

OLIVIA LONGO

ORCID: 0000-0002-4961-2249

University of Brescia, Italy

THE INFLUENCE OF THE AVANT-GARDE ON DE CARLO'S CONCEPTION OF SPACE: ANARCHIST AND SITUATIONIST HUMANISM AND THE SERIES OF THRESHOLDS

WPŁYW AWANGARDY NA KONCEPCJĘ PRZESTRZENI DE CARLEGO: ANARCHISTYCZNY I SYTUACJONISTYCZNY HUMANIZM ORAZ SERIA PROGÓW

Abstract

This contribution speculates on the influence of the methods of avant-garde artistic movements in the early twentieth century on the subsequent architectural production of Giancarlo De Carlo. The protagonist of this relationship is the conception of "space", a fundamental component of architectural and urban design. To this end, De Carlo's work has been read according to these two interpretations: his anarchist and situationist humanism, and his articulation of space through series of thresholds.

Keywords: De Carlo, humanism, anarchy, situationism, thresholds

Streszczenie

W niniejszym artykule rozważa się wpływ metod awangardowych ruchów artystycznych z początku XX wieku na późniejszą twórczość architektoniczną Giancarlo De Carlego. Protagonistą tej relacji jest koncepcja „przestrzeni”, podstawowy składnik architektonicznego i urbanistycznego projektu. W tym celu twórczość De Carlego rozpatrywana jest pod kątem dwóch interpretacji: jego anarchistycznego i sytuacjonistycznego humanizmu oraz artykulacji przestrzeni poprzez serie progów.

Słowa kluczowe: De Carlo, humanizm, anarchia, sytuacjonizm, progi

1. INTRODUCTION

The precursor of the spatial and plastic expedients of the continental avant-garde (De Stijl, Art Déco, etc.) was Charles Rennie Mackintosh who made a fundamental contribution to the architecture of the twentieth century. He had studied at the Glasgow School of Art at a time when painting, in that city, had surpassed the provincial tradition, producing new forms that aroused considerable interest. In 1896, Mackintosh won the competition for the new Glasgow School of Art by creating a building with a central area full of inventiveness, influenced by Scottish castles and Manor House. The metal works on the façade and much of the interior

express a fusion of the linearity of geometric shapes with the long and delicate curves of the Liberty. The importance of Mackintosh lies in this unrepeatable harmony that inspired the Viennese architects of the time, who rejected the excess of the Art Nouveau. No one has ever been able to combine rationalism and expressiveness in such a disconcerting way¹.

Mackintosh is a good example to highlight the “fil rouge” that unites art, architecture, and construction, and understand how the methods of avant-garde artistic movements have a direct reference to the spatial conceptions of the twentieth century.

In the “House for an Art Lover” (Ill. 1), the organization of the house around many axes that compensated each other and its division into two longitudinal main volumes, that seem on the verge of slipping away, produced a tense but compact composition. He created a work that went beyond traditional models to exhibit a formal plasticity almost akin to Cubism².



Ill. 1. The rear façade of the *House for an Art Lover*, designed by Charles Rennie Mackintosh in 1901, built in Bellahouston Park, 1989–1994. Source: La façade nord (House for an art lover, Glasgow); author: Jean-Pierre Dalbéra (2009); Creative Commons 2.0; [https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:La_fa%C3%A7ade_nord_\(House_for_an_art_lover,_Glasgow\)_\(3809391720\).jpg](https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:La_fa%C3%A7ade_nord_(House_for_an_art_lover,_Glasgow)_(3809391720).jpg)

The representative method of spatial relations, developed by the Cubists, established the principles of contemporary vision. In the fifty years before Cubism, while we were witnessing the decline of painting, in France the high pictorial civilization of artists such as Picasso and Le Corbusier fertilized the ground for subsequent contemporary art. The old habit of seeing the world by the Renaissance way, that is, in three-dimensional terms, had such deep roots

¹ H. Honour, J. Fleming, N. Pevsner, *A Dictionary of Architecture*, Penguin Books Ltd, London 1966, p. 397.

