

ULTRA

Positions and Polarities Beyond Crisis

TO CITE THIS PAPER | Emina Kristina Petrović. "Two Conceptualisations of Change in Architectural History: Towards Driving Pro-sustainable Change in Architecture." In *Proceedings of the Society of Architectural Historians, Australia and New Zealand: 38, Ultra: Positions and Polarities Beyond Crisis*, edited by David Kroll, James Curry and Madeline Nolan, 544-551. Adelaide: SAHANZ, 2022. Accepted for publication December 1, 2021. DOI: 10.55939/a4006pqv8s



Image: Michaelmore, Roeger & Russell, *Chester House*, Belair 1966, State Library of South Australia BRG 346/28/6/2.

PROCEEDINGS OF THE SOCIETY OF ARCHITECTURAL HISTORIANS, AUSTRALIA AND NEW ZEALAND (SAHANZ) VOLUME 38

Convened by The University of Adelaide, School of Architecture and Built Environment, Adelaide,
10-13 November, 2021.

Edited by David Kroll, James Curry and Madeline Nolan.

Published in Adelaide, South Australia, by SAHANZ, 2022.

ISBN: 978-0-646-85443-4

Copyright of this volume belongs to SAHANZ; authors retain the copyright of the content of their individual papers. All efforts have been undertaken to ensure the authors have secured appropriate permissions to reproduce the images illustrating individual contributions. Interested parties may contact the editors.

Two Conceptualisations of Change in Architectural History: Towards Driving Pro-sustainable Change in Architecture

Emina Kristina Petrović

Victoria University of Wellington, New Zealand

Keywords

Johann Joachim
Winckelmann
Joan Ockman
Change in architectural history
Conceptualisations of change

Abstract

At the time when it is important to act on the Climate Emergency and other pro-sustainable efforts, the key question is how to drive change. This paper examines two conceptualisations of change in architectural history in an attempt to support a better understanding of architecture-specific conceptualisations of change itself. Such understanding could offer real value in articulating how to drive pro-sustainable change in architecture.

The paper identifies two conceptualisations of change which are easily found in existing writing on change in architectural history. One such conceptualisation considers architectural developments in terms of cyclical styles, or triads of early, high, and decadent stages of development of styles. Attributed to the 18th century writing of Johann Joachim Winckelmann on ancient Greek art, this conceptualisation presents one useful interpretation which links the change with natural growth. A simpler conceptualisation of two-point change is interpreted using the minor/major interpretations of change, as developed by Joan Ockman, based on the work of Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari.

The key proposition is that the selected historical examples of conceptualisation of change reveal useful aspects of the past patterns of change in architecture. These might help understand how to drive needed change now. One critical factor in the transition which is facing us now, is that in contrast to many past transitions which were driven by technological innovation, current transition requires development of technologies capable to support the change which is scientifically proven as needed and real. Therefore, some of the historical natural ease of the past transitions in the current contexts needs active driving of change.

Without an intention to propose a holistic new framework, the main value of this paper is that it identifies some of the key conceptualisations which are evident in architectural history and that could be useful in driving pro-sustainable change.

Introduction

In recent years, world-wide recognition of the necessity of climate action has been steadily increasing to international declarations of Climate Emergency. This requires changes of a range of important aspects of human activities, especially in architecture and the built environment which present a significant impact on planetary systems. In addition, in the last couple of years it is possible to notice an increase in polarities in a few aspects of contemporary society. Calls for social justice have been gaining momentum through the Me-Too movement, Black Lives Matter protests and similar. In 2020 and 2021, the international response to the Covid-19 pandemic demonstrated effectiveness of collaboration and unified actions for the betterment of many. Yet, importantly, all of these transformations are taking place against the backdrop of accelerated shifts to digital and automated labour. These, and other transformative polarities, are likely to continue requiring change from many of the existing systems and equilibriums. Thus, it is conceivable that accelerated change could be one of the key constants in the coming decades. Furthermore, one critical factor in the transition which is facing us now is that in contrast to many past transitions which were driven by technological innovation, current transitions require development of technologies capable to support a change which is scientifically proven as needed and real. Therefore, some of the historical natural ease of the past transitions in the current contexts needs active driving of change. Unsurprisingly, such efforts are met with resistance to change and the emotional discomfort from losing perceived security or simplicity.

