New Europe College
Yearbook 1995–1996

VLAD ALEXANDRESCU
TEODOR BACONSKY
CAIUS DOBRESCU
AUGUSTIN IOAN
MARIANA NEȚ
LIVIU PAPADIMA
CARMEN-ADRIANA STRUNGARU
MIHAI-RĂZVAN UNGUREANU
CONSTANTIN OVIDIU VERDEȘ
LAURENȚIU VLAD

New Europe College
Yearbook 1995–1996

VLAD ALEXANDRESCU
TEODOR BACONSKY
CAIUS DOBRESCU
AUGUSTIN IOAN
MARIANA NEȚ
LIVIU PAPADIMA
CARMEN-ADRIANA STRUNGARU
MIHAI-RĂZVAN UNGUREANU
CONSTANTIN OVIDIU VERDEȘ
LAURENȚIU VLAD

Contents

AUGUSTIN IOAN

Born in 1965, in Dorobanțu
M.A. in architecture at the Institute 'Ion Mincu', Bucharest, 1990
Ph D at the Institute of Architecture, Bucharest
Lecturer at the Institute of Architecture, Bucharest
Editor of *Arhitectura*, since 1992
Soros/FCO Scholarship at St. Edmund Hall, Oxford, 1992–1993
Fulbright Grant, University of Cincinnati, 1993–1994
Visiting Associate, The Martin Centre for Architectural
and urban Studies, Cambridge, 1996
Grand Prix, International Architectural Film Festival
FIFA 4, 4, Bucharest, 1994

Books: *Arhitectura și puterea*, Agerfilm, Bucharest, 1992;
Celălalt modernism, IAIM, Bucharest, 1995;
Ezekia's Dream — Body, Geometry and Sacred Space,
Anastasia, Bucharest, 1996

Address:
aioan@ap.nec.ro
PO BOX 1–507, București, Romania

Modern Architectural Discourse
After the Death of Stalin

I. The Corpse

I.1. Modernism, Mimesis, Nostalgia

The only hope for the European painting now is to develop a new realism.

ANTHONY BLUNT, 1937[1]

For the first time in many centuries, reality and artistic ideal are no longer contradictory (...) because never before did such an epoch exist, where the very grounds of historic reality are beautiful.

I.V. STALIN

The way official edifices were built between the two World Wars and — as far as Socialist Realism is concerned — after World War Two, cannot be dissociated from the general context of their respective epochs: economic and moral crisis, social restlessness and radicalism, the threat of an emerging war. We discuss about *Zeitgeist*, yet we should not forget the self-commitment of its actors. Gone was the utopianism of the early 1920s, with technology and the myth of progress as universal panacea. Gone was the Russian Constructivist 'desurbanism', and the aesthetic-political project of the Avant-Garde to reshape the reality was finally fulfilled; yet not by the Avant-Garde itself, and not in the way it had envisaged the process, but by a new political elite. This elite believed itself to be far more entitled to implement the project than a bunch of radical and untrustworthy artists.

Such a pessimistic (realistic?) abandon of the critical edge of the Avant-Garde in architecture as well as in other arts, explained by Kenneth Frampton in his text on critical regionalism[2], boosted the 'conservative' discourse and its promoters, who had been outcasted for a while by the Avantgardists. Academic and/or ethnocentric, always populist, such discourse produced the official architecture of the totalitarian regimes that governed during the interwar period and, half a century later, Post Modern architecture.

The first five-year plan in the USSR, the economic crisis in the West and in the US replaced gradually the fantasies of their early days with 'realist'

projects: utopias were replaced by short deadlines within which the existing cities were supposed to be reshaped by implanting monumental edifices and by inflicting the absent 'rational' (i.e. straight) axes upon the 'irrational' (i.e. medieval) textures, while new communities were equally being developed and ample public works — bridges, cannals, highways- were being undertaken. What emerged was a new kind of utopianism[3]: anti-medieval, populist, focused on rewriting the cities, 'heroic' and, like every utopianism, based upon an 'archetypal', primal and 'pure' architecture, that was reached by replacing the War Communism in Russia and its small utopias convincingly described by R. Stites in his excellent book on the 'revolutionary dreams' of that epoch.

Re-designing the existing, corrupt reality, rapid and radical building programs for a society in crisis might constitute the grounds for an apparent paradox. In fact, building was the soundest evidence on how strong and stable a given regime was, since it enacted the myth of the salvation state and its willingness to control the shaking social reality. Weak states, societies in crisis do build massively. Architecture offered the antidote against the mistrust with which subjects regarded a certain regime. Yet this was Architecture with a capital A (i.e. monumental edifices, ample urban schemes aimed at entirely reshaping capital cities), one which privileged stability over the other two attributes in the Vitruvian definition. As for styles, the mixing of various languages from Modernism to Eclecticism[4] to Art Deco was the envisaged answer to using the best in each of the above-mentioned styles while avoiding the implicit dangers comprised within any of them: the alleged lack of monumental potential[5] in the case of Modernism, redundance in that of Eclecticism or any of the national variants of historical styles (vernacular Gothic in Völkisch, 'Arian' Doric in Heimatstil, Russian Baroque, Neo-Romanian), and an overstated penchant for decor in Art Deco.

The result? An architecture with antique references, centered, symmetrical, frontally experienced, solemn, 'heroic' and ordonated, best suited for an epoch in which controll over society, often exercised in a totalitarian manner, was seen as the answer to crisis. The emergence of such a discourse was refreshed by the Modern attribute: fewer or no ornaments at all, structural sincerity, rational expression of the façades and interior spaces, and most important, the free-standing, high-rising building, autonomous to the urban tissue.

Here one must ask two fundamental questions regarding this fusion vocabulary: *a)* How can the same style — 'purged Classicism' or 'conservative Modernism' — bear witness for two apparently self-styled opposed ideologic discourses? and *b)* How can the nationalist rhetorics, centered on the question of identity, be expressed by divergent formulas? The first such formula was to exhibit the very same architecture, as it happened in Paris at the 1937 *Exposition Universelle* with the Soviet, German, Romanian, Italian, British national pavi-

lions; the second formula was to put forth replicas of certain heritage edifices, pertaining to a given national historical myth or event, to a regional/local idiom expanded to 'national style' ('sentimental regionalism', as Frampton called it), as it had happened in Paris in 1900.[6]

There is an immediate answer to the first question: the idioms of the 1930s emerged from relatively similar conditions, regardless of the ideologies in each of the above-mentioned states. The solutions given to reshaping reality covered evenly the entire range, from left to right. I shall not comment here why Stalinist ideology was inherently 'rightist', and thus 'conservative', or why Roosevelt's New Deal, allegedly democratic and placed at the left of classical liberalism, needed its 'conservative' edifices.

Yet one can propose the following hypothesis: the way those buildings looked was relatively independent of aesthetic criteria. Their expression was the outcome, not the cause. Only a discourse on the formers' origins might illuminate the differences between, say, the 'democratic' and the 'totalitarian' architectures of that epoch. The 'progressive' attitude towards reality condemns it as inescapably corrupt and proposes alternative/utopic communities, combined with a total condemnation of the sinful cities. Only radical and violent changes, achieved by the revolutionary purification of the environment, could change the latter's essence.

What followed? Environmental revolutions: the Volga-Don Canal, Tennessee Valley Authority's terraformations, desurbanists and experimental communities in early Soviet Russia (described by R. Stites), the United States and Italy (comparatively investigated by Diane Ghirardo), or — on a smaller scale — in Germany. According to the other, 'conservative', approach, the city was not to be abolished, but healed by implanting authority, and thereby formal order, within the wounded tissue. This perspective was centered on negotiating with the past and with its formal anamorphosis; one had to create new Jerusalems, ideal cities or city centers which, by empathy, would replace the existing, often medieval structure. This perspective was based on private ownership, traditional values in society and the family. 'Conservatives' treasured the white, European, male culture, founded on issues of identity and authority. In the 1930s such edifices and urban schemes could be found in Washington, D.C., were they followed L'Enfant's rigorous/rational axes of the Enlightenment. Yet the Zeppelinfeld as well as the Stalinist plan for Moscow (1935), Hitler's and Speer's Berlin, as well as the 1935 plan for Bucharest looked precisely the same.

One can thus understand why the architectural processes of the thirties cannot be confined exclusively to one or another of the above-mentioned categories. In fact, the official attitude toward the built environment was rather problem-solving, 'pragmatic', pursuing the adequate answer to a given challenge, beyond

ideologies. The attitude of the authority with regard to trasforming the reality was 'leftist', 'progressive', as well as 'rightist', 'conservative', according to the context and the nature of the problem.

One can even forward the hypothesis that there are clear similarities between the projects of the Avant-Garde and the official rhetorics on arts in the 1930s and 1940s; this may well raise the question whether, despite opposite appearances, Avant-Garde and Modernism as a whole did not, perhaps, outlive their time as totalitarian projects; in other words, whether at least parts of the edifices and mass architecture built under totalitarian regimes did not employ concepts envisaged by Modernism. The bottom line lies in the following question: was Modernism a totalitarian project?

There are at least three perspectives on this topic. The first one, and the most radical, advanced by Boris Groys in his book *The Total Art of Stalin* (Princeton, 1992), argues that the aesthetic/political plan of the Avant-Garde to fundamentally reshape the reality was in fact over-fulfilled by the Stalinist regime. Both projects dwell on the fact that society as well as its built environment should be highly controlled. Furthermore, the idea could be extended to post-Stalinist Eastern-Europe, where hard-core Modern concepts such as 'prefabrication', 'standardization' and 'urban control' became deliriously successful from 1954 onward, and in Romania in the 1980s, when one could slide backward to the 'neo-Stalinist' architecture of the so-called 'new civic center' of Bucharest, spiced as it was with a Modernist rhetoric of 'national specificity' and of 'upgrading' the capital city.

If Socialist Realism could change the style of a nearly-erected Constructivist building (Moskva Hotel), the reverse example is equally at hand: Ceciulin's 'White House' (Russia's House of the Soviets), built as late as 1981, was in fact a Stalinist design stripped off of its ornaments, Palladian statues and the other ingredients that made it desirable before 1953. 'Modern' edifices erected after 1954, such as the Palace Hall and Radio House in Bucharest, are stripped versions of Classicism (or 'conservative' variants of Modernism, for that matter), as well as remakes of pre-war edifices. Even commited Modern architects could dance the Socialist-Realist polka perfectly (Duiliu Marcu, Octav Doicescu in Romania, Rimanockzy in Hungary, as well as the Vesnin brothers in the USSR a decade earlier), only to serenely return to their betrayed 'first love' after 1954.

According to this interpretation, the apparently least Modern of all, that is the Stalinist regime, did in fact the most to reshape the Soviet reality in its entirety, thus implementing the project of the Avant-Garde beyond the original expectations, albeit distorted in its aesthetic appearance and without the original 'travel companions' — the Modern architects — who were left behind by the rapid changes they had first designed.

The second viewpoint is in fact a milder form of the previous one, in saying that the totalitarian regimes reserved the most relevant official edifices for

them-selves. These were to be designed in a rather traditional, classicizing manner (for instance the Führer's Third Reich buildings, the Royal Palace and the Victoria Palace in Bucharest, the Palace of the Soviets in Moscow and so on). Thus they could remain rather detached from the mass production of architecture and second-hand edifices, which could in fact continue to be 'Modern' (i.e. driven by efficiency rather than expression). It was there, at the periphery of official discourses, when it came to industrial architecture, collective dwelling quarters as well as upper class residences, that marginal Modernists could still employ their previously acquired skills.

Finally, there is the healthy Modern tradition, represented by C. Cooke, Khan-Magomedov, Ikkonikov, A. Kopp, which acknowledged the definitive break between Avant-Garde and Modernism on the one hand and totalitarianism on the other hand. Its arguments? Avant-Garde artists were marginalized, Constructivism and other 'degenerated' and 'decadent' styles were ridiculed as 'formalist' (USSR), 'Judaic/masonic' and 'Bolshevik' (Germany, Italy). A huge amount of literature supports this line of reasoning, so I shall only add that the first, two-fold hypothesis — Modernism as a totalitarian project, and its reverse, European totalitarianism as the heir of aesthetic-political plan of the Avant-Garde to redesign the reality — has only recently taken the fast lane, particularly since 1989, and is well-rooted in Eastern European literature on the topic that has been published so far. Scholars in architecture as well as other various artistic and cultural fields often representing the younger generation, are currently investigating the Modern project and its embodiments in Eastern Europe from that perspective, and with solid results. Mention should be made here of Tatiana Pereliaeva from Russia, Mart Kalm from Estonia, the German Boris Groys, the first to submit the concept with excellence, as well as of the Romanians Caius Dobrescu, Marius Marcu-Lăpădat and myself.

