function of Dutch architectural heritage, “if there is something that the NAI is not, then it is a museum.”¹¹⁸⁸

¹¹⁸⁴ Arnold Reijndorp, “Een Prettig Vooruitzicht: Een Mogelijke Toekomst Voor Het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut,” April 18, 1995, 3, BSTU 1995. Jo Coenen’s design of the NAI’s building was based on a clear expression of the institute’s different functions, articulated in a composition of three distinct, yet adjacent volumes, namely: a banana shaped mass accommodating the archives, a simple, regular blind box accommodating the galleries, and a slim tower at the center of the composition accommodating the institute’s entrance, library and offices.

¹¹⁸⁵ Colenbrander even described the NAI’s program as “a collection of incidents with no more than a rhetorical connection,” but he was equally critical of the collection of overly ambiguous platitudes that constituted the strategic orientation of the institute. Colenbrander, “De Akelige Galm van Een Hol Vat: Perspectieven Voor Het NAI,” 6.

¹¹⁸⁶ Ole Bouman, “Architectuur Op Een Kruispunt; Van ‘de Culturele Dimensie van de Architectuur’ Naar Architectuur Als Dimensie van Cultuur,” March 20, 1995, 2, BSTU 1995.

¹¹⁸⁷ Reijndorp best expressed the disjunction between imagined and realized institute when he reflected on “why the NAI that had so strongly appealed to [his] imagination [did] not match its current form,” but Colenbrander was much more precise by denouncing that the NAI “had only resolved the ‘problem of *Droogbak*’ in a material sense,” that is, that the NAI had thus far been much more concerned with the format than the content of the architecture institute. Reijndorp, “Een Prettig Vooruitzicht: Een Mogelijke Toekomst Voor Het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut,” 1; Colenbrander, “De Akelige Galm van Een Hol Vat: Perspectieven Voor Het NAI,” 4.

¹¹⁸⁸ Reijndorp, “Een Prettig Vooruitzicht: Een Mogelijke Toekomst Voor Het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut,” 2; Colenbrander, “De Akelige Galm van Een Hol Vat: Perspectieven Voor Het NAI,” 5.

Colenbrander and Reijndorp were disheartened that the NAI had not yet been able to facilitate and direct a constructive architectural discussion, but had thus far been mostly limited to the production of avulse activities. Both critics agreed that the future of the NAI was to be auspicious if only it “develop[ed] into an open and active center of study and debate” and revealed its “true form: a hive of scholarly activities.”¹¹⁸⁹

The essence of the NAI, both claimed, was found in its function of research center on which the institute’s near future should be further focused. Accordingly, both believed that a renewed focus on the institute’s intellectual program would provide a sort of “intellectual body” that would form the core of the institute and from which other activities could be developed.¹¹⁹⁰ Such an intellectual foundation was expected to not only bridge the growing disconnect between the general public and the discipline (primarily the fields of architecture “theory and history”) but also become the hinge between the macro and micro organizational levels, establishing a much needed coherence across the institute’s departments.¹¹⁹¹ The only point where both critics truly disagreed was in their understanding of the NAI’s sprawling activities, with Reijndorp advocating for greater autonomy between the institute’s constituent parts, while Colenbrander appealing for a greater integration between them.¹¹⁹²

¹¹⁸⁹ Reijndorp, “Een Prettig Vooruitzicht: Een Mogelijke Toekomst Voor Het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut,” 6.

¹¹⁹⁰ Colenbrander, “De Akelige Galm van Een Hol Vat: Perspectieven Voor Het NAI,” 17. Colenbrander claimed it to be of the utmost importance to define the distinction between the core and the accessory.

¹¹⁹¹ Colenbrander argued that by developing strong intellectual thematic lines, the institute would be able to enter into “sublime, albeit temporary symbiosis of the three spheres [of the institute’s] activity: history, design, and policy.” *Ibid.*, 6.

¹¹⁹² Reijndorp expressed some concern that by accommodating too many activities, they were becoming lost in “the stew that is the NAI” rather than reinforced by possible synergies, while Colenbrander (after considering the possibility for greater autonomy) advocated for a greater “degree of integration in the program.” Reijndorp, “Een Prettig Vooruitzicht: Een Mogelijke Toekomst Voor Het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut,” 4; Colenbrander, “De Akelige Galm van Een Hol Vat: Perspectieven Voor Het NAI,” 5.

Despite the remarkable agreement in the independent assessment of these two critics, the NAI's Board was more inclined to value the reading of the problem posited by Ole Bouman, who found the causes for the NAI's woes not inside, but outside the institute.¹¹⁹³ Although briefly addressing the latent ambiguity of the NAI's objectives and processes, Bouman identified the source of the institute's difficulties in five pressing challenges facing contemporary architectural practice and in the ever-shifting nature of contemporary audiences.

Bouman's five points offered a perspective of architecture's cultural standing and, most importantly, associated it with architecture's economic condition. The first point was most clear about this condition, by claiming "architecture [had] always been the most expensive art and thus very dependent on available funding."¹¹⁹⁴ The same overarching idea continued in the second and third point, namely that architecture was increasingly expandable due to "capital depreciation" and that architecture's "cultural value" had degraded from being "at the vanguard of construction" to becoming a mere "smokescreen for the iron discipline [imposed] by real estate."¹¹⁹⁵ As both a symptom and a result of this condition, the fourth point indicated that there was an increased "marginalization of the architect in the construction process."¹¹⁹⁶ Bouman's fifth and final point extended the current state of helplessness in architecture to a new realm by claiming that "architecture [was] threatened by the emergence of electronic media and interactive digital networks."¹¹⁹⁷ According to Bouman, these "five key, highly productive ambiguities in

¹¹⁹³ The Board meeting in which each critic had the opportunity to present his scenario was the first time the three scenarios were jointly discussed. See Annemieke de Kler, "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 22 April 1995," May 2, 1995, BSTU 1995.

¹¹⁹⁴ Bouman, "Architectuur Op Een Kruispunt; Van 'de Culturele Dimensie van de Architectuur' Naar Architectuur Als Dimensie van Cultuur," 3.

¹¹⁹⁵ Ibid., 3, 4.

¹¹⁹⁶ Ibid., 4.

¹¹⁹⁷ Ibid. In the following year, Bouman published a book reflecting precisely on the instrumentalization of architecture in the digital realm in collaboration with Ben van Berkel for the NAI. See Ole Bouman and Ben van Berkel, *RealSpace in QuickTimes: Architecture and Digitization* (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1996).

contemporary practice” both posed “a great danger to the future of architecture as culture medium” and “open[ed] an opportunity for” upholding “the cultural significance of architecture.”¹¹⁹⁸

The NAI’s Board agreed with that assertion, and after discussing the three scenarios concluded that “the core of the debate [was] in Ole Bouman’s argument as described in the five issues.”¹¹⁹⁹ This was a convenient position for the Board, since it implied that there were no structural or organizational issues within the institute, but rather a troubled programmatic orientation that needed to be redefined. This idea was further reinforced with another of the Board’s conclusions, namely that “the current practice of the NAI [was] experienced as mediocre.”¹²⁰⁰

The other underlying idea in Bouman’s assessment was equally welcomed by the Board, namely his claim that for the NAI to progress “what matters [was] the public, in all its forms” with the “potential to be activated at the right time with the right topics (or service).¹²⁰¹ Such public-oriented focus was also adopted into the Board’s conclusions with the recommendation that the “NAI must dare to innovate, update and analyze what the people are concerned about.”¹²⁰² While seemingly innocuous, this conclusion implied that rather than architecture, the focus of the institute was to be the fancies of the public. Rather than investigate and discuss the issues and challenges of architecture, the institute’s main objective became to attract as much public as possible. The engagement of a wide audience was no longer one of the means to advance architectural discussion and inherently the discipline, but became an end in itself. This was a turning point for the NAI, as the delicate balance established between popular and critical was lopsided and popular

¹¹⁹⁸ Bouman, “Architectuur Op Een Kruispunt; Van ‘de Culturele Dimensie van de Architectuur’ Naar Architectuur Als Dimensie van Cultuur,” 4.

¹¹⁹⁹ Kler, “Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 22 April 1995,” 5.

¹²⁰⁰ Ibid., 4.

¹²⁰¹ Bouman, “Architectuur Op Een Kruispunt; Van ‘de Culturele Dimensie van de Architectuur’ Naar Architectuur Als Dimensie van Cultuur,” 12.

¹²⁰² Kler, “Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 22 April 1995,” 4.

dissemination of architecture was promoted at the cost of critical discussion of the discipline, as it will be demonstrated.

Popular dissemination and critical discussion within the NAI were not inherently incompatible, but the Board's previous decisions had already revealed their partiality towards popular dissemination over critical discussion. The engagement of the three critics to envision scenarios for the NAI's future was not only a step in the preparation of the institute's impending policy plan, but had also been a direct response to the identity and management crisis resulting from the Board's botched appointment of the institute's second director.

In 1994, after having directed the establishment of the institute and the construction of its new building, Adri Duivesteijn considered his work at the NAI's helm to be completed and returned to active politics.¹²⁰³ Although advertisements for the position were only published once Duivesteijn was elected to the Dutch House of Representatives in May 1994, the profile of the new director had already been defined by the institute's Board.¹²⁰⁴ In its previous March meeting, the Board had decided that the NAI was to "develop more public friendly activities and exhibitions" that were better "aimed at the target group(s)" and thus "this issue [was] fundamental in the coming years and decisive in the selection of a new director."¹²⁰⁵ Specifically, the future director was to foster a significant change in the NAI's institutional culture by strongly encouraging the institute and its

¹²⁰³ Adri Duivesteijn was elected in May of that year to the Dutch House of Representatives (*Tweede Kamer der Staten-Generaal*) as the nineteenth candidate of the *PvdA* (*Partij van de Arbeid*, the Dutch Labor Party), officially beginning his term on October 15, 1994. "Frits Becht Wordt Nieuwe Directeur van Architectuurinstituut," *Trouw*, July 12, 1994.

¹²⁰⁴ The same month as Duivesteijn was elected to the Dutch House of Representatives, advertisements for the NAI director's position were published. See "Announcement of Position NAI Director."

¹²⁰⁵ Annemieke de Kler, "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 16 Maart 1994," March 23, 1994, 4, BSTU 1994. The meeting also served to appoint the selection committee that was to direct the procedure and report to the entire Board. This committee was composed of the Board's chairman Pieter Cornelis Beelaerts van Blokland (also acting as chairman of the selection committee), together with Board members Benno Prensela, Ig. Caminada, and Francine Houben (as reserve).

staff to adopt a more public-friendly attitude, or as the Board put it, to “redirect the elitist (serene coded language) and top-oriented thinking towards a public-oriented thinking.”¹²⁰⁶ Accordingly, the Board also concluded that although “quality remain[ed] paramount,” the institute’s “presentation need[ed] to engage with the relation that the public ha[d] with architecture.”¹²⁰⁷

The Board’s renewed interest in a greater engagement with a wide audience was primarily motivated by an audience survey and marketing research conducted at the NAI during the exhibition dedicated to “De Stijl” in that same month.¹²⁰⁸ The conclusions of the research and subsequent discussion were compiled and presented to the Board in a memorandum titled “Eleven Issues for the Future Development of the NAI,” in which the elitist perception of the institute was criticized and a strategy of popularization advocated.¹²⁰⁹ While the three first issues explicitly recommended the popularization of the institute through the institutionalization of a product marketing approach, the same idea was implicit in the eight remaining issues that assessed the NAI’s “positioning” (not only of the institute, but of its exhibitions, collections, and study center) within the “cultural context” and the “leisure market” of the Netherlands.¹²¹⁰ Although a valid and useful research, this marketing exercise was fundamentally flawed by approaching the institute as a generic cultural institution without adequately considering the specificities of its functions as a study center and an archive, as well as the specificity of architecture.

¹²⁰⁶ Ibid., 3–4. The Board also considered that “marketing [was] missed in the organization” and greater efforts needed to be done to incorporate it within the NAI’s operations in order to attract a greater number of visitors and shape public perceptions of the institute.

¹²⁰⁷ Ibid., 4.

¹²⁰⁸ The audience survey was conducted by the recently graduated sociologist Liesbeth Eikenaar, who was later hired by the NAI in September 1994. Adri Duivesteijn, “Brief Aan de Medewerkers van Het NAI,” June 15, 1994, BSTU 1994. For the survey script and complete results, see Liesbeth Eikenaar, “NAI En Het Publiek,” March 1994, BSTU 1994.

¹²⁰⁹ Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, “Elf Aandachtspunten Voor de Verdere Ontwikkeling van Het NAI,” March 16, 1994, BSTU 1994.

¹²¹⁰ Ibid., 2.

Nevertheless, the ideas expressed in the “Eleven Issues” memorandum were adopted by the NAI’s Board, to which the appointment of Frits Becht as the second director of the institute was nothing if not consistent. Frits Becht was a noted art collector, who had been the head of a market research company until 1987, after which he had been involved in the organization of several high-profile “large-scale cultural events” such as the Van Gogh Year (1990) and the Mondrian Year (1994).¹²¹¹ However, Becht was not interested in architecture nor had he ever been to any of the NAI’s exhibitions or participated in any of its activities. This was dismissed by the outgoing director, who considered that the institute had “in-house all the art historical and architectural expertise necessary for exhibitions” and expected “Becht to perfect in the subsequent years the techniques of presentation.”¹²¹² In accordance to the Board’s intentions, Becht’s main task at the NAI would be to organize blockbuster exhibitions that could draw large crowds and attract sponsors.

By appointing Becht as the NAI’s new director, the Board implicitly established an attitude of form over substance that did not go unnoticed. At least publicly, the major criticism of Becht’s appointment took the form of an editorial in *Archis* authored by Geert Bekaert, who openly questioned the Board’s decision and the overall orientation of the institute. Bekaert believed that “for the second time running, the NAI Board ha[d] expressly disregarded [the] fairly obvious requirement” that the director of the institute should be “an established authority in the field of architecture.”¹²¹³ Although there had been several valid reasons for overlooking this requirement when Duivesteijn was appointed, for Bekaert “this time, it [was] not so easy to justify” Becht’s appointment “unless we assume, as the Board suggests, that the institute fulfils a marketing function, which would make the director’s PR qualities decisive.”¹²¹⁴ Such imposed limitation on the

¹²¹¹ “Persoonlijk,” *De Volkskrant*, July 12, 1994.

¹²¹² “Frits Becht Nieuwe Directeur van Het NAI in Rotterdam,” *NRC Handelsblad*, July 12, 1994.

¹²¹³ Geert Bekaert, “Editorial: The Difference,” *Archis*, no. 8 (August 1994): 17.

¹²¹⁴ *Ibid.*

NAi's operations and objectives was considered "shortsighted," since the institute was not only "admirably equipped" to conduct "some trailblazing work" and foster a renewal of architecture from within, but the only way it would be able to attract an audience was if it had something new to offer and was not merely "following trends."¹²¹⁵ In short, the NAi should "be allowed to concentrate on the core of the matter," that is with architecture as such, and "not be taken up with pandering to an imaginary public."¹²¹⁶

While not personalizing their criticism in the appointment of Frits Becht, some academic institutions also privately appealed to the institute's Board to not neglect the NAi's core function of architectural research. The Department of Architecture History of the *Vrije Universiteit* (VU University) in Amsterdam was among those expressing concern with the direction of the institute.¹²¹⁷ Specifically, the VU group stated their conviction that "the NAi's contribution to the discussion of architectural quality should not conclude in slogans but in revealing a substantive basis and analytical depth" that could reveal "the essence of architecture as a profession and of the significance of architecture in society."¹²¹⁸ Accordingly, the group urged the Board to "focus specifically on finding that base and depth in the NAi's policy" and to consider whether it would not be "better off to the wider society to have a small influential audience acting as the intermediary for the general public," that is, favoring a policy of quality over quantity.¹²¹⁹

¹²¹⁵ Ibid.

¹²¹⁶ Ibid. Bekaert also left the same recommendation for "subsidizing bodies," since he considered to be equally unwise "to judge the Institute's work on its immediate success."

¹²¹⁷ Although "Free University" would be the literal translation of this university's name, used here is the title adopted by the university in its own English literature, namely VU University.

¹²¹⁸ Auke van der Woud, "Brief Aan Het Bestuur van de Stichting NAi," September 12, 1994, 1, BSTU 1994.

¹²¹⁹ Ibid., 1–2. In support of their argument, the VU group also alluded to the "history of Dutch television in the past 25 years," specifically suggesting that by pursuing a policy of quantity, the quality of Dutch television programming had inevitably suffered.

Becht's appointment thus signaled a displacement of critical discussion for popular dissemination that was not only noticed by scholarly circles but was also contrary to the NAI's founding principles and "against the expectations of the greater proportion of the institute's staff."¹²²⁰ From the outset, "half of the NAI's staff was against the appointment of Frits Becht as [the institute's] new director."¹²²¹ Beyond his lack of experience with—and interest in—architecture, Becht was resented for his unfortunate comments to the press revealing contempt for the NAI's work, namely that "he found the NAI's exhibition policy of recent years to be substandard" and the rumors that "he would remove the artwork by Auke de Vries from the NAI pond as soon as he took office."¹²²² Becht's concern with presentation procedures and disregard for the substance of the content clashed with the curatorial staff's prospects for the institute, who had believed that with Duivesteijn's departure the NAI would grow into a nexus of architectural knowledge. According to Colenbrander, "the institute was there, the building was there, the time was there to realize the serious ambitions of the institute."¹²²³ Internally, the staff organized meetings to debate the new direction of the institute and to plead with the Board to reverse its appointment for a candidate more suitable to the ambitions of the institute, warning that "Becht's appointment would bring serious harm to the institute."¹²²⁴

The mounting internal opposition to the Board's decision was quite vocal, and as a result, Becht declined to fulfill his appointment less than a month before the planned start of his tenure.¹²²⁵

¹²²⁰ Bekaert, "Editorial: The Difference."

¹²²¹ "Becht Was Niet Welkom," *Trouw*, September 14, 1994.

¹²²² Ben Maandag, "Frits Becht Doet Opnieuw Iedereen Versted Staan," *Rotterdams Dagblad*, September 13, 1994. The same article indicates that the staff would have preferred the appointment of the Groningen Professor of Architecture History Ed Taverne, "who was considered until the last moment, when he has passed by Becht."

¹²²³ Colenbrander, interview.

¹²²⁴ *Ibid.*

¹²²⁵ Brouwers, interview. Becht cited the contracting subsidies awarded by the Ministry of Culture to the institute as the main reason for his refusal to take on the NAI directorship, but still criticized the NAI Board for "lacking decisiveness." See "Becht Was Niet Welkom."

Although Ruud Brouwers referred to Becht's resignation as the NAI's own "Velvet Revolution" where the staff had successfully prevented the institute from compromising its original cultural ambitions, the writing was on the wall. The seeds for the displacement of the institute's cultural aspirations by an economic orientation and for the replacement of critical discussion by popular dissemination had been planted.

With only one month before the still director Adri Duivesteijn was to step down and begin his term in the House of Representatives, the Board scrambled to find an adequate solution to the looming leadership void. In a memorandum marked "Strictly Confidential," Duivesteijn proposed to organize an urgent search committee to "provide an interim solution" and "designate a person to function as acting director."¹²²⁶ This time around, however, the heads of the departments and the Workers Council were to be engaged *before* the selection in order to jointly redefine the profile of the new director and ensure that there would not be any further conflict. The Board not only accepted Duivesteijn's proposal, but five days later had already nominated a candidate for the interim position: Hein van Haaren.¹²²⁷

Unlike Frits Becht, Hein van Haaren was professionally trained in art history and had a long experience with architecture and culture, having been chief curator of the *Gemeentemuseum* in The Hague and more recently director of the Rotterdam Academy of Visual Arts (*Academie van Beeldende Kunsten Rotterdam*, currently named the Willem de Kooning Academy).¹²²⁸ Although

¹²²⁶ Adri Duivesteijn, "Opvolging Directeur," September 21, 1994, BSTU 1994.

¹²²⁷ Adri Duivesteijn, "Brief Aan Het Ministerie OCW," September 16, 1994, BSTU 1995. In this letter the Board requested clearance from the Ministry of Culture for Hein van Haaren's appointment as interim director of the institute.

¹²²⁸ "NAi Krijgt Interim-Directeur. Staf Architectuurinstituut Heeft Vertrouwen in Van Haaren," *Trouw*, September 28, 1994.

recently retired, Duivesteijn was able to convince Van Haaren to temporarily take up the directorship of the NAI, which was well received by the staff and Board alike.

The NAI staff's agreement of Van Haaren's appointment was particularly significant, since the Becht episode had produced a loss of trust between the institute's Board and staff. While the staff resented the Board for its strategy of form over substance, the Board resented the staff for blocking Becht's appointment. The tension between the Board and the institute's staff was the only point of discussion in a meeting between the Board and the NAI's Workers Council (*Ondernemingsraad*) shortly after Frits Becht's resignation. As a result, the Board recognized that there had been "a communication problem" and that although the procedure followed for Becht's appointment had been correct, "it could perhaps be adjusted in details," most significantly by consulting the Workers Council regarding the profile and responsibilities of any future appointments before the selection procedure took place.¹²²⁹ It was also decided that "a delegation of the Board would meet with the Workers Council twice a year" to discuss "topics concerning the NAI in advance."¹²³⁰ Another crucial element in smoothing the relations between the staff and the Board was the renewal of the Board, as several new members were also scheduled to begin their appointments along with the change in the institute's management, including a new secretary, treasurer, and chairman.¹²³¹

Initially, Van Haaren was expected to remain at the helm of the institute for a mere four months, but as the search for a suitable new director took longer to yield satisfactory results, his tenure was

¹²²⁹ Frans Hoving, "Verslag Bijeenkomst van de Ondernemingsraad van Het NAI Met Een Afvaardiging van Het Stichtingsbestuur," September 15, 1994, BSTU 1994. According to Colenbrander the Board's dissatisfaction had been particularly directed at him, since he had been among the most vocal in opposing Becht's appointment. As a result of that tension, Colenbrander decided to complete a doctoral degree and take a sabbatical leave from the institute. Colenbrander, interview.

¹²³⁰ The first meeting was scheduled for early 1995, when the procedure for the appointment of a new director would be one of the topics. Annemieke de Kler, "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 7 November 1994," November 16, 1994, 3, BSTU 1994.

¹²³¹ The staff was particularly enthusiastic about Hedy d'Ancona leadership as the new chairwoman of the Board. Hein van Haaren, "Overzicht Samenstelling Bestuur NAI," November 10, 1994, BSTU 1994.

extended to almost seventeen months. Although still brief, Van Haaren's tenure at the NAI would turn out to be, both directly and indirectly, instrumental for Dutch architecture.

During that period, Van Haaren was at the center of a remarkable and unprecedented operation conducted by the NAI: a financial assistance package to Rem Koolhaas' financially troubled Office for Metropolitan Architecture (OMA). Although OMA's financial difficulties were well documented in the press and are well known in architectural circles, the NAI's decisive contribution to their resolution has remained fairly unknown until now.¹²³² Since the institute was not mandated to provide financial assistance to architectural offices, nor was there any provision of how to deal with these cases in the NAI's statutes and policies, the operation was presented as a purchase of OMA's material (primarily models) for the NAI's collection. The purchase of OMA's 'Art Work' (as it was referred within the institute) was completely antithetical to the NAI's own collecting policies. These not only stipulated that all archives were to be acquired through donations, but also strongly favored the collection of full archives rather than discrete projects.¹²³³

After some discussions, the purchase arrangement was first formalized by Van Haaren in December 1994, as he admitted that the "cost of the operation" to purchase the OMA material was

¹²³² Although not widely publicized, the NAI's intervention was an open secret within the institute, since several former employees were aware of the operation and its objective to assist the financially troubled office, which is widely corroborated by the documentation available in the NAI's institutional archive. A selection of the press coverage of OMA's troubled finances include "Crisissfeer Bij Koolhaas; Personeel Zonder Salaris," *Rotterdams Dagblad*, May 5, 1995; "Bureau Rem Koolhaas in Financiële Problemen," *NRC Handelsblad*, May 6, 1995.

¹²³³ Hein van Haaren alluded to this contradiction in his correspondence requesting subsidies, noting that "the NAI's efforts to acquire [the material] was contrary in principle to its acquisition policy since it had never paid for collection items," but this was a special case, given "the importance of OMA's work." Hein van Haaren, "Brief Aan Het Prins Bernhard Fonds," February 23, 1995, 1, BSTU 1995. Although the Collections Department was particularly concerned with the impact in future acquisitions of establishing the precedent of purchasing collections, it included guidelines for these operations in the subsequent "NAI Collection Acquisition Policy 1995-2000," which contemplated the possibility of "special situations" to "purchase works of contemporary architects." However, it was clarified that "the NAI ha[d] no budget for this" and accordingly "these purchases must be financed by external resources." NAI Afdeling Collectie, "Kwaliteit in de Collectie van Het NAI: Acquisitie- En Selectiebeleid NAI-Collectie 1995-2000," October 1995, 13, BSTU 1995.

“beyond the NAI’s financial capability” and requested subsidies from a range of institutions.¹²³⁴ The total cost of the acquisition had been negotiated at 500,000 guilders for ten projects, with Van Haaren requesting 75,000 from each subsidy-granting institution, complemented by 50,000 from the NAI’s own funds.¹²³⁵ After a couple of setbacks in the negotiations and fund-raising activities, the final purchase agreement was signed on March 15, 1995. The final agreement was limited to the purchase of a restricted set of material (mostly design and final models) for only six projects at the reduced cost of 400,000 guilders, with the NAI also being responsible to raise an additional 100,000 guilders to produce an exhibition of OMA’s work.¹²³⁶

The threat that this important piece of Dutch architectural culture might be broken apart and sold to foreign architecture museums (or even worst, private collectors) was used throughout the entire process as a main justification for the operation. Van Haaren often mentioned how this threat “was not imaginary” given the “great interest that [was] emerging with the exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art in New York.”¹²³⁷ However, there was a hint of contradictory logic to this

¹²³⁴ Hein van Haaren, “Brief Aan Het College van Burgemeester En Wethouders,” December 13, 1994, 1, BSTU 1994.

¹²³⁵ This initial agreement covered the purchase of the projects for the *Two Jussieu Libraries*, the *Très-Grande Bibliothèque*, the *ZFK (Zentrum für Kunst und Medien)*, the *Euralille*, the *Congrexpo*, the *Kunsthall*, the *Ij-Oevers*, the *Huis van Bewaring*, the *Patio-Villa’s*, and the *De Brink*. The NAI approached the Ministry of Culture, the City of Rotterdam, the Dutch Architectural Fund, the Mondriaan Foundation, the VSB Fonds, as well as an assortment of other smaller funds to support the purchase. In the final agreement, different institutions contributed in accordance with their possibilities with different amounts. *Ibid.*, 2; Haaren, “Brief Aan Het Prins Bernhard Fonds,” 3.

¹²³⁶ Hein van Haaren and A.J. Schippers, “Overeenkomst Tussen de Stichting Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw (NAi) En Office for Metropolitan Architecture (OMA),” March 15, 1995, BSTU 1995. The six projects included in the final agreement were the *Two Jussieu Libraries*, the *ZFK (Zentrum für Kunst und Medien)*, the *Euralille*, the *Congrexpo*, the *Kunsthall*, and the *Huis van Bewaring*. As Van Haaren reported to the Board, the discrepancy between the initial and final agreement was a result of “Koolhaas changing his offer, requesting a higher amount and offering less material,” with Van Haaren refusing this new proposal until a compromise was achieved. Annemieke de Kler, “Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 22 December 1994,” December 29, 1994, 3, BSTU 1994. Several institutions also refused the NAI’s subsidy request for the purchase, including the Rembrandt Association. H.F. Heerkens Thijssen, “Brief Aan Hein van Haaren,” March 10, 1995, BSTU 1995.

¹²³⁷ Haaren, “Brief Aan Het College van Burgemeester En Wethouders,” 1. In its reply, the Prins Bernhard Cultural Fonds requested further information regarding the context of the acquisition, namely a specification of the items included in the agreement, a description on “what the purchase price [had been] based on, if

assertion, since not only was the MoMA exhibition made possible by grants from, among others, the Dutch Ministry of Culture, but the agreement singled out individual pieces (particularly the models) of these projects to be acquired, effectively breaking apart the complete archive.

The NAI's decision to exceptionally disregard its own acquisition policy and purchase material from the OMA collection was undoubtedly complex and layered with several elements and scenarios being considered. Certainly, both director and Board recognized in this operation an opportunity to retain some important material from recent Dutch architecture in the Netherlands, but the causal relation between OMA's financial difficulties and the unprecedented purchase of models for the NAI's collection is equally clear.¹²³⁸ The connection was more than suggested when Van Haaren stated that the "acquisition of the collection" was also motivated "because the survival of the office [was] not ensured only by its assignment fees," while Ruud Brouwers described it as "a kind of a hidden state-subsidy" to Rem Koolhaas and OMA.¹²³⁹ But if there were any doubts about the underlying objective of the acquisition, the institute's Board also congratulated itself when OMA's Financial Director, A.J. Schippers reported that the 400,000 guilders collected by the institute had ensured OMA's continuity.¹²⁴⁰

In a remarkable direct intervention, the NAI's assistance went beyond anything ever planned or expected from either the Dutch institute or any other architecture institute, center, or museum. Although directly providing assistance to a singular architecture office, the NAI's intervention had a

there [was] a valuation," and if OMA's had "announced other buyers for the Art Work" among other questions raised. Jeanine M. S. Perryck, "Brief Aan Hein van Haaren," March 10, 1995, BSTU 1995.

¹²³⁸ Rem Koolhaas had already sold some prints of his work to the Canadian Centre for Architecture (CCA) in 1984 and to the German Architecture Museum (*DAM*) in 1993, selling some other material to the MoMA in 1996.

¹²³⁹ Haaren, "Brief Aan Het Prins Bernhard Fonds," 1; Brouwers, interview.

¹²⁴⁰ Annemieke de Kler, "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 20 Juni 1995," June 28, 1995, 4, BSTU 1995.

considerable indirect impact in Rotterdam's architectural climate in particular and Dutch architecture culture in general.

Soon after OMA's finances were stabilized, Rem Koolhaas' international stardom achieved supernova status with the publication of the (still) best-selling book *S, M, L, XL*.¹²⁴¹ The 1,344 pages behemoth compilation of projects, observations, and fascinations developed in OMA's work not only made Koolhaas famous globally but also established an important precedent for emerging Dutch talent. In order to achieve similar international recognition, new Dutch architecture offices began publishing their own compendium of manifestos and projects, presenting "not so much monographs on their work, but rather a continuation of the work by this other means."¹²⁴²

Koolhaas' influence on an entire new generation of Dutch architects went further than merely providing a template for publication strategies, as former OMA-alumni launched their own independent careers and were increasingly recognized as a new generation of Dutch architecture. However, Koolhaas not only exerted a tremendous "influence on an entirely new generation of Dutch architects who emerged onto the national and international scene" in the 1990s, but it was also "the interest aroused by Koolhaas and his practice" that "prompted magazines, museums and educational institutions to seek other interesting architecture [also] being produced in the Netherlands."¹²⁴³ Rem Koolhaas' seminal impact on Dutch architecture culture is thus hard to overestimate.¹²⁴⁴

¹²⁴¹ It has been reported that "*S, M, L, XL*'s first printing of 30,000 copies sold out in just a few months," as well as "second printing of 70,000 copies in a semi-authorized edition by Taschen." Robin Kinross and Linda Eerme, "The Architects of the Book," *Domus*, no. 847 (April 2002): 59.

¹²⁴² Ibid. The most often cited example is MVRDV's *Farmax*.

¹²⁴³ Robert Kloosterman and Eva Stegmeijer, "Delirious Rotterdam: The Formation of an Innovative Cluster of Architectural Firms," in *Learning from Clusters* (Dordrecht: Springer, 2005), 203; Lootsma, "The Second Modernity of Dutch Architecture," 9.

¹²⁴⁴ As Kloosterman and Stegmeier have demonstrated in their study, Rem Koolhaas and OMA had a decisive influence in the creation and expansion of the "Dutch architectural cluster." See Kloosterman and Stegmeijer, "Delirious Rotterdam."

Inside the institute, OMA's growing influence within Dutch architectural culture was perhaps best signaled by the preparation of the exhibition *Reference: OMA*, which considered "the nascent independent careers of sixteen architects who" shared the experience of having been "a trainee or staff member in the now famous Office for Metropolitan Architecture."¹²⁴⁵ Certainly the preparation of this exhibition devised by Colenbrander influenced Van Haaren's and the Board's understanding of the importance for Dutch architectural culture of ensuring the OMA's survival.¹²⁴⁶ If there were still any doubts, validation to this operation came when Rem Koolhaas was awarded the prestigious Pritzker award in 2000.

The exceptional decision to go beyond the institute's charter in creating a favorable climate for architecture by providing direct financial assistance to OMA must be credited to Van Haaren, but it also served to demonstrate the importance of having a director at the head of the NAI who was well versed in architecture. Albeit controversial, this was a type of subjective decision that, had he accepted the directorship of the institute, would have been very difficult for Frits Becht to take given his lack of knowledge and understanding of architecture.