Within this context, the question is how to drive positive pro-sustainable change in architecture in response to the rapidly evolving polarities and pressures? More specifically, could logic offered by the past conceptualisations of change in architecture assist with such efforts? In order to answer these questions, it is important to identify past conceptualisations of change, to better understand contexts needed for past changes, to examine and test these from the relevant historiographical perspectives, and to situate findings in relation to contemporary scholarship in other disciplines. This paper focuses on starting the first step of this process by identifying and reviewing two different conceptualisations of change in architectural history and establishing some elements of the needed subsequent steps in order to sketch a novel evaluation of the strengths and shortcomings of these patterns within architecture when engaging with change.

1. Alina Payne, Wölfflin, architecture and the problem of *Stilwandelung*. *Journal of Art Historiography* (2012), 7: 1-20.

The assumption of this paper is that many disciplines, including architecture, might have their own discipline-specific interpretations of change. Thus, in order to understand how to drive change in architecture, it is important to understand how change has been already conceptualised in architectural history. Further to that, stylistic changes have been discussed in history of art and architecture almost interchangeably, with some even noting that art historians went to architectural history when developing frameworks to interpret stylistic changes.¹ While this paper does not focus on stylistic change per se, some learning is possible from such discussions.

Winckelmann's Conceptualisation of Stages of Development

2. David Carter summarises a range of such interpretations in David Carter, Introduction, In Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *Johann Joachim Winckelmann on Art, Architecture, and Archaeology*, with an Introduction and notes by David Carter (Rochester, New York: Boydell & Brewer, Camden House, 2013), pp. 1-28; Alex Potts, Introduction, in *Johann Joachim Winckelmann, History of the art of antiquity* (Los Angeles: Getty Publications, 2006), pp. 1-53.

3. Katherine Harloe, *Winckelmann and the invention of antiquity: history and aesthetics in the age of alternumswissenschaft* (Oxford: Oxford Scholarship Online, 2013), see especially chapter 4, pp.105-130; Mari Hvattum, Zeitgeist, style, and Stimmung: historiography of architecture, in *The Companions to the History of Architecture*, edited by Harry Francis Mallgrave, Volume II: Eighteenth-century architecture, edited by Caroline van Eck and Sigrid de Jong (Chichester, UK: Wiley Blackwell, 2017), pp.691-714.

4. Johann Joachim Winckelmann, *Johann Joachim Winckelmann on Art, Architecture, and Archaeology*, Translated by Harry Francis Mallgrave (Rochester, New York: Boydell & Brewer, Camden House, 2013), p. 227.

5. Winckelmann, *Johann Joachim Winckelmann on Art, Architecture, and Archaeology*, p. 227.

6. Winckelmann, *Johann Joachim Winckelmann on Art, Architecture, and Archaeology*, p. 244.

7. Harloe, *Winckelmann and the invention of antiquity: history and aesthetics in the age of alternumswissenschaft*, p. 108.

8. Potts, Introduction, in *Johann Joachim Winckelmann, History of the art of antiquity*, p. 2.

9. Winckelmann, *Johann Joachim Winckelmann on Art, Architecture, and Archaeology*, pp. 231, 233-234, 240, 243, 244.

10. Winckelmann, *Johann Joachim Winckelmann on Art, Architecture, and Archaeology*, p. 71.

11. Carter, Introduction, In *Johann Joachim Winckelmann, Johann Joachim Winckelmann on Art, Architecture, and Archaeology*, p. 13. Similar sentiment is expressed by others, see: Harloe, *Winckelmann and the invention of antiquity*; Potts, Introduction, in *Johann Joachim Winckelmann, History of the art of antiquity*, pp. 1-53.

12. Harloe, *Winckelmann and the invention of antiquity*; Carter, Introduction, In *Johann Joachim Winckelmann, Johann Joachim Winckelmann on Art, Architecture, and Archaeology*, p. 12; Potts, Introduction, in *Johann Joachim Winckelmann, History of the art of antiquity*, pp. 1-53.

