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INTRODUCTION

This book gathers the results from the EAHN 2015 BELGRADE Thematic Conference: ENTANGLED HISTORIES, MULTIPLE GEOGRAPHIES held in Belgrade, Serbia on 14-17 October 2015.

Papers presented bring together different responses to questioning architectural history to perplexing, competing and complementary perceptions and interpretations of the past, its geography and culture. The focus is on the multiple perceptual forms and interpretations of architecture and their entanglements regarding conditions of historicity, notions of geographical belonging, as well as concepts of cultural or political identity.

In this sense, the complexity of historical experiences and processes, along with geographical convolutions – as constructed or mediated by architectural narratives – is the main theme researched. It includes all historical periods from antiquity to the present day and all the regions of the world. It discusses how various narratives – in architectural history, theory or criticism – represent and reinforce broader cultural patterns by which we perceive interrelated phenomena of history, space and identity.

This collection of papers presents how different interpretations of architecture and the built environment have contributed to different readings of history, culture, nature and society, either simultaneously or in alternation, with special attention given to addressing conflicting and complementary views, explanatory systems and theories that stem from understanding and interpreting the past by means of architecture.

The conference was structured around three broad themes: historicity, tradition / innovation in architecture and the role of politics, both in terms of the direct interaction of (local) powers with the field of architecture and of the intermediate pressure of geopolitics. Out of those, eight different sessions arose and structured the chapters in the book of proceedings.

The first one, TRANSFER, focuses on realizing a link between different places through transferring and appropriating cultural and political propaganda in the built environment. The second one, POLITICIZED CITY, focuses on reading reflections that political and ideological issues have on spatial context as well as mechanisms that previously led to shape networks of political influences. The third one, IDEOLOGY, on the contrary delivers how architecture becomes a tool and an instrument of political and religious issues and more over how architecture communicates those and becomes instrumentalised. The next one, COMMUNITIES’ ROOTS: PLANTING AND UPROOTING, in an unusual and innovative way, sheds light on a diversity of issues hidden under the commonly accepted platforms for building and developing different environments. Then, the session HISTORIOGRAPHY addresses mainly universal historical topics but in a particular geo-political contexts. It questions architectural history and its role in the simultaneity of multiple modernities, ideological restructuring of cultural and political discourse and similar topics. The session IDENTITY tries to intertwine different aspects of the place seeking for a new reading of history and architecture and seeking for the roles of architecture in the terms of construction. Finally, the sessions CONTESTED HERITAGE and CONSTRUCTED TRADITIONS include the appropriation and interpretation of the past from antiquity to the recent past addressing questions of centre-periphery, globalization, and cultural, political, or religious propaganda in the built environment.

This book of proceedings has introduced the theme of ENTANGLED HISTORIES, MULTIPLE GEOGRAPHIES and is looking to continue the discussion further – to elaborate further, to provoke and to challenge new questions and views, reconfiguring the whole of an idea.
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Vladimir Braco Mušič was one of key figures of the first post-WWII generation of architects in Slovenia, Yugoslavia. His international collaborations, especially the academic experience in the US, as well as his later involvement in the American-Yugoslav Project (AYP), had a strong impact on his design and research approach. The transfer of knowledge between the American academic circles and the Urban Planning Institute, where he worked, unfolded in both directions in a process of developing methodologies of spatial planning. In the Cold War international arena conditions of planning strategies were changing, different contexts called for a rethinking of the architectural practice in which the AYP furthered its influence to other European countries via workshops and conferences. Mušič’s dynamic planning method that he developed and used to design neighbourhoods was based on the idea of architecture as a non-fixed object and thus allowed adjusting the design to different conditions of planning while retaining the desired aesthetic characteristics. The article analyses the influences and conditions in which Mušič developed his architectural approach to determine possible starting points for historicizing his work in the post-socialist context.

KEYWORDS: architecture, planning, socialism, ideology, America, Yugoslavia

Backgrounds

Vladimir Braco Mušič, graduated from the Architecture Department of the Technical Faculty in Ljubljana in 1958. He was internationally active and took part in the CIAM meetings in France and Dubrovnik. In 1961 he became an assistant for subject Composition within the so-called ‘B-course’ proposed by Edvard Ravnikar at the Ljubljana School of Architecture as a renewed pedagogical approach to design. Its experimental methods stemmed from the ideas of Bauhaus, Hochschule für Gestaltung, Ulm and aimed at a wider social and university reform. The experimental research methods combined with a techno-analytical approach influenced young Mušič.

In 1963 he enrolled in GSD Harvard and graduated at the end of the academic-year of 1964. He had collaborated with the Urban Planning Institute (UPI) before his departure. It was there where he was employed upon his return to Ljubljana and was one of the directors of the AYP from 1966-72. While in the States, Mušič attended the Shopping Around Period lectures of Kevin Lynch. They met and discussed the particularities of the Ljubljana School of Architecture, the teachings of Ravnikar, perception, progress, and design of cities. The theme of sequential perception of the city was a shared interest.

Mušič attributed the academic success of Lynch to his research. At the same time Lynch himself, however, recognized being largely influenced by his colleague art theoretician Gyorgy Kepes, who had reinforced the teachings of Bauhaus as design pedagogy, theory, and practice. In The Image of the City, a result of a five-year study about perception of information of the city, Lynch showed how users of cities understood the environment in consistent and predictable ways by creating mental maps with five elements: paths, edges, districts, nodes, landmarks.

It was easy for Mušič to relate to the themes Lynch was opening, but most importantly Lynch’s methods gave his perspective a new dimension reconsidering the city in a post-industrial age and analytical tools as methods of design process. The street for Mušič became an operative model to rethink public space. His final Harvard project from 1964 reflected this: the residential neighbourhood was treated as an integral part of a wider city community (and the spatial organism of the city as a whole); Mušič employed different levels of architectural treatment of the neighbourhood in terms of design; the street
was designed as a dominant city space (showing functional nodes and intersecting functions).  

There was, however, an additional side to Mušič’s interests. Rethinking the methods of urban planning in the context of the US was significant for his collaboration with the UPI. In his writings Mušič mentioned the work of John Friedman and the theory of planning as relevant for the context of Slovenia, Yugoslavia. Both John Friedman and John W. Dyckman, were active at the Journal of the American Institute of Planners (JAIP) in the 1960s that dealt intensively with environmental issues and questions of regional planning. Dyckman wrote about new approaches to planning and decision theory. In 1968 Friedman was a guest editor of a special issue New Ideas in Regional Planning to which they both contributed.

The ideas and research that emerged in JAIP were, to an extent, a reaction to the issues related to large business-backed developments in the states after WWII. They bore a negative effect on the environment while the investors understood zoning and controlled city development as an obstacle of capital accumulation.  

In the 1960s state planning became an issue for the second time in the history of the US, the first being Roosevelt’s New Deal. The questions that surfaced by promoting regional planning were on the boundary between legislation, planning, and capital accumulation.

In 1971 this new age of state land use planning was chronicled as ‘the quiet revolution’ in the report commissioned by the Council of Environmental Quality. The document on the innovative land use laws of several states analysed how complex land use issues and problems of re-allocationing responsibilities between state and local governments were being addressed. Dyckman was at the time writing about state planning and the California case.

Mušič referred to Friedman and his early academic experience with the theory of planning as particularly interesting for the context of Yugoslavia. J. Dyckman, I. Robinson, L. Wingo, J. Meltzer, M. Meyerson were for him the ‘wonder boys’ from University of Chicago that contributed to the AYP. And it was Mušič that was the crucial connection that made future collaborations between the UPI, where he was employed upon his return, and the American academy possible.

The American-Yugoslav Project

The AYP was a project of studies of regional and urban planning, an initiative of the Cornell University and the UPI in Ljubljana within which educational activities, seminars, and other forms to inform the experts in the field were organized. The project was financed by the Federal Fund for Scientific Research and other funds of Yugoslavia, Ford Foundation, and the Department of State. In the years 1966-67 its coordinator on the American side was Dyckman and the goal of the project was to ‘contribute to the development of spatial planning in Yugoslavia by confronting the problems of the Yugoslav side to the experience of the concepts of the American academy in the field.’ The project was founded twice for a period of two years. In 1970 a proposal to establish The Yugoslav Centre for Regional and Urban Studies as a third stage of the project under the UPI Secretariat was rejected.

Within these developments Dyckman and Fisher describe two processes taking place: ‘Europeization of the project’s activities’—working with operational groups and professionals due to the emphasis on American social science techniques and methods that were of interest in Europe. This was related to the desire of the AYP to act outside the regular government channels. The second process, ‘Americanization of administration,’ was related to the American realization that ‘no empirical output oriented project can survive without an administrative base that operates with the efficiency that can be found in the US.’

What did this mean? One of the scopes outlined in the initial documents of the project was establishing an International Centre for Regional Planning Studies chartered as a Yugoslav legal entity. Its charter would provide for a board of directors composed of representatives of Yugoslav planning institutions as well as non-Yugoslav professionals, regional planners and researchers to enable research activities on regional planning problems; training of professional planners, regional scientists, economists, geographers, demographers, sociologists, architects, and administrative experts. The UPI provided the quarters, full time secretarial staff, and some equipment for the researchers, while participating Yugoslav institutes provided computing and other services.

The AYP therefore started as the Centre in its
formative years located in Ljubljana, Slovenia, Yugoslavia at the UPI. The AYP was a planning study project; it was about defining a way of planning. The idea was to produce an evolution of better planning processes, for which physical, social, and economic factors were presented as maps. The statistics were given graphic representation while the Ljubljana metropolitan region was a case-study upon which procedures were discussed. It was about laying foundations for a regional planning institution that would cooperate internationally connecting urban planners in the region with the American side.

To determine the principles of work, coordination, and implementing the methodologies of regional development, a common language and planning procedures had to be determined. At the 1967 AY team meeting Dyckman presented his Ideal Regional Planning Procedure and a detailed work program. All the stages of the procedure were discussed: 1) macro stage; 2) sector stage; 3) project stage; 4) physical planning stage. In 1968 UPI issued a report on the slightly changed ideal regional planning procedure that included six phases: 1) macro stage; 2) sector stage; 3) project stage; 4) space planning stage; 5) adjustment of the macro general plan stage; 6) establishing a societal plan stage. Two changes appeared in the final report given the original proposal: since the Yugoslav side understood physical planning as space planning, which related to the difference between the European and American approach to planning, the fourth stage was renamed. Second, planning in self-managed socialist context had to enable an adjustment of the societal plan so that planning was not merely an extension of a top-down state planning system. For the American side there was no societal plan and stage five and six were not needed.

**Megastructures and the Socialist Landscape**

How did the American experience and the AYP influence Mušič’s work as an urban planner and architect? What were the impacts of the research in built environment? Mušič is one of the authors of Bratovševa pločad (BS7), Split 3, and Maribor South. The projects vary in scale – the first is an experiment in the scale of a neighbourhood, the second in terms of building a new part of a city, as a node to be developed adjacent to the existing old town of Split, the third even bigger, a plan to expand the city of Maribor across the river Sava, thus Maribor South. Similarly to the Harvard project, Mušič and his team tried to work around the concept of the street as the main principle of public space.

Even though BS7 remained a formal structure not having contained the many activities that would give the neighbourhood the characteristics of city life (it only included the basic programs: schools, kindergartens, shops), it reveals a complex attempt of urban-architectonic planning referred to as the method of dynamic planning. The neighbourhood was treated as a megastructure within which possible re-combinations of elements could occur. Mušič developed a design approach containing an interpretative freedom to articulate space through perception of a pedestrian. Volumes of buildings were considered objects to be manipulated to achieve spatial effects while the design of modern architectural elements was to emphasize this main idea. (Fig. 1)

The starting point of the design concept was to determine nodal points in the surrounding landscape, then further defined the joining elements within the given surroundings (the volume of the building, design of window openings, roofs) and those became the guiding principles of design, constants within which it would be possible to implement individual planning ideas. Space as an operative concept was for Mušič not merely a physical, but also a qualitative entity that allowed for a new relationship between planning and the landscape, enabling programmatic or formal changes of the plan while controlling the aesthetics of the composition via elements, textures, roofs, access points, views, edges, etc. (Fig. 2)

The influence of Lynch is clear. What about the planning procedure and data evaluation? A neighbourhood in Yugoslav socialist society was regarded as not only an urban element to define the size and the equipment of residential neighbourhoods, one of the starting points to organize the area of the city, but also a societal organization that developed and managed the services of social standard and in doing so connected people of certain fields. Mušič’s design for BS7 was selected at a competition in 1967 (construction started in 1970) precisely because of
his complex approach to planning that later opened the doors to other large-scale projects in Yugoslavia. The dynamic design approach Mušič used for BS7 theoretically allowed for an adjustment of the general societal plan of a self-managed society as it was proposed in the Ideal Regional Planning Procedure. A similar tendency can be noticed in the planning of Split 3 and Maribor South.

In 1969 the cooperation between the Ljubljana Urban Institute (LUI) and the UPI (within which AYP was run) evolved in terms of data-sharing, and exchange of personnel. LUI was at the time engaged in a program to extend the master plan for the City of Ljubljana. Since the interests of LUI and UPI coincided, a joint team was composed of staff members of LUI and UPI to revision the master plan. In this way the planning procedures of the AYP were implemented into the planning strategies of Ljubljana, which made a favourable environment for Mušič to construct his BS7 neighbourhood unit.

**Plans and Influences**

The transfer of knowledge did not unravel only from the American side to Yugoslavia, but also in the other direction. In 1969 Mušič visited the US as one of the invited European fellows to present the planning methods and programs from Yugoslavia and compare them to the ‘analogous American context.’ The idea of the exchange program was first presented at an international conference of urban and regional planning in Ljubljana in 1968 ‘to promote a critical examination of American planning practice and planning philosophy’ in the Detroit area. It served as a case-study to investigate the decision-making mechanism and to develop the core-area as well as a rethinking of institutional framework of planning efforts and conceptualization of urban development policies. The contributions of the visiting professionals came from all parts of Europe. From Yugoslavia Mušič and Stanko Žuljič presented. To write about the project would mean writing another paper. Mutual collaborations, however, do allow for some comparisons.

In the reports and articles about the AYP there are no comments about the ideological contexts of the two countries. Mušič, however, makes a remark about Dyckman’s use of the term planning as having adopted the context and the definition of societal planning in the report, which in the US did not belong to the domain of the government. The socio-political context was understood as the basic proposition of planning practice according to which planning methodology was adjusted.

While urban planners in Yugoslavia were striving to influence the legislation and thus redefine societal planning in socialist context, similarly, urban planners in the States aspired to change the legislation, but this did not mean changing the plan. Regional planning meant establishing a plan on a regional level that had to recognize the vocabulary of economy defined by the capitalist context and taxation as its social corrective.

During the Cold War Yugoslavia was interesting for the US as the terrain to explore and to form further alliances towards the East. Americanization of the administration within the AYP meant an opportunity to expand strategic partnerships. Constructive rethinking of the question of regional, state, spatial planning in relation to society found a common denominator in promoting quality of ambiance.
(space), environmental protection, and mostly in establishing a constructive relationship towards the systems of governance, be it on one or on the other side of ideology, and in mutually exchanging experience and tools. The context of the two different ideologies made visible the mechanisms of management and thus opened the doors for new planning methodologies. It would be beneficial to know which parameters were adapted and how, but for this further research has to be done.

**Concluding notes**

Writing about Mušič’s projects today means historicizing them in the context of global economy and waning of an unsustainable social state. His neighbourhoods no longer belong to the working class of self-managed society and planned economy. The AYP not only reveals there were mutual influences in planning, it also reminds us that in the US regional planning methodologies were not used in the domain of societal state planning. Rather, they were used to oppose business-backed developments that preceded regardless of environmental or societal considerations.

When at the break of Yugoslavia ideology changed in the 1990s, the newly emerged Slovenia, adapted a new attitude to planning. Institutions of urban planning remained related to the mechanisms of the state, but without a societal plan. The Institute for Social Planning was renamed the Institute of Macroeconomic Analysis and Development. Its spatial development department, however, was joined to the Ministry of Environment and Spatial Planning. Space or physical planning thus became subordinate to economic development.

Talking about Mušič’s neighbourhoods today means at the same time posing a question: what is a sustainable society and what kind of built environment does it need? It means constructing a new object of architecture, it means unfolding a new truth out of old facts. In this process of unfolding of the truth the discipline of architecture has its role since it becomes an operative part of society ever anew. In the process history of the architectural works and of the discipline is reconstructed. It is in the idea of architecture, not in the material object itself, that the basic dilemmas to rethink the possibility of redefining spatial planning and with it related architectonic articulation of space can be found.

Thinking of urban planning in terms of dynamic planning strategies with the idea of architecture as a non-fixed object, rethinking social and environmental issues in relation to aesthetic considerations that Mušič’s achievements reveal, might make a promising new beginning. It should be possible to do today what was possible in the midst of Cold War ideologies: an open collaboration of professionals from all sides striving for a common goal – a better living environment for a better society. Writing about architecture means as much preserving a memory of ideas as imagining a future ever anew, or else we continue living in the mechanical reproduction of the present.
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Florence and Prague in the late sixteenth century possessed intense ties between their respective rulers; however, while few discernible Bohemian influences can be detected in Florentine art and architecture, monuments and buildings constructed by Rudolph II, his father, and grandfather in and around Renaissance Prague bear obvious Italian influences. This paper concerns itself with one construction of Rudolph II in particular, an artificial grotto (Fig. 1) constructed adjacent to a pre-existing mill complex at the edge of the old game reserve (Alte Thiergarten), and its potential link to a grotto realized by Bernardo Buontalenti, who built grottoes on an unprecedented scale at Pratolino as well as at the Pitti Palace, influenced constructions in Prague by proxy of the Florentine architect Giovanni Gargioli, to whom Rudolph II’s grotto is attributed. A third and final consideration is an adjacent renovated mill site which received stone-cutting and polishing machines at the same time that documents attest to a transfer of this technology from Florence, enabling independent production of pietre dure works and virtuosic handlings of hard-stone. Although documentary evidence does not confirm the connection between Rudolph II’s grotto and Buontalenti’s Grotto of Cupid, the alignment of formal similarities, evidence for other Buontalentian influence in Prague, and the debt of the adjacent mill to Medici technology supports a relationship between the two Renaissance grottoes.
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FROM MEDICEAN FLORENCE TO RUDOLPHINE PRAGUE: TWO ARTIFICIAL GROTTOES AND THE TRANSFER OF IDEAS AND TECHNOLOGY IN THE LATE SIXTEENTH CENTURY

A late sixteenth-century grotto in Prague may be a variant of a type found among many examples constructed for Francesco I de’ Medici at the Villa Pratolino roughly a decade prior. The Bohemian grotto and its Florentine corollary, called the Grotto of Cupid, are roughly circular and housed under domed vaults with central apertures; both have been compared to tholos-style mounds. Although many examples of Habsburg architecture in Prague display Italian influence, this paper builds upon the theory put forward by Guido Carrai that Bernardo Buontalenti, who built grottoes on an unprecedented scale at Pratolino as well as at the Pitti Palace, influenced constructions in Prague by proxy of the Florentine architect Giovanni Gargioli, to whom Rudolph II’s grotto is attributed. A third and final consideration is an adjacent renovated mill site which received stone-cutting and polishing machines at the same time that documents attest to a transfer of this technology from Florence, enabling independent production of pietre dure works and virtuosic handlings of hard-stone. Although documentary evidence does not confirm the connection between Rudolph II’s grotto and Buontalenti’s Grotto of Cupid, the alignment of formal similarities, evidence for other Buontalentian influence in Prague, and the debt of the adjacent mill to Medici technology supports a relationship between the two Renaissance grottoes.

This is not the first study which concerns itself primarily with the Prague grotto, nor is it the first to posit a connection to the Villa Pratolino’s grottoes. Sylvá Dobalová’s 2009 article compares concentric circles from an eighteenth-century plan of the Prague grotto (Fig. 3) to the arrangement of the circular Fountain of Thetis installed within an interior grotto of the Appennine colossus at Pratolino. A connection is also posited between the Prague grotto’s central aperture for light in its dome and what Dobalová identifies as similar apertures in the ceiling of the Grotto of Thetis in a ca. 1600 drawing of the same grotto by Giovanni Guerra (Fig. 4); however, as a recent cross-section of the Appennine colossus demonstrates (Fig. 5), this grotto was located under a second-floor with
its own grotto, and the apertures which Dobalová identifies more likely are the artist’s short-hand for pictorial lunettes, perhaps of the type which can be seen gracing the ceiling of Francesco I’s studiolo in the Palazzo Vecchio (Fig 6). Nevertheless, by linking the Prague grotto of Rudolph II thematically to grottoes observable from the same time period in other Italian Renaissance villas, in addition to the Villa Pratolino, the Grotta of the Tartari at the Palazzo Farnese in Caprarola and the Grotta delle Mose in the Boboli Gardens of the Palazzo Pitti in Florence, Dobalová laid the foundation upon which the present study is built.

**The Pratolino and Prague Grottoes: Similarities, Divergences**

The two grottoes which are the focus of this study, Rudolph II’s grotto in Prague and the “Grotto of Cupid” from the park of the Medici Villa Pratolino have both survived to the present day, anomalies when considered within the context of their respective patrons’ other works which have been lost. However, their present-day outward appearances do not immediately suggest a relationship or influence. Pratolino’s Grotto of Cupid today looks like little more than a badly-eroded hill, with a circular interior covered in artificial stalactites and ringed by stone ledges, ostensibly benches. Rudolph II’s grotto, when not completely obscured by the scaffolds of on-going preservation work, is entered through a portal modeled from Sebastiano Serlio’s *Seven Books on Architecture*, which appeared in various editions from 1537 to 1575. This portal has been remarked upon by several historians of Rudolphine architecture for its Italianate derivation; however, it does not find any parallel in the Grotto of Cupid, which originally possessed only a rustic pergola no longer in situ today.

The interior of the Prague grotto presents the appearance of regular, cut-stone masonry and five empty niches: one directly ahead of the entrance, two more spaced evenly to the left and right side of the circular grotto, and two to either side within the entrance portal; it is not known what, if any, sculpture or other objects these spaces were intended for. In contrast, the back wall facing the entrance of the Grotto of Cupid at Pratolino is punctuated by a circular vestibule, now empty, which once contained a rotating Cupid statue which squirted water without warning on visitors to the grotto. The ovoid interior of the Grotto of Cupid is distended by two small alcoves on its left and right sides, whereas the Prague grotto approaches a more perfect circle.

A comparison between the Pratolino and Prague grottoes in their present states yields little results; instead, plans and drawings from the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries bring to light parallel structures which are not immediately obvious today. The 1750 plan which Dobalová used in her 2009 study presents the formal similarity to a ca. 1600 floorplan sketched by Giovanni Guerra (Fig. 7) which Dobalová assigned to the Grotto of Thetis at Pratolino. That is, the concentric circles observable in the eighteenth-century plan of Rudolph II’s
grotto, connoting the grotto’s circular form with a circular aperture for light, match more or less perfectly with Guerra’s floor-plan of the Grotto of Cupid. Guerra’s notation within the central space, “LUCE DI SOPRA,” eliminates any doubt that these shapes connote openings for light; however, unlike the Prague grotto, the Grotto of Cupid possesses two smaller apertures for light to either side in the Guerra drawing. These can also be seen in a second drawing by Guerra of the grotto with its Cupid statue in situ (Fig. 8). Today, these have presumably been filled in; they are visible neither from the exterior or the interior of the grotto, and it is not known when this occurred. A drawing by Heinrich Schickhardt (Fig. 9) also from the early seventeenth century does not note these supplemental light sources, depicting only a classicizing lantern placed over the central aperture; at first glance, it would be tempting to make a comparison with the single-aperture topped by a lantern which the Prague grotto presents today, but it is not known either whether the lantern presently observable was an original feature or added later. Nevertheless, the comparison which Dobalová made between the Prague grotto and Pratolino’s Grotto of Thetis on the basis of concentric circles and apertures in the ceiling for light must be revised in light of a much closer similarity between another grotto from Pratolino, the Grotto of Cupid.

Another shared aspect of the Grotto of Cupid at Pratolino and the Prague grotto is the tendency of architectural scholars to compare them to antique mausolea rather than to other contemporary examples. Rudolph II’s grotto garners this comparison from the regular masonry of its ceiling which evokes the “beehive” construction of tholoi tombs from the ancient world; additionally, it must be noted that the Prague grotto was excavated from a hillside, all’antica, and not built up ex novo as an artificial mound. Pratolino’s Grotto of Cupid, although such an artificial mound, appears in the Schickhardt drawing presenting a long, cut-away approach still observable today, erosion notwithstanding. This strong evocation of a dromos approaching a mound with a vaulted chamber in its interior recalls not only the archetypical, oft-cited Mycenaean tholoi, but Etruscan mound-tombs of the same type found a mere kilometers from Pratolino\(^{8}\) and known to Renaissance antiquarians and the Medici.\(^{9}\) Furthermore, “artificial hills” akin to this type appeared in both Medicean and Rudolphine pageantry of the late-sixteenth century,\(^{10}\) suggesting that the Pratolino and Prague grottoes may be the permanent, monumental incarnations of a type which also found expression in more ephemeral forms at both courts.

Bernardo Buontalenti, Giovanni Gargiollì, and Rudolphine Prague

In addition to formal and thematic similarities between the Grotto of Cupid at Pratolino and the Prague grotto, there is the tantalizing possibility that these parallels may support the hypothesis of the architectural scholar Guido Carrai that Pratolino’s architect, Bernardo Buontalenti, exerted an influence at the court of Rudolph II. Carrai published a paper in 2003\(^{11}\) which posited an identification of a drawing of Buontalenti’s from the Florentine archives as a design intended for an oval staircase in Prague Castle as well as a letter dated June 11, 1587 from Buontalenti to Rudolph II mentioning, presumably, the same castle staircase design.\(^{12}\) Eleven years prior in 1578, Rudolph II had conferred upon Buontalenti an imperial privilege in recognition of his feats of hydraulic engineering achieved at Pratolino.\(^{13}\) From around this time of Rudolph II’s recognition of Buontalenti’s labors, engineers were sent from the Medici court to

Fig. 3: Heinrich Schickhardt, The “Grotto of Cupid,” plan, perspective, and hydraulic mechanism. Drawing, 1601.
Vienna and Prague; Antonio Lupicini arrived in 1578, and in 1584, Giovanni Gargioli was recruited to work for the Holy Roman Emperor in Prague.