Changing Landscape

If Van Haaren's orchestration of a coordinated financial assistance to OMA had an indirect impact in Dutch architecture, the ripples of the NAI's second Policy Plan formulated during his tenure were much more direct. Given the interim quality of his directorship, Hein Van Haaren had not been mandated to formulate any long-term policy changes to the institute but rather maintain

¹²⁴⁵ Bernard Colenbrander, *Reference OMA: The Sublime Start of an Architectural Generation* (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1995), 1. Despite their many differences, Colenbrander argued that the work of these offices seemed "to suggest the existence of a 'movement' of some coherence in intellectual and ideological respects" and the exhibition intended to "place that 'movement' within a clear thematic framework."

¹²⁴⁶ Echoes of the argument developed by Colenbrander for the exhibition and accompanying volume are found in some of Van Haaren's subsidy requests, particularly the references to how OMA was similar "to the way the office of Le Corbusier once acted as an inspiration for architects and urban designers." Haaren, "Brief Aan Het Prins Bernhard Fonds," 2.

its course while the Board appointed a new director. However, given that the Board's recruitment efforts were taking longer than originally anticipated and the current Policy Plan was drawing to an end in 1996, Van Haaren was required to devise and codify the institute's long-term strategy in a new four-year Policy Plan for the period 1997-2000.¹²⁴⁷

Titled *Changing Landscape (Veranderend Landschap)*, the new policy plan was considered a natural consolidation of the institute and "another step in the development of the NAI."¹²⁴⁸ The title alluded to the changing context for architecture in the Netherlands hailed by the government's second Architecture Policy (*Architectuurnota*). With the new Architecture Policy, the implementation of the "explicit commitment by the government to architecture" presented in the first *Nota* was now delegated to local authorities "in line with the decentralization policy of the government," and it was this "combination of cultural engagement and instrument withdrawal [that] characterized the 'changing landscape' of architectural culture."¹²⁴⁹

Accordingly, the NAI's new Policy Plan also reflected some of the structural ideas of the government's Architecture Policy, namely the intention to extend the previous policies of architecture to also include "urban planning, interior architecture, landscape architecture and spatial planning," increasingly approach the different disciplines as a whole, and "emphasize their similarities."¹²⁵⁰ Such intention was a part of the institute's "integration" efforts, which also

¹²⁴⁷ It was in preparation for this policy plan that Van Haaren and the Board commissioned Arnold Reijndorp, Ole Bouman, and Bernard Colenbrander to devise the previously discussed scenarios for the future of the institute.

¹²⁴⁸ Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, "Veranderend Landschap: NAI Beleidsplan 1997-2000," December 30, 1995, 2.

¹²⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 3. A succinct analysis of the changing conditions was presented in the NAI's Policy Plan in order to contextualize the strategies adopted by the institutes within the government's own policies. Additionally, it was also claimed that the funding provided to the institute had been inadequate.

¹²⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 5.

contemplated the development of integrated programs and publications that could combine architecture's "history, design, and policy."¹²⁵¹

"Integration" was one of the "three central, leading themes" organizing the institute's "policies for the years 1997-2000," along with "participation and internationalization."¹²⁵² The theme of "participation" was based on the idea that "architecture is the most democratic of all art forms" and was expressed in the institute's ambition to further expand architecture's audiences and promote a more inclusive discussion by incentivizing the participation of the general public in its activities.¹²⁵³ Similarly, the theme of "internationalization" was equally concerned with the expansion of the institute's appeal, but in this case, to an international audience. By both presenting Dutch architecture abroad and presenting foreign architecture in Rotterdam, the NAI intended to foster an "international cultural interaction that [could] produce enriching and stimulating impulses."¹²⁵⁴

The three themes were present in both general policies and specific activities proposed by the institute's new Policy Plan. Despite the "changing landscape," the NAI's second Policy Plan was a balanced framework that continued and expanded upon the original policies of the institute, as critical discussion and popular dissemination were not only equally considered but were also further integrated.

The expansion of critical discussion was contemplated with the deepening of the NAI's research and study activities, of which, the bolstering and restructuring of the Study Center was the most symbolic. With the new policy, the NAI's Study Center was to transcend its original function of a focal point for advanced architectural research by also becoming more inviting to the uninitiated.

¹²⁵¹ Ibid. The integration of "history, design, and policy" was reminiscent of Colenbrander's scenario.

¹²⁵² Ibid., 4.

¹²⁵³ Ibid., 5. For the first time the "quantitative target of 100,000 visitors in a year" was established for the NAI.

¹²⁵⁴ Ibid., 6.

In fact, the Study Center was “to function as an agency between universities and the NAI,” not only facilitating research but also organizing recurring lectures, seminars, “a symposium conference organized every two years in cooperation with other departments and universities,” and even the first International Architecture Biennale of Rotterdam (IABR).¹²⁵⁵

On the opposite end of the critical-popular spectrum, beyond the organization of “workshops, summer academies, symposia, and the establishment of a laboratory for schoolchildren,” the signature initiative of this Policy Plan was the consecration of the “export task” of the institute.¹²⁵⁶ The NAI’s “export task” referred specifically to the presentation of Dutch architecture abroad and was the foundation of the institute’s internationalization strategy and the government’s propaganda efforts. In the previous period, bilingual publications like the journal *Archis* and the *Architecture in the Netherlands Yearbook* series had been responsible for projecting Dutch architecture beyond its borders, but with the new Policy Plan it was stipulated that those publications would be complemented by exhibitions produced for foreign audiences.¹²⁵⁷

These exhibitions were to include “large historical monographic exhibitions in a series [dedicated to] Dutch masters” as well as “present contemporary Dutch architecture.”¹²⁵⁸ In the spirit of integration, it was proposed to organize a travelling exhibition “in conjunction with the publication of the *Yearbook*” and another to be developed “based on Hans Ibelings’ book *Dutch*

¹²⁵⁵ Ibid., 11. It was also stipulated that the Study Center would “reserve free study places” for any kind of research related to the institute’s archive, as well as “two spaces reserved for project-based research that has a direct relationship with NAI,” which was taken to mean space for the research project *BONAS (Bibliografieën en Oeuvrelijsten van Nederlandse Architecten en Stedebouw kundigen*, or Bibliographies and Lists of Works of Dutch Architects and Urbanists) which compiled documentation and information on Dutch architects and urbanists from 1800 to the present.

¹²⁵⁶ Ibid., 8,9.

¹²⁵⁷ Ibid., 9. The NAI took on this task in order to reverse the current condition in which “the possibilities to present the Dutch architecture abroad in exhibition form [were] scarce.”

¹²⁵⁸ Ibid.

*Architecture of the Twentieth-Century.*¹²⁵⁹ The NAI's international efforts were completed with the organization of the Dutch participation to "recurring architecture events (Biennales, Triennales) commissioned by the state," as it had "already happened several times in recent years."¹²⁶⁰

Although primarily concerned with the "presentation of Dutch architecture," the NAI's international efforts were equally concerned with confronting Dutch architecture with other ideas and contexts and "initiate a dialogue with the world beyond the Netherlands."¹²⁶¹ The NAI's proposed international dialogue was not exhausted in its export task, since it was complemented with its continued commitment to hosting "exhibitions of the work of internationally renowned foreign architects," inviting "foreign speakers" and even organizing an annual "Summer Academy" directed every year by a guest curator from a different country with the "overarching theme . . . Europe in Dialogue."¹²⁶²

With the integration of critical discussion with public presentation of architecture, the Policy Plan aimed at a proper balance between discussion and popularization. However, given the way it had been formulated, the Policy Plan had one inherent, and fracturing flaw: it had been devised by one director but was to be implemented by another.¹²⁶³

¹²⁵⁹ Ibid.

¹²⁶⁰ Ibid. Most notably, the NAI had organized the Dutch participation in the Venice Biennale in 1991 and the Milan Triennale in 1996.

¹²⁶¹ Ibid., 8.

¹²⁶² Ibid., 6, 8. Other activities included the organization of study trips abroad for architects and institutional clients as well as making available in the NAI's library a wide selection of international books and magazines.

¹²⁶³ The difficulties encountered by this situation were also recognized by the NAI at the time, as the introduction to its operating budget indicated that the budget "provide[d] overall direction to the functioning of the NAI in 1997-2000, but these intentions need to be considered with the necessary flexibility" to accommodate "the changes to the organization and programming" resulting from "the arrival of a new director." Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, "Meerjaren Activiteiten Begroting (MAB) 1997 - 2000: Speciale Editie Bij Beleidsplan 1997-2000," December 31, 1995, 3, BSTU 1995.

Concurrently with the development of the new Policy Plan, the NAI's Board had been absorbed with the selection of a new director for the institute. Unlike the previous procedure that resulted in the Frits Becht's appointment and subsequent controversy, this time, the NAI's Workers Council was to be represented in the Selection Committee. However, "before the [selection] procedure start[ed], the Board [was to] conduct a focused discussion on the future of the NAI" and "define the desired profile" for the institute's future director.¹²⁶⁴

Upon discussing the three scenarios previously formulated by Bouman, Colenbrander, and Reijndorp, the NAI Board deliberated on the profile of the new director. Overall, the Board was intent on recruiting someone that had a "broad understanding and vision" of both architecture and the institute's programming and profile.¹²⁶⁵ Specifically, the Board was looking for "a trend finder (with networks, including international) with sensitivity to address the right issues head-on (current debate) and to ask the right questions" to "initiate public debate."¹²⁶⁶

While these were qualities to be expected from the director of an architecture institute, other considerations were certainly more contentious and already indicated the institute's future focus

¹²⁶⁴ Annemieke de Kler, "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 7 Februari 1995," March 8, 1995, 4–5, BSTU 1995. The Selection Committee was composed of "two to three members of the NAI Board, including the chairman who act[ed] as chairman of the Selection Committee, a representative of the Workers Council, an external representative of the museum world, and the NAI director." The composition of the Selection Committee was finalized in the following Board meeting and was thus composed by Hedy d'Ancona (chairman), Ronald de Leeuw and Ben van Berkel (members of the NAI Board), Hans Ibelings (representative of the Workers Council), and Hein van Haaren (NAI director). See Annemieke de Kler, "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 21 Maart 1995," April 8, 1995, 3, BSTU 1995. Even before the selection procedure was initiated, there was "a broad-based committee of recommendation" that pleaded with the NAI Board "to appoint Mr. Ruud Brouwers as director of the NAI." The letter was signed by Maarten Lubbers, but included eighty respected members of the Dutch architecture community (mostly from the Amsterdam) as signatories, including the architects Aldo van Eyck, Herman Hertzberger, Piet Blom, Wim Quist, Sjoerd Soeters, and Rudy Uytenhaak. However, according to Hein van Haaren, "despite all of his merits, Brouwers' candidacy was rejected because he did not meet the director's profile." Maarten Lubbers, "Brief Aan Het Bestuur van Het Nederlands Architectuur Instituut," February 5, 1995, BSTU 1995; "Nieuwe Directeur NAI Wordt Berlijnse Kristin Feireiss," *De Volkskrant*, November 15, 1995.

¹²⁶⁵ Kler, "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 22 April 1995," 7.

¹²⁶⁶ Ibid.

on a greater popularization of the discipline at the cost of rigorous architectural research. Namely, the Board defined that the future director was to “find inspiration in questions of history” and have a “strong intellectual baggage,” but was to be “no scholar.”¹²⁶⁷ Instead, the future director was to be a “sober generalist,” a “*Homme de culture*” that could ask specialized questions and aptly represent the institute.¹²⁶⁸ The advertisement for the position was published in both national general newspapers and international architectural journals in the following weeks.¹²⁶⁹

In Kristin Feireiss, the Board found someone that closely met all the characteristics of the profile previously stipulated, and then some. In mid-November, after a few months of confidential selection procedures, the Board announced its appointment of the German gallerist Kristin Feireiss as director of the NAI.¹²⁷⁰ As with the Board’s previous two appointments (of Adri Duivesteijn and Frits Becht), Feireiss’ appointment surprised everyone.¹²⁷¹

The general surprise from Feireiss’ nomination originated from Feireiss being “still unknown in the Dutch architecture world,” with D. van der Veer, a director of the professional association *BNA*, claiming that he had “no idea of who or what she [was] when [he] sent her a congratulatory telegram.”¹²⁷² This condition, however, was perceived favorably as the head of the *BNA*, Carel Weeber, asserted that given the institute’s troubled past, bringing an outsider who did not have any

¹²⁶⁷ Ibid.

¹²⁶⁸ Ibid. The Board even described the future director as being an “open, liberal, and attractive person, who [was] not a *vakidoot*” (literally translated as “professional idiot,” but commonly used to refer to someone who knows everything about his profession, but nothing else).

¹²⁶⁹ For the advertisement text, see Hein van Haaren, “NAi Berichten van de Bestuursvergadering van 22 April 1995,” May 2, 1995, 4, BSTU 1995.

¹²⁷⁰ From the start of the selection procedure in April 1995 to the November 1995 announcement of Feireiss’ appointment, all the reports of the Board monthly meetings indicated that the selection procedure had been discussed, but that it was left out of the report in order to keep the discussions confidential. See Annemieke de Kler, “Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 7 November 1995,” November 21, 1995, 5, BSTU 1995.

¹²⁷¹ Some of the titles used by several newspaper articles were eerily similar to those used for the previous NAI director appointments. See Ben Maandag, “Benoeming Nieuwe Directeur NAI Wekt Verbazing,” *Rotterdams Dagblad*, November 15, 1995.

¹²⁷² “Duitse Directeur Architectuurinstituut,” *Algemeen Dagblad*, November 15, 1995.

prejudices regarding the NAI's past could work as "a blank slate" and "further forge the institute together."¹²⁷³ Also Hans van Dijk expressed his optimism with Feireiss' appointment, describing her as someone "with a prominent standing in the architecture world," with "lots of ideas and lots of initiative," as well as "someone who has a nose for what is going on."¹²⁷⁴ Equally positive was the reaction from the State Secretary of Culture A. Nuis and the NAI staff to Feireiss' appointment, making her appointment unanimously unopposed.¹²⁷⁵

Even through the "reactions from newspaper articles [were] positive," the question "who [was] Kristin Feireiss" was persistently posed.¹²⁷⁶ As a trained art-historian, Feireiss had been the art and architecture critic of the Berlin-based daily newspaper *Der Abend*, and later of the *RIAS-Berlin* radio station before becoming the publicist and editor of the *Internationales Design Zentrum Berlin* (IDZ, or International Design Center Berlin).¹²⁷⁷ Feireiss' connection to architecture was most clearly expressed in 1980, when she co-founded (with Helga Retzer) the first private architecture gallery in Germany, the Aedes Gallery and Architecture Forum (*Aedes Galerie und Architekturforum*).

As director of Aedes since its foundation, Feireiss had not only pioneered the exhibition of architecture and urbanism in Berlin but had also provided a decisive contribution to the "quality of the architectural discussion" as the city engaged in vast renewal projects by engaging both the

¹²⁷³ "Berlijnse Galeriehoudster Wordt Nieuwe Directeur Architectuurinstituut," *Trouw*, November 15, 1995.

¹²⁷⁴ *Ibid.*

¹²⁷⁵ R.J.H. Docter, "Brief Aan Het Bestuur van Het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut," November 20, 1995, BSTU 1995; Frans Hoving, "Brief Aan Het Bestuur van Het Stichting Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw," November 13, 1995, BSTU 1995. While approving of Feireiss' nomination, the NAI's staff noted that her "lack of experience leading a medium sized organization" would require "adequate support" and supervision by the Board.

¹²⁷⁶ Annemieke de Kler, "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 19 December 1995," December 28, 1995, 2, BSTU 1996; Maandag, "Benoeming Nieuwe Directeur NAI Wekt Verbazing."

¹²⁷⁷ Feireiss' complete *curriculum vitae* at the time she became director of the NAI can be found accompanying her in-depth interview with *VB Magazine*. See Christine Pannebakker, "Huilen En Feesten Met Kristin Feireiss," *VB Magazine*, April 1996, 71.

professional community and the wider public.¹²⁷⁸ Through the organization of exhibitions and debates at Aedes, Feireiss had developed a broad international network which included renowned contemporary architects such as “Joseph Paul Kleihues, Coop Himmelblau, John Hejduk, Alvaro Siza, Arata Isozaki, Bernard Tschumi, Frank Gehry, Aldo Rossi, Norman Foster,” Thom Mayne, and Daniel Libeskind, as well as the Dutch Kees Christiansen, Rem Koolhaas, and Ben van Berkel.¹²⁷⁹ Van Berkel was particularly familiar with Feireiss’ approach to architecture and unrelenting energy, since after his 1993 exhibition *Crossing Points* at the Aedes Gallery the “connection [with Feireiss] was so good that Van Berkel was asked to design a new gallery for her.”¹²⁸⁰ As a member of the Selection Committee, Van Berkel was also directly involved with the decision to appoint Kristin Feireiss as the new director of the Netherlands Architecture Institute.

Feireiss’ work at Aedes made her the perfect candidate for the NAI’s directorship, particularly since her experience suggested that she would be well suited to further establish and advance architectural debate in the Netherlands, attract a larger audience to the institute, and raise the NAI’s international profile. In short, Feireiss had the right experience of combining critical discussion and public presentation of architecture.

Although Feireiss was only to begin her tenure at the NAI in March 1996, she was invited to discuss her plans for the institute (as well as her thoughts on the recently completed Policy Plan) at the first Board meeting following her appointment.¹²⁸¹ In this meeting, Feireiss revealed her “Frame for the Program 1997-2000,” in which the focus of her tenure was clearly established in promoting

¹²⁷⁸ “Berlijnse Galeriehoudster Wordt Nieuwe Directeur Architectuurinstituut.” Among the several exhibitions produced by Feireiss at Aedes, the 1988 exhibition Berlin - Denkmal oder Denkmodell (Berlin – Monument or Conceptual Model) in the context of Berlin European Cultural Capital and the 1991 exhibition on Hans Poelzig for the Center Pompidou in Paris were particularly praised internationally.

¹²⁷⁹ Maandag, “Benoeming Nieuwe Directeur NAI Wekt Verbazing.”

¹²⁸⁰ Ibid. Van Berkel’s UN Studio completed in 1995 the interior renovation of a building in Eastern Berlin to accommodate a gallery and a café dubbed Aedes East.

¹²⁸¹ For a complete discussion, see Kler, “Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 19 December 1995.”

and exhibiting contemporary and international architecture. Exposure of archival material from the NAI's collections was limited to one exhibition per year with the remaining time the galleries being occupied by monographic exhibitions of international architects and thematic exhibitions associated with the annual theme. In 1997, for example, Feireiss had planned a large exhibition on J.J.P. Oud from the archives (with a lecture by Philip Johnson), as well as a monographic exhibition on Daniel Libeskind, a Summer Academy led by Wolf Prix (associated with the Summer Festival "Europe in Dialogue" dedicated to Austria), an exhibition curated by Jeffrey Kipnis, and another dedicated to Cooper Union's Architecture School.¹²⁸² In what would become a staple of her tenure, the NAI was to gain international notoriety by hosting renowned foreign architects and presenting the best of contemporary architecture.

A change of narrative was equally important for the NAI's resurgence. Having previously collaborated with several different types of media—from magazines to radio—and worked as a publicist, Feireiss was also incredibly media savvy. As soon as she took office on March 15, 1996, Feireiss initiated a media blitz to spread far and wide the message that the NAI was changing.¹²⁸³ The main message of change conveyed by Feireiss in her many interviews was based on three dominant sound bites that were continuously reproduced.¹²⁸⁴ Firstly, the NAI was "no longer exclusive to architects" as Feireiss was "opening the doors of the institute" to make it "more accessible" to a "broad public."¹²⁸⁵ Secondly, the NAI was "not a museum of art" that is "concerned

¹²⁸² Kristin Feireiss, "Frame of the Programm [sic] 1997-2000," December 19, 1995, 3, BSTU 1996. In 1997 the NAI also hosted the international conference Anyhow, but that had already been scheduled a couple of years before Feireiss was involved with the institute.

¹²⁸³ Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, "NAi Jaarverslag 1996," September 1997.

¹²⁸⁴ The implicit narrative from these interviews was that Feireiss was bringing "a breath of fresh air for the architecture institute" that would "bring the NAI to life." "Frisse Wind Door Het Architectuurinstituut in Rotterdam," *De Stem*, April 5, 1996; "Feireiss Gaat NAI Tot Leven Brengen," *Trouw*, April 4, 1996.

¹²⁸⁵ Ben Maandag, "Architectuur Niet Alleen Voor Vakgenoten," *Rotterdams Dagblad*, April 11, 1996; "Directeur Wil Toegankelijker Architectuur Instituut," *Dordtenaar*, April 4, 1996; "Architectuurinstituut Voor Breed Publiek," *Gelders GB Graafschap*, April 5, 1996.

with aesthetic or artistic aspects” but a center for architecture debate preoccupied with addressing “current problems that require solutions.”¹²⁸⁶ Thirdly, the NAI was still too unknown in architectural circles and thus needed “more internationalism” to garner visibility and exposure.¹²⁸⁷

Even as Feireiss was genuinely committed to further both critical discussion and public dissemination within the institute, the NAI Board, seemed mainly interested in how the German director could contribute to the popularization of architecture. Symbolic of the Board’s concern of form over substance, in their first discussion with Feireiss regarding how to “strengthen the image and reputation of the NAI, especially abroad,” the Board expressed more concern with the “standardization of invitations” rather than the events to which participants were actually being invited.¹²⁸⁸ In fairness to the Board, it was merely following the government’s lead and translating into the institute’s strategic planning a wider political shift in cultural subsidies that was soon revealed in the government’s cultural policy.

Titled *Aarmor or Backbone (Pantser of Ruggengraat)*, the 1997-2000 Cultural Policy revealed the government’s interest in reforming the Dutch cultural system, particularly its reliance on public support. The new Cultural Policy proclaimed that cultural institutions should no longer merely aim at improving the cultural landscape of the Netherlands, but also assist in the expansion of the Dutch economy. The title of the Policy was claimed to refer to two diverging approaches to culture. If with one approach “culture degenerate[d] into an armor against an outside world experienced as hostile” that provided safety but prevented further growth, the second approach allowed culture to create “an inner security, a backbone that allow[ed] connections without the fear of a loss of

¹²⁸⁶ “Berlijnse Benoemd Tot Directeur NAI,” *Rotterdam Pont Magazine*, Spring 1996.

¹²⁸⁷ Bernard Hulsman, “Kristin Feireiss, Nieuwe Directeur, Vindt NAI Nog Te Onbekend,” *NRC Handelsblad*, April 11, 1996.

¹²⁸⁸ Kler, “Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 19 December 1995,” 4.

identity, remaining agile and able to change.”¹²⁸⁹ Since “a society full of armors leads to suspicion, but a society of backbone culture can grow towards unity in diversity,” it was considered that “the last cultural attitude [was] far better and should be promoted by the government.”¹²⁹⁰

The distinction between these two approaches seemed to reside in the way public subsidies were disbursed, and thus the rather explicit subtext of the opposition established between “armor and backbone” referred much more aptly to the government’s vision of its own role in the cultural landscape. Specifically, the new cultural policy attempted to correct the “danger that subsidies work[ed] like an armor” and prevented cultural institutions from attracting a wide audience, by shrinking subsidies to only provide the “backbone” (or, more accurately, bare bones) for these institutions and compel them to engage and compete within the cultural market.¹²⁹¹ By having to cope with market forces and competition in order to survive, it was claimed that cultural institutions would gain efficiency and be required to become more accessible. The implication was clear: if there was no commercial interest in these artistic expressions or manifestations, then they should also not be supported by the public coffers.

The boundary between cultural and economic objectives was further blurred as the Cultural Policy indicated that cultural institutions should not only “operate more like market agents” to balance their finances, but also strive to make a profit since “with art and culture, there are many instances for money to be made.”¹²⁹² Cloaked in the argument of efficiency and responsibility, the new Cultural Policy initiated a period of unapologetic commercialization of Dutch culture. Within

¹²⁸⁹ Ministerie Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap, *Pantser of Ruggengraat: Cultuurnota 1997-2000* (The Hague: Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschappen, 1996), 4.

¹²⁹⁰ *Ibid.*

¹²⁹¹ *Ibid.*, 9.

¹²⁹² *Ibid.*, 9, 8.

this new cultural-economic context, “marketing and promotion require[d] more attention” from institutions such as the NAI.¹²⁹³

It is possible to concede that the Board consciously decided to focus the NAI’s resources in the dissemination of architecture as a strategy to ensure that the NAI could quantitatively justify the public subsidies received through the tangible number of visitors resulting from popular dissemination rather than qualitatively through the intangible improvement of the Dutch architectural climate fostered by critical discussion. It could also be conceded that only by justifying its past subsidies in a manner that was understandable and quantifiable by politicians and bureaucrats could the NAI reasonably expect to continue receiving public subsidies in the future. It is equally possible to conceive that the Board, having privileged connections to the government (after all, most of the members were appointed by either the Ministry of Culture or the Ministry of Housing), was merely anticipating the government’s application of a market model to Dutch culture.

The logic of such argument, however, is problematic at best and disingenuous at worst, since it would imply that the institute needed to be destroyed in order to be saved. If the NAI needed to forgo architectural discussion (critical or otherwise) and focus solely on the production of blockbuster exhibitions to merely entertain rather than explain, there would not be much of an institute that would be worth saving. The same could be said if the institute, for some reason, had instead decided to do without popular dissemination and become entirely dedicated to critical discussion, since, regardless of the depth and importance of the discussion, it would remain inconsequential. It was the balance of critical and popular, the combination of content and format, that sustained the NAI’s role in advancing architecture as a discipline and a profession in order to improve the architectural climate in the Netherlands.

¹²⁹³ Ibid., 9.

Instead of capitulating to the commercialization of architecture and allowing the institute's work to be *de facto* sublimated to mere presentation (as the board seemed to have done), the NAI management attempted to reconcile its ambitions and future plans with the new guidelines devised by the Ministry of Culture. As it has been previously discussed, with its own Policy Plan for the same period (still directed by Hein van Haaren), the NAI aimed to respond to the government's new "cultural concerns" and incorporate a greater focus on reaching a wider audience but combining it with a renewed emphasis on architectural research and discussion. Nevertheless, throughout the NAI's Policy Plan, there was already an underlying recurrent criticism of the government's Cultural Policy (or its principles, which had been made public), particularly its paradoxical claim at "cultural engagement and instrumental withdrawal," where culture was to become more socially engaged with the withdrawal of the central government.¹²⁹⁴

If criticism of the Cultural Policy's abstract principles was—albeit muted—already present in the institute's Policy Plan, once these principles were announced as concrete measures to reduce the public subsidy allocated to the institute, the institute's opposition to the government's plans became much more active and vocal. In contrast with its previous uncritical stance in implementing the government-directed shift towards promotion and marketing, the NAI's Board actively resisted the announced subsidy cut. After discussing the implications of the budget cuts stipulated in the Cultural Policy's application, the Board devised a strategy to oppose their implementation.¹²⁹⁵ The first phase of the plan attempted to resolve the issue through the political system by both engaging Members of Parliament, making them amenable to the NAI's plea to maintain the previous level of funding, and directly addressing Secretary of Culture A. Nuis, the responsible for the *Armor and*

¹²⁹⁴ Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, "Veranderend Landschap: NAI Beleidsplan 1997-2000," 3.

¹²⁹⁵ Annemieke de Kler, "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 17 September 1996," October 2, 1996, 3, BSTU 1996. Details of the strategy were later finalized in a meeting between Hedy d'Ancona and Kristin Feireiss. See Kristin Feireiss, "Gesprek Hedy d'Ancona En Kristin Feireiss," October 1, 1996, BSTU 1996.

Backbone Policy.¹²⁹⁶ The second phase of the plan relied on publicly denouncing the Cultural Policy in order to publicly pressure Secretary Nuis to reverse his decision. As a previous Member of Parliament and Minister of Culture, Chairwoman of the Board Hedy d'Ancona was responsible for the political defense of the institute, while Kristin Feireiss' background as a publicist was best suited to organize the NAI's public plea. Thus, while Hedy d'Ancona privately pleaded with Secretary Nuis, Kristin Feireiss organized a press conference to publicly denounce the effects of the government's Cultural Policy on the institute.¹²⁹⁷

The opposition to the government's plan was fierce, as the institute estimated the reduced basic subsidy allocated by the government to be grossly inadequate. Specifically, after covering already minimal services for the institute's fixed costs (staff, building maintenance, archive and library), there would only be 281.000 guilders left to organize all of the institute's activities. The "absurdity of the situation was further accentuated" when considering that this remaining budget was much less than what the NAI had spent in 1996 with a single exhibition.¹²⁹⁸ Therefore, the institute demanded an additional 1.7 million guilders to its basic subsidy for "the execution of exhibitions and activities at the level of 1995 and 1996," since otherwise it would be forced to effectively "close as a public institution in late 1997, and no more exhibitions and activities [would] take place."¹²⁹⁹

¹²⁹⁶ Kler, "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 17 September 1996," 3.

¹²⁹⁷ Hedy d' Ancona, "Brief Aan de Staatssecretaris van Onderwijs, Cultuur En Wetenschappen, De Heer Drs. A. Nuis," September 30, 1996, BSTU 1996; Kristin Feireiss, "Speciale Persconferentie: Toekomst Nederlands Architectuurinstituut Ernstig in Gevaar," October 8, 1996, BSTU 1996. At the same time, a petition to prevent the decrease of public funding to the institute was also launched. See Kristin Feireiss, "Voortbestaan van Het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut Mag Niet in Gevaar Komen," October 8, 1996, BSTU 1996.

¹²⁹⁸ Kristin Feireiss, "Bijlage: Toekomst Nederlands Architectuurinstituut Ernstig in Gevaar," October 8, 1996, 3, BSTU 1996. The NAI had spent 400.000 guilders with the exhibition "Netherlands to School" (*Nederland naar School*) commissioned by the Ministry of Education.

¹²⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 3, 4. Therefore, "only the archive [would] remain with the task of documenting and researching," but since the subsidy allocated was "a fraction of the amount required for [the archive] to function, it would only work at minimal capacity" with accessibility and restoration greatly compromised.

Although d’Ancona’s and Feireiss’ target audience and means of engagement differed, the message was the same: with the planned basic subsidy, “the future of the NAI [was] in grave danger.”¹³⁰⁰

The NAI’s funding crisis was resolved with the development of a new system to provide subsidies for the institute, but it also laid bare the fragility and dependency of the institute. The solution negotiated between the Ministry of Culture and the NAI relied on the institute retaining the basic subsidy from that Ministry for its everyday operations (or as former NAI director Aaron Betsky has put it, “to open its doors,”) while the funding for any other activity, event, exhibition, or publication would be assessed separately through additional applications for separate subsidies.¹³⁰¹ The new system meant that the NAI only had guaranteed funding for its basic operations and that every single activity would effectively be vetted by one or more ministries for the disbursement of its respective subsidy.

For the 1997-2000 period, the budget for the NAI’s activities required the approval of the inter-ministerial work group Architecture Platform (*Architectuurplatform*) that had been responsible for the formulation of the most recent Dutch Architectural Policy.¹³⁰² After having first met with members of the Architecture Platform to “present the institute’s program and budget,” the NAI was asked to respond (in writing) to a set of questions posed by that work group. The central question posed required, quite simply, the NAI to “provide a substantive and budgetary list of the changes

¹³⁰⁰ This was also the very expressive title of the press conference. See Feireiss, “Speciale Persconferentie: Toekomst Nederlands Architectuurinstituut Ernstig in Gevaar.”

¹³⁰¹ Aaron Betsky, interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo, audio, July 8, 2010.

¹³⁰² For the NAI, the inclusion of the Architecture Platform workgroup as an intermediary between the institute and the funding ministries was perceived as positive, since although aligned with the government’s Cultural Policy, the Architectural Policy (The Architecture of Space: Architecture Policy 1997-2000) produced by that group had stipulated an expansion of the NAI’s tasks. The Architecture Platform was comprised of representatives of the Ministry of Culture (OCW), the Ministry of Housing (VROM), the Ministry of Agriculture (LNV), and the Ministry of Transport and Water Management (VenW), and was chaired by Wytze Patijn.

compared to the Policy Plan and Budget for 1997-2000,” specifically to identify “which proposed plans/projects [had] been dropped, or pushed back.”¹³⁰³

Given that the realization of any activity organized by the institute now depended on *de facto* approval from government entities, it was unsurprising that the list provided by the NAI focused heavily on activities and programs closely identified with the government’s priorities. Accordingly, the institute’s programmatic focus was now on the development of “joint ventures” with partner institutions, the intensification of “public outreach,” the expansion of its activities dedicated to “education,” and an increased international presence through “presentations abroad” and “international conferences.”¹³⁰⁴ Beyond reiterating the continuity of programs such as the “International Masterclass” or the “Europe in Dialogue” series which had already been inspired by the government cultural policy of internationalization of Dutch culture, the NAI also proposed to initiate a “Series of Young Dutch Architects ‘Nine + One’” in 1997.¹³⁰⁵

Perhaps even more revealing than what was *in* the program was what was left *out* of it. Previous intentions to organize activities in response to current events from which the institute could develop its political and societal interventions (primarily addressing the structural conditions for architecture in the Netherlands) were now absent. The revised program was similarly lacking the previously specified activities to bolster the NAI’s engagement with historical research and advanced architectural study. Instead of a restructuring of the Study Center, the new NAI program referred only to the institute’s new affiliation protocol with the Dutch Postgraduate School for Art History (*Onderzoekschool Kunstgeschiedenis*, also known as *OSK*) where it would cooperate with the

¹³⁰³ Kristin Feireiss, “Antwoorden Op de Door Het Architectuurplatform Gestelde Vragen,” April 21, 1997, 3, BSTU 1997. The importance of this question was not only revealed by being the first question posed but also by the length of its response (more than half of the document).