Starting from the above-mentioned arguments one can infer that the interest of the Soviet elite lay with controlling the arts by controlling those who produced them rather than with a particular type of aesthetics. The so-called Edifice Committee, the *de facto* jury of the Palace of the Soviets Competition, was a short list of the Politbiuro itself, albeit without Stalin. What the jury expected from this competition was not the emergence of some esoteric new art ideas. The outcome, that is Iofan's design as well as the clues as to what the architectural expression of something called Socialist Realism would have to be, were mere by-products, side effects of the political agenda underlying the competition. This was: *a)* the 'socialism in one country' architectural variant, i.e. no 'gringos' working in the USSR; *b)* the limitation of Avant-Garde influence within the artistic field and its organizations; *c)* a grand replica of the building resulting from the Palais de Nations competition, which was to be — once in Moscow *d)* the largest building in the world.

One knows now that the competition was rather useless, since the difference between Iofan's original tower topped with the statue of an anonimous worker and the winning entry was only a minor one. Both designs reflect the principle of subordinating architecture (the building is seen as a mere pedestal for a gigantic statue); only the worker went out as Lenin made his grand-style appearance. Yet the worker did not disappear for good: he returned in 1937, on top of the Soviet national pavilion (coupled with the Kolkhoz Girl), and once more in 1939, to mimic the Liberty Statue in New York by grabbing a star from the Queens' sky. This was really cynical: the resemblance with the 'Lady with a Torch' was precisely the reason for which Iofan's first entry for the Palace of the Soviets was rejected in the first place!

However, during this competition, much was fulfilled from what the Bolshevik elite had wanted: *a)* foreign architects — most of them committed Modernists — disappeared from the very first stage, with the sole exception of Oscar Hamilton, co-winner, but who was eventually equally eliminated; *b)* apart from the Vesnin brothers, who made it to the final stage of the competition only by disfiguring (i.e. classicizing) their design beyond any Constructivist feature, all the other avantgardists were eliminated, including the proletarian-architects from VOPRA, who were then closest to the party line; *c)* the importance of this competition had already surpassed the one the Palais des Nations competition had had; *d)* the design finally bred was indeed that of the largest and tallest building in the world, a result arrived at by reviewing the design several times, so that it would become taller than any of its contemporary American challengers. Furthermore, the decree of April 23, 1932 (i.e. issued during the competition) had dissolved the existing organizations and forged the controlled Union of Architects and the Academy of Architecture, that is the very institutional grounds for an abrupt change in the way in which Socialist Realist architecture would eventually be designed.

I.2. A Postmodern Critic's Kit to Interpreting Socialist Realism

When discussing Soviet Socialist Realism of, roughly, the period between 1932 and 1954,[7] and Post-Modernism, which flourished and then faded away in the 1980s, one has to address several points that can shed light on possible aesthetic solutions to tasks which are common, or rather comparable. Here I shall address the adverse reaction to Avant-Garde and Modernism respectively, as a plausible 'primordial cause' for both 'styles', centered on the question of identity. Consequently, and deriving from the anti-Modern matrix, the use of the classicist idiom in architecture, and of realist representation in the fine arts

will be analyzed as the major tools in the resuscitation of a populist adherence to certain value and power systems induced by the two discourses. As there is a large amount of contemporary literature on Post-Modernism, and the primal interest of this paper is Socialist Realism, the 'reading' here given will use the lenses/concepts usually associated with Post-Modernism. Therefore the comparison is rather indirect and perhaps unbalanced. Inevitably and by way of consequence, there will be more room for Socialist Realism than for Post-Modernism.

The issue of identity underlines both Reaganism in the United States, and Thatcherism in the United Kingdom, as a way of reacting against a dissolving, corrosive lack of ideology. By reactivating the ideological rhetoric in the dry veins of the power system, 'conservative revolutions' have awakened the latter's dormant inner strength, reaffirming values associated with tradition, and, implicitly, approaching an aesthetic different from that of the exhausted, redundant Modernism, already drained of its last drop of expressiveness.

Fragmentation — Pastiche — Collage

In looking at the aesthetic discourses of Socialist Realism and (historical) Post-Modernism, one has to note that both were cultures of fragments, collating and pastiche, though for different reasons. Post-Modernism rejected the unified set of values promoted by modernity, in saying that there were many more systems, equally valid, and that aesthetic should include as many as possible, no matter how contradictory or even opposed. It was not recommendable to re-press any virtual chance a building might have to please the masses. As a way of enhancing the meaning of a certain edifice, it was desirable to address the diversity of possible options by bringing into the text, and thereby enriching it, multiple references that could allude to the cultural plurality the text stood for. Pastiche was a way of 'quoting' other texts, and therefore a tool in expanding the horizon of meanings, references, sources, and related layers of interpreting a given text.

Socialist Realism used pastiche, collage and fragmentation in the appearance of its architecture as yet another way of re-affirming its identity. What sort of identity, though? One defined by contrast, and by Manichean dichotomies; inclusivist, yes, but only after the target answered positively to the *friend-or-foe* message launched toward the history of art (architecture) by Socialist-Realist censors. History was divided into 'revolutionary', 'progressive' episodes, which fought against 'retrograde', 'conservative' ones. The criterion used in 'dividing' history was the Bolshevik one: according to the Marxist theory,[8] there were epochs when the most advanced social forces expressed their political agenda through the arts. For Socialist Realism, Greek Classicism was 'progressive' because it belonged to a 'democratic' society. The Italian Renaissance was admitted in the

post-apocalyptic, members-only club of Stalinist culture, because it was responsible for the raising of the bourgeoisie, then an 'advanced' social force. In the fine arts, the *Peredvizhniky* realist movement of nineteenth-century Russia was yet another select guest, for both national and social reasons, whereas in architecture the Russian neoclassicism and baroque were reliable sources for the enrichment of the vocabulary. In playing inside this wide range of discourses, all of them 'politically correct', an artist was not only allowed and entitled to select his own *melange* of historical forms, but was morally (i.e. ideologically) obliged to do so. Could it then be said that, once inside the 'good' half of history, an architect could 'play' at his own will? Not really. There were rules according to which one edifice had to be more severe than the other. Furthermore, local and traditional ornaments were to be included, in compliance with the Stalinist thesis of a compulsory 'socialist content and national form'. A Socialist Realist edifice would therefore account for trans-historical class solidarity, being a living proof that history finally brought justice to the 'good', who now enjoyed the Bolshevik heaven. Since Socialist Realism inherited this treasure of 'purified' discourses, its identity could best be expressed by association with the encompassed moral virtues imbedded in the 'left' half of humankind's history.

Subsequently, all further research of 'new' vocabularies had to stop. Communism was the happy end of history, and Socialist Realism had to be the ultimate style, which recycled, and, in so doing, dramatically improved the meaning of 'the chosen ones'. To search for new forms meant to reject the positive message encompassed by previous discourses, and to refuse the aura of continuity, legitimacy and, consequently, of identity that could be bestowed by using a 'reliable' pool of rhetoric. For an ideology centered on historical Manicheism and social teleology, not to take advantage of such an opportunity of the Constructivist avant-garde served as an example in this respect. A joyous, eclectic play of fragments and pastiches of earlier edifices,[9] or of earlier vocabularies[10] the unified aesthetic of the Avant-Garde.

Decorum and Classicism

A unique power grid expressed in a plurality of discourses, allowed to play, as in Post-Modernism, either at random, or according to implicit ideologic scenarios, seems to be a contradiction in terms. However, the contradiction is only apparent, since the play remains artificial and extroversive. The edifices are decorated in rich, but nevertheless extroversive skins. The *decorum* that enveloped both Socialist Realist and Post-Modernist edifices was meant to beautify an austere way to express power. It was meant to appropriate popular culture, to make the edifice 'user-friendly' and theatrical, by apparently sharing with the average citizen the 'secrets of the gods' which reside in Form. Consequently,

populism came into picture, and official propaganda advanced either the 'Soviet people's right to columns' (Lunatcharsky), the 'popular capitalism' (Thatcherism), or the 'Versailles for the people' (Boffil) slogans.

In erecting 'palaces for masses', the *piano nobile* moved outside/in front of the building (Arata Isozaki's Tsukuba Civic Center), or in the square (Piazza d'Italia). The Socialist Realist edifices, exhibiting their richness toward the city, had squares for mass gatherings and marches in front of their main elevations (the Palace of the Soviets, Lenin's Mausoleum, all regional party headquarters), which equally incorporated tribunes for leaders/orators. Since the masses could not enter, and were not to have access to the 'Winter Palaces' of Soviet Regime ever again, sharing the meaning of the edifice by organizing gatherings in front of it was a minor concession aimed at maintaining a fascination in the people by suggesting that it was sometimes possible to shortcut the hierarchy, and that the top leaders were somehow accessible, at least visually.[11]

Conversely, by designing luxurious, rich, and symbolic edifices such as supermarkets and company headquarters, the corporate world intended to suggest that consumerism and businesses were meaningful activities in today's society, and were to be celebrated as such.

In this context, the 'popular palaces' of Socialist Realism and Post-Modernism were a means of rendering accessible and explicit that which allegedly was elitist and encoded: the Modernist aesthetic. They were 'decorated sheds', not 'dead ducks'. They simulated the grass-roots origins of the power systems, that stood for, and were an offspring of the people, and shared with the people the richness of representation, by celebrating common values in an unanimous, allegedly classless society. The best way to assert and celebrate those values was through a classical language. Classicism could decorate the offices of the State Department, at the top of the pyramid, city halls and corporate headquarters, placed somewhere at the interface between 'masses' and power structures, as well as consumerist institutions, placed at the lower end of the social hierarchy. Its language could be both elitist and populist; both utopian, and therefore projective, and 'realist' and retrospective.

Both discourses addressed the question of origins. Whereas Socialist Realism 'inherited', and consequently displayed its stylistic 'ancestors', who were identified according to ideological criteria, Post-Modernism intended to recapture and appropriate tradition, from 'the primitive hut' to the 'golden', Classical Age. Graves' allusions to *megaron*-like structures on top of its proposed Portland building, Rossi's 'types', Leon Krier's and HRH Prince Charles' nostalgic and retrospectivist attempts to recapture past values as if they were forever engraved within Classical forms, all dealt with 'primordial', 'pure' architecture in a way that differed from that of Modernism.

Classicism was not only delightful in both discourses, but was equally more meaningful for the community as compared to Modernism. It inflicted order and hierarchy upon cities, granted edifices an accessible monumentalism, and, unlike Modernism, could act as a 'readable' and, therefore, 'understandable' text.

The contradiction between postmodern irony and the 'seriousness' with which Socialist-Realism made use of Classicism dissolves in the concept of play. Post-modern architects were ironic and sarcastic about the values celebrated in their buildings. Nevertheless, they did not attempt to dissolve them. Unlike Deconstruction, Post-Modernism acknowledged the centered grids of power while attempting to play with its exterior appearance, the interface between power and society, in a sort of semiotic schizophrenia. It made no attempt to uproot or set free the inner contradictions within architecture which were only being camouflaged. Socialist-Realism was also allowed to 'play' with synonymous languages within an unique frame of (ideological) meaning, without questioning it. It was a highly regulated game: the meaning was controlled by the party, as was the amount of toys involved. The artist had only to choose from among the officially approved portfolio the best (combination of) vocabularies in order to embellish and make the meaning more accessible to the masses.

Despite the global visions and degraded utopias of the Stalinist plan for Moscow (1935), and of successive post-war plans to reshape the most important Soviet cities, the implementation of Socialist Realism was only local and piecemeal. Retrograde heavens, those 'Communist Jerusalems' were so highly present in posters, international exhibitions, maps and models set with precious stones, that there was little need to have them actually erected. Holograms and fragments of a larger discourse, the edifices, 'cvartals' and squares which have actually managed to become 'real' allude to an immanent and imminent vision of total coherence. Socialist Realism and Post-Modernism defined themselves by contrast to Avant-Garde and Modernism, respectively. They were implemented as disjointed, yet ubiquous epiphanies. It is hard to identify the same comprehensive approach in the case of postmodern urbanists. Rather, one can speak about a local and piecemeal kind of approach, as if by implementing punctual works or ensembles, the corrupted environment were healed by mutual sympathy. It was Cristopher Alexander's *Architectural DIY Handbook* for the 'average citizen'.

Both Post-Modernism and Socialist Realism attempted to embellish reality, and to transform the state in a work of art. Yet they remained fragmented, collated, epidermic and superficial. Playing with forms, having no deeper agenda of their own (because, allegedly, no such agenda could exist, or it was not within the reach of the artist/architect, respectively) behind their 'beautiful' façades, neither of these two styles changed the world. By 1953, Socialist Realism was a corpse. An embellished one, yet a corpse nevertheless. But was it really the

'dead style walking'? Perhaps the strongest arguments against an untimely burial of Socialist Realism would be: 1) at least in name, Socialist Realism was the official Soviet style up to the Gorbatchev era; 2) immediately after Stalin died, many designs which had been on the waiting list, to be erected stripped off of their theatrical *decorum*, were born anew as Modern edifices. Such was the case with Tchetchulin's 'White House' (the Soviet parliament).