Giovanni Gargioli is the Tuscan architect to whom the Prague grotto is generally credited, as well as the realization of a new garden design for the castle of Brandeis on the Elbe and other projects. Carrai interprets Gargioli’s role at Rudolph’s court as that of an intermediary between Francesco I’s court and Buontalenti specifically, rather than as an architect in his own right. The skeletal details of his career which we know with certainty do suggest a constant contact with Florence; following his recruitment, a letter exists from 1585 in which Carrai reads an implicit acknowledgement that his appointment in Prague owed to his friendship with the Medici ambassador and the approval of Francesco I. In 1586, the same year that his formal contract began, Gargioli was sent back to Italy to show his models to “eminent architects” there; it is unthinkable that this would not have included Buontalenti. In 1587 another letter from Gargioli that Carrai cites emphasizes Rudolph II’s “great appreciation for everything that comes from the hand and ingenuity of Francesco I.”

Knowing the close collaboration between the Medici Grand Duke and Bernardo Buontalenti, this may reasonably be construed to be a reference to Buontalenti as well. For the next eight years, Gargioli carried out works in Prague, including a palace design presented in Francesco I’s name to Rudolph II, which have been characterized as large building projects which eclipsed the mostly decorative work of Rudolph’s predecessors.

Other projects undertaken by Rudolph II may also have been inspired by the large-scale hydraulic engineering pioneered at Pratolino, such as the celebrated Rudolph water tunnel (Rodolf-stolle), which brought water from the Vltava River to an artificial lake created at the same time. The Prague grotto is believed to have featured running water and hydraulic works as well from its designation as a wasserbrunnen oder Bath or Badegrotte and the presence of a circular fountain or reservoir in historic plans believed to have been installed around 1604. Yet so far, Guido Carrai is the only scholar to assign an influence from Buontalenti and Francesco I to any known work in Prague; this paper submits Rudolph II’s grotto as a site which exhibits a transfer of ideas specifically from the Medici Villa Pratolino and its celebrated hydraulic works, as well as one which potentially testifies to a well-documented exchange between Buontalenti, Francesco I, Giovanni Gargioli, and Rudolph II.
The Prague Grotto and Mill Site: Genuis Loci and Medicean Technology

Giovanni Gargioli’s communications between Rudolphine Prague and Medicean Florence at the turn of the sixteenth century reveal a concrete transfer of technology and materials which had the mill site adjacent to the grotto at its epicenter in Prague. A letter dated July 25, 1587 to Francesco I informs the Grand Duke of the emperor’s happiness upon receiving stone-cutting and polishing devices sent from Florence.26 The letter doesn’t precise where these machines were destined to go, but current scholarship presents us with two options: either to the workshops in Prague Castle, which finished a gem’s cutting and transformation into a work of art, or to the mill located next to Rudolph’s grotto. When the Bohemian Council Chamber purchased this site in 1584, it was already a simple brett und schleifmühle, but under Rudolph II it underwent a dramatic expansion through the 1600’s with the addition of cutting and polishing equipment for stones and glass. The machines from Florence very probably could very well have constituted this equipment or perhaps have been included among them.

With the renovation of the mill site and its new capacity to work hard stone, Prague became a producer in its own right of pietre dure artworks, a medium which had been the virtually exclusive domain of the Medici in Florence.27 Although the Bohemian lands produced an abundance of hardstones and rock crystal, before the mill’s expansion, Bohemian stones had to be sent to Florence in order to be transformed into pietre dure works,28 scenes composed from semiprecious stones cut and fitted together to form seamless pictorial scenes (e.g. Fig. 10). It must be underlined that Francesco I de’ Medici was not only sending machinery to Rudolph II, he was sending Medici technology which empowered Rudolph’s court to set up a production of their own, which began in earnest with the arrival of the Florentine goldsmith and master of pietre dure Cosimo Castrucci in 1596. It’s not certain that the Medici stone-cutting and polishing machines were installed at the mill site; however, the refurbishment of a mill acquired in 1584, the receipt of technology in Florence from 1587, and the arrival of the master stone-cutter from Florence in the next decade support such a conjecture.
Conclusion

At the close of the sixteenth century and the beginning of the seventeenth, the transformation of an unassuming mill site on a tributary of the Vltava at the edge of the Royal Hunting Preserve into an imperial mill site with the capacity to produce hardstone and glassworks was indebted to Rudolph II’s close relationship with Francesco I de’ Medici’s court in Florence. In the same period as the mill was undergoing its transition into a state-of-the-art imperial workshop, Rudolph II’s grotto was carved out of the hillside adjacent to the mill. The large-scale nature of its construction, involving both the excavation of the hillside as well as apparently a hydraulic engineering component, would perhaps be sufficient to advance a comparison with the works recently completed by Bernardo Buontalenti for Francesco I de’ Medici’s Villa Pratolino; the imperial privilege bestowed upon by Buontalenti for these same feats of engineering attests to Rudolph II’s admiration for the architect and his works.

Coupled with the wonders of engineering it took to construct the Medici Villa Pratolino, another distinguishing feature of Francesco I de’ Medici’s villa was the unprecedented number of grottoes scattered throughout its parks and consolidated under the villa’s piano nobile. Italian historian Luigi Zangheri has identified the construction of similar grottoes directly influenced by Pratolino’s in France, Germany, England, and Spain; in the same article, Rudolph II’s grotto in Prague is included within this general category, but apart from recognizing Giovanni Gargioli’s Tuscan origins, no further analysis is made. When Guido Carrai posited that Gargioli functioned more as an intermediary between Buontalenti and Francesco I de’ Medici, rather than as a creative force in his own right, he did not expand his argument to include the grotto that Gargioli is credited for building with Rudolph II; this paper’s goal has been to expand that possibility to consider the Rudolphine grotto as another instance in which Buontalenti’s influence can be detected in late-Renaissance Prague.

So far, this grotto has escaped definitive inclusion within the set of early-seventeenth century grottoes inspired by Pratolino, perhaps primarily on account of the unique, austere character lent by the apparently regular blocks of stone-work lining the walls and dome, leading to comparisons with antique tholoi instead of with contemporary examples. However, in the present state of the
Rudolphine grotto (Fig. 11), the destruction of the rear wall niche reveals that these regular rows are a thin skin, a trompe-l’oeil covering that gives the impression of a construction all’antica from the builder’s point of view, covering the surface of the grotto’s interior in stonework imitating antique masonry or natural stalactites becomes only a question of aesthetic preference. When this illusion has been stripped away, we are left with a grotto that is remarkably similar to Buontalenti’s Grotto of Cupid realized at Pratolino: both are of the domed “mound” type although at Pratolino, this was an artificial hill and at Prague, a real hill was hollowed out, both possess a more or less round floorplan with a central, roughly concentric central aperture for light, both grottoes’ interiors were covered in illusionistic stonework stalactites in the case of Pratolino and “masonry” all’antica in Prague, and both grottoes possessed running water and other hydraulic features. That the only grotto Rudolph II constructed was installed adjacent to the mill which likely incorporated Medici technology must also be taken into consideration; was the Prague grotto a parallel homage to Florentine engineering and themes? Between the genius locus of the site, its debt to Florentine innovations in stone-cutting and polishing, what is known about the connections between Giovanni Gargioli, Francesco I, and Buontalenti, and the architectural similarities of the Prague Grotto to the Grotto of Cupid at Pratolino, this paper draws the conclusion that in Rudolph II’s grotto, there is an observable transfer of forms and ideas from Francesco I de’ Medici’s Florence.

Fig. 11: Cosimo Castrucci, Pietre Dure scene.

Endnotes

1 Rudolph II was connected to Medicean Florence by the 1565 marriage of Rudolph II’s paternal aunt, Joanna of Austria (1547-1578), to Francesco I de’ Medici (1541-1587); both rulers also shared a similar, if not parallel experience as youths brought to Philip II’s court in Spain, with life-long effects on both rulers’ dress, manners, and personalities. Both are remembered as introverted men, with an interest in alchemy and fledgling experimental sciences of their day, and a singularity between the Mannerist styles embraced in Florence and Prague has been observed to be one that, compared to other European courts at this time, was not anti-Classical or anti-Natural- see Peter Marshall, The Magic Circle of Rudolf II: Alchemy and Astrology in Renaissance Prague (New York, 2006), p. 73. Their respective sojourns in Spain have also been posited as key influences behind the large-scale engineering and building projects both rulers undertook later on in their respective reigns- see Pablo Jiménez Díaz, “Spain, Prague, and the Habsburg Ideology: Some Aspects of the Architecture of Rudolf II, in L. Konečnýed, ed. Rudolf II, Prague, and the World (Prague, 1998), p. 12. Relations intensified in the 1590’s, when Francesco I’s daughter was a proposed bride to Rudolph II; although this was by now after Francesco I’s death, these developments as well as the connection between Rudolph II’s grotto and the Pratolino grotto may be indications of Francesco I’s lasting posthumous influence.

2 The fresco of Prague among the cities depicted in the cycle of the courtyard of the Palazzo Vecchio has been identified as a relatively rare nod to Bohemian ties within Florence political iconography- see Jarmila Krčálová, La Toscana e l’architettura di Rodolfo II: Giovanni Gargioli a Praga (Firenze, 1983), p. 1031. Additionally, Maximilian II’s aviary at Schönbrunn Palace, which Francesco I is presumed to have seen during his travels in Austria, has been suggested as the inspiration between the aviary constructed at the Villa Pratolino – see Costanza Riva, Pratolino: Il sogno alchemico di Francesco I de’ Medici: miti, simboli, e allegorie (Livorno, 2013), p. 31.

3 The legacy of Italian architects and artists within Bohemian architecture has been the subject of


5 Pratolino’s villa and most of the constructions of its parks were demolished in the 1820’s, and in Prague, Rudolph II’s Mathematics Tower at Prague Castle and the his dismantled kunstkammer, among others, stand as parallel lost works.

6 For a recent mention of the Prague grotto in connection with ongoing works, see “The Imperial Mill in Prague- Bubeneč,” Czech Republic: Heritage at Risk 2004/2006: 6; contact information for the apartments situated at this site is as follows: Císařsk Mlyn Residence Mlýnská 3/6, 160 00 Praha 6 - Bubeneč, Czech Republic +420 222 559 003.


8 Etruscan tumulus tombs north of the Arno form part of an archaeological heritage that includes the settlement at Fiesole, small centers, and necropoli in various valleys. Quinto Fiorentino, the name of which derives from its location on the fifth mile of the Roman road, possesses two tholoi-type tombs dubbed “La Montagnola” and “La Mula” which possess strong formal similarities to the Grotto of Cupid. Both belong to circa the seventh or sixth centuries B.C., which saw grandiose constructions in the vicinity, including the Monte Fortini tumulus and the tomb of the Boschetti at Comeana near Artimino, which furnished material for the antiquaria of Medici villas. La Montagnola’s dromos entrance cut out from its mound is virtually identical to the view of Buontalenti’s Grotto of Cupid in a ca. 1600 drawing by Heinrich Schickhard; however, this dromos was not fully excavated until 1959. Both La Montagnola and La Mula are characterized as tombs possessing a “False” cupola, the progressive laying of stones to create a rough dome without an aperture, which is recalled by the dome-like ceiling of the Grotto of Cupid, though the latter construction possesses a lantern cupola and originally two adjacent openings for light. Whereas the Montagnola tomb’s interior is dominated by a central supporting pillar for its ceiling, the Mula tomb was constructed in a way where this central column was omitted, creating an open space of similar shape and dimensions to the Grotto of Cupid. This tomb has been noted since the sixteenth century and once possessed a dromos like that of the Montagnola’s; however, its incorporation into the Villa Shokley as a wine cellar has reduced its original length, and the dome has since been opened to let in light and air. The existence of a third tholos tomb near the Villa Carter today which belonged to this group on the left bank of the Zamba, a tributary of the Arno, has been identified but no trace of which remains today. See Francesca Boitani, Maria Cataldi, and Mariella Pasquinucci. Le Città Etrusche (Firenze, 1973), p. 35; Settis, Salvatore et al. La Terra degli Etruschi. (Firenze, 1985), p. 40; “L’Erma” di Bretschneider, Atlante dei siti archeologici della Toscana Vol. II (Firenze, 1992), pp. 113-114; Antonio Giuliano and Giancarlo Buzzi, Etruschi (Firenze, 1994), p. 125.

9 The identification and alignment of the Medici with Etruscan culture, based on a claim of descent from Porsenna, the legendary King of Tuscany who fought the Romans, has been observed to have been a calculated move to legitimize their reign as well as their military aggression, particularly in the case of the unification of lands between the Tiber and the Arno which they perceived as their inheritance from their Etruscan forbears – see Lucy Shipley, "Guelphs and Ghibellines and Etruscans: Archaeological Discoveries and Civic Identity in Late Medieval and Early Renaissance Tuscany.” Bulletin of the History of Archaeology 23.1 (2013), p. 1. Lorenzo de’ Medici’s searched for, excavated, and collected Etruscan artifacts in the 1490’s, setting the tone for his successors’ own acquisitions and collections. Lorenzo, upon taking possession of the marble-rich areas around Carrara, ordered that all objects found in the ruins, apparently including gems, coins, and statuettes, there were to be sent
directly to him – see Steven Bule, “Etruscan Echoes in Italian Renaissance Art.” John Franklin Hall, ed., Etruscan Italy: Etruscan Influences on the Civilizations of Italy from Antiquity to the Modern Era (Provo, UT, 1996), p. 311. A 1466 letter to Lorenzo de’ Medici from the humanist Antonio Ivani describes grave goods from a tomb near Volterra, and Ivani later sent finds from the same site in 1474 – see Katherine Coty, A Dream of Etruria: The Sacro Bosco of Bomarzo and the Alternate Antiquity of Alto Lazio (University of Washington M.A. Thesis, 2013), p. 33. Leo X promoted iconographies featuring Romulus, Remus, Numa, and Aeneas which have been read as an adaptation of Etruscan history to legitimate Medici rule– see P. J. Jacks, The Antquarian and the Myth of Antiquity: The Origins of Rome in Renaissance Thought (New York, 1993), p. 181 f. and Bule (op. cit.), p. 317. Cosimo I de’ Medici, Francesco I’s father, was an enthusiast of Etruscan art and archaeology, and his extensive collection formed the basis of what is now the Florence Archaeological Museum. Tommaso Braccioli and Rinaldo Baldelli, documented their sixteenth-century excavations of tombs near Cortona with sketches and sent objects they found to Cosimo I de’ Medici. Giorgio Vasari sketched a vaulted tholos tomb near Cortona as well – see Coty (op. cit.), p. 34.

10 Such an “artificial hill” played a part in the courtly pageantry surrounding the wedding of Charles of Styria to Maria of Bavaria in 1571, which were designed by Giuseppe Arcimboldo. Rudolph II not only witnessed the proceedings in Vienna, he even played the role of the Sun in an allegorical tableau, carrying Spanish gold as his emblem – see Marshall 2006 (note 1), p. 31. Stage sets by Buontalenti, who also designed the Grotto of Cupid, for the wedding festivities of Ferdinando de’ Medici and Christina of Lorraine in 1589 featured twin circular grottoes with a central opening in the second intermedio of “La Pelegrina;” the Muses occupied the grotto on the right-hand side of the stage while the daughters of Pierus occupied the one on the left. When the Pierides lost their musical contest, they were “transformed” into birds, animated automata that could hop and peck, of the kind Buontalenti had already manufactured for Pratolino. Another mound-shaped grotto with a lantern cupola was used in another 1589 Florentine intermedio by Epifanio d’Alfiano and engraved in 1592 – see Stella Mary Newton, “Stage Design for Renaissance Theatre,” Early Music 5 (1977), pp. 12-18.


12 Idem, p. 373.

13 Idem, p. 378.

14 Idem, p. 371.

15 Documentation also exists for the payment of the Italian stone-cutter Antonio Brocco for the Prague grotto as well as the Rudolphine oval basins installed at the Brandeis castle; however, he does not appear to have enjoyed the same status as an architect that Gargioli held. Cf. Eliška Fučíková et al., Rodolphe II: Monarque et Mécène (Paris, 1990), pp. 157, 189.


19 Ibid.


29 See Zangheri 1986 (note 7).
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**BEYOND ‘THE AVANT-GARDE’ AND ‘TOTALITARIANISM’**

My presentation critically examines the historiography of Soviet Interwar art and architecture to question the opposition of the avant-garde and totalitarianism, which has remained its recurring theme since the 1960s. I argue that this opposition conflates aesthetic and political discourses and is rooted in the Cold-War ideology. The problems posed by the architecture of the First Five-Year Plan (1928-1932) serve an example of its inability to adequately represent the complexity of cultural development in Interwar Russia. Finally, I call for an alternative analytic model – for an approach that explains rather than judges, and situates architecture within the context of political, economic, and intellectual life, comparing, not juxtaposing, Soviet modernism, including its Stalinist versions, to its Western counterparts.
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In his seminal book *How New York Stole the Idea of Modern Art: Abstract Expressionism, Freedom and the Cold War* (1983), Serge Guilbaut argued that ‘the unprecedented national and international success of an American avant-garde was due not solely to aesthetic and stylistic considerations […] but also, even more, to the movement’s ideological resonance.’ Guilbaut has demonstrated how the unrestrained, spontaneous splashing of paint over the canvas by artists like Jackson Pollock became associated with the liberal interpretation of freedom, central for American ideology and repackaged for both domestic and international use during the Cold War. In this presentation, I will assess another example of Cold-War and post-Cold-War critical discourse deeply penetrated by ideology. Taking the form of sometimes dialectical, sometimes binary opposition, the pair of ‘the avant-garde’ and ‘totalitarianism’ has determined the reception of Soviet early-modernist art and architecture by generations of post-war scholars, critics, and thinkers across both sides of the geopolitical divide. I will question the validity of this opposition, which conflates aesthetic and political discourses, and demonstrate its rootedness in the Cold War ideology of the West. Instead, I will argue for an approach that explains rather than judges – an approach that situates architecture within the context of political, economic, and intellectual life, and compares, not juxtaposes, Soviet modernism, including its Stalinist versions, to its Western counterparts. To do so, I will first examine the use of the opposition of the avant-garde and totalitarianism in the historiography of Soviet architecture, and then demonstrate that this opposition fails to describe one of the most contested periods of Soviet pre-War architectural history, the so-called First Five-Year Plan (1928-1932).

**The Avant-Garde**

The term ‘the avant-garde,’ which was used in a military sense between the fifteenth and the eighteenth centuries, was in the 1910s borrowed to refer to all innovative artistic approaches, whereas modernist art was initially typically named after a predominant local movement or style (for example, Futurism in Russia or *Neue Sachlichkeit* in Germany). Only in the 1930s did art critics associate the notion of the avant-garde with those modernist movements that announced a radical break with the past, most notably, with Italian Futurism, Russian Constructivism, and Surrealism. The word endowed these movements with a positive ethical charge, underlining their evolutionary progressive role as guiding stars of cultural development. At
the same time, the rise of mass movements made critics turn their attention to the emergence of the new, collective, type of spectator and to the role of art in mass propaganda. The break with tradition was reinterpreted as a confrontation with the tastes of the majority. In the parlance of critics, ‘the avant-garde’ was opposed to ‘the rear-garde,’ which the authors, depending on their political platform, associated with either petty-bourgeois tastelessness, or with ‘kitsch’ produced for the poor. The former position was taken by radical Soviet critics of the 1920s, who saw the proletarian masses as the source of the true avant-garde; the latter – by such liberal critics as an American Clement Greenberg, whose fear of the masses (‘the mob,’ as they were often dismissed at the time) recalled right wing turn-of-the-century mass psychology of Gabriel Tarde and Gustave Le Bon, but also anticipated the writings of Hannah Arendt and other American post-War discussions of social freedom. In his famous essay ‘Avant-Garde and Kitsch’ (1939) Greenberg illustrated kitsch with the work of Russian academic painter Il’ia Repin, which he mistook for proto-Socialist Realism, but which in fact belonged to the tradition of nineteenth-century theatrical historicism initiated by Paul Delaroche. Nevertheless, Greenberg tied kitsch not to the Russian or Soviet political regime, but to the lack of education and taste of the presumed admirers of Repin’s painting, and maintained that kitsch was the product of Western urbanization. Preceding the publication of Greenberg’s essay by three years, Walter Benjamin was the first to raise the question of the potential of art for control over the masses, pointing to connections between art and Fascism. For Benjamin, any art that was perceived in a state of distraction possessed this potential, and architecture was its earliest and purest example. Focusing on the mode of perception and its technological determinants, Benjamin did not connect Fascism to modernist aesthetics. It was not until the beginning of the Cold War that ‘the avant-garde,’ reinterpreted as artistic pluralism, was opposed to ‘totalitarianism’ as a mode of state power. If the former was associated with the presumably liberal West, the latter was symbolized by Nazi Germany and the USSR.

History and Historiography

The first histories of Soviet modernist art and architecture emerged in the 1960s in the warming atmosphere of the anticipation of détente. In the USSR, the death of Stalin in 1953 was followed by Khrushchev’s 1955 attack on Stalinist architecture as excessive and uneconomical and the resultant triumphal return of modernism to architecture and its historiography (interestingly, modernist art was not rehabilitated until much later). Meanwhile, in European countries, first of all, in France and Italy, a generation of post-war left-wing architectural historians embarked on a sympathetic study of Russian revolutionary architecture. Finally, following the first attempts at easing the relationships between the US and the USSR, such as Khrushchev’s official visit to the US in 1959, Soviet modernism for the first time became a matter of concern of English-language scholarship. Each of these three approaches to the historiography of Soviet architecture was ideological in its own way, interpreting its subject in the light of its own political position. Soviet historians, most notably Selim Khan-Magomedov, for whom formalism was the sole available escape from the dogma of official Marxism-Leninism, refrained from critical interpretation, concentrating on issues of authorship and style. Unlike them, their European counterparts such as Anatole Kopp saw in Soviet revolutionary architecture a viable model for the communist architecture of the future. Finally, English-language scholarship, most notably, the 1962 book The Great Experiment: Russian art, 1863-1922, written by the daughter-in-law of Sergei Prokofiev Camilla Gray, approached the Russian avant-garde as a doomed utopian experiment, cautiously assessing only the early development of modernism in Russia and stopping at the very down of radical approaches. The re-freezing political climate of the 1970s again made publication of books on Soviet art and architecture impossible in the English-speaking world. At the same time, the USSR entered the so-called period of stagnation, characterized by a decline of Khrushchev’s cultural ‘thaw’ and consequently of interest in experimental art and architecture. Meanwhile, in Europe, the waning of left activism after 1968 left the new generation of scholars uninterested in the revolutionary movements of the 1920s.

After a decade of relative neglect, Russian culture again attracted Western society as the Soviet regime began to weaken in the 1980s. Western powers assumed a flattering, promising tone in
its political negotiations with Russia, sweetening the requests of dismantling its imperial legacy and destroying its military complex by such symbolic recognitions of Russia’s future place among the world’s elite as an invitation to join the G7. Meanwhile, historians relied on the ideological agenda present already at Gray’s book: the Russian revolution was stimulated by great humanist ideals, but the ideals that were essentially naïve and unrealizable and therefore dangerous and destined for failure. Such terms as ‘experiment,’ ‘utopia,’ ‘dream,’ and ‘the visionary’ filled accounts of early-Soviet art and architecture: take, for instance, Richard Stites’s *Revolutionary Dreams: Utopian Vision and Experimental Life in the Russian Revolution* (1989) or Guggenheim seminal exhibition *The Great Utopia: The Russian and Soviet Avant-Garde, 1915-1932* (1992).7

However, in the mid-1990s, when Russia’s absolute defeat at the Cold War became clear and irreversible, this flattering rhetoric was left aside. While political negotiations now acquired harsh and imperative tone, historians shifted their attention from dreams of the avant-garde to the crimes of totalitarianism – a notion developed in the late 1930s-early 40s by Friedrich Hayek and other theoreticians of economic liberalism. Hugh Hudson’s ominously titled *Blueprints and Blood: The Stalinization of Soviet Architecture, 1917-1937* (1994) serves an example of this new trend.8 The chronological scope of the book is defined by political events (the revolution and the so-called Great Purges – another term of American historiography) rather than by the events of cultural life. The gravest of totalitarianism’s crimes was, according to this narrative, the assassination of the avant-garde – sometimes physical, but more often symbolic. Politics, not art and architectural production that resulted from it, was at the focus of these scholars investigations: the architecture that followed was considered a criminal betrayal of the ideals enforced by the omnipotent state power and thus not worthy of attention.

Meanwhile, in the 1980s, left-wing art historians in Germany and the United States approached the question of the avant-garde and totalitarianism under the influence of Theodor Adorno’s concept of autonomous art. Most notably represented by Benjamin Buchloh, this school, which still dominates in American art history, asked how the transition from the avant-garde to totalitarianism could have been possible. The word ‘Constructivism,’ quickly adopted as a synecdoche for Soviet modernism, was thought to express its essence. It seemed to embody both the social and the aesthetic program appreciated by progressive Western intellectuals: Marxism, materialism, respect to labor, collectivity, as well as a modernist visual language that resembled post-War American abstraction. Totalitarianism, on the other hand, was viewed as a return to representational art and Classicist architecture, and as philosophical dogmatism. While the avant-garde and totalitarianism were presented as two ethical, rather than aesthetic, opposites, the fact that the same artists sometimes contributed to both presented the major riddle that these historians tried to solve. Thus, in his seminal essay ‘From faktura to factography’ (1984) Buchloh examined the presumed transformation of El Lissitzky from a carrier of emancipatory aesthetics to an agent of totalitarian propaganda.9

Soviet historians approached the problem of the relationship between the avant-garde and totalitarianism by either returning ‘totalitarian art’ to the domain of the aesthetic or by politicizing the avant-garde. On one hand, Selim Khan-Magomedov introduced the notion of post-Constructivism as a formal category that described the architecture of the late 1920s-early 1930s as the missing link in the evolutionary development of architecture from Constructivism to Socialist Realism.10 On the other hand, émigré cultural historian Boris Groys claimed that totalitarianism was nothing else than one of the avant-garde’s avatars.11 Groys pointed to the militant radicalism characteristic of all modernists, which were intolerant to pluralism and often demanded a political persecution of their opponents. According to Groys, Stalin’s transformation of the USSR could be interpreted as an aesthetic project: the medium of this project was the entirety of life in the country. Although the Russian scholars’ attempts at restoring the logical coherency of the opposition of the avant-garde and totalitarianism by subjugating one of its domains to the other were more productive than the work of their Western counterparts, they remained largely single-sided. The dilemmas that the opposition poses could be solved only by its total rejection and a search for new categories and operative paradigms.
Soviet anti-humanism as a modernist posthumanism

An example of such an approach can be seen in the work of Michael Hays, who in his 1992 book *Modernism and the Posthumanist Subject: The Architecture of Hannes Meyer and Ludwig Hilberseimer* introduced the notion of posthumanism. Emerging as a response of artists and architects to the fragmentation of the individual during the era of industrial capitalism, posthumanism, according to Hays, eradicated from architecture a holistic, authorial and centralized humanist subjectivity that was still pertinent to early modernism. Instead, it replaced this subjectivity with the one that was fragmented, decentered and serialized. Consequently, in art and architecture, posthumanism led to a negation, sublation, or masking of such formalist strategies of canonical modernism as self-referentiality, autonomy and the grounding of every art in a particular domain of experience. Hays’s study focused on Germany rather than Russia, and the category of posthumanism that he introduced cut across political divides; rather than juxtaposing East and West, Hays, in a Marxist tradition, differentiated between progressive and regressive versions of posthumanism, which he saw as embodied by Hannes Meyer and Ludwig Hilberseimer respectively.