² K. Frampton, *Modern Architecture: a critical History*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1980, p. 80.

in the human mind that no other form of perception was conceivable. Around 1830, a new geometry was created which differed from Euclid's in its use of more than three dimensions. Its development led mathematicians to deal with figures and dimensions that cannot be conceived through the imagination. Like the scientist, the artist has come to recognize that the classical conceptions of space and volume are limited and one-sided. The essence of space thus becomes its multilateralism, the multiplicity of potential relationships that it contains. The description of a surface from a single point of view is incomplete and its character changes depending on the point of view. In modern physics, space is conceived in relation to a mobile point of view, leading to a conscious enrichment of the ways of conceiving space in modern art. The Cubists revolved around objects, trying to get hold of their internal structure and considering objects from several points of view, none of which has absolute dominance. By dissecting the objects in this way, the Cubists see them simultaneously from all sides, adding a fourth to the three dimensions of the Renaissance: time. Thus, the principle of simultaneity is introduced into modern life, accurately defined by Einstein in one of his well-known works from 1905³.



III. 2. *Wendingen*, no. 4, 1922, with a lithographed cover after an original design by the Russian artist El Lissitzky. Source: <http://hdl.handle.net/10934/RM0001.COLLECT.509625>; author: Rijksmuseum (2019); Creative Commons 1.0; https://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Wendingen_nr_4_november_1922_RP-D-2012-3.jpg

³ S. Giedion, *Space, time and architecture*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, 1995, pp. 425–427.

In this introduction, we therefore want to emphasize only some of the scientific and artistic roots that influenced the spatial sense of the avant-garde architectural production of the twentieth century.

To the affinity with the “simultaneity” of the Cubist vision, Futurism adds homage to the triumph of industrialization and to the technical discoveries (aviation, electricity) that subsequently influenced the architectural aesthetics of Italian Futurism and Russian Constructivism⁴.

In 1919, Malevič told his students and colleagues at the Vitebsk art school that the work of artists had preceded that of the revolutionaries: Cubism and Futurism were the harbingers of the political and economic revolution of 1917. His friend and colleague El Lissitzky (Ill. 2) replied that their life had thus received new foundations, a *tabula rasa* of reinforced concrete useful for all peoples of the earth. His drawing of Lenin’s Tribune constitutes the second pillar of Constructivism and, together with the Tatlin Tower, seems to represent the observation of a new reality in progress. In 1922, together with Ilja Ehrenburg, El Lissitzky published a manifesto text where he declares that art is “international” and proclaims the establishment of a solid link between Russia and the West, beyond the differences of customs and economics. They announce the rejection of *pathos* and the search for a constructive art that does not embellish life but organizes it. This was the theoretical principle of the ABC magazine (founded in 1924), where “A” refers to “action”, “B” takes up the subtitle of the newspaper, *Beiträge zum Bauen*, meaning “contributions to building”, and “C” indicates “collective”, that is, the collective depth of architecture. ABC intended to demonstrate the gratuitousness of the aesthetic discourse and the emptiness of speculations on the autonomy of art. ABC’s proposals on reinforced concrete are linked to the interests of some Berlin and Dutch architects on its “implementation”, which should demonstrate that architecture is not an infinite accumulation of singular events, but an “industrial” production system open to all local adaptations. Reinforced concrete thus becomes the means to produce the places of collective society. The termination of the publication of ABC constituted an exhortation to “take action”. The magazine expressed a militant discourse through a “rapid montage” which, dialectically, moved between dream and *feuilleton*, between utopia and reality. The poetics of social action, manifested by the editors of the ABC magazine, never explicitly contains reference to a historical necessity of Marxism or Leninism. On the other hand, the planning and rationalization techniques developed by American capitalism are presented as a model of effectiveness, as if Taylorism and the skyscraper had no political content, and one wanted to find a balance between news from the East and those from the West⁵.

This brief historical *excursus* allows us to introduce our hypothesis on the relationship between the avant-gardes of the early twentieth century and the subsequent architectural production of Giancarlo De Carlo, which represents the centre of this contribution.