II. The Eulogy

Is Khrushchev's discourse of December 7, 1954 at the 'All-Union Conference of builders, architects and workers in the construction materials industry, in the machine-building industry, in design and research organizations' the lost manifesto of Modern architecture?

II.1. Goals

Before the speech delivered in 1956 at the party congress, widely regarded as marking the actual beginning of the de-stalinization process in the USSR, the discourse Khrushchev gave in December 1954 — albeit a 'gentle manifesto',[12] just like Venturi's was to be twenty-two years later — was, arguably, his first major attack on Stalinism, and an oblique one, too. In it Khrushchev stood up against the previous official perspective on architecture — the Socialist Realist one —, rather than against the ideology that had produced it. However, certain points can definitely be made with regard to the speech itself, from a Modernist / Functionalist perspective on architecture.

a) The speech proclaimed the definitive urge to modernize (i.e. to industrialize) construction techniques, and thus emphasized the standardization of building types, prefabrication and mass-production of structural elements, and eventually — derived from the above — the need to change the way architecture was designed in the USSR.

b) Khrushchev argued against monumentalism (unique monuments and church-like edifices), and favored instead social/common dwelling, which was to be judged on the grounds of the average building costs per square meter, rather than on the number of ornaments adorning their façades.

c) Although the speech did not explicitly bring forth Constructivism as 'good' architectural ideology, it identified the latter as a 'false target', in saying that fighting Constructivism was at that time merely a diversion to camouflage the poor architecture of the Stalinist era.

d) Finally and by way of consequence, by criticising Mordvinov, the Head of the Academy of Architecture, Khrushchev in fact attacked violently the institutional structures Stalinism had left behind.

II.2. Industrialization — Prefabrication — Serial Homes: The Line of Reasoning

Khrushchev's speech was clearly structured as an attack against architecture such as it had been conceived during Stalin's period. First of all, that was neither a conference of the Union of Architects, nor one of the Academy, although both institutions were present (and severely criticized) at the meeting. Rather, it was a meeting of the building industry, of which architects were just a tiny part, and certainly not the most important one, as they had been during the Stalinist era. Let it be remembered that architects were among those most favored by the previous *nomenklatura*: when it came to picturing the highest living standards in the USSR in motion pictures, the interiors featured were those in the homes of architects. The union had its own *dacha* outside Moscow, at Suchanov. The Academy used an old palace all by itself. Even Frank Lloyd Wright, who was on the American team attending the first Congress of the All-Union of Architects in 1937, was surprised and delighted by the luxurious standards architects enjoyed.[13]

The title of the discourse itself made no reference whatsoever to architecture ('On implementing on a large scale the industrial methods, on improving the quality and on reducing the cost of constructions'); the guild itself was mentioned second to that of constructors, in the subtitle. Furthermore, architecture was hardly ever mentioned in the first part of the discourse.

The introduction claimed that heavy industry was the only one that could contribute to the proper development of the USSR. Khrushchev then took the idea one step further, saying that heavy industry meant: *a)* more cement and thus more (reinforced) concrete; *b)* 'the large-scale industrialization of constructions', and thus *c)* prefabricated, *not* monolith concrete,[14] and, in any case, definitely *not* bricks. For Khrushchev, 'more progressive' meant 'industrialized building methods'; thus a whole industry had to be created starting from the concept of progress:

> By decree of the CC of CPSU and of the Council of Ministers of the USSR, it is envisaged that in the next three years four hundred and two new factories and two hundred platforms for the production of prefabricated elements and items of reinforced concrete will be built. In these three years, the production of reinforced concrete prefabricated units will increase five-fold; accordingly, the cement production will grow by more than one-hundred-and-fifty percent.

Within the realm of prefabrication, it was hard for the Soviet leader to choose between the existing systems — with prefabricated structure and panels, or just with large panels. Therefore he rather had them compete in the future in a rather 'democratic' fashion: '(...) it seems to me that for the time being one does not have to pass a certain verdict (...) We must offer both systems the chance to develop.' Furthermore, everything that could be prefabricated out of reinforced concrete — not just walls and building elements — had to be done in this way: bridges, pipes, milestones, everything, in order to replace wood, bricks and metal: 'In buildings, everything that can be replaced with concrete or reinforced concrete will be replaced.' There was a shortage of wood in the USSR at that time, allegedly; metal was used inappropriately and 'unjustly'; yet when it came to bricks, Khrushchev's concern clearly regarded the backwardness in building which was associated with their use: why wasting manual labor when there were machines and mechanisms to do that in a more efficient way?

Backwardness is a key word in interpreting this speech, underlined as it is by a 'moral' dichotomy, very similar to that employed by Socialist Realism in the interpretation of history. Bricks and handwork belonged to the past, thereby they were bad. Cement/(reinforced)concrete and industrial building techniques were 'progressive', therefore good. The same logic applied to design activity, the topic of the second chapter in Khrushchev's speech. The design process lagged behind industry, in Khrushchev's opinion: 'sometimes simple buildings are designed over a period of two years or more'. If architects did not realize how slow they were, industry nevertheless urged them to move forward more rapidly. What, then, was 'progressive'? Typified designs — the simpler, the better. Even more: the less types — the better:

> Why are thirty-eight typified projects currently used? Is this *rational*? (...) One must choose a limited number of type-designs for dwellings, schools, hospitals, kindergardens, shops, as well as for other buildings and constructions; one must mass-build only according to these designs, for, say, five years. After this period one will discuss, and, if there will be no other better projects, the duration of using them will be extended by another five years. What's bad in this proposal, comrades? (italics are mine, A.I.)

In Khrushchev's dual logic, there was no room for such elaborated (his word is 'exaggerated') finishings and adornments. Architects who design individual buildings suddenly became 'an obstacle against industrializing constructions'; they are the reactionaries who do not like 'building well and fast'. Rather they learned to build monuments (by which the Soviet leader meant 'a building erected according to a personal project'), and probably the education they received in schools had its own guilt. By no means less guilty was the Academy of Architecture, whose president 'has changed after the war. There is no more the same comrade Mordvinov.'

The speech engulfed a definitely more 'social' approach towards the question of architecture than the previous Socialist Realist agenda. The USSR did not need monuments, at least not anymore, but rather 'humble' social housing projects, 'useful' buildings like hospitals, *creches*, schools. Unlike the Stalinist architects, who had lost touch with reality, Khrushchev had empirical, grass-roots arguments from 'out there' to prove his points. Here is one of his examples: in the industrial city of Vatutenki (Moscow region) the kindergarten was oversized (91,9sq.m./child instead of 24sq.m./child, as the norms stated) and 'overloaded with stucco ornaments'; it was a 'palace', claimed ironically the speaker, which costed three times the 'normal' building. 'Yet, the author of the design was rewarded the first prize. For what? For wasting the funds.'

If architects wanted to 'walk along with life', they must have learned to design not only forms, but rather materials, techniques and — even more important — economy as well. One can see here a clear attack against the *beaux-arts* tradition of the Soviet architectural schools. By the same token, he privileged the polytechnical model of teaching architecture, closer perhaps to a Bauhaus curriculum, yet nevertheless strictly controlled by the Bolshevik party. By embellishing their architecture, the *beaux-arts*-ists hanged tasteless and — a Modern argument — useless decorations on their façades. They were difficult to be built, expensive, time and energy consuming. Instead, Khrushchev asserted that the only important criterion was 'the cost of the square meter of building', the effectiveness of their construction.

II.3. 'Ornament is politically incorrect': The Hidden Modern Agenda

'Ornament is crime', Adolf Loos had said long before. Khrushchev would have agreed, adding that it was the fault of an aberrant ('irrational') building program, which had privileged high rising buildings towards which 'we can look, but in which we cannot dwell or work'. The argument against the Stalinist edifices ran eventually as a tipically Modern one. Why did Moscow need spires at all, let alone the price, since they looked like churches? 'Do you like churches?', asked rhetorically the Communist leader. It was not just the spires, but the improper expression of the interior function:

> One cannot transform a contemporary house, by means of forms, into some kind of church or museum. This does not bring any extra confort to their dweller, but complicates the use of the building and makes its cost more expensive.

But, unlike Loos, Khrushchev was sarcastic in criticising the adornments of high rising buildings in Moscow. 'These are pervertions in architecture', and

whoever did not understand it had to be replaced ('He who will not understand must be brought on the right path'), as it happened to comrade Zaharov, who had been previously replaced from leading a design studio. His fault, apart from belonging to the Stalinist nomenklatura? Allegedly, he had designed a tall building with Palladian statues on top of it, yet this was a block of flats with:

> a dwelling room with five walls, with a corner window [which] was not comfortable, let alone that the dwellers had to watch all their life the back of the statues. One can understand that it is not very nice to live in such a room.

Yet Zaharov was not alone in this. He could have been inspired by the theories of the necessary monumental approach towards cities' skyline. A.G. Mordvinov himself, the president of the Academy of Architecture, quoted by Khrushchev from *Arkitektura SSSR* 1/1945 (*nota bene*: nine years before the speech), as well as professor A.V. Bunin, who had both argued in favor of major, tall urban elements, without an immediate purpose ('porticos, monumental halls, towers'; the city centres, believed Bunin, had to exclude prefabrication, and had to be individually designed, with domes and towers, that is with major vertical silhouettes. No wonder then that the designing architects sacrificed confort and costs, since from the very top came such examples of misunderstanding.

II.4. 'Dead Style Walking': Nikita Khrushchev Promoting Constructivism

But was it really a misunderstanding, or, rather, under the banner of anti-constructivism, Stalinist architects only 'justified their wrong trend'? From this point onward, Khrushchev enters the most surprising and radical part of his discourse. He had to demolish both the Stalinist establishment in architecture, and the atheist ideology promoted in its name. He could deal with the former in a rather easy way, using a 'Trojan horse' named comrade Gradov, who had allegedly tried to criticize Mordvinov (i.e. the establishment itself) by using similar arguments to those used by Khrushchev on December 7, 1954. Yet Mordvinov had tried to prevent him from speaking at the meeting, which proved once again, according to the party leader, 'that in the Academy of architecture there are neither the necessary conditions for a free exchange of opinions regarding the architectural work, nor criticism'. It was not exclusively Mordvinov's fault: worse even, he shared it with the State Committee for Constructions, who was supposed to oversee the work of the academy, to promote the 'standardization activity, urban planning and city building', which they had hardly ever done before 1953.

As for the aesthetics of Socialist Realism, Khrushchev had to be more subtle than just imposing another language by decree; rather, he prefered to build his argument applying the idea that the-enemy-of-my-enemy-is-my-friend kind of approach. Which was the single most hated aesthetics for Socialist Realism? — Constructivism. The Avant-garde elite was gradually replaced even before 1925 by classicists as I. Zholtovsky, A. Schusev[15] and I. Fomin. How then to best subvert the Socialist Realist rhetoric other than by claiming that it was obsessed with fighting Constructivism instead of concentrating on how to properly design the Soviet architecture. 'Of course' one had to find against Constructivism (Khrushchev did not want to go all the way to surprizing his audience), but it had to be done only by using 'rational means'. What does this key word in his speech really mean?

If constructivism meant formalism, and if that was bad, then perhaps the Stalinism architects were the real constructivists, since they themselves 'slide towards the aesthetizing passion for a form disconnected from its content'. They were probably blind — one can argue following Khrushchev's arguments — not to see that, well, there were good parts in Constructivism after all. First of all, 'the grey, sad box-style', as the *Great Soviet Encyclopedia* called it[16], would have been cheaper than building towers, collonades. Then the interior distribution of its buildings, the way those could be used were obviously more 'rational', as he liked to point out frequently during the speech, than the useless adornments of the façades. It was a rather negligent attitude towards 'the ardent needs of the people' than was it efficient in fighting Constructivism.

Khrushchev went on eventually only to stupefy even more his audience by proclaiming several aesthetic points dear to any Modernist. a) First of all, a generic one: 'We are not against beauty, but against useless things'. Then, derived from this slogan, it followed that b) façades should be beautiful not because of their decoration, but due to 'skilfull proportions of the whole building, a good proportion of the windows and doors (...), due to a proper use of finishing materials', and, perhaps the clearest paraphrase to the 'form follows function' Modern mantra, c) façades have to be beautiful by '*veridically outlining* the wall pieces and elements in the block buildings with large panels'.