Whereas Hays saw posthumanism as intrinsic to all modernist culture, I would like to propose that it could be best located within a particular historic period – the same, in fact, that Khan-Magomedov described as post-Constructivism. Neither avant-garde nor totalitarian, its logic avoided ethical and aesthetic concerns and instead prioritized efficiency and rationalization. In the USSR, this period saw the abandonment of semi-liberal New Economic Policy (NEP) and a transition to a planned and centralized economic system. The so-called First Five-Year Plan (1928-1932) was to lay the industrial foundation for the transformation of a backward agricultural country, devastated by a revolution and a civil war, into a modernized European power. It stipulated a forced industrialization of Soviet economy, an ambitious program whose implementation required an intensive exploitation of labor, leading to the growing control of the state over an individual. In architecture, these changes were reflected by the disbandment of independent creative organizations in April of 1932 and their replacement with the state-controlled Union of Soviet Architects, which set about developing principles of Socialist Realism as the single prescribed style of literature, art, architecture. Nevertheless, the modernists were far from resisting the new political turn: on the contrary, they welcomed it as a return to revolutionary militant collectivism and reacted with a burst of projects that celebrated the new unified subjectivity. Many of the projects that are habitually associated with heroic, canonical Soviet avant-garde architecture – Moisei Ginzburg’s Narkomfin residential block, Ivan Leonidov’s planning scheme for Magnitogorsk, and Konstantin Mel’nikov’s Rusakov House of Culture to give just the most famous examples – in fact, belong to this historic period that marked the ultimate dissolution of post-revolutionary pluralism in both politics and artistic life.

Not specific for Soviet Russia, the tendency for social experimentation simultaneously manifested itself in various parts of the world. Politically, the announcement of the First Five-Year Plan in the Soviet Union could be seen in parallel to the growing influence of the National Socialist Party in Germany and to an increasing employment of techniques of mass manipulation throughout the Western world in the aftermath of the Great Depression. On the plane of architecture, this period was characterized by large-scale, standardized, regimented and rationalized models of living, which rejected the autonomy of individuals for the sake of the rationalization of society as a whole. Karl Ehn’s Karl-Marx-Hof in Vienna (1927-1930), the organization of CIAM in 1928, and the tenure of Hannes Meyer as the director of the Bauhaus (1928-1930), can all be viewed as examples of this trend for total planning on all scales from everyday life to macroeconomics. The novel ambitions of architecture, above all its refashioning as urbanism, required a new level of collaboration with the state and municipal bureaucracies, a partnership that preferably involved access to administrative and even political power. It was the possibility of participating in the implementation of the Soviet economic plan by designing new cities – the symbol of modernism’s new scale of thinking – rather than lucrative contracts, naiveté or persecutions at home that in the early 1930s attracted to the USSR Western modernist architects and artists, among whom were André Lurçat, Hannes Meyer, Mart Stam, and Ernst May, to name just a few.
Not an aberration, but rather the epitome of modernist tradition, this period exposed modernism’s dehumanizing core inseparable from its reliance on rationality and science. In the definition of Hannah Arendt, totalitarianism differed from authoritarian regimes in that it aspired to control every aspect of the citizens’ lives. It assaulted the values of humanism: individuality, personal freedom and privacy, the independence of thought and judgment. Quite similarly, modernism—or, in the words of Michael Hays, posthumanism—disprivileged individuality for the sake of efficiency, rationality, and organization. Relying on scientific method, it reduced individuality to its presumably standard biological core and employed various methods of social engineering (Taylorism, Fordism, psychotechnics, ergography, among others) to manipulate the living working machine.

This standardized, dehumanized subject, which can be discerned in all modernist works, in particular, those of late 1920s-early 1930s, was certainly a highly troubling part of modernism’s program. Nevertheless, its ethical evaluation should not limit the discussion to its political context, because that reduces the entire multiplicity of architectural production to one dimension, neglecting its formal and social sides. Moreover, every ethical system is prescriptive and thus ideological, and establishing a causal relationship between political and aesthetic development with the help of ethics, one inevitably saturates criticism with ideology. If the concept of totalitarianism is informed by the ethics of Cold-War economic liberalism, the notion of the avant-garde reflects the early-modernist ethics of cultural evolutionarism, asserting its suprematism on the basis of its self-declared historical progressivism. To stop smuggling these ideologies into architectural history, we have to leave the opposition of the avant-garde and totalitarianism behind and search for new explanatory models that address cultural and social contexts.
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Introduction

The postwar construction in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and in particular in the capital of Sarajevo, plays a vital role in the formation of the country's urban identity. Sarajevo experienced a devastating war, the demolition of urban fabric, and the city is currently in the process of creating a postwar identity, an identity of a capitalist, post-communist society. The architecture of contemporary Bosnian and Herzegovinian cities exhibits elements of the contemporary European architectural events, but also unveils variations in the city's urban fabric influenced by both political and economic changes in the contemporary Bosnian society, not necessarily following the prevailing architectural trends present in the Western Europe. This paper will focus on the examination of the shifts taking place in architectural trends – and whether such occurrences can even be identified as trends – in the Bosnian postwar and post-communist urban fabric through the examination of newly erected commercial structures in the city of Sarajevo.

The long Ottoman occupation of the country; short, yet architecturally eventful period of Austro-Hungarian rule; two brief decades of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia; and the five decades of the communist Yugoslavia have all left significant impact on the construction of Bosnia and Herzegovina political present, and as such must be acknowledged when discussing current events in both politics and architecture. I argue that the architecture of Bosnia and Herzegovina has been a mirror of political and geopolitical events that have taken place throughout the history, as well as today.

What is the architectural reality of Bosnia and Herzegovina now? And what role does politics play in this reality?

To begin with, we must determine what the architecture of post-communist Sarajevo is. In the last decade, after the still incomplete process of reconstruction was seemingly put on hold, the city of Sarajevo has become the city of commercial endeavours. Shopping malls have permeated the city centre, and the investors from Europe and the Islamic world are ever present in the city. But who are these investors? And what will be the consequence of such economic investments on the architecture of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian capital? Today, we can only speculate of the future of the architecture of Sarajevo, and acknowledge
the present of the local urban fabric as the one of unidentified fusion. One may argue it is the mixture of political and religious influences meshed with the know-how of local architects that created such architectural present, but it can also be argued that it is the organic development of the political and geopolitical relations in the country and region. Newfound religious freedoms in the post-communist Bosnia and Herzegovina play a significant role due to the predominant Muslim population of Sarajevo, as well as its political and religious favouritism toward the Islamic investors – this paper will attempt to examine such assumptions, and perhaps broaden the understating of the postwar city of Sarajevo through its architecture. Current architecture conditions cannot be identified without difficulty – the architectural activity in the late 1990s and early 21st century was mostly focused on the reconstruction of war-torn buildings with a few new structures, but in the last decade the situation has significantly shifted and new architecture is slowly permeating the existing urban fabric. The structures erected are both of smaller and larger scale, funded by large investor groups as well as the smaller, private investors building private single-family homes. Design-wise, current architecture can be – only to an extent – identified as a mixture of contemporary European trends, and of neo-Ottoman architectural influences, mainly seen in the smaller scale structures. Hi-tech architecture that characterized the postmodernism – or its iteration – in the Balkans of 1980s is still present, with shopping centers’ digital facades blinding Sarajevans in their everyday lives.

The architecture and the politics of the past

Bosnian present is an unfortunate one. Almost all of the countries transitioning from communist to capitalist societies and economies in Eastern and South-eastern Europe have been struggling in the past decades, but nevertheless, the conditions in the postwar Yugoslavian successor states have been significantly harsher. Shattered by the long war, Bosnia and Herzegovina and the city of Sarajevo exist in a perpetual struggle of self-identifying, and self-defining, both as a post-communist country, and as the country and the city in the region that has never politically settled since the early 1990s. It is often argued that the present condition in the region is the result of the political events of the past. Ever since the Ottomans arrived in the fifteenth century, turbulent events have been pervading the lives of the people in the Balkans, leaving long existing marks. The Ottomans introduced new architectural style and elements in the architecture of Sarajevo, and constructed the city throughout the centuries of their presence by Ottoman architectural principles – mainly focusing on the housing and religious architecture.

The Congress of Berlin in 1878 allowed the Austro-Hungarian Empire to conquer Bosnia and Herzegovina. By 1908, when the country was annexed by the Austro-Hungarians, the Empire had already engaged in transformation of the urban fabric of Sarajevo, but also in the creation of the civic society, one constructed by the Central European standards. The architecture played a significant role in the exhibition of political change in the occupied country – now, imperial architects mainly focused on the construction of public buildings – city hall, main postal office building, as well as the multi-Family residential structures. Austro-Hungarians introduced construction laws and codes. The Ottoman Sarajevo was ‘Europeanized’ through “strictly regulated new neighbourhoods populated by historicist buildings.”

The interwar period in Sarajevo was characterized by only a few examples of early modernist architecture – mainly housing – yet the following period of communist rule brought true exploration of modernism, albeit in the iteration of a socialist country. Strikingly, and as a consequence of such historical permutations in Bosnia and Herzegovina, the “resultant built environments […] brought large architectural traditions into proximity that is rarely found elsewhere.”

The Old Town constructed by the Ottomans with its small neighbourhoods, mahalas, and tall minarets; the Austro-Hungarian expansion westward, and exhibits of public buildings designed by Austrian architects of the time period; modernist interwar buildings of Kadic brothers; and the socialist modernist architecture of the Yugoslav period all create a unique mesh of styles, all to be extended into the present of the city – the present architecture we are examining as it is being created, and as the history is unfolding.
Architecture now

Ethnically and religiously diverse, Bosnians and Herzegovinians are searching for the political and financial stability. In 1994, during the war, Charles Gati argued that "mainly because of the powerful lasting impact of communist political culture, the road to democracy in east-central Europe is paved not only with bumps but with long detours that could lead to dead ends." The story of Bosnian architecture in the post-1990s concurs with such assertion. I argue that the lack of political clarity and constant economic struggle in the last two decades conditioned the creation of a distinct path in Bosnian architecture, constructing it as a mixture of foreign and local influences, mainly directed by investors, and not in the tradition of the local architectural narrative. The lack of a defined architectural direction in Sarajevo – the one with precise and easily identifiable characteristics – and architecture's intertwined narrative with the everyday politics can be identified as the trend in the Bosnian contemporary architecture, meshed between the local people, local traditions, and tenuous politics of the time period.

The war in Bosnia and Herzegovina ended in November 1995. In regard to architecture, overwhelming processes of reconstruction, of both urban fabric and infrastructure, characterized the last years of the twentieth century. In the first decade after the war some new construction did take place – mainly in the housing sector with few exceptions (Mercator and Wisa shopping centres) – yet the real wave of postwar construction took place in the late years of the first decade of the twenty-first century. The reconstruction process was seemingly put on hold, or at least downsized, and the construction of new structures emerged in full effect.

Shopping centres

Three recent commercial centres, BBI Centre Sarajevo, Alta Shopping Centre, and Sarajevo City Centre, that are to be examined in this paper, were constructed in the city centre region, the former Austro-Hungarian residential part of the town, and the administrative centre from the period of socialist Yugoslavia. The oldest of the three, BBI was constructed in 2009, on the location of the former Robna kuća 'Sarajka,' an iconic shopping centre from the communist period. After an early outrage amongst the people of the city of Sarajevo, war-ravished Sarajka – once a ‘pearl of a socialist society’ – was demolished to leave room for a shopping centre of a new society – a post-communist one. The construction took place in the period between 2006 and 2009, and the building today houses a shopping mall, but also the Al Jazeera Balkans TV channel, and Bosna Bank International offices amongst others. The architect of the building was Sead Golos and his Grupa ARH.

The shopping centre Alta was completed in 2010 – constructed on a previously empty, green area in Marijin Dvor neighbourhood, it stands now amongst the residential buildings from both Austro-Hungarian and Yugoslav periods, as well as the government and office high-rises from the later decades of socialist architecture. UNIS skyscrapers and Holiday Inn Hotel – some of the most recognizable symbols of the war destruction in Sarajevo – stand in the proximity of the building of Alta shopping centre, home to mostly commercial stores, designed by Sanja Galić Grozdanić and Igor Grozdanić.

The latest and the largest structure of the three, Sarajevo City Centre was completed in 2014. Located just across the street from Alta, SCC is another building designed by Grupa ARH and Sead Golos. Comprised of four segments – hotel, commercial and office space, entertainment centre, and parking garage – the structure covers over 49000 square meters, and it has replaced war-demolished tobacco factory. Two defining architectural elements of the building are the hotel tower, supposedly to be occupied in the future by a world-class hotelier group, and the SCC Media Façade – a video billboard, broadcasting news, weather, and advertising. Almost a year after the construction was completed and the shopping centre opened for public, the hotel remains uninhabited, and offices partially empty.

All three shopping centres are located at the city centre, amongst historically and politically significant works of architecture. I argue, that as such, they represent the permeation of the new architecture styles in the city core, and are engaging in the process of the constructing of new, interwoven architecture of Sarajevo, the architecture of a post-communist city. While BBI may be considered an urban extension, located...
in the site of a previous shopping centre, both Alta and SCC are insertions into the fabric of the city, and aggressive ones for that matter.

As of the early years after the war, the capital inflow from the European and American companies has been constant, yet in the last decade a new trend in investment emerged – an introduction of companies from Islamic countries in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It can be speculated that the presence of Islamic countries based companies in the Federation of Bosnia and Herzegovina lays in diplomatic relations forged by a large percentage of Muslim population living in the Federation entity, and such speculations would be proven accurate. Foreign Investment Promotion Agency of Bosnia and Herzegovina (hereinafter FIPA) stated in its 2012 report that the largest investor in the past two decades has been the Republic of Austria with the investment worth of €1,194 billion, surpassing all others but the character of the investment of Islamic countries differs in its public presentation, resulting in high visibility and public presence. SCC and BBI are visible features in the urban fabric of Sarajevo, and banking investments (main interest of Austrian companies) bear different presence.

Shopping malls, in particular if located in city centre, make a significant mark on daily activities of Sarajevans – they are present in everyday interactions as the great majority of people living in the city work in the city centre. The argued relation between architecture and politics can be identified here through the newly opened channels in the post-communist period – due to re-established religious freedoms and political connections to the Islamic world the urban fabric of Sarajevo is changing, once again exhibiting the political change taking place in the Bosnian society.

Urban fabric development

How do new shopping malls permeate the existing urban fabric and can these be considered an organic development? Elaborate projects have been developed for Marijin Dvor neighbourhood during the communist times, and brought into question the issue of historic heritage in the westward expansion of the city. Nevertheless, and regardless of the failures and successes of communist architects and planners, in the five decades of socialist Yugoslavia the city of Sarajevo developed without any dramatic intrusion in the pre-existing urban fabric, and shows the feats of the socialist modernism in Yugoslavian architecture not interfering with the preexisting condition. The urban development during communist times was under more rigorous legal regulation and, arguably, such legal regulation can be credited for a more organic urban development.

When we speak of the postwar architecture – the architecture of new, post-communist Bosnia and Herzegovina – I argue that the lack of regulations, and governmental supervision allows for both architects and investors to fully control the process of design and construction of any structure on their property, and “according to the Law on Foreign Direct Investment Policy in B&H there is no any [sic] restrictions and limitations regarding buying [sic] or possessing the construction land and buildings by the foreign investor who is allowed to be a 100% owner of the land or building and has the same rights such as a local owner.” The local government does propose the purpose of the land, but due to the local laws, the investor is entitled to change the design and features of the proposed building.

Architecturally, the shopping malls in question can be examined through particularities of their designs, and it is arguable whether they resemble the existing commercial centres in the home countries of investor companies, but that cannot be seen as a sole issue of contention in regard to the construction of such buildings. I argue that these structures add to the uncontrolled expansion of urban fabric of Sarajevo, but also that the interpolation of large projects in the existing historic fabric causing uninhibited development is not conditioned by design or investors’ plans – such expansion and development is caused by the lack of regulations in Bosnian and Herzegovinian local governments. The full control over one’s investments is a feature of a capitalist society, yet the creation of urban fabric should be prone to open public and professional debate, as the uncontrolled construction in the city will result not in organic development and exploration of contemporary architectural styles, but in the destruction of historic and architectural heritage, and it will negatively affect the quality of life of Sarajevans. Such lack of regulations and supervision may be seen as one of the crucial characteristics of the new trend in the architecture of Bosnia and Herzegovina.
Concluding note

The architecture of Sarajevo, the capital of Bosnia and Herzegovina, once again is a stage of the historical changes and shifts – the ones creating the face of the city, and profoundly permeating the lives of Sarajevans. Just as throughout the history, architecture is now the façade of the political and economic developments and changes, as profound as they are in any country in transition. Nowadays, the historical heritage of Sarajevo is in peril and the question of what architecture is today remains to a certain extent impermeable. While researching new shopping centres in Sarajevo, located within the historic Austro-Hungarian core, one may determine the architecture of today as undefined in traditional terms. But what else have we learned from the new structures overshadowing buildings from the early nineteenth century? The relationship between investors and the design of the buildings is clearly an important one – architectural trends in the home countries of investors do play a role in determining the main principles of design and construction, as well as the principles of conducting business in a multi-religious and multi-ethnic city (e.g. no alcoholic beverages can be purchased in either BBI or SCC) – yet the problematic of the foreign investment in regard to architecture is vital in a different concern. Foreign investors have no limitations or restrictions in regard to purchasing land or buildings, as well as their control over the property in question. Hence, one cannot anticipate an investment group to engage in research of architectural history of a city or a country (although, it would be an ideal practice), but the local government is to deal with any possible issues accordingly and take into consideration all possible ramifications of such investments on architecture and the development of urban fabric of a city. Charles Gati wrote back in 1992 that “democracies, unlike communist systems, base their claim to legitimacy more on respect for proper constitutional procedures than on economic performance.”
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Introduction

Taksim area, as a geographical place, has a special character of being a place, which is under a constant change. According to Eyal Weizman’s definition of architecture; architecture is a “political plastic” whose materiality is continuously in shape by political forces. In this context, Taksim is becoming a space to read the forces which shape the area constantly, physically, socially and politically. In this sense we can also see Taksim area as a political place and the Taksim Artillery Barracks as a political object, which shaped and changed the Taksim area by its construction, destruction and the reproduction process in the history.

In his book Social Justice and The City, David Harvey reciprocally explains spatial forms that include social processes, which is shaped by spatial forms. For Harvey also spatial forms are not ontological categories but a social dimension, which can be shaped by human and at the same time, which shapes the human.
loosing power, the modernization in the army had become a necessity for the reconstruction of the empire. When the reforms started in the army, the heart of the empire, military institutions were the opening doors to a modern and developed world. It was not easy for a traditional society like Ottomans to accept the reforms immediately and because of the initial point of the reforms was army, first rejections came from Janissaries and from time to time they gave response to reforms with bloody riots (Kuban, 2004).

The reforms started by Ottoman Sultan Selim III, at the end of the 18th century and ended at the beginning of 19th century in 1807. One of the reforms was the constitution of a new army formation instead of current formation of Janissaries. Janissaries started a riot against the new Nizam-ı Cedid army of Selim III. After the 16th century, Janissaries achieved a powerful position in the empire according to the serious increase in their number. During the time of peace, Janissaries served as craftsmen and tradesmen living in the military barracks located in the city ensuring the law, order and they were fulfilling important roles as the regulation of economic life and firefighting. (Gül, 2013)

The military power of the Janissaries turned into political power up to their presence and activities in the city. Mahmud II eliminated the Janissaries in 1826 by gaining the support of the public, knowing that they were the biggest obstacles to reforms. With the abolition of Janissaries, the empire had experienced several changes in its structure (Gül, 2013).

In the time of Alboulhamid I (1789-1808) and Selim III (1789-1808), along with the reforms, there were very dense construction activities in Istanbul. Despite this fact, the city’s image, surrounded by the city walls showed continuity in this century. There were no settlements outside the walls in both Istanbul and Galata districts. At the time of the modernizations, new buildings appeared in the district outside of the walls of Galata, called Pera and today Beyoğlu.

Pera was a place of vineyards and gardens until the 18th century. At that time the district was called Vignes de Pera because of the presence of the vineyards. Wealthy Europeans and Christian Ottoman traders showed presence in Pera from the 17th century and they constructed mansions in large yards. While Galata maintained its presence as a commercial center inside the walls, vineyards were transformed and developed as a high-class residence area outside the walls in Pera (Çelik, 1996).

This distinction between the inside and outside of the walls thoroughly increased in the 19th century (Akin, 2002).

Cezar (1991), relates the growth outside the walls of Galata to both reforms and bringing water to the region. After the most important problem of the region, the water problem was solved. Large-scale settlements appeared in the area. It’s hard to say which one of the factors played a significant role in the development of the area. As well as the reforms and the effective solutions of the water problems, the empire’s new constructions of new institutions like palaces, modern schools, military barracks, hospitals and administrative buildings in the area had accelerated the development. It’s remarkable that all of these buildings are related with reforms and all of them were constructed outside of the walls, in Pera.
At the time of Selim III (1789-1807), which is referred to as the reforms era, the first large scale military buildings like Selimiye, Takım Barracks and some others were constructed. Selimiye Barracks in Uskudar and Levend Farm Barracks beyond Beyoğlu district were the most known military buildings constructed for Nizam-i Cedid, the new army of Selim the third. The sultan ordered buildings not just for the new army, but for a part of Kapikulu soldiers, the troops directly under the sultan’s command. In order to modernize the artillery, the technical class of Kapikulu soldiers, Takım Artillery Barracks were built on the highest point of Pera, called Takım. Takım Artillery Barracks was the equivalent of the Selimiye Barracks on the European side, and had considerable long wings and a quite wide courtyard. The construction of Takım Artillery Barracks started in 1803-1804 and completed in 1806. (Cezar, 1991).

Takım Artillery Barracks with its architectural style and its big scale was the symbol of a powerful and modern empire.

**The Second Period and the Second Layer: Object of Destruction**

During the 19th century, beside its military function, the Artillery Barracks was used for various activities, such as acrobatic shows, horse races or accommodation of Greek pilgrims. Also the courtyard of the barracks was used as a football stadium for many years and hosted many public events. In 20th century, with its function as a military base ended in 1913, it was sold to Ottoman National Company for Industry and Trade. (Hayalet Yapilar)

During the First World War and the Invasion Years, it was an abandoned building, reserved for Senegalese soldiers under French occupation forces. (Hayalet Yapilar)

In the Republican era, during the final years of Atatürk, a French city planner, Henri Prost was invited to the republic in order to plan the former capital city, Istanbul. According to the town planning approaches during the 20th century green areas were regarded as prerequisites in order to create the healthy cities. Prost frequently used the notion of *les espaces libres*, known as free spaces and encompassed all public open spaces such as parks, promenades, esplanades, panoramic terraces, boulevards etc. (Bilsel, 2010)

Prost, referred to three large areas, which called ‘Park No.1’, ‘Park No.2’ and ‘Park No.3’ in the Istanbul European Side Master Plan. Park No.2 was located in the deep valley stretched between Dolmabahçe, Macka and Harbiye in the Master Plan of Beyoğlu area where Takım Artillery Barracks were located. The Barracks were decided to be destroyed according to the proposals of Henri Prost which constitutes the causalities of the “object of destruction” as the second part of the three folds of the case. After the demolition of the Barracks, residential and social buildings would be constructed on the empty area, and a big green park would stretch from there to Harbiye. The area would also be used as a ceremonial ground with the name “İnönü Esplanade” to be integrated with Takım Square during İsmet İnönü’s presidential period. In front of the esplanade there would be a statue of İnönü and to maintain a unity in design, the Takım Republican Monument would be moved to that point. However, after the gradual
destruction of the Barracks, only a few of these arrangements could be achieved. Taksim Square already took the place of stables in an early stage and Talimhane (the former military exercise ground) changed to be a modern residential area, and the Barracks was gone forever (Bilsel, 2010).

The destruction of the building was a part of a modernisation process. Under the forces of a modernisation process Artillery Barracks wouldn’t be a part of a modern site with its architectural style. In the totality of the Park No.2 design, barracks would not fit into the concept of modern organisation of the area both because of its function and its style as an object.

The Third Period and the Third Layer: Reproduction of the Copy

In one of the 2010 Cultural Capital City Istanbul events called Ghost Buildings exhibition Taksim Artillery Barracks was one of the case study of the exhibition showing the buildings which do not exist today, but if they did, how they could be used. So there were some images of the building with some CAD renders, showing the building as a football stadium, a concert hall at the courtyard or a park again at the courtyard. The aim of the project was to remember some of the buildings in Istanbul as our collective history. (Ungur, Erdem)

In 9 February 2011, due to the decision number 4225 Taksim Artillery Barracks rebuild and revivification project was treated in the 1/5000 scale master plan project which was called “Beyoglu Municipality Area Taksim Square Pedestrianisation Project” by the assembly of the Istanbul Metropolitan Municipality which carried the case to the “reproduction of the copy” fold of the case. (Hurriyet Gundem)

In June 2011, one of the same image of Taksim Artillery Barracks imaginary-representable renders had been shown in the Ghost Buildings exhibition, projected on the screen as the future planned building for the Taksim area by Recep Tayyip Erdogan without asking any permission of the Ghost Buildings exhibition team, during the AKP (the leading party of Turkish Republic) meeting called “Turkey is ready, Target is 2023” (Ungur, Erdem)

The official department of Protection and Preservation Board had rejected the proposed building. After the decision, in his speech, Recep Tayyip Erdogan declared his denial of the decision: “We will build the Taksim Artillery Barracks. The Board has rejected the proposed project. We will reject their rejection”

After a short period, the board has retrieved the decision and gave the permission for the requested proposal of re-building of the Barracks. For the following process this issue had been carried to a public discussion according to objections about the top-down intervention on the decision of the board.