In art and architecture history, a frequently used interpretation when considering change is the idea that development occurs in a series of stages of development. Reviews of the literature in this area suggested that the origin of this conceptualisation in art history has been attributed to German art historian and archaeologist Johann Joachim Winckelmann (1717-1768) by a few researchers.² Although some more recent scholarship in this area notes that these ideas were developed within their own cultural and social milieu,³ the historical impact of these conceptualisations are not actively challenged. In *History of art of antiquity* (1764), Winckelmann writes about four stylistic periods or stages of development of ancient Greek art: ancient style, grand or high style, beautiful style, and decline into imitation to a fall.⁴ Winckelmann explains that similar periods can be found in poetry, especially in theatrical pieces, summarising five stages of chronological progression: 'beginning, development, plateau, waning, and end.'⁵ Applied to Greek sculpture, Winckelmann describes these as 'four stylistic stages, namely, the straight and hard, the grand and angular, the beautiful and flowing, and the style of the imitators.'⁶ These are sometimes interpreted as 'origin, growth, change and fall.'⁷ Yet, in some parts of Winckelmann's own writing and in many subsequent interpretations, this has been simplified into three main periods: early, mature, and late.⁸ The core pattern appears to be made out of three key stages, which can have more than one part within them. Thus, regardless of the number of stages, this conceptualisation of change provides a consistent interpretation.

References to the same core stages of development tend to be evident in the subsequent antiquity scholarship, but also in the interpretations of other subsequent developments in art and architectural history. This should not surprise, given that even as Winckelmann introduced this system in his *History of art of antiquity*, he mixed ancient with more modern examples, and art and architecture, and used comparisons of ancient Greek stages with artists such as Michelangelo, Raphael, Bernini and specific examples, like the Palazzo Barberini and Campidoglio, to make his points clearer to his readers.⁹

Some important propositions are imbedded in Winckelmann's conceptualisation, and it is relevant to make these explicit. From the opening of *History of art of antiquity*, Winckelmann declares the relevance of history 'in the wider sense,' and that his intention is to provide a system of interpretations of the art of antiquity within this broader context.¹⁰ This has two significant implications. Firstly, Winckelmann asserts the importance of a broader social and cultural context, and since then a range of commentators have attributed to Winckelmann the development of 'what was essentially cultural history.'¹¹ Secondly, Winckelmann asserts that he will provide a systematic interpretation of change and development of ancient styles. This aspect of Winckelmann's work has been used by a range of scholars to explain not only the lasting influence of his ideas, but also his aspiration to identify universal patterns.¹² On these levels, it is appropriate to interpret his developmental stages as explicitly assuming that these patterns are universal, and as such, ready to be applied to any developments, but also that these are deeply grounded in their cultural context.

13. Mari Hvattum, *Zeitgeist, style, and Stimmung: historiography of architecture*, in *The Companions to the History of Architecture*, edited by Harry Francis Mallgrave, Volume II: Eighteenth-century architecture, edited by Caroline van Eck and Sigrid de Jong (Chichester, UK: Wiley Blackwell, 2017), pp.691-714, p.698.

14. Potts, Introduction, in *Johann Joachim Winckelmann, History of the art of antiquity*, pp. 21-22.

15. For definitions of evolution see Merriam-Webster Web Dictionary. Available from: <https://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/evolution> (accessed July 2021); Dictionary, Available from: <https://www.dictionary.com/browse/evolution> (accessed July 2021).

16. Harloe, *Winckelmann and the invention of antiquity*, pp.114-115, 119.

17. Hvattum, *Zeitgeist, style, and Stimmung*, pp.698, 701.

18. Hvattum, *Zeitgeist, style, and Stimmung*, p.694.

19. Hvattum, *Zeitgeist, style, and Stimmung*.

20. Alina Payne, Wölfflin, architecture and the problem of *Stilwandlung*. *Journal of Art Historiography* (2012), 7: 1-20; Lino Bianco, In defence of Baroque: the Wölfflin-Frankl-Giedion tradition, *The Journal of Baroque Studies* (2016), 1(4): 5-20.