II.5. Architecture Bare Naked and the Malignant City: Effects on Architectural Practice

Obviously, this speech was meant to act like a manifesto *against* Socialist Realism as the most representative expression of Stalinism, more than acting as a cathalist *for* a specific alternative aesthetics. The agenda of Modern architecture was used in order to define by contrast what Khrushchev was fighting

against. However, it is obvious that its influence in reshaping the architectural discourse in the Soviet Union and the satellite countries was enormous. After 1954 several Socialist Realist buildings which were under construction in 1953 continued to be erected, yet not without harsh criticism for their costs and decoration. Mordvinov, author of the *Ukraine Hotel* in Moscow (one of the seven Stalinist sky-scrapers), had his share of party criticism rigth on the spot, during the speech: the square meter was allegedly 17% more expensive here than at the *Moskva Hotel*[17], due largely to the excessive decoration. Many other pavilions at the Agricultural All-Union Exhibition in Moscow (which was extensively described by its chief architect A. Jukov in *Arkitektura SSSR* 7/1954, as well as in *Arhitectura RPR* 9/1954) were completely finished after Stalin died.[18] D.N. Tchetchiulin's *Soviet House of RFSSR* on Krasnopresnenskaia was eventually built[19] very much with the same outline as it had been designed before 1953, yet entirely stripped of its ornaments. Later edifices, such as *Lenin Central Stadium* in Lujniki (1956, A.V. Vlasov, who was in 1954 the chief architect of Moscow, 'a good architect, but who sometimes does not manifest the right perseverence', Khrushchev argued in his speech), recall pre-war edifices such as B. Iofan's *Dinamo Central Stadium*: still classicizing, yet without the emphasis on flamboyant decorations as the post-1948 ones.

In November 1955 the 'useless stylistic elements' were officially and definitely eliminated from the architectural discourse. According to Ockman and Eigen, the first to mention this speech as a possible Modernist text (1993:184), by 1958 almost 70% of the constructive parts in a building were prefabricated, as opposed to 25% in 1950. While in 1948 the Academy of Architecture had to advance prototypes for various building types for five different regions in the country, typification was hardly the result — in Khrushchev's terms later on — since the outcome was: 50 different types of dwelling units and (nota bene) 200 types of public buildings, each with its own set of decorations, 'traditional/local' details. After 1954 this was hardly the case anymore, although it did not mean that the Soviet modernism evolving from Khrushchev's speech was in any way a return to Constructivist experiences. Exhibited at Brussels in the Soviet pavilion, prefabricated architecture taylored according to Khrushchev's speech meant in fact 'a stripped-down façade treatment and fewer compulsory symmetries, but in rigidity of conception it remained very similar to the work carried out under Stalin' (ibidem).

Very much the same thing happened in the satellite countries. In Romania one could observe how the edificies built after 1954 were stripped off of their decorations and entertained the severe clasicizing style inspired by *stille littorio* before the war. An eloquent example in Romania was *Romarta Copiilor* Building, opposite to the CCA eclectic edifice. Although in 1954 there was a major competition for designing the square and the surrounding façades, where

the design 18 won the 2nd — highest — prize (arch. Al. Zamfiropol, Al. Hempel and team), and although all the winning entries were clearly indebted to a Socialist Realist aesthetics, the erected building was a symmetrical composition, with stone pilasters, closer to the 1930's architecture in Bucharest than to the Stalinist one. In fact, it was an entirely different design, regardless of the competition.20 Architecs like Duiliu Marcu and Tiberiu Ricci could work again after the war and the brief Stalinist intermezzo (Marcu was even the president of the Union of Architects in Romania, which, following the Decree of November 13, 1952 of the Central Committee of the Romanian Workers' Party — PMR — was initiated on December 21, 1952, that is: twenty years after the Soviet decree of April 23, 1932 with similar effects in the USSR).

Ricci, the alleged author of some of Marcu's attributed buildings, designed after the war the *Radio House and Concert Hall* in precisely the same manner he used for the pre-*war CAM-Regia Monopolurilor Building* on the Victoria Avenue in Bucharest. Edifices like the *Palace Hall* resemble pre-war clasicizing 'palaces' like the one in the Victoria Square, whereas the surrounding blocks recall Bauhaus/CIAM's severe aesthetics. Destalinization made room for flattering national precedents just before opening the door for a flat, industrialized Modernism in the early sixties.

As Grigore Ionescu points out, during the 1955–1960 five-year plan the radical shift from 'design methods based upon an archaic, narrow understanding of the connection between form and content in both architecture and urbanism' happened (Ionescu, 1969: 59) thus taking 'a preparatory step for the ample, high scale work in planning and building which became obvious after 1960' (ibidem). However, it is not until late-1950s, especially after the 1956 revolution and a greater social awareness of the Romanian Communist leadership, that question directly pertaining to architecture and urbanism are abruptly and officially addressed. The Romanian Worker's Party's plenum in November 1958 criticised the late response of the building industry to the economy issue ('let's build cheap housings of good quality'), as well as the backwardness in urban planning, only to have an echo in February 8–10, 1959 when they criticised the 'aesthetic exaggerations' that opposed the 'economic factor' in housing buildings, whereas in terms of urbanism the lack of coherence in decision making regarding the necessity to site large ensembles of dwelling units (too spread out, or too small groups, low density, lack of services). In the same year of 1959 the focus on the so-called 'systematization of the (national) territory' started to become the major event in expanding the Romanian built environment until the mid 1980s, having among the very first projects the enormous trend to systematize the Black Sea coast, which did not become real and complete until the late 1960s and 1970s. On the other hand, in order to build such ample new quartiers and cities, prefabrication was obviously the key word, following Khrushchev's speech. There was an international exhi-

bition of typified-projects (October 23-November 10, 1957), while competitions were launched to design prefabricated/standard edifices for social programs and even for administrative buildings (from 1955 onward).

Although it is clear that the first trend after the speech was to 'look back' for bridging the gap Socialist Realism inflicted upon the architectural discourses in East-European architecture, the sources of this retrospectivism may vary from one country to another. Romania envisaged a hybrid classicizing Modernism and/or a stripped Classicism (the so-called *Carol II Style* celebrated by its promotors like Petre Antonescu or I.D. Enescu) in its major edifices before the war, indebted to the Italian examples. And for good political reasons: Italy and Romania are both of Latin origins, while the German official architecture was questionable, as anything Nazi at the time.

Estonia had its alternative Modern tradition, while the Soviet Union could not entirely return to the blamed Constructivism whole heartedly, despite Khrushchev's half blessing. However, after 1960, Bauhaus and CIAM urban schemes became the norm in East-European architecture, only to be somehow altered later on, at the top level of the discourse, by a late-Corbusierian aesthetics of rough concrete and spectacular, 'poetic' forms.

Very much the same thing happened in Hungary, where architects like Rimanockzy worked before, during, and after Stalinism, only to use his old tools again after 1956, when the revolution had abruptly switched the clock from Socialist Realism 'back' to plain Modernity. A similar trend can be seen in Estonia, which, largely exposed to pre-war Scandinavian/Aalto Modernism, did precisely the same thing after 1954, that is returned to its modern sources before the war.

II.6. Ideology As /Instead of Aesthetics: Effects On The Critical Discourse

The real issue in interpreting East-European architecture is that it lacked the critical edge, its self reflexiveness. After the suppression of the Avant-garde in the USSR, official discourses stood for/and thus replaced any form of criticism. The leaders would 'draw the official line', while architects would eventually strive to 'implement' it within the discourse, embellishing the respective vague, superficial suggestions with an aesthetic/architectural parlance, attributing a line of reasoning that was allegedly traced from the given speech. After becoming the norm, no one but the party leader himself would dare to criticize the 'official line' in architecture, be it Socialist Realist or its complete reverse after 1954.

One must say that Socialist Realism itself was not the immediate result of certain elaborate aesthetics descending from Stalin, Jdanov or the like, but a by-product of their acts within the realm of architecture, as well as the 'translation'

of their rough discourses on architectural topics. Socialist Realism was the offspring of its many step-parents: the 23 April 1932 decree which had suppressed the organizations within the field, replacing them with a union and an academy; the Palace of the Soviets competition which rejected any straightforward Modern as well as foreign designs, thus suppressing the European Avant-gardists as well as the local ones; and finally, the method of interpreting the history formulated by Lunatcharsky and Gorky, who then concluded that it was not only commandable to use historic precedents in the 'new' Soviet architecture, but, furthermore, compulsory, since Bolshevism was the intended end of the historical 'progress'. After 1934, when V. Vesnin criticised the 'schusism' of Soviet architecture, (i.e. its complete abandon of any aesthetic set of principles in favor of 'anything works', a sort of cowardness promoted, Vesnin believed, by Schusev), and perhaps of some weak criticism at the first congress of the union in 1937, there was no critical agenda attached to the Soviet architecture before Stalin died.

Which brings us to Khrushchev's speech. This was the first top level official discourse in the Communist world which focused upon specific aesthetic issues, drew the respective consequences derived from the theoretical approach and thus inflicted practical tasks upon the Soviet — as well as East-European — architecture. My point is that it was precisely its wholeness that had furthermore suppressed the critical edge of East-European architecture. From now on, one can find exclusively buildings, and very little, if any critical discourse at all. Whereas it is extremely relevant to interpret not only the corpus of Modern edifices in the West, but theoretical discourses: criticism, utopian designs, 'myths' and various *ars poetica,* the researcher has to contend with watching reflections and traces of the official discourses in various how-to texts on architecture, as well as in the built environment.

Perhaps the most illuminating examples in that respect are: a) an article by I. Nikolaev, called 'Questions of economy and aesthetics in Soviet architecture' (*Arhitectura RPR* 7/1955), an architects' digest of Khrushchev's speech, as well as b) the 'table talk' at the Academy of Architecture 'around the question of the nature and specific of architecture' (*Arkitektura SSSR* 6/1955), a mere deciphering of the same discourse, now properly translated into the professional jargon, justified with readings of historical precedents, and with the envisaged consequences for the architectural practice at the end of each talk..

If one looks for eloquent examples of Khrushchev's speech, one has to look very attentively at the architectural media, where the discourse could be swiftly tuned to accord to the official hymns. Watching the 1955 summary of *Arhitectura,* the journal of the Union of Architects *and* of the (post-Stalinist) State Committee for Architecture and Constructions of the Ministers Council, is reading the abstract of Khrushchev's speech. First of all, industrial building methods took over the content: to theory and history — the last chapter — is devoted

roughly only one seventh of the page numbers during the year. Reading the titles means addressing to anything but building unique edifices; instead, dwelling units, social-cultural buildings, industrial and agricultural buildings are the norm. And — above all — standardization, prefabrication, and typification. *Type*-designs for social-cultural buildings in the countryside (issue 2/55), *type*-designs for public buildings (5/55 — *horribile dictu,* would have said the Stalinist architect before 1953!), *type* designs for schools and kindergardens (10 and 11–12/55) are the key concepts.

Furthermore, the main concern of the IIIrd national conference of the Union of Architects in the People's Republic of Romania (December 10–11, 1954, covered in *Arhitectura* 3/1955, precisely in the aftermath of Khrushchev's speech), had, because of the blurred significance and consequences of the speech, a rather confused and remarkably low-key agenda, while the final conclusions resemble in a striking manner the way Khrushchev's speech (neither he nor it are in any way acknowledged in the text) was structured. But while the latter discussed the industrialization of building activity, followed by the consequences for architecture, the former conclusions addressed the agricultural architecture for the emerging collective farms (kolkhozes).

Later on urbanism became again a key issue, as the so called 'systematization of the national territory' began to be looked at as a means to control the landscape/ reality, as an early sketch of the *megastructure* concept that took over the discourse in the 1960s.

II.7. The 'As If' Manifesto of East-European Modernism

Is Khrushchev's discourse really the lost manifesto of Modern architecture? The answer is twofolded. Yes, it was — and no in the same time, depending on where the mirror stands.

Yes, because it engulfed definitely Modern consequences (a definite social agenda for its envisaged architectural program, prefabrication of building, the predominant use of concrete, as well as a remote yet recognizeable 'form-follows-function' approach); because it rejected the Socialist Realist aesthetics, used a 'rational' parlance, and because it reversed the anti-Constructivism trend in Soviet architecture.

No, because it was merely a political discourse, not to be critically scrutinized, opposed to, but which was meant to be obediently 'translated' and applied within the practice as such, without further questions. And no, because many of its aesthetic principles are not inherently Modern, but rather the conclusions of Khrushchev's economical obsessions: price-per-square-meter, heavy industry, concrete and the industrialization of building techniques, mirroring a compulsory lack of alternatives to the worldwide trends Socialist Realism wanted to ignore for so long.

Perhaps a better way to characterize the discourse of December 7, 1954, is this: a) the beginning of the de-Stalinization process; b) the speech that *stood for* East-European Modern manifestoes largely by replacing them and suppressing their eventual birth.

III. The Out-Of-Body Experiences:
A Reading of Modern Architecture in the Fifties and Sixties

III.1. The Disappearing Body of Modern Architecture?

Architecture in the fifties and sixties increasingly lost its corporeality. It was not just a desfiguring. It was not just an *écorché*, skinless mechanism, displaying (rarely in a glass window) every single organ outside; it emphasised its respective shape (brutalism), flexing rough concrete muscles (Paul Rudolph's Yale Faculty of Architecture, late-Corbusier's La Tourette, Chandigarh and Notre Dame de Haute Ronchamp).