The reconstruction of the Taksim Artillery Barracks should be seen as a part of a big picture in the context of reshaping the Taksim area as a political space. Intertwined relationship of the different on going projects around Taksim area unites all the projects in a common ground of a neoliberal political effort of making the area touristically and economically more attractive place.

Compared to the first period and the second period, the motivation of the third period is neither the representation of a powerful and modern empire, nor the representation of a secular national state with its espaces libres but the representation of a neoliberal space, a consumption place in the shape of former Taksim Artillery Barracks.

Fig. 3: Taksim before and after of the demolition in the first 2 pictures and Taksim İnönü Esplanade in the third picture.
Conclusion: Causality between the Three Folds

In one sense, the copy is a reproduction referring both to itself and to its original, a part of an endless series of “aura-less” multiplications, so in this context, the reproduction of Taksim Artillery Barracks is referring both to itself and to its original. (Weizman, Ines)

In another sense, this opaque process is a historiographical problem. Re-building a copy of an original cannot rebuild the history again in the same context. (Tanyeli, Ugur)

This contradictory and dual relationship between the original and the copy is becoming visible in the reproduction process of the Taksim Artillery Barracks. By referring to its original, physically being the same as the object which is legitimating its existence in the legal framework of preservation and idealisation of a nostalgic attitude of invigoration thinking, but by referring to its original having different functions created a gap between the original and the copy.

The act of Copying is becoming a tool in the making of the space.
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Introduction

Gaza City, the capital of the Gaza Strip, was occupied by Israel during its war with Egypt, Syria and Jordan in June 1967. The war was waged in one of the central battlefields of the Cold War, a region which saw decolonization processes and modernization processes that emerging postcolonial states tried to impose in the area in order to assert their independence.¹ The Israeli occupation of Gaza started a new chapter in the city’s history – control by a military commander under the Israeli government’s full responsibility.² With the help of state bodies, the military government tried to promote the area’s development, believing that its modernization will solve the refugee camp problem, thereby dispensing with the refugees’ demand to return to their former homes in what is now Israel’s sovereign territory.

Al-Shati was one of eight camps Israel had to deal with in the Gaza Strip. It had been built in the aftermath of the 1948 war by United Nations Relief and Works Agency (UNRWA) and the local Egyptian administration in the northern part of Gaza City, across from the affluent Rimal Neighbourhood. The camp housed about 23,000 out of the 200,000 refugees deported to Gaza during and after the war. They arrived mostly by sea and settled on state lands. The camp was planned as a grid of modular shelters and grew with the years to become an overcrowded living space.³

Immediately after the 1967 war, Israel began applying parallel mechanisms of destruction and construction to deal with the population density in the occupied cities.⁴ These activities were formalized in a master plan commissioned by the Ministry of Defence for the Gaza Strip and Northern Sinai Area.⁵ The architects and planners were required to blur the morphological and typological differences between the cities and camps, decrease the refugee population by transferring some of them to newly built neighbourhoods, and destroy the camps in order to build neighbourhoods for both the refugees and local inhabitants.⁶ (as Figure 1) Gaza City, including al-Shati within it, was central to the plan, but military operations conducted in 1971-72 created new facts on the ground. Entire streets in the camp were bulldozed under the command of Chief of Southern Command and future Prime Minister Ariel Sharon.⁷ At the same time, Israel began rehabilitation activities such as building the Sheikh Radwan Neighbourhood,
promoted as an ‘Israel-style modern neighbourhood for refugees’, designed to house some of the al-Shati evacuees. The Gaza Strip Master Plan sought to reduce Gaza City’s centrality through the plan to build a port next to the new Jewish city of Yamit planned on the strip’s southern border as a buffer between it and Sinai and as another link in a chain of Israeli port cities. Al-Shawa, appointed as the city’s mayor by the military government in 1971, opposed these plans, which among other things annexed the camp to the city’s municipal area thereby condemning it, in his view, to non-development. It was his adamant opposition to this move that lead to his dismissal the following year. These findings are the result of a broader doctoral research. In this paper, I focus on acts of delay, destruction and construction from 1975, when al-Shawa was reinstated as mayor, to 1982 when Yamit was finally evacuated and returned to Egypt together with the rest of Sinai. Al-Shawa wanted to turn Gaza into a port city with a central power plant and the first-ever planned cultural centre in Palestine. For him, architecture and urban planning were tools of modernization that would turn his city’s inhabitants into citizens, despite the political reality. Unlike the modernization processes envisioned and initiated by Israel, which however, sought to assimilate the camp’s population with the native Gazans, al-Shawa did not consider the refugees as city dwellers, but as residents of a distinct area that must remain segregated until such time as they return to their pre-1948 homes. Against the backdrop of these spatial conflicts, and through the work of both Israeli and Palestinian architects and planners, I demonstrate how that sought-after modernization not only prevented the city from developing, but also retained the refugees as a bargaining chip between Palestinian nationalism and the occupation.

Reorganizing Gaza

Al-Shawa wanted to develop the port, but at the same time to leave the coastal refugee camp in place. To do so, he commissioned Syrian-British architect Saad Mohaffel, a graduate of the Architectural Association School of Architecture in London, to be in charge of the plan, and Israeli architect Eylon Meromi, a graduate of the Technion in Haifa to draw up a master plan for the city. Their joint planning invites different interpretations of the roles played by the various actors in the planning arena, their motives and the outcomes of their work. The mayor’s daughter, Laila al-Shawa, relates that the military government forced her father to employ architects approved by them. Al-Shawa agreed to hire Meromi on condition that Mohaffel head the team, ensure the city’s culture is preserved, and avoid plans that could destroy the city’s life. Meromi argues that Mohaffel did not specialize in town planning, but in architecture. Since his understanding and consequently, his influence on planning was minimal, al-Shawa looked for an urban planner. Mohaffel, on the other hand, argued that his urban planning concept was very different from Meromi’s. Having worked in Singapore, Yemen and Bahrain, his approach to development was inspired by Gaza City’s local culture. He believed Meromi did a thorough job, but reduced the plan management to statistics and demographics. How was the master plan formulated in a conflict-ridden city that brought two planners together, one advocating modernism of place, and the other advocating development modernism? Did the two modernist approaches eventually meet Al-Shawa’s expectations and ambitions?

Negotiating with Modernization

Both architects viewed urban renewal as the way of dealing the city’s complexities. To them, ‘The city is an association of events spreading both temporally and spatially, and involving a continually expanding place’. Both believed that the physical aspect of every urban renewal, in every city, included conservation, rehabilitation and redevelopment. They disagreed above all on how to deal with the challenge posed by al-Shati. Meromi did not view the camp as an obstacle. The real difficulty for him lay in the high density that characterized the camp and the rest of the city – the densest in the world at the time. He proposed tearing down the camp and turning it into an urban satellite neighbourhood, while dividing the city itself into additional satellite neighbourhoods. Within those neighbourhoods, including the farmlands included in their area, high-rise buildings would be built. This way, the camp and its residents will be integrated in the city’s urban environment. Mohaffel viewed the
refugees – 45,000 out of a total urban population of 160,000 – as a temporary issue. To him, the camp and its dwellers were not the city’s problem, and had to be dealt with as part of the solution to the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. Accordingly, he proposed destroying the camp in order to enable the Gaza’s development as a coastal city, albeit in coordination with the guidelines of the Israeli Gaza Strip Master Plan. According to Mohaffel, he and al-Shawa repeatedly contacted the Israeli military government and planning authorities and asked for a copy of the plan, but to no avail.¹⁷

The Gaza Association of Engineers and Architects and Laila al-Shawa, who attended the planning discussions, interpreted Meromi’s insistence on high-rise buildings as a move designed to settle the refugees in Gaza, thereby preventing their return to their former homes. One of the main alternatives proposed by Meromi was to build 170 20-story buildings in the al-Shati area, a move that stood in stark contrast to the principles espoused by her father, her ex-husband Mohaffel, and herself.¹⁸

Meromi had a different take on their opposition to his development plans. He believed it was motivated by the al-Shawa family’s desire to preserve the farmlands that were its economic basis. He also considered their demand to build one- or two-story buildings in the local style that maintains the traditional Arab attachment to the land detrimental to the project of improving the poor refugees’ living conditions. He believed that the native Gazans feared that any development activities could empower al-Shati’s urban and educated refugees, who could then take over the important positions in the city. The way he saw it, his was apolitical planning, since no Israeli authority intervened in his work. He planned what he viewed as the optimal solutions for Gazans and refugees living under terrible conditions in a specific space and time.¹⁹

Mouhaffel disagreed. If Meromi intended to plan for the Gazans, why did he insist on those anti-social high-rises? Why planning similar housing for locals and the refugees whose presence is temporary? He says:
I never had the opportunity to learn from Eylon whether some of the ideas we used to discuss were coming from political expediency or architectural experience. Eylon and his team also had the job of dealing with the politics as well as liaise with the planners of the Gaza Strip Master Plan which was in the process of being produced when we began the study.  

The discussion of the politics of architecture raises the question of the politics of actual architectural practice: what was drawn on paper and submitted to al-Shawa? Al-Shawa asked Meromi to inquire with the Israeli authorities as to why they would not enable the construction of a port in his city. The officials and transportation consultants approached by Meromi emphasized the need for a port in the area, but made it clear that it would not be built next to Gaza City. Meromi realized Israel did not want to turn Gaza into a port city under any circumstances – it wanted a ‘port for Gaza but not a port in Gaza’, in the Israeli city of Yamit.

Moreover, since Meromi was concerned with the inhabitants’ welfare, the poor neighbourhoods had to be demolished, so he saw to it that the camp’s area would be marked on the plan as designated for demolition and reconstruction. Meromi’s plan connected the camp with Sheikh Radwan and proposed a similar average density of 2-4 stories. This was the result of negotiations with Mohaffel: Meromi gave up on his high-rises, and agreed to the typology suggested by Mohaffel as a compromise between traditional and modern typology.

Despite this progress, Mohaffel insisted that without access to the Gaza Strip Master Plan, he would not be able to discuss the refugees or the port. After failing to obtain it, his hopes for overall development were crushed. Alternatively, his plan tried to preserve the city’s authentic architecture and save the historical buildings in its old centre.

When the architects finally submitted the plan to al-Shawa in late 1978 he was deeply disappointed, as he realized that nothing was done to improve the inhabitants’ economic situation and deal with the refugees. Israel kept restricting his authorities and promoting Jewish settlements inside the strip and around the city itself. This trend had only been reinforced with the rise of the right-wing Likud party to power in 1977. In December 1981, Israel appointed a so-called Civil Administration in Gaza – part of an overall administrative reform in the Occupied Territories whereby civilian affairs were handled by the Ministry of Defence rather than directly by the IDF. This reduced al-Shawa’s powers and influence still further, and after bitter conflicts with the new administration, Al-Shawa was removed from office in 1982.

Concluding Note

After its partial destruction and development during the period under study, Al-Shati remained suspended in space-time, in its haphazardly planned shape for two main reasons. First, the modernization envisioned by Al-Shawa in the planned port did not include its refugees despite being an integral part of Gaza City, and second, the modernization promoted by Israel in order to permanently settle the refugees did not include ensuring their employment by developing the port. The ongoing tension between Palestinian nationalism and Israeli occupation, which only became exacerbated in the plan, ultimately prevented any significant development in Gaza and retained the refugees as a political bargaining chip.

The conflicting political concepts played out in the master plan represented divergent perspectives on space and time. For Meromi, the planning space was the city’s municipal border, and the time was the development time, the orientation towards a future of improved physical living conditions. Mohaffel, on the other hand, applied the plan only to historical Gaza, while viewing al-Shati as part of a Palestinian space suspended in time. Historical Gaza was to profit from a preservation plan, that is, modernization of the past, while the camp was to remain strictly as a monument of memory without any physical interpretation. In other words, Mohaffel preserved the camp as a monument of time which was divorced from Gaza’s physical space, and consequently turned into an idea – the very idea Meromi sought to obliterate. Both perceived the camp as an idea that had to be either retained or revoked, but not as a sociocultural agent of urban renewal. The question is, therefore: What is more Palestinian and at the same time more Israeli than that monument and the yearning for it?
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The constant confrontations and uncertainties between North and South Korea have been a symbol of the Cold War. Risk of potential catastrophe in the peninsula seems, even today, to be unchanged. It is particularly clear in the Korean Demilitarized Zone created as a result of the Korean Armistice Agreement in 1953. The DMZ is a strip of land crossing the whole Korean Peninsula dividing North and South Korea. Despite its name, it is the most heavily militarized border in the world.

Within the DMZ is the Joint Security Area where all meetings between North Korea and the United Nations Command or South Korea happen. It is about 800 meters wide and approximately circular in shape. The history of the JSA reveals the frequent and continuous conflicts and clashes around the DMZ. Particularly important is the Axe Murder Incident of 18 August 1976, which permanently changed the organizational and spatial settings of the two parties in the JSA. Before the incident, the small area was a neutral territory where members on either side had free movement with military posts on both sides of the Military Demarcation Line. After the death of two U.S. officers and ensuing military confrontations, the MDL in the JSA was re-established, permanently separating physical contacts between two sides.

KEYWORDS: Korea, war, JSA, DMZ, borderline

Introduction

In the summer of 2015, North and South Korea faced another crisis around their borderline, fiercely criticizing each other and soon exchanging artillery shells. Considering that most of Seoul, the capital of South Korea, is within the North Korean artillery range, the situation was considered grave by the world (Fig.1). The tension on the peninsula escalated so rapidly that many global media outlets treated it as a major potential threat to the peace of the region and the world. Although the tension was defused within weeks through high level talks, the volatility of the peninsula was clearly recognized again. Since the end of the Korean War in July 1953, the borderline between North and South Korea has been viewed as one of the most dangerous places in the world.

The urban landscapes of Seoul or any other city in the peninsula may present their attractiveness in various ways, but it is unavoidable that each city and its architecture face this threat of unpredictable catastrophe. While many South Koreans appear almost indifferent to the various forms of periodic clashes between the north and the south, the gravity of the imminent danger is always there. As a matter of fact, this danger is the very basic condition of architectural and urban activities in South Korea. It is crucial to be aware of this situation before delving into any specific architectural or urban investigations. The omnipresent threat of confrontation along the borderline shapes the meaning of any architectural urban activity in the country.

This article, while seemingly unrelated to the scholarship of urban studies, can be read as an introduction to South Korean architecture and urbanism during the Cold War. Here, I examine the perilous condition of the borderline, and its spatial and political interconnectedness with global politics through the deadly incident in the Joint Security Area (JSA) in the Korean Demilitarized Zone (DMZ) in the 1970s. In doing so, I also explicate the meaning of spatial division and constant surveillance in the JSA and, to some degree, in the country.
DMZ and JSA

The Korean War began in June 1950 between North and South Korea, when a United Nations force, led by the United States, fought for the South and China, assisted by the Soviet Union, fought for the North. The war ended with the Korean Armistice signed at Panmunjom on 27th July 1953 after three years of massive destruction of both countries with several million casualties. Senior U.S. military officers, acting under the aegis of the Military Armistice Commission (MAC) of the United Nations Command (UNC), met with representatives of the Korean People’s Army (KPA) and, to a lesser degree, the Chinese People’s Volunteers. As a part of the Agreement, the DMZ was created. It is a strip of land crossing the entire Korean Peninsula, running along the 38th parallel north. It is a narrow line, 250km (160miles) long and approximately 4km (2.5miles) wide, serving as a buffer. Despite its name, it is the most heavily militarized border in the world.

The Armistice stipulates that its headquarters should be in the vicinity of Panmunjom. In addition, ‘The Military Armistice Commission may re-locate its headquarters at another point within the Demilitarized Zone by agreement of the senior members of both sides on the Commission.’ And it operates as ‘a joint organization without a chairman.’ The headquarters has been commonly called Panmunjom, or the Joint Security Area. All meetings between North Korea and the United Nations Command or South Korea happen here. This site is about 800 meters wide and roughly circular in shape. It is bisected by the Military Demarcation Line (MDL) separating South and North Korea.

The selection of Panmunjom as a negotiation venue was accidental. While negotiating with the United Nations Command in 1951, North Korea and China initially insisted to meet at Kaesung; however, ‘on October 7th, 1951, the North suggested Panmunjom as a meeting place. Officers of the two sides met and agreed on a circular demilitarized area in the vicinity of Panmunjom. It should be noted that the current location of Panmunjom is different from where the North and South met during the war. The present JSA is about one kilometer south of the historic place where the Armistice Agreement was signed. The North requested moving the meeting place to the current area after discovering that the original site was situated about one kilometer north of the MDL. The current site was selected after the war and new buildings were constructed by the North Koreans and the United Nations Command.

While there was little chance of physical contact between the North and the South in the DMZ, the situation of the JSA was quite the opposite. Here North Koreans had direct, constant daily physical contact with U.S. and South Korean military personnel in the JSA. The JSA was also the only place where the two sides were in consistent formal communication. Under the Armistice Agreement, free access and movement were guaranteed to personnel of both sides in the area.

A Poplar Tree and ‘Axe Murder Incident’

The critical change in the JSA happened 23 years later with the so-called Panmunjom Axe Murder of 1976. On 18th August 1976, the United Nation Command guards wanted to prune a poplar tree which blocked the view each summer between UN Checkpoint 3 and Checkpoint 5. Checkpoint 3 was close to the so-called ‘Bridge of No Return,’ the only entrance to Panmunjom from North Korea, while Checkpoint 5 was on a hill looking down on the bridge and Checkpoint 3. Due to its location, Checkpoint 3 was considered critical for the UNC. The Korean Service Corps (KSC) workers had trimmed the tree every year. It was on 6th August when four workers and four guards went to cut the tree. However, they were told by North Korean soldiers that they would be killed if they tried. The KSC employees cancelled the work and returned to their base.

Fig. 1: Image of Gwynne Dyer’s online article on the Crisis in the Korean Peninsula published in The Georgia Straight, 25 August 2015.
About 10:30am on 18th August, a UNC group consisting of five KSC workers, three UNC security officers and a seven-man security force arrived at the site of the tree again. Captain Arthur G. Bonifas and First Lieutenant Mark T. Barrett led the group. Because of the North Korean threat, the UNC team decided to trim only branches and not the tree itself. Soon after the work party had begun its task, two North Korean officers and nine North Korean soldiers came to the site by truck. One of the officers, Lt. Pak Chul, who was known to be belligerent and vicious, ordered that the work be stopped. When he was ignored by the working party, he sent reinforcements. Around 11:00am, ten more North Korean guards arrived by truck, followed by several more from two KPA guards post, raising the total to around 30 men. Lt. Pak put his watch into his pocket after wrapping it in a handkerchief and rolled up his sleeves. He, then, yelled ‘Kill!’ and kicked Capt. Bonifas in the groin. This was the beginning of a full-blown attack by the KPA guards on the UNC security force. The KPA guards charged in with clubs, metal pipes, pick handles, and axes taken from the work party. Capt. Bonifas was surrounded by at least five KPA guards, beaten to death. Lt. Barrett was beaten to death a few minutes later. This fiery melee lasted less than four minutes. The incident left two U.S. officers killed, one South Korean officer wounded, and four U.S. and four South Korean guards wounded. While there were many deaths in the DMZ, they were the first deaths in the JSA since the end of the Korean War.

Washington Special Actions Group

The Gerald Ford Administration of the United States wanted to show a strong response to the North Korean brutality. After being informed in the morning of 18th August 1976, the Secretary of State Henry Kissinger in Washington D.C. vowed ‘retaliatory action.’ That afternoon, the first meeting of the Washington Special Actions Group (WSAG) convened at the White House Situation Room to deal with the crisis. The group’s major purpose during the crisis situation was to develop options for the National Security Council (NSC) or presidential consideration. At the meeting, the chairperson of the group, Kissinger, and other participants agreed that the incident was a ‘deliberate provocation,’ although the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) did not judge that ‘the North had a major attack in mind.’ They concluded that North Korea carried out the brutality as part of their diplomatic efforts to draw international attention to the instability of the peninsula and to portray American forces as the main cause of the uncertainty. It was also believed that North Korea intended ‘to primarily agitate American public opinion’ over the issues of American troops in Korea, particularly ‘in the context of the U.S. election campaign.’ The incident occurred while Ronald Reagan was challenging Gerald Ford for the Republican presidential nomination at the party’s national conference in Kansas City, Missouri.

As a result of the meeting, the WSAG recommended that the president take certain military actions in addition to cutting the poplar tree right away. These military actions included the deployment of a squadron (10-20 aircraft) of F-4 fighter-bombers from Okinawa, a squadron of F-111 fighter-bombers from Idaho, the dispatching of the aircraft carrier USS Midway from Yokosuka, Japan, the training mission of B-52 Stratofortress long-range strategic bombers from Guam, and the raising of the defense alert status to DEFCON 3 (a condition midway between peacetime status and full wartime alert). Kissinger stated that ‘If we do nothing they will think of us as the paper tiger of Saigon.’ He added that ‘If we do nothing there might be another incident and then another.’ These comments clearly reflected the desperate efforts of the U.S. government to keep military and diplomatic control of Asia, in particular after the fall of South Vietnam in April 1975. While agreeing that the U.S. should do something, Deputy Defense Secretary William Clements questioned the effectiveness of cutting the poplar tree. To this comment, Kissinger countered that ‘if we do nothing they will do it again. We have to do something.’ As an alternative, Kissinger proposed an idea of destroying North Korean barracks outside the JSA. However, Clement was hesitant because ‘The North Koreans would certainly react violently.’ He instead suggested secretly infiltrating the coast and bombing some areas.

At the end of the meeting, Kissinger reminded the participants of the tree-cutting and military exercises that ‘the purpose of doing something is to show that we are ready to take risks. The trick is to do something from which they will back off.’ ‘The purpose of this exercise is to overawe them. We are 200 million people and they are 16 million.’
At 11:00am, 19th August, a DEFCON increase was declared in South Korea, initiating all sets of military actions by South Korean and U.S. forces. This was the first change in the local DEFCON based on events in Korea since 1953. Shortly thereafter, in Washington D.C., the Joint Chiefs of Staff were transmitting orders required to begin the show of force deployment. F-4s started to arrive, and soon all U.S. personnel were recalled from local leave and liberty. When South Korean and U.S. forces concentrated on the logistical and military actions for the plan approved by the President in Kansas City, North Korea promptly responded to the shift. The same day, North Korea went to a ‘war posture.’ However, this was essentially defensive in character and clearly marked its fear over possible U.S. military retaliation.

Cutting the Tree, or ‘Operation Paul Bunyan’

On 21st August, the operation to cut the tree began at 7a.m. It was named Operation Paul Bunyan (Fig. 2) after the giant lumberjack of American folklore. Sixteen U.S. Army Engineers were accompanied by a 30-man security platoon and 64 South Korean special force Taekwondo experts. Twenty-three vehicles brought them into the DMZ. Twenty-seven helicopters provided air support. As the ground unit moved into the JSA, the formidable B-52 Stratofortress long-range strategic bombers from Guam flew along the DMZ. Simultaneously, the aircraft carrier USS Midway and her task group of auxiliary vessels were in Korean waters with 40 combat aircraft onboard. This enormous firepower was much more than necessary to thoroughly destroy the JSA and its surrounding areas. It was entirely possible this could begin a new war in the Korean peninsula. With this preparation, the U.S. soldiers cut the tree and removed two North Korean road barriers, and the work party moved out of the JSA by 8:26am.

Responding to criticism of the tree-cutting, Assistant Secretary of State for East Asian and Pacific Affairs Arthur Hummel admitted that the WSAG were aware of ‘critical comments to the effects that we took massive and expensive military moves simply to cut down a tree.’ He argued that the military deployments and the tree-cutting achieved two different goals. The military augmentations were preparative deployments to deter any larger military threat from North Korea, and the tree-cutting operation was to uphold the rights of the UNC in the JSA to help insure the future safety of its personnel.

A few hours after the completion of Operation Paul Bunyan, the senior member of the North Korean MAC team proposed a meeting. There, the North Korean leader Kim Il-Sung replied to the UNC’s protest of 19th August:

It was a good thing that no big incident occurred at Panmunjom for a long period. However, it is regretful that an incident occurred in the Joint Security Area, Panmunjom this time. An effort must be made so that such incidents may not recur in the future. For this purpose both sides should makes efforts. We urge your side to prevent the provocation. Our side will never provoke first, but take self-defensive measures only when provocation occurs. This is our consistent stand.

While Kim’s response was ambiguous and diplomatic, the fact that he directly engaged in the situation was unusual. On 25th August, the next MAC meeting took place. Here, the UNC senior member, following instructions from Washington, admitted that the expression of ‘regret’ in Kim’s message was not enough but a positive step. In addition, the UNC called for the punishment of those KPA guards responsible for the murders and insisted on assurances that safety of UNC personnel in the JSA be preserved. The KPA Senior Member responded that the KPA’s position on the issues was already expressed in Kim’s message. Then, he offered a proposal calling for the physical separation of UNC and KPA security force personnel within the JSA by adhering to the MDL, which bisects the area.
Overall, Kissinger and others in Washington D.C. were generally satisfied with the tree-cutting operation. In a telegram to American Ambassador to South Korea Richard L. Sneider, Kissinger revealed his evaluation of Operation Paul Bunyan and its impact on the North:

The North Koreans have clearly been taken aback. Militarily, they have done little more than take defensive precautions against our build-up. In the JSA they stood by and watched the tree-cutting without raising a finger. Kim Il-Sung has sent an apologetic message on the August 18 incident. Their whole attitude in recent meetings in the JSA has been subdued and business-like.25

Sneider’s observation was accurate. Right after the incident, the North Koreans behaved more restrained and unusually cautious. Clearly, the enormous military campaign and tree-cutting was effective in preventing North Korea from provoking more violence. In fact, all these efforts were much more than ordinary military operations. It was no wonder that Kissinger stated that he had ‘never seen the North Koreans so scared.’26

Facing overwhelming show of military forces by the U.S. in the middle of the borderline, North Korea tried to avoid any risk of possible devastation. This proposal of physical separation was made by the UNC in 1970 and was then picked up by the North Koreans.27 However, it meant more. Since the UNC had no guard post to the north of the MDL, KPA was virtually suggesting the unilateral dismantlement of four of their guard posts located in the south of the line in the JSA.28 This was clearly another concession made by the North. Negotiations on the issue of physical separation proceeded smoothly and quickly. On 6th September, the MAC secretaries signed a ‘Supplement’ introducing the new security arrangements for the JSA as agreed by both sides. A political scientist, John K. C. Oh, stated that ‘What was striking was that the accord, which technically supplements the 1953 truce agreement, was so quickly reached and implemented and that the show of force by the United States quietly ceased.’29

Now, by confining the North and the South into respective areas, the chance of physical contact between them except in the conference building was virtually eliminated. Obviously, this new arrangement appeared to be a convincing safeguard for unpredictable physical conflicts in the JSA.