Furthermore, Winckelmann's key stages of the development of art can be seen as similar or reflective of biological growth in general: early, mature, and late stages of development can be seen as reflective of childhood, adulthood and elderhood of an organism. This can be seen as a reference to 'a continuous cycle of birth, growth and decay.'¹³ At times this progression was explained as an expression of evolution.¹⁴ In the historical context of Winckelmann's work, evolution should be understood as signifying the movement of the unrolling of a papyrus scroll, which is the older Latin origin of the verb, rather than a reference to the subsequent Darwinian theory of evolution.¹⁵ However, if one includes connotations of growth of an organism, the evolution of an individual could also be seen as implied in this progression. These characteristics of Winckelmann's system can be seen as 'naturalistic,' and at times reflective of the writing of his contemporary Jean-Jacques Rousseau.¹⁶

This 'naturalistic' connection with Winckelmann's contemporaries is not the only link which can be found with his own cultural and intellectual context. Mari Hvattum explains that while the stages introduced by Winckelmann were not really new, what was new was the idea that 'art and architectural history [can be] seen as a succession of epochs, each of which was the product of specific conditions and manifested through a distinct architectural expression, or style.'¹⁷ Within the context of the mid 18th century critical aspect was the emancipation of individual histories from the older concepts of history as a record of 'the consistency and universal validity of the classical models.'¹⁸ Winckelmann was not unique in contributing to these more individual understandings of history, which eventually culminated in the rise of the historicist styles of the 19th century. Nevertheless, Winckelmann's systematic interpretation of progressive change and emphasis on the social and cultural context which influence these, Hvattum attributes to have later served as a basis for the formation of the concept of the spirit of the time, *zeitgeist*.¹⁹

Unfortunately, one potential real shortcoming of Winckelmann's set of stages is that in order to accurately interpret the change in this way, it might be necessary to have a historical distance in order to see the full cycle. It could be argued that Winckelmann had such distance for his 18th century discussions of the ancient Greek developments. Lack of historical distance could be especially challenging when trying to interpret late stages of development as the cycle moves towards imitation and fall. Prolonged discussions of baroque as its own style illustrate this issue.²⁰ However, if Winckelmann's set of stages is applied to relatively recent developments, there is the potential to misread the stages as being newer and more developed than they truly are. Since early 20th century modern developments, possibly this tendency to overemphasise novelty as the outset of a major cycle has been prominent. Yet, Winckelmann's set of stages does not resolve what triggers the outset of change.

Ockman's Concept of Change Driven by the Minor/Major

An alternative approach to change can be found in a simpler two-step interpretation, which can be seen as more specifically focused

21. Joan Ockman, 'Toward a Theory of Normative Architecture.' In Stephen Harris and Deborah Berke (Eds), *Architecture of the Everyday* (New York: Princeton Architectural Press, 1997), pp. 122-152.

22. Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, 'What is a minor literature?', in Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *Kafka: Towards a Minor Literature* (Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, 1986; First published in French in 1975; Translated by Dana Polan).

23. Ockman, 'Toward a Theory of Normative Architecture', p. 122.

24. Deleuze and Guattari, 'What is a minor literature?', p. 16.

25. Deleuze and Guattari, 'What is a minor literature?', p. 26. In the translation by Robert Brinkley this reads as 'only the minor is great and revolutionary,' see Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, 'What is a minor literature?', *Mississippi Review*, Winter/Spring, 1983, Vol. 11, No. 3, p. 26.

26. Ockman, 'Toward a Theory of Normative Architecture', p. 123.

27. Ockman, 'Toward a Theory of Normative Architecture', p. 123.

28. Ockman, 'Toward a Theory of Normative Architecture'.

29. Emina Petrović, 'Your new house – or would a flat suit you better?: development of housing preferences in England, Paris, Germany and New Zealand (Master of Architecture at Victoria University of Wellington, 2003), pp. 66-67, 83-87.