It was much more than all these: architecture after the war revolted against its integrity, completion, definitiveness, permanence, and inside coherence. It stood against internal measure (Michelis, 1982: 200–8) and ended up by being anti-antropomorphous — at one end the Hi-Tech wizardries, at the other end Kurokawa's 'cyborg architecture'. Architecture as an unique body exploded. Its internal, sustaining structures became interconnected and proliferated, leading to the megastructure concept, while its cells became autonomous, replaceable, moveable, only to evolve eventually towards Reiner Banham's 'bubbles'[21], to capsules (in Metabolism) and to disposable (Cook called it 'throw-away') architecture later on.

III.1.a. Who Framed the European City?
Megastructures and East-European Look-Alikes

Megastructure had a great size; was built of modular units; was capable of great, or even 'unlimited' extension; was a structural network into which smaller structural units (for example rooms, houses, or small buildings, of other sorts) can be built or even 'plugged-in' or 'clipped on' after having been prefabricated elsewhere; a structural framework expected to have a useful life much longer than that of the smaller units which it might support.
REINER BANHAM (1976:2)

The part played by the corporal metaphors in the post-war architecture was not throughout researched. First of all, it may be looked at from the perspective of an analogy between functional and organic: among the ideologies of func-

tionalism identified by Benjamin Handler (1970:5), organicism was by far the most radically encompassing. Sullivan's slogan is thus enhanced, since Handler looks at the perfect identity between form and function (Handler, 1970:9). Form was understood as the outcome, the external expression of an internal process of functioning. According to the theory of systems, form would be 'the functioning of the whole' (ibidem).

Obviously, post-war Modernism played with its body (or with what was left after dismembering it) in a rather peculiar way. Architecture as a single, internally and (thus, the Modernists would say) externally coherent body had to disappear. Brutalism was an *corche*: skinless architecture without its protecting envelope to keep together in an unique body the entire building, and to mask its interior from outside looks. The house did not need to be draped by a unique façade anymore. Instead, each part of any given building should be exclamated, displaced from its system/structure and loudly displayed towards the exterior, to be widely visible. For the Smithsons, 'form follows function' became 'every single function should be expressed in a separated exterior shape/volume'. By letting the parts free, Brutalism pointed towards the internal mechanism of the (architectural) body, towards its vital systems sustaining it, which then became essential: circulation/transportation, water pipes and electricity wires in the city, structural elements and correspondents of the above in the building.

There was only one step left to the megastructure concept, which could be looked at as architectural structuralism. The step was made by Archigram and Yona Friedman, by Japanese Metabolists, Urbanisme Spatial in France and by Città Territorio in Italy. The body disappeared, only to be replaced by a twofold alternative: on the one hand the mega/meta organisms that could spread over a whole city and even a (national/world-wide) territory; all it mattered was the 'biological', internal functioning of the whole, how the 'atoms' move and are distributed within it is secondary. While the first Modernists, like Le Corbusier, were fascinated by cars and hangars, architects of the so called 'second Machine Age' (Martin Pawley) looked at space forms and chemical plants instead, 'all canned in exposed lattice frames, NASA style' (Colquhoun, 1986:17), since those provided the kind of 'dismembering' needed to prove their point.

Without bodies to contain them, the internal mechanism could proliferate malignantly, from house to city to the whole environment. All of those were in fact systems of control and manipulation upon the urban structure, that have gradually evolved and took over the architectural discourse, and from which Western environment was saved (except for the interesting Cumbernauld example), since they remained largely as urban utopias rather than realities. In the East 'and in Cuba' (Banham, 1976:10), though, megastructure — as a macro-concept regarding a whole country as *the site* for heroically extending the central control

over it — became increasingly popular since the sixties, only to devour their host — the city — in the late eighties in Romania.

For megastructure was not the 'neutral grid' (Colquhoun, 1986: 121) envisaged by Yona Friedman for the University of Berlin, or by Le Corbusier for his hospital project in Venice — neither in its original understanding, nor in its East-European counterparts. First of all, because the frame was dominant, permanent, fixed and structuring. Secondly because, given the above mentioned inner qualities, it was supposed to be expressed in a monumental way, which eliminates definitively its neutrality. The frame is not the background against which the city projects its functioning, but the functioning mechanism turned the very essence of the city/environment.

In the late 1960s Romania, as well as in the West earlier, the community spirit was replaced by 'civic centres' — monuments dedicated to it, best described, as its West European counterparts, as 'grotesque civic monuments with compulsory piazzas (...) an elephantine tendency' (Curtis,1982:349) inspired obviously by 'the last' Le Corbusier[22]. It is here where the frame/structure exists the internality of the architecture to exhibit its 'heroic' part in sustaining the whole. The grids were metaphors of control displayed on the façades of major administrative buildings built since late 1960's in every county capital city. Although the structural/decorative frames did not become autonomous, as in megastructures, this exhibition of inflated concrete grids is perhaps the most important feature of East European official architecture in the 1960s and 1970s.

In the same 'heroic' style, but closer to a brutalist disembodiment, several major edifices were built in the sixties and early seventies in Romania. The Polytechnic Institute in Bucharest (1962–1972, Octav Doicescu chief-architect; P.Iubu, C. Hacker. S. Lungu, P. Swoboda, I. Podocea architects) was an early example of a monumental, brutalist approach towards a dramatic change in designing edifices after Stalinism. Grids and rough, plugged-in volumes were nevertheless masked with superficial brick finishing, altering their 'sincere expression' praised by Gheorghe Curinschi Vorona (1981:344). A slightly similar approach was conveyed in designing the Academy 'Ştefan Gheorghiu' (Ştefan Rulea chief-architect): its auditoriums are huge masses detached from the concrete grid of the façade and individually exposed as 'primadonas' of the exterior composition.

Communist Eastern Europe, plagued by prefabrication and social housing after 1954 (i.e. exclusively common dwelling units, with very little ownership allowed since 1970's), was the perfect playground for megastructures — an efficient way to control the environment and its inhabitants. During the sixties, vast areas of environment and historical city centres were destroyed everywhere in Europe in the name of development (Curtis, 1982: 349). Tradition disappeared for Modernism to take over and impose 'a simple and architectonic order on the layout of human society and its equipment' (Banham,1976:199).

III.1.b. 'Arise, And Take Up Thy Bed, And Walk': Capsules And the (re)Movable Home

Art.1. The capsule is cyborg architecture. Man, machine and space build a new organic body which transcends confrontation (...). Art. 2. A capsule is a dwelling of Homo movens.   Kisho Kurokawa (1977: 75–6)

On the other hand, one discusses about the prime unit: a dwelling capsule — detachable, transferable, thus mobile. The body metaphor retreated inside the cell. Yet the cell is secondary, since it depended on the megastructure. Within a 'permanent and dominating frame containing subordinate and transient accommodations'[23], the capsule is just another function of the city 'housed' in 'a large frame'[24]. While the capsule celebrated by Metabolism had its own roots in the Japanese tradition: kago, the individual transportation unit, and the shoin pavilions called jiga (Charles Jencks in its Foreword to Kurokawa, 1977:11), in the west it was a clear mark of disembodying architecture.

Yet Kurokawa refined the concept, since the capsule is not exclusively biologic any longer: he talks about 'cyborg architecture' — architectural body with prothesis. Architects should not look at the body for inspiration, but rather to its technological alter-ego. And, with technology and capsule, 'A Home is not a House' anymore, as claimed by Reiner Banham in 1965. Any of its internal functions could be supplied technologically, and thus their material expression became irrelevant: solid, permanent walls, windows, furniture items with their bourgeois, monumental appearance criticised by Baudrillard (1968).

Despite its compulsory modernism, East European architecture and interior design have never questioned the alleged 'conservative' nature of house furniture, capable of subverting the 'revolutionary' message conveyed by the social common dwelling. More even, furniture in Romania after the war produced retarded yet traditionally 'bourgeois' furniture items, such as the enormously popular glass cases, where the household valuables could be displayed. More even, Modern architecture was transformed and even repressed by vernacular ways of appropriating the internal home space. The 'clean' room for guests took over the living room as a place with the best furniture, the most valuable possessions in the household, where children were not allowed to play. The kitchen, despite its small sizes in Modern apartments, was still the 'fire centre' of the home, and arguably the most important place in any Romanian apartment and so on and so forth.

Yet, as a consequence of their mobility, homes of post-war visionaries lack oikos, the site with qualities best described by the concept of Raum (Heidegger, 1995:185). 'Home of the Homo movens' (Kurokawa, 1977:76), the capsule is in fact the most elaborated consequence of previous concepts elaborated by the Constructivst 'desurbanists', who have searched to allegedly give the Soviet

citizen an unlimited freedom to move across the Soviet Union without having to depend on a given, fixed 'dwelling place'. Placeless architecture was the alternative to 'bourgeois'city envisaged by desurbanists, who were repressed since 1930 by Stalin and Jdanov in saying that, since the Bolshevik revolution had won in the cities, it followed that those cities were revolutionary from that point onward. With capsule architecture plugged into megastructures, one deals with a generic human being as opposed to individuals. Man became a social, anonymous being docked in a space without attributes, which he did not own, yet which he had to call home.

The question rises here whether standardisation and prefabrication of home in East-European architecture is the ultimate encapsulation of dwelling, expressed on the façades as well. Architecture in the 1960s emphasised the structural frame, which then celebrated the repetitiveness of its internal units[25]. The actual limits of any given home (i.e. flat within the block, even individual rooms) were not only left apparent, but they were emphasised towards the exterior. Façades as drapes that could veil and mask such details had already disappeared. One can look at a 'brutalist' attitude: the box frame 'expressed the actual physical limit to each dwelling; each unit reads' (Banham, 1966:91). The poor craftmanship and mere economy induced this separatedness of each panel, rather than any conceptual attitude.

While in the West the common dwelling was rather the exception, in the East it was the norm: an artificial environment, capable of being manipulated, which could repress self-representations of the individual ego, flattering in exchange the social indistinctiveness. With the skinless, paneled façades, home as a shelter/refuge/ hiding space was gone from the post-war Modern architecture.

III.1.c. CorpoReality: Organic vs technological or Architecture as Prothesis

Naturalism does not fit well with modern trends, nor with the structures of today.
E. HEINLE & M. BCHER (1971:284)

By the same token, 'organic' meant something different in the post-war Modernism. While Gaudi's bone columns and visceral Gel chapel still refer to the body metaphor, for Metabolists the organic was just the host for healing technologies. Modern organic architecture looked at how organism worked; at systems, not at their shapes. It was fascinated by velocity, self-sustained processes, internal functioning — metabolism in a word. Bionic architecture itself was not about miming the complete plant or animal body, but rather about why is it working so well. 'Organicism' in the latter discourse was not a celebration of the Body as a whole, but of the way it worked as a *Mechanism* — the ultimate metaphor of Modern architecture.

Banham's environmental bubble as well as Quarnby's 'organic' forms, the fantastic shapes of W.E. Wedin's polyurethan houses have inspired and been inspired by sci-fi/cosmic architecture. An example is Barbarella's Sojo city (imagined by Mario Garbuglia in 1968) and its fur coated space-ship where Jane Fonda purred bare naked — all are somewhat indebted to the organic metaphor, yet expressed in non-organic materials. Although Kurokawa did discuss 'living' concepts, they were scarcely addressing the body alone: movement (Kurokawa, 1977:87), dynamic modulation (ibidem), growth and change (idem: 89–91), or even a possible 'aesthetics of death' (Jencks in idem: 10) referred to mechanism, to cyborgs more than to beings.

III.2. Looking Through: Artificial Environments and The Ultimate Sense

To be able to see through substance became more and more magic as techniques of production were able to give larger and larger uninterrupted forms.
PETER COOK (1970:63)

Combining existing materials, inventing new, artificial building materials and building colours, eroding conventional ways of employing old and new materials in architecture were perhaps the most radical strategy to displace the being from its nest of conventions regarding its urban/public as well as interior/private space after 1950. The most intimate archetypes, such as the trilitic arche-structure, had to be disrupted and dis/re/placed.

Unlike before the war, when architecture, albeit Modern, had still a sense of appropriatedness in dealing with (building) matter, after 1950 one can see architects looking into it to find 'new' ways of twisting, folding, packing, inflating, exposing and even making invisible the very same matter, or its 'cyborg' mutants.

A look into the substance of architecture and how dealing with it changed the very nature of the architectural discourse in Western as well as Eastern Europe might illuminate fractures as well as continuities within this process, and their relevance to our understanding of the architecture of the fifities and sixities.