¹³⁰⁴ “Joint ventures, public outreach, education, presentations abroad, [and] international conferences” were the subheadings of the NAI’s response. See *Ibid.*

¹³⁰⁵ *Ibid.*, 3–4.

“Faculties of Art History of all Dutch Universities.”¹³⁰⁶ While seemingly a minor change, it signaled a fundamental shift in the NAI’s approach to architectural research, specifically that research was no longer to be initiated by the institute but merely facilitated by it. Such shift also indicated the diminishing interest of the institute (and its director) in utilizing history to better understand the contemporary developments of the discipline. As a result, within the institute’s organizational hierarchy both the archives and the study center were neglected in favor of other, more popular, functions.

The NAI’s precarious financial condition not only revealed the institute’s financial dependence on the central government but also shattered any illusions regarding its political independence. While the NAI founders had attempted to insulate the institute from direct governmental interference by adopting an institutional model independent from state hierarchy, by controlling the institute’s funding the government wielded a powerful instrument to influence the NAI’s strategies and policies, which was becoming increasingly evident with these budget struggles.¹³⁰⁷ In short, although the institute had been organized as a “nonofficial institution” to ensure that the NAI would be “free to express opinions and fulfill a critical role” (for which political independence from the central government was a fundamental prerequisite), the financing model adopted proved to be a dormant tether to governmental control.¹³⁰⁸

The institute founders had believed that the compromise achieved with the government’s indirect presence in the institute’s leadership—as well as the widespread understanding and

¹³⁰⁶ Ibid., 6. The only exception was the “University of Groningen which [at the time had] its own research center with which the NAI already directly cooperate[d].”

¹³⁰⁷ At the foundation of the institute the compromise restricted governmental influence to the appointment of some Board members. For more on the foundation of the institute, see the previous chapter “A Public Sphere for Architecture: Creating the *Nederlands Architectuurinstituut* (1984-1994).”

¹³⁰⁸ Brouwers, “The NAI - The History of a Design Task,” 65. These comments were offered by Ruud Brouwers when describing the sober, yet fundamental, role of Jan Jessurun in establishing the NAI.

support of the institute's mission—to have been sufficient to ensure a relation based on mutual respect between political power and the institute. This, however, proved to be a rather idealistic—and to some extent naïve—assumption.

While the aptness of the institute's hybrid funding model of a private institution entirely dependent on public funds could be questioned (even when considering the ramifications of alternate models), it is more useful to understand why the funding model adopted did not produce the expected results. In hindsight, it should be clear that the problem was not so much the funding model adopted, but instead the lack of definition of its parameters, most notably, the absence of a clear set of criteria and metrics through which the performance of the institute could be continuously assessed.

When the institute was founded, its fundamental objective had been the improvement of the architectural climate in the Netherlands. Since this was a rather vague objective that could not be directly—nor easily—measured, it was never stipulated how the performance of the institute in achieving its goal would be evaluated.¹³⁰⁹ Instead, the assessment of the institute's performance relied on an implicit understanding of the NAI's role as an enabler of architecture's renewed cultural standing, an understanding which was never explicitly codified in collaboration or funding agreements.¹³¹⁰ The lack of clear assessment criteria allowed successive governmental cabinets and officials to unilaterally determine what constituted the adequate application of the NAI's public subsidy and how its impact should be measured. Therefore, although the NAI founders' lapse to

¹³⁰⁹ Beyond the absence of any document within the NAI's archive identifying the criteria for assessing the institute's performance, the lack of criteria was also confirmed by former Minister of Culture Elco Brinkman, the NAI's first director Adri Duivesteijn, and Ruud Brouwers. Brinkman, interview; Adri Duivesteijn, interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo, audio, January 17, 2011; Brouwers, interview.

¹³¹⁰ The definition of objective criteria to assess the NAI's impact (as well as other organizations active in the Dutch architectural cultural landscape) remains elusive today, as indicated in the evaluation of the Dutch national policy of architecture. See Nicis Institute and Platform 31, "Bouwen Op Een Sterk Fundament: Een Tussenevaluatie van Het Architectuurbeleid," September 2012.

define evaluating criteria for the institute only became problematic once the institute's original political supporters were replaced by new officials, I would argue that this lapse constituted the 'original sin' for the radical transformation of the institute.

It was the absence of clearly established criteria for assessing the NAI's impact and justify the government's continued (financial and political) support that enabled public officials to impose their own vision of what the NAI should be striving to become and what it should be attempting to affect. Moreover, as activities that did not conform to the government's policies (or that openly questioned them) had virtually no chance of being funded, the NAI also internalized a degree of self-censorship.¹³¹¹ Thus, the government not only exerted a close oversight of the institute, but effectively directed its engagement.

The most notorious shift pertained the NAI's focus and objectives, as its original intentions to affect the culture of Dutch architecture were displaced by the government's pragmatic, economic concerns. If the NAI had originally been founded to reveal the cultural dimension of the economic activity that had become Dutch architecture, the new governmental oversight seemed intent on exploring the economic possibilities of Dutch architecture's improving cultural standing. This was a particular defining moment for the NAI, since the budget crisis allowed the government to redefine the success of the institute in economic rather than cultural achievements.

The funding crisis instituted a new framework for the relation between the NAI and the government, one where the institute's subservience to the will of the central government could no longer be repudiated. This fundamental shift in the power structure between the NAI and the government is perhaps best illustrated by the contrast between the assurances offered in 1983 to

¹³¹¹ This is perhaps best demonstrated in the discrepancy between the NAI original 1997-2000 activities plan and the revised version submitted for approval of the Architecture Platform.

the merging organizations forming the NAI that the institute “would not be a mouthpiece for the government” and Kristin Feireiss’ 1997 offer to use the NAI’s building as the *actual* mouthpiece of the government, when she proposed that the NAI’s supporting ministries could “make use of the institute [building] for the presentations of their policies.”¹³¹²

The 1997 funding crisis became, therefore, one of the most significant turning points in the history of the institute, substantially altering the NAI’s institutional dynamic and conditioning the institute’s development in subsequent years. Both the increased preoccupation with the economic dimension and the popular dissemination of architecture can be traced back to this defining moment in the life of the institute.

From Critical Discussion to Projective Exhibition

The shift in the NAI’s policies also affected the institute’s conceptual framework and basic approach to architecture. If originally the NAI’s strategy to improve architectural climate in the Netherlands had been based on facilitating architectural discussion, in this new chapter, its primary focus was expanding architectural presentation. The contrast between both approaches was best illustrated by the discourse and practice pursued by the two directors Adri Duivesteijn and Kristin Feireiss. While Duivesteijn had identified the organization of inclusive architectural discussion as the core function of the institute, Feireiss believed public presentation of architecture to be the NAI’s primary function. This is not to say that either Duivesteijn or Feireiss did not value both

¹³¹² Werkgroep WVC-VR0M, “Verslag van Het Gesprek Met Het SAM.” For more on the preparatory discussions, see the previous chapter “A Public Sphere for Architecture: Creating The *Nederlands Architectuurinstituut* (1984-1994).” Kristin Feireiss, “Brief Aan de Heer Prof. Ir. W. Patijn, Voorzitter Architectuurplatform,” April 23, 1997, BSTU 1997. Feireiss specifically mentioned the Ministry of Culture, Education, and Science (*OCW*), the Ministry of Housing, Spatial Planning, and Environment (*VR0M*), the Ministry of Agriculture, Nature and Fisheries (*LNV*), and the Ministry of Transport, Public Works and Water (*V&W*), the same ministries which had been involved with the Architecture Platform Workgroup.

discussion and presentation, merely that they both tended to favor one over the other, which was also reflected on the NAI's changing conceptual framework.

Duivesteijn's position was clearly presented in a 1993 text aptly titled "The Architecture Debate: A Declaration of Intent."¹³¹³ In it, Duivesteijn claimed that the NAI was to primarily become a common platform for discussion where different positions could be engaged. This was intended to invert the current condition in which no real debate was possible given that too many cross discussions failed to communicate, in a cacophony that only favored confusion. Therefore, Duivesteijn considered that the NAI could "initiate and lend form to the debate, by offering a forum, by inviting the interested parties and challenging them to speak to each other, by formulating material for the debate, by remaining alert to misunderstandings and differences in language which disrupt communication."¹³¹⁴ Effectively, the NAI intended to become the facilitator and stimulator of architecture debate.

The central position of critical discussion in the NAI's activities and organization was further established by Duivesteijn's description of the institute. Specifically, Duivesteijn claimed that the combination of different functions ("archive, library, study centre, museum, publisher, stimulator, forum for debate and producer of an architectural magazine") opened up "untold possibilities . . . for an integrated forum for architecture" in which critical discussion could be bolstered by different means of engagement.¹³¹⁵

There were several instances that illustrated the primacy of discussion over presentation in the early years of the NAI, but no other caused as much impact as the 1995 debate of the government's

¹³¹³ This text constituted Duivesteijn's contribution to a volume dedicated to the Netherlands Architecture Institute in celebration of the inauguration of the NAI's new building in Rotterdam.

¹³¹⁴ Adri Duivesteijn, "The Architecture Debate: A Declaration of Intent," in *The Netherlands Architecture Institute*, trans. Robyn de Jong-Dalziel (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1993), 19.

¹³¹⁵ Adri Duivesteijn, "To the Reader," *Archis*, no. 1 (1993): 10.

plan to resolve the Netherlands' chronic housing shortage by suburban expansion.¹³¹⁶ In assisting the debate, Adriaan Geuze's installed "an enormous model of eight hundred thousand small individual houses on the floor of the arcade of the Netherlands Architecture Institute" which formed "an almost endless sea of houses so vast that the individual layout of the parts was completely submerged in the whole."¹³¹⁷ With such a clear visualization of the problem at hand, the NAI and Geuze were providing a materiality to abstract numbers that facilitated discussion. Thus, for Duivestijn (and the early NAI), critical discussion was the fundamental function of the institute, which was to be stimulated and supported by public presentation in the form of exhibitions and publications.

Conversely, Feireiss believed public presentation of architecture to be the NAI's leading function and the organization of critical discussion to be its supporting endeavor. Feireiss' enthusiasm for the public presentation of architecture—specifically architecture exhibitions and installations—was such that, to commemorate the end of her directorship in 2001, Feireiss edited a book titled *The Art of Architecture Exhibitions*.¹³¹⁸ The volume served not only to present an overview of the most significant exhibitions organized at the NAI during Feireiss' tenure, but also for Feireiss to extoll the centrality of public presentation over critical discussion. Upon declaring her personal belief that "contemporary architecture museums have both a cultural and a social mission," Feireiss described how architecture exhibitions were fundamental in achieving them.¹³¹⁹

¹³¹⁶ The impact of this event was such that its graphics were used to illustrate the NAI's yearly report. The government's plan became known as VINEX, since it was stipulated in the Fourth Memorandum for Spatial Planning (*Vierde Nota Ruimtelijke Ordening*), particularly with its attachment that defined the areas for expansion (*Vierde Nota Extra*).

¹³¹⁷ Bart Lootsma, "Synthetic Regionalization: The Dutch Landscape Toward a Second Modernity," in *Recovering Landscape: Essays in Contemporary Landscape Architecture*, ed. James Corner (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999), 255.

¹³¹⁸ Kristin Feireiss, ed., *The Art of Architecture Exhibitions* (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 2001).

¹³¹⁹ It was also revealing of Feireiss' position regarding the importance of presentation over discussion her continued use of the term "architecture museum" rather than "architecture institute." For a thorough discussion on the evolution of both terms in the Netherlands, see chapter 3, "Museum Or Institute: From

By combining “information, confrontation, provocation, stimulation and entertainment,” exhibitions not only informed visitors on the different dimensions of architecture but also created “a dialogue and emotional rapport between people and an architectural object.”¹³²⁰ To that end, Feireiss was greatly interested in a “new genre of architecture exhibition: the architectural installation.”¹³²¹

According to Feireiss, architecture exhibitions allowed a renewed understanding of architecture to both architectural circles and the general public, primarily by “plac[ing] architecture in a different context,” revealing common elements, and making comparisons possible.¹³²² However, it was only by doing so “in the most imaginative, vivid, impressive, and emotive way possible,” that these exhibitions and installations elicited an “overwhelming” public reaction.¹³²³

Chief among these architecture installations were the monographic exhibitions curated by Kristin Feireiss. The steel construction for *Daniel Libeskind: Beyond the Wall, 26.36°*, which transformed the NAI exhibition hall into a fragment of the spiral maze designed by Libeskind for the extension of the Victoria & Albert Museum in London, and the installation of *Silent Collisions: Morphosis at Work*, which formalized the negotiation between tectonic and transitory forces in a

Projective to Reflective and Back Again (1912-1983).” A version of Feireiss’ text had already been published in 1998, in the second edition of a book dedicated to the NAI, specifically replacing the original text in which Duivesteijn had previously declared the “architecture debate” as the primary function of the NAI. This second edition was published in celebration of the NAI’s tenth anniversary. Beyond the replacement of Duivesteijn’s text, this edition also included a contribution by the Head of Collections, Mariet Willinge, a brief introduction to the institute’s educational activities and semi-permanent exhibition, as well as some significant edits to Ruud Brouwers text chronicling the process of establishing the NAI. See Robyn de Jong-Dalziel, trans., *The Netherlands Architecture Institute* (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1998).

¹³²⁰ Kristin Feireiss, “It’s Not About Art,” in *The Art of Architecture Exhibitions* (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 2001), 9, 10.

¹³²¹ *Ibid.*, 11.

¹³²² *Ibid.*, 9.

¹³²³ *Ibid.*, 9, 13.

slowly moving hydraulic wing constantly shifting the space, caused the greatest impression on the NAI's public.¹³²⁴

Beyond ideological, Feireiss' partiality towards architecture exhibitions was also pragmatic. Specifically, she understood that the public responded enthusiastically to the "skillful combination of both information and enjoyment" patent in these installations, and that "the increasing number of visitors and the positive media reception made it easier for [the NAI] to continue to pursue radical and cutting-edge exhibition concepts" by justifying its public subsidies through the increased attendance.¹³²⁵

The expansion of architecture's—and inherently the institute's—audience had been a common goal for both Feireiss and Duivesteijn. Both directors advocated and pursued a strategy of inclusion, in which "the knowledge confined to the [architectural] experts [was to] be disseminated in broader circles," opening up the NAI to a wider public and stimulating interest in architecture across a diverse audience of "people of all ages with different levels of education and different interests."¹³²⁶ However, governmental officials supervising the NAI had criticized the strategy of critical discussion and scholarly research pursued by the institute by implying that it was overly concerned with architecture insiders (architects, scholars, students) and promoted an elitist conception of architecture that prevented the general public's engagement.¹³²⁷ Effectively, the

¹³²⁴ Daniel Libeskind's exhibition was installed at the NAI between September 6 and November 23, 1997, while the monographic exhibition of Morphosis' was open to the public between September 4, 1999 and January 16, 2000. Previous to these exhibitions, Kristin Feireiss already had a good working relation with both Daniel Libeskind and Thom Mayne, as both had organized several exhibitions at Feireiss' gallery in Berlin.

¹³²⁵ Feireiss, "It's Not About Art," 13.

¹³²⁶ Duivesteijn, "The Architecture Debate: A Declaration of Intent," 14; Kristin Feireiss, "Policy and Building," in *The Netherlands Architecture Institute*, trans. Robyn de Jong-Dalziel (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1998), 8.

¹³²⁷ This assumption, however, was refuted by the results of the 1994 public survey on the institute's public which had revealed that although the NAI was perceived as "elitist" by some respondents (41%), it was also overwhelmingly considered to be openly accessible by most (66%). In fact, the survey also seemed to validate the NAI's approach to garnering interest in architecture, with a majority of respondents describing

government's new cultural guidelines equated the expansion of the NAI's—and other cultural institutions'—audiences with popularization through public presentation.

The contrast between the two directors' approach to developing the NAI was also the contrast between idealism and pragmatism, between idealized conditions and the *realpolitik* of operating an architecture institute so dependent on public funding. Such distinction between both approaches anticipated what would in following years become a “significant divergence appearing in the territory of contemporary [architectural] theory,” namely the increasing challenge to the concept of “a critical architecture” by the emergence of the contrasting idea of “projective architecture.”¹³²⁸

The notion of “criticality” in architecture has been associated with a neo-Marxist approach in which architecture should “self-consciously manipulate[e] codes in order to evoke a consciousness of existing preconceptions,” or “lifting the veil of an illusory reality.”¹³²⁹ Therefore, the lineage of “criticality” in architecture had been primarily identified in the work and writings of Peter Eisenman and K. Michael Hays, particularly in their understanding of Manfredo Tafuri's project of ‘resistance.’¹³³⁰ While in the 1980s and 1990s the theoretical notion of criticality “changed the practice of architecture,” at the turn of the century it had “lost touch and no longer [had] any consequence for the practice of architecture.”¹³³¹ In its stead, a more pragmatic ‘sensitivity’ to

the institute as “fascinating” (83%) and “surprising” (69%). While a detailed study, its methodology prevented any significant extrapolations, since the sample used for the survey was restricted to people who were already visiting the institute and thus did not gauge how the institute was perceived by the public at large. See, Eikenaar, “NAi En Het Publiek,” 21.

¹³²⁸ Baird, “‘Criticality’ and Its Discontents,” 16.

¹³²⁹ Lara Schrijver, “Architecture: Projective, Critical, or Craft?,” in *Internationales Bauhaus-Kolloquium 2009* (Weimar: Bauhaus-Universität Weimar, 2011), 354. This revolved around societal conditions, namely by “revealing oppressions and preconceptions that perpetuate our unequal divisions of power and affluence, in particular in the contemporary conditions of late capitalism.”

¹³³⁰ Theodor Adorno, Fredric Jameson, and others have also been recognized as influences in the definition of criticality in architecture. For a concise, yet thorough, account of the lineage of both “critical architecture” and its “projective” counterpart, see Baird, “‘Criticality’ and Its Discontents.”

¹³³¹ Michael Speaks, “Theory Was Interesting... But Now We Have Work,” *Arq: Architectural Research Quarterly* 6, no. 03 (2002): 209.

architecture began to emerge, one in which frontal resistance was displaced by subversive compliance as first articulated by Michael Speaks and later by Robert Somol and Sarah Whiting.¹³³² Instead of “looking back or criticizing the status quo,” projective architecture (as it became known) “project[ed] forward alternative (not necessarily oppositional) arrangements or scenarios.”¹³³³ Projective architecture thus signaled a retreat from critical theory and a return to the architectural object “driven by a new relationship between thinking and doing in architecture.”¹³³⁴

Much like critical architecture, critical discussion at the NAI had attempted to reveal and resist established preconceptions through the use of dialectics.¹³³⁵ Much like critical architecture, the organization of critical discussion in the NAI was increasingly perceived as arcane, convoluted, and obsolete. And much like critical architecture, the NAI-organized critical discussion was increasingly opposed by a new form of architectural thinking that incorporated—and was based on—a notion of pragmatism.

But while the rise of projective architecture was presented by its proponents as a response to the trappings of criticality, the post-critical approach of the growing prominence of public presentation at the NAI was a direct result of the changing context for the institute’s funding. If projective architecture acknowledged and accepted the many contingencies of reality, the NAI’s

¹³³² In these emerging sensibilities there was a conflation of two slightly distinct positions, as Speaks primarily identified the demise of theory in architecture and inherently of “criticality” as its dominant expression, while Somol and Whiting claimed that criticality was being displaced by another form of theoretical construction that was more apt at understanding and revealing an increasingly complex reality. Since both positions found their basis in a form of realism and pragmatism, they have here been combined under the banner of “projective architecture.”

¹³³³ Robert Somol and Sarah Whiting, “Notes around the Doppler Effect and Other Moods of Modernism,” *Perspecta* 33 (2002): 75.

¹³³⁴ Speaks, “Versioning,” 4. In this schism, Baird also identified a generational gap within (American) architectural circles. See Baird, “‘Criticality’ and Its Discontents,” 18.

¹³³⁵ The influence of Manfredo Tafuri’s conceptual framework for historical practice (particularly the notion of continuous dialectic between design and historical practice) has been previously argued in this dissertation. See the section “Criticality in the Architecture Museum” in chapter 4, “Towards an Architecture Institute (1978-1983).”

revised focus on public presentation accepted the limitations inherent to its funding and the neo-liberal demands of the Dutch government attitude towards culture.

Nevertheless, Feireiss' intent for the NAI's exhibition program still shared several attributes with projective architecture. Rather than resist the economic orientation and the (perceived) limitations of public presentation imposed by the government, Feireiss' exhibition program attempted to use those limitations to stimulate new forms of criticism and discussion. In fact, the new economic-oriented presentation at the NAI accompanied the emerging trend of new criticism and also attempted to "capitalize on its engagement with commodity culture to make history and theory contemporary and to give architecture more value, not less."¹³³⁶ Ultimately, in their combination of information and entertainment and their emphasis on experience, the NAI architectural installations were "cool, easy, and never look[ed] like work."¹³³⁷ They were but another expression of "projective architecture."

The resurgence of pragmatism and realism in architecture discourse and practice was also indelibly associated with Dutch architecture culture. Just as the notion of post-critical, pragmatic, projective architecture was increasingly discussed and accepted in American architecture circles, it seemed to identify principles of an architectural practice that was already occurring in the Netherlands.

As early as 1995, as editor of the *Architecture in the Netherlands Yearbook*, Hans van Dijk noted the emerging "shared stance . . . of the aestheticisation of the pragmatic" and aversion "to philosophical pretensions or intellectual affectation" in Dutch architecture.¹³³⁸ Although

¹³³⁶ Sylvia Lavin, "The Newest 'New' Criticism," *Log*, no. 3 (October 1, 2004): 80.

¹³³⁷ Somol and Whiting, "Notes around the Doppler Effect and Other Moods of Modernism," 76.

¹³³⁸ Hans van Dijk, "On Stagnation and Innovation: Commentary on a Selection," in *Architecture in the Netherlands: Yearbook 1994-1995* (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1995), 144.

acknowledging this emerging condition to be rather embryonic, Van Dijk identified its main principles which—similarly to what would later be identified as ‘projective architecture’—included a “renewed attention to the programme” and “the intelligent exploitation of forces which influence the practice of architecture and building.”¹³³⁹ Despite the similarities, these architects were “not theorizing their work as ‘projective;’ rather they [were] practicing and making in ways that fit the projective concept.”¹³⁴⁰ Furthermore, both Van Dijk’s early identification of the yet unnamed ‘projective architecture’ and most—if not all—later proponents of projective architecture identified the clearest expression of this novel architectural practice in the work of OMA, Rem Koolhaas’ Rotterdam-based office.¹³⁴¹

The notion that pragmatic realism was a significant force in Dutch architecture culture became particularly visible internationally with the, now famous, publication of Bart Lootsma’s *SuperDutch: New Architecture in the Netherlands*.¹³⁴² In this volume, Lootsma attempted to define the pragmatic

¹³³⁹ Ibid., 151–152. Van Dijk also described as main principles of this condition “a non-aesthetic stance to avoid the stupor of stylistic connoisseurship,” and the “formal renewal through absorption of powers and insights outside one’s own discipline.”

¹³⁴⁰ Roemer van Toorn, “No More Dreams? The Passion for Reality in Recent Dutch Architecture...and Its Limitations,” *Harvard Design Magazine*, no. 21 (Fall-Winter 2004): 25. Nevertheless, in the later refinement of Van Dijk’s observation, Roemer van Toorn identified three distinct forms of projective practice in the Netherlands, namely ‘projective autonomy,’ ‘projective *mise-en-scène*,’ and ‘projective naturalization.’ Accordingly, “while projective autonomy is interested in form—what the aesthetic by its own means is able to communicate—the projective *mise-en-scène* seeks the creation of theatrical situations, and projective naturalization seeks strictly instrumental and operational systems.” Ibid., 26.

¹³⁴¹ See Somol and Whiting, “Notes around the Doppler Effect and Other Moods of Modernism”; Baird, “‘Criticality’ and Its Discontents.” Koolhaas was associated with this new condition, not only by his body of design work, but primarily by his remark identifying OMA with a surfer on the waves of free-market global capitalism, in which he claimed that although these waves were uncontrollable, it was always possible to know how to make use of them and how to go against the current.

¹³⁴² *SuperDutch* was first published in Dutch by SUN (publishers), but it became an international phenomenon with its German edition and its publication in English by Princeton Architectural Press. Lootsma was greatly criticized (including by some of the architects in his book, most notably by Rem Koolhaas) for the title of the book, namely the use of the prefix Super. However, Lootsma was using that prefix not in its commonly understood sense, but as a reference to the definition of a globalized contemporary moment posited by French sociologist Marc Augé as “Supermodernity” which had been recently adapted to architecture by Hans Ibelings. See, Marc Augé, *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity* (London: Verso, 1995); Hans Ibelings, *Supermodernism: Architecture in the Age of Globalization*, trans. Robin de Jong-Dalziel, Fascinations (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 2002).

moment in Dutch architecture by describing its “second modernity,” which he directly associated with the conflation of international forces of global capital and a re-evaluation of the “Dutch qualities of realism and *Sachlichkeit* (matter-of-factness).”¹³⁴³ With this introductory essay, Lootsma intended to contextualize the work of the twelve architecture offices presented in the book, since despite the obvious formal distinctions of their designs, “a certain common signature [could] be detected among” them.¹³⁴⁴ Rather than form, these offices shared a method—a method based on mapping external conditions affecting architecture (primarily in diagrams) and then translate them into their built work.

The theme of pragmatism and acceptance of reality was not limited to the twelve offices featured in *SuperDutch*. Lootsma argued that the reason for “so many interesting developments in Dutch architecture during the [previous] ten years [was] not just a sudden outbreak of talent,” but rather the result of “unquestionably better opportunities.”¹³⁴⁵ Thus, Lootsma also identified an entire new generation of Dutch architects already using a similar vocabulary and creating designs that reflected the social-political context of deregulation and a newfound individualization. Also for this new generation, acceptance of reality—particularly the conditions created by the free-market—was a basic common element as they embraced greater degrees of “freedom and adventure” and rejection of formal design in their work.¹³⁴⁶

¹³⁴³ Lootsma, “The Second Modernity of Dutch Architecture,” 9.

¹³⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 24. The twelve featured architecture offices were (by order of appearance): Wiel Arets, UN Studio, Erick van Egeraat, Atelier van Lieshout, Mecanoo, MVRDV, Neuteligs Riedijk, NOX, Office for Metropolitan Architecture (OMA), Oosterhuis.nl, Koen van Velsen, and West 8.

¹³⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 9.

¹³⁴⁶ Bart Lootsma, “Amnesty for the Real World,” in *SuperDutch: New Architecture in the Netherlands* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2000), 251.

Selling Architecture

Lootsma's book both signaled and enhanced the growing interest in Dutch architecture from international circles. However, the international perception of Dutch architecture was, even if indirectly, crafted by the NAI's activities. The continuity of the NAI's promotional efforts in Lootsma's assessment of Dutch architecture was both explicit and implicit. Explicit, since several of the offices selected by the NAI to the travelling exhibition *Nine + One* (one of the anchors of the NAI's program for the promotion of young Dutch architects) were featured in Lootsma's book.¹³⁴⁷ Implicit, since Lootsma's characterization of the contemporary moment of Dutch architecture echoed the argument advanced by the NAI's exhibition and accompanying book.¹³⁴⁸

In the foreword to the book, Kristin Feireiss claimed that what "unite[d] the participants in the '*Nine + One*' series most of all [was] an analytic approach" in which "architectonic form [was] the result of a design strategy and not of stylistic idiom."¹³⁴⁹ The same idea was expanded in the two essays by Christoph Grafe and Michael Speaks. While Grafe claimed the work presented at the exhibition to portray a cross-section of a moment of Dutch architecture devoid of rhetoric, Speaks discussed the context for the emergence of this work, which he characterized as occupying a new space between pragmatism and utopia, between a market and a public model.¹³⁵⁰ Both agreed that

¹³⁴⁷ Max 1, MVRDV, NL Architects, NOX, and Buro Schie were both introduced by *Nine + One* and celebrated in *SuperDutch*. Bosch Haslett, Marx & Steketee, Endry van Velzen De Nijl, VMX Architects, and René van Zuuk were the other offices introduced by *Nine + One*.

¹³⁴⁸ Although both arguments were based on earlier discussions regarding the reevaluation of the relation between contemporary architectural practice and Dutch modernist legacy including the 1990 symposium *How Modern is Dutch Architecture?* organized by Rem Koolhaas and the Dutch participation in the 1991 Venice Biennale entitled *Modernism without Dogma* organized by the NAI, the continuity and refinement of the argument from *Nine + One* and *SuperDutch* is undeniable.

¹³⁴⁹ Kristin Feireiss, "Foreword," in *Nine + One: Ten Young Dutch Architectural Offices* (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1997), 7.

¹³⁵⁰ During this period, Speaks lived for several months at a time in the Netherlands and became particularly close with the group of (primarily) architects associated with the magazine *Wiederhall*, namely Mathijs Bouw of One Architecture, Kamiel Klaasse of NL Architects, Riens Dijkstra of Max 1 (currently named Maxwan) and Wouter Vanstiphout of Crimson Architectural Historians.

these offices were much more interested in exploring the limits of architecture through a co-option of external forces and were “allergic to ideology, and to the self-consciously critical, resistant, or theoretical architectural stances.”¹³⁵¹

Nine + One became an important marker in the development of Dutch architecture, not only in launching the international careers of emerging Dutch talent, but also in the construction and dissemination of Dutch architecture’s well-crafted image for the consumption of an international audience. In hindsight, the significance of the exhibition is recognized by both architects involved and critics. When discussing the perceived decline of Dutch architecture in a special edition in 2005, the Dutch journal *OASE* posited that the *Nine + One* exhibition should be considered a “publicity initiative” that “marked the climax in the celebration of 1990s Dutch architecture.”¹³⁵² Therefore, they not only interviewed Kristin Feireiss (the only former NAI director to be featured) but also organized a reflection of the legacy of *Nine + One*.¹³⁵³ For the architects involved, the exhibition had a direct impact. NL Architects, for example, considered it “a crucial opportunity,” having even “triggered the renaming of the office.”¹³⁵⁴ The significance attributed to the exhibition becomes

¹³⁵¹ Speaks, “Just There Modernism: A Fresh New Approach,” 23. Since Michael Speaks’ contribution that initiated the debate of post-critical, projective architecture in American circles was closely aligned with his description of recent Dutch architecture in *Nine + One*, it would be possible to contend that both projective architectural practice and projective architectural discourse had their origins in the Netherlands.

¹³⁵² Christoph Grafe, “Eight Years After Nine +One: A Conversation between Mark Linnemann, Matthijs Bouw, Mechthild Stuhlmacher and Christoph Grafe,” *OASE*, no. 67, *After the Party: Dutch Architecture 2005* (2005): 81.

¹³⁵³ There were four participants in this discussion, namely Mechthild Stuhlmacher from *OASE*, Christof Grafe, who had contributed with an essay to the exhibition’s catalogue and edited this special edition of *OASE*, Mark Linneman a former partner of NL Architects, and Matthijs Bouw founder and principal of One Architecture. Although One Architecture had not been presented in the exhibition, its absence had been rather surprising and widely noted, with the “insider joke” at the time being that the exhibition should not have been named Nine + One, but rather Eleven – One in reference to the absence of that office from the travelling exhibition. Kamiel Klaasse, interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo, audio, January 17, 2011; Michael Speaks, interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo, audio, July 7, 2010.

¹³⁵⁴ Klaasse, interview. Previous to the exhibition, NL Architects had been collaborating under the banner of LEGO Architects.

even clearer when it is taken into consideration that in that period, NL Architects had also won one of the Dutch European competitions for young architects.¹³⁵⁵

The value of such a crucial opportunity was also widely understood by Michael Speaks. For Speaks, the formidable promotion of new architecture in the Netherlands constituted “parcels of seed capital,” since “study commissions [were] business plans-in-formation, and publications, exhibitions, and conferences offer[ed] unique marketing opportunities.”¹³⁵⁶ Furthermore, Speaks noted that the “Dutch welfare state [was] becoming confluent with the very market it was presumed to resist, transforming all that was once public subsidy into a vibrant new market condition.”¹³⁵⁷ Without ever uttering the NAI’s name, Speaks’ comment aptly described the resulting condition of the institute’s growing obfuscation between cultural and economic aspirations.