The protagonist of this relationship is the conception of “space”, a fundamental component of architectural and urban design, which critics have investigated little in De Carlo’s work, often recognized only for some themes that have characterized his work: participation in architecture, controversy against the orthodoxy of the modern (Fifties and Sixties) and that against the autonomy of architecture (Seventies and Eighties). Or for his activities of

⁴ K. Frampton, *op. cit.*, p. 90.

⁵ J. Gubler (ed), *ABC 1924–1928. Avanguardia e architettura radicale*, Electa, Milano 1983.

architectural and urban design (Urbino) and urban planning (among many, the Milanese Intercommunal Plan)⁶.

2. DE CARLO'S ANARCHIST AND SITUATIONIST HUMANISM

In 2019, during the celebration (organized by the Association of Architects in the Province of Milan) of the centenary of De Carlo's birth on the themes most dear to the master (participation, ethics and future), Massimo Cacciari underlines the strong ethical-political spirit of De Carlo and his fundamentally anarchist approach.

In 1987, during a lecture at the School of Architecture in Hull, Colin Ward emphasized the presence of a "minority and dissident" approach to architecture, against the popular idea of the architect-first woman or slave to building speculation. That approach instead sees architecture as a widespread social activity, where the architect is a propitiator or repairer, rather than an aesthetic dictator. Among these architects, he cites John F. Turner, Nikolas John Habraken, Charles Correa, Walter Segal, Giancarlo De Carlo and Hassan Fathy. A good number of professionals (like these) would like this approach to become the rule and not the exception⁷.

After the Second World War, De Carlo came into contact with the anarchist groups of the magazine "Volontà" with Berneri and Zaccaria, and of the English magazine "Freedom" with Woodcock, Read, Richards. In 1966, De Carlo went for the first time to the United States where he returned to several times for teaching periods at MIT, UCLA, Cornell. The discovery of the American reality had a considerable influence on him, in a particular periods: the war in Vietnam, the revolt of the young, pop-art, rock music, the advent of anti-Bauhaus architecture⁸.

In an interview with Franco Bunčuga, De Carlo declares that, after the 1950s and the disappointment of communism, he has returned to anarchist thinkers, rereading their writings, and reflecting on the meaning that efficiency can have, to achieve significant results. He emphasizes the ability of anarchists to be patient and not outraged or furious. He affirms that these principles have been his starting point for architecture and urbanism.

By giving importance to the means, the anarchists end up suggesting complex and tortuous processes, described by curves, hesitant and itinerant. The inefficiency of anarchists thus becomes an ethical and political quality because it can lead to being "effective", allowing them to be more candid and therefore more confident, more inclusive, aware, and consistent. It gives the possibility of encountering other processes that are not linear, such as those of nature. According to De Carlo, it is possible to have a project without keeping the goals fixed because they will continuously adapt to the circumstances, to the contour, and the project becomes much more effective and interesting⁹.

⁶ F. Bilò, *Tessiture dello spazio. Tre progetti di Giancarlo De Carlo del 1961*, Quodlibet, Macerata 2014, pp. 9–10.

⁷ C. Ward, *Architetture del dissenso. Forme e pratiche alternative dello spazio urbano*. It. trans. by Borella G., Brambilla A. (eds.), Elèuthera, Milano 2016, pp. 90–91.

⁸ A. Mioni, E.C. Occhialini (eds.), *Giancarlo De Carlo. Immagini e frammenti*, Electa, Milano 1995, p. 179.

⁹ G. De Carlo, F. Bunčuga, *Conversazioni su architettura e libertà*, Elèuthera, Milano 2000, pp. 210–212.

From anarchist thought, De Carlo took the theme of freedom from which some important corollaries derive: social spontaneity, self-management and voluntary cooperation as the foundation of free social organization, the importance of small social groups. The latter is the basis of De Carlo's choices regarding the organization of space in his architecture¹⁰.

In comparing the projects of De Carlo and Woods for the University of Dublin, as different interpretations of “mat-building”, Zuddas identified the conception of the university as a system of scattered poles connected by generic spaces for use as public as possible, through which De Carlo fragments the systems of academic power, destabilizing the old conception of a centralized university. The university is transformed into a large urban infrastructure in which proper academic use becomes only a transitory moment, creating instead the spatial conditions to define continuous reterritorialization, for the practice of different forms of learning, in addition to the traditional ones¹¹.