III.2.a. Erotic vs heroic: Plastic/Soft Architecture

Architecture can be seen more related to the ambiguity of life.
PETER COOK (1970:67)

The most important quality of plastic, apart from its modernity, came from its versatility: by designing plastic furniture, one could invent items with multiple functions and, most important, with non-conventional colours. Even entire cities,

plastic utopias as the Spatial Housing Project (W. Doring), or the suspended Rendo Housing Project (Casoni&Casoni), or the 1966 utopian pneumatic town by Gernot Nalbach. A living capsule made entirely of the same material thus became reality, while inflatable furniture, with its erotic, soft and sometimes transparent shapes, was fashionable in the sixties (and had a comeback in the mid-nineties).

There were clear references to attributes of the body, yet 'embodied' by the most artificial, anti-organic material. Soft architecture is perhaps the best example.[26] Bionics and metaphors of life are clearly incorporated in this definitely Modern material, which is more clearly related to the sixties, with its out-of-body experiences — mind expanding, drugs (H.Rucker: Mind Expander, 1968) — than with 'classical' anthropomorphism as such. 'Sculptectures': all these dialogues, distortions, frustrations have to do with corporeality, witnessing an impossible struggle of Modernity to completely exile its traces within the architectural discourse. Finally, one can argue that the most striking similarity between body and later Modern architecture was their sheer temporality. Architecture was no longer eternal, but replaceable, disposable, and ready to die. Plastic does not die, however.

It has a pre-war history especially in Germany — that wanted to be independent from importing raw materials — and in the UK — with its 1941 Building Plastics Research Corporation in Glasgow. Eventually, it emerged as *the* alternative, up-to-date building material in the early fifties[27], due to the dwelling crisis and to plastic's easy prefabrication. The first real structure did not come out until 1955, when, at the Paris Exhibition, Ionel Schein (with R.A. Coulon and Y. Magnart) exhibited a plastic house.

The plastic capsules appeared later on, by the same team: Motel cabin (1956) and exhibition units for a mobile library (1958). Plastic was so popular and hype in the sixties, that it was adopted instantly by the pop culture, thus being present at Disneyland, as a crossed plastic home sitting on a pilaster (1957), shaping 'the ideal home' designed by the Smithsons (1956), and envisaging future habitations (Monsanto House of the Future by Hamilton and Goody).

Plastics then offered unexpected ways to avoid traditional design strategies and conventional forms. There were details: curved window frames, probably alluding to (space)ships, or no window frames at all. Then it corroded the very nature of any architectural structure to day. As mentioned at the beginning of this chapter, Peter Cook thought that a revolution in architecture happened during the fifties and sixties, as new materials and structural techniques allowed architects to blow the trilitic system up. By detaching the structure from the architectural skin after 1945, each component had its own eventual destiny. Without columns and beams, the skin became the structure by itself, due to Otto Frei and Buckminster Fuller: plastic structures[28], pneumatics — with their erotic,

'very exciting looking shapes' (Cook,1970:62) — reinforced cables, as well as geodezic domes.

Finally architecture could become really 'new'. And, more important, Modern architecture found a way to be thrilling without employing strategies of visual heroism. Soft architecture, although inherently big, was regarded as a 'gradual erosion of monumentality' (idem:67). One must remember here that the lack of monumentality was by far the strongest argument to resisting Modernism before the war. It was seen as an unreliable aesthetics, since it was not capable to offer the heroic structures the elites of nation/states needed to convey their messages within city textures.

Modernism thus had to accept pollination with other idioms to accede to more important edifices than extravagant houses in the woods for the rich and the snob intellectual/art elite before the war. Rationalism, Art Deco and Classical features negotiated together to offer a cocktail called either stripped Classicism (as seen at the Paris Exhibition in 1937), or Classical Modernism (of the New York World Fair in 1939)[29]. This is why Cook's remark is highly important in a discussion on whether Modern architecture was ever able or indeed really willing to produce monumental structures at all.

III.2.b. A Love/Hate Liaison: Glass and Concrete Playing Sight Against Touch

> Glass (...) was, quite clearly, the ideal 'skin' (...) the purpose was to produce maximum invisibility for the wall and maximum visibility for the structural skeleton of the building.
>
> PETER BLAKE (1977:72)

Perhaps the most striking development in Modern architecture after the war is the steady disappearance of the other senses in experiencing the built matter but the visual. In fact, seeing became more and more the only possible way to experience architecture. Yet the more the visual took over, the more substanceless the façades became. Glass was used either as a mirror, or as a transparent 'skin' whose primordial function was not to protect, but to unveil, even expose the structural skeleton.

How did it come to this? First of all, there was the separation between structure and façades, which was a product of the first Modern generation: Gropius' Faguswerk, Le Corbusier's continuous glass windows, and especially Mies van der Rohe's triangular glass Friedrichstrasse tower competition entry displaced the wall from its structural purpose, and the latter was attributed to pillars retreated behind the glass façade. Then, in the fifties and sixties, even the pillar disappeared, as in Fuller's USA Pavilion and his 'roof' for Manhattan, only to make room to a completely glass/transparent façade, regardless how intimate

the interior might have been — a home, as in Philip Johnson's New Canaan re-sidence, or a sky-scrapper, as in Lever House of Mies/Johnson.

As the façade was peeled off the structure, the former became just a way of negotiating the dichotomy between interior and exterior, and the latter was increasingly regarded as the essential part of the architectural organism, it was only logical that the former should 'disappear' in order to display/emphasise the latter. While brutalism left the building skinless, arguing that there was no need to camouflage at all the structure — quite the opposite — other idioms found more metaphysical ways to deal with sensual experiences of architecture as a physical body.

In the Western Europe and the US, roughness and opacity (flattering the tactile and being key qualities of an aesthetics based upon concrete) were increasingly and deliberately suppressed from the discourse, by focusing on smoothness and transparency (which in turn emphasised the sight, and were centered around glass and metal). More and more, the choice of materials, surfaces as well as colours in Modern architecture was intended to complement a unique sense, and thus to alienate the being from its built environment.

It was not a straightforward process, nor was it ubiquitously present in all national/regional architectures after the war. One can see it in France, from the late Le Corbusier (with his raw concrete masses which have started a trend in the fifties and sixties in western Europe and the US, only to find it anew in the East in the late sixties and the seventies as 'lyrical functionalism') to Jean Nouvel 'disappearing' glass tower in Defense and the recent Fondation Cartier, where there is no more resistance opposed to visually penetrating the architec-ture in its entirety.

One can obviously find it in the US, yet in a rather distorted manner, since Rudolph's mid-sixties, à la manière de Le Corbusier, muscle flexing at Yale was rather a reaction *against* the glass curtain of 'Orthodox' (Venturi), corporate Modernism, and where Post-modern opaque consistence brought back matter onto building façades.

However, one cannot find the same process in the East, where Khrushchev's *laudatio* for cement and concrete was absolute. One can make edifices out of concrete: rough, powerful, heavy, thus monumental. Concrete was 'revolutio-nary', as it was an outcome of the heavy industry, and it was grey, which, as pointed out by Schusev, is worker's colour[30].

Glass is cool, both transparent and reflective, fragile and easy, thus 'feminine'. It is present, corporeal as well as absent and virtual. Thus concrete is 'mascu-line': rough, 'as found' (Glendenning&Muthesius, 1994:92), massive, immobile, the very embodiment of (heavy) industry, progress, and materiality.

There was a discrete yet fundamental change in the nature of finishing. It became a quality of the surface itself, indeed of the structural system, rather than

174

something applied eventually. Finishing could be a quality, something to enhance the surface's attributes, yet it could also stand for 'accidental marks of shuttering' (ibidem), 'out-of-form'ness (Stillman & Eastwick-Field), in order to obtain a 'directness of expression' (ibidem). Obviously, a 'revolutionary' discourse had to look for certain metaphors and be attentive to the metaphysics of matter.

Thus, following Khrushchev's emphasis on concrete, one can read the glass/concrete marriage as key dichotomy in understanding Communist archi-tecture. Sight was a key sense in experiencing Western architecture. Unlike in the West, due to a ubiquitous presence of concrete, tactile was still present and relevant. Much like plastics, yet more impressive and heroic, concrete could be manipulated and could subvert the trilitic system as well. The so called 'visual concrete' (Heinle&Bcher, 1971) stands not only for the immediate finishing of the structure, but also for expressive, unconventional forms like shell structures with complicated geometry, as well as for a whole range of 'hard landscape[s] in concrete' (ibidem). Up to the 1970's in both West and East, concrete made it to playgrounds, interiors, schools, fountains and urban furniture items.

Hardly can one find towers with glass 'curtain walls' in the east. First of all, because high rising buildings, as major characters of Stalinist architecture from the Palace of the Soviets to the post-war seven towers in Moscow and Warsaw, were among the most important targets of Khrushchev's speech. Secondly, because one cannot imagine unframed glass, i.e. uncontrolled building elements. Thirdly, because architecture (i.e. the structure), although artificial, had to be present, visible, material, whereas glass offered but elusiveness, was slippery and meta-physical, could entail uncontrollable reflections under various light conditions: 'a giant Hall of Mirrors, or Skyline of Mirrors (...) [which] implies, of course, total abdication' (Blake, 1977:73). The concrete structure had to be emphasised, not camouflaged. It was exhibited, not allowed to be unveiled by the glass walls.

Why then reflect the reality, and not be real? The reflected city is not the real city anymore, but an image, an interpretation of it, it's the other city from beyond the mirror. Mies van der Rohe could assert back in 1919 that 'the im-portant thing in a glass tower is *the play of reflections*' (quoted by Blake:ibidem; italics mine, A.I.); and perhaps in the west one needed now more than ever) a second cornea, a screen prothesis to act as protective/interpretative interme-diary between reality and being. Perhaps glass could be built in the most ethereal ways, as were the glass skyscrapers in the desert outside Teheran (Iran), where only the chaos was reflected and multiplied, or as is SOM's Bank in Rhyad (Saudy Arabia), with his glass walls (towards the inner, empty, triangular court) looking into themselves.

Yet this was not the case in the East, where glass was heavily guarded and/or framed by opaque panels of concrete, rarely stone, retracted behind heavy *brise-soleils* or colonnades. Enframing the glass panels is the norm in Romanian

175

architecture during the envisaged period, recalling works like the Ministry of Education in Rio de Janeiro by Le Corbusier and Oscar Niemeyer, or, closer to home, Duiliu Marcu's CAM building on Victoria Avenue in Bucharest.

The outcome were T.Ricci's glass-within-stone/concrete grids Radio House and especially Romanian Television building. The latter's façades are quite relevant in that context, as its boxes resemble TV sets, yet the emphasis is not on the glass screens, but on the green structure which sends the glass towards the depths of the façade surface. Glass flanked in between two opaque panels was also popular in the Classicizing edifices before the war, such as D.Marcu's War School and especially Victoria Palace in Bucharest were sources for post-Stalinist edifices as the Palace Hall in Bucharest, as well as for many city halls and 'unions' culture houses' in the sixties and seventies.

III.3. Original as Originary: Towards The Archaic Modernism?

Andre Lurat invokes the pile dwelling of the late Stone Age in justification of the pilotis so favoured by architects in the thirties to liberate the congested city terrain.

ALAN COLQUHOUN (1986: 16–17)

Originality is return to the origin.

ANTONIO GAUDI

Alan Colquhoun raised the question of whether post-war Modernism recuperates — deliberately or unconsciously — certain archaic structures, patterns and/or archetypes (i.e. 'exemplary models') of architecture. After Collin Rowe, we know that the Modernists were not entirely estranged from composition patterns used by architects beforehand. His comparison of Palladio and Le Corbusier was relevant in that respect. Steiner's Goetheanums, as well as Aalto's sacred spaces could indeed question the entirety of the alleged gap between Modernity and Tradition. Yet an even deeper *raison d'être* of Modern discourse has to be interrogated in connection with its *arche*-tecture (an analogy to Derrida's *arche*-writing). Such ontology might be proudly claimed, accepted as obvious, or rejected. Yet, regardless of the authors' opinion, origins have to be accounted for when one looks into the nature and ingredients of their architecture.

A parallel to the official architecture in the 1930s might be illuminating in that respect. In *Celălalt modernism (The Other Modernism,* 1995: 125–37*)* I looked into the loudly celebrated, self-styled origins of 'Nazi' and 'Fascist' architectures. At stake there was the question of identity, yet differently tailored, according to the respective regime's ideology. Identity in Nazi and Fascist architectural discourse was defined by nationalism *as* (aesthetic) ideology, whereas in Socialist Realism it was informed by ideology *and* (since the war) nationalism.

Returning to (alleged) origins was then, once again after the French Revolution, the source for restoring the 'revolutionary purity' of architecture. Racial origins would determine the architectural starting point: for Rosenberg, himself an architect who studied at Riga and Moscow, as well as for Speer later on, Dorians (i.e. the Arian ancestors of German people) had their own (Dorian) style. It follows that, when one wants to acknowledge and celebrate one's people origins, one can do it within the built environment by using that particular 'originary' architecture envisaged by ancestors 'as an expression of their racial awareness'.