The specific apprehension regarding the obfuscation of cultural and economic interests within the NAI concerned the increasing spectacle of the architecture exhibitions and installations organized by the institute did not advance architecture but were merely a device to attract ever increasing visitors to its galleries. This condition posed a real threat that the spectacle of these exhibitions could “become an economic end in itself, rather than either a cultural or social critique” of the work on display.¹³⁵⁸ A similar concern was also emerging with the educational component of architecture exhibitions since the political pressure exerted to expand these activities did not aim

¹³⁵⁵ NL Architects won the Dutch European IV with the project Pixel City, an alternative strategy for VINEX locations which was never built.

¹³⁵⁶ Speaks, “Just There Modernism: A Fresh New Approach,” 18.

¹³⁵⁷ Ibid. Speaks also became an indirect beneficiary of the system to promote Dutch architecture abroad, namely as he was asked to curate an exhibition on Dutch architecture sponsored by the Dutch government. The exhibition *Big, Soft, Orange* travelled throughout the US (mostly in academic settings), allowing Speaks to “situate himself in an innovative position” and serving “the marketing purpose” of promoting new Dutch architecture. For a discussion of *Big, Soft, Orange*, see Scott Colman, “The Architectural Narrative: On Michael Speaks’ Ruminations on a ‘Big, Soft, Orange,’” *Architectural Theory Review: Journal of the Department of Architecture* 5, no. 2 (November 2000): 112–127.

¹³⁵⁸ Lootsma, “Forgotten Worlds, Possible Worlds,” 22–23.

to “develop any educational role itself, but to broaden the public reach of institutions by appealing to a younger audience.”¹³⁵⁹ In short, by focusing so heavily on the public presentation of architecture and overlooking (critical) discussion, the NAI risked becoming an uncritical, empty vessel for promotion, marketing, and propaganda. This was a significant change, since it was becoming increasingly accepted that the NAI’s mission was not the improvement of the Dutch architectural climate and cultural context, but instead the advancement of economic opportunities.

In 2003, using an admittedly provocative tone, the Head of both Publications and of History and Theory program at the Berlage Institute, Roemer van Toorn declared that there was no such thing as architectural criticism in the Netherlands in a lecture titled “Critique = Propaganda.”¹³⁶⁰ Specifically, Van Toorn argued that “not only did critics help to create a ‘SuperDutch’ condition,” but that they were also “part of a propaganda machinery in advocating, promoting and installing the idea of the SuperDutch through government policies, publications, exhibitions, congresses, research, polemics, and the like.”¹³⁶¹ Even though Somol and Whiting had claimed that “setting out this projective program [did] not necessarily entail a capitulation to market forces” but rather a reorganization of “multiple economies, ecologies, information systems, and social groups,” it still promoted and required a certain complicity with subjects and given conditions.¹³⁶² In the Netherlands, the promotion of the projective SuperDutch architecture demanded a specific

¹³⁵⁹ Ibid., 24.

¹³⁶⁰ The lecture served as introductory remarks to the public discussion “Critici aan het woord” about the role of critics in contemporary Dutch architecture organized by ARCAM, the Amsterdam Architecture Center in January 15, 2003. A couple of years later, an adapted version, translated to English was published in *Hunch*.

¹³⁶¹ Roemer van Toorn, “Critique = Propaganda: The Role of Critics in the Netherlands,” *Hunch: The Berlage Institute Report*, no. 10 (2006): 22. Van Toorn also identified and described the profile of the most usual forms of contemporary architectural critic, which he dubbed “ghostwriter, launcher, ambassador, informer, researcher, journalist, and double agent.” Van Toorn considered that although “no longer critical,” these different positions “demonstrate[d] particularly intelligent and creative mode of mediation” that assisted in the discussion of architecture. Ibid., 24.

¹³⁶² Somol and Whiting, “Notes around the Doppler Effect and Other Moods of Modernism,” 77.

approach from critics, “one that could help [architects] communicate with the public and embrace free market economy.”¹³⁶³

Even as the NAI had attempted to continue to advance architecture through public presentation, there was no question that it was increasingly complicit with the government’s propaganda. While the NAI still pursued the cultural advancement associated with the presentation of Dutch architecture, the government perceived this as privileged business opportunities to garner building commissions. In short, while the NAI continued developing the cultural benefits of the public presentation of architecture, the government was more interested in the economic advantages that could result from it. Although it was in Kristin Feireiss’ tenure that the funding of the institute was first associated with the promotion and economic advance of Dutch architecture, the full manifestation of that condition only emerged in the tenure of her successor, Aaron Betsky.

In May of 2000, Feireiss announced to the Board that she would be stepping down from her position as director in one year’s time, when she would complete five years at the head of the NAI.¹³⁶⁴ Having learned from its experience in appointing previous directors, the Board immediately started planning a “soft transition” by discussing the profile of the new director not only internally, but also with NAI’s Workers Council and the consulting agency P-Overleg-Team. From these discussions, it was agreed that the new director should have a vision to expand the “current policy and internationalization,” but should also pay closer attention to the NAI’s collection.¹³⁶⁵

¹³⁶³ Toorn, “Critique = Propaganda: The Role of Critics in the Netherlands,” 22.

¹³⁶⁴ Annemieke de Kler, “Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 29 Mei 2000,” June 10, 2000, 4, BSTU 2000. Upon stepping down from the NAI, Kristin Feireiss became fully involved with establishing and organizing the first International Architecture Biennale NL in Rotterdam, now commonly known as IABR.

¹³⁶⁵ Annemieke de Kler, “Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 5 September 2000,” September 17, 2000, 4, BSTU 2000.

By the end of January 2001, the Board considered the selection process complete with the appointment of the American architect and art historian Aaron Betsky.¹³⁶⁶ At the time, Betsky was the “curator of architecture, design and digital projects” at the San Francisco Museum of Modern Art (SFMOMA) and had previously been “the *Los Angeles Times* architecture critic” and “authored several books on architecture.”¹³⁶⁷ Equally important, Betsky had “grown up in the Netherlands,” was “fully fluent in Dutch,” and had “a particular interest in Dutch architecture and its history.”¹³⁶⁸

Betsky did not disappoint in continuing to develop the NAI’s strategy of internationalization. During the five and a half years of his tenure, the NAI became even more famous in international architecture circles. But if during Feireiss’ tenure the focus of the NAI’s strategy had been to host foreign architects and feature different countries at the NAI, during Betsky’s tenure the promotion of Dutch architecture abroad became the primary concern in the institute’s international activities.

The strategic decision to emphasize the promotion of Dutch architecture abroad in the NAI’s program had, once again, its basis in the institute’s funding model. As it had been established in 1997, funding for the NAI’s basic operations were based on the institute’s four-year policy plans, but as Betsky admitted, “that money [was] only barely enough to keep the doors open.”¹³⁶⁹ For any other activity, “the institute [had to] make special requests to separate funds.”¹³⁷⁰

During Betsky’s tenure, the most prolific grant provider to the NAI was *HGIS (Homogene Groep Internationale Samenwerking* or, Homogenous Budget for International Cooperation), a separate

¹³⁶⁶ Continuing the practice first established with Feireiss’ appointment, the discussions of the Selection Committee and its recurrent updates to the Board remained secret and were not included in the reports of the Board’s meetings.

¹³⁶⁷ “Hollandse Amerikaan Aaron Betsky Directeur van Het NAI,” *NRC Handelsblad*, February 1, 2001.

¹³⁶⁸ “Aaron Betsky Wil NAI in Rotterdam Verder Uitbouwen,” *Het Financieele Dagblad*, February 1, 2001.

¹³⁶⁹ Aaron Betsky and Adam Eeuwens, “The Solace of Subsidies,” in *False Flat: Why Dutch Design Is so Good* (London: Phaidon, 2004), 274.

¹³⁷⁰ *Ibid.*

budget from the central government's budget combining "the foreign policy budgets of individual ministries" and administered by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs (*Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken*, often referred to as *BuZa*).¹³⁷¹ Established in the public-funding reform of 1997, *HGIS* has commonly used economic diplomacy for "promoting Dutch values and interest internationally," including "raising the standing of Dutch culture."¹³⁷² As such, in procuring financial support from *HGIS*, the NAI often "targeted its audience" of public officials by emphasizing in its grant proposals how its activities "would directly support the export of Dutch architecture."¹³⁷³

The combination of cultural and economic interests proved to be a winning argument for the NAI, and *HGIS* became a reliable source of funding for the institute's activities throughout those years. Therefore, the funding model institutionalized by the NAI's budget difficulties of 1997 continued to shape the institute's policy in its remaining years, as the direction of the institute continued to be conditioned not only by cultural or social concerns but also economic criteria.

Betsky understood quite clearly the importance of directly engaging architecture with commodity culture, particularly in a networked society. In 2005, Betsky gave a lecture titled *Selling Architecture* at the Berlage Institute that seemed to aptly encapsulate his experience at the NAI. In this lecture, Betsky's claimed that in an increasingly globalized world, architects should develop new ways to operate and clearly position themselves (and their work) in the contemporary cultural production industry. Accordingly, Betsky argued that architects must—especially at a time that their audience is more sophisticated than ever—provide not only building design services but also a strong image. In fact, he posited that "presentation is an integral part of the work," since

¹³⁷¹ Ibid.; Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken, "Factsheet on the Homogeneous Budget for International Cooperation (HGIS)," September 19, 2013, 1.

¹³⁷² Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken, "Factsheet on the Homogeneous Budget for International Cooperation (HGIS)."

¹³⁷³ Betsky, interview. The NAI was so successful in collecting grants from *HGIS*, that Betsky believed that there might have been some resentment from other institutions.

“architecture is not building,” but instead is “about building: it is how we know, understand, see and represent the shaped environment.”¹³⁷⁴ Therefore, to be successful at selling their work, architects must differentiate themselves and their work, by having a “unique selling point,” namely the combination of a specific “discourse” and a “particular image.”¹³⁷⁵

Betsky’s account of “selling architecture” closely paralleled his own approach to Dutch architecture during his directorship at the NAI, as Betsky claimed credit for packaging and branding Dutch architecture for an international audience.¹³⁷⁶ His efforts, moreover, seemed to be fruitful, as on April 6, 2005—one day after the lecture at the Berlage Institute—it was announced that the Mies van der Rohe European Architecture Award had been awarded to two Dutch architecture offices. While Rem Koolhaas’s OMA had won the main prize with the *Netherlands Embassy* in Berlin, NL Architects had won the prize for “Emerging Architects under 40” with the *BasketBar* in Utrecht.¹³⁷⁷ The unprecedented (and unrepeated) distinction of having two offices from the same country winning both awards in the same year prompted some in the Netherlands to question if “Dutch architects [were] really that good or [did they] have a superb lobbyist for Dutch architecture in the person of Aaron Betsky, the director of the NAI?”¹³⁷⁸

While Betsky’s tenure became most remembered by the brazen promotion of both established and emerging Dutch architects, his work was not exhausted in those activities. Even before being officially appointed by the Board, Betsky had expressed his concern with the “lack of scientific

¹³⁷⁴ Aaron Betsky, “Selling Architecture,” ed. Penelope Dean, *Hunch: The Berlage Institute Report 10: Mediators* (Summer 2006): 63.

¹³⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 64.

¹³⁷⁶ Betsky, interview.

¹³⁷⁷ See, *Mies Van Der Rohe Award 2005: European Union Prize for Contemporary Architecture* (Barcelona: Actar, 2005).

¹³⁷⁸ “Mies van Der Rohe Award 2005 for OMA,” *ArchiNed*, April 6, 2005, <http://www.archined.nl/en/also-in-the-news/overig/mies-van-der-rohe-award-2005-for-oma/>.

research” in the NAI.¹³⁷⁹ He was, however, reassured by the Board, since it indicated that as director of the NAI he would be able to address that situation. While the Board only required that he re-incorporate the institute’s collections into its main activities, he would be given the conditions to rectify any shortcomings concerning the institute’s research efforts.¹³⁸⁰

The neglect of architectural research and critical discussion at the NAI during Feireiss’ tenure resulted from a combination of factors, most importantly the ever tightening budget of the institute and Feireiss’ personal indifference towards the institute’s collection. As such, several functions of the NAI either saw their support decrease, became independent from the institute, or were simply eliminated. The Study Center and the NAI Collections Department were among those most affected by this situation, but NAI Publishers, the *Architecture in the Netherlands Yearbook*, and the institute’s journal *Archis*, were also impacted.

While the Study Center was unceremoniously closed and replaced by a collaboration with the Dutch Postgraduate School for Art History (*Onderzoekschool Kunstgeschiedenis*, or *OSK*), the Collections Department saw its funding decrease substantially, inherently diminishing its ability to support exhibitions and exterior research. In between these two extremes were the institute’s publishing efforts, as NAI Publishers, the *Yearbook*, and *Archis* all attempted to continue their activity fully independent from the institute with varying degrees of success. Although NAI Publishers had already become an independent organization in 1994, it still retained some indirect support and administrative connections to the institute, which were terminated.¹³⁸¹ Likewise, the

¹³⁷⁹ Annemieke de Kler, “Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 23 Januari 2001,” January 23, 2001, 2, BSTU 2001.

¹³⁸⁰ *Ibid.*

¹³⁸¹ Prior to that, the publishers’ offices were located in the NAI’s building which not only facilitated communication between the institute and the publishers, but also created a certain confusion regarding its actual independence from the institute. For several years Hans Oldewarris, founder and director of 010 Publishers, continuously protested the unfair advantage of NAI publishers derived primarily by the ambiguity of their relation to the institute. Oldewarris had also been one of the most vocal proponents in demanding the

Yearbook's similarly ambiguous relation to the NAI was also clarified by distancing itself from the institute.¹³⁸² *Archis'* independence, on the other hand, was not as amicable, since it resulted from the NAI and the publisher's agreement to terminate its activities due to its rapidly declining subscriber base. *Archis* editor-in-chief, Ole Bouman, however, was able to negotiate the continuity of the magazine as an independent organization with another publishing company.¹³⁸³

Betsky perceived the decreased funding, separation, and elimination of these functions as a tremendous blow to the institute—particularly to its ability to conduct and disseminate advanced research—and attempted to redress it. Beyond increasing the Collection Department's budget, and rendering it much more visible in the NAI's exhibition and publication programs, the NAI's newfound support for advanced architecture research was most clearly expressed in the publication of a new architectural journal, the *Architecture Bulletin: Essays on the Designed*.¹³⁸⁴ Published with the specific goal of disseminating advanced scholarly research, the *Architecture Bulletin* offered a much more sober, academic tone than *Archis* ever presented. With these

separation of the NAI Publishers from the institute in early 1994. Hans Oldewarris, interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo, audio, January 6, 2011; Simon Franke, interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo, audio, January 24, 2011.

¹³⁸² Although edited and produced by NAI staff members (mostly from the Presentation Department), the *Yearbook* and its selection of projects was not officially sanctioned by the institute. According to Hans Ibelings, Feireiss presented an ultimatum to the staff involved with the *Yearbook*, namely they had to decide if the *Yearbook* was an instrument of the institute or not. If they decided that it was a part of the institute, then she should also be able to weigh in on the selection, but if they decided against it, they would have to work on it in their own time. The *Yearbook* editors chose the latter option. Hans Ibelings, interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo, audio, January 10, 2011.

¹³⁸³ A crucial component in this outcome was Bouman's ability to ensure that the previously allocated subsidy to the magazine could be separated from the NAI's own subsidies and that it would continue to be disbursed to the now fully independent magazine. See Tweede Kamer, "Vragen van de Leden Belinfante (PvdA), Halsema (GroenLinks), Visser-van Doorn (CDA), Dittrich (D66) En Van Bommel (SP) Aan de Staatssecretaris van Onderwijs, Cultuur En Wetenschappen, Dhr. Van Der Ploeg over Een Mogelijke Opheffing van Het Tijdschrift Archis. (Ingezonden 26 September 2000)," *Tweede Kamer, Vergaderjaar 2000–2001*, 2000, 217–218. Signaling *Archis* newfound independence, its offices were relocated to Amsterdam, where the magazine continued to be published until 2004.

¹³⁸⁴ While in 2002, all the NAI departments hired additional staff, in subsequent years the Collections Department was the only one that continued to add new staff members and that also had its operating budget continuously increased at approximately ten to 15 percent every year according to the institute's yearly reports from 2002-2006.

initiatives, Betsky attempted to restore the balance between presentation and discussion, contemporary design and historical practice.

It is worth noting, however, that Betsky was only able to thwart this imbalance by first addressing the root of the problem: the institute's funding. Therefore, Betsky increased the NAI's budget by further diversifying the institute's funding and complementing it with corporate fundraising. While the NAI diversified its public income by becoming one of the cultural recipients of the *Bankgiro Loterij*, the gross of the institute's new financial resources derived from active fundraising.¹³⁸⁵ In 2004, for example, the NAI raised 452.000 euros from private companies to directly support its exhibitions program, while securing at least 265.000 euros more from companies that it had identified as "structural sponsors" for its everyday activities.¹³⁸⁶ The majority of these companies, and all of the largest contributors to the NAI—were construction companies, real-estate developers, and housing corporations.

An important instrument in the NAI's fundraising operation was the constitution of the NAI Circle, where directors, chairmen, and heads of these companies were presented with special programs, such as visits to new architecture, forums for discussions, and social gatherings. In many ways, the NAI Circle resembled NAI's original Special Projects Department, but this time around, the intention was not merely to educate the leading members of the Dutch construction industry about the importance of quality architecture but also to appeal to their largess to support the institute.

¹³⁸⁵ The *Bankgiro Loterij* is a Dutch national Lottery of which half of the lottery profit is disbursed to cultural organizations. This lottery provided approximately 300.000 euros annually to the NAI. For an overview of the sponsors engaged by the NAI, see Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, "Overzicht Sponsoring Bedrijven," April 21, 2005, RVTO 2005.

¹³⁸⁶ The NAI considered "structural sponsors" companies that routinely contributed over 100.000 euros annually to the institute. Four companies achieved that status in 2004, *AM* (which also sponsored the NAI's prize for Young Architects), *ComWonen*, *Vestia*, and *Het Oosten*.

As a result of these fundraising activities, the NAI became much less dependent on its regular public subsidy to fund its operations, despite considerably enlarging its budget. According to Betsky's rough estimates, in the five and a half years of his tenure the NAI's budget grew approximately 40 percent larger, but the institute's public funding diminished from 90 to 70 percent of the total budget and expenses.¹³⁸⁷ The influx of funds to the NAI, or as Betsky put it, "this huge amount of money" that became available, allowed the institute to not only restore its lost activities, but even expand them.¹³⁸⁸ Thus, in September 2005 the institute opened the Open Model Storage (OMD) in the Van Nelle Factory, and a year later, in September 2006 inaugurated an outpost in the Southern city of Maastricht appropriately designated NAI Maastricht (also known as NAI M).¹³⁸⁹

¹³⁸⁷ Betsky, interview. A comparison of the institute's yearly report validates Betsky's assertion, as in 2001 the total expense of the institute was 6.2 million euros, but in 2006 it was 8.5 million, an increase of 37 percent. Regarding the institute dependency from its regular subsidy, the same financial reports present a more conservative estimates, indicating that in 2001 that subsidy amounted to 5.1 million euros (approximately 83 percent of the budget), while in 2006, it amounted to 5.7 million (circa 67 percent). See Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, "NAi Jaarverslag 2001," June 2002, 182-189; Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, "NAi Jaarverslag 2006: Spektakel En Verdieping," February 2007, 46-47.

¹³⁸⁸ Throughout Betsky's tenure, between 2001 and 2006, the NAI consistently secured more income than initially budgeted, mainly through active fundraising and several additional grants, as indicated by the yearly reports of the institute. This ensured that during that period, the NAI consistently presented a positive operating balance.

¹³⁸⁹ The Open Model Storage was intended to expand the facilities of the ever growing archive, and "improve [the conditions] for the preservation and presentation of [its] collection" while allowing "visitors [to] see how scale models are kept and restored" by being regularly open to the public. Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, "NAi Jaarverslag 2005," July 2006, 2-3. The NAI Maastricht was envisioned as an outpost of the NAI that could not only engage with a Southern audience, but also attract visitors from the regions of the surrounding countries (since Maastricht is located in the Southern tip of the Netherlands, between Belgium and Germany and close by Luxembourg and France). It occupied the renovated Wiebengahal gallery in the center of Maastricht and its inaugural exhibitions reflected the dual purpose of the regional branch, namely with the exhibition 'New Faces in European Architecture: David Adjaye, Jurgen Mayer H., PLOT = BIG + JDS, SeArch' with an European scope and the exhibition 'From Cuypers to Coenen - Architecture and Landscape of South Limburg 1750-2050' with a regional scope. Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, "NAi Jaarverslag 2006," 6.

The expansion of the institute envisioned by Betsky was considerably adjusted when he stepped down and former *Archis* editor Ole Bouman was appointed director of the NAI.¹³⁹⁰ Although the NAI continued to grow under Bouman, it grew in a different direction as an entire new strategic approach to architecture was adopted. That much was announced in one of Bouman's first interviews, as he admitted that while changing the NAI's approach was "not as simple as turning a switch" (since the institute's programming was often scheduled years in advance), that he vowed "to shift the emphasis" at the institute.¹³⁹¹ But while the emphasis of the institute may have changed, the promiscuity between cultural and economic interest not only endured, but became increasingly unbalanced.

Under Bouman, the NAI new emphasis was based on direct engagement, particularly as he envisioned the NAI to also become "a laboratory that pose[d]s new questions for the profession of architecture."¹³⁹² Specifically, Bouman promoted a greater engagement of architecture with society through emphasizing how architecture could address a variety of "societal issues and social urgencies."¹³⁹³ By revealing to the general public that architecture had the ability to affect structural change (or at least to become a catalyst for it) in everyday life, Bouman believed that the NAI would assist in garnering renewed relevance and legitimacy for architecture. The institute's new approach was therefore much more focused in the application and practice of architecture than its theory and

¹³⁹⁰ While Betsky left the NAI in October 2006 to become the new Director of the Cincinnati Art Museum, Ole Bouman only assumed the position in April 2007. In the interim period, while the Board conducted a "meticulous open application procedure" that would culminate with Bouman's appointment, deputy director Patrick van Mill acted as interim director. Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, "NAI Jaarverslag 2006," 26.

¹³⁹¹ Piet Vollaard and Marina van der Bergen, "What Ole Bouman Wants," *ArchiNed*, September 18, 2007, <http://www.archined.nl/interviews/2007/what-ole-bouman-wants/>.

¹³⁹² *Ibid.*

¹³⁹³ Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, "Op Het Snijvlak van Opgave En Ontwerp: NAI Beleidsplan 2009-2012," March 2008, 6.

discourse. At the new NAI there was no autonomy for architecture, but rather a complete societal engagement.¹³⁹⁴

The new direction of the institute was forcefully expressed in its new Policy Plan for the period 2009-2012, directed by Bouman less than a year into his tenure. Titled *At the Intersection of Task and Design (Op het Snijvlak van Opgave en Ontwerp)*, the new policy plan indicated that “the NAI strive[d] for two main objectives:” allowing the cultural significance of architecture to become more visible” and “entering into partnerships that [could] make this significance visible elsewhere.”¹³⁹⁵ While the first objective was but a continuation of the NAI’s original ambitions, the second revealed a new positioning of the NAI as mediator and facilitator. The new NAI intended to become “a centre of knowledge, a moderator, an organiser, a matchmaker – organising things elsewhere, making things happen and setting things in motion.”¹³⁹⁶ Specifically, it was claimed that the NAI was “the perfect place to bridge the gap between what should be and what is possible. Between task and design. Between priority and talent. And between a wonderful profession and a respectable audience.”¹³⁹⁷

In its new role as mediator, the NAI seemed intent to also become the bridge between Dutch architects and clients, particularly abroad. The institute’s renewed international policy reflected just that. Prepared in collaboration with the Ministries of Education and Economic Affairs, it

¹³⁹⁴ Accordingly, Betsky’s previous inroads into advanced scholarly research were unceremoniously terminated, most notably, in 2008 *Architecture Bulletin* was published for the last time and NAI Maastricht was distanced from the institute through a rebranding as *Bureau Europa* (becoming fully independent in April 2009).

¹³⁹⁵ Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, “NAi Beleidsplan 2009-2012,” 3. These partnerships included “international projects, agreements, “endorsements,” publications, joint research, [and the organization of] events on location.”

¹³⁹⁶ Vollaard and Bergen, “What Ole Bouman Wants.”

¹³⁹⁷ Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, “NAi Beleidsplan 2009-2012,” 6.

focused mainly on the development of “economic opportunities for the Dutch architecture in the international arena.”¹³⁹⁸ As such, *HGIS* became, once again, a fundamental partner of the institute.

The most visible expression of the NAI’s renewed ambitions—particularly its focus on engagement and the creation of economic opportunities—was arguably the *Matchmaking Programme*. According to the NAI, the matchmaking program intended to “draw attention” to global spatial challenges and “bring expertise and challenges together.”¹³⁹⁹ Despite the NAI’s claims that the *Matchmaking Programme* was intended to assist in resolving societal and social challenges around the globe, the economic objectives of the program were clear from the start.

While the NAI was rather coy in publicly asserting the economic motivations of the program, its partner organization, the DutchDFA (Dutch Design Fashion Architecture, an organization established specifically for the promotion of Dutch Design, Fashion, and Architecture in emerging economies) was much more direct. Thus, the DutchDFA not only stated that “expanding the network of Dutch architecture” was “certainly one of the objectives of the *Matchmaking Programme*,” but also that it “admittedly ha[d] a direct link to the unfavourable economic situation in the Netherlands and the lack of employment for architects.”¹⁴⁰⁰ Furthermore, the DutchDFA also admitted what was already obvious, that is, in a time when advanced western economies were either stagnating or contracting, the “choice of India—as well as China in an earlier session—was no accident” since these were “countries with strong economic growth.”¹⁴⁰¹ As a mediator, the NAI

¹³⁹⁸ Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, “NAi Jaarverslag 2007: Tussen Continuïteit En Verandering,” June 2008, 15.

¹³⁹⁹ Netherlands Architecture Institute, “NAi Matchmaking,” *NAi*, 2012, http://en.nai.nl/platform/matchmaking/item/_pid/kolom2-1/_rp_kolom2-1_elementId/1_776870.

¹⁴⁰⁰ “NAi Matchmaking in Mumbai,” *Dutch Design Fashion Architecture*, accessed February 3, 2014, <http://www.dutchdfa.com/india/dutch-design-workspace-india/nai-matchmaking-in-mumbai>.

¹⁴⁰¹ Netherlands Architecture Institute, “NAi Matchmaking.” The first *Matchmaking Programme* was organized in China in 2010, followed by another in India. Another *Matchmaking Programme* was also developed for Brazil, as well as Turkey and Russia. With these programs the NAI engaged all the fastest growing emerging economies that economists refer by the acronym BRIC (Brazil, Russia, India, and China). As

intended to provide Dutch architecture a foothold in the rapidly expanding markets of emerging economies, promoting a “mercantilist attitude” to Dutch architecture.¹⁴⁰²

The *Matchmaking Programme* also expressed how the new strategy of engagement adopted by the NAI was all-encompassing. Dutch architecture was not merely presented, but was to be experienced. Rather than merely organizing exhibitions that *showed* the ideas and solutions devised by Dutch architects, the NAI’s international program now also *applied* these solutions to foreign contexts. With its new international policy the NAI intended to not only have an intellectual impact, but a material one as well, one that could have a legacy of practical results.

The strategy of engagement was equally expressed in the NAI’s new research programs. If before, research at the NAI was conducted through thinking (primarily resulting in scholarly work and exhibitions), in the new NAI, research was conducted through designing (primarily resulting in specific design proposals). Launched in the end of 2010, the *Studio for Unsolicited Architecture* became the most visible research component of the institute.¹⁴⁰³ In this studio, the NAI adopted the role of client for progressive architecture by asking (young) architecture offices to devise specific solutions to resolve social and design challenges. While presented as entirely experimental, a “fertile breeding ground for valuable design concepts and good plans,” the studio was equally

the NAI promoted the search of new economic opportunities in emerging markets across the globe, there were also unforeseen consequences, with reports that several architects had been subjected to fraud by false promises of building in China. See “Chinese Fraudeur Dupeert Nederlandse Bureaus,” *Architectenweb*, May 22, 2012, http://www.architectenweb.nl/aweb/redactie/redactie_detail.asp?iNID=29075.

¹⁴⁰² Matthias Pauwels, “So You Think You Can Practice Architecture in China?,” *ArchiNed*, November 9, 2011, <http://www.archined.nl/opinie/2011/so-you-think-you-can-practice-architecture-in-china/>. The “mercantilist attitude” of the NAI’s initiative was the focus of an article on the website ArchiNed, where the program was generally considered positive with the NAI’s position described as attempting to “strike a balance between ideological flexibility and ideological opportunism.” This article ignited a passionate debate on its comments section, as even Ole Bouman responded to criticism to the *Matchmaking Programme* in that online forum.

¹⁴⁰³ In 2013, the studio became the *Studio for Unsolicited Architecture, Design & E-Culture*.

intended to become an economic incubator, as the NAI also pledged to “adopt promising projects and prepare them for the market.”¹⁴⁰⁴

The institute’s renewed focus on advancing economic interests and a stronger societal engagement was not merely ideological, but also pragmatic. Specifically, it attempted to both validate the legitimacy of architecture to a general public and revive a policy of steadfast promotion of young Dutch architects that had proved quite successful in the recognition of Dutch architecture a few years earlier. If the NAI could instrumentalize, once again, a recognition of architecture in society and raise the stock of Dutch architecture abroad, it might just be enough to justify its public subsidy from an increasingly weary central government, now controlled by a conservative coalition. This time around, however, there were no accolades nor wide international praise to show for.

Nevertheless, the NAI’s concern with the economic dimension of architecture and its engagement with society became most visible when the institute reopened its doors in July 2011. As it reopened its galleries to the public, the NAI not only revealed its renovated entrance, but also a renewed communication strategy to position the institute within the cultural market.¹⁴⁰⁵ Specifically, the NAI presented a complete rebranding of the institute, which included not only a new logo and graphic language, but also the renaming of the institute as “NAI Museum of Architecture” (NAI, *Museum voor Architectuur*). The main objective of the renaming was to make the NAI more approachable to the general public by adopting the more familiar title of museum. This was intended to better communicate to the public at large the main function of the NAI, as the organizer of exhibitions about architecture. Most revealing of the NAI’s new approach of social

¹⁴⁰⁴ Nederlands Architectuurinstituut, “NAI Jaarverslag 2010,” January 21, 2011, 5.

¹⁴⁰⁵ The renovation work was commissioned to Jo Coenen, the original architect of the building. Coenen’s new entrance attempted to translate to spatial terms the policy of engagement pursued by the NAI by reinforcing the connections to its surroundings. As Ole Bouman put it, the “transformation of the building, [was] not only physical, but symbolic as well.” Marina van der Bergen, “De Verbouwing,” *ArchiNed*, April 19, 2010, <http://www.archined.nl/interviews/2010/de-verbouwing/>.

engagement and economic opportunities, however, were the two temporary exhibitions accommodated in the renovated building.¹⁴⁰⁶

Installed on the top floor gallery, the exhibition *Testify! The Consequences of Architecture* presented twenty-five projects from around the world that attempted to use architecture (in its widest possible sense) to meaningfully impact local social conditions with global implications.¹⁴⁰⁷ Although the range of projects in *Testify!* was quite eclectic, the argument mounted by the exhibition was clear. *Testify!* not only advocated for an architecture of societal engagement, but also appealed for a reconsideration of what constituted architecture, and its intrinsic agency.

The underlying critical and projective qualities of *Testify!*, and even a cogent argument, were largely absent in the exhibition installed in the NAI's main gallery. *Daring Design (Dwarsdesign)* presented the work of eight Dutch and Chinese designers. Beyond architects, the exhibition also presented the work of graphic, industrial, and fashion designers.¹⁴⁰⁸ Even though the exhibition documentation extolled them as "designers with guts" that "do not evade commercially or politically sensitive issues," the entire exhibition seemed to have been produced precisely with political and commercial influence in mind as the critical fangs of these designers were manicured to a point of dullness.¹⁴⁰⁹ Moreover, the (restrained) ideas investigated by any one designer did not

¹⁴⁰⁶ For a critical discussion of the two permanent exhibitions also inaugurated with the reopening of the NAI, see chapter 1 "Architecture in the Gallery: The Museum and the Archive."

¹⁴⁰⁷ *Testify! The Consequences of Architecture* was also the expansion of one of the last exhibitions presented at the NAI before its renovation, namely the *Architecture of Consequence* (February 20 to May 16, 2010). Although based on the same premise, the earlier exhibition had only featured Dutch projects, while the later present projects from around the world. See Lukas Feireiss and Ole Bouman, eds., *Testify! The Consequences of Architecture* (Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 2011).

¹⁴⁰⁸ The eight designers involved were for the Netherlands architect Rem Koolhaas, industrial designer Hella Jongerius, graphic designer Irma Boom, and the fashion design Alexander van Slobbe, while China was represented by the architecture office Urbanus, the graphic design studio MEEET YOU, the fashion designer Ma Ke, and the contemporary artists Ai Weiwei.