30. Ockman, 'Toward a Theory of Normative Architecture', p. 124.

31. Ockman, 'Toward a Theory of Normative Architecture', p. 131.

32. Ockman, 'Toward a Theory of Normative Architecture', p. 123.

on the onset of change. In 1997, architectural historian Joan Ockman discusses the dynamics of change examining the polarities between the 'minor' and the 'normative.'²¹ Ockman bases her conceptualisation on core ideas discussed by Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari in 'What is a minor literature?' (1975).²² Deleuze and Guattari note three core characteristics of a minor literature : 1) a deterritorialized language which reflects the minority status, 2) the political nature of such a language, and 3) the fact that minority writing in a deterritorialized language is not only political, but also represents the experience of the outsider.²³ Deleuze and Guattari explore these dynamics using the writing of Franz Kafka, and explain that '[a] minor literature doesn't come from a minor language, it is rather that which a minority constructs within a major language.'²⁴ They also establish that 'there is nothing major or revolutionary except the minor.'²⁵ Based on these propositions, Ockman asks if the reverse could be used to 'derive the reciprocal definition: that is, the opposite, counterrevolutionary process of transformation?'²⁶ And further to that, could the definitions offered by Deleuze and Guattari when defining a minor language also help in defining the 'major'? Ockman asks if such 'major' would be 'defined as territorial, apolitical, and conservative of the status quo, or normative?'²⁷

Based on these propositions, Ockman moves to review developments of modern architecture in the United States to trace the transition from the 'minor' to 'normative.' The proposed argument is that while the development of modern architecture in Europe can be seen as 'minor,' upon arrival to the United States this influence shifts to 'major' or 'normative.' To illustrate this, Ockman gives attention to Walter Gropius, Marcel Breuer, Ludwig Mies van der Rohe, and Laszlo Moholy-Nagy, as a group of German protagonists of modern developments in Europe, who emigrated to the United States and were influential through reputable United States educational organisations like the Harvard Graduate School of Design, the Illinois Institute of Technology and the New Bauhaus in Chicago.²⁸ (The move of Sigfried Giedion to the Harvard University and later the Massachusetts Institute of Technology illustrates the same trend.) While in Germany social transformation was frequently discussed in relation to early modern architecture,²⁹ Ockman refers to comments made by Colin Rowe and Catherine Bauer who, respectively, described the shift upon the arrival to the United States as making modern architecture 'safe for capitalism' and 'safe for millionaires.'³⁰ From Hendy-Russell Hitchcock and Philip Johnson's exhibition of the International Style at the Museum of Modern Art in 1932, and especially with the development of abstract expressionism, Ockman interprets modern architecture as discussed in the United States predominantly as apolitical, in service of the state, an 'expression of advanced capitalism, corporate bureaucracy, and big business.'³¹

Importantly, Ockman also emphasises that 'the relationship between minor and major architecture that is being proposed is to be understood as a historical condition in which that which is major is constantly redefining itself in relation to that which is minor, and that which is minor is always potentially challenging or hybridising that which is major.'³² Furthermore, Ockman concludes the text by asserting the importance of a critical practice to continually challenge the establishment of the normative, and stating that 'so many of the most critically minded architects today end up by remaining deterritorialized, homeless,

33. Ockman, *Toward a Theory of Normative Architecture*, p. 150.

34. Deleuze and Guattari, *What is a minor literature?*, p. 27.

“minor.”³³ This proposition is in line with the Deleuze and Guattari’s text which, towards the end, sets a challenge to the reader: ‘Create the opposite dream: know how to create a becoming-minor.’³⁴ However, Ockman’s conceptualisation also offers the subtle but relevant shift from major to normative, suggesting a further shift away from minor.

From the perspective of this paper, this minor/normative conceptualisation of change establishes a two-point interpretation of shifts which drive change. In many situations, this takes the format of an action, followed by a reaction. The emergence of the minor can also be seen as a reaction to the established normative. Therefore, by definition it is always the minor identifying and reacting to the shortcomings of the established normative, and as such the objective of the change can be seen as an improvement, refinement of the existing, without necessarily requiring the revolutionary aspect. This conceptualisation can be useful when explaining less polarised changes where reactions are subtle and modest in scale. On that level, the change created by the minor might have only a subtle impact on the existing normative. Changes of this nature are also easier to observe even when historical distance is more modest.

35. Gilles Deleuze and Félix Guattari, *A thousand plateaus: capitalism and schizophrenia* (London, New York: Continuum, 1988).