In *Revolution in der bildenden Kunst*, Rosenberg thus describes how the trilitic structure is genuinely Doric, thus arian, thus 'good', commendable; whereas the arch pertained to Southern, non-arian and (worse!) matriarchal population (Etruscans), was therefore 'feminised', thus 'weak', thus 'bad'[31]. Reversibly, for *stille littorio* (and, remotely, but precisely with similar racial arguments, for the Romanian Carol II style of the 1930s) by immediately or obliquely celebrating the Roman imperial tradition, one could revive and bring forth the values imbedded in the ancient built forms.

At least certain aspects of Modern architecture before and especially after the war could send us to an alternative source. One knows the direct references to Mediterranean vernacular as a privileged source for Cubist architecture: flat roofs/terraces, whiteness, lack of decoration and rectangular shapes. One can also remember the opposition between the circular tent and *tholos* as the built expression of appropriating the space by migrant populations of hunters, as opposed to the Cartesian *megaron*, made out of rectangular bricks of crude or burned argyle, the home of the sedentary agricultural communities. Josef Strzygowski has long ago stated in *Der Norden in der bildenden Kunst Westeuropas* such a Semperian positivist idea that wood was originally the building material of his German/Indo-European ancestors, who were separated by East-Mediterranean and China 'by a belt of brick and of tent builders respectively' (quoted by Rykwelt, 1993:26).

Whereas it seems obvious that the French and Italian Modernism has privileged the latter way of appropriation the built forms, one can elaborate the hypothesise that — predominantly after the war — the architecture of troglodytes was, much like the projective 'cosmic architecture', a (subconscious?) reference for Anglo-Saxon, Scandinavian and German architects. After all, Semper believed, archaic forms are not affected by civilisation: 'even today Europe's over-civilised sons, when they wander in the primeval forests of America, built themselves log cabins' (vol.2: 298, note 2). If Le Corbusier's primitive had rationally 'designed the site' (a concept forwarded by Vittorio Gregotti in his 1966 *Il territorio dell'architettura* and celebrated by Kenneth Frampton in Mario Botta's practice) of his walled home, the walking streets at the first floor envisaged by Brutalists (and eventually built at Barbican and in downtown Cincinnati, for

example), the Metabolist pillars, Friedman's megastructure above the existing cities, as well as Archigram's Walking City and the 1960's and 1970's houses on pilotis could be seen as an effort to switch the 'origins' of architecture towards 'troglodytes' (Colquhoun, 1986: 121). The argument might be eventually unfolded as a means of investigating the alternative approaches to built forms/environment: the walled tradition returned in Romanesque, Renaissance to be eventually found in its Modern epiphanies either in the rough concrete architecture of the late Le Corbusier and Paul Rudolph, in the Italian new-Rationalism, in Postmodernism as well as — dematerialised — in the glass/curtain walls of sky-scrapers or in the transparent architectures of Philip Johnson and Jean Nouvel. The 'structural', trilitic tradition of (Northern) Indo-Europeans and 'troglodytes' could be traced in Gothic (both vernacular and sacred), in Constructivist experiments, and in the above mentioned genealogy of megastructures leading towards Hi-Tech. It is an uprooted architecture, without *Raum,* migrant thus placeless and ephemeral.

Perhaps the most important event in Modern discourse after the war was the shift (in the fifties and sixties) from one origin to another. This shift did not happen in East-European architecture.

Coda

The scope of this text is not only to verify whether the East-European architecture after Stalin died, while lacking a definitely critical, self reflective edge, nevertheless echoed and employed major concepts of Western architectural discourse. It is, in fact, a comparative study with rather optimistic conclusions.

While obviously trailing — at least temporally — the Western discourse, it seems quite stunning that Communist architecture, regardless — or, rather, despite — the ideological pressure, the overwhelming state control, the poor craftsmanship as well as the obsessive industrialisation of building techniques, materials and finishing, was in fact able to roughly go along the same trends as its less controlled, more democratic counterpart outside the Iron Curtain.

Which brings us to the question: how really important are ideologies and power manipulations when one observes the aesthetic discourse? Obviously, they were not able to completely turn the clock backward, as Stalinist elite believed, nor were they able to completely control the practice or to stop inner processes emerging within the discourse. For most of the concepts enumerated before, one has merely reflections, distorted copies or look-alikes. It was not, given the absent critical edge, a complete assimilation. Yet, they existed.

There were several directions where East-European architecture leads, with little — if any — equivalent in the West. When Bolshevik ideology met Moder-

nism after Khrushchev's speech, it was love at first sight (or second sight for that matter, after the Avant-garde). Certain aspects of Modernity found in the East their most spectacular fulfilment: mass prefabrication of social housing, which were able to entirely reshape the existing urban structures; inventing new environments, as well as extending the megastructure concept to its malignant variant' — the so-called 'systematisation of the national territory'.

Perhaps the bottom line of this paper would have to be the following phrase: Modernity is a totalitarian concept in the end, and the only place where its basic, most important goal, that of entirely reshaping the reality according to its political/aesthetic plan, was abundantly achieved in the USSR and (some) of its satellite countries between 1954 and 1989.

Notes

1. Quoted in L.Morris and R. Dradford, *History of the International Artists' Association 1933–1953*, p. 15, and in Briony Fer, David Batchelor, Paul Wood, *Realism, Rationalism, Surrealism — Art Between The Wars*. New Haven, Yale UP, 1993.

2. K. Frampton in Hal Foster, 1983, p. 16 sqq.

3. The utopian nature of that epoch was further analyzed by this author in the research journal *Simetria-Caiete de Artă şi Critică* of the Institute of Architecture [Bucharest] (Summer 1995) as well as in *The Other Modernism.*Cincinnati, 1995.

4. With a special mark for Soviet architecture, where this word entails several 'Classical' stages: Greek architecture, Renaissance, as well as Russian Baroque and Neo-Classicism.

5. In fact there was probably just the absence of major works. The competition for the Smithsonian Institution, won by Eliel Saarinen, as well as the edifices built by European modernists such as Van der Rohe and Gropius would soon prove otherwise.

6. The Austro-Hungarian pavilion at that exhibition was a replica of the Vajda-Hunyad Castle; that of Belgium was the replica of a famous city-hall,whereas the eclectic one of Russia was somewhat reminiscent of the Vassilii Blajenii Cathedral in Moscow.

7. Although Stalin died in 1953, several projects were not finished until as late as 1956, when the process of 'de-stalinization' actually began.

8. Lunatcharsky delivered several speeches on the appropriate use of historical styles in Socialist Realist arts on many occasions, of which the meetings of the Orgburo of Writers' Union between 1932 and 1934 are only the most important. At the 1934 Writers' Congress, Maxim Gorky delivered the official address, presenting an annotated version of 'good' and 'bad' sides of history. Since Gorky was then celebrated as the father figure of Stalinist literature and a close friend of Stalin, his speech can be looked at as the manifesto of would-be Socialist Realism.

9. Tchentrosoyuz Building, designed by Zholtovsky and erected in Moscow in 1934, copied the Palladian Palazzo del Capitanato in Piazza dei Signori, Vicenza, Italy.

10. Ivan Fomin proposed his 'Red Doric' as the most appropriate style for proletarian architecture.

11. The light put on continuously at the 'Stalin' office in Kremlin was another Agitprop trick: the Father of the nation was ever without sleep, he permanently took care for his people.

12. Khruschev's discourse opens with a *laudatio*: 'The industralization of the Soviet country was accomplished thanks to the fact that our party has continuously put into practice the teachings of Lenin and Stalin.'

13. See F.L. Wright: 'Architecture and Life in USSR' in *Architectural Record*/Oct. 1937; trans. Augustin Ioan, *Simetria*, Bucharest (Spring, 1995): 137–44.

14. 'We'll not indicate the names and we'll not accuse those who have directed the builders towards using monolith concrete. I think those comrades have realized themselves they were on the wrong track. Nowadays it is clear to everyone that we should follow *the more progressive* way, (which is) the way of using prefabricated elements and pieces' (italics mine, A.I.).

15. 'One of the fundamental contradictions of Schusev's work was that between his progressive stand — to reject eclecticism and to use the national forms — and the reactionary content of these buildings, often serving the anti-popular czarist church (...) Only after the Great Socialist Revolution in October Schusev could rise up to his own possibilities, his works gaining a proper social and ideological content, thus placing Schusev among the first and most important masters of Soviet architecture'. 'Alexei Victorovici Sciusev — The Great Master of Soviet Architecture' in *Arhitectura* 2/1953. Note the way Stalin's thesis on the dichotomy between form/expression and its content is used in dissociating between Schusev's churches before 1917 and his work after Revolution.

16. Edited in Russian in 1953, vol. 22, pag. 437, quoted in text by Khrushchev himself, only to point to the ideological irrelevance of the way Constructivism was actually defined there.

17. The story, described by Tarkhanov and Kavtaradze, runs that Schusev, who had to redesign the façades of what had initially been meant to be a Constructivist edifice, brought two half-façades united along the symmetry axis instead of two separate variants. As he was not allowed to see Stalin personally to explain the two options, the latter signed across the drawings, which thus became official. No one dared to explain the mistake to Stalin, and the hotel was buil with two slightly different half-façades.

18. Tarkhanov and Kavtaradze, in their 1992 *Stalinist Architecture*, wrote about Khrushchev's obsession to compete in making 'his' pavilion the most flamboyant of the agricultural exhibition. While he was the party leader in Ukraine, he ordered that its pavilion should be the most decorated. Becoming eventually the party leader in Moscow, he ordered this next pavilion to be redesigned, to surpass the Ukrainian one.

19. And badly damaged during Eltsin's 1992 attack against the Russian parliament.

20. For details, one can read G. Pătraşcu: 'Notes regarding the competition for the planning of the Square of the Central Army House in Bucharest' in *Arhitectura* 4/1955, pp. 9–22. In fact, nobody won the first prize, which was diluted into smaller prizes. It is perhaps the last wide competition for major edifices of the Stalinist period in Romania.

21. In 'A Home is not a House' 1965, (reprinted in *Design by Choice*, 1981), with drawings by François Dallegret.

22. These buildings are described as 'Rough concrete piers, heavy crates of brise-soleil and rugged overhangs' (Curtis: 1982: 349).

23. Reyner Banham in *Megastructure: Urban Futures of the Recent Past*, quoted by Colquhoun (1986:120).

24. Fumihiko Maki on megastructure (1964), quoted by Colquhoun (ibidem).

25. 'Some architects around 1950 (...) identified endlessness as a particular aesthetic virtue of frame construction' (Banham, 1966:91). Thus the structure was no longer 'neutral'. In fact, as Banham pointed out previously, for most of the works of Modernism, technology has to

be understood 'as symbolic rather than actual technology' (ibidem). Modernist as Heinle and Max Bcher could believe though that structure is neutral as long as it is 'sincere' and presents itself 'to be contemplated in its entirety' (1971; 285), without noting that, by saying exactly this, they had in fact recited a stylistic, hard-core Modern slogan. Curt Siegel went even further to say that 'another important characteristic of structural form is its independence of all 'trends' and 'new directions' in architecture' (1961:303).

26. Quarmby gives (1984:63) a throughout classification of spatial enclosures made out of plastic: shell assemblies (pure or frames filled with shells); on site enclosures; folding structures; suspension structures; and pneumatics (with low and high pressure), such as the French Pavilion at Expo 1970, made by Birdair Structures Inc, or the Fuji Pavilion at the same exhibition.

27. Quarmby gives a history of plastics, of which one can note: 1950 — mass scale Teflon; 1952 — MacDonald produces commercial polyformaldehyde; 1953 — Ziegler produced polyetilene; 1954 — Matta produced polypropilene (idem: 15).

28. Cook quotes the 1962 Pascal Hausemann house, the 1964 housing project by W. Dring, and the 1965 W. Chalk, R. Heron and Gaskit homes.

29. For more details one can address my book *The Other Modernism — Utopian Spaces, Decor and Virtual Discourse in the 1930s Architecture*, IAIM, Bucharest, 1995.

30. He used for Lenin's tomb black, red, and grey stone: mourning, comunism, and workers.

31. 'The trilitic system, eventually carried by German tribes towards South, did not flourish there with the same strength, because it met the resistance of a non-Arian structure', the arch of a matriarchal society.