¹⁴⁰⁹ Netherlands Architecture Institute, "Daring Design/Dwarsdesign Exhibition Brochure," 2011. Perhaps the clearest expression of this condition was the sober contribution by Rem Koolhaas/OMA, which was composed of two thick books of construction drawings and a sectioned model of OMA's Taipei Performing Arts Center.

resonate in the work of the others, even when they operated in the same field. The critical depth for which each designer was recognized in their individual practice was thus oddly absent, as the overlap between the works presented seemed to be the tenuous idea of being either Dutch or Chinese.

The reason for this exhibition lacking any critical punch and instead presenting an undisputed promotion of Dutch and Chinese designers was simple: promotion had been its objective all along. *Daring Design* was in fact the homecoming of a promotional exhibition that had toured China in 2010, organized by the NAI and the DutchDFA.¹⁴¹⁰ Although only being listed for its “financial contribution,” the DutchDFA was still the driving force of this exhibition in Rotterdam; from the selection of the design fields presented (that neatly corresponded to the DutchDFA’s field of action) to its tacit dual purpose of both reinforcing the branding of Dutch designers as ‘critical pragmatists’ and appealing to the enormous Chinese market by strategic flattery of its domestic design (despite of its own merits).¹⁴¹¹ Effectively, in *Daring Design* it was not the DutchDFA that collaborated with the NAI, but instead the NAI that collaborated with the DutchDFA by validating its promotional efforts.

If *Testify!* articulated the repositioning of the NAI as an institution increasingly concerned with the social rather than the cultural, *Daring Design* articulated how architectural institutions were increasingly pressured to serve the prevalent economic systems and interests. Although the NAI had previously engaged in the explicit promotion of Dutch architecture, there was now a substantial difference (beside the increased scope to also include other design fields), namely there was a transfer of control from the NAI to other organizations (in this case the DutchDFA) in the definition

¹⁴¹⁰ While touring in China (Shanghai, Beijing and Shenzhen), the exhibition had been titled *Taking a Stance: 8 Critical Attitudes in Chinese and Dutch Architecture and Design*.

¹⁴¹¹ Ole Bouman was credited as “commissioner” and then Head of the NAI’s Presentation Department, Linda Vlassenrood, was credited as curator of *Daring Design*.

of the message constructed in its galleries. This situation not only tarnished the NAI's institutional standing, but risked turning the NAI into an idea-empty megaphone, used to disseminate other organizations' agendas.

Implicitly, by hosting *Daring Design* as its grand reopening exhibition, the NAI indicated that the way forward was to forget discussion and focus on promotion, to forget cultural interests and focus on economic benefits. The NAI's increased concern with assisting in the advancement of economic interests effectively became a fundamental threat to the institute's very survival. In many ways, *Daring Design* became a prescient prelude of what was stored for the NAI, even undermining the institute's own position and discourse.

Het Nieuwe Instituut / The New Institute

The predominance of economic over cultural interests hailed by *Daring Design* resulted in an increased tension within the institute as contradictions begin to emerge. Just as it was welcoming fashion and design in its main galleries, the NAI—particularly through Ole Bouman—was actively opposing the combination of architecture with those two design fields (along with e-culture) in establishing the new category of 'creative industries' proposed by the central government's new cultural policy.

With the new cultural policy, the Dutch government presented a vision for the cultural sector that was greatly based on the earlier policy *Armor or Backbone* (*Pantser of Ruggengraat*) introduced almost fifteen years earlier.¹⁴¹² The same underlying logic was pervasive in both cultural

¹⁴¹² While the earlier cultural policy is not specifically mentioned, the introduction of both cultural policies is eerily similar in its reference to the way culture both defines and is defined by tradition and identity as well as the growing preponderance of international flows in that process. Both cultural policies equally employed the same populist argument that the arts were too removed from the general public and needed to be made accountable to the free market, as the entire cultural sector was to be better monetized. Ministerie Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap, *Pantser of ruggengraat*, 4–5; Ministerie Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap, "Meer dan Kwaliteit, Een Nieuwe Visie op Cultuurbeleid," June 10, 2011, 2–3.

policies, namely that only those cultural activities that were validated by the market by attracting large audiences merited public subsidies. If the earlier cultural policy had provoked a crisis in the identity and focus of the NAI (revealing its complete lack of political independence and compelling it to further focus on the promotion of economic interests at the cost of scholarly research and critical discussion), the new cultural policy became responsible for concluding that process.

The new cultural policy was publicly announced by (then) State Secretary for Education, Culture and Science, Halbe Zijlstra in June 2011, dropping a bombshell in Dutch cultural circles by unilaterally determining a structural reorganization of all cultural institutions receiving public grants and subsidies in the Netherlands. At the center of this dramatic overhaul was the government's intention to "cut back on culture," with a reduction of 200 million euro, or approximately 25 percent of the national budget for culture, "of which, 125 million would be cut from the basic cultural infrastructure: the cultural institutions and funds that receive direct funding from the state."¹⁴¹³

While cuts in culture were widely expected given the government's political leanings and the thoroughly debated advice of advisory body Council for Culture (*Raad voor Cultuur*), the severity of the cuts was completely surprising. Secretary Zijlstra, who admitted "lack[ing] any understanding of art and culture, ha[d] blatantly ignored all the recommendations made to him on this subject," including those from the Council for Culture, whose chairman and many of its members stepped down after Secretary Zijlstra's announcement.¹⁴¹⁴ Widespread outcry ensued, including the denouncement that "all those who were asked to make recommendations about the plan [had] advised against it in the strongest possible terms, and all of the unsolicited recommendations [had

¹⁴¹³ Ministerie Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap, "Meer dan Kwaliteit," 2, 39. While the totality of the cuts were announced in the first page of the document, these were only specified in one of the last pages.

¹⁴¹⁴ Isabel Löfgren, "Collateral Damage: Cultural Politics in the Age of Cultural Depression," *Paletten*, no. 284–285 (September 2011): 12.

been] negative too.”¹⁴¹⁵ Criticism of Secretary Zijlstra’s plan condemned not just the 25 percent cuts to subsidies and what those implied, but also the reach of the proposed reform. The brunt of the cuts were to be experienced by smaller institutions, effectively condemning them to closure. Furthermore, beyond a reasonable and realistic reorganization of resources and allocation of funds, the new cultural policy instituted a purely market-driven approach to culture entirely guided by ideology.¹⁴¹⁶ The approach, emerging from the appropriately titled policy *More than Quality: A New Vision of Cultural Policy* (*Meer dan Kwaliteit: Een Nieuwe Visie op Cultuurbeleid*) suggested that cultural activities were no longer appreciated for the quality of their contribution to the edification of Dutch society, but were instead only valued by the quantity of euros they could generate for the country’s economy.

If architecture could consider itself fortunate for ‘only’ having its budget slashed in 20 percent, the effects of this drastic change of policy in architecture’s basic support infrastructure was rather dramatic. Beyond completely defunding most smaller organizations dedicated to architecture—such as *Architectuur Lokaal*, *Archiprix*, the (Dutch) European, the International Architecture Biennale Rotterdam (IABR), and even the Berlage Institute—the funding of the NAI and the *Stimuleringsfonds voor Architectuur* (Dutch Architecture Fund, or *SfA*), the only remaining architectural institutions, was substantially reduced and greatly conditioned.

Much like every other cultural institution in the Netherlands, the NAI was encouraged to complement the shortcomings of public funding in its yearly budget by engaging in commercial

¹⁴¹⁵ Annette Wolfsberger, “A New Dark Age For Dutch Culture,” *Digimag*, no. 66 (August 2011). The most visible form of protest took the form of a quarter-page advertisement taken by a coalition of Dutch artists in the pages of the *New York Times* on June 24, 2011 with the phrase “Do not enter the Netherlands, cultural meltdown in progress.” The ad was just one of several forms of protest and resistance to the cultural policy organized by Dutch artists and cultural circles. For an overview, see Löfgren, “Collateral Damage,” 16–17.

¹⁴¹⁶ The plan was described as “a direct attack on art, an attack on anything that does not fit into a market economy, on anything that refuses to, or cannot be, adapted to a populist-tinted, neo-liberal mindset.” Wolfsberger, “A New Dark Age For Dutch Culture.”

collaborations with market partners. Through these partnerships, the government intended for cultural institutions to increasingly attain a self-sustainable cultural production

Although Ole Bouman had mounted a mild resistance to the government's plan, by August 2011, he and the NAI became the most visible face of capitulation to Secretary Zijlstra's plan.¹⁴¹⁷ Facing the prospective cut of 1 million euros in the NAI's yearly budget, Bouman signed a cooperation agreement for low-cost housing with VANKE, the largest real-estate developer in China, in a ceremony presided by Secretary Zijlstra.¹⁴¹⁸ This formal agreement was the result of the cooperation initiated between the NAI and VANKE over a year earlier, as a part of the *Matchmaking Programme*, with Secretary Zijlstra presenting it as a legitimization of his cultural policy to foster the connection between culture and economy. Further handshakes and photo-ops ensued less than two weeks later, when the institute signed another partnership with Gispen, the historic Dutch furniture company.¹⁴¹⁹

Beyond imposing an overtaxing economic orientation, the plan for architecture in the cultural policy effectively required the dissolution of the famed Dutch architectural infrastructure. If the defunding of smaller institutions effectively condemned them to closure, the general subsidy for the NAI was dependent on the stipulation that the institute merged with *Premsele*, the Netherlands Institute for Design and Fashion and Virtual Platform (*Virtueel Platform*) the industry institute for

¹⁴¹⁷ Bouman's public opposition emerged as an open letter on the NAI website declaring that "the contraction of the sector" was "particularly serious," even warning to the nefarious effects of closing smaller architecture organizations. However, he remained optimistic to the possibilities opened by the combination of architecture, design, and electronic media by referring to an opportunity "for an inspiring dialogue across the disciplines." See Ole Bouman, "Vallen En Weer Opstaan: Reactie Ole Bouman Op Bezuinigingsplannen Cultuursector," *NAi Nieuws*, June 24, 2011, http://www.nai.nl/toolbar/nieuws/item/_pid/kolom2-1/_rp_kolom2-1_elementId/1_1012889.

¹⁴¹⁸ "NAi En VANKE Sluiten Overeenkomst Low Cost Housing," *NAi Nieuws*, August 29, 2011, http://www.nai.nl/toolbar/pers/item/_pid/kolom2-1/_rp_kolom2-1_elementId/1_1044949.

¹⁴¹⁹ This time the NAI was represented by Peter Haasbroek, the NAI's business director. NAI, "Gispen Nieuwe Partner NAI," *NAi Nieuws*, September 10, 2011, http://www.nai.nl/content/1054858/gispen_nieuwe_partner_nai.

electronic culture.¹⁴²⁰ From January 1, 2013 onwards, the NAI would no longer be eligible for public funding, only this new combined institution for ‘creative industries.’

According to Secretary Zijlstra’s plan, the New Institute (a name eventually adopted by the organization that resulted from the merger) was to capitalize on the increasing overlap between architecture, design, fashion, and new media and consolidate the efforts supporting these ‘creative industries.’ Nevertheless, it was still claimed that “the power and the strong brand of the [separate] institutions [was to be] retained, along with the visibility of the individual disciplines.”¹⁴²¹ While such interdisciplinary cooperation could (potentially) create opportunities for a renewed interrogation of architecture (but also of design, fashion, and electronic culture), the economic undertones of the cultural policy strongly indicated the constitution of an institute for ‘creative industries’ primarily intended for the facilitation of business and the development of coordinated economic strategies.¹⁴²²

Despite its benefits lacking proper substantiation, the New Institute (*Het Nieuwe Instituut*) began its operation on January 1, 2013 under the direction of Guus Beumer.¹⁴²³ Conversely, what is

¹⁴²⁰ The only other institutions dedicated to supporting architecture remaining suffered the same fate, as the *SfA* was equally compelled to become the Creative Industries Fund (*Stimuleringsfonds Creatieve Industrie*) and thus supporting architecture, design, fashion, and new media. Ministerie Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap, “Meer dan Kwaliteit,” 29.

¹⁴²¹ *Ibid.*, 30.

¹⁴²² The economic motivation of the policy was often quite explicit, as the first sentence dedicated to the ‘creative industries’ claimed that the government considered them to be “significant economic and social benefits for the Netherlands.” *Ibid.*, 29.

¹⁴²³ The New Institute’s Financial and Operational Plan was publicly denounced by the Rotterdam Council for Arts and Culture (*Rotterdamse Raad voor Kunst en Cultuur*, or *RRKC*), when it rejected the institute’s grant application for 150.000 euros from the city of Rotterdam. In no uncertain terms, the *RRKC* stated that “the policy under review provide[d] no confidence that this merger [would] succeed, since the plan lack[ed] precision and show[ed] no self-awareness.” In its assessment, the *RRKC* pointed out the unrealistic expectations of the institute raising 5.2 million in direct income from sponsors, partnerships, and ticket sales, particularly since the sponsorship to the NAI had dramatically decreased in the previous three years, and at its maximum, it had only garnered 1.25 million euros in direct income. The *RRKC* also criticized the vagueness of the institute’s stated goals and means to achieve them. Marc Vlemmings, “Tegenvaller Voor Sectorinstituut in Oprichting,” *Items*, May 7, 2012, <http://www.items.nl/2012/5/7/niadec-ave/>.

abundantly clear is the demotion of architecture in the Dutch cultural apparatus through the closure of the NAI and the comprehensive dissolution of the network of other institutions dedicated to the advancement and promotion of the discipline.

An Alternative Ending?

Throughout its twenty-five years of existence, the NAI was one of the major elements in creating an almost unique context for the development of architecture in the Netherlands. Either by critical discussion or projective practice, the NAI stimulated the emergence of a dynamic architecture culture that provided the conditions for Dutch architecture offices to succeed on a national and international level. While the exact financial rewards directly associated with the institute might have been difficult to accurately quantify, it should be clear that it performed a central function. It allowed Dutch architecture culture to develop and mature, it allowed Dutch architects to engage with new ideas, develop new skills, as well as ponder on the social, cultural, artistic, and even economic implications of architecture, in a way that would have been impossible otherwise. The production of exhibitions, the organization of lectures and symposia, the publication of books and magazines, all served to stimulate the development of Dutch flavored architectural innovation. The institute not only nurtured new talent, but also conferred a remarkable competitive advantage to Dutch architecture in an increasingly globalized market.

In a business analogy, the NAI should be perceived as—and it was certainly intended to be—the Research and Development (R&D) department of Dutch architecture. Its activities were never intended to generate immediate profit and involved a great deal of uncertainty as to the return of investment. But these activities were also crucial in creating the conditions for innovation to emerge, often a decisive factor in the ability for any commercial endeavor to remain relevant (and profitable). With the closure of the NAI (and the dissolution of the network of architecture-specific institutions) there is already an erosion of the strategic advantage previously enjoyed by Dutch architecture. In an increasingly competitive architectural market, the Dutch original strategy of

governmental support to architecture is already delivering strong results in Denmark, primarily expressed by the international recognition garnered by the new architectural talent from that Scandinavian country.¹⁴²⁴

There is no question that after twenty-five years the NAI was due for a reassessment, bringing it into line with the contemporary challenges facing architecture. However, the expansion of the institute by an imposed merger with other loosely affiliated ‘creative disciplines’ might not have been the best solution. Arguably, Dutch architecture would have been better served by another type of merger, one that effectively capitalized on immediate synergies and emboldened the discipline. By consolidating the efforts and resources that support the development of architecture and promote its appreciation, certainly some redundancies would have been identified and savings achieved (satiating the thirst for cuts). But by centralizing the diverse array of instruments supporting architecture, a new super-institute of architecture could be created. A super-institute that could be even stronger in directing architectural discussion, stimulating architectural innovation, and emboldening Dutch architectural culture. A super-institute solely dedicated to architecture, where rather than being displaced by economic objectives, cultural ambitions could be significantly reinforced. A super-institute in which the authority and legitimacy of architecture would not be under attack, but vigorously renewed.

The establishment of such institute was never proposed, nor would it ever be feasible, since it would not have conformed to the prevailing economic determinism guiding the reorganization of the Dutch cultural sector. In fact, the merger and the constitution of the New Institute was merely the logical conclusion of a process that was initiated in the 1990s, when the NAI was compelled to

¹⁴²⁴ In an ironic twist, the Danish government has notably based its architectural policy in the original Dutch policies of the early 1990s that established the NAI as a central component in Dutch architecture culture and Bjarke Ingels, is famously an alumni of Rem Koolhaas’ OMA. See, Ministry of Culture, *A Nation of Architecture - Denmark: Settings for Life and Growth* (Copenhagen: Ministry of Culture, 2007).

focus on the economic dimension of architecture and to displace discussion by promotion. Such governmental imposition, however, was only possible due to the NAI's founders' original failure to define and institutionalize clear and measurable criteria for assessing the institute's performance.

While the advancement of architecture's economic interests had always been inherently present in the NAI, it had never been its main objective. Even as potential economic benefits and the commercialization of architecture became increasingly central to the NAI's activities, there was an attempt to co-opt those impulses in a projective practice to understand and define a specific moment in Dutch architecture. Nevertheless, that first moment of financial distress also served to severely compromise the balance between critical discussion and popular dissemination at the NAI. While it continued to promote the appreciation of architecture, the institute became divorced from its intention to openly address and discuss the discipline's structural issues. A similar trend was perceived in its attitude towards history, with the institute becoming increasingly focused on contemporary architecture to the detriment of its historical collections and research archives.

As the objective of advancing architecture's economic dimension (particularly through the promotion of Dutch architecture) became not merely accepted, but also normalized, the economic determinism that shaped the institute's policy and strategy became a natural progression. However, it must be said that, at the very least, the NAI was complicit with this outcome. In its desire to please the central government and thus ensure its financial stability, the NAI increasingly favored economic criteria in defining its role within the discipline and devising its own activities. By already promoting commercial partnerships under the guise of cultural advancement with its *Matchmaking Programme* and presenting architecture along with design and fashion in its main gallery with *Daring Design*, the NAI was already applying the same principles established in the government's plan. Therefore, it was very difficult for the institute to challenge a cultural policy that merely

expanded the vision of an architecture museum already explicitly established within its own galleries and operational plans.

Although highly dependent on public subsidies, the NAI, for all effects and purposes, remained an independent organization. Had the NAI Board, director, and management had the fortitude to resist, oppose, and outright reject the government's merger plan, perhaps the institute's inglorious end could have been prevented. Alternatives to the imposed merger, and inherently the continuity of the institute without governmental subsidies, however, were never seriously entertained. Perhaps an alternative model for the institute could have been a clearer separation between its own organization and the central government. Absent an endowment that could fund its operating costs, the institute might have considered establishing a services contract with the central government for the management and maintenance of the Netherlands cultural heritage in the state's architectural archive. The economic rent from these services could then be used to fund exhibitions, publications, and other projects and activities. While still a hybrid public-private model, this would have ensured a greater political independence for the institute and a clear separation between funding and activities, thus minimizing the government's possibility to dictate the institute's future development. Most likely, this plan would never have worked, but it could have been enough to wrest some concessions from Secretary Zijlstra, or even to inspire the emergence of other alternatives to the impositions of the government's plan.¹⁴²⁵

While it is still too early to determine if the merging of the NAI into the New Institute was beneficial or detrimental for Dutch architecture, we can only hope that the NAI will not suffer the same fate as the Netherlands first proto-architecture institute. Almost one century earlier, the old

¹⁴²⁵ The best example of refusing to accept the fate determined by the government's plan must be the Berlage Institute, which after being forced to dissolve by its complete defunding, it was able to adapt to its new condition and re-open as the Berlage Center for Advanced Studies in Architecture and Urban Design, associated with the Faculty of Architecture of the Delft University of Technology.

Maatschappij tot Bevordering der Bouwkunst also became too concerned with advancing architecture's economic interests, losing its cultural standing in the process. Upon merging with the *Bond van Nederlandse Architecten*, the *Maatschappij* became a mere name brand in the new, larger organization, with every vestige of its legacy and existence being either lost or forgotten.

EPILOGUE: BETWEEN CRITICAL AND POPULAR

While architecture museums have only become prevalent in the past thirty years, the first recorded use of the term can be traced back over two hundred years, when in 1806, architect and theorist Jacques-Guillaume Legrand proposed the combination of two very different collections of architecture. According to Legrand, the merger of the academic collection of architectural casts and original artifacts hosted by the Parisian *École d'Architecture* with the popular collection of architectural models and picturesque images assembled by Louis-François Cassas would result in a 'complete museum of architecture.'¹⁴²⁶ Fellow architect and curator of the gallery at the *École d'Architecture*, Léon Dufourny, furthered Legrand's idea by defining the objectives of the 'complete museum of architecture' as both to inspire the creativity of architects and to stimulate the appreciation of architecture by the public. From its very beginning, the architecture museum was defined as a fundamental instrument to connect the interior and exterior of the discipline by occupying a territory between critical discussion and popular dissemination of architecture. Since then, the notion that the architecture museum operates at the intersection between critical and popular has only gained currency.

In the late 1970s and early 1980s, as interest in architectural history intensified, there was a veritable boom of new architecture museums intent on occupying that intersection.¹⁴²⁷ While institutions like the Sir John Soane Museum (1813) in London or the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) Department of Architecture and Design (1932) in New York were already well-established, the ranks of architecture museums were limited at best.¹⁴²⁸ The 1980s surge in architecture museums changed that, with the foundation of several prominent institutions, like the Canadian

¹⁴²⁶ Legrand, *Collection des Chefs-d'Oeuvre de l'Architecture des Différents Peuples*, xv.

¹⁴²⁷ Bergdoll, "Curating History."

¹⁴²⁸ In 1949 MoMA merged the departments of Architecture and Design establishing the present configuration of the Department of Architecture and Design.

Centre for Architecture (CCA, 1979) in Montreal, the *Institut Français d'Architecture* (IFA, 1981) in Paris, the *Deutsches Architektur Museum* (DAM, 1983) in Frankfurt, and the *Nederlands Architectuurinstituut* (NAi, 1988) in Rotterdam.

As the range of titles adopted by these institutions already indicates, the establishment of an architecture museum did not rely on a single formula. Instead, architecture museums were established – and developed – within different contexts and conditions, but also with a diverse array of organizations, ambitions, and agendas. The variety of architecture museums was such, that the organization created to promote cooperation among these institutions deliberately adopted the title of ‘confederation’ to better describe the loose-knit character of its member-institutions.¹⁴²⁹ However, while the conditions and agendas of this plethora of institutions still vary greatly today, they all fundamentally share the same objective: to advance architecture through critical discussion and public dissemination.

The Societal Interface of Architecture

Throughout the years, architecture museums have instrumentalized this dual mandate to achieve a rather unique objective: to actively guide architecture’s development. Such ambition is particularly striking when compared to art museums, which are perfectly content to simply reflect on art. In contrast, architecture museums actively project architecture’s disciplinary advancement; they aspire to be instrumental in architecture’s progress.

In pursuit of this objective, museums intervene both directly and indirectly with architecture. With the disbursement of commissions, the organization of competitions, and the promotion of commercial connections, architecture museums directly participate in the production of new work. But by establishing sophisticated networks of societal and cultural engagement, the same museums

¹⁴²⁹ ICAM, “ICAM Charter.”

indirectly affect the discipline by creating a new context for the reception of that work. However varied the strategies, they result in a forceful activism that has become a defining characteristic of architecture museums. With these strategies, architecture museums become primary incubators for architectural culture.

Together with the MoMA, the NAI was perhaps the most ambitious architecture museum in this regard. The Dutch institute not only created a “favorable climate for architecture” through the support of the journal *Archis*, the foundation of NAI Publishers, and surgical societal interventions, but also forcefully influenced the development of Dutch architecture. The plethora of study commissions and competitions organized by the institute is well known, but the most direct intervention occurred in 1995, when the NAI orchestrated financial assistance to Rem Koolhaas’ nearly bankrupt office to the tune of 400.000 guilders.¹⁴³⁰ A more direct intervention than funneling funds to an architecture office could hardly be conceived.

The political agency of the architecture museum is also expressed, albeit less conspicuously, in the archives of these institutions. Beyond an essential interface between the interiority and exteriority of architecture, museums are also a privileged interface between the past, present, and future of the discipline. By hosting—and making available—the archives of accumulated architectural knowledge, museums have not only grounded their activism and activities, but further claimed their position within the architectural apparatus. As Michel Foucault has argued, the archive is not merely the sum of all texts and artifacts that define a culture, nor the set of institutions that make it possible to record and preserve them. Instead, the archive regulates how

¹⁴³⁰ The operation was brokered by the NAI and involved several other public organizations. Instead of a direct bailout to the ailing office, the operation was presented as a purchase of select OMA’s models for the institute’s archive. Nevertheless, the purchase of this material was still remarkable, since it contravened the institute’s long-standing policy of acquiring new archival material solely through donations. Shortly afterwards, the CCA engaged in a similar operation and purchased Peter Eisenman’s entire archive for an undisclosed amount.

history is understood and how new meanings are formulated.¹⁴³¹ The archive not only allows for new statements to be enunciated, but also for previous statements to remain present and relevant, in a continuous production of knowledge that enables the spread of architecture across space and time.

Far from being monolithic, archival policies within contemporary architecture museums vary considerably. While some (like the CCA and the NAI) have favored the encyclopedic breadth of full archives, others (like the MoMA and the DAM) have pursued the critical depth afforded by antiquarian collections of select artifacts. Paradoxically, such divergent stances towards the archive both reflect the different museums' conceptions of architecture and reinforce the centrality of the archive as the instrument where claims are made and statements established. While their basic perspective of architecture may differ, all museums instrumentalize the archive to validate and legitimize their specific conception of the discipline. As George Orwell so aptly phrased it: "Who controls the past controls the future: who controls the present controls the past."¹⁴³²

Critical Processes, Popular Products

The focus on processes rather than products of architecture within the museum's architectural archive is also a defining quality of architecture museums. While art museums typically collect and exhibit finished products, most architecture museums have found it physically impossible to collect, let alone exhibit, the 'conventional' products of architecture. Given the difficulty of exhibiting buildings, architecture museums have conventionally displayed representations of the architectural process in their place.¹⁴³³ Drawings, documents, models and other artifacts have come to populate the archives and galleries of museums as proxies for buildings and as expressions of

¹⁴³¹ Foucault, *The Archaeology of Knowledge*, 129.

¹⁴³² George Orwell, *Nineteen Eighty-Four* (New York: Knopf, 1992).

¹⁴³³ The most notable exception must be the Vitra Design Museum which boasts several buildings by Pritzker prize recipients in its campus in Weil am Rhein, Germany.

architecture.¹⁴³⁴ This situation has served to reinforce the basic premise underpinning the modern conception of architecture famously established by Leon-Battista Alberti: the separation of the abstract act of design and the material act of construction.¹⁴³⁵

Such an intellectualization of architecture has proven decisive in constructing the discipline's cultural standing, enabling its dissemination independent of construction. However, the same intellectualization that has allowed architecture to be collected by and exhibited in museums has also erected a barrier, making it all too difficult for those outside the discipline to be engaged. Architectural representations, shrouded by a blanket of drawing conventions and disciplinary jargon, are far from the everyday experience of a building. Such distance between abstraction and experience has mostly alienated rather than engaged a wider audience with the processes and issues of architecture. Accordingly, the MoMA has hosted several exhibitions that have been widely recognized for directly influencing the development of architecture, but its most popular exhibitions were the houses built in the museum's garden between 1949 and 1953.¹⁴³⁶ In the architecture museum, the intellectualization that separates concept from material, representation from experience, also creates a distinct division between critical and popular. Effectively, these critical and popular mandates pull in different and often conflicting directions. Although architecture museums traditionally attempt to balance these conflicting pulls, given their inability

¹⁴³⁴ In a special issue of *Log* dedicated to "Curating Architecture," most contributors acknowledge—even if indirectly—this difficulty in collecting and exhibiting architecture, but Eve Blau is most incisive as she identifies this difficulty as the "central paradox of the architecture museum." Blau, "Curating Architecture with Architecture."

¹⁴³⁵ Pointed by many as the crucial moment for the formalization of architecture as a discipline, it was perhaps best articulated by Patrik Schumacher's claim that "Alberti's distinction between form and material is constitutive for the emergence of architecture as intellectual discipline." See Schumacher, *The Autopoiesis of Architecture*, 83.

¹⁴³⁶ Barry Bergdoll, "At Home in the Museum?," *Log* 15 (Winter 2009): 40.

to exhibit architecture itself, it has led to a natural propensity to favor critical discussion over popular dissemination.

A simple solution to this problem—which has been adopted all too frequently—has been to merely sublimate architecture with painting or sculpture. By selecting and presenting architectural drawings and models based on their aesthetic qualities rather than the depth of their architectural ingenuity, museums have been able to sidestep the issue. However, if the appreciation of the architectural drawing is exhausted in the admiration of the aesthetic qualities of the object of representation itself, the underlying architectural ideas become, basically, redundant. Therefore, the sublimation of architecture may lower the barrier to entry and allow the engagement of a wider audience, but it also normalizes a skewed understanding of the discipline.

One of the most productive ways in which architecture museums are re-engaging a wider audience while stimulating critical discussion is through a fundamental shift in curatorial strategies. Instead of merely displaying objects, architecture museums are increasingly creating architectural experiences. Through the creation of experiences, museums address the problem of the intellectualization of architectural representation in a way that elevates, rather than sublimates, architecture's specificity. These experiences not only translate architectural knowledge to a format more adept to popular dissemination, but also recontextualize knowledge to construct new meaning for critical discussion. As Sylvia Lavin points out, architecture exhibitions not only display architectural work, but in and of themselves can produce a new form of architectural work. Something other than mere interpretation or simple spectacle, something that seeks particular effects of its own.¹⁴³⁷

¹⁴³⁷ Sylvia Lavin, "Showing Work," ed. Cynthia Davidson, *Log 20: Curating Architecture*, Fall 2010, 4–10. I have also worked on several architectural exhibitions under Sylvia Lavin's guidance.

While seemingly a minor detail, the importance of cultivating a knowledgeable and well-informed audience for architecture can hardly be overstated. As Fredric Jameson has eloquently argued, architecture is intrinsically connected to economic systems, and the development of architecture relies on a power structure driven as much by exterior economic forces as interior expert opinions.¹⁴³⁸ In architecture's development, patrons and critics have been just as influential as architects. By being able to communicate the meaning of architecture beyond the aesthetic expression of its representation, architecture museums can cultivate a well-informed audience—including knowledgeable patrons—that appreciate architecture as a cultural activity. By understanding architectural processes, an educated audience not only values the cultural and intellectual depth of architecture, but will also demand for an architecture of higher standards, an architecture that contemplates not just functions and costs, but also concepts and forms.

From Popular to Commercial

The exposure to a large audience has granted the architecture museum the ability to confer greater visibility not just to architecture, but to specific architects as well. Since such recognition invariably increases the profile of the involved architects, architectural offices have a material incentive to use museums as marketing instruments to increase brand recognition and, inherently, their value. The well-known “stories of the OMA and Herzog & de Meuron exhibitions in the beginning of the 1990s” were for current ICAM president Dietmar Steiner, the most famed expression of such condition.¹⁴³⁹

Architectural practices have been able to gain influence over architecture museums by astutely leveraging the museum's interest in presenting contemporary developments of the discipline.

¹⁴³⁸ Fredric Jameson, *Postmodernism, Or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, Post-Contemporary Interventions (Durham: Duke University Press, 1991), 4–5.

¹⁴³⁹ Steiner, “ICAM, 30 Years Lecture: Architecture Museums Today,” 59.

Specifically, by owning the drawings, models, and other artifacts that are exhibited in museums, architects fundamentally retain tremendous control over possible readings of their work and can shape the discourse being produced by museums. Museums, however, cannot be exculpated from these dealings. Well aware of the potential financial benefits created by the cultural validation of their galleries, museums have frequently requested that architectural practices take on some of these exhibition expenses. Such a financial arrangement may allow museums to produce shows without much funding, but inevitably further compromises the museum's critical independence.

If ownership of material already entitled architects to some tacit control over the museum's construction of discourse, by footing the bill, their control becomes more noticeable. Simply put, if the narrative created by the curator is not to the architect's liking, an entire exhibition can be shut down in an instant. That is precisely what almost happened when Frank Gehry began doubting the direction of the exhibition *A New Sculpturalism: Contemporary Architecture From Southern California* and announced his unwillingness to participate in the show. As a central figure in the collective exhibition of thirty-four different offices and architects, Gehry's withdrawal threw the entire show into complete disarray and its opening was no longer certain.¹⁴⁴⁰ While Gehry may have been right to object to the perceived trivialization of his work, the affect of his withdrawal on the exhibition only exposed the curator's lack of intellectual independence to construct a reading of Gehry's work to which Gehry clearly opposed. Inevitably, when vested interests—financial or otherwise—lurk in architectural exhibitions, critical discussion becomes precluded. As any salesman knows, to close a sale you must accentuate the positive and disregard the negative.