Within the context of the body of work by Deleuze and Guattari, the discussion of the minor can be seen as part of their larger project which sought to supersede existing concepts of hierarchy, calling for articulation of alternative forms of order.³⁵ On that level, this minor/normative dynamic becomes one possible ahierarchical organisation, which can provide useful clarity and organisation of ideas. On this level, the minor/normative concept belongs to post-structuralism and, as such, similarities with other post-structuralist works are possible. From the position of this paper, post-structuralist connotations are less relevant than the core realities and opportunities of the two-step interpretation of change.

Just as Winckelmann’s conceptualisation assumes a clear progression in a single direction, minor/normative conceptualisation also assumes a clear directionality with the minor disrupting the normative and thus stimulating innovation necessary for the development of the new, which may or may not become the subsequent normative. However, in contrast to Winckelmann’s conceptualisation of the stages of development which imply growth, the interpretation of minor/normative dynamics appears to imply undergrowth, or emergence of roots of the new from the shortcomings of the established. Thus, theoretically minor/normative interpretation of change can be incorporated into the explanation of the reasons for the onset of transitions in Winckelmann’s stages, although it is unable to offer a holistic interpretation of broader periods in the way Winckelmann’s stages can.

Two Conceptualisations in Historiographical Texts

The primary purpose of this paper is to introduce the two conceptualisations of change, rather than to provide a proper historiographical analysis of these. Still, a modest set of examples of other historiographical texts discussing similar models of change can help illustrate the use of the same core conceptualisations of change.

36. Sokratis Georgiadis, *Sigfried Giedion: an intellectual biography* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press, 1993), p. 73.

37. Panayotis Tournikiotis, *The historiography of modern architecture* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, The MIT Press, 1999), p. 41.

38. Anthony Vidler, *Histories of the immediate present: inventing architectural modernism* (Cambridge, Massachusetts, The MIT Press, 2008), p. 1.

39. Tournikiotis, *The historiography of modern architecture*, p. 88.

40. Dana Arnold, Reading architectural herstories: the discourse of gender, in Dana Arnold, *Reading architectural history* (London, New York: Routledge, 2002), pp. 199-204; Dana Arnold, Beyond a boundary: towards an architectural history of the non-east, in Dana Arnold, Elvan Altan Ergut and Belgin Turan Özkaya (eds), *Rethinking architectural historiography* (London, New York: Routledge, 2006), pp. 229-245.

41. Cindi Katz, Towards minor theory, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* (1996), vol.14. pp.487-499; Cindi Katz, Revisiting minor theory, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* (2017), vol.35(4) pp.596-599; Thomas Jellis and Joe Gerlach, Micropolitics and the minor, *Environment and Planning D: Society and Space* (2017), vol.35(4) pp.563-567.

42. Deleuze and Guattari, What is a minor literature?, p. 27.

43. Tournikiotis, *The historiography of modern architecture*, p. 224.

Winckelmann's conceptualisation of 3-4 stages of development can be found in a range of architectural history texts. For example, Sokratis Georgiadis in his analysis of the writing of Sigfried Giedion explains that already in 1934 Giedion summarised the development of modern architecture using the four stage conceptualisation: '[the first stage] was distinguished by the mastery and utilisation of the new materials, especially reinforced concrete [Frank Lloyd Wright, Auguste Perret, and Tony Garnier]. . . . The second stage was distinguished by the change which had taken place in the area of aesthetics [Gropius, Le Corbusier, Oud, and influence of Cubism]. . . . The third stage "completed the purification" and "emphasised the social element in the housing problem" [Mart Stam and Hans Schmidt]. . . . Finally, the fourth stage concerned itself principally with questions of urban and regional planning.'³⁶ Similarly, Panayotis Tournikiotis summarises Giedion's *Space, Time and Architecture* (1941) as a three-stage genealogy with a 'view of the evolution of periods from their genesis to their zenith and then their decline.'³⁷ Other authors have used the same conceptualisation. In fact, referring to the stages of development is so prevalent in architectural history that it is not uncommon for even recent sources to open their discussion with this notion.³⁸