In his works, De Carlo often resorted to the “staging” of the daily life of the inhabitants of his architecture, acts of his stories of ordinary people who become active protagonists of the architectural expression of his buildings.



III. 3. Residential complex in Mazzorbo, Venice, Giancarlo De Carlo, 1980–1997. Source: Guido, Adobe Stock, https://stock.adobe.com/it/search?k=Mazzorbo+Giancarlo+De+Carlo&search_type=usertyped&asset_id=473965806>

¹⁰ F. Bilò, *Tessiture dello spazio. Tre progetti di Giancarlo De Carlo del 1961*, Quodlibet, Macerata 2014, pp. 86–87.

¹¹ F. Zuddas, *Pretese di equivalenza. De Carlo, Woods e il mat-building*, “Magazine del Festival dell’Architettura” 2015, 34, p. 60.

The general topics, which concern the human condition, are translated into a formal enunciation, generating a sort of antipole that highlights, by contrast, the central theme of the work, and allowing greater visibility from the outside and from afar. The contradiction that runs through the theme of freedom in De Carlo's architecture lies, on the one hand, in the tension towards the conquest of an architectural expression devoid of obligations towards pre-existing buildings, and on the other, in the ability to measure itself with the context. His critical approach to typology emerges in his way of considering dwelling as a set of ever-changing ways, shaped over time by community life. From the reality of a consolidated settlement custom, De Carlo triggers a series of progressive mutations, according to a situationist attitude that explores its hidden potential and implicit subversions. In the Mazzorbo residences (Ill. 3), a series of spaces (from the urban scale to that of the single flat) and the typological matrix dissolve in a network of topological relationships, where distance and proximity become tools for the story of living together, in an urban landscape that does not seem designed but born spontaneously¹².

3. SOCIAL NECESSITY: THE ARTICULATION OF SPACE THROUGH SERIES OF THRESHOLDS

The theme of relations between social groups, recurrent in De Carlo's research, emerges from the spatial articulation of his architecture. In the marine colony in Riccione, he considers the interesting way in which the relationships between the groups that inhabit it take place, regulating the passage from a large group to smaller ones through a series of "discrete thresholds". In this way, guests can easily choose the level of communication they prefer at different times of the day. In the Riccione building, the articulation of spaces acts at all levels, from the overall organization of the spaces to the details, both indoors and outdoors. This mastery of De Carlo became much more evident in the colleges of Urbino, such as in the Tridente, characterized by a sequence of architectural devices, by an articulation of the thresholds that from the "head" of the collective services lead to the "arms", each with its covered stairway, and from this to the common spaces. In the sea colony of Riccione, the thresholds are "discrete", that is, they consist of small changes in height or in the placement of a sequence of beams, capable of marking a spatial metric, or even in a mode of entry of light, which emphasizes a specific area, or finally in a shady portico, a threshold itself¹³ that distinguishes the internal collective life from the external one. These devices help to

¹² F. Purini, *L'opera e il tema*, [in:] F. Samassa (ed.), *Giancarlo De Carlo. Percorsi*, IUAV – AP archivio progetti, Il Poligrafo, Padua 2004, pp. 83–86.

¹³ On the theme "threshold in architecture", see the author's publications: O. Longo, *I confini psicologici dell'architettura domestica*, [in:] S. Dalzero, A. Iorio, O. Longo, C. Pirina, S. Rugino, D. Sigurtà (eds.), *Boundary Landscapes*, Tab edizioni, Rome 2020, pp. 69–76; *eadem*, *Abitare la soglia architettonica tra in-between e perturbante*, [in:] S. Rugino, *Pensare Osservare Progettare. Processi mentali e reali nel progetto di architettura liquida*, Aracne Editrice, Rome 2018, pp. 77–83; *eadem*, *Sulla soglia*, [in:] A. Margagliotta, G.F. Tuzzolino, *Spazi di città. Spazi di natura*, Abadir, Palermo 2007, pp. 54–56; *eadem*, *Architettura di soglie sceniche*, [in:] F. Avella, G. Girgenti, O. Longo, R. Pistone (eds.), *Eksédra. Disegno, rilievo, progetto, comunicazione visiva*, Edizioni Caracol, Palermo 2006, pp. 33–42; *eadem*, *Abitare la contemporaneità. Forme e identità nell'architettura*, Italo-Latino-Americana Palma Uliano Greca coeditore, Palermo–São Paulo 2004.

circumscribe the correspondence postulated by De Carlo between the definition of space and the identification of social groups¹⁴.