A New Line in the JSA

The MDL within the Conference Buildings’ site in the JSA was marked only by cement pavement, 50cm wide and 5cm high. This site covers the seven buildings on the MDL and a yard surrounding them and also includes areas 10m from the building of the western end and 10m from the building of the eastern end. In the other part of the JSA, it was marked by concrete posts each 10cm thick and 1m high erected at intervals of 10m.30 Now, ‘All military personnel, including the security personnel in the Joint Security Area, shall not go into the area of the other side crossing the Military Demarcation Line in the Joint Security Area.’31

The Deputy Assistant to the President for National Security Affairs William Hyland sent a memorandum to President Ford, reporting the new agreement with North Korea about new regulations for the JSA the following day. Hyland stated that the negotiation would ‘bring the incident to a close on very favorable terms.’ He reported that the North Korean attempt to enhance their position at the Non-Aligned Conference then in Colombo, Sri Lanka, ended in a clear setback to the county’s international image and a loss of ‘face’ in the Far East, due to the resolution of the U.S. response.32

The U.S. clearly recognized it as a major military and diplomatic victory against North Korea. Following the signing of the agreement on September 6th, the U.S. and South Korean governments issued a joint statement:

The two Governments believe that the new arrangement, restricting movement of military personnel of both sides to their respective portions of the Joint Security Area, eliminating contact in the JSA infringing on personal safety, and removing the North Korean guard posts from the UNC [United Nations Command] side of the JSA, are realistic and constructive steps which when implemented will better assure the security of personnel of both sides in the Joint Security Area.33

Now, by confining the North and the South into respective areas, the chance of physical contact between them except in the conference building was virtually eliminated. Obviously, this new arrangement appeared to be a convincing safeguard for unpredictable physical conflicts in the JSA.

The Operation Paul Bunyan had a risk of severe crisis escalation. It could trigger a full-blown
The poplar tree which blocked the view between UNC check points was gone. A new line, resulting from the negotiations between North Korean and the U.S., was constructed. This new line prevented daily physical contact between the two sides. Chaotic interactions in the JSA were replaced by physical separation and visual observation, and the violent, physical contacts were replaced by continuous mutual surveillance. With this new arrangement in the JSA, the crisis appeared to be entirely over. There were almost no incidents in the following eight years until the sudden exchange of fire due to a Russian defector on 23rd November 1984. When Vasily Matuzok on a North Korean-sponsored tour in the JSA bolted for the southern sector, six North Korean guards, soon joined by two dozen more soldiers, penetrated about 100 yards into southern territory. North Korean soldiers and about 80 South Korean and U.S. soldiers exchanged fire for about 40 minutes, leaving three North Korean soldiers and one South Korean soldier dead and wounding many on both sides.

The volatility in the JSA and in the DMZ did not disappear with the physical separation of the two opposing parties, but became different. It is entirely possible now that any little event around the borderlines can trigger a series of chain reactions and lead to a calamity. A random yet fatal event can happen within mainly confined areas of the borderlines, and it can put tens of millions of lives under immediate danger in the Korean peninsula. However, as seen in the incident of 1976 in the JSA, the decision-making process goes far beyond the geographical boundaries. Living under the threat of imminent catastrophe is a basic condition of life in the JSA and, more broadly, in South Korea.
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In the nineteenth century, the politics of imperialism brought transnational geographies of the entire planet into focus. In 1881, in his book Hopes and Fears for Art: The Prospects for Architecture in Civilization, British writer William Morris abstracted that architecture had to find a new role in the face of the challenges of modernity. “A great subject truly, for it embraces the consideration of the whole external surroundings of the life of man; we cannot escape from it if we would so long as we are part of civilization, for it means the molding and altering to human needs of the very face of the earth itself, except in the outermost desert.” At stake was nothing more than the affairs of Western reason with the totality of the world questioning territories and nation states as pre-constituted geographical units; “peopling the desert; for breaking down the walls between nation and nation; and the earth we tread on.”

At the beginning of the twentieth century, architects confronted the world with the realities of World War I. In their critique they saw potential in expanding narrowly defined territorial delimitations with what they referred to as “Weltbauen.”

Translated from the German as world-building or world-making, Bruno Taut and Hermann Sörgel, amongst others, envisioned Weltbauen as an extension of the agency of architecture in which they employed territorial scales to give Gestalt to new geographies somewhere between the cosmos and earth, and utopia and reality. Partly engineering and partly utopian in meaning, Weltbauen recovered a geographically aligned aesthetic from the long intellectual and political history of modernity. The idea was to not only disengage architecture from history and place, but to move it beyond geographical constraints into a new dialogue that could restructure the entire planet.

In the light of these challenges, Weltbauen reconceptualised territories with geographically articulated designs that advocated new world orders built upon the rewriting of the surface of the earth. In fact, it referred to more than William Morris’ concept of the totality of planning across the entire planet. I argue, Weltbauen rescaled the relationships between nature, city and territory, and envisioned new operational geographies through the lens of architecture.

This paper turns to the early twentieth-century self-proclaimed “Weltbauermeister” in an attempt to recast our understanding of the relationships between transnational geographies, form and
territory in which architecture contains territory, and extends itself through it. In contention are questions of the restructuring of transnational territories, and how architecture as an expanded and geographically inspired idea structures, shapes and produces new territories and transnational systems. Through the lens of the critique of ideological, geopolitical and technotopian orders, this paper contextualizes Weltbauer Bruno Taut’s *Alpine Architecture* and Hermann Sörgel’s *Atlantropa* projects questioning central concepts and motives of the twentieth-century that were forged by its *Weltanschauungen* [worldviews] and seeking to illuminate the relationships between territory, world-making, and architectural form.

In his book *Alpine Architecture*, Bruno Taut critically interrogated the social metabolisms of the early twentieth century with the aim to recontextualise entire geographies synthesizing society with territory by the means of architecture. After a gruelling World War I, he proposed to engage with the world through a new lens that imagined new territories reflecting properties intrinsic to nature, which he saw as the foundation of living together. The war united architects in search for chiliastic hope, cosmic depth, pacifistic spirit, and technology that could not be abused by war. He envisioned architecture in its own right as an empathetic interpretation of natural forms. In fact, he argued radical visions were necessary to make “earth a good dwelling.”

He imagined buildings and mountains as living organisms that are capable of transcending life with architecture and the entire planet. Taut’s mission also matched his conception of the agency of the architect: “Building, when all is said and done, is the recognition of matter and the abolition of all contradiction between it and mind. The architect becomes demiurge, the demiurge architect.”

For example, in his theatrical performance *Der Weltbaumeister*, he drafted a scenario in which he sought to represent the creative principles of the world at work. His proposal for the global reconstruction performed a double function: “first, the process of construction itself could be seen as a pacifist statement, and, second, the completed reconstructions would be silent memorials proclaiming an end to the folly of war-time destruction.”

Inspired by artists, his work mainly resonated with writer and theorist Paul Scheerbart. According to Taut, Scheerbart was the true architect of *Alpine Architecture*. His *Weltanschauung* echoed with Taut’s ideas and set the foundation for his concepts to restructure Earth based on principles of nature and geometry. In his science fiction novel, *Rakkóx der Billionär*, Scheerbart envisioned architecture on a scale unknown to the world at the time; he proposed the transformation of entire mountain ranges into triangulated landscapes of empathy. Taut translated Scheerbart’s imaginations into a world of spiritual architecture that not only transcended people and territories, but had the aspiration to unite “normal everyday people (Volk) with an infinite, mystical, transcendent reality connected by the way of the spirit (Geist).”

However, if Scheerbart was the father of the subject and apostle of Taut’s moral compass – his ideology was reflected in formal properties intrinsic to nature – it was philosopher and psychologist Gustav Theodor Fechner who “provided the aesthetic and philosophical framework for Taut’s dramatization of the world of form.” Fechner’s materialistic perspective, shaped by Darwin and Haeckel, saw everything, including every natural appearance, embedded in relation to larger contexts. In his view, “the eye of God and the consciousness behind it are inscrutable to us … why not consider the senses of sight and touch – despite their division in the mundane world into countless individual points of view – as the workings of God, a superordinate consciousness of which the denizens of the Earth are merely a part and whose wholeness they, being parts, are unable to comprehend.”

His understanding of the world was based on natural laws as modes of an unfolding of God’s perfection. He imagined the entire globe as a single great eye contained with all individual points of view in the mundane world transcending.

But ultimately, it was Friedrich Nietzsche’s “perspectivism” that determined Taut’s ideology of form, beauty and vision. In his novel *Thus Spoke Zarathustra*, Nietzsche told the story of Zarathustra who lived in a perilous solitude of the mountains. It was the purity of the icy heights of the peaks that stood in stark contrast to the conditions in the metropolis – an indication for Nietzsche’s anticipation of the hostility to all things urban that characterized the period. However, Nietzsche’s understanding of society, culture and politics was not calling for an external relationship of architecture, as Taut envisioned, it was his sense for beauty that determined his *Weltdenken* [world-thinking] that externalized architecture from the
environment, and enabled it to disengage from history; that made the scenery of the Alps the ideal geography to accomplish these rather ambitious trajectories. Rugged angles and polished surfaces characterized the forms and aesthetics of his depictions. Nietzsche’s influence on Taut was so big that he even annotated his sketches with quotes from his work: “The time may come when man has the power … to play with mountains as a child plays with sand. To create works of art as high as the Himalaya, formed from his imagination as the jeweller forms a casket for his jewels, perforated like lace, with stone used like metal, forest and field like jewels, glaciers like pearls, and water like crystal.”

According to Taut, the crystalline aesthetic recovered the critical relationship between ethical geographies, cultural and national identities, and the role of humankind. His drawings reconceptualised the role of the body as object and how this aesthetic may inflect, define or resist the territorial scale; typically the artist assigns everything to its place and light casts its radiance over all: “The earth itself sparkles with the new; as the impossible becomes possible, “hard” reality yields up miracles.” However, the timelessness and the absence of the human object in his drawings were by no means meant as an antihumanist gesture. On the contrary, the territories he transformed addressed the very changes of society external to nature. His fusion of territory and architecture represented the change of nature and society: “That is, this man made nature does more than just signify a new political man. The change itself, the public’s engagement in this reconstruction, is the means to a new peaceful condition.”

A sense of urgency in the “reterritorialization”, or as a matter of fact “deterриториализация” of the planet after the war also motivated the architect engineer Hermann Sörgel. The mastermind behind Atlantropa proposed the complete restructuring of the culturally and politically complex Mediterranean. In his geographically inspired vision, Sörgel, contrary to Taut, saw in technology an ally. Based on Sörgel’s understanding of the world he could not imagine that human beings alone were capable of accomplishing macro-transformations of the surface of the Earth. In fact, he argued for technology and engineering to achieve unprecedented accomplishments. In his eyes technology no longer misused by the war could not only give positive impulses in transforming the globe, but also help Atlantropa become reality.

What started as an exhibition in the early 1930s in Germany and Switzerland became one of the boldest architectural visions ever seen. Sörgel presented a scheme on such a grand scale that it even outshined the fantasies of a novelist like Jules Verne. Atlantropa, which was first known as "Panropa," was a proposition that restructured the entire Mediterranean region, from the Western Mediterranean and the Straits of Gibraltar to Israel in the East, and from Northern Italy to the Sahara desert in Africa. A 35-kilometer-long dam in the Straits of Gibraltar was the key element of his design and disconnected the water supply from the Atlantic Ocean to the Mediterranean Sea. As a result, Atlantropa was born and created a new super-geography of what was once known as the Mediterranean.

His idea of a gigantic dam set the foundation for a project that gradually dried up the Mediterranean Sea and reduced the water level by over 200 meters. The territory affected by this shrinkage was the largest geographical transformation ever imagined. Sörgel’s vision created up to 600,000 square kilometers of new arable land where the sea had been. At the core of his designs were several trans-Mediterranean arteries that supported the flow of people, cars, trains, and natural resources between Europe, the Eurasian peninsula west of the Ural Mountains and Persia, including the Arabian...
He proposed infrastructural systems on never before seen dimensions; he essentially completely restructured and envisioned the entire Mediterranean geography, by actually eliminating it. Nothing that once characterized the region remained the same; his project effaced the region’s complex systems, and disengaged it from history to enter a new dialogue that was determined by world-making. It seems as if by eliminating such a complex cultural ecosystem, and replacing it with new infrastructures, environmental systems, and distributions of capacities and power the meaning of transnational geographies, architecture and form entered a new era.15

Not only the reconceptualization of citizenship – Sörgel wasn’t primarily interested in who would be the people populating these new territories – played a role, but also the new role of borders or boundaries. Sörgel operated within these frameworks focusing on the idea that Atlantropa would become a new geopolitical force and resource-driven supercontinent.

With the Great Depression, World War I, and a looming World War II, Europe was in desperate need of a vision for the future. Sörgel’s angle on the problem was not only to change the geography of the entire Mediterranean, but also of the transformation of the African continent. European racist ideologies of that time saw Africa as an empty continent devoid of history and culture. For him, it was always integrated in his geopolitical considerations and part of his belief in technology’s political power. His vision was an alternative to anything ever imagined, and with the larger geopolitical goal of venturing deep into the Congo Basin to secure the vast natural resources of Africa with European engineering, he turned Africa into a “territory useful to Europe.”16

At a time in which apocalyptic visions determined the Zeitgeist and the politics of imperialism were dominant, Sörgel placed his project within larger geopolitical orders. Part of his ideological foundation followed a social Darwinist and colonialist school of thought, declaring, “the fight for survival is a fight for territory.”17 His plans for Atlantropa aimed to revolutionize the north-south connection between Europe and Africa, and convert the global west-east imbalance into a “harmonious coexistence” of the three A’s: America, Asia, and Atlantropa, which he considered Kontinentale Grossräume (continental megaspaces) that would coexist in a new world order of supercontinents. As a result, Atlantropa not only completely obliterated the Mediterranean, but it completely sacrificed its cultural complexity for the promise of continental European economic security and energy independence.

In its early stages, Atlantropa was created in the political context of the Pan-European Union, founded in 1923. The assembly brought together by the Austrian (geo)-politician Richard Coudenhove-Kalergi sought political unification of the European continent after the devastating First World War. When in 1929, Sörgel’s vision took on the name Panropa, he wanted to emphasize its close connection to the Pan-European Union. However, in 1932 Sörgel replaced Panropa with the official project name, Atlantropa, to avoid confusion with the Pan-European Union. He changed the name primarily because he did not believe in the Union’s ideological principles, national identities and interests, and disagreed with Coudenhove-Kalergi politically and morally. Sörgel believed that only an economic union could bring Europe together, and
advertised the guaranteed profit of Atlantropa and its economic benefits and energy independence. The change of name was also an expression of the ways in which Sörgel’s geopolitical ambitions went far beyond Coudenhove-Kalergi’s organization. 

Atlantropa, the term invented by Sörgel, meant new territory at the Atlantic Ocean [Festland am Atlantik], and stood for the idea of politically and geographically uniting Europe with Africa into a supercontinent of tomorrow.

It was his interest in geography that shaped his Weltanschauung. German geographer Friedrich Ratzel and philosopher Oswald Spengler were elemental to Sörgel’s self-assessment as Weltbauer. Both shaped this understanding in very different ways. Ratzel was fundamental to Sörgel’s concept of an architect as possessing a chiliastic spirit that liberated him to aim for cosmic depth, and a pacifist spirit that aspired to create new borders. Ratzel’s theory was that of der Staat als Organismus [the state as organism], in which he equated dams, autobahns, railways, and bridges to the digestive and circulatory systems in natural organisms. Ratzel argued that the more extensively and qualitatively these systems were built, the more the organism, the Lebensraum [living environment] of a nation-state, would thrive.

Spengler, on the other hand, had a much deeper and more personal influence on Oswald Spengler were elemental to Sörgel’s self-assessment as Weltbauer. Both shaped this understanding in very different ways. Ratzel was fundamental to Sörgel’s concept of an architect as possessing a chiliastic spirit that liberated him to aim for cosmic depth, and a pacifist spirit that aspired to create new borders. Ratzel’s theory was that of der Staat als Organismus [the state as organism], in which he equated dams, autobahns, railways, and bridges to the digestive and circulatory systems in natural organisms. Ratzel argued that the more extensively and qualitatively these systems were built, the more the organism, the Lebensraum [living environment] of a nation-state, would thrive.

Spengler published his book, Der Untergang des Abendlandes [The Decline of the West], whose pessimistic prophecies about the extinction of western culture through “civilization” and “overpopulation” captured Sörgel’s attention. Sörgel, however, had a more positive outlook and believed in the technical advancements of modern societies. He shared Spengler’s critique of the nineteenth century and that uncontrollably growing urban environments were a sign of weakness of western civilizations. While Spengler looked at technology as a demonic force that destroyed culture, Sörgel believed in technical and artistic urban planning solutions for the future. In one of his countless publications, and movies, Atlantropa: Der neue Erdteil, Das Land der Zukunft [Atlantropa: The New Continent, Land of the Future], Sörgel responded to the Spenglerian despair of civilization with his engineering megalomania and the desire to solve all major problems of the European continent.

Forged between Europe and Africa, his transnational supercontinent in the Mediterranean did not only challenge anything ever imagined technologically, but it also was a massive public works project in which he promised it would relieve the unemployment crisis on the entire continent after the war. He was convinced that in order to remain globally competitive with the technologically and economically advanced United States, and an emerging Pan-Asia continent, Europe needed to be self-sufficient, which required possession of territories in all climate zones.

In conclusion, in the aftermath of World War I, with the entire planet as emerging subject, new discourses about the role and extend of architecture were formulated, and radically new territories were discovered somewhere between utopia and macro-scale engineering. Weltbaumeister Bruno Taut and Hermann Sörgel reconceptualised the relationships between architecture and territory in which they saw new models of transnational and techno-environmental geographies emerging. In contention were not only the terms of morphological characteristics of new territories, or as a result its forms and aesthetics, but also the metamorphosis of the agencies that shape it.

The critical evaluation of Taut and Sörgel’s approach gives perspective to our ability to recognize, deconstruct, or counteract more recent incarnations of environmental transformations in theory and practice. The way Weltbauen redefined aesthetics and trajectories, both, as an investigation and geographically infused practice, illuminates deeper conflicts between the environment, matters of territorial autonomy, world-making and form. I argue Taut and Sörgel used Weltbauen as a position against the isolationism of the taken-for-granted scheme of the “urbanization of the territory”. Weltbauen functioned as a framework of the “territorialisation of the urban” and unearthed systems, materialistic and territorial characteristics that addressed the political significance of the spaces between the “urban and non-urban”17, or as a matter of fact, between the resource-hinterland, nature and the “urban fabric.” Further, Weltbauen was concerned about a world separated into two distinct political systems based on too much focus on the metropolis and the ramifications of its overpopulation. Alpine Architecture, as well as Atlantropa addressed the political divisions between the urban and non-urban, the national and transnational, and unearthed critical perspectives
of global design recovering inequalities and the distribution of capacities and power. Weltbauen addressed the political significance of the transnationalisation of territories and the territorialisation of the urban, and foregrounded systems and aesthetics of territories in which the urban and non-urban were blended into operational geographies for the consumption of ethics and aesthetics (Alpine Architecture) and resource production (Atlantropa).

Taut aestheticized the hinterland as geography with an external relationship to architecture. He demanded that the extension of architecture as a force resisted the larger technologization of society and transformation of nature into a commodity. However, the externalized aesthetic of his crystalline mountains did not simply represent the redesign of nature as an anarchist event in which he envisioned new architectural forms that aligned, if not redefined, entire geographies, but he symbolically determined new architectural autonomies within the territory.

For both, Taut and Sörgel, the territories they envisioned were a production of a combination of architectural concepts and architectural matter. However, Alpine Architecture and Atlantropa are not the outcomes of other territories. Rather, they explore the very nature of territory, with all its political, economical, social, environmental and cultural systems, as they attempt to recode their surroundings, and ultimately reshape the world ‘in their own color’ as they remain autonomous in the world (within the world). Taut and Sörgel’s visions about the relationship between their territories and “the rest” were largely aligned as they provide an intellectual foundation for new discourses. Yet, Taut and Sörgel’s visions reveal the limits of technotopian ideologies and their ability to reshape socio-spatial structures and its relationships to architectural form. The distance between the spheres in which they operated as Weltbaumeister became less significant than the environment that held them together – distance and scale were not indicators or even relevant to the human body, agency, or the relationship between technology and the environment, of either proximity or separation; neither Bruno Taut nor Hermann Sörgel engaged with one of the long-standing principle metaphors for architecture. The way they replaced it, and the way they regarded the body as “agent” or “agency,” offers an opportunity to consider the metaphorical, theoretical, and praxis based impact on architecture both as metaphor for epistemology, and as practice aspiring a reformulation of aesthetic assumptions and geopolitical relations upon which the totality of urbanism and transnationalism rests today.
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19. His plan had the objective to position Europe as a sustainable global player among the US, Great Britain – which he believed could not maintain its empire in the long run – and Asia – still a mystery to Europeans – his plan was to produce infinite amounts of electric power.


Introduction
During the process of Greece’s post-war modernization in the early 1950s, political agendas prioritized urban development. In the metropolitan area of Athens, the reconstruction policies, partly-financed by the Marshall Plan, focused on important urban renewal projects, which had a two-fold goal: to construct Athens’s modern image, and to reappropriate its ancient past and its natural beauty. These aspirations were expressed by contradictory approaches in the management of the Attic landscape. On the one hand, the unprecedented sprawl of the Greek typology apartment building (the polykatoikia unit), or the covering of important ancient streams in order to construct new highways, reveal a tendency to depreciate its existing physical background. On the other hand, projects that focused on the restoration of the Athenian topography, such as the unification of the archaeological sites through landscape projects, manifest a more “sustainable” approach. The above mentioned reconstruction policies also caused conflicting views among the theory and practice of Greek architects of the era. The paper underlines the intertwinement of State reconstruction policies and architectural approaches in the early post-WWII management of the landscape of Athens, and examines it through the lens of today’s current theme of sustainability and contemplates how they still characterize recent “grand” development projects such as those for the Olympic Games of 2004.
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architecture, first came up in the 70’s as an antidote to obsolescence’s temporality and waste production and – along with the ecological movements of that time – initially introduced the ideas of conservation of natural and human-made resources, environmentalism and adaptive reuse. However, some forerunners of sustainability had already emerged since the 1950s and expressed through the ideas of historic preservation, vernacularism and ecologically sensitive approaches. Abramson analyzes how obsolescence and sustainability, such contradictory paradigms of change, coexist in architectural culture. The paper highlights the coexistence of these – yet premature by that time but critical today – conflicting terms in the perception and the construction of the early post-war Athenian landscape.

By examining various types and scales of landscape interventions (from housing projects to road networks and archaeological sites) and simultaneously their reception by architects and intellectuals accounted in personal or public debates of that time, the paper also underlines the entanglement of the modernization processes with the diverse ideologies reflected in the cultural values attributed to the landscape.

The paper also contemplates how such interpretations that lay principally on the fact that Athens should encompass its – recent and ancient – past with the promise of a modern metropolis still underlie in contemporary “grand” development projects such those for the Olympic Games of 2004 in Athens.

The **polykatoikia** unit and the **antiparochi** system as paradigms of change in the urban landscape of Athens

There could be no analysis of the urban development during the early post-war years of Athens’ reconstruction that doesn’t refer to the particular phenomenon of the **polykatoikia** unit and the **antiparochi** system that came up as a solution to the rapid increase of population and shaped dramatically the Athenian cityscape. They also serve as an original model of obsolescence that depicts how change was conceptualized in the existing urban condition. **Polykatoikia** – the Greek typical housing block unit – had already come up as an (architect-designed) Greek version of the maison-domino in the interwar period producing some typical modernist examples, but in the post-war period it was produced primarily and massively by small builders and developers as the product of the **antiparochi** (part-exchange) system: depending on negotiation from both sides, the plot-owner would exchange its property with one or more apartments in the new housing block that the contractor would in turn construct. **Antiparochi** served a direct triangular contract between the landowner, the contractor and the prospective buyers, that responded to the demanding housing needs without the state involvement and the need of bank financing. Since then, housing construction based on private funding has played the role of a driving force in the Greek economy and was not based on the existing market, but instead created its own.

The expansion of **polykatoikia** has a very indicative example of Abramson’s definition of obsolescence as a capitalist model of urban change, with its subsequent benefit to the economic development. It also manifests a depreciation and expendability of the existing urban background depicted in multiple levels: the spread of **polykatoikia** and the embrace of a modern international way of life signalled an obsolescence of the past-way of domestic life which was followed by the demolition of vernacular or neoclassical Athenian small houses erasing memory and small scale from the urban landscape. Thus, the **polykatoikia** phenomenon invaded the existing urban fabric but also to the surrounding hills and – along with the lack of any particular master plan regulation – transformed the cityscape to a forest of **polykatoikias** (Figure 1).

Though rather immature and fragmentary at that time, some first voices of resistance by architects, artists and intellectuals expressed oppositions about the loss of the vernacular “Greek” typical house and instead the domination of this uniform form of housing, with the subsequent impact on the city’s physical environment: In 1950, architect Aris Konstantinidis published a small book “the Old Athenian Houses”, a manifesto which documents and praises the typology of the vernacular Athenian houses constructed in great numbers during the nineteenth century. Konstantinidis’ book and drawings serve as a parable by which he expressed his concerns towards contemporary mainstream residential architecture in Greece. Furthermore, Yannis Tsarouchis’ paintings in the beginning of the ’50s of old neoclassical buildings might have
seemed romantic and conservative, but they also were a critique against their gradual disappearance and the environmentally harmful ways of new construction, long before the popularization and finally the legitimation of the idea of preservation of these historic buildings in the 1970’s. The above turns towards vernacularism could be acknowledged as a “prehistoric” sustainable approach.

Networks infrastructure in the process of Athens’ modernization

Apart from the promotion of the private initiative, the state reconstruction policies also prioritized important public infrastructure work, partly-financed by the Marshall Plan for the European Reconstruction: various scales and types of road and pedestrian networks were implemented in Athens that served for both the development of industry, tourism and transportation and that belong to a broader effort to transform Athens to a modern metropolis and “revive” the beauty of ancient areas. This bipolar image could not be reconciled under one strategy, thus the divergent approaches only reveal the oscillation between a rationalistic approach that disregarded the existing landscape in the name of modernization and a restorative perception of the Athenian topography.