The two-step minor/normative conceptualisation of change is also easily found in architectural history. Tournikiotis attributes to Leonardo Benevolo the use of a two-step approach to explain change through 'a conceptual dichotomy and shows us a narrative of failure followed by a narrative of success.'³⁹ This can be seen as a reasonably mild version of the minor/normative conceptualisation of change. On the more radical side of the spectrum, ideas reflective of the minor/normative dominate historiographical interpretations of the positioning of gender and the colonial/post-colonial in architectural histories.⁴⁰ Similar interpretations were developed in neighbouring disciplines and used for similar purposes.⁴¹ Central to these more radical approaches to the two-step change is the challenge issued by Deleuze and Guattari of 'becoming-minor,'⁴² which might have overstimulated aspirations of the minor. Contrasting these, the relevance of Ockman's work is the use of the same concepts to understand the emergence of a normative, and the understanding that normative developments can be, and perhaps are always, founded on the minor, initially revolutionary, challenges. Nevertheless, this two-step minor/normative conceptualisation can be useful when developing broader, overarching 'metanarratives' to explain change. A good example of one such metanarrative is the repeating assertion of the importance of modern architecture as breaking away from the historicist architectures of the past.

While this is a very brief overview, it shows that both conceptualisations are evident in the existing historiography of architecture, which justifies an examination of potentials they offer for pro-sustainable change.

Discussion and Conclusion

One of the issues with both the discussed conceptualisations of change is that they appear to approach change from favouring the new. This was also one of the frequently found features of the history of modern architecture.⁴³ The last one hundred years of architectural history and

theory can be summarised as a search for the new. This has led to often premature declarations of various ends, and introductions of systems of three-four stages to give credibility to the new. The two-step minor/normative (or major) interpretation of change would have been truer and easier to assert in many such discussions. On the other hand, the question is if these self-professed changes were as complete as declared. High level of reliance on self-professed swift moving to the new could be used as an avoidance strategy.

44. Kerri S. Kearney and Kayla D. Siegman, The emotions of change: a case study, *Organization Management Journal*, Vol. 10, No. 2, pp. 110-119; Kerri Shultz Kearney, A study of the emotional effects on employees who remain through organizational change: a view through Kulber-Ross (1969) in an educational institution (PhD in Education at Oklahoma State University, 2002).

Some of the current models for understanding change in other disciplines have established that when organisational or personal change is undertaken, psychological processes reflective of grief are an unavoidable part of the process.⁴⁴ The process of grieving is often organised into five stages: denial, anger, bargaining, depression, acceptance. Translated to understanding change, this means moving through: denial, anger, depression, experimentation, decision and integration. Importantly these change stages do not align directly with Winckelmann's stages, which essentially start with experimentation, progress into a developed integrated system, which subsequently disintegrates leading to likely emotions of denial, anger and depression. Thus, it is possible that the prolonged architectural search for the new has not only contributed to prolonged periods of focus on experimentation and the novel aspects, but also provided an effective shared strategy for avoiding acknowledgement of the disappointment and emotional discomfort associated by disintegration and decay. However, because the process of having to move away from what was familiar and loved would always create some grief, the grief patterns probably apply to all changes in style. Thus, it seems possible that Winckelmann's stages have been instrumental in the architectural history of the 20th century to avoid acknowledging later stages of the conceptualisation or even denial.

These are important features when facing the changes necessary due to the Climate Emergency, because in the world which is currently facing denial, anger, bargaining and depression when considering Climate Emergency, this emotional discomfort might be received in architecture with a tradition of avoidance and denial, through the use of emphasis on the developing new self-professed re-starts. Such strategies can be effective in decreasing the focus on complexity, refinement and possibly less obvious solutions which are all necessary for the pro-sustainable change to profoundly re-shape architecture.

Even this introductory examination of the two conceptualisations of change suggests that some ongoing implicit biases can be observed in architectural writing and possibly architecture as a profession, which could be playing an underrecognized covert role in shaping the pro-sustainable change in architecture. The dominant favouring of the new, readiness to declare the new, and prematurely anticipate major changes, might be an obstacle to accurate recognition of the importance of reasonably minor shifts which become part of refinement of established systems. The main value of this paper is that it starts to interrogate some potential implicit biases within the profession of architecture, which could be playing an underrecognized covert role. More work is still needed to refine the understanding of these historical patterns, and to develop strategies to actively use these insights to support pro-sustainable change in architecture.