To underline the topicality of the theme of the “threshold in architecture”, among the many examples, we remember the research of Acre and Wyckmans who wrote, in 2015, that renovation of dwellings for energy efficiency has implications other than only technical and economic dimensions, such as performance and cost reduction. They demonstrated how the renovation of dwellings for energy efficiency impacts spatial quality by crossing technical measures of dwelling renovation with the definition of spatial quality. They affirm that “Spatial quality consists of the interaction between four determinants: (1) views, (2) internal spatiality and spatial arrangements, (3) transition between public and private spaces, and (4) perceived, built and human densities”. They underline a facet that is rarely explored in the current literature, which is how building renovation affects spatial quality. Acre and Wyckmans emphasize the relevance of non-technical dimensions such as spatial quality that influences people’s well-being¹⁵.

De Carlo’s architecture seems to spring directly from Paul Ricoeur’s theories on the concepts of “narrative architecture”, “architectural narrativity”, “spatiality of the story”, “temporality of the architectural project”. Starting from the assumption that all stories take place in one space, Ricoeur states that both the space of settlement and that of circulation consist of a system of rituals intended for the great interactions of life, and that remembering is equivalent to telling what happened in a certain place. He emphasizes the importance of considering the act of living as a receptacle of expectations, and not just of needs. “Receptive” and “active” living implies a careful reinterpretation of the urban environment and the life stories of which all the monuments and buildings bear traces. This “text of the city” contains the indissoluble coexistence of narrated time and built space. The reader not only perceives the meaning of a told story but also the “world” designed by the text. What the reader compares with this “world of the text” is the world he lived, offered to interpretation, that is, to revelation and transformation. The world of the text is a space-time world (between universal time and historical time), containing all the traces of the stories lived by the men of the past time, and is therefore mediated by the places of memory. In the figure of the “chronotype” space and time are integrated, which Ricoeur defines as “itinerancy”, halfway between wandering and the domestic spirit¹⁶.

The paths and thresholds designed by De Carlo underline the value of the “walk” and the *promenade*, carried out using the “body as a vehicle”. Gubler reminds us that if we walk thinking we will soon be fatigued, but if we abandon ourselves to the free play of the imagination, movement invigorates. Walking in this way allows us to “distract” our attention fixed on each object, by changing the objects we observe in motion. Picasso was credited with the aphorism “I reflect with my feet”. According to Rousseau, walking generates geographical awareness. Gubler quotes Laurence Sterne who states: “man is the most curious of vehicles and there is nothing more pleasing to the traveller, and more terrible for travel writers, than

¹⁴ F. Bilò, *Tessiture dello spazio. Tre progetti di Giancarlo De Carlo del 1961*, Quodlibet, Macerata 2014, pp. 26–28.

¹⁵ F. Acre, A. Wyckmans, *Dwelling renovation and spatial quality. The impact of the dwelling renovation on spatial quality determinants*, “International Journal of Sustainable Built Environment” 2015, 4, pp. 12–15.

¹⁶ P. Ricoeur, *Architettura come narrazione*, [in:] E. Rocca (ed), *Estetica e architettura*, Il Mulino, Bologna 2008, pp. 236, 240, 248–249.

a great and rich plain”. In particular, if it has no rivers or bridges, because the writer would not know what to do with it, and would find it useful only for heading to some city which, in turn, would become a starting point for reaching another plain, and so on¹⁷.

The inhabitants of De Carlo’s architectures could therefore be considered receptive bodies of sensory and phenomenological “truths”, shaken by the surrounding geography.