¹⁴⁴⁰ After some concessions, Gehry accepted to remain in the show. The exhibition was hosted at the Museum of Contemporary Art (MoCA) in Los Angeles, between June 16 and September 16, 2013. The entire saga was reported by the Los Angeles Times architecture critic, Christopher Hawthorne. For an overview, see Christopher Hawthorne, "Review: MOCA's Revamped Architecture Show a Model of Insularity," *Los Angeles Times*, June 29, 2013.

Of greater concern, however, is the way commercial interests are metastasizing in architecture museums. Even though economic benefits have always been a side effect of showing work in a museum, recently there has been an unapologetic reversal where economic, rather than cultural, advancement has become the main goal of museum-activity. The recent reformulation of the NAI as The New Institute for 'creative industries', and the entire rhetoric supporting it, is a case in point. By reframing the mission of the architecture museum in an economic rather than cultural framework, the foundation of the New Institute gravely endangers the cultural authority accrued by the NAI in its twenty-five years of existence. In this market-driven context, architecture museums risk becoming mere glorified showrooms for commodity architecture, where the only advancement of the discipline is experienced in the pockets of the championed architects.

Ultimately, by displacing architectural discussion with marketing propaganda, the planned monetization of the museum's cultural standing is tantamount to a critical withdrawal, which may bring short-term financial gains but will inevitably lead to long-term cultural losses for the discipline. The distinction between commercial and popular appears blurry at first, but if we look at their divergent objectives we see a clear difference. If the commercial direction finds its purpose in increasing revenue, the popular function aims to educate its audience in the cultural appreciation of the discipline. And while critical and popular are not inherently incompatible within the architecture museum, critical and commercial most certainly are.

Criticality in the Museum

The capacity in which an architecture museum can be critical is an enduring question. Its favored medium, the architectural exhibition, has been accused of being uncritical; its engagement with a wider audience of being simplistic; even its archive has been cast as obsolete. However, just because criticality is not immediately discernible, it does not mean that it does not exist. The architecture museum is critical when it forces new architectural work to be contextualized and confronted with the previous knowledge contained in its archives. It is critical, when it compels

architecture to reveal its issues, resolve its discrepancies, and enunciate its positions to a wider public. And it is critical, when it produces new disciplinary discourse through the juxtaposition of objects and installations in its galleries. It is in this multiplicity of strategies and policies that the architecture museum both reveals and conceals its criticality.

The continued success—and relevance—of the architecture museum within architecture's critical apparatus hinges upon its ability to continue bridging the divide between critical and popular. The museum still needs to be able to construct theoretical and critical frameworks through which the production of architecture can be informed and assessed, but it needs to be equally able to articulate architectural knowledge to a wider audience not privy to the intellectualization of the discipline. The most productive work the architecture museum can accomplish is to increasingly close this gap while embracing architecture's specificity.

By all accounts, architecture museums have been increasingly successful in this objective. There seem to be signs of a growing interest in architecture as a cultural activity—from the establishment of university degrees in architectural curating to the increased ticket sales at architectural museums. It is ironic then, that this surge of interest in architecture is primarily understood by the powers that be as indicative that the architecture museum has achieved its objective and can now be dismantled or have its cultural standing co-opted to the service of economic flows.

The museum's objective to support the advancement of architecture is always a task in progress, one that is inherently ongoing, continually developing, and incomplete. To dispense with the architecture museum is to deprive architectural culture from its most significant instrument of mediating between the past and the present, the interior and the exterior, of the discipline. It signifies the dismantling of an important disciplinary instrument that constructs and upholds the fundamental framework for architectural innovation and invention, a framework based on the

critical qualities of inclusive discussion. Like other infrastructural amenities, the fundamental agency of the architecture museum remains unnoticed until it is no longer available.

More than ever, the architecture museum merits and requires support from architectural circles since the imposition of market-driven ideologies on the museum may have unforeseen consequences to the entire discipline. For if the architecture museum—the most public of all architectural institutions—no longer believes in the cultural standing of architecture, why then should its audience?

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- “Aan Onze Lezers.” *De Opmerker* 1, no. 1 (April 7, 1866): 1.
- “Aaron Betsky Wil NAI in Rotterdam Verder Uitbouwen.” *Het Financieele Dagblad*, February 1, 2001.
- Adorno, Theodor W. “Valéry Proust Museum.” In *Prisms*, translated by Samuel Weber and Shierry Weber, 173–185. *Studies in Contemporary German Social Thought*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1981.
- “Adri Duivesteyn Directeur Architectuurinstituut Rotterdam.” *Het Vrije Volk*, September 22, 1989.
- AIA-ACSA Teacher Seminar. *The History, Theory, and Criticism of Architecture: Papers*. Edited by Marcus Whiffen. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1965.
- Alberti, Leon Battista. *On the Art of Building in Ten Books*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1988.
- “Algemeene Vergadering van de Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst.” *De Opmerker* 16, no. 22, bijvoegsel (May 28, 1881).
- Andersson, Hans. “Brief Aan de Minister van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur,” July 25, 1987. SGWO s23.
- . “Brief Aan de Selectiecommissie van Het Bestuur,” January 27, 1989. BSTU 1989.
- . “Brief Aan de Stichting Instituut Voor Architectuur,” April 7, 1988. NDBK 415.
- . “Concept-Advertentietekst,” August 19, 1988. BSTU 1988.
- . “Leidraad Discussie Beleidsplan Ten Gunste van Bestuur,” November 15, 1988. BSTU 1989.
- . “Lezingencylus ‘Zes Ontwerpen Voor Het Nederlands Architectuur Instituut,’” July 1988. BSTU 1989.
- . “Oprichting Akte van de Stichting Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw,” August 17, 1988. NDBK 424.
- . “Oprichting Akte van de Vereniging Leliman, Vrienden van Het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut,” September 27, 1989. BSTU 1989.
- . “Persbericht Benoeming Directeur Nederlands Architectuur Instituut,” September 21, 1989. BSTU 1989.
- . “Persbericht Nederlands Architectuur Instituut,” November 1987. SGWO s23.
- . “Persbericht: Samengaan Bibliotheken Stichting Wonen En Nederlands Documentatiecentrum Voor de Bouwkunst,” December 1988. BSTU 1988.
- . “Samenstelling Bestuur Stichting Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw,” August 1988. BSTU 1988.
- . “Stuurgroep/Overige Actuele Zaken,” August 26, 1988. BSTU 1988.
- . “Suggesties Speech Jhr. Drs. P.A.C. Beelaerts van Blokland Ten Gunste van Speciale Ontvangst in Boymans-van Beuningen,” August 1988. BSTU 1988.
- . “Suggesties Speech Voor Overdracht Archieven/Collecties SAM-Staat En Staat-Nederlands Architectuurinstituut,” September 29, 1989. BSTU 1989.
- . “Verhouding Tussen Bestuur En Directie Architectuurinstituut,” November 1988. BSTU 1988.
- . “Voorstel Voor de Statuten Ten Behoeve van de Oprichting van de Stichting Leliman, Vrienden van Het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut,” February 3, 1989. BSTU 1989.
- . “Voortgang Project Architectuur Instituut,” November 27, 1986. BSTU 1988.
- . “Voortgang Project Architectuur Instituut: (t.b.v. Agendapunt 3 Stuurgroep Vergadering 5-9-1986),” August 28, 1986. BSTU 1988.
- Andersson, Hans, and E.T. van Wijk. “Detacheringsovereenkomst,” December 30, 1988. BSTU 1989.
- André de la Porte, M. “Verslag van de Eerste Bestuursvergadering van 22 Augustus 1988,” August 23, 1988. BSTU 1988.

- . “Verslag van de Vierde Bestuursvergadering van 2 Oktober 1988,” October 5, 1988. BSTU 1988.
- . “Verslag van de Vijfde Bestuursvergadering van 18 Oktober 1988,” October 24, 1988. BSTU 1988.
- “Announcement of Position NAI Director.” *Archis*, May 1994.
- “ARAM 3: “Notulen van Ledenvergaderingen, 22 Oktober 1862 - 2 Februari 1870,” n.d.
- “Architectuur- En Kunstnijverheidstentoonstelling November 1935.” *Bouwkundig Weekblad Architectura* 56, no. 35 (August 31, 1935): 364.
- “Architectuurinstituut Voor Breed Publiek.” *Gelders GB Graafschap*, April 5, 1996.
- “Architectuurmuseum.” *Plan* 10, no. 9 (September 1979): 6–10.
- “Architectuurtijdschriften.” *TU Delft*. Accessed October 11, 2012.
<http://tresor.tudelft.nl/tijdschrift/>.
- Asselbergs, Fons. “Een Nederlands Architectuurmuseum.” *Spiegel Historiae* 10, no. 10 (October 1975): 514–521.
- . *M. de Klerk en de Amsterdamse School: Architectuur, Tekeningen, Documentatie*. Amsterdam, 1973.
- . *Nederlandse Architectuur 1880-1930 Americana: Tentoonstelling*. Amsterdam: Rijksmuseum Kröller-Müller, 1975.
- Augé, Marc. *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. London: Verso, 1995.
- Baalman, Dirk, and Erik de Jong. “Museum of Archief: Kanttekeningen Bij de Collecties van Een Nieuw Architectuurinstituut.” *Wonen TABK*, no. 11–12 (June 1985): 30–43.
- Baird, George. “‘Criticality’ and Its Discontents.” *Harvard Design Magazine*, no. 21 (October 2004): 16–21.
- Barbieri, S. Umberto. “Architectuurmuseum: Het Ongeboren Kind van de BNA.” *Plan*, no. 6 (June 1979): 4–11.
- . “De Trieste Geschiedenis van de Stichting Architectuurmuseum.” *Vrij Nederland*, December 9, 1978.
- Barbieri, S. Umberto, and Leen van Duin, eds. *A Hundred Years of Dutch Architecture 1901-2000: Trends, Highlights*. Amsterdam: Uitgeverij SUN, 2003.
- Barbieri, Umberto. *De Kop van Zuid: Ontwerp En Onderzoek*. Architecture International Rotterdam. Rotterdam: Rotterdamse Kunststichting Uitgeverij, 1982.
- Baudrillard, Jean. *Selected Writings*. Edited by Mark Poster. Stanford: Stanford University Press, 2001.
- . “The Implosion of Meaning in Media.” In *Simulacra and Simulation*, 79–88. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press, 1994.
- Beasley, Gerald. “Interview with Phylis Lambert.” Edited by Monika Platzer. *ICAM Print* 3 (December 2009): 34–39.
- “Becht Was Niet Welkom.” *Trouw*, September 14, 1994.
- Bédard, Jean-François, ed. *Cities of Artificial Excavation: The Work of Peter Eisenman, 1978-1988*. New York: Rizzoli International, 1994.
- Bee, Harriet Schoenholz, and Michelle Elligott, eds. *Art in Our Time: A Chronicle of the Museum of Modern Art*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2004.
- Beek, C. van. “Inventaris Op Het Archief van de Meervoudige Opdracht Architectuur Instituut (archieff MOAI),” October 1992.
- Beeren, Wim, F Bless, M Schnitker, and M Willinge. *Het Nieuwe Bouwen: Voorgeschiedenis / Previous History*. Delft: Delft University Press, 1982.
- Bekaert, Geert. “Editorial: The Difference.” *Archis*, no. 8 (August 1994): 17.
- Bennett, Tony. *The Birth of the Museum: History, Theory, Politics*. Culture: Policies and Politics. London: Routledge, 1995.

- "Benoeming van Duivesteijn Verrast Haagse Politici En de Architecten." *NRC Handelsblad*, September 22, 1989.
- Bergdoll, Barry. "At Home in the Museum?" *Log* 15 (Winter 2009): 35–48.
- . "Curating History." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 57, no. 3 (September 1998): 257, 366.
- . "Prototypes and Archetypes: Deutsches Architekturmuseum, Frankfurt, West Germany." *Architectural Record* 172, no. 9 (August 1984): 104–117.
- Bergen, Marina van der. "De Verbouwing." *ArchiNed*, April 19, 2010. <http://www.archined.nl/interviews/2010/de-verbouwing/>.
- Berger, Peter L, and Thomas Luckmann. *The Social Construction of Reality: A Treatise in the Sociology of Knowledge*. New York: Anchor Books, 1990.
- Bergvelt, Ellinoor, and Stedelijk Museum. *Amsterdamse School, 1910-1930: Tentoonstelling*. Amsterdam: Stedelijk Museum, 1975.
- "Berichten Bouwkunst." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 38, no. 16 (April 21, 1917): 94.
- Berlage, H. P. "Brief Aan Den Directeur van Het Prentenkabinet Rijksmuseum Amesterdam," November 15, 1923. NDBK 445.
- . "Feestrede Uitgesproken Door Den Heer H.P. Berlage." *Architectura: Gedenkboek Uitgegeven Ter Gelegenheid van Het Vyftig Jarig Bestaan van Het Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia* 13 (1905): 65–67.
- "Berlijnse Benoemd Tot Directeur NAI." *Rotterdam Pont Magazine*, Spring 1996.
- "Berlijnse Galeriehoudster Wordt Nieuwe Directeur Architectuurinstituut." *Trouw*, November 15, 1995.
- Betsky, Aaron. "Selling Architecture." Edited by Penelope Dean. *Hunch: The Berlage Institute Report* 10: Mediators (Summer 2006): 62–67.
- . Interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo. Audio, July 8, 2010.
- Betsky, Aaron, and Adam Eeuwens. "The Solace of Subsidies." In *False Flat: Why Dutch Design Is so Good*, 264–303. London: Phaidon, 2004.
- Blau, Eve. "Curating Architecture with Architecture." Edited by Cynthia Davidson. *Log* 20 (Fall 2010): 18–28.
- Blau, Eve, and Edward Kaufman, eds. *Architecture and Its Image: Four Centuries of Architectural Representation: Works from the Collection of the Canadian Centre for Architecture*. Canadian Centre for Architecture Documents of Contemporary Architecture. Montreal: Canadian Centre for Architecture, 1989.
- Bock, Manfred, and Stichting Architectuurmuseum. *Architectura, 1893-1918: Tentoonstelling*. Amsterdam: Architectuurmuseum, 1975.
- Boeyinga, B. T. "Het Borstbeeld van Kromhout En Het Architectuur Museum." *Bouwkundig Weekblad Architectura* 61, no. 24 (June 15, 1940): 194.
- Boterenbrood, Jan. "Naar Aanleiding van Een Jubileums-Bouwkunst Tentoonstelling in Amsterdam." *Architectura* 27, no. 29 (September 15, 1923): 178–180.
- Bouman, Ole. "Architectuur Op Een Kruispunt; Van 'de Culturele Dimensie van de Architectuur' Naar Architectuur Als Dimensie van Cultuur," March 20, 1995. BSTU 1995.
- . "The Rise and Fall of SuperDutch." *Volume*, no. 5 (2005): 25–33.
- . "Vallen En Weer Opstaan: Reactie Ole Bouman Op Bezuinigingsplannen Cultuursector." *NAI Nieuws*, June 24, 2011. http://www.nai.nl/toolbar/nieuws/item/_pid/kolom2-1/_rp_kolom2-1_elementId/1_1012889.
- . "Why the New NAI?" Edited by Monika Platzer. *ICAM Print* 4 (February 2012): 20–29.
- . Interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo. Audio, May 2, 2011.
- Bouman, Ole, and Ben van Berkel. *RealSpace in QuickTimes: Architecture and Digitization*. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1996.

- Bourdieu, Pierre. "The Historical Genesis of a Pure Aesthetic." *The Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism* 46 (January 1987): 201–210.
- "Bouwkunst-Tentoonstelling." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 44, no. 25 (June 23, 1923): 273.
- "Bouwkunst-Tentoonstelling 1898-1923 Te Amsterdam (I)." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 44, no. 37 (September 15, 1923): 388–389.
- "Bouwkunst-Tentoonstelling 1898-1923 Te Amsterdam (II)." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 44, no. 38 (September 22, 1923): 396–398.
- Braham, Allan. *The Architecture of the French Enlightenment*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1980.
- Brinkman, Elco. "Besluit Stuurgroep," August 26, 1986. NDBK 417.
- . "Brief Aan de Bestuur van de Stichting Wonen," June 20, 1986. SGWO s23.
- . "Brief Aan de Stichting Wonen," December 18, 1984. NDBK 407.
- . "Brief van de Minister van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur Aan de Voorzitter van de Tweede Kamer Der Staten-Generaal," December 18, 1984. NDBK 407.
- . "Speech by the Minister for Welfare, Health and Cultural Affairs at the Opening of the Third International Conference of Architectural Museums," September 18, 1984. NDBK 391.
- . Interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo. Audio, April 26, 2011.
- Broekhuizen, Adolf. "Mr. Oud Loses Ornament: Correspondence between Philip Johnson and J.J.P. Oud 1931-55." In *Mart Stam's Trousers*, 55–77. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1999.
- Broos, Kees. "Signalement van Het NDB." *Museumjournaal*, no. 1 (March 1975): 2–8.
- Brouwers, Ruud. "Berlijn: Bauhaus Archiv." *Wonen TABK*, no. 11–12 (June 1985): 22–24.
- . "Nadere Uitwerking van Het Doel En de Uitgangspunten van Het Architectuurinstituut Voor de Afdeling Presentatie (Tentoonstellingen, Publikaties, Toegepast Onderzoek, Manifestaties, Educatie, Dienstverlening)," November 14, 1988. BSTU 1989.
- . "Punten Uit Gesprek over Vestigingsplaats Instituut En Aangekondigde Ombuiging '85," October 4, 1984. NDBK 407.
- . "The NAI - The History of a Design Task." In *The Netherlands Architecture Institute*, translated by Robyn de Jong-Dalziel, 68–85. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1993.
- . "Vorbereiding Bespreking Op 29/03/84 in Rijkswijk over 'Architectuurinstituut,'" March 28, 1984. NDBK 391.
- . Interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo. Audio, January 5, 2011.
- Brouwers, Ruud, and Mariet Willinge. "Activiteiten Architectuurinstituut: 1989-1992," October 13, 1988. NDBK 422.
- Bruggen, Carel van. "Helsinki: Suomen Rakennustaiteen Museo." *Wonen TABK*, no. 11–12 (June 1985): 16–18.
- Büchler, D.D. "Het Huis Met de Hoofden, Te Amsterdam." *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* 6 (1851): 182–188.
- Buffon, George Louis Leclerc. *Natural History General and Particular, Vol. 1*. Translated by William Smellie. A. Strahan, 1791.
- "Bureau Rem Koolhaas in Financiële Problemen." *NRC Handelsblad*, May 6, 1995.
- Cameron, Duncan F. "The Museum, a Temple or the Forum." *Curator: The Museum Journal* 14, no. 1 (March 1971): 11–24.
- Canadian Centre for Architecture. "AP143: Peter Eisenman Fonds." *CCA Finding Aids*. Accessed October 26, 2012.
<http://svrdam.cca.qc.ca/search/bs.aspx?langID=1#a=arch&s=380476&d=AP143&p=1&nr=1&nq=1>.
- . *CCA: The Canadian Centre for Architecture Today*. Montreal: Canadian Centre for Architecture, 1986.
- . *Centre Canadien d'Architecture: Les Débuts, 1979-1984*. Montréal: Canadian Centre for Architecture, 1984.

- . “The Collections.” In *Centre Canadien d’Architecture: Les Débuts, 1979-1984*, 114–128. Montreal: Canadian Centre for Architecture, 1984.
- . “The First Five Years.” In *Centre Canadien d’Architecture: Les Débuts, 1979-1984*, 109–113. Montréal: Canadian Centre for Architecture, 1984.
- Carpò, Mario. “Monstrous Objects, Morphing Things: On Alberti, Wiki and Bloggers.” *Perspecta*, no. 40 (September 2008): 16–21.
- . “The Turning Point of 1450: Abstract Rules versus Standardized Components in Albertian Theory.” In *Architecture in the Age of Printing: Orality, Writing, Typography, and Printed Images in the History of Architectural Theory*, translated by Sarah Benson, 119–139. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2001.
- Carr, Richard. “Phyllis Lambert and the Canadian Centre for Architecture.” *Studio International*, September 22, 2008. <http://www.studiointernational.com/index.php/phyllis-lambert-and-the-canadian-centre-for-architecture>.
- “Catalogus van Tentoonstelling van Bouwkunst in Het Maatschappelijk Gebouw.” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 6, no. 15 (April 10, 1886): 90–91.
- Chartier, Roger. *Cultural History: Between Practices and Representations*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1988.
- “Chinese Fraudeur Dupeert Nederlandse Bureaus.” *Architectenweb*, May 22, 2012. http://www.architectenweb.nl/aweb/redactie/redactie_detail.asp?iNID=29075.
- Clercq, S. de. “Instituut Voor Bouwkunst.” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 38, no. 43 (October 27, 1917): 250–251.
- Cohen, Jean-Louis. *La Coupure entre Architectes et Intellectuels, ou les Enseignements de l’Italophilie*. Paris: Ecole d’Architecture Paris-Villemin, 1984.
- Colenbrander, Bernard. “De Akelige Galm van Een Hol Vat: Perspectieven Voor Het NAI,” March 1995. BSTU 1995.
- . “Londen: RIBA - Drawings Collection En British Architectural Library.” *Wonen TABK*, no. 11–12 (June 1985): 13–16.
- . *Reference OMA: The Sublime Start of an Architectural Generation*. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1995.
- . “Samenvatting Lezingen Architecten Meervoudige Opdracht Architectuurinstituut,” September 1988. BSTU 1989.
- . “The Attractiveness of Strangers.” In *Architecture in the Netherlands: Yearbook 1988-1989*, 11–15. Deventer: Van Loghum Slaterus, 1989.
- . Interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo. Audio, January 12, 2011.
- Colenbrander, Bernard, and Ruud Brouwers, eds. *6 Designs for the Dutch Architectural Institute*. Amsterdam: Dutch Architectural Institute, 1988.
- Colman, Scott. “The Architectural Narrative: On Michael Speaks’ Ruminations on a ‘Big, Soft, Orange.’” *Architectural Theory Review: Journal of the Department of Architecture* 5, no. 2 (November 2000): 112–127.
- Commissie tot Stichting van een Architectuur Museum. “Rapport Inzake Een Architectuur-Museum,” February 4, 1913. NDBK 444.
- Commissie van Toezicht op de Ryks Akademie van Beeldende Kunsten. “Brief Aan de Minister van Binnenlandse Zaken,” September 7, 1916. NDBK 444.
- “Concept-Programma Architectuur-Museum,” January 24, 1917. NDBK 444.
- Connor, T. P. “The Making of ‘Vitruvius Britannicus.’” *Architectural History* 20 (January 1977): 14–81.
- “Contract Tussen de Stichting Architectuurmuseum En de Staat Der Nederlanden Voor de Overdracht van de Collecties Naar Het Nederlands Documentatiecentrum Voor de Bouwkunst,” September 28, 1972. VNAI 1984, 1912-1975.

- Crinion, Elizabeth. "Montreal Opens Its Architecture Museum." *Blueprint*, no. 60 (September 1989): 10.
- "Crisissfeer Bij Koolhaas; Personeel Zonder Salaris." *Rotterdams Dagblad*, May 5, 1995.
- D' Ancona, Hedy. "Brief Aan de Staatssecretaris van Onderwijs, Cultuur En Wetenschappen, De Heer Drs. A. Nuis," September 30, 1996. BSTU 1996.
- Davidson, Cynthia. "Editorial." *Log 20* (Fall 2010): 2.
- "De Inwijding van Het Maatschappelijk Gebouw En Algemeene Vergadering." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 5, no. 20 (May 23, 1885): 125–129.
- "De Onderscheidingen Op de Parijsche Tentoonstelling." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 46, no. 44 (October 31, 1925): 518.
- "De Tentoonstelling Der Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst I." *De Opmerker* 17, no. 35 (September 2, 1882): 1.
- "De Tentoonstelling Der Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst III." *De Opmerker* 17, no. 37 (September 16, 1882): 1–2.
- "De Tentoonstelling van de Maatschappij Tot Bevordering van Bouwkunst." *De Opmerker* 21, no. 15 (April 10, 1886): 123.
- "De Tentoonstellingsraad Verbiedt Den Nederlandschen Kunstenaars Elke Medewerking Aan de Wereld Tentoonstelling New York 1939." *Bouwkundig Weekblad Architectura* 59, no. 27 (July 2, 1938): 225–226.
- "Deelnemerslijst Werkgroepen Architectuur Instituut," n.d. NDBK 391.
- Derrida, Jacques. *Archive Fever: A Freudian Impression*. Religion and Postmodernism. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1996.
- Dijk, B. van. "Correspondentie." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 1, no. 11 (July 13, 1881): 57.
- Dijk, Hans van, ed. *Architecture in the Netherlands: Yearbook 1987-1988*. Deventer: Van Loghum Slaterus, 1988.
- . "Architecture: Formal Morality." In *Architecture in the Netherlands: Yearbook 1987-1988*, 6–9. Deventer: Van Loghum Slaterus, 1988.
- . "Coenen. Een Vraaggesprek Met Jo Coenen." *Archis*, no. 7 (July 1989): 29–33.
- . "'Deze Generatie Wil Weer Oplossingen Zoeken Voor Het Weena En Het Amsterdamse Stadhuis.'" *Wonen TABK*, no. 17–18 (September 1983): 56–58.
- . "Geografie En Eclecticisme: Het Recente Werk van Jo Coenen." *Archis*, no. 7 (July 1989): 10–28.
- . "Groepsgesprek Biennale Jonge Nederlandse Architecten 1983," July 13, 1983. NDBK 235.
- . "On Stagnation and Innovation: Commentary on a Selection." In *Architecture in the Netherlands: Yearbook 1994-1995*, 138–152. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1995.
- . "Paris: Institut Francais d'Architecture." *Wonen TABK*, no. 11–12 (June 1985): 18–20.
- . "Redactioneel: Coenen, Een Verrassende Keuze." *Archis*, no. 11 (November 1988): 9.
- . *Twentieth-Century Architecture in the Netherlands*. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1999.
- . "Urban Restructuring." In *Twentieth-Century Architecture in the Netherlands*, 168–175. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1999.
- . "Zes Architecturen Op Zoek Naar Een Opdrachtgever: De Ontwerpen Voor Het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut." *Archis*, no. 7 (July 1988): 8–21.
- . Interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo. Audio, January 11, 2011.
- . Interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo. Audio, February 1, 2011.
- Dijk, Hans van, and Nederlands Architectuurinstituut. *NAi Beleidsplan 1993-1996: 2nd Edition*. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1993.
- "Directeur Wil Toegankelijker Architectuur Instituut." *Dordtenaar*, April 4, 1996.
- Docter, R.J.H. "Brief Aan Het Bestuur van Het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut," November 20, 1995. BSTU 1995.

- Dorey, Helen. "12-14 Lincoln's Inn Fields." In *John Soane, Architect: Master of Space and Light*, edited by Margaret Richardson and Mary Anne Stevens, 150–173. London: Yale University Press, 1999.
- Drouin, Martin. *Le Combat du Patrimoine à Montréal (1973-2003)*. Presses de l'Université du Québec, 2005.
- Dubois, Marc. "Frankfurt: Deutsches Architektur Museum." *Wonen TABK*, no. 11–12 (June 1985): 24–27.
- Dufourny, Léon. "DOCUMENT XII: Rapport Fait À Son Excellence Le Ministre de l'Intérieur Sur La Collection de Modèles d'Architecture de M. Cassas. Par M. Dufourny Directeur de La Galerie d'Architecture." In *Le Musée d'Architecture*, edited by Werner Szambien, 140–145. Paris: Picard, 1988.
- "Duitse Directeur Architectuurinstituut." *Algemeen Dagblad*, November 15, 1995.
- Duivesteijn, Adri. "Brief Aan de Medewerkers van Het NAI," June 15, 1994. BSTU 1994.
- . "Brief Aan Het Ministerie OCW," September 16, 1994. BSTU 1995.
- . "Opvolging Directeur," September 21, 1994. BSTU 1994.
- . "The Architecture Debate: A Declaration of Intent." In *The Netherlands Architecture Institute*, translated by Robyn de Jong-Dalziel, 9–27. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1993.
- . "To the Reader." *Archis*, no. 1 (1993): 10.
- . Interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo. Audio, January 17, 2011.
- "Editorial." *Architectural Design* 55, no. 3 (1985): 1.
- "Een Woord van Protest." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 27, no. 51 (December 21, 1907): 803–804.
- "Een Architectuurmuseum Te Amsterdam: Plannen van Den B.N.A. Voor de Zuiderkerk." *Algemeen Handelsblad*, November 23, 1928.
- "Een Instituut Voor Bouwkunst." *De Opmerker* 52, no. 17 (April 28, 1917): 129–130.
- "Een Nieuwe Vereeniging." *Architectura* 25, no. 17 (April 28, 1917): 135–136.
- "Een Permanente Tentoonstelling." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 1, no. 2 (May 11, 1881): 7–8.
- "Een Tentoonstelling van Bouwkunst." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 5, no. 34 (August 29, 1885): 212.
- Ehrenberg, C.F. von. "Theorie En Praktijk." *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* 1 (1843): 48–51.
- Eikenaar, Liesbeth. "NAi En Het Publiek," March 1994. BSTU 1994.
- Elsner, John. "A Collector's Model of Desire: The House and Museum of Sir John Soane." In *The Cultures of Collecting*, edited by Roger Cardinal, 155–176. London: Reaktion Books, 1994.
- Estourgie-Beijer, Marijke. "Schoonheid, Waarheid En Karakter: Lelimans Denken over Bouwkunst." In *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst: Schetsen Uit de Geschiedenis van Het Genootschap*, edited by Erik de Jong, Coert Peter Krabbe, and Tiede J Boersma, 51–72. Amsterdam: De Sluitsteen A & NP, 1993.
- Etzel, Karl. "Over de Inrigting En Karakter van Landhuizen." *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* 1 (1843): 1–10.
- Faber, J., and B. Zwaan. "Inventaris van Het Archief van de Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst 1842-1918." Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg, Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst, 1988.
- "Feireiss Gaat NAI Tot Leven Brengen." *Trouw*, April 4, 1996.
- Feireiss, Kristin. "Antwoorden Op de Door Het Architectuurplatform Gestelde Vragen," April 21, 1997. BSTU 1997.
- . "Bijlage: Toekomst Nederlands Architectuurinstituut Ernstig in Gevaar," October 8, 1996. BSTU 1996.
- . "Brief Aan de Heer Prof. Ir. W. Patijn, Voorzitter Architectuurplatform," April 23, 1997. BSTU 1997.
- . "Foreword." In *Nine + One: Ten Young Dutch Architectural Offices*, 6–7. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1997.
- . "Frame of the Programm [sic] 1997-2000," December 19, 1995. BSTU 1996.
- . "Gesprek Hedy d'Ancona En Kristin Feireiss," October 1, 1996. BSTU 1996.

- . “It’s Not About Art.” In *The Art of Architecture Exhibitions*, 8–15. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 2001.
- . “Policy and Building.” In *The Netherlands Architecture Institute*, translated by Robyn de Jong-Dalziel, 7–12. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1998.
- . “Speciale Persconferentie: Toekomst Nederlands Architectuurinstituut Ernstig in Gevaar,” October 8, 1996. BSTU 1996.
- . , ed. *The Art of Architecture Exhibitions*. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 2001.
- . “Voortbestaan van Het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut Mag Niet in Gevaar Komen,” October 8, 1996. BSTU 1996.
- Feireiss, Lukas, and Ole Bouman, eds. *Testify! The Consequences of Architecture*. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 2011.
- Fischer, Volker. “The German Museum of Architecture.” Translated by David Porter. *International Journal of Museum Management and Curatorship* 5, no. 1 (March 1986): 19–26.
- Fletcher, Sir Banister. *Andrea Palladio: His Life and Works*. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1902.
- Forster, Kurt W. “Why Buildings Need Books.” *Log* 15 (Winter 2009): 17–23.
- Forster, Kurt Walter. “Puzzling the Pieces.” In *En Chantier: The Collections of the CCA, 1989-1999*, 11–15. Montreal: Canadian Centre for Architecture, 1999.
- Foster, Hal. “The Archive without Museums.” *October* 77 (July 1996): 97–119.
- “Foto’s Tentoonstellingsraad Op Het Geheugen van Nederland.” *NAi*. Accessed March 4, 2013. http://www.nai.nl/toolbar/nieuws/item/_rp_kolom2-1_elementId/1_1211515.
- Foucault, Michel. “Of Other Spaces.” Translated by Jay Miskowicz. *Diacritics* 16, no. 1 (Spring 1986): 22–27.
- . *The Archaeology of Knowledge*. World of Man. New York: Pantheon Books, 1972.
- Franke, Simon. Interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo. Audio, January 24, 2011.
- Frederiks, J.W. “Inschrijven Brief,” January 20, 1918. NDBK 445.
- “Frisse Wind Door Het Architectuurinstituut in Rotterdam.” *De Stem*, April 5, 1996.
- “Frits Becht Nieuwe Directeur van Het NAI in Rotterdam.” *NRC Handelsblad*, July 12, 1994.
- “Frits Becht Wordt Nieuwe Directeur van Architectuurinstituut.” *Trouw*, July 12, 1994.
- Galema, Wijnand, and Piet Vollaard, eds. *Rotterdam Herzien: Dertig Jaar Architectuur 1977 - 2007*. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2007.
- Gemeente Amsterdam. “Brief Aan de Minister van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur,” April 4, 1984. NDBK 407.
- “Gemengde Berichten: De Staatsbegroting 1918.” *De Bouwwereld* 16, no. 39 (September 26, 1917): 306–307.
- Genosko, Gary. *McLuhan and Baudrillard: The Masters of Implosion*. London: Routledge, 1999.
- Ghirardo, Diane Y. “Manfredo Tafuri and Architecture Theory in the U.S., 1970-2000.” *Perspecta* 33 (January 1, 2002): 38–47.
- Giral, Angela. “International Confederation of Architectural Museums, A History.” *ICAM Print* 3 (December 2009): 8–15.
- Grafe, Christoph. “Eight Years After Nine +One: A Conversation between Mark Linnemann, Matthijs Bouw, Mechthild Stuhlmacher and Christoph Grafe.” *OASE*, no. 67, *After the Party: Dutch Architecture 2005* (2005): 81–98.
- Gutman, Bob, and Colin Amery. “Two Architecture Museums: Washington Classic, Frankfurt First.” *Architects’ Journal* 180, no. 32 (August 1984): 30–38.
- Haan-Groen, N. A. den, and R. R. de Haas. “Advies van de Rijkscommissie Voor de Musea Aan de Minister van WVC over Oprichting van Een Architectuurinstituut 1989,” December 16, 1982. SAMU 94.
- Haaren, Hein van. “Brief Aan Arnold Reijndorp (tevens Verzonden Aan Bernard Colenbrander En Ole Bouman),” March 3, 1995. BSTU 1995.
- . “Brief Aan Het College van Burgemeester En Wethouders,” December 13, 1994. BSTU 1994.