During the early 1950s, the ministry of public works constructed some important road networks such as the national highway that linked Athens to Thessaloniki, on which the industrial zone of the city was placed, and new urban motorways, that linked the city centre with the recreational seafront. During these procedures the physical and historical background was often declared obsolete: an indicative example is the covering of river Ilissos – an ancient river running in the centre of Athens – in the process of the construction of the avenue that linked the centre of Athens with the seafront (Figure 2). The covering of the river caused many reactions as in the case of the Academy of Athens, which opposed it on the grounds of the historic importance of the river.

Another ancient river, Kifissos, was among the natural resources that were gradually deteriorated in post-war years. Particularly, the southwest part of it was “caged” in the industrial zone of Athens whose growth was unregulated. The absence of any state control for the development of the industrial area and the management of industrial waste caused their shedding to the river.

On the other hand, some state-funded important pedestrian network and landscape projects aimed to highlight and connect the ancient monuments with their surrounding natural landscape. These projects managed the physical environment from a completely different perspective: The ministry of public works carried out projects such as the major undertaking of landscaping and unifying of the Zappeion Conference area, the National Gardens and the restoration of the temple of Olympian Zeus archaeological site that also included the restoration of the original form of the landscape along the river Ilissos (in this case the ancient river was not considered obsolete)!

Fig. 1: Contemporary view of Athens-scape. Source: http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Athens,_Greece_%283473123784%29.jpg

Fig. 2: View of Kallirois Avenue in the beginning of the 1960s. Part of Ilissos river was covered. Source: http://buenos-athens.blogspot.com/2011/06/60.html
that architect Dimitris Pikionis was commissioned with the “grand” project of the landscaping of the areas around the Acropolis and Philopappou hills (1951-59). Although extensively analysed by the architectural historiography as an important moment of critical regionalism, Pikionis’ approach also contains an exemplary sensitivity in the management of the landscape, a pre-narrative of ecologism: Pikionis composed an improvisational mosaic of materials with different patterns and from different ages, some of which were found during the excavation in situ, respecting the characteristics of the existing topography. The project adapts perfectly to the surrounding landscape and creates the illusion of a “naturally” (not human) made intervention. His approach, in regard with the previously mentioned opposite depreciating attitude towards the landscape, is felicitously described by Kenneth Frampton: “…it is this almost ecological insistence on the interdependency of culture and nature, which gives Pikionis’ work a critical edge that is relevant today as it was twenty years ago. For it repudiates our habitual fixation on the freestanding technical and/or aesthetic object, not to mention our destructive, Promethean attitude towards nature that once was beneficial but now is assuming the ominous dimensions of a tragic legacy.”

The Committee for the Protection of the Greek landscape as an architects’ institution

Though it was not yet realized by the state institutions, the concern for the preservation of the landscape in the process of the rapid and uncontrolled modernization was one of the burning issues since the beginning of the 1950s among the Greek architects’ public debates. On November 11, 1953, during a meeting of the representatives of the Technical Chamber of Greece (T.C.O.), architect Vagianos suggested that the protection of the Greek landscape was a vital issue of great national and cultural importance, and that the engineers should take action towards that goal. He also added that: “The Ilissos river, which has been connected with Greek mythology, has become a conduit”. This led to the direct formation of the Committee for the Protection of the Greek landscape (1953-54), whose founding members where eminent architects but also poets such as Odysseas Elytis, later Nobel laureate. The Committee evolved to a permanent institution and, after a short pause, was reformed to the National Landscape Committee (NLC) (1954-86). The objective of the Committee was the study and the surveillance for the preservation of the Greek landscape, which included the premonition of the public opinion about the need to protect the landscape. It also prompted the appropriate political institutions for the measures need to be taken. During its first meetings, a number of current issues – some of which already discussed in this paper – were highlighted: the “unnatural” and parasitic expansion of urban areas, the preservation of the ancient pedestrian route of Panathinaia and the restriction of circulation on the west road around Acropolis. Therefore, since then, the multifarious composition of the Committee provoked some apparent contradictions in the perception of the landscape along with the modernization processes. This was mainly expressed by an oscillation between a romantic idealization of the existing (principally historically rooted) landscape that was often criticized as an anachronistic and unrealistic objection to development and on the other hand a tendency of managerialism, an effort of some members of the Committee to undertake the grand projects. Indicative of the above conflicting situation is the famous speech of Dimitris Pikionis at the open meeting of the Committee, on May 1954, titled “the Dishonor of Gea” and on the other hand the perspective of Kostas Kitsikis. Pikionis talked in a metaphorical and often metaphysical tone of the value of the sacred Attic landscape and its violent alteration by projects such as the quarries. Meanwhile, a few years later, at 1957, Kostas Kitsikis, one of the founding members of the Committee began to publish ARXITEKTONIKI, the first Greek architectural periodical which aspired to become a key consultant in the country’s urban planning issues. The conservation of the landscape was one of the primary subjects of the journal since the first issue, where projects such as the town-planning for the Athens’ basin and proposals for the redesigning of the city center were presented. However, Kitsikis’ perception of the landscape seems to gradually distance itself from that of Pikionis, which was manifested clearly on the second issue of the journal, where he expressed his zealous support to the national cause behind the reconstruction policies and where “any romanticism about the landscape was obviously missing”. Such conflicting views which reflect the bipolar
foundations of the Committee caused a delay in its effectiveness. Eventually, the Committee was confined to an ethical rhetoric and didn’t manage to keep up with the pace of urban and architectural transformations of the landscape. Though it was fighting against obsolescence, the Committee became itself obsolete.

1950s and 2000s, Athens amid two reconstructions: some concluding remarks

All the above instances offer a narrative of the “entangled” interpretations of modernization that have shaped the post-war Greek cityscape since. However, looking back at them, one cannot help but thinking how these conflicting approaches to development still characterize contemporary urban renewal projects, especially recent “grand” projects such as those for Olympic games of 2004 in Athens, and how, respectively, the issues of obsolescence and sustainability in the management of the Athenian landscape still co-exist: the continuing densification — or as it is often called the “cementing” — of the urban space and the domination of polykatoikias in the image of the city, the covering of Kifissos’ mouth, in order to construct the Olympic roundabout, and the interruption of Hymettus hill for the construction of Attiki Odos ring road, with its consequent disturbance of the surrounding ecosystem and on the other hand the completion and extension of the unification of archaeological sites consisted some indicative examples where the parallelism with the early ’50s is profound. Meanwhile, the architects’ society still oscillated between rejecting and opportunistically endorsing the rhetoric of development. The above “recycled” history brings in mind of the “necessity in a vibrant architectural culture both for radical change and simultaneously resistance to it”.
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20. However, we shouldn’t neglect its significant role in the designation of the boundaries of the historic and archaeological areas of Athens.

The utility as well as the amusement that a civilized and qualified play can grant the spectator was little known to us, as the most necessary for it, the stage itself, was missing [...]. His Majesty [...] has not only authorised a [...] well-ordered theatre for the Ofen Fortress, but has also [financed one] [...]. This is how we had [...] one of the lordliest Temples for Germany’s dramatic muse.

This quotation, taken from the Theater Kalender for 1788 (published in Gotha, Bavaria), celebrates the opening of the theatre in Ofen (Buda, Hungary), built between 1786-7. By providing one of the most extensive theatre building’s description in the German theatrical press of the time, and by being published in a new journal section entitled ‘New Theatre Buildings’, this presentation of the theatre building in Ofen is one of the first recognition marks of theatre architecture’s integration in the theatrical arts.

Furthermore, the quotation points out the role assigned to ‘theatre spaces’ in the reform of theatre arts. Defined in 1731 by Gottsched and in 1750 by Lessing, the reformed, ‘educative’ theatre was introduced in Viennese circles in 1761. Beginning with the censorship decree written by Sonnenfels and promulgated by Josef II in 1770, theatre as a ‘morality’ school (Sittenschule) is officially promoted by the Habsburg court. Even though theoretical texts framing the reform are not concerned with architecture, this quotation, as well as other documents I shall refer to, prove that an appropriate space was seen as a precondition for a “civilized” theatrical activity.

Eventually, this description suggests the widespread media coverage of Central European theatres as well as a form of competition between these “temples for Germany’s dramatic muse”. Peter Heßelmann has shown that the content of German theatrical periodicals after 1750 extended well beyond the political borders of the Holy Roman Empire and Habsburg Monarchy, enclosing every city presenting a German theatre in a cultural community often-called ‘Germany’. This cultural geography was also highly ideological, since in the rhetoric of the German press it represented an...
enlightened territory supposed to push further east the limits of “Civilized Europe”. This very interest in the Habsburg Monarchy’s ideological manipulations of the entangled geographies of German theatres and Civilized Enlightened Europe caused the case-study selection for this paper.

Regarding to the German theatres’ shifting geographies, apart from Ofen and Pressburg (Bratislava, nowadays Slovakia), the urban centres dealt with in this paper had a peripheral position. By highlighting several criteria defining the role and reception given to three contemporary theatres built in free royal cities, the aim of this study is to show how the cities’ administrative status and their geographical location towards the political centre of the Habsburg Monarchy modulated the official discourses on the theatre buildings’ social usefulness as well as their reception in the press of the time.

Ofen-theatre projects date from 1785-7, shortly after the city regained its status as capital-city of the Kingdom of Hungary (1784). When the theatre was built (1786-90), Kaschau (Košice, nowadays Slovakia) was housing the Chamber of Zips (Spiš), whose administrator, Count Mihály Sztáray, was the main supporter of the theatre’s project. In Hermannstadt (Sibiu, nowadays Romania), the capital of the Principality of Transylvania, the theatre was built in 1787-8 by a local book-printer by Governor Count György Bánnffy’s initiative.

Reform of German theatre and its impact on the Kingdom of Hungary and Principality of Transylvania have been extensively studied. Theatre historians have frequently pointed out to the simultaneous emergence of theatre reform, theatrical press, and permanent theatres buildings. Yet, neither these first buildings nor their perceptions in contemporary writings have made the object of a detailed study. Hungarian, Slovak, and Romanian architectural historiographies focus mostly on nineteenth-century theatres. This paper tries to overcome the apparent discrepancy between theatrical- and architectural-historiographies by analysing the variations occurring in formal and functional requirements for theatre buildings as expressed in building projects submitted to the authorities, as well as in press articles and travel journals dating from 1774-98. Until now only press and travel journals have been studied extensively, mainly by theatre historians, while official correspondence regarding theatre constructions have only been partially studied. These sources were mostly used for monographic purposes, whilst their rhetoric has not been studied yet.

Starting in the 1770s, the theatre was presented in both media as a proof of urbanity and of an educated society. The majority of theatre-building demands, dating from 1774-93, insist on the advantages a stone theatre can grant to urban society. Linking the leisure, moral, and educative role of the theatre to its financial advantages, and even to city embellishment, arguments invoked by official documents integrate the theatre in a broader reflection on a ‘well-organised’ city, influenced by cameral-sciences writings such as those of J. H. G. v. Justi (1756-60) and J. v. Sonnenfels (1765). Instead, theatrical press – as principal vector of the theatre’s reform ideals – focused on the educative role of the theatre.

Theatre director’s project
The first demand for a theatre in Ofen, submitted on 25 July 1785 to the Lieutenancy Council by the theatre-troupe director Franz Heinrich Bulla, introduced the theatre enterprise as a civilization marker, by complaining that Pest and Ofen, ‘nevertheless civilized cities’, do not have a theatre in winter. Whereas this expression recalls the dichotomy between civilized/uncivilized Europe, the arguments invoked in the second demand (19 August 1786) also refer to the city’s administrative status. Here, the utility of ‘the well-organised theatre in Ofen and in Pest’ is justified by the statement that ‘every capital-city in civilized Europe satisfied its desire and need for the theatre’. Theatre, as an attribute for a capital-city, reappears several times in this document, as it compares entrepreneurial statuses of Pest and Ofen theatres with those of the Monarchy’s other ‘capital-cities’, mentioning Hermannstadt and Temeschwar (Timișoara, nowadays Romania). These arguments suggest the director’s intention to insert theatre enterprise on a double symbolic hierarchy: the one of ‘Civilized Europe’s and the one of Habsburg Monarchy’s provincial capitals.

After evoking that theatre ‘educat[es] reason, customs, language, and moral feeling’, F. H. Bulla insists on the importance of an appropriate space by claiming that ‘the finer parts of the public refused to go to any […] instructive play in the [old] Ofen theatre since, the best of the acting or
singing efforts are wasted.’ However, the ‘decent theatre’ Bulla asks for is not a freestanding building, nor even a separate building, but the rebuilding of the former Carmelite refectory or church. His requirements exclusively deal with interior space: heating, phonic and visual isolation from the outside, and a semi-circular auditorium. It may seem striking that, in a period when the auditorium form was an important topic elsewhere in Europe, Bulla’s demand was the only official document I found to mention the benefits of the semicircular form.

Bulla’s disinterest in the exterior shape of the building recalls the viewpoints expressed in the travel journal (1793) of another theatre director, Ch. Seipp, during his stay in Kaschau: ‘When [writers] want a durable Temple to be built for the Goddess [Thalia], they want a city to maintain continuous theatre. They do not want the city to gather […] masons, carpenters and equipments in order to build a magnificent Temple […]. The Goddess is the Art and the Temple is the Money […].’ This ambivalent conception of a ‘well-organised theatre’ essential for a reformed theatrical activity and for a ‘civilized capital’, yet still designed as an interior space, may well be representative of the status of theatre directors. Wishing to affirm the noble status of their profession, as opposed to ambulant actors, they invoked the educative role of their activity and its representative value for the city itself as an argument. On the other side, as they were concerned by financial aspects, they showed little interest in shaping a monumental appearance of their theatres.

Projects supported by authorities

In 1774, the Commissio Mixta authorised Count G. Csaky to build a theatre in Pressburg, arguing that, thanks to the theatre, the city ‘as a capital in Hungary’ would improve its ‘Public security’, ‘Convenience’, ‘Utility’ and ‘Decorum’. Do these qualities, inspired by cameral sciences, represent requirements from authorities for a theatre in a capital-city? Without any doubt, the Pressburg theatre, the only freestanding theatre in the Kingdom of Hungary at the time, designed with a U-shaped auditorium, possessing several entrances and stairs, and grouping a theatre and a ballroom, was perceived that way. In his first travel journal, Ch. Seipp characterised it as ‘worthy for a capital-city’, whilst in his History of the theatre in Pressburg (1793), he complains about the difficulty of maintaining a ‘magnificent’ building appropriate only ‘for a city where Court, Nobles and rich inhabitants’ live, at a time when Ofen had already become capital-city. Also the public authorities in Ofen associated the Pressburg theatre with capital cities as proven by the first project for the Ofen theatre, eventually
abandoned due to its unaffordable costs. In this unrealized project drawn by the court and Hofkammer (court chamber) chief architect Franz Anton Hillebrandt and supported by the Court Chancellery and Emperor (July 1785), Pressburg theatre appears as a model for size and distribution.

Even though the final project (Figure 1), made by the court councillor and inventor Wolfgang von Kempelen, consisted in the rebuilding of the Carmelite Convent’s former church, documents prove the Emperor’s interest in an explicit typological reconversion: ‘the church, which must lose the form of a church both on the exterior and in the interior, […] [is] to be rebuilt into a Theatre’. This reconversion was perceived as successful in the Theater Kalender: ‘the formless machine [sic] of a former church was reshaped into one of the nicest theatres through the most precise distribution’.

The projects for Ofen theatre, supported by the public authorities, suggest that, in the authorities’ conception, a complex and typologically identifiable theatre was a necessity in a capital-city.

Are typologically-identifiable theatres reserved to capital-cities?

The hypothesis that in this period such a theatre was not only a necessity, but also an exclusive right for capital-cities is suggested by correspondence regarding the building of a theatre in Klagenfurt in 1787. The argument invoked by local Estates was precisely that ‘theatre entertainment, relaxing and educating the public, is not only useful, but even indispensable in a capital-city’. The very same argument served to the Emperor to refuse the project: ‘since Klagenfurt is not a capital, it is not suitable to build there a new theatre’.

As a matter of fact, almost all freestanding, newly-built theatres of the Monarchy were situated in capital-cities. In the Eastern lands, the only exception is the theatre in Kaschau supported by the Zips Chamber Administration. Built in 1786-90 according to the plans of first Hofkammer architect Josef Tallherr, it was a freestanding building composed of two symmetrical parts, one reserved to the theatre, designed with a U-shaped auditorium, and the other one to a coffeehouse and a dance hall. However, the first demands (5-6 May 1786) focus on the rebuilding of the old coffeehouse occasionally used for theatrical representations. The theatre, the dance hall and shops were presented as mere parts of the coffeehouse project. As a consequence, the arguments invoked here are above all economical, showing no significant distinction between the benefits provided by the coffeehouse and by the theatre: ‘attracting actors’, ‘foreigners’, and ‘nobles’, the theatre and the coffeehouse ‘encourage money circulation’ and contribute to the city’s ‘utility, […] education, and civilization’.

Despite being one of the most complex theatre buildings in Eastern provinces (overtaken only by the ones in Pressburg and Ofen), the press echo of this theatre, counting two mentions by Ch. Seipp in the Theater Kalender in Gotha (1788-91), was poorer than the one for Hermannstadt theatre. Instead, Ch. Seipp, in his Travel Journal, states the inappropriateness of this ‘very beautiful, freestanding theatre’ for the peripheral position of the city: ‘a good theatre company will never come to Kaschau. Where should it come from? Where should it go to? (…) Time, place, and circumstances are against such a building in Kaschau’.

As a matter of fact, the city was seen by theatre directors merely as a pause in their journey between two provincial capitals of the Monarchy, as Kaschau was on the route going from Pressburg and Ofen to Hermannstadt, Temeschwar or Lemberg (Lviv, Ukraine).

Unlike the theatre in Kaschau, the reception given by theatrical press to the Hermannstadt theatre was rather rich and pleasant. If the Allgemeine deutsche Theaterzeitung (Pressburg, 1798) described it as ‘worthy of a capital’, a local publication claimed that the Transylvanian capital ‘shines with a theatre that can be counted among the most excellent ones in Germany’. However, its entrepreneurial organization and architecture did not present any of the features of the capital-cities’ theatres referred to before.

From an entrepreneurial point of view, the project had a mixed character. Initiated in 1787 by the Governor of the Principality of Transylvania Count György Bánffy (1787-822), the theatre-building enterprise was officially given to Martin Hochmeister, a local book-printer. Mentioned in the Gubernium, the Hofkammer and Chancellery archives, the intervention of the governor left only a brief mention in a minute book of the municipality. For municipality, the theatre enterprise was an ‘entertainment of the local
Noblesse’ and interesting only under its economic dimension, as shown in the contract signed with M. Hochmeister⁴⁰. Both local press and historiography contributed to spread the image of a theatre built by the local book-printer⁴¹.

Even if counted among the most outstanding ‘buildings’ in the city⁴², this theatre consisted in a rebuilding of the interior of the so-called thick fortification tower, dating from the 16th century (Figure 2). Since initial plans made by General Count Dominico Fabris⁴³ are lost, the only sources for the aspect of the building before 1800 are the descriptions published in the press and in Ch. Seipp’s travel-journal. Whereas the interior received positive descriptions, the entrance and exterior seem to have been left unfinished for several years⁴⁴.

Hence, the reception given to this theatre seems to be established by the capital-city status of Hermannstadt, and by the presence there of the qualified theatre company of Ch. Seipp, rather than by its architectural qualities. The theatre director was presented in the Neues Theater Journal für Deutschland (Leipzig, 1789) as a man capable to integrate the Hermannstadt stage among ‘the first ones of Europe’⁴⁵. If this article foresees a good placement for this theatre in a European cultural hierarchy, a letter sent by Seipp to Theater Kalender (1790) points out also the peripheral setting of this provincial capital-city, by describing the Governor as an ‘important protector [of the German theatre] in the farthest regions of civilized Europe’⁴⁶.

Concluding note

Regardless of whether evoking the periphery of “Civilized Europe” (Hermannstadt), the attraction of strangers as a civilizing factor (Kaschau) or “the capitals of civilized Europe” (Ofen), obviously the goal of these discourses is to improve the theatres’ placement both in a Habsburg Monarchy’s and European’s symbolic urban hierarchy. The official acknowledgment of the theatre’s representative role in a civilized capital-city is proved by the projects and reception of the Ofen theatre, and eventually by the insistence on the coffeehouse rather than on the theatre in the building demand from Kaschau.

In this regard, the construction here of a complex building is an attempt to improve the city’s position in this symbolic hierarchy. The descriptions emphasising the qualities of the Hermannstadt theatre had the same purpose.

The western travellers’ perception of the Eastern Habsburg lands as peripheral to “Enlightened Europe” was explained by Larry Wolff as a conception centred on the western Enlightenment model⁴⁷. In order to explain the reasons for assuming this peripheral setting in locally produced documents one should point out notably to the manner in which German theatrical press disseminated the equivalence established between German theatre and Enlightenment. If one recalls that, in 1791, the Theater Kalender had praised the settlement of Weilhammer’s theatre company in Agram (Zagreb, Croatia) as a ‘sign that Enlightenment and Taste for the theatre do not have strangers anymore even in the farthest regions of Germany’⁴⁸, it becomes evident that, in this period, [German] theatre had become synonymous with Enlightenment for German theatrical press. As Rahul Markovits has proved it, in the 18th Century the equivalence between French theatre and Enlightenment was central to strategies of dissemination of French theatre in Europe, and to French construction of the notion of a “civilized Europe”⁴⁹. The reception given to the three theatres in theatrical press, as well as in official documents might suggest the elaboration of a similar ideology in German theatrical press at a time when most important German courts, in Vienna and in Berlin, were renouncing their French theatre ensembles in order to promote German theatre.

In the Habsburg Monarchy, the representative value assigned to theatre buildings in capital-cites is closely connected to the rehabilitation of the German theatre in the Vienna court, leading to the renaming of Hoftheater to Nationaltheater (1776). As Karstens proved it, Nationaltheater served for the Habsburgs as a political statement meant to reinforce Vienna’s status in the Holy Roman Empire, presenting this city not only as the residence of the Emperor of the Holy Empire, but also as a cultural capital⁵⁰. Consequently, the theatre was used in order both to reinforce the status of Vienna in Europe, and to present German theatre as an Enlightenment factor in the multilingual provinces of the Monarchy.

Therefore, the uses made in the documents analysed in this paper of the terms “Civilization”, “Enlightenment”, “Europe”, “farthest region”, “capital-city”, directly echoed the complex
relationship between theatre buildings and urban, cultural and political hierarchy in the context of the Habsburg Monarchy’s ambitions in late eighteenth century.
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**Introduction**

Relations between exhibitions as events, within which affirmation (or denial) of a certain system of values occurs, and architecture as a disciplinary field can be defined as the relationship of discursive dependence. Within the framework of such relations, exhibition as the institutional framework and architecture both as an object and subject for the articulation of social reality, these two terms are mutually interdependent and intertwined in the process of presenting architecture as a field which is related to and dependent on wider social, political, cultural and economic context. In this research, exhibitions will be considered primarily as enabling interaction between different identities, manifested through a selection of exhibits, their presentation, and their spatial arrangement and also through the selection and use of appropriate texts included in the accompanying catalogue. It is within this theoretical and historical background, that I will attempt to investigate the genesis of the exhibition “Serbian Architecture 1900–1970” and to interpret the exhibition content and its influence on the local architectural discourse. In addition, I will reconsider the ways within which the aforementioned exhibition has participated in the creation and promotion of new ideas in architecture, overlapping the shifts within the broader philosophical, political, cultural debates and technological innovations, in the 1970s Yugoslavia.

**Architecture exhibitions between social systems and cultural values**

In general architecture, exhibitions are challenging and suitable for research primarily due to the fact that, very often, they have been dually determined - as part of the activities of professional associations of the architects on one, and as part of the institutional activities and cultural practices on the other side. Therefore architecture exhibitions can be observed as representatives of the social systems and their cultural values. By creating an insight in the history of architecture exhibition, an opportunity is provided to evaluate and understand architecture both as a separate cultural field and discipline, and also as the profession of architects.
Researching both aspects means investigating at the same time processes that define these as well as their broader social role within a certain period. This study is based on the assumption that the cultural and art productions, including building industry, architecture and urbanism can be ‘read’ both as an expression and also as a critique of the social and political context in which they are conceived and developed.4

Insight into the exhibition “Serbian Architecture 1900 – 1970”, which was organized and performed under the institutional framework of the Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade, between 24 March and 14 May 1972, will enable better and deeper understanding of the architectural practices in Yugoslavia during the 1970s.5 Complex social and political surroundings that have largely determined the context of the exhibition were becoming more visible in the fields of art, architecture and everyday events.6 Having this in mind the exhibition is not only seen as a form of independent diffusion of culture, but also as a product of multiple influences and various factors, which have emerged in the process of its organization. Considering that this exhibition was being prepared for a period of two years, more precisely since 1970, its final form and content are the results of intentions, desires, limitations, and (im)possibilities of a wider range of participants – curators, authors of the displayed objects (architects), financiers, politicians, museum professionals, among others, which collaborated with each other in the process of professional, artistic and scientific research that preceded the exhibition. Various studies on the practices of the architecture exhibitions, especially during the early twentieth century, have shown us that there is a specific relationship between specialized events of display in the form of architecture exhibitions, their intervention in various media and real, everyday perception of space and architecture.7 By analysing the nature of exhibitions and their role in the field of architecture, one can conclude that it is through the exhibition as a medium that alternative histories of architecture can be detected and displayed. Within this context, history is interpreted as a constructed narrative based on the events that constitute a change in the understanding of architecture (history of architecture) and in its form of presentation (history of exhibitions).