As William Gilpin (quoted by Gubler) states in his *Il viaggio pittoresco*, when the purpose of the journey is amusement, the hunt for sensation and novelty puts the spirit in a condition of pleasant and constant suspense. This tension indicates a primary state of receptivity or, indeed, of non-thought that culminates in the spasm of the sublime¹⁸.

4. CONCLUSION

This contribution wanted to highlight only a small part of De Carlo’s complex and multifaceted legacy, which could nourish the contemporary design culture by responding to many current needs, both for architecture and for the city.

In 2019, Biraghi wrote on the ILAUD:

the laboratories devised and strongly desired by De Carlo gave rise to a real ‘experiment’ not only with design but also humanly: ‘a place where we not only discuss but above all plan, all together.’ And it was this last notation that represented the element that distinguished ILAUD: the collective of the actions that took place there. [...] ‘All together’ meant discussing and sharing choices [...]. ‘All together’ speaks of De Carlo’s desire to get rid of the superstructures of ‘power’ of which the architect [...] seems almost inevitably to be a bearer. From this point of view, ILAUD represent only one of the forms of ‘active opposition’ to which he resorted in the course of his life to undermine such widespread and current ‘mechanisms’ as are normally tolerated.¹⁹

In today’s perspective and with a critical distance, the activities of ILAUD can appear “untimely”. From another point of view, they seem necessary, because De Carlo conceived them as a “recomposition” of architecture and urban planning, “not at all geared to showing its ‘will to power’ but rather at revealing its constitutively ‘tentative’ nature, committed to investigating multiple possibilities and solutions, and so also open to trial and error”²⁰.

This contribution concludes with a series of still open questions, which the curators of the international conference *A partire da De Carlo* posed to the speakers a few months after De Carlo’s death. The questions are inspired by the need to affect the contemporary world and by the belief that De Carlo’s teaching constitutes an alternative to the spectacle of hypermodern architecture. Among the eleven questions, those concerning this contribution are: can humanism, which permeates De Carlo’s thought, still nourish contemporary design culture? Can political commitment still be valid in a society where aesthetics has

¹⁷ J. Gubler, *Motion, émotions. Architettura, movimento e percezione*, Christian Marinotti Edizioni, Milano 2014, pp. 14–15, 17–19.

¹⁸ *Ibidem*.

¹⁹ M. Biraghi, *Laboratory experiment*, [in:] P. Ceccarelli (ed.), *Giancarlo De Carlo and ILAUD. A movable frontier. The International Laboratory of Architecture and Urban Design from 1976*, Fondazione OAMi, Milano 2019 pp. 27–28.

²⁰ *Ibidem*.

prevailed over ideology? Can his idea of the sociality of space be current and counteract some formalist drifts of contemporary architecture? Can the idea of settlement continuity, through a careful reading of physical and social contexts, still be useful in contemporary homologated territories?²¹

References:

- [1] Acre F., Wyckmans A., *Dwelling renovation and spatial quality. The impact of the dwelling renovation on spatial quality determinants*, "International Journal of Sustainable Built Environment" 2015, 4, pp. 12–41.
- [2] Bilò F., «Materiale architettonico eversivo». *Un'introduzione ai lavori* [in:] F. Bilò (ed.), *A partire da Giancarlo De Carlo*, Gangemi Editore, Rome 2007, pp. 15–21.
- [3] Bilò F., *Tessiture dello spazio. Tre progetti di Giancarlo De Carlo del 1961*, Quodlibet, Macerata 2014.
- [4] Biraghi M., *Laboratory experiment* [in:] P. Ceccarelli (ed.), *Giancarlo De Carlo and ILAUD. A movable frontier. The International Laboratory of Architecture and Urban Design from 1976*, Fondazione OAMi, Milano 2019, pp. 24–29.
- [5] De Carlo G., Bunčuga F., *Conversazioni su architettura e libertà*, Elèuthera, Milano 2000.
- [6] Frampton K., *Modern Architecture: a critical History*, Thames and Hudson, London 1980.
- [7] Giedion S., *Space, time and architecture*, Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., USA.
- [8] Gubler J. (ed.), *ABC 1924–1928. Avanguardia e architettura radicale*, Electa, Milano 1983.
- [9] Gubler J., *Motion, émotions. Architettura, movimento e percezione*, Christian Marinotti Edizioni, Milano 2014.
- [10] Honour H., Fleming J., Pevsner N., *A Dictionary of Architecture*, Penguin Books Ltd, London 1966.
- [11] Longo O., *I confini psicologici dell'architettura domestica*, [in:] S. Dalzero, A. Iorio, O. Longo, C. Pirina, S. Rugino, D. Sigurtà (eds.), *Boundary Landscapes*, Tab edizioni, Rome 2020, pp. 69–76.
- [12] Longo O., *Abitare la soglia architettonica tra in-between e perturbante*, [in:] S. Rugino, *Pensare Osservare Progettare. Processi mentali e reali nel progetto di architettura liquida*, Aracne Editrice, Roma 2018, pp. 77–83.
- [13] Longo O., *Sulla soglia*, [in:] A. Margagliotta, G.F. Tuzzolino, *Spazi di città. Spazi di natura*, Abadir, Palermo 2007, pp. 54–56.
- [14] Longo O., *Architettura di soglie sceniche*, [in:] F. Avella, G. Girgenti, O. Longo, R. Pistone (eds.), *Eksédra. Disegno, rilievo, progetto, comunicazione visiva*, Edizioni Caracol, Palermo 2006, pp. 33–42.
- [15] Longo O., *Abitare la contemporaneità. Forme e identità nell'architettura*, Italo-Latino-Americana Palma Uliano Greca coeditore, Palermo–São Paulo 2004.
- [16] Mioni A., Occhialini E.C. (eds.), *Giancarlo De Carlo. Immagini e frammenti*, Electa, Milano 1995.
- [17] Purini F., *L'opera e il tema*, [in:] Samassa F. (ed.), *Giancarlo De Carlo. Percorsi*, IUAV – AP archivio progetti, Il Poligrafo, Padua 2004, pp. 83–86.
- [18] Ricoeur P., *Architettura come narrazione*, [in:] E. Rocca (ed.), *Estetica e architettura*, Il Mulino, Bologna 2008, pp. 235–250.
- [19] Ward C., *Architetture del dissenso. Forme e pratiche alternative dello spazio urbano*. It. trans. by Borella G., Brambilla A. (eds.), Elèuthera, Milano 2016.

²¹ F. Bilò, «Materiale architettonico eversivo». *Un'introduzione ai lavori*, [in:] F. Bilò (ed.), *A partire da Giancarlo De Carlo*, Gangemi Editore, Rome 2007, pp. 15, 6–7.

- [20] Zuddas F., *Pretese di equivalenza. De Carlo, Woods e il mat-building*, “Magazine del Festival dell’Architettura” 2015, 34, pp. 45–65.

Author’s Note:

Assoc. Prof. Olivia Longo, PhD, Arch.

Architect, PhD in Architectural Design, Associate Professor in Architectural and Urban Design at the DICATAM University of Brescia, where she teaches *Architecture and Architectural Design*. Her interdisciplinary research focuses on “Military and Boundary Landscapes” through scientific analysis and experimental designs of the Great War and Cold War sites in north-eastern Italy. Since 2015 she has been a member of Lombardy’s Commissione regionale per i beni paesaggistici.

Since 1996 she has coordinated and participated in national and international scientific activities such as: coordinator of the seminar *Architecture and Communication* at the School of Architecture and Planning in Washington DC (2006), participant at the international exhibition *Temporary Cities* in Moscow (2006), coordinator of the international workshop *Liquid box* in Agrigento (2007). She has been a teacher and scientific responsible in Summer and Winter Schools at the University of Palermo (2007 School of Advanced Studies) and at the University of Brescia (2016 <http://sschool-garda-fronts.unibs.it/>, 2019 <http://issre-incowanaba.unibs.it/>). She taught *Theories of Contemporary Architecture* (1999–2004) and *Laboratory of Architectural and Urban Design* (2004–2010) at the University of Palermo. In 2010, she coordinated a Summer Workshop at the IUAV University in Venice. She is the author of about ninety scientific publications. She has participated in design competitions, winning awards and mentions.

olivia.longo@unibs.it