- . “Brief Aan Het Prins Bernhard Fonds,” February 23, 1995. BSTU 1995.
- . “NAi Berichten van de Bestuursvergadering van 22 April 1995,” May 2, 1995. BSTU 1995.
- . “Overzicht Samenstelling Bestuur NAI,” November 10, 1994. BSTU 1994.
- Haaren, Hein van, and A.J. Schippers. “Overeenkomst Tussen de Stichting Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw (NAi) En Office for Metropolitan Architecture (OMA),” March 15, 1995. BSTU 1995.
- Habermas, Jürgen. “Social Structures of the Public Sphere.” In *The Structural Transformation of the Public Sphere: An Inquiry into a Category of Bourgeois Society*. Studies in Contemporary German Social Thought. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1991.
- Harris, John. “John Talman’s Design for His Wunderkammern.” *Furniture History* 21 (1985): 211–216.
- . “Le Dessin d’Architecture: Une Nouvelle Marchandise Culturelle.” In *Images et Imaginaires d’Architecture: Dessin, Peinture, Photographie, Arts Graphiques, Théâtre, Cinéma En Europe Aux XIXe et XXe Siècles*, 74–78. Paris: Centre National d’Art et de Culture Georges Pompidou, 1984.
- . “Report of ICAM 2 Conference Proceedings,” April 1981. NAI Archive: NDBK 312: “Stukken betreffende het congres ICAM II gehouden in 1981 in Londen, 1980-1981.”
- . “RIBA ‘Doesn’t Deserve Drawings Collection.’” *Architects’ Journal* 184, no. o.41 (October 8, 1986): 18.
- . “Storehouses of Knowledge: The Origins of the Contemporary Architectural Museum.” In *Centre Canadien d’Architecture/Canadian Centre for Architecture: Building and Gardens*, edited by Larry Richards, 15–32. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989.
- . “The Colen Campbell Drawings.” *Royal Institute of British Architects Journal* 74 (July 1967): 269–270.
- . *The Palladian Revival: Lord Burlington, His Villa and Garden at Chiswick*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1994.
- . *William Talman, Maverick Architect*. Studies in Architecture 2. London: Allen and Unwin, 1982.
- Harwood, John. “How Useful? The Stakes of Architectural History, Theory, and Criticism at MIT, 1945-1976.” In *A Second Modernism: MIT, Architecture, and the “Techno-Social” Moment*, edited by Arindam Dutta, 106–143, 2013.
- Hawthorne, Christopher. “Review: MOCA’s Revamped Architecture Show a Model of Insularity.” *Los Angeles Times*, June 29, 2013.
- Heerkens Thijssen, H.F. “Brief Aan Hein van Haaren,” March 10, 1995. BSTU 1995.
- Henning, Michelle. “New Media.” In *A Companion to Museum Studies*, edited by Sharon Macdonald, 302–318. Blackwell Companions in Cultural Studies 12. Malden: Blackwell Publishers, 2006.
- “Het Architectuurmuseum.” *De Bouwwereld* 13, no. 8 (February 25, 1914): 63.
- “Het Veertigjarig Bestaan Der Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst.” *De Opmerker* 16, no. 27 (July 2, 1881).
- Heuvel, Wim J. van. “Opinie: Jo Coenen Wint Meervoudige Opdracht Architectuurmuseum.” *Architectuur/Bouwen* 4, no. 10 (October 1988): 5.
- Hitchcock, Henry Russell, and Arthur Drexler, eds. *Built in USA: Post-War Architecture*. New York: Simon & Schuster, 1952.
- Hoekstra, Titia Rixt. “Building versus Bildung: Manfredo Tafuri and the Construction of a Historical Discipline.” Doctoral Dissertation, Rijksuniversiteit Groningen, 2005.
- Hofstede, C. “Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 13 December 1988,” December 21, 1988. BSTU 1989.
- . “Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 15 November 1988,” November 20, 1988. BSTU 1988.
- . “Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 18 April 1989,” April 20, 1989. BSTU 1989.

- . “Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 19 Oktober 1989,” October 23, 1989. BSTU 1989.
- . “Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 1ste Maart 1989,” March 10, 1989. BSTU 1989.
- . “Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 20 Juni 1989,” June 23, 1989. BSTU 1989.
- . “Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 20 September 1989,” September 22, 1989. BSTU 1989.
- “Hollandse Amerikaan Aaron Betsky Directeur van Het NAI.” *NRC Handelsblad*, February 1, 2001.
- Hooper-Greenhill, Eilean. “The Museum in the Disciplinary Society.” In *Museum Studies in Material Culture*, edited by Susan M. Pearce. London: Leicester University Press, 1989.
- Hoving, Frans. “Brief Aan Het Bestuur van Het Stichting Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw,” November 13, 1995. BSTU 1995.
- . “Verslag Bijeenkomst van de Ondernemingsraad van Het NAI Met Een Afvaardiging van Het Het Stichtingsbestuur,” September 15, 1994. BSTU 1994.
- Huber, Dorothy. “Bazel: Architekturmuseum.” *Wonen TABK*, no. 11–12 (June 1985): 20–21.
- Hulsman, Bernard. “Kristin Feireiss, Nieuwe Directeur, Vindt NAI Nog Te Onbekend.” *NRC Handelsblad*, April 11, 1996.
- Ibelings, Hans. *20th Century Architecture in the Netherlands*. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1995.
- . *Supermodernism: Architecture in the Age of Globalization*. Translated by Robin de Jong-Dalziel. Fascinations. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 2002.
- . Interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo. Audio, January 10, 2011.
- ICAM. “ICAM 1 List of Attendees,” August 1979. NDBK 311.
- . “ICAM 3 Report of Conference Proceedings,” September 1984. NDBK 300.
- . “ICAM Charter,” August 22, 1979.
- . “Project Document on Architectural Records,” December 1981. NAI Archive: NDBK 312: “Stukken betreffende het congres ICAM II gehouden in 1981 in Londen, 1980-1981.”
- “ICAM from 1979 to 2010.” *ICAM Print* 3 (December 2009): 32–33.
- Instituut voor Bouwkunst. “Lijst Der Personen Die in Eerste Instantie Reeds Toetraden Tot Het Instituut Voor Bouwkunst,” August 16, 1917. NDBK 445.
- . “Statuten van Het Instituut Voor Bouwkunst,” August 16, 1917. NDBK 445.
- “Instituut Voor Bouwkunst.” *De Bouwwereld* 16, no. 17 (April 28, 1917): 135.
- J. P. M. “De Tentoonstelling Te Parijs in 1925 (II).” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 46, no. 19 (May 9, 1925): 271–280.
- “J.H.W. Leliman.” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 42, no. 16 (April 16, 1921): 97–98.
- Jacques, Annie. “French Architects and the Prix de Rome.” In *Ruins of Ancient Rome: The Drawings of French Architects Who Won the Prix de Rome, 1786-1924*, edited by Roberto Cassanelli and Massimiliano David, translated by Thomas M. Hartmann, 10–21. Los Angeles: J. Paul Getty Museum, 2002.
- Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism, Or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Post-Contemporary Interventions. Durham: Duke University Press, 1991.
- Jencks, Charles, and Heinrich Klotz. “In the Steps of Vasari: Charles Jencks Interviews Heinrich Klotz.” *Architectural Design* 55, no. 3 (1985): 9–16.
- Jesserun, Jan. “Brief Aan de Minister van WVC, de Minister van VROM En de Staatssecretaris van VROM Inzake Vestigingsplaats Architectuurinstituut,” October 19, 1984. NDBK 407.
- Jessurun, Jan. “Brief Betreft NDB/Architectuur-Instituut,” July 14, 1986. NDBK 417.
- Jessurun, Jan, Pieter Cornelis Beelaerts van Blokland, and Hong Seng Yap. “Beheer Akte Tussen de Staat Der Nederlanden En de Stichting Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw,” September 29, 1989.
- Jong, Sigrid de. *J. H. Leliman (1828-1910): Eclecticisme Als Ontwerpmethode Voor Een Nieuwe Bouwkunst*. Bibliografieën En Oeuvrelijsten van Nederlandse Architecten En Stedebouwkundigen. Rotterdam: Stichting Bonas, 2001.

- Jong-Dalziel, Robyn de, trans. *The Netherlands Architecture Institute*. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1998.
- "Jubileum's Tentoonstelling Bouwkunst 1898-1923." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 44, no. 36 (September 8, 1923): 379–380.
- Kamercommissie Welzijn en Cultuur. "Verslag Mondeling Overleg Kamercommissie Welzijn En Cultuur Met Minister Brinkman," May 15, 1985. NDBK 407.
- Kantor, Sybil Gordon. *Alfred H. Barr, Jr., and the Intellectual Origins of the Museum of Modern Art*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 2002.
- Kassies, Jan. "Over Cultuurspreiding En Cultuurvorming." *Wonen TABK*, no. 11–12 (June 1985): 44–45.
- Kaufman, Edward N. "A History of the Architectural Museum: From Napoleon to Henry Ford." In *Fragments of Chicago's Past: The Collection of Architectural Fragments at the Art Institute of Chicago*, edited by Pauline A. Saliga and Robert Brueggemann, 16–51. Chicago: Art Institute of Chicago, 1990.
- . "The Architectural Museum from World's Fair to Restoration Village." *Assemblage*, no. 9 (June 1989): 21–39.
- Kaye, Barrington. *The Development of the Architectural Profession in Britain: A Sociological Study*. London: G. Allen & Unwin, 1960.
- Keith, W.G. "Inigo Jones as a Collector." *Royal Institute of British Architects Journal* 33 (December 19, 1925): 94–108.
- "Keurmeestersproject." *Wonen TABK*, no. 16–17 (September 1979).
- Kinderen, A. J. der. "Ontslag Brief van Stichting Voor Architectuur Museum," December 15, 1916. NDBK 444.
- King, Emily. "Media Archis." *032c*, no. 7 (Summer 2004): 90–95.
- Kinross, Robin, and Linda Eerme. "The Architects of the Book." *Domus*, no. 847 (April 2002): 50–79.
- Klaasse, Kamiel. Interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo. Audio, January 17, 2011.
- Kler, Annemieke de. "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 16 Maart 1994," March 23, 1994. BSTU 1994.
- . "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 17 September 1996," October 2, 1996. BSTU 1996.
- . "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 19 December 1995," December 28, 1995. BSTU 1996.
- . "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 20 Juni 1995," June 28, 1995. BSTU 1995.
- . "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 21 Maart 1995," April 8, 1995. BSTU 1995.
- . "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 22 April 1995," May 2, 1995. BSTU 1995.
- . "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 22 December 1994," December 29, 1994. BSTU 1994.
- . "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 23 Januari 2001," January 23, 2001. BSTU 2001.
- . "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 29 Mei 2000," June 10, 2000. BSTU 2000.
- . "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 5 September 2000," September 17, 2000. BSTU 2000.
- . "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 7 Februari 1995," March 8, 1995. BSTU 1995.
- . "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 7 November 1994," November 16, 1994. BSTU 1994.
- . "Verslag van de Bestuursvergadering van 7 November 1995," November 21, 1995. BSTU 1995.
- Kloosterman, Robert, and Eva Stegmeijer. "Delirious Rotterdam: The Formation of an Innovative Cluster of Architectural Firms." In *Learning from Clusters*, 203–224. Dordrecht: Springer, 2005.

- Klotz, Heinrich. "Preface." In *The History of Postmodern Architecture*, xiii–xv. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1988.
- . "The Founding of the German Architecture Museum." *Architectural Design* 55, no. 3 (1985): 5–7.
- . "The Museum of Architecture, Frankfurt-Am-Main." *Transactions / Royal Institute of British Architects* 4, no. 1 (1985).
- Knox, Tim. *Sir John Soane's Museum, London*. London: Merrell, 2009.
- Komter, Auke. "Nota Architectuurmuseum," December 1967. SAMU 94.
- . "Toespraak Namens Stichting Architectuurmuseum." Amsterdam, September 28, 1972. SAMU 30.
- "Koninklijk Besluit Nummer 5," August 16, 1917. NDBK 444.
- "Kort Verslag Bespreking Drs. Den Blauwen Rijksmuseum, Amsterdam," November 13, 1969. NDBK 122.
- Kossmann, Ernst Heinrich. *The Low Countries, 1780-1940*. Oxford History of Modern Europe. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1978.
- Kostof, Spiro, ed. *The Architect: Chapters in the History of the Profession*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 2000.
- Krabbe, Coert Peter. *Ambacht, Kunst, Wetenschap: Bevordering van de Bouwkunst in Nederland (1775-1880)*. Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg, 1998.
- Kromhout, Willem. "De Kern Voor Een Museum van Bouwkunst, Door W. Kromhout (III)." *Architectura* 29 (March 14, 1925): 103–105.
- Kruyff, J. R. "Ons Weekblad." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 1, no. 1 (May 4, 1881): 1–4.
- Lahr, M.W.E. "Verslag van de Derde Bestuursvergadering van 22 September 1988," September 26, 1988. BSTU 1988.
- . "Verslag van de Tweede Bestuursvergadering van 13 September 1988," September 15, 1988. BSTU 1988.
- Lambert, Phyllis. *Building Seagram*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2013.
- . "Design Imperatives." In *Centre Canadien d'Architecture/Canadian Centre for Architecture: Building and Gardens*, edited by Larry Richards, 55–68. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989.
- . "The Architectural Museum: A Founder's Perspective." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 58, no. 3 (September 1999): 308–315.
- . "The Canadian Centre for Architecture." *Society of Architectural Historians. Newsletter* 33, no. 1 (February 1989): 3–4.
- . "The Canadian Centre for Architecture: Collections and Programs." *ARQ: Architecture/Quebec*, no. 47 (February 1989): 8–13.
- . "The Collections of the Canadian Centre for Architecture." *Architectural Design* 59, no. 3–4 (1989): 8–11.
- Lauweriks, J. "Brief Aan Den Directeur van Den Publieke Werken Te Amsterdam," February 12, 1935. NDBK 445.
- . "Brief Aan Mevr. de Bazel-Osschot," December 13, 1934. NDBK 445.
- . "Bruikleen van Het Architectuur Museum Ter Plaatsing in de Bibliotheek van Het Ryksmuseum," January 21, 1935. NDBK 445.
- Lavin, Sylvia. *Quatremère De Quincy and the Invention of a Modern Language of Architecture*. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1992.
- . "Re Reading the Encyclopedia: Architectural Theory and the Formation of the Public in Late-Eighteenth-Century France." *The Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 53, no. 2 (June 1994): 184–192.
- . "Showing Work." Edited by Cynthia Davidson. *Log 20: Curating Architecture*, Fall 2010, 4–10.
- . "The Newest 'New' Criticism." *Log*, no. 3 (October 1, 2004): 79–80.

- Leach, Andrew. "Choosing History: A Study of Manfredo Tafuri's Theorisation of Architectural History and Architectural History Research." Doctoral Dissertation, Universiteit Gent, 2006.
- . "Choosing History: Tafuri, Criticality and the Limits of Architecture." *The Journal of Architecture* 10, no. 3 (2005): 235–244.
- . "History in the Age of Historical Representation." In *Manfredo Tafuri: Choosing History*, 91–114. Ghent: A&S Books, Department of Architecture & Urban Planning, Ghent University, 2007.
- . "Instrumentality and Criticality." In *Manfredo Tafuri: Choosing History*, 115–138. Ghent: A&S Books, Department of Architecture & Urban Planning, Ghent University, 2007.
- . *Manfredo Tafuri: Choosing History*. Ghent: A&S Books, Department of Architecture & Urban Planning, Ghent University, 2007.
- Lee, Paula Young. "Still Life, After Death." Edited by Cynthia Davidson. *Log 20* (Fall 2010): 133–140.
- Legrand, Jacques-Guillaume. *Collection des Chefs-d'Oeuvre de l'Architecture des Différents Peuples, Exécutés en Modèles sous la Direction de L. F. Cassas*. Paris: Leblanc, 1806.
- . *Essai sur l'Histoire Générale de l'Architecture: Pour servir de Texte Explicatif au Recueil et Parallèle des Édifices de tout Genre, Anciens et Modernes, Remarquables par leur Beauté, leur Grandeur ou leur Singularité*. L. Ch. Soyer, 1809.
- Legrand, Jacques-Guillaume, and Jacques Molinos. "Lettre Aux Rédacteurs." *Journal Des Arts, Des Sciences et de La Littérature*, no. 46 (20 Ventôse): 1–2.
- Leliman, J. H. "Tentoonstelling Bij Gelegenheid van Het 25-Jarig Bestaan van de Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst. Lijst Der Voorwerpen, Tentoongesteld in de Zalen Der Koninklijke Akademie van Beeldende Kunsten Te Amsterdam, 7-25 Augustus 1867." *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* 16, bijlage V (1869): 69–102.
- . "Tentoonstelling Bij Gelegenheid van Het 25-Jarig Bestaan van de Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst. Toespraak van Den Heer A.N. Godefroy, Voorzitter van de Maatschappij, 7 Augustus 1867." *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* 16, bijlage IV (1869): 65–68.
- . "Verslag van de 24ste Algemeene Vergadering (gehouden Te Amsterdam Den 27 Junij 1866)." *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* 15, bijlage IV (1867): 5–28.
- Leliman, J. H. W. "Een Architectuurmuseum." *De Bouwwereld* 11, no. 44 (October 30, 1912): 345–347.
- . "Een Museum van Bouwkundige Teekeningen." *De Bouwwereld* 10, no. 35 (August 30, 1911): 273–275.
- . "Iets over Middelbaar Technisch Onderwijs." *De Bouwwereld* 4, no. 7 (February 15, 1905): 49–51.
- Leliman, J. H. W. "J. H. W. Leliman B-I De Tuinstadtentoonstelling I." *De Bouwwereld* 7, no. 49 (December 2, 1908): 389–392.
- . "J. H. W. Leliman B-I De Tuinstadtentoonstelling II." *De Bouwwereld* 7, no. 50 (December 9, 1908): 397–401.
- . "J. H. W. Leliman B-I De Tuinstadtentoonstelling III." *De Bouwwereld* 7, no. 51 (December 16, 1908): 405–409.
- Lindvall, Jöran. "13 Years with the ICAM Board." *ICAM Print* 3 (December 2009): 28–31.
- Lipstadt, Hélène. "Architectural Publications, Competitions, and Exhibitions." In *Architecture and Its Image: Four Centuries of Architectural Representation: Works from the Collection of the Canadian Centre for Architecture*, edited by Eve Blau and Edward Kaufman, 109–137. Canadian Centre for Architecture Documents of Contemporary Architecture. Montreal: Canadian Centre for Architecture/Centre Canadien d'Architecture, 1989.
- Löfgren, Isabel. "Collateral Damage: Cultural Politics in the Age of Cultural Depression." *Paletten*, no. 284–285 (September 2011): 11–27.
- Lookman, W. M. "Architectuurmuseum Zou Geschiedenis van Opdracht En Ontwerp in Beeld Moeten Brengen." *Het Financieele Dagblad*, August 11, 1978.

- Lootsma, Bart. "Amnesty for the Real World." In *SuperDutch: New Architecture in the Netherlands*, 248–260. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2000.
- . "Forgotten Worlds, Possible Worlds." In *The Art of Architecture Exhibitions*, edited by Kristin Feireiss, 16–24. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 2001.
- . "Synthetic Regionalization: The Dutch Landscape Toward a Second Modernity." In *Recovering Landscape: Essays in Contemporary Landscape Architecture*, edited by James Corner, 250–274. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1999.
- . "The Second Modernity of Dutch Architecture." In *SuperDutch: New Architecture in the Netherlands*, 8–24. New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 2000.
- Lough, John. *Essays on the Encyclopédie of Diderot and D'Alembert*. University of Durham Publications. London: Oxford University Press, 1968.
- Lowe, C. G. "Fauvel's First Trip through Greece." *Hesperia: The Journal of the American School of Classical Studies at Athens* 5, no. 2 (January 1936): 206–224.
- Lowry, Glenn D. "Foreword." In *Envisioning Architecture: Drawings from the Museum of Modern Art*, 6–7. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2002.
- Lubbers, Maarten. "Brief Aan Het Bestuur van Het Nederlands Architectuur Instituut," February 5, 1995. BSTU 1995.
- Maandag, Ben. "Architectuur Niet Alleen Voor Vakgenoten." *Rotterdams Dagblad*, April 11, 1996.
- . "Benoeming Nieuwe Directeur NAI Wekt Verbazing." *Rotterdams Dagblad*, November 15, 1995.
- . "Frits Becht Doet Opnieuw Iedereen Versteld Staan." *Rotterdams Dagblad*, September 13, 1994.
- Malkin, Helen. "Building and Gardens: Participants, Chronology, and Specifications." In *Centre Canadien d'Architecture/Canadian Centre for Architecture: Building and Gardens*, edited by Larry Richards, 153–160. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989.
- Mallgrave, Harry Francis. *Gottfried Semper: Architect of the Nineteenth Century, A Personal and Intellectual Biography*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1996.
- Malraux, André. *Museum without Walls*. [1st ed. in the U.S.A.]. Garden City: Doubleday, 1967.
- Marchant, Hendrik Pieter. "Brief over Huisvesting Architectuur Collectie," October 26, 1934. NDBK 445.
- Marks, Alfred. Interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo. Audio, January 19, 2011.
- Matthews, Henry. "The Promotion of Modern Architecture by the Museum of Modern Art in the 1930s." *Journal of Design History* 7, no. 1 (1994): 43–59.
- McClellan, Andrew. *Inventing the Louvre: Art, Politics, and the Origins of the Modern Museum in Eighteenth-Century Paris*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1994.
- McLeod, Mary. "On Criticism [Criticism of Place: A Symposium]." *Places* 4, no. 1 (1987): 4–6.
- McQuaid, Matilda. "Acquiring Architecture: Building a Modern Collection." In *Envisioning Architecture: Drawings from the Museum of Modern Art*, 19–37. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2002.
- "Mededeelingen Betreffende de Maatschappij." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 4, no. 20 (May 15, 1884): 133.
- "Medewerkersadvies Architectenkeuze," August 1988. SGWO s23.
- Mendelsohn, Erich. *Briefe Eines Architekten*. Neuausg. Birkhäuser Architektur Bibliothek. Basel: Birkhäuser Verlag, 1991.
- Merewether, Charles. "Art and the Archive." In *The Archive*, 10–17. London: Whitechapel, 2006.
- Metz, Tracy. "Vernieuwde NAI Gaat Op de Belevingstoer." *NRC Handelsblad*, June 30, 2011.
- "Mies van Der Rohe Award 2005 for OMA." *ArchiNed*, April 6, 2005.
<http://www.archined.nl/en/also-in-the-news/overig/mies-van-der-rohe-award-2005-for-oma/>.

- Mies Van Der Rohe Award 2005: European Union Prize for Contemporary Architecture*. Barcelona: Actar, 2005.
- Ministerie Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschap. "Meer dan Kwaliteit, Een Nieuwe Visie op Cultuurbeleid," June 10, 2011.
- . *Pantser of Ruggengraat: Cultuurnota 1997-2000*. The Hague: Ministerie van Onderwijs, Cultuur en Wetenschappen, 1996.
- Ministerie Onderwijs, Kunsten en Wetenschap. "Brief Aan J. de Bie Leuveling Tjeek," November 28, 1928. SAMU 94.
- Ministerie van Buitenlandse Zaken. "Factsheet on the Homogeneous Budget for International Cooperation (HGIS)," September 19, 2013.
- Ministerie van Cultuur, Recreatie en Maatschappelijk Werk. "Persbericht Architectuurmuseum/Nederlands Documentatiecentrum Voor de Bouwkunst," September 15, 1972. SAMU 30.
- Ministerie van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid en Cultuur, and Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting, Ruimtelijke Ordening en Milieu. "Convenant Tussen de Ministerie van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur En de Ministerie van Volkshuisvesting, Ruimtelijke Ordening En Milieu," March 23, 1983. NDBK 391.
- Ministry of Culture. *A Nation of Architecture - Denmark: Settings for Life and Growth*. Copenhagen: Ministry of Culture, 2007.
- Moes, Constance. "Een 'Waardig Gebouw' Voor de Maatschappij." In *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst: Schetsen Uit de Geschiedenis van Het Genootschap*, edited by Erik de Jong, Coert Peter Krabbe, and Tiede J Boersma, 73–88. Amsterdam: De Sluitsteen A & NP, 1993.
- Mohney, David. "The Rise of Rotterdam: The First Decade of AIR." *Hunch: The Berlage Institute Report*, no. 14 (Summer 2010): 116–125.
- "MoMA: The Collection, A&D Architectural Drawing." *MoMA.org*. Accessed September 29, 2012. http://www.moma.org/collection/browse_results.php?criteria=0%3ACL%3AI%3A1&page_number=&template_id=6&sort_order=1.
- "MoMA: The Collection, A&D Architectural Model." *MoMA.org*. Accessed September 29, 2012. http://www.moma.org/collection/browse_results.php?criteria=0%3ACL%3AI%3A2&page_number=&template_id=6&sort_order=1.
- Momigliano, Arnaldo. "Ancient History and the Antiquarian." *Journal of the Warburg and Courtauld Institutes* 13, no. 3/4 (January 1950): 285–315.
- Moscoviter, Herman. "Eis van Amsterdammers: 'Bouw Naast Boymans Architectuurmuseum.'" *Vrije Volk*, December 14, 1985.
- Mueller, Milton. "Digital Convergence and Its Consequences." *Javnost - The Public* 6, no. 3 (1999): 11–28.
- Muysken, C, and C.T.J. Louis Rieber. "Een Jaarlijksche Tentoonstelling." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 6, no. 7 (February 13, 1886): 37.
- . "Prijsvraag." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 3, no. 44 (November 1, 1883): 280–281.
- Myrone, Martin, and Lucy Peltz, eds. *Producing the Past: Aspects of Antiquarian Culture and Practice, 1700-1850*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 1999.
- NAi. "Gispen Nieuwe Partner NAI." *NAi Nieuws*, September 10, 2011. http://www.nai.nl/content/1054858/gispen_nieuwe_partner_nai.
- NAi Afdeling Collectie. "Kwaliteit in de Collectie van Het NAI: Acquisitie- En Selectiebeleid NAI-Collectie 1995-2000," October 1995. BSTU 1995.
- . "Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw Afdeling Collectie: Overzicht van de Archieven En Verzamelingen," June 16, 1989. BSTU 1989.
- NAi Afdeling Presentatie. "Internationalisering Archis: Archis Quarterly," April 1989. BSTU 1989.
- NAi archive. "Inventory NDBK (Nederlands Documentatiecentrum Voor de Bouwkunst)," 2000. NAI archief NDBK. NAI.

- . "Inventory TENT (Tentoonstellingraad Voor Bouwkunst En Verwante Kunsten)," 1994. NAI archief TENT. NAI.
- . "NDBK 444," 1919. NAI archief NDBK. NAI.
- . "NDBK s1," 1928. NAI archief NDBK. NAI.
- . "Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur." *NAi*. Accessed June 11, 2013. <http://zoeken.nai.nl/CIS/object/862>.
- "NAi En VANKE Sluiten Overeenkomst Low Cost Housing." *NAi Nieuws*, August 29, 2011. http://www.nai.nl/toolbar/pers/item/_pid/kolom2-1/_rp_kolom2-1_elementId/1_1044949.
- "NAi Krijgt Interim-Directeur. Staf Architectuurinstituut Heeft Vertrouwen in Van Haaren." *Trouw*, September 28, 1994.
- "NAi Matchmaking in Mumbai." *Dutch Design Fashion Architecture*. Accessed February 3, 2014. <http://www.dutchdfa.com/india/dutch-design-workspace-india/nai-matchmaking-in-mumbai>.
- "NDBK 274: 'Stukken Betreffende de Tentoonstellingen "Auke Komter - Architect" En "Jan Wils - Olympisch Stadion," 1978-1979,," n.d.
- "NDBK 338: 'Brieven van de Beheerder van Het NDB Aan Het Bestuur van de SAM Betreffende de Problemen Tussen de Stichting En Het NDB, Concept. 1980,," n.d.
- "NDBK 391: 'Verslagen Met Bijlagen van de Vergaderingen van de Werkgroep, 1984-1985,," n.d.
- "NDBK 392: 'Subwerkgroep A: Beleidsplan,," 1984.
- "NDBK 393: 'Subwerkgroep B: "Status Aparte,,"" 1984.
- "NDBK 394: 'Subwerkgroep C: Collectie + Wat Daar Mee Verband Houdt,," 1984.
- "NDBK 395: 'Subwerkgroep D: Externe Ondersteuning,," 1984.
- "NDBK 396: 'Subwerkgroep E: Organisatie,," 1984.
- "NDBK 397: 'Subwerkgroep F: B-3 Status,," 1984.
- "NDBK 407: 'Stukken Betreffende de Keuze van de Plaats En Huisvesting van Het Nieuwe Architectuurinstituut, 1984-1985,," n.d.
- Nederlands Architectuurinstituut. "Activiteitenplan Nederlands Architectuurinstituut 1993-1996," June 30, 1991. NAI Jaarverslag.
- . "Archives and Collections." *NAi*. Accessed August 27, 2012. http://en.nai.nl/collection/about_the_collection/item/_rp_kolom2-1_elementId/1_95698.
- . "Dutchville." *NAi*. Accessed September 29, 2011. http://en.nai.nl/museum/exhibitions/current/item/_rp_kolom2-1_elementId/1_987780.
- . "Elf Aandachtspunten Voor de Verdere Ontwikkeling van Het NAI," March 16, 1994. BSTU 1994.
- . "Meerjaren Activiteiten Begroting (MAB) 1997 - 2000: Speciale Editie Bij Beleidsplan 1997-2000," December 31, 1995. BSTU 1995.
- . *NAi Beleidsplan/Policy Plan 1993-1996*. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1991.
- . "NAi Jaarverslag 1989," April 1990.
- . "NAi Jaarverslag 1993," 1994.
- . "NAi Jaarverslag 1996," September 1997.
- . "NAi Jaarverslag 2001," June 2002.
- . "NAi Jaarverslag 2005," July 2006.
- . "NAi Jaarverslag 2006: Spektakel En Verdieping," February 2007.
- . "NAi Jaarverslag 2007: Tussen Continuïteit En Verandering," June 2008.
- . "NAi Jaarverslag 2010," January 21, 2011.
- . "Op Het Snijsvlak van Opgave En Ontwerp: NAI Beleidsplan 2009-2012," March 2008.
- . "Overzicht Sponsoring Bedrijven," April 21, 2005. RVTO 2005.