Exhibition narratives through history of exhibitions or exhibitions of history

The practice of organizing architecture exhibitions, as supporting or independent events, existed in Serbia, later Yugoslavia,8 from the nineteenth century onwards. Following the example of other European countries, the beginning of the twentieth century was marked by the participation of Serbia in international exhibitions in which architects were often responsible for the design of the exhibition pavilion project and the exhibition settings. With the development of the project of Serbian, and later of Yugoslavian state (first in the form of monarchy between 1918-1941, and after the WWII in the form of federal socialist republic) the related institutions and events that were supposed to support the project were also developed.9 The practice of organizing exhibitions continued after World War II and after the change of socio-political system in Yugoslavia, from monarchy to republic. Although exhibitions were formally the same or similar to the exhibitions that had been organized before the war, the new situation changed their content so they presented conflicts and differences that were present on the social, cultural and artistic scene. In Yugoslavia, during the 1950s and 1960s, there were many events with the character of an exhibition and among them a large number of domestic and foreign exhibitions. The processes of “opening” and “closing” in the foreign policy influenced cultural policies of Yugoslavia in the post war period and made it necessary to (dis)connect the Yugoslav art with the rest of the world, and exhibitions were a perfect opportunity to do so. Activities on architecture exhibitions have continued, although with reduced intensity and of lesser importance during the 1970s and 1980s although the focus of the exhibitions was more geared towards domestic rather than to the international public. In all these events, architects and architecture played an active and important role, and architecture exhibitions were more than once confirmed as a space for criticism and formation of public opinion in which it is possible to propagate the desirable ideas and values.

Socio-historical and cultural context of the exhibition “Serbian Architecture 1900–1970”

The period from the late 1950s and early 1960s is referred to as a time of rapid development of
Yugoslavia, which is accompanied by urbanisation and intense building activities throughout the country until the first economic reforms in 1965.10 Decisions that were envisaged within the framework of economic reform have slowed down the development of building activities in the country, primarily because the reform predicted the ban on investments in buildings with non-economic or non-productive activities.11 In reviewing the 1960s architecture in Yugoslavia some architecture critics said that: ‘on the global stage of architecture, some important and long dominant trends are coming to an end and new tendencies in architecture will shift faster in the world than they will catch firm roots in our country’.12 While outlining events, architects and ideas that marked this period globally, it is noted that ‘extraordinary publicity of all these tendencies in the world’s architectural publications is reaching out to us and it will be during the 1970s that these ideas will have a very strong and beneficial impact on the architectural practice in Yugoslavia’.13

In comparison to earlier periods, architecture from the 1970s offers quite diversified images regarding ideas and built works. This is the consequence of the intense building activities worldwide on one side, and ‘a certain conceptual and aesthetic pluralism that developed from the resistance against ideological dogmatism and uniformity of architectural thinking’14. According to Žarko Domijan, aesthetic pluralism, which will appear as a reaction to former architectural uniformity of opinion, will be developed over this period and will have an influence on the dissolution of the dogmas that prevailed until then in architectural discourse.15 Parallel with this process it will enable promotion of postmodern architecture, which will be the subject of various explanations by different theorist in various researches.16 During the analysis of the 1970s in Yugoslavia, one should bear in mind that this period was characterized by exceptional intensity in building that was conceived on the false increase of economic opportunities as a result of uncontrolled rise of foreign debt.17 However, economic prosperity, even if it was constructed on false representations because it was not based on the real economic growth, does not match the state of the architecture discourse of that period. While considering this issue Ivan Štraus said that pretentious realizations that prevailed in this period, do not correspond to the ‘economic potential of the city or region in which they are constructed’.18

Based on previous studies, it is clear that the exhibition in question is prepared at a time of a change, reversal and formation of different value systems. Although one can say that at that time, Yugoslavia was on the “periphery” of world events, it is unlikely that such large shifts at the global level have not had the impact on events in the country. Also inside, the country significantly altered in political, cultural and economic terms thus causing shifts in the entire society. With significant changes to the Constitution of Yugoslavia of 1963, along with constitutional amendments of 1967, 1968 and 1971, began the processes of transformation of Yugoslav society that will have implications on all spheres of life. In this period leaderships of socialist Republics strengthened and Federal government and at the same time federal policies and strategies were weakened.

**Conceptual framework of the exhibition – between displayed and imagined**

In the beginning of the 1970s, within the Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade, Miodrag Protic, at that time the director of the museum, began preparations for the organization of the exhibition which will be realized two years later under the name of ‘Serbian Architecture 1900–1970’.19 The exhibition was designed as a programmatic upgrade of museum activities, becoming the first exhibition regarding exclusively the subject of architecture. In combination with the performance abilities of the Museum of Contemporary Art, as a newly established cultural institution, and exhibitions as places for exchanging and promoting ideas, an ideal environment was created for the consideration of architecture as a discipline within broader social events. According to Ješa Denegri, the exhibition is the result of the efforts of the Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade to expand its activities beyond the traditional art fields of painting and sculpture.20 While listing the reasons for organising the exhibition as a Museum activity, Denegri states that ‘Serbian architecture - as painting, graphics and sculpture deserves exhibition because of its interesting and insufficiently known genesis and because these kinds of exhibitions and accompanying catalogues are first of its kind’.21 The basic concept of the exhibition was historiographical and more precisely the exhibition was conceived as the first historical retrospective of
the Serbian architecture of the twentieth century, which aimed to present and highlight the cultural and social dimension of architecture during this period.22

The preparations for the exhibition, according to the data contained within the archives of the Museum of Contemporary Art started in the beginning of 1970 when the museum staff began to work on fundraising for the realization of the exhibition as well as the organization of expert committees which will be in charge for the selection and organization of the exhibition material.23 It is in this period that Miodrag Protić started its correspondence with various experts, economic and cultural organizations and participants.24

The conceptual proposal of the exhibition was done by Zoran Manević,25 while the final form and content of the exhibition were defined by an expert committee that was formed to organize the exhibition and which was composed of architects.26

Organizers of the exhibition planned to display a great number of architectural projects and built objects that have emerged in a long period of time, and because of that the content of the exhibition was divided into three parts – three sections which, in the words of Zoran Manević, should represent the three dominant periods of Serbian architecture in twentieth century: academicism, modernism and contemporary architecture. In order to accompany this division of the exhibition material according to space and time, objects were displayed on 37 panels with photographs of the objects, which were divided into three entities defined by the year of construction. Three groups of objects were identified: 1) objects that were built in the period of 1900-1930, 2) objects from the period of 1930-1950 and 3) the objects built in the period from 1950 to 1970.27

According to Miodrag Protić, conceptualized in this way, the exhibition shows three narratives – 1) the way that certain major European styles have transformed on the domestic soil under the influence of economic factors and practical social needs; 2) the way how the aspirations for national style were expressed; and 3) how important the role of creative thinking and creative processes in Serbian architecture in the twentieth century is, i.e. how building was transformed into architecture and how much of architecture regarded as technical and technological discipline was transformed into art.28

In fact, the aim of the exhibition was not only to show how certain styles are alternated in a certain period of time, but also to show the overall relations between particular society and architectural discourse. The exhibition itself, through a series of examples, should have presented a general picture of developmental trends of Serbian architecture in the first seven decades of the twentieth century and its links with social developments.29

After reviewing the texts from this period that accompanied the exhibition itself, as well as from subsequent publications that have considered this question, it is clear that the issue of Serbian national style definitely was in focus of the exhibition, and accompanying texts.30 Actualization of this issue is very interesting, especially if social context within which the exhibition itself was created is taken into account. This period at the beginning of the 1970s was marked by tumultuous events in the political, cultural and artistic scene within Yugoslavia and it is very likely that they left an important mark on the concept of the exhibition. The processes of transformation that are intensified in this period, especially in field of culture, probably led to a change in terminology, which resulted in the shift from ‘our, Yugoslav architecture’ that was in the intensive use during 1950s and 1960s,31 to the ‘republican architecture’ afterwards. In the post II World War period, the only legitimate way was to talk about Yugoslav or “our” architecture. In first two decades of socialist Yugoslavia there was a strong influence of federal state on republics, but it was minimized through years of political, social and economic reforms. With the beginning of the 1970s federal state was not as important as its units – republics, and the new more local narratives were constructed including the architecture.

Concluding note

By analysing the history of Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia in post WWII period, especially in few years that have preceded the exhibition, one could follow the line of events that have largely determined exhibition itself. Comparing these events taking place in the political, economic and cultural context of the time, it is obvious that some kind of identity shift took part in the late 1960s that resulted with the change of the narrative from ‘our’ or ‘Yugoslav architecture’ to local(national) or ‘republican’ architectures.32

Architecture exhibitions are positioned between the invention of ‘fantasy’ of unbuilt projects and the real of the built environment and as such
they can be used as generators of narrative(s), metaphors, images, representations and public relations. These events were used many times for propaganda, experimentation, presentation and historical investigations. This last group is especially important having in mind, that ‘whether they want to or not, historians or interpreters hold a position in the social disputes of their time. The perspective from which they view their subject is determined by the position they occupy among the social forces of the epoch.’ The exhibition named ‘Serbian Architecture 1900–1970’ lasted until 14 May 1972. However, the exhibition continued to ‘live’ after, through catalogues and reviews in magazines and through its presentation in other cities. At the same time, it became an inevitable object for studying the history of architecture in Yugoslavia (Serbia), at least for the part that was presented in the catalogue. Although its program and displays were simple, the effects of the exhibition were important as the construction and deconstruction of the ‘supranational’ identity of Yugoslavia have happened through the discursive cultural practices within the framework of exhibitions as well.
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Barely a decade old, Léonce Reynaud’s Gare du Nord (1845-6) had already been rendered obsolete by the explosion of rail traffic flowing in and out of Paris by the late-1850s. James de Rothschild, managing director of the Compagnie des chemins de fer du Nord, financed construction of its enlarged and aggrandized replacement in 1857, and Jacques-Ignace Hittorff’s Gare du Nord opened for service in 1864. German-born, Hittorff trained as an architect at Paris’ Académie des Beaux-arts and had already designed several of Paris’ most important public plazas and structures during the July Monarchy by the time Rothschild commissioned him to build what would become – and remains today – Europe’s busiest train station.

Hittorff’s design resulted in a monumental edifice, both in scale and conception. Its stone façade, 180 meters across, features paired, colossally scaled Ionic pilasters that frame round arches surmounted by pediments – two single arches at either end and a group of three under the larger central pediment (Figure 1). These five arches illuminate the reception hall while also housing fourteen allegorical statues, each representing a French city served by the trains departing from the station. Eight more statues allegorize international destinations along the top of the central pediment, with a ninth at its apex symbolizing Paris. Inside, the façade joins to the station’s enormous iron and glass central hall, 66 meters wide and 183 meters long (Figure 2). A skeleton composed of iron columns and beams forged in Scotland supports the massive rail shed. Clad substantially in glass to keep the space bright, the central hall’s use of these quintessentially modern, industrial materials made it exemplary of the most advanced building technologies available in the mid-19th century.

In combining the Classical forms articulating the façade with the forward-looking materials supporting the rail shed, Hittorff’s design for the Gare du Nord makes it exemplary of 19th-century historicism: what architects and critics of the Second Empire called eclecticism. Pioneered as a philosophical system during the Bourbon restoration (1814-30), Victor Cousin’s eclecticism sought to forge a centrist coalition out of the nation’s deeply fractured body politics through compromise. It became an ideological cornerstone of the July Monarchy’s juste milieu politics (1830-48), ‘seek[ing] to hold to a middle way, equally distant from the excesses of popular power and the abuses of royal power.’ Eclectic artists like Thomas Couture would apply the philosophy to painting, suggesting a composite French style ‘based above all on the
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ROME OR BABYLON? THE GARE DU NORD IN COMPETING NARRATIVES OF SECOND EMPIRE PARIS

Jacques Hittorff’s Gare du Nord exemplifies the triumph of architectural eclecticism during the Second Empire. An all-encompassing framework for constructing French identity, eclecticism became Napoléon III’s rubric to justify the transformation of Paris into a modern Rome: a cosmopolitan hub embracing diverse peoples and cultural forms. Combining Romanizing arches, Gothic-inspired statuary, a stone façade and an iron rail shed, the Gare du Nord would become one of Paris’ hubs of travel, commerce and cultural exchange. At the same time, an alternate narrative described Paris as a modern Babylon and its newly cosmopolitan complexion as weak – overrun by the influx of foreign peoples and forms. As the city’s gateways for commercial and cultural exchange, Paris’ new train stations took the blame for this new, chaotic state. Both in terms of form and function, critics argued that the Gare du Nord brought disorganization and incoherence to the French capital. Rome and Babylon thus became opposed models for either celebrating or denigrating Second Empire Paris.

Bradley Fratello
St. Louis Community College – Meramec
great art of ancient Greece, the Renaissance masters and the admirable Flemish school’. And Jules Michelet’s multi-volume *Histoire de France* would propose a hybrid origin for the nation, declaring that ‘France … is not composed of two principles. In her, the Celtic element has combined with the Roman, and makes but one with it.’ For Napoléon III and Georges Haussmann, the emperor’s Prefect of Paris, the complicated task of rebuilding the French capital would demote eclecticism still further: the philosophical principle turned ideological framework would, in their hands, become a practical ‘catch-all’ that could justify whichever solutions seemed most workable as they transformed Paris into the capital of the 19th century.

In the hands of Couture and Michelet, then, eclecticism manifested itself in terms of cultural geography: through assertions that France lay between the ancient, Classic Mediterranean cultures of Greece and Italy and the forward-looking ones of the North: England and Holland. It was a cultural dialog whose spatial implications dovetailed easily with the rapid expansion of rail travel in the middle decades of the 19th century. While the opening of the Manchester-Liverpool line officially ushered in the age of passenger travel by steam locomotive in 1830, continuous political upheaval slowed its growth in France for two decades. It would be 1842 before the July Monarchy established a public-private model on which France’s national rail network would be built, and the instability of that government’s last years delayed large-scale expansion of the system until the Second Empire. By 1855 however, private corporations like the Baron de Rothschild’s had exploded. Rail traffic increased fivefold in that decade and created an extensive network modelled on the Legrand Star: Alexis Victor Legrand’s plan that made Paris the hub for lines extending to the borders of France and beyond. It established the French capital not just at the centre of the national rail system, but as ‘the rendez-vous of all Europe’.

Rail travel thus prompted the same language of border crossings, hybridity and transnational experience that eclecticism did, encouraging the ebb and flow of people, goods and cultures beyond the nation’s borders.

‘Paris as Rome’: Official Narratives

‘Sire, it is our descendants who will reap the fruits of Your Majesty’s constant solicitude as regards the administration of Paris, who will find that among us, the nephew of Caesar renewed the Imperial City.’ Throughout the Second Empire, Baron Haussmann seized every opportunity to stroke the Emperor’s ego by reinforcing the link between Paris and imperial Rome. Serving as the obvious model for any imperial capital, the legacy of Rome cast a particularly long shadow over the Paris of ‘Napoléon le Petit’, whose namesake had ordered...
the construction of the Arc de Triomphe, the Vendôme Column and la Madeleine in his campaign to make the city the capital of a European empire that rivalled Caesar’s. But it would be Haussmann, as Napoléon III’s Prefect of Paris, who would truly modernise the city. From the cutting of broad new boulevards to the construction of modern sewers and aqueducts to the establishment of gas lighting, he would make Paris into the city of light.

Louis-Napoléon himself had begun using a Roman metaphor to justify his vision for a rebuilt Paris even before he became President of the Second Republic, an office he would dissolve in a coup d’état three years later. Humbled by his uncle’s overwhelming military achievements, Louis-Napoléon wrote in 1842 that his ambitions would be more akin to those of Augustus Caesar than to Julius: ‘I want to be a second Augustus, because Augustus … made Rome a city of marble.’

Like both Imperial and Papal Rome, he envisioned his new capital as a cosmopolitan hub: a centre in which art and science, present and past, would converge. Paris would be eclecticism writ large across the French landscape.

... all the wealth of the universe flowed into her treasury, and the luxury of the table was increased to a height almost incredible. The Romans ate of everything, from the grasshopper to the ostrich, from the dormouse to the wild boar … They brought African guinea fowl and truffles, Spanish rabbits, Greek pheasants and peacocks from the extremity of Asia. This was the Rome that eclectics admired, and that academically trained architects like Hittorff sought to emulate in transforming Paris: a cosmopolitan hub where the riches of the world came together. The Empire’s official journal, the Moniteur Universel, described the city’s new Boulevard de Sébastopol by comparing it to an ancient Roman predecessor, calling it an ‘endless perspective … beside which the Via Sacra of Rome pales.’

Rail traffic and the stations connecting a vast, modern network of passengers and goods became the quintessential symbol of Paris as a modern Rome. If all roads had led to the Rome, all rails would lead to the Paris, and the Gare du Nord’s façade reprised the theme of Constantine’s triple arch not once, but twice: in the three arches beneath the central pediment, and again with outermost arches of the façade flanking the central group. And attaching it to the modern rail shed simply reinforced the notion of Paris’ open, assimilative nature, capable of accommodating both old forms and new ones. Théophile Gautier romantically lauded train stations as ‘palaces of modern industry where the religion of the century is displayed … These cathedrals of the new humanity are the meeting points of nations, the centre where all converges, the nucleus of huge stars whose iron rays stretch out to the ends of the earth’. Amsterdam, Brussels, Berlin, Cologne, Frankfurt, London, Vienna and Warsaw, the statues adorning the central pediment of the Gare du Nord, assumed the positions and roles that the figures of ancient French kings had held on Gothic cathedrals like Notre Dame, and all of them would be within quick reach of the new station. Its decisively modern shed stood poised to greet arriving visitors and its staid granite façade embraced departing passengers.

‘Modern Babylon’: Alternative Discourse

While the government celebrated the new, cosmopolitan nature of Paris, its detractors...
proposed the metaphor of another ancient city to describe Haussmannization. Another generation would pass before Gustave Eiffel’s 300-meter tower would give the metaphor a worthy referent, but already in the 1850s and 1860s opponents of Paris’ transformation into an imperial capital denounced it as a modern-day Babylon. ‘It is obvious that the memory of Babylon and the Seven Wonders of the World … was not without influence on the embellishments of Paris.’

Babylon’s usefulness as a metaphor for a chaotic, disorganized cultural pluralism derives from God’s curse upon the city during the construction of the Tower of Babel:

> And the LORD came down to see the city and the tower, which the children of men built. And the LORD said, Behold, the people is one, and they have all one language; and this they begin to do: and now nothing will be restrained from them, which they have imagined to do. Go to, let us go down, and there confound their language, that they may not understand one another’s speech. So the LORD scattered them abroad from thence upon the face of all the earth: and they left off to build the city. Therefore is the name of it called Babel; because the LORD did there confound the language of all the earth: and from thence did the LORD scatter them abroad upon the face of all the earth. (Genesis 11: 5-9)

Michael Seymour has explored the historical resonance of Babylon as a metaphor for urban centres. He noted that its reputation as an ambitious, ruined city of decadence and sin has long transcended its location, and that more recently, in the twentieth century, artists have referenced Babylon to ‘reflect increasingly the concerns of a multicultural and multilingual world’. Mid-nineteenth century writings about Haussmann’s Paris, however, suggest that Seymour’s dating of the Babylonian metaphor to describe a multicultural, multilingual condition can be pushed back at least fifty years. In 1860, the Goncourts described Paris as ‘some American Babylon of the future,’ comparing the influx of foreigners, their languages and their cultural practices with the phenomenon of America’s rapidly diversifying immigrant culture. Theodore Child remarked that Paris’ new boulevards teemed with the people of the world dressed in an array of exotic fashions. On them, he found specimens of all the nationalities of the earth – Chinese, Japanese, Turks with fezes, Arabs enveloped in voluminous burnouses, Germans with blond hair, Brazilians with yellow skins and flaming eyes, Englishmen smoking pipes and wearing absurd caps…

Critics who derided Napoléon III’s regime as illegitimate heaped dispersion on his projects to modernize the capital, and Babylon offered a means of recasting official rhetoric that celebrated its globalisation. Instead of a strong, cosmopolitan hub capable of unifying an empire whose reach stretched beyond linguistic and cultural borders, it suggested that the ambitions of the Second Empire had produced a weak capital: that Paris was a mere intersection buffeted by foreign influences. “There is no such thing as a Parisian society, there are no such persons as Parisians. Paris is nothing but a nomad’s camp.”

Victor Fournel refused to sanction Haussmann’s new architecture, critiquing the new style explicitly in Babylonian terms:

> Confusion of languages has presided over these ambitious undertakings, and the great modern Babel – as professors of rhetoric call it – the city where all ideas, all beliefs and all passions clash in a contradictory melee, seems complacently mirrored in the chaos of disparate monuments.

Even in a single space, the capital’s newly renovated Bois du Boulogne, quiet and order seemed to have given way to chaos and confusion. The Bois had become, to critics, mingled with all languages, all the slang of Europe … English by its turf, Italian by its trails, German by its music, Dutch by its skates, Chinese by its lanterns, French by its ladies and gendarmes, the once quiet, rarely frequented Bois … is now the favorite meeting point of vanities, effronteries, pell-mell cosmopolitans.

Eugène Pelletan extended the metaphor to book length. Speaking of train stations and their effect on Paris, he offered a vision that directly contradicted Gautier’s. Not ‘cathedrals of the new humanity,’ train stations like the Gare du Nord, Pelletan argued, had transformed Paris into the crowded, confused terminus of the world – a French prototype for Ellis Island that fuelled the fire of Paris’ chaotic globalisation.

> Trains pour into this new Babylon ceaselessly, floods and floods of English, Russians, Germans,
Norwegians, Swedes, Danes, Dutch, Serbs, Bedouins, Croatians, Moldavians. And there was such a clogging of the sidewalk because of this foreign invasion that walkers had to queue up in the street as if at a show.29 The design of the station leant itself to critical dispersion as well. Unlike a more purely modernist structure like Victor Baltard’s contemporary design for Les Halles, the two components of the Gare du Nord could be recast less as a synthesis of old and new than as a disparate combination of elements lacking cohesion or purpose.

What strikes us immediately about this building is the lack of any relationship between its exterior and interior … If we examine the interior, we see clearly that the purpose was to satisfy bare necessities … As for the design of the façade, it would seem to have had an entirely different rationale; necessity has had little influence on it; neither the nature of the materials nor their function have governed the thickness of the walls; it is not the discipline of necessity which dictated the forms … [but] wild imaginativeness.30 Critics argued that instead of aesthetically communicating with one another, classical and modern forms spoke past one another at the Gare du Nord. Like the hordes of people passing through it, the station’s architectural elements connoted not synthesis, but culturally incoherent, misguided intentions.

Conclusion
Control of the narrative characterizing Second Empire Paris’ transformation into a cosmopolitan city slipped through the regime’s fingers. Countering official voices that claimed the Emperor had built a new Rome, Napoleon III’s critics heaped dispersion on his new capital by calling it a modern Babylon. Gothic and Roman, granite and iron, old and new, the Gare du Nord’s layers of hybridity easily accommodated both of these narratives. Rome and Babylon operated as 19th-century discursive frameworks that accommodated the era’s “cosmopolitics” and Hittorff’s Gare du Nord became a key battlefield on which that culture war raged in its time.31
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God is with us, understand ye all nations. These words of Prophet Isaias come to one’s mind, dear brothers, as this temple is being consecrated. Just ask yourselves: What was here a year ago? Nothing, an empty space. But today, here stands a magnificent temple. I will also ask you: What did we have, and were there any of us just a few years ago?

Bishop Tikhon (Bellavin) of the Aleutians and North America, on the consecration of the Holy Trinity Orthodox Church in Chicago, March 16, 1903.

On 16 March 1903, Russian Orthodox immigrants in Chicago’s Ukrainian neighborhood had gathered for the consecration of their new church — Holy Trinity Cathedral, designed by Louis Sullivan. The architectural genesis of this church ties it to the wooden structure of the Russian Pavilion at the Chicago’s World’s Columbian Exposition of 1893 (Fig. 1). The pavilion, designed by Ivan Ropet, shared stylistic and structural characteristics of a specific type of churches, serially constructed at stations along the new routes of Trans-Siberian Railway in 1890s and 1900s — a part of government policy of creating cheap and accessible places of Orthodox worship across vast territories of Russian Empire. Becoming a direct inspiration of Sullivan’s cathedral, the pavilion’s history continued beyond the Exposition. Its parts were later disassembled, moved to Streator, Illinois, and turned into a church (Fig. 2) where, until the 1960s, it served the religious needs of the local immigrant communities, mostly employed in the region’s coal-mining and glass industries. The late nineteenth century saw a steady stream of immigration to Illinois from the western regions of Russian Empire. Although lacking a well-developed administrative structure that the Catholic Church established in the United States, Russian Orthodox Church kept strong ties to diverse groups of immigrants through a practice of maintaining small parish churches in many of the newly created areas of compact Russian settlement. This paper examines ties between Russian Imperial religious ‘foreign’ policies, exemplified in immigrant churches in Illinois, and ‘domestic’ policies of a campaign of building churches alongside its new transportation

**MISSION IN STYLE: RUSSIAN ORTHODOXY AND CHURCH-BUILDING IN ILLINOIS**

The late nineteenth century was a period of an increased church-building on the part of Russian Orthodox Church, including overseas, in the areas of compact Russian settlement beyond the borders of the Empire. Most of the newly constructed churches were designed in the Russian Revival style, appropriating architectural heritage of medieval Russia. Although European cities such as Paris and Florence have more prominent examples of that building campaign, Chicago and some communities in Illinois also became home to structures whose style was unmistakably “Russian.”

Parts of the dismantled Russian pavilion from Chicago’s World’s Columbian Exposition of 1893, were moved to a smaller town in Illinois, Streator, forming the main part of a newly-constructed Russian Orthodox church. Yet within a decade, the building’s revivalist style started to be obliterated through successive renovations. In 1960s remnants of the Russian church were demolished and replaced by a modernist building. This paper examines immigrant Orthodox churches in the American Midwest in the context of the official imperial policies of Russification alongside Orthodoxy’s missionary activity. More specifically, the paper considers revivalist style as a means of constructing not only actual ecclesiastical architecture, but also an “authentically Russian” identity of the Orthodox immigrants to America.
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network in Siberia. What are implications of viewing the developments on the American soil through a prism of Russian colonization policies in Siberia? I suggest that replication of the building type exhibited at the Exposition was very much a part of larger policies of Russification employed across the Empire and well beyond it.