Bibliography

BANHAM, Reyner, *Theory and Design in the First Machine Age*, The Architectural Press, London, 1960.
Age of Masters, A Personal View of Modern Architecture, The Architectural Press, 1962.
Guide to Modern Architecture, The Architectural Press, London 1962.
Architect of the Well Tempered Environment, The Architectural Press/Phaidon, 1969.
Megastructure — Urban Frames of the Recent Past, Thames and Hudson, London, 1976.
Design by Choice, Academy Editions, London 1981.
BAUDRILLARD, Jean, *Sistemul obiectelor*, Echinox, Cluj, 1996.
BENEDIKT, Michael, *Deconstructing The Kimbell — An Essay on Meaning and Architecture*, Sites Books, NY, 1991.
BENEVOLO, Leonardo, *History of Modern Architecture*, Routledge & Kegan Paul, London 1971, vol. 2: *The Modern Movement*.
BLAKE, Peter, *Form Follows Fiasco — Why Modern Architecture Hasn't Worked*, Atlantic Monthly Press, Boston/Toronto, 1977.
BLUNDELL, Jones, Peter, 'Architecture and political legitimation' in *Architectural Record* no. 7, 1996, pp. 64–8.
BODENSCHATZ, H., *Platz frei für das neue Berlin!* Transit, Berlin, 1987.
BROADBENT, Geoffrey 'Buildings as Symbols of Political Ideology' in *Semiotics 1980*, Plenum Press, NY/London, 1982.
CĂLINESCU, Matei, *Cinci feţe ale modernităţii*, Univers, Bucharest, 1996.

COHEN, Jean-Louis, *Scenes of the World to Come — European Architecture and the American Challenge, 1893–1960*, CCA, Montreal, 1995.

COOK, Peter, *Experimental Architecture*, Studio Vista, London, 1970.

COLQUHOUN, Alan, *Essays in Architectural Criticism — Modern Architecture and Historical Change*, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1986.

CONRADS, Ulrich (editor), *Programs and Manifestoes on 20th Century Architecture*, Lund Humphries, London, 1970.

CURINSCHI-VORONA, Gheorghe, *Istoria arhitecturii în România*, Editura Tehnică, Bucharest, 1981.

CURTIS, William Jr., *Modern Architecture since 1900*, Phaidon, Oxford, 1982.

DAWN Ades et al eds., *Art and Power — Europe Under Dictators*, Hayward Gallery, Cornerhouse, London/ Manchester, 1995.

DREW, Philip, *Third Generation — The Changing Meaning of Architecture*, Pall Mall Press, 1972.

DURTH, Werner and GUTSCHOW, Niels, *Architektur und Städtebau der fünfziger Jahre*, Band 41, *Schriftenreihe des deutschen nationalkomitees für Denkmalschutz*, Bonn 1990.

DURTH, Werner and Nerdinger, Winfried, (eds.) *Architektur und Stdtebau der 30er/40er Jahre*, Band 46, *Schriftenreihe des deutschen nationalkomitees für Denkmalschutz*, Bonn 1994.

DURTH, Werner and NERDINGER, Winfried (eds.), *Architektur und Stdtebau der 30er/40er Jahre*, Band 48, *Schriftenreihe des deutschen nationalkomitees für Denkmalschutz*, Bonn 1994.

DWEL, Jr., *Baukunst voran! Architektur und Städtebau in der SBZ/DDR*, Schelzy&Jeep, Berlin, 1995.

FARMER, Ben and LOUW, Hentie (eds.), *Companion to Contemporary Architectural Thought*, Routledge, London/NY, 1993.

FRAMPTON, Kenneth, *Modern Architecture — A Critical History*, 3rd ed., Thames and Hudson, London, 1992.

MUTHESIUS, Ştefan, *Tower Block*, Yale University Press, New Haven/London, 1994.

GROPIUS, Walter, *Scope of Total Architecture*, Collier Books, Toronto, 1970 (first printing 1943).

HAL FOSTER (ed.), *The Anti-Aesthetic — Essays on Postmodern Culture*, Bay Press, Seattle, 1982.

HEINLE, Erwin, and BUCHER, Max, *Building in Visual Concrete*, Technical Press Ltd, London, 1971 (German edition 1966).

HUDSON, Hugh D., jr., *Blueprints and Blood — The Stalinization of Soviet Architecture*, Princeton University Press, Princeton, NJ, 1994.

HESSE, Norbert (ed.), *Verloren, geführdet, geschätzt — Baudekmale in Berlin*, Berlin, 1989.

IOAN, Augustin, *Arhitectura şi Puterea*, Agerfilm, Bucureşti, 1992.
The Other Modernism — Utopian Spaces, Decorum and Virtual Discourse in the 1930s, Cincinnati, 1994 (Romanian edition *Celălalt modernism — Spaţii utopice, butaforie şi discurs virtual în anii treizeci*, Institutul de Arhitectură 'Ion Mincu', Buchares, 1995).

IONESCU, Grigore, *Arhitectura în România 1944–1969*, Editura Academiei RSR, Bucharest, 1969.
Arhitectura pe teritoriul României de-a lungul veacurilor, Editura Academiei RSR, Bucharest, 1982.

KULTERMAN, Udo, *Zeitgenössische Architektur in Osteuropa*, DuMont Buchverlag, Köln, 1985.

KUROKAWA, Kisho, *Metabolism in Architecture*, Studio Vista, London, 1977.

LASCU, Nicolae, 'Modernizare şi distrugere în istoria postbelică a oraşelor româneşti', *Historia Urbana*, Editura Academiei Române, Bucharest, nos. 1–2, 1995.

LEACH, Neil, (ed.), *Rethinking Architecture*, Routledge, London/ New York, 1997.

MARKUS, Thomas A., *Building and Power — Freedom and Control in the Origin of Modern Building Types*, Routledge, NY, 1993.

MASSEY, Anne *Interior Design of the 20th Century*, Penguin Books, London 1990.

McKEAN, Charles, 'A Scottish Modernism 1933–1939', in *History Workshop Journal*, no. 40 (Autumn 1995), pp. 165–72.

OCHS, Haila, Werner, *Verliebt im Bauen*, Birkhuser Verlag, Basel/Berlin, 1990.

OCKMAN, Joan, and Eigen, Edward (eds.), *Architecture Culture 1943–1968 — A Documentary Anthology*, Columbia Books of Architecture, Rizzoli, NY, 1993.

PATETTA, Luciano, *La monumentalità nell'architettura moderna*, CLUP, Milano, 1982.

PAWLEY, Martin, *Theory and Design in the Second Machine Age*, Blackwell, Oxford, 1990.

QUARNBY, Arthur, *The Plastic Architect*, Pall Mall Press, London, 1974.

RISEBERO, Bill, *Modern Architecture and Design*, Herbert Press, London, 1982.

SIEGEL, Kurt, *Structure and Form in Modern Architecture*, Crosby Lockwood & Son Ltd., London, 1961.

ST JOHN WILSON, Colin, *The Other Tradition of Modern Architecture — The Uncompleted Project*, Academy Editions, London 1995.

SZENDRI, Jen et al, *Neue Architektur in Ungarn*, G.D.W Callwey Verlag, München 1978.

TAFURI, Manfredo, *Theories and History of Architecture*, Granada, London, 1980.
The Sphere and the Labyrinth — Avant Gardes and Architecture from Piranesi to the 1990s, MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1987

TOPFSTEDT Thomas, *Städtebau in der DDR*, VEB E.A. Seeman Verlag, Leipzig, 1988.

TZONIS, A., LEFAIVRE, L. and DIAMOND, R., *Architecture in North America since 1960*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1995.

VALE, Lawrence J., *Architecture, Power, and National Identity*, Yale University Press, New Haven/London, 1992.

VASILESCU, Sorin, *Arhitectura totalitară*, Institutul de Arhitectură 'Ion Mincu', Bucharest, 1993.

VESELY, Dalibor, 'Architecture and the Conflict of Representation', *AA Files* 8.

WALKER, John A., *Glossary of Art, Architecture, and Design since 1945*, 2nd ed., Clive Bingley/Linnet Books, London, 1977.

WILCOXON, Ralph, *Megastructure Bibliography*, Council of Planning Librarians Exchange Bibliography (Monticello III), 66, 1968.

Socialist Realism and institutions

BOWLT, John E (ed.), *Russian Art of the Avant-Garde*, Thames and Hudson, 1988.

FITZPATRICK, Sheila, *The Comissariat of Enlightenment*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1970.

GLEASON, Kenez and R. Stites (eds.), *Bolshevik Culture*, Indiana University Press, 1985.

KEMP-WELSH, Anthony, *Stalin and the Literarry Inteligentsia*, MacMillan, Basingstoke, 1991.

KRIDL-VALKENIER, Elisabeth, *Russian Realist Art*, N.Y., 1989.

PASSEK, J.L., *Le cinema russe et sovietique*, Paris 1981

REMINGTON, Thomas F., *The Truth of Authority*, University of Pittsburgh Press, 1988.

ROBIN, R., *Le Realisme Socialiste: Une Esthetique Impossible*, Paris 1986.

ROSE, Clive, *The Soviet Propaganda Network*, Pinter&Spiers, London-New York, 1988.

SCRIVEN, Michael, *European Socialist Realism*, Oxford 1988.

TAYLOR, Brandon, *Modernism, Postmodernism, Realism*, Winchester 1987.

TAYLOR, Richard *The Politics of Soviet Cinema, 1917–1929*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1979.

VAUGHAN, James *Soviet Socialist Realism*, London 1973.

Arhitectură

BERTON, Kathleen, *Moscow — An Architectural History*, Studio Vista, London 1987.

BRUMFIELD, C., KOPP, A. and BLAIR, A., *Architecture and the New Urban Environment*, Kennan Institute for Advanced Russian Studies, Washington, 1988.

COOKE, Catherine, *Architectural Drawings of The Russian Avant-Garde*, New York, 1990.
Russian Avant-Garde, Art and Architecture, London, 1984.
Cernikhov, Fantasy And Construction, London, 1984.
(with KAZUS, Igor) *Soviet Architectural Competitions 1920s- 1930s*, Phaidon, London, 1992
(with PAPADAKIS, A.and BENJAMIN, A.), *Deconstruction*, Academy Editions, London, 1987.

CONRAD, Ulrich and Sperlich, H., *The Architecture Of Fantasy*, London, 1962.

COLLIER, P. and TIMMS, E., *Visions and Blueprints*, Manchester, 1988.

COPPLESTONE, Trewin, *Twentieth Century World Architecture*, Trodd, London, 1991

COHER, de Michelis and TAFURI (eds.), *Les Avant-Gardes et l'Etat: URSS 1917–1978*, L'Equerre, Paris, 1979.

DE FEO, Vittorio, *URSS Architettura 1917–1936*, Roma, 1963.

HARBISON, Robert, *The Built, The Unbuilt, The Unbuildable*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1991.

HAMILTON, G.M., *The Art And Architecture Of Russia*, N.Y., 1975.

GOLOMSTOCK, Igor, *Totalitarnoe Isskustvo*, Moscow, 1994.

IKKONIKOV, A and Zhuralev, A.M., *Arkhitektura Sovetskoi Rossii*, Moscow, 1987.

KHAN Magomedov, Selim, *Pioneers of the Russian Architecture*, London, 1987.

KOPP, Anatole, *Town and Revolution-Soviet Architecture and City Planning 1917–1935*, Thames and Hudson, London, 1970.
L'Architecture de la periode Stalinienne, Grenoble, 1978.

PEEL, L. Garrett, A. and Powell, P. *An Introduction to Twentieth Century Architecture*, Apple, London, 1989.

QUILICI, Vieri, *Architettura Sovietica Contemporanea*, Capelli, Roma, 1965.

RUBLE, Blair A., 'Moscow's Avantgarde Architecture in the 1920s: A Tour,' in *Architecture and the New Environment*, Kennan Institute, 1988.

SCRUTON, Roger, *The Aesthetics of Architecture*, London, 1979.

SKVIDKOVSKY, O.A., *Building in the USSR 1917–1932*, Praeger, N.Y., 1971.

SENKEVITCH, Anatole, *Soviet Architecture 1917–1962: A Bibliographical Guide to Source Material*, Charlottesville, 1974.

TARKHANOV, S. and Kavtaradze, *The Stalinist Architecture*, L. King, London, 1992.

Architectural journals, proceedings

Arhitectura (Romanian architectural journal since 1906)

Bauwelt — 1953–1960

Die grosse Magistrale — Perspektiven der städtebaulichen Entwicklung (Dokumentation der Festveranstaltung vom 18 Juni 1993).

Die Interbau wird diskutiert — Die ersten Ergebnisse, Bauverlag GmbH, Wiesbaden/Berlin, 1960.

Interbau Berlin 1/57–4/57.

Interbau Berlin 1957 (July 6–Sep. 29); Amtlicher Katalog der Internationalen Bauaustellung Berlin, redaktion Ewald Weitz/Jurgen Friedenberg.

KURSBUCH: Städte bauen, Juni 1993.

Miturile comunismului românesc (proceedings), ed. Lucian Boia, Universitatea București, 1995.

MAGYAR EPITMVESZET (Hungarian architectural journal) — *since 1950.*

Techniques et Architecture, December 1959.

Verfallen und vergessen oder aufgehoben und geschätzt? Architektur und Städtebau der DDR — Geschichte, Bedeutung, Umgang, Erhaltung — Dokumentation der Tagung des Deutschen Nationalkomitees für Denkmalschutz am 15–16 Mai 1995 in Berlin.