- . “Persbericht 15 Maart 2011: Architectuur Dichterbij Dan Je Denkt.” *NAi Nieuws*, March 15, 2011. http://www.nai.nl/content/943823/persbericht_15-3-2011_architectuur_dichterbij_dan_je_denkt.
- . “Treasures of the NAI.” *Treasures of the NAI*. Accessed August 26, 2012. <http://schatkamer.nai.nl/en>.
- . “Veranderend Landschap: NAI Beleidsplan 1997-2000,” December 30, 1995. Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst. “Overzichten van Medewerkers,” 1980. NDBK 67.
- . “The Museum of Architecture in Amsterdam,” 1984. NDBK 455. Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst, Stichting Architectuurmuseum, and Stichting Wonen. “Bijlage van Persbericht,” August 17, 1983. NDBK 235.
- Neggers, Frans. “Inleiding.” In *Inventaris Op Het Archief van de NDB (archieff NDBK)*, 3, 2000.
- . “Voorwoord.” In *Inventaris Op Het Archief van de NDB (archieff NDBK)*, 3, 2000.
- Netherlands Architecture Institute. “Daring Design/Dwarsdesign Exhibition Brochure,” 2011.
- . “NAi Matchmaking.” *NAi*, 2012. http://en.nai.nl/platform/matchmaking/item/_pid/kolom2-1/_rp_kolom2-1_elementId/1_776870.
- Nicis Institute, and Platform 31. “Bouwen Op Een Sterk Fundament: Een Tussenevaluatie van Het Architectuurbeleid,” September 2012.
- Nietzsche, Friedrich Wilhelm. *The Use and Abuse of History*. 2d rev. ed. The Library of Liberal Arts, No. 11. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill Educational Publishing, 1957.
- “Nieuwe Directeur NAI Wordt Berlijnse Kristin Feireiss.” *De Volkskrant*, November 15, 1995.
- “Observation on a Documentary.” *Log 15* (Winter 2009): 16.
- “Officieel Gedeelte.” *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 35, no. 7 (February 15, 1915): 47.
- Oldewarris, Hans. Interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo. Audio, January 6, 2011.
- Oldewarris, Hans, and Peter de Winter. “Introduction.” In *20 Jaar 010: 1983-2003*, 11–27. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2003.
- Orwell, George. *Nineteen Eighty-Four*. New York: Knopf, 1992.
- “Overzicht van de Geschiedenis En Ontwikkeling Der Bouwkunst Bij de Verschillende Volken Der Aarde: I. De Egyptische Bouwkunst.” *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* 1 (1843): 25–34.
- Oxenaar, Aart. “Solutions to a Persistent Dilemma: Nineteenth Century.” In *Style: Standard and Signature in Dutch Architecture of the Nineteenth and Twentieth Centuries*, edited by Bernard Colenbrander, 18–54. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1993.
- Pallasmaa, Juhani. “ICAM 30 Years, The Founding of a Confederation.” *ICAM Print* 3 (December 2009): 4–6.
- Pannebakker, Christine. “Huilen En Feesten Met Kristin Feireiss.” *VB Magazine*, April 1996.
- Patteeuw, Véronique, ed. *Fresh Facts: The Best Buildings by Young Architects in the Netherlands*. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 2002.
- . , ed. *Fresher Facts: The Best Buildings by Young Architects in the Netherlands*. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 2004.
- Pauwels, Matthias. “So You Think You Can Practice Architecture in China?” *ArchiNed*, November 9, 2011. <http://www.archined.nl/opinie/2011/so-you-think-you-can-practice-architecture-in-china/>.
- Perryck, Jeanine M. S. “Brief Aan Hein van Haaren,” March 10, 1995. BSTU 1995.
- “Persoonlijk.” *De Volkskrant*, July 12, 1994.
- Pevsner, Nikolaus. “Modern Architecture and the Historian or the Return of Historicism.” *RIBA Journal* 48, no. 4 (April 1961): 230–240.
- Pey, E. B. F., Tjeerd Boersma, Esther Prook, and Dorothee Segaar. *J.H.W. Leliman (1878-1921): Architect en Publicist*. Rotterdam: Stichting Bonas, 1997.
- Platzer, Monika. “Interview with Mariet Willinge.” *ICAM Print* 3 (December 2009): 48–55.

- Pluym, Willem van der. "Het Architectuurmuseum." *Architectura* 23, no. 18 (May 1, 1915): 103.
- . "Verslag Der 2de Vergadering van de Commissie Tot Stichting van Een Architectuur-Museum, Gehouden Op 21 Maart 1914 in Het Gebouw Op Ryks Akademie van Beeldende Kunst Te Amsterdam," March 21, 1914. NDBK 444.
- . "Verslag van de Vergadering van de Commissie Tot Stichting van Een Architectuur-Museum, Gehouden Op 18 Februari 1914 in Het Gebouw Op Ryks Akademie van Beeldende Kunst Te Amsterdam," February 18, 1914. NDBK 444.
- . "Voorgeschiedenis Architectuurmuseum." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 74, no. 5 (1956): 57–59.
- Poelje, Gerrit van. "Brief Aan Jhr. H. Teding van Berkhout En Prof. W. van Der Pluym," October 26, 1934. NDBK 445.
- Pontbriand, Chantal, and George Baird. "Interview with Peter Rose." In *Centre Canadien d'Architecture/Canadian Centre for Architecture: Building and Gardens*, edited by Larry Richards, 69–77. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1989.
- Porter, Roy. *The Enlightenment*. 2nd ed. Studies in European History. Basingstoke: Palgrave, 2001.
- Postmaa, Casper, and Ben Maandag. "Directeur Architectuur Instituut Meteen Al Omstreden." *Haagsche Courant*, September 22, 1989.
- Poulot, Dominique. "Architectural Models: The Birth of a Museum of Architecture in France during the Revolution." *Lotus International* 35 (1982): 32–35.
- "Praeadvies van Het Hoofdbestuur in Zake Het Architectuur-Museum." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 35, no. 16 (April 17, 1915): 106–109.
- Presto. "De Tentoonstelling En Ons Woonvertrek." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 2, no. 39 (September 28, 1882): 399–400.
- "Prijsvraag van Het Instituut Voor Bouwkunst." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 39, no. 16 (April 20, 1918): 99.
- "Programma Voor de BNA Ledenvergadering Te Zwolle Op 23 Juni 1939." *Bouwkundig Weekblad Architectura* 60, no. 24 (June 17, 1939).
- Ree, Petra van der. "Foto's van de Tentoonstellingsraad Onder de Scanner." *NAi Blog*, December 15, 2009. http://www.nai.nl/toolbar/blog/item/_rp_kolom2-1_elementId/1_605742.
- Reijndorp, Arnold. "Een Prettig Vooruitzicht: Een Mogelijke Toekomst Voor Het Nederlands Architectuurinstituut," April 18, 1995. BSTU 1995.
- Rem Koolhaas OMA Profile*. Dutch Profiles. Rotterdam: Dutch Design Fashion Architecture, 2010. <http://www.dutchprofiles.com/profile/362/rem-koolhaas-oma>.
- Rieber, C.T.J. Louis. *De Maatschappij Tot Bevordering Der Bouwkunst van 1842 Tot 1892*. Amsterdam: Van Munster Zoon, 1892.
- . "Verslag van de 44ste Algemeene Vergadering (gehouden Op Woensdag September 28 1881, in Een Der Lokalen van Het Nutsgebouw Te Arnhem)." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 1, bijlage (1881): 30–39.
- . "Verslag van de 45ste Algemeene Vergadering (gehouden Op Donderdag 25 En Vrijdag 26 Mei 1882, in Een Der Lokalen van Het Het Genootschap: Natura Artis Magistra)." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 1, bijlage (1882): 1–17.
- Riegl, Alois. "The Architecture." In *Late Roman Art Industry*, translated by Rolf Winkes, 19–50. *Archaeologica* 36. Roma: G. Bretschneider, 1985.
- Riezenkamp, J. "Toespraak van de Plv. Directeur-Generaal Culturele Zaken, Drs. J. Riezenkamp Namens de Minister van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur, Mr. Drs. L.C. Brinkman Ter Gelegenheid van de Opening Biennale Jonge Nederlandse Architecten Bij Het Nederlands Documentatiecentrum Te Amsterdam Op 22 September 1983 Om 11.30 Uur.," September 22, 1983. NDBK 235.
- "Rijksarchitectuurmuseum." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 39, no. 25 (June 22, 1918): 170.
- Rijkscommissie van Advies in Zake der Musea. "Notulen van de Vergadering 4 Februari 1928," March 26, 1928. NDBK 445.

- . “Uitnodiging Voor Een Vergadering,” January 24, 1928. NDBK 445.
- Rijksdienst voor de Monumentenzorg. “Nota Betreffende de Plaats En Taak van Het NDB Binnen de Organisatie van de RDMZ,” September 1977. NDBK 33.
- Rijksgebouwdienst. “Alternative Analyse Inzake de Locatiekeuze Voor Een Op Te Richten Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw,” October 1984. VNAI 1984, 1984.
- Rijksgebouwendienst. “Meervoudige Opdracht Bouw/Verbouw Tweede Kamer 'S-Gravenhage,” December 1978. SGWO s23.
- Rijksprentenkabinet. “Inventarisatie van Het Werk van Architect K.P.C. de Bazel,” 1951. NDBK 445.
- Riley, Terence. “Drawn into a Collection: A Context of Practices.” In *Envisioning Architecture: Drawings from the Museum of Modern Art*, 11–17. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2002.
- Rodermond, Janny. “Architectenkeuze Architectuurinstituut: Ondoorzichtige Besluitvorming.” *De Architect* 19, no. 11 (November 1988): 32–33.
- . “Duivesteijn: Architectuur Te Lang Het Exclusieve Domein van Architecten.” *Architect* 20, no. 11 (November 1989): 42–45.
- . “Zes Ontwerpen Voor Een Architectuurinstituut.” *De Architect* 19, no. 7–8 (August 1988): 29–41.
- Rooy, Max van. “Auke Komter Neemt Afscheid van de Stichting Architectuurmuseum.” *NRC Handelsblad*, December 15, 1978.
- “Rotterdam Krijgt Nieuw Architectuurmuseum.” *Algemeen Dagblad*, January 5, 1985.
- Rotterdamse Kunststichting, sectie Architectuur. “Rapportage Betreffende de Vestiging van Een Architectuurmuseum in Rotterdam.” Rotterdamse Kunststichting, sectie Architectuur, January 1984.
- Roux, Caroline. “Interview: Phyllis Lambert.” *Blueprint*, no. 279 (June 2009): 50–51, 53–54.
- “SAMU 30: ‘Stukken Betreffende de Overdracht van de Archieven Aan de Staat Der Nederlanden, 1972,’” n.d.
- Sanders, T. “Verslag van de 40ste Algemeene Vergadering (gehouden Den 26sten En 27sten Mei 1880, in Een Der Lokalen van Het Kom. Zoolog. Genootschap Natura Artis Magistra Te Amsterdam).” *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* 26, bijlage I (1881): 1–18.
- . “Verslag van de 41ste Algemeene Vergadering (gehouden Op Donderdag 30 September 1880, in Het Lokaal van de Vereeniging Te s’Gravenhage).” *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* 26, bijlage I (1881): 41–46.
- Schilt, Jeroen, and Jouke van der Werf. *Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia: 1855-1990*. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 1992.
- Schmiedeknecht, Torsten. “Heinrich Klotz and Postmodernism in Germany.” *Architectural Design* 71, no. 6 (2001): 79–84.
- Schrijver, Lara. “Architecture: Projective, Critical, or Craft?” In *Internationales Bauhaus-Kolloquium 2009*, 353–367. Weimar: Bauhaus-Universität Weimar, 2011.
- Schumacher, Patrik. *The Autopoiesis of Architecture: A New Framework for Architecture*. Wiley, 2011.
- Seip, Elisabeth, and Dietmar Steiner. “ICAM Conferences, A Retrospective View.” *ICAM Print* 3 (December 2009): 16–27.
- Semper, Gottfried. *Style in the Technical and Tectonic Arts, or, Practical Aesthetics*. Translated by Harry Francis Mallgrave and Michael Robinson. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2004.
- “SGWO s23: ‘Architectuur Instituut Vanaf 1-1-1986; W.V.C. Correspondentie V.a. 1985,’” 1988.
- Singelenberg, P., Manfred Bock, C. Broos, and Haags Gemeentemuseum. *H.P. Berlage, Bouwmeester 1856-1934: Tentoonstelling*. Den Haag: Haags Gemeentemuseum, 1975.
- Sir John Soane’s Museum. *General Description of Sir John Soane’s Museum, with Brief Notices of Some of the More Interesting Works of Art*. Oxford: H. Hart, 1910.
<http://archive.org/details/cu31924031291119>.
- Six, Jan. “De Bazel’s Werk in Het Toekomstig Museum van Bouwkunst.” *Architectura* 29 (August 15, 1925): 293–295.

- . “De Kern Voor Een Museum van Bouwkunst, Door Jhr. Dr. J. Six.” *Architectura* 29 (February 14, 1925): 65–67.
- Sluys Veer, J.A. van der. “Kronyk, Geschiedenis van Het Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia van 1855-1905.” *Architectura: Gedenkboek Uitgegeven Ter Gelegenheid van Het Vyftig Jarig Bestaan van Het Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia* 13 (1905): 14–32.
- Société de l’Histoire de l’Art Français. “Bulletin de la Société de l’Histoire de l’Art Français.” *Bulletin de la Société de l’Histoire de l’Art Français*, 2006.
- Solà-Morales, Ignasi de. “History and History of Architecture.” *ANY 25-26: Becoming Manfredo Tafuri*, 2000, 8.
- . “The Origins of Modern Eclecticism: The Theories of Architecture in Early Nineteenth Century France.” *Perspecta* 23 (January 1987): 120–133.
- Solà-Morales, Ignasi de, and Cynthia Davidson, eds. *Being Manfredo Tafuri*. *ANY Magazine* 25-26, 2000.
- Somol, Robert E, and Sarah Whiting. “Notes Around the Doppler Effect and Other Moods of Modernism.” In *The New Architectural Pragmatism: A Harvard Design Magazine Reader*, edited by William S Saunders, 22–33. *Harvard Design Magazine Readers* 5. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 2007.
- Somol, Robert, and Sarah Whiting. “Notes around the Doppler Effect and Other Moods of Modernism.” *Perspecta* 33 (2002): 72–77.
- Speaks, Michael. “Design Intelligence: Or Thinking After the End of Metaphysics.” *Architectural Design* 72, no. 5 (October 2002): 4–9.
- . “Just There Modernism: A Fresh New Approach.” In *Nine + One: Ten Young Dutch Architectural Offices*, 18–25. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1997.
- . “Theory Was Interesting... But Now We Have Work.” *Arq: Architectural Research Quarterly* 6, no. 03 (2002): 209–212.
- . Interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo. Audio, July 7, 2010.
- “Statuten van de Stichting Vrienden van Het Nationaal Museum van Speeldoos Tot Pierement,” August 10, 1971. BSTU 1988.
- Steiner, Dietmar. “ICAM, 30 Years Lecture: Architecture Museums Today.” Edited by Monika Platzer. *ICAM Print* 3 (December 2009): 56–63.
- Stichting Architectuurmuseum. “Architectuur Museum, Nu of Nooit...!,” 1980. SAMU 78.
- . “Brief Aan de Minister van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur,” January 23, 1985. NDBK 407.
- . “Brief Aan de Minister van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur,” May 3, 1985. NDBK 407.
- . “Brief Aan de Minister van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur,” December 9, 1985. SGWO s23.
- . “Brief Aan Redactie Wonen TABK,” January 1975. VNAI 1984, 1912-1975.
- . “Geschiedenis van Het Architectuurmuseum,” 1975. SAMU 94.
- . “Statuten van de Stichting Architectuurmuseum,” September 5, 1955. SAMU 28.
- . “Statuten van de Stichting Architectuurmuseum,” August 24, 1972. SAMU 29.
- . “Statuten van de Stichting Architectuurmuseum,” February 26, 1980. SAMU 29.
- . “Structuur En Inrichting van de Leliman Vereniging,” November 11, 1987. NDBK 415.
- . “Verslag van de Bijeenkomst Dato 15 Februari 1989 Met de Heer Andersson Wnd. Directeur Ned. Architectuur Instituut En de SAM Inzake de Lelimanvereniging,” February 17, 1989. BSTU 1989.
- . “Verslag van de Bijeenkomst Met de Interdepartementale Werkgroep Inzake de Totstandkoming van Een ‘Architectuurmuseum,’” March 29, 1984. NDBK 391.
- Stichting Architectuurmuseum, Stichting Wonen, and Nederlands Documentatiecentrum voor de Bouwkunst. “Brief Aan Minister Brinkman Inzake Vestigingsplaats/Huisvesting Nederlands Architectuur Instituut,” October 12, 1984. NDBK 407.

- Stichting Wonen. "Brief Aan de Minister van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur," January 17, 1985. NDBK 407.
- . "Brief Aan de Minister van Welzijn, Volksgezondheid En Cultuur," January 21, 1986. SGWO s23.
- . "Brief Aan de Voorzitter van de Vaste Kamercommissie Voor Welzijn En Cultuur," January 18, 1985. NDBK 407.
- . "Communique: Bestuur Stichting Wonen Acht Beslissing van Minister Brinkman over Vestigingsplaats Architectuurinstituut Onjuist," December 20, 1984. NDBK 407.
- . "Uitnodiging Voor Een Bezoek Aan de Koopmansbeurs van Berlage in Amsterdam," February 13, 1985. NDBK 407.
- Stieber, Nancy. "The Criteria of Architectural Expertise." In *Housing Design and Society in Amsterdam: Reconfiguring Urban Order and Identity, 1900-1920*, 171-182. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1998.
- Stock-Nieden, Dietmar. "Die Bauten der Vitra Design GmbH in Weil am Rhein 1981-1994: Untersuchungen zur Architektur- und Ideengeschichte eines Industrieunternehmens am Ende des 20. Jahrhunderts." Dissertation, Universität Freiburg Philosophische Fakultät. Kunstgeschichtliches Institut, 2005. <http://www.freidok.uni-freiburg.de/volltexte/2530/>.
- Stuurgroep NAI. "Keuze Architect Meervoudige Opdracht, Advies van Stuurgroep Aan Het Bestuur," September 5, 1988. BSTU 1988.
- . "Overdracht Taken Stuurgroep - Bestuur Architectuurinstituut: Takenlijst Bestuur AI, Beginperiode," July 28, 1988. SGWO s23.
- . "Sollicitatieprocedure Directeur," July 28, 1988. SGWO s23.
- Stuyt, Jan. "Bouwkunst-Tentoonstelling." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 34, no. 49 (December 5, 1914): 511-514.
- Szambien, Werner. *Le Musée d'Architecture*. Paris: Picard, 1988.
- . *Le Musée d'Architecture (1776-1836), Un Projet Inachevé*. Paris: I.E.R.A.U. / S.R.A., 1984.
- . "Les Origines Du Musée d'Architecture En France." *Gazette Des Beaux-Arts* 108, no. 1413 (October 1986): 135-140.
- Tafuri, Manfredo. *Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development*. Translated by Barbara Luigia La Penta. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1976.
- . "Architecture as Metalanguage: The Critical Value of the Image." In *Theories and History of Architecture*, 103-139. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.
- . "Introduction: The Historical Project." In *The Sphere and the Labyrinth: Avant-Gardes and Architecture from Piranesi to the 1970s*, translated by Robert Connolly and Pellegrino d' Acierno, 1-21. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987.
- . *La Sfera E Il Labirinto: Avanguardia E Architettura Da Piranesi Agli Anni '70*. Torino: G. Einaudi, 1980.
- . "Modern Architecture and the Eclipse of History." In *Theories and History of Architecture*, 11-78. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.
- . "Operative Criticism." In *Theories and History of Architecture*, 141-170. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.
- . *Progetto E Utopia: Architettura E Sviluppo Capitalistico*. Roma-Bari: Laterza, 1973.
- . *Teorie E Storia dell'Architettura*. Bari: Laterza, 1968.
- . *The Sphere and the Labyrinth: Avant-Gardes and Architecture from Piranesi to the 1970s*. Translated by Robert Connolly and Pellegrino d' Acierno. Cambridge: MIT Press, 1987.
- . "The Tasks of Criticism." In *Theories and History of Architecture*, 227-237. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.
- . *Theories and History of Architecture*. 1st U.S. ed. New York: Harper & Row, 1976.
- Taverne, Ed. "Brief Aan Het Bestuur van de Stichting Nederlands Instituut Voor Stedebouw En Architectuur," March 8, 1989. BSTU 1989.

- Taverne, Ed, and Cor Wagenaar. "Between Elite and Mass: 010 and the Rise of the Architecture Industry in the Netherlands." In *20 Jaar 010: 1983-2003*, edited by Hans Oldewarris and Peter de Winter, 28–68. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2003.
- Teding van Berkhout, Jhr. H. "'S Rijks Architectuurmuseum." *Wendingen* 1, no. 12 (December 1918): 43–44.
- . "Brief Aan de Minister van Binnenlandse Zaken," August 9, 1916. NDBK 444.
- . "Nota Betreffende Plannen Voor Een Museum Voor Bouwkunde." Amsterdam, August 1950. NDBK 445.
- Teding van Berkhout, Jhr. H., and Willem van der Pluym. "'S Ryks Architectuur-Museum: Memorie van Toelichting by Het Verzoekschrift van 9 Augustus 1916," August 9, 1916. NDBK 444.
- . "Architectuurmuseum." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 39, no. 27 (July 6, 1918): 157–158.
- . "Brief Aan Den Minister van Onderwys, Kunsten En Wetenschappen," October 13, 1934. NDBK 445.
- . "Rapport van de Ryks-Commissie Tot Voorbereiding van de Stichting van Een Ryks-Architectuur-Museum," April 4, 1919. NDBK 445.
- "The Soanean Museum." *The Civil Engineer and Architect's Journal*, November 1837, 44.
- Theokas, Andrew C. "The Dutch Floriades." In *Grounds for Review: The Garden Festival in Urban Planning and Design*, 96–139. Liverpool University Press, 2004.
- Tinker Imagineers. "Experience Space: Dutchville," 2011.
- Tjeek, J. de Bie Leuveling. "De Nederlandsche Afdeeling Op de Tentoonstelling Te Parijs in 1925." *Architectura* 29 (January 3, 1925): 9–11.
- . "Oprichting Vereenigen: Financieele Basis, Enz.," September 1928. SAMU 94.
- . "Vierde Schema Voor Het Architectuurmuseum in de Zuiderkerk Te Amsterdam," February 1929. SAMU 94.
- Tjeek, J. de Bie Leuveling, and B. T. Boeyinga. "De Nederlandsche Afdeeling Op de Internationale Tentoonstelling van Moderne Decoratieve En Industriele Kunst Te Parijs in 1925." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 45, no. 38 (September 20, 1924): 369–372.
- . "Verslag van Den Tentoonstellingraad Voor Bouwkunst En Verwante Kunsten over Het Jaar 1924." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 46, no. 25 (June 20, 1925): 341.
- Tjeek, J. de Bie Leuveling, and J Luthmann. "Reglement van Den Tentoonstellingraad Voor Bouwkunst En Verwante Kunsten." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 44, no. 12 (March 24, 1923): 127–129.
- Toorn, Roemer van. "Critique = Propaganda: The Role of Critics in the Netherlands." *Hunch: The Berlage Institute Report*, no. 10 (2006): 22–25.
- . "Fresh Conservatism and Beyond." *Archis*, no. 11 (November 1997): 15–22.
- . "No More Dreams? The Passion for Reality in Recent Dutch Architecture...and Its Limitations." *Harvard Design Magazine*, no. 21 (Fall-Winter 2004): 22–31.
- Tummers, Nic, and Dirk van der Veer. "Uitnodiging Overdracht van de SAM Collecties," September 15, 1989. BSTU 1989.
- Tummers, Nic, Dirk van der Veer, and Jan Jessurun. "Schenking Akte Tussen de Stichting Architectuurmuseum En de Staat Der Nederlanden," September 29, 1989.
- Tweede Kamer. "Vragen van de Leden Belinfante (PvdA), Halsema (GroenLinks), Visser-van Doorn (CDA), Dittrich (D66) En Van Bommel (SP) Aan de Staatssecretaris van Onderwijs, Cultuur En Wetenschappen, Dhr. Van Der Ploeg over Een Mogelijke Opheffing van Het Tijdschrift Archis. (Ingezonden 26 September 2000)." *Tweede Kamer, Vergaderjaar 2000–2001*, 2000, 217–218.
- Ulzen, Patricia van. "The Battle for the Netherlands Architecture Institute." In *Imagine a Metropolis: Rotterdam's Creative Class, 1970-2000*, 171–172. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2007.
- Urbach, Henry. "Exhibition as Atmosphere." *Log 20: Curating Architecture*, Fall 2010, 11–17.
- Ursprung, Philip, ed. *Herzog & de Meuron: Natural History*. Baden: Lars Müller Publishers, 2002.

- Vasari, Giorgio. "The Nature and Materials of Design or Drawing." In *On Technique: Being the Introduction to the Three Arts of Design, Architecture, Sculpture and Painting, Prefixed to the Lives of the Most Excellent Painters, Sculptors and Architects*, translated by Louisa S. Macle hose, 205–206. London: J. M. Dent, 1907.
- Venturi, Robert. *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*. The Museum of Modern Art Papers on Architecture. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 1977.
- "Verslag van de 1320ste Gewone Leden Vergadering van Het Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia." *Architectura* 20, no. 49 (December 7, 1912): 415–417.
- "Verslag van de 1324ste Gewone Leden Vergadering van Het Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia." *Architectura* 21, no. 6 (December 7, 1912): 37–38.
- "Verslag van de 1398ste Leden Vergadering van Het Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia." *Architectura* 25, no. 44 (November 3, 1917): 340.
- "Verslag van de 1400ste Leden Vergadering van Het Genootschap Architectura et Amicitia." *Architectura* 25, no. 44 (December 1, 1917): 370.
- "Verslag van de Ledenvergadering Der M.B.V.A. Op Woensdag 14 November 1917 in 'Café Brinkmann' Te Haarlem." *Bouwkundig Weekblad* 38, no. 47 (November 24, 1917): 269–270.
- Vidler, Anthony. "Architecture in the Museum: Didactic Narratives from Boullée to Lenoir." In *The Writing of the Walls: Architectural Theory in the Late Enlightenment*, 165–173. Princeton: Princeton Architectural Press, 1987.
- . "The Paradoxes of Vandalism: Henri Grégoire and the Thermidorian Discourse on Historical Monuments." In *The Abbé Grégoire and His World*, edited by Jeremy D Popkin and Richard H Popkin, 129–156. Archives Internationales D'histoire Des Idées = International Archives of the History of Ideas 169. Dordrecht: Kluwer Academic Publishers, 2000.
- Villari, Sergio. "Scientific Thought and Architectural Language in Durand's Theoretical Work." In *J.N.L. Durand (1760-1834): Art and Science of Architecture*, 52–67. New York: Rizzoli International, 1990.
- Vlemmings, Marc. "Tegenvaller Voor Sectorinstituut in Oprichting." *Items*, May 7, 2012. <http://www.items.nl/2012/5/7/niadec-ave/>.
- Vletter, Martien de. *The Critical Seventies: Architecture and Urban Planning in the Netherlands 1968-1982*. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 2004.
- "VNAI 1984, 1984: 'Documentatie En Persknipsels over Locatiekeuze Voor Een Op Te Richten Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw. 1984.,'" 1984.
- Vollaard, Piet, and Marina van der Bergen. "What Ole Bouman Wants." *ArchiNed*, September 18, 2007. <http://www.archined.nl/interviews/2007/what-ole-bouman-wants/>.
- Warnsinck, I. "Voorrede." *Bouwkundige Bijdragen* 1, no. 1 (1843): I–VIII.
- Watkin, David. *Sir John Soane: Enlightenment Thought and the Royal Academy Lectures*. Cambridge Studies in the History of Architecture. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1996.
- Wendt, Dave. "Bekwame Architecten bij alles Gebouwd Wordt, 1946-1967." In *Academie van Bouwkunst Amsterdam 1908-2008*, 106–145. Rotterdam: 010 Publishers, 2008.
- Werkgroep NAI. "Brochure Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur, Stedebouw En Landschaaparchitectuur," May 1987. NDBK 414.
- . "Functieomschrijving Directeur Architectuur Instituut," November 21, 1986. NDBK 414.
- . "Functietyperingen," October 1988. BSTU 1988.
- . "Meervoudige Opdracht Architectuur Instituut," October 19, 1987. SGWO s23.
- . "Mogelijke Tijdelijk-Vaste Vestiging (1989 Tot 1992) Architectuurinstituut in Deel van Voormalige Drukkerij Plantijn, Westersingel 9a/b, 10, Rotterdam," December 1988. BSTU 1988.
- . "Notitie Procedure En Opdracht Nieuwbouw Architectuurinstituut," August 1986. SGWO s23.
- . "Organisatie Architectuur Instituut," December 2, 1986. SGWO s23.

- . “Organisatie Architectuur Instituut,” August 1988. NDBK 422.
- . “Schets Beleidsplan Architectuur-Instituut,” September 1986. NDBK 420.
- . “Voor Begroting Kosten Meervoudige Opdracht Architectuurinstituut,” December 1988. SGWO s23.
- Werkgroep WVC-VROM. “Hoofdlijnen M.b.t. Een Op Te Richten Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw (NIAS),” March 1, 1984. NDBK 391.
- . “Hoofdlijnen M.b.t. Een Op Te Richten Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw (NIAS) (Definitieve Versie),” July 1, 1984. NDBK 391.
- . “Notitie Ten Behoeve van de Gesprekken Tussen VWVC-VROM Werkgroep En NDB, SAM En Stichting Wonen over Het Toekomstig Architectuur-Instituut,” November 11, 1983. NDBK 391.
- . “Ontwerp Voor Een Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedenbouw,” November 23, 1984. NDBK 398.
- . “Ontwerp Voor Een Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedenbouw,” December 1, 1984. NDBK 399.
- . “Statuten van de Stichting Voor de Gebouwde Omgeving: Het Nederlands Architectuur Museum (SNAM),” March 23, 1983. NDBK 391.
- . “Verslag van Het Gesprek van de Werkgroep WVC-VROM Met Het Nederlands Documentatiecentrum Voor de Bouwkunst (NDB) over de Oprichting van Een Architectuurinstituut,” December 15, 1983. NDBK 391.
- . “Verslag van Het Gesprek van de Werkgroep WVC-VROM Met Het Stichting Architectuurmuseum (SAM) over de Oprichting van Een Architectuurinstituut,” December 15, 1983. NDBK 391.
- . “Verslag van Het Gesprek van de Werkgroep WVC-VROM Met Het Stichting Wonen over de Oprichting van Een Architectuurinstituut,” December 15, 1983. NDBK 407.
- . “Verslag van Het Overlegt over Een Op Te Richten Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedenbouw,” March 29, 1984. NDBK 391.
- White, Hayden. *The Content of the Form: Narrative Discourse and Historical Representation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press, 1987.
- Wiersema, S.J.J. “Brief Aan de Stuurgroep En Projectleden Nederlands Architectuur Instituut,” March 22, 1988. NDBK 424.
- Wigley, Mark. “Post-Operative History.” *ANY 25-26: Becoming Manfredo Tafuri*, 2000, 47–59.
- Willinge, Mariet. “Brief Aan Mevr. Drs. C. Cramer,” April 9, 1984. NDBK 391.
- . “The Collection, Backbone of the NAI.” In *The Netherlands Architecture Institute*, translated by Robyn de Jong-Dalziel, 13–19. Rotterdam: NAI Publishers, 1998.
- . Interview by Sergio Miguel Figueiredo. Audio, January 11, 2011.
- Woerkom, Dick van. “Amsterdam of Rotterdam?,” December 1983. NDBK 391.
- . “Nota Het Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedenbouw (NIAS),” April 18, 1982. NDBK 35.
- . “Standplaats Amsterdam of Rotterdam? In Het Gebouw Te Rotterdam,” October 1984. NDBK 407.
- Wolfsberger, Annette. “A New Dark Age For Dutch Culture.” *Digimag*, no. 66 (August 2011).
- Wortmann, Arthur, and Adri Duivesteyn. “Fusie Opdracht Stichting Wonen En Stichting Nederlands Instituut Voor Architectuur En Stedebouw,” December 30, 1988. BSTU 1989.
- Woud, Auke. *The Art of Building: From Classicism to Modernity: The Dutch Architectural Debate 1840-1990*. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001.
- Woud, Auke van der. “Brief Aan Het Bestuur van de Stichting NAI,” September 12, 1994. BSTU 1994.
- . “Post-Classicism, and Classicism in Disguise: The 1850s.” In *The Art of Building: From Classicism to Modernity: The Dutch Architectural Debate 1840-1990*, 27–44. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001.

- . “The Campaign to Educate the Public: The Supremacy of the Visual Image.” In *The Art of Building: From Classicism to Modernity: The Dutch Architectural Debate 1840-1990*, 113–116. Aldershot: Ashgate, 2001.
- Yeo, Richard. “Reading Encyclopedias: Science and the Organization of Knowledge in British Dictionaries of Arts and Sciences, 1730-1850.” *Isis* 82, no. 1 (March 1991): 24–49.
- Zardini, Mirko. “A Project for Two Buildings.” Edited by Monika Platzer. *ICAM Print* 4 (February 2012): 30–35.
- . “Exhibiting and Collecting Ideas: A Montreal Perspective.” *Log 20: Curating Architecture*, Fall 2010, 77–84.
- Zardini, Mirko, and Giovanna Borasi, eds. *Actions: What You Can Do With the City*. Montreal: Canadian Centre for Architecture, 2008.
- Zwiers, Henri Tino. “Zuiderkerk Als Architectuurmuseum.” *Bouwkundig Weekblad Architectura* 39, no. 27 (November 17, 1928): 361.