The American Midwest at the end of nineteenth century was a site of a major conflict between Roman Catholic hierarchy of the United States and immigrants from Subcarpathian Ukraine. Although Catholic, many Ukrainian immigrants adhered to the Byzantine Rite, which, unlike the Latin Roman Rite, allowed for married priesthood. American Roman Catholicism was in the midst of ‘Americanizing’ effort on the part of the hierarchy: a strong movement to eradicate ethnic parishes and create an image of Catholicism as a religion not exclusive to only immigrants: Germans, Irish, Italians, Polish and others. While the efforts were somewhat successful with immigrants from Northern and Central Europe, Eastern European Slavs such as Ukrainians proved to be more ‘insular.’ The existence of a married Catholic priesthood was a public relation problem for the Latin Rite Catholic hierarchs of a predominantly Northern European extraction. A conflict developed between a native Irishman, John Ireland, Archbishop of St. Paul in Minnesota (in 1888-1918), and a Slovakian-born Greek-Catholic priest, Father Alexis Toth (Tovt) (1853-1909), which led to the latter leaving the Catholic Church in 1891. Toth’s action provoked an outcry in the community and as many as 29000 Catholics of the Byzantine Rite left Catholic Church and were received in the Russian Orthodox Church over the next twenty years. Due to his polarizing policies, Archbishop Ireland became known as the ‘Father of the Orthodox Church in America,’ while Fr. Alexis Toth became a canonized saint of the Orthodoxy.

**Russian Orthodoxy in Chicago**

This ethno-religious conflict and a resultant missionary activity provided a context in which we can trace a trajectory of the Russian Orthodoxy in the Chicago area. The first Russian Orthodox parish was that of St. Vladimir (later known as Holy Trinity Cathedral), organized in 1882 somewhere on the North Noble Street, in a rented house. In 1892 this home church moved to a two-flat house at 13 Centre Avenue (now Racine Avenue) near Madison. Fr. Alexis Toth visited the parish of St. Vladimir and celebrated liturgy there on numerous occasions. Although in its very early days the parish was demographically diverse – consisting

---

**Fig. 1:** Russian Pavilion at the Chicago’s Columbian Exposition, by Ivan Ropet.  
Source: National Library of Russia, image no. 010117854.  

**Fig. 2:** Russian Orthodox Church of the Three Holy Hierarchs, Streator, IL, Photo from 1890s.  
Source: Streatorland Historical Society.
of immigrants from Galicia (Western Ukraine), Carpatho-Rusins, Greeks and Serbs – a predominant contingent was still from the Western borders of the Russian Empire and the Eastern territories of Austria-Hungary. The newly established St. Vladimir parish stressed a primacy of Church Slavonic liturgy above precise ethnic and regional divisions. Such vision attempted to substitute ethnocentric model, as practiced by the Greek immigrants in the United States, with an ‘ecclesiacentric’ model. For instance, held in the New York Deanery, parish records show that in the years 1901-1904 Chicago St. Vladimir’s counted among its members 321 Galician, 45 Russians, 12 Ugro-Russians, 220 Serbs and others, 55 Arabs and no Greeks. In comparison, a small parish of Three Hierarchs Russian Orthodox in Streator, IL, in the same books, lists 104 parishioners, all Ugro-Russians. Despite substantial Belarusian peasant immigration, and that of Russian intelligentsia, regional Ukrainian element persisted from the earliest years of the Chicago parish and the ‘descendants of the original Galician and Ugro-Russian parishioners remain the mainstay of the cathedral to this day.’

The Ukrainian ethnic predominance in the parish might explain a new location that Fr. John Kochurov envisioned for it to be in the Ukrainian Village neighborhood in Chicago. The area bordered a stretch of Milwaukee Avenue inhabited by Catholic and Orthodox Slavs from Western regions held by Russian Empire: Poles, Belarusians, and Ukrainians. In effect, it proved to be a perfect missionary territory for Russian Orthodoxy beyond the borders of the Empire. To substitute a decrepit two-flat on 13 Center Avenue rented for US$35 a month, parishioners started a fundraising campaign for a new church in 1898. The parish purchased four lots of vacant land on Leavitt and Haddon Streets for the total of US$5000 in 1899. The choice to design the new building unexpectedly fell on a famous American architect with no prior ties to Orthodox Church – Louis Sullivan. Construction of the church began in 1902 and already a year later, on 16 March 1903, the Cathedral of the Holy Trinity was consecrated by the Primate of Russian Orthodox Church in America, Bishop Tikhon (Belavin). In addition to the money collected among Orthodox parishioners, even Czar Nicholas II of Russia donated US$4000 from his personal funds. The project also intimately involved two wealthy Chicagoans: Harold Fowler McCormick Sr. and Charles R. Crane. Crane had already employed the architectural firm of Adler & Sullivan, and it appears that he, known as a Slavophile, might have suggested his own architect, Sullivan, to his Russian friend, Bishop Tikhon. Several aspects of the architectural genesis of Sullivan’s Holy Trinity tie the structure’s appearance to the Russian Imperial missionary policies in Siberia and beyond, in Chicago. A decade earlier, in 1893 Chicago’s World’s Columbian Exposition featured a Russian pavilion, designed by Ivan Pavlovich Ropet. Pavilion’s entrance was marked by an ornate polychrome carved wooden tower, structurally and stylistically very similar to Sullivan’s later building of the Holy Trinity. Sullivan, of course, worked on the Exposition’s White City, and would have had numerous opportunities to visit Russian pavilion both during its construction, exhibition, and dismantling. The style of Ropet’s pavilion is known as the Russian Revival, or Pseudo-Russian and Neo-Russian style, falling firmly within the phenomenon of nationalistic and historicist styles revival of the second half of nineteenth century. Although many contemporaries often disparagingly called the style Ропетовщина (Ropet’s stuff), it had an official approval of the cultural establishment and a widespread dissemination through governmental patronage.

To further explain and complicate the stylistic pedigree of the church, a Russian-American historian and scientist, Anatoly Bezkorovainy, suggested a possible influence of the late nineteenth-century Russian Orthodox wooden churches that were serially constructed at the stations along the new routes of the Trans-Siberian Railway in 1890s and 1900s. In conjunction with the World’s Columbian Exposition of 1893, Imperial Russian Ministry of Transportation published Siberia and the Great Siberian Railway the same year both in Russian and English. Its more illustrated version, The Guide to the Great Siberian Railway, was published by the same Ministry of Transportation in 1900, and also reprinted by Drake Publishers, Inc., New York, in English. Either of the books, if not all versions, would have likely been known to all three men involved in the construction of the Holy Trinity: Crane, Sullivan, and Bishop Tikhon. Richly illustrated with examples of ornate wooden churches, the Guide of 1900 would have further exposed Sullivan to a particular version of the Russian Revival Style as practiced by Ropet. The latter was directly and indirectly involved in the development of the easily-transportable, ready-
to assemble model of a small church for train stations. For instance, one Ropet’s colleagues and a fellow practitioner of the Russian Revival Style, Konstantin Lygin (1854-1932), designed some of the Siberian railroad churches in his capacity as an official architect for the Administration of the Middle-Siberian Railroad. The Emperor Alexander III Foundation sponsored construction of most of the railroad churches and schools in an effort to strengthen Orthodoxy and Russian rule in Siberia, while the heir to the Russian throne, future Nicholas II, was made the Head of the Committee of the Trans-Siberian Railroad. Thus the enterprise of the transportational expansion and strengthening of the Orthodoxy personally involved the Emperor and his son both in Siberia and in Chicago: Alexander was an admirer of Ropet and his architectural style, and Nicholas, as already mentioned, paid for the new Orthodox church in Chicago. Although Sullivan’s Holy Trinity was an attempt at creating a ‘Russian’ church on American soil from scratch, our next example took the idea of ready-made part assembly as practiced in Siberia to the test, this time also in Illinois.

After the closure of the Exposition, Russian pavilion was again dismantled, while its main part, in a deal secured by Fr. Kochurov, was moved to Streator, IL. Reassembled in Streator with newer parts, it became the Russian Orthodox church of the Three Hierarchs, serving a local Carpatho-Rusin community. Being involved in Orthodox mission parishes across Illinois (in Madison and Joliet as well as St. Michael the Archangel Orthodox Church in the south of Chicago), Fr. John Kochurov celebrated Sunday liturgies in Streator as part of his extended duties as a parish priest in Holy Trinity parish in Chicago, and was instrumental in setting up a permanent parish in the late 1890s. Streator, Illinois, was a coalmining center just south west of Chicago from 1866 until closing of most mines in 1920s. Many Slavic immigrants moved there and were employed in the mines as well as in glass industry. However, reflecting a persistent economic decay of the area, the Three Hierarchs church was sold to Beulah Baptist community in 1910, which re-sold it in 1916 to members of the local Polish community who sought to establish a permanent Polish parish. The building became home to St. Casimir Catholic parish, while its distinctive façade was fully obliterated during later remodeling with a brick-patterned asphalt siding. The political and religious undertones inherent to the style explain the fact that Polish Catholic immigrant community decided to completely erase a Russian-Revival appearance of the church. This stylistic erasure continued when in 1964 diocese chose to build a new modernist church for St. Casimir parish and demolished the original building. In its long protracted death, once an exotic relic of the Columbian World’s Exposition, the church looked nothing like it did when it was first constructed in the late 1890s.

Conclusion

Although scholars had known about a connection of Sullivan’s design of the Holy Trinity Cathedral to Ropet’s Russian pavilion as well as a purported influence of the Trans-Siberian Railroad guide, the context of the imperial ecclesiastical policies has not been fully explored. Fr. Kochurov created a parish in Illinois out of reused parts of the Russian pavilion employing the same mission-driven approach we saw utilized in Siberia. Placed in this context, Sullivan’s reuse and reinterpretation of Ropet’s style parallels the salvage and reuse of the latter’s pavilion parts in the town of Streator. In both cases we witness nearly identical players, persons imbued with shared (or overlapping) ideologies and beliefs. Although not an Orthodox, Sullivan nevertheless masterfully participated in the dissemination of an imperially-approved style – a style that carried with it very specific ethno-religious meaning. It would be hard to gauge the full extent to which Sullivan understood how perfectly his structure fit into architectural program of the missionary project of the Russian imperial government and its spiritual branch – the Russian Orthodox Church. Moreover, the new church matched perfectly an ever-present missionary rhetoric that permeated the religious climate of Russian Orthodoxy in America. Evidently, only when we consider architecture built for Orthodox immigrants within a larger context of the Russian state-sponsored foreign and domestic missionary policies, a new pattern appears and a completely new understanding arises.
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**FASCISM MAKES HISTORY. IT DOES NOT WRITE IT.**
ITALY’S PARTICIPATION IN THE CHICAGO WORLD EXHIBITION, 1933.

Italian architecture during the Fascist period is an intense locus of inter-weavings between past and present. It both served and represented politics by reconceptualising and renegotiating the past through an immanent conception of history that was made, not written. This is evidenced through the inter-relationship between architecture, spectacle and antiquity that was Italy’s official state participation at the Chicago Century of Progress Exhibition of 1933. The pavilion merged Roman symbolism with technological triumph to represent Italy, as a nation of cutting edge modernity and acted as harbinger of the future. Italo Balbo and his armada brought past, present and future together when they landed in Chicago after a record-breaking Transatlantic cruise. This enterprise of cutting edge technology was memorialised by an ancient Corinthian column shipped over from Ostia, exemplifying Fascism’s anomalous relationship to modernity. Italy’s three-fold participation in the Chicago Fair of 1933 juxtaposed the eternal tradition of the Classical with a future-present where history was made. Architecture and spectacle reconceptualised and renegotiated history where the *signum rememorativum* (past), the *signum demonstrativum* (present) and the *signum prognostikon* (future) became one and the same.
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**Introduction**

Italian architecture is an intense locus of inter-weavings between past and present. This was particularly apparent during the Fascist period, when architecture both served and represented politics by reconceptualising and renegotiating the past through an immanent conception of history that was made, not written. Architecture was an important element of the Fascist party’s aestheticisation of politics in a bid to influence the beliefs and behaviour of the masses to obtain their consent by reaffirming the value of the Roman tradition.¹

The traditions, practices and beliefs of Ancient Rome were an integral part of Fascist propaganda and ideology and were made manifest in the daily life of Italians via the rhetoric of Romanità (or Roman-ness). The Fascist propaganda machine renegotiated the Roman past to regenerate the present in order to, first, secure the future for a regime whose political and ideological foundations were never firmly established and, second, to underpin social and economic policies.² This was most demonstrably present in the very symbol of the Party: the lictoral fasces, chosen by Mussolini for its beauty and its potential to communicate the authority of an eternal Rome through unity, force, discipline and justice. It stood for the history-making Fascist Revolution that resurrected Italy as a great power at the hands of the Duce.³ Romanità underpinned Fascism’s actualist will make history.⁴

Material manifestations of Romanità pervaded postage stamps and posters; sculpture, mural art and frescoes were integrated into buildings featuring stylized columns and quotes in Latin that stood along grand avenues and vast piazzes. The new Fascist city made urban spaces for mass spectacle in orchestrated events like exhibitions, conferences, inaugurations and anniversaries, especially the ten year anniversaries (or decennali). Their propaganda value was at the foundation of the mass ritual integral to the formation of consent and to the mythology around Mussolini as leader and ‘New Man’.⁵

Historicity and re-negotiated pasts are brought forth through the inter-relationship between architecture, spectacle and antiquity that was Italy’s official state participation at the Chicago Century of
Progress Exhibition of 1933: the pavilion, designed by Adalberto Libera, Mario De Renzi and Antonio Valente; the arrival of General Italo Balbo’s armada of seaplanes from across the Atlantic and the unveiling of a 1st Century column from the ancient port town of Ostia. Spectacle, exhibitions and mass culture have played a large role in the service of politics as they offer a highly charged and easily accessible combination of technology, consumption and simulation as a vehicle for propaganda. Although there is sufficient literature on the pavilion, extensive coverage of the Transatlantic flight and a little on the Ostia column, there is no discussion of the Italian participation as a three-fold integration of architecture, spectacle and artefact that firstly, exemplifies Fascist re-conceptualisations of history and secondly, is aimed to convey a strong political message around: the formation of the ‘New Man’, the perpetuation of the war myth and the economic successes of a disciplined, totalitarian society.

Italy’s presence at the Chicago Fair resolved the dichotomy between the writing of history and the making of history by employing different forms of temporal renegotiation between past, present and future. Each aspect of its participation held a strong symbolic value where the past, the present, and the future became one and the same. This is evident in the highly symbolic use of the fasces within the form, design and exhibits of the pavilion. Secondly, it appears in the mass spectacle surrounding the arrival of Balbo’s record-breaking flight across the Atlantic, an event typical of both international expos and of Italian Fascist society. Thirdly, past, present and future coalesce in the paradoxical permanence of an ancient column that is one of the only vestiges of Chicago’s Century of Progress exposition.

**The Italian Pavilion**

The Italian pavilion’s avant-garde architectural expression fitted into the Fair’s overall style of streamlined architecture that was closely tied to the notion of technological precision and efficiency with overtones of optimism for a unified and smoothly functioning future. The designers added Roman symbolism and Classical form to technological triumph and modern aviation and presented this synthesis as integral part of Italy’s identity. Giant fasces dominated the pavilion and its surrounding space. Stylised and streamlined, the ancient symbol of Roman magisterial power was pared down to a pure, monolithic sign that spoke at the same time of Roman past, Fascist present and (even more) Fascist future (Figure 1). This motif had recently met with great success on the architects’ re-design of the façade of the Palazzo delle Esposizioni in Rome for the Exhibition of the Fascist Revolution that Mussolini called “superb and typically Fascist”. The fasces’ high symbolic value gave the façade an audacity that expressed the Fascist times. “Nude and soaring, smooth and severe”, they captured that “unanchored and dynamic sensation of a symbol that knows no pause and no obstacle”.

Giacomo Balla also depicted fasces ascending into the heavens alongside the hydroplanes of Balbo’s first Atlantic crossing to Brazil. Another measure of the fasces’ success as a symbol was the architects’ re-use of the motif both for the Italian Pavilion at the Brussels Fair of 1935 and Libera’s first competition entry for the New Fascist Party Headquarters, the Palazzo Littorio. Past and present co-existed in the building’s form. Classical principles such as symmetry determined a harmonic rhythm of space and volume, the main hall recalled the ancient language of exedra and apse,
and the horizontality of the side wings encapsulated the essence of the Mediterranean tradition. In all, its augmented form strongly resembled an aeroplane posed for take-off, made apparent by those that had just alighted near the shores of Lake Michigan, thus interpreting the present state of the art technology of Italy’s Savoia – Marchetti hydroplanes. An actual aeroplane wing was used as the building’s awning, the porthole openings and ribbon windows were made possible by the modern technologies of glass and steel, of aeroplanes and ocean liners.

In the lead up to their historic landing on 15 July 1933, the pavilion acted as a harbinger of Italo Balbo’s arrival, for the remainder of the fair it crystallized the event as recent past. A contemporary postcard of the Italian pavilion bore the caption: “Shaped like a giant airplane, Italy’s building is symbolically prophetic of the flight from Rome to Chicago of 24 Italian planes under General Balbo.”

The pavilion’s smooth, rounded forms also captured the dynamic movement of flight in the same way as the aeropittura paintings whose curved shapes and aerial perspectives merged Futurist modernity with Fascist power through a mix of Surrealism, spiritualism and politics. Futurism was more than an artistic avant garde, its political agenda was highly influential on Fascism’s formative stages. Its fervent Nationalism, martial attitudes and belief in the power of manliness, energy and violence to bring about a new historical era are all strongly linked to the future political era desired by Mussolini. The pavilion itself was not put forth as ‘Futurist’ building even if it corresponds to a number of descriptors in the “Futurist Architecture” manifesto of 1914. It reflects the image of Futurist men as “accumulators and generators of movement”, it presents a “new harmony of profiles and volumes” whose “raison d’être lies solely in the special conditions of modern life”, it supports the proclamation of an architecture of “calculation, audacity and simplicity” with a focus on “maximum elasticity and lightness” and finally it draws inspiration from the “immensely new mechanical world.”

An adapted Futurist style was consciously employed in the interiors where photomontages and a gigantic Aeropittura style frieze presented the evolution of Italian progress from the time of the Caesars to the era of the ‘New Caesar’: Mussolini (Figure 1). All the modern progress of transport and communications appears to emanate from the mind of the Dux: the maker of history. His profile, backed by a honorary column reminded visitors that Rome is the centre of the world (caput mundi) showing that both present and future progress is founded in the past. Many roads lead to Rome and, at the same time, stretch out from the stylised profile whose panoptic view oversees the space like a God. To the left the roads merge into the wings of the same planes flown by Balbo and his armada as they speed off over a map of Italy that is the same size as Africa. Underneath, a photomontage
showed the new Via dell’Impero (now Via dei Fori Imperiali). Inaugurated on the tenth anniversary of the March on Rome, it was described as: “more than a road – it is an ideal and vital bond between the Colosseum (the symbol of the eternity of Rome) and the Vittoriano, the Altar of the Mother land and the symbol of the new Italy”.

From this large, unencumbered space floored with linoleum and dotted with modern, tubular furniture visitors could proceed upstairs to view the main space from a small balcony that recalled the arengario (speaker’s platform) of both ancient Rome and contemporary Italy. More exhibits in the pavilion’s wings showcased Italy’s attractions to increase support for Fascism in the Americas with a focus on tourism and the achievements of the present, or at least of the recent past.

Thanks to Fascism, Italy could offer the best of both worlds: ancient history and tradition as well as the most advanced technology that, together with the discipline and order of a totalitarian regime, could bring about economic success. As the booklet stated: “in addition to those based on traditional history and civilisation there are now modern advantages, such as fast and comfortable trans-Atlantic liners, improved and highly developed railroad, road and air services … experiences never so much dreamed of by travellers of yore await those who see Italy from an aeroplane.”

The Italy of 1933 was presented as a nation of cutting edge modernity populated by men and women of action, a united populace who lived an organised and disciplined life of devotion to their single leader. This image substituted the former picturesque construct of a country of “mandolin players and singers, artists and historical ruins, tourism and nostalgia, indolence and peacefulness” that was incidentally being promoted at the Fair’s Italian village. Funded by the local Italo-American community, it was built for the Fair’s second season amongst other nostalgic reproductions of Europe. In contrast to American progress, they reified an unreal past of temporal reconstructions of historic regional architecture with souvenirs, handcrafts and food sold by ‘residents’ in national costumes.

Despite the presence of this particular past, the Italian pavilion achieved the desired effect. According to one edition of the Fair’s guide book it gave modern Italy a “voice … vibrant with heroic deeds of Fascism” that spoke “more resoundingly, more intelligently and more forcefully to the World’s Fair visitor than that of any other foreign nation.”
The Arrival of Italo Balbo and his Atlantic Seaplanes

The arrival of the Atlantici (as Balbo and his armada became known) was one of the Fair’s major spectacles, fitting in with a number of other events, shows and exhibits dedicated to the ‘exciting’ new era of transportation.\(^{31}\) Italo Balbo became Air Force Minister during the ‘golden age’ of aviation: a time of air spectacles, epic flights, competitions and fast-evolving technology. Fuelled by the efforts of the Futurist movement with its focus on the dynamism of speed, flight was becoming a veritable cult capable of influencing public opinion.\(^{32}\) Aviators were seen to encapsulate the image of the ‘New Man’ that was melded into both Futurist and Fascist politics. They were objects of romantic longing and were able to render both the historical idea of knightly combat and the future conquest of space and time.\(^{33}\) Within this context Balbo chose to commemorate the tenth anniversary of Italy’s Royal Air Force with a record-breaking Transatlantic cruise (Figure 2).\(^{34}\) The past was evoked in its more recent dimension through the commemoration of an event from a decade ago while at the same time drawing on the ancient practice of the decennalia when Emperors celebrated their ten years of rule. This practice was brought into the present political context with the recent celebrations for decennale fascista in 1932 which carried over into the events dedicated to Italy’s ‘dominion of the Skies’. Commemorative medals and stamps made direct connections between the Roman eagle of military power, allegories of Victory and the armada of planes crossing the Atlantic. This military aspect was politically important in order to perpetuate the state of constant war that formed the common nexus of the Futurist, Nationalist and Fascist projects and that could be seen in the manipulation of post-war events like the Annexation of Fiume and extended the battles of WWI into the everyday of Fascist society.

Although less dedicated to theatre as a medium than some of his fellow Fascist hierarchs, Balbo was fully aware of the potential of his arrival at the Chicago Fair of 1933 to place him at “centre stage”\(^{35}\) as a hero of the skies and guarantee him a massive audience who would see that, despite the depression and thanks to new men like him, Italy remained vital and resilient.\(^{36}\) Balbo was already known in the Unites States as a Hero of the Air and presented in the papers as the “Next Mussolini”.\(^{37}\)

As the Atlantici flew towards Chicago, their progress was followed by all forms of international media, lending itself particularly to the more visually-oriented illustrated magazines and documentary newsreels (Figure 2).\(^{38}\) Aeroplanes, flight and Balbo the Hero were the subject of posters, postcards, paperweights, even chocolate bars. Flight as a technology of the future was able to permeate mass media thanks to the fortuitously parallel development of compact film and photographic cameras.\(^{39}\) Cameras became weapons of propaganda and footage of the entire flight was skilfully edited down as the dramatic subject of dozens of newsreels. These short documentary films produced by the State-run Istituto Luce combined Forceful narrative, dramatic music and highly choreographed imagery to popularise to present a highly-orchestrated version of history as it was made. Modern technology therefore did not just allow the flight itself to take place, it magnified its political significance by making it a mass-media event. Balbo cabled Mussolini soon after landing to reassure him that the greeting he received was proof that anti-fascist feelings in the United States were “mere myth.”\(^{40}\) Balbo’s arrival sparked national pride amongst the migrant population, it was predicted that more than half of Chicago’s Italian population of 300,000 would be there, some of whom booked rooms in the same hotels as the pilots.\(^{41}\)

The Atlantici stayed in Chicago for three days during which time Balbo attended dances and banquets, was proclaimed Chief Flying Eagle by the local Sioux Indians and unveiled a statue to Christopher Columbus in the nearby Grant Park. It was funded by the local Italian community who received radio messages from Mussolini held a ’disciplined’ parade accompanied by 30,000 people from the park to the Hall of Science and listened to a vocal concert of the Fascist hymn Giovinessa followed by the Star Spangled Banner.\(^{42}\) This side event is another example of temporal renegotiation where Balbo both made and re-made history as the ‘Columbus of the 20th Century’, where the sign of the present was conflated with the sign of the past. The Atlantici’s triumphant return to Rome legitimated the present making of history with the rituals of and spectacles of its ancient traditions. The Chicago Tribune reported that, on the morrow of his return, “reviving an ancient custom of the emperors Gen. Balbo and his flyers will ride triumphantly through the 1,600 year old Arch of Constantine.” (Figure 2)
The spectacle continued with fireworks bursting into the sky from the Palatine hill to form the word: DUX thus reminding viewers that the hand and mind behind it all was Mussolini’s (Figure 2).\textsuperscript{43}

The Column from Ostia

Balbo’s flight was an enterprise of cutting edge technology yet it was memorialised by an ancient Corinthian column, making it an emblematic case study for Fascism’s anomalous relationship to modernity.\textsuperscript{44} By taking the column from a site in Ostia that had been undergoing large-scale excavation from the late 1920s, Mussolini was able to showcase the latest developments in archaeology and bring them to the attention of the world.\textsuperscript{45} The archaeological campaigns of the Fascist period were arguably more about political propaganda than academic or epistemological rigour. The vestiges of ancient Rome were a past propaganda than academic or epistemological

It stands today, still largely ignored, as one of the only remaining vestiges of the Fair.\textsuperscript{51}

Conclusion

Italy’s three-fold participation in the Chicago Fair of 1933 juxtaposed the eternal tradition of the Classical with a future-present where history was made. The aim was to communicate key political messages around the formation of the ‘New Man’, the perpetuation of the war myth and the economic successes of a disciplined, totalitarian society. The pavilion fused innovation in the form of an aeroplane with the eternal symbol of the fasces as the harbinger of a future event. The flight of the Atlantici brought the future of aviation into the spectacle of the present and then bound itself almost immediately to a distant past through the staging of a triumphal parade and its memorialisation through the placing of a de-contextualised column. The column was, and still remains, an empty signifier of the past. Antiquity in the guise of Romanità was a politically efficient way for the Fascist propaganda machine to solve the dichotomy between the writing of history (historia rerum gestarum) and the making of history (res gestae). Italy’s participation at the Chicago Fair of 1933 reconceptualised and renegotiated architecture as sign where the signum rememorativum (past), the signum demonstratum (present) and the signum prognostikon (future) became one and the same.

Endnotes


8. Kihlstedt, “Utopia Realized”.


24. This bizarre juxtaposition represented a perceived relative might and was typical of Aeropittura where the middle ground disappeared in favour of the dramatic confrontation between near and far typical of the view from an airplane. Emily Braun, “Shock and Awe: Futurist Aeropittura and the Theories of Giulio Douhet,” in Green (ed.), *Italian Futurism 1909-1944*, 272.


29. Fair organisers initially approached the European nations to contribute to the Fair in this way to provide a contrast to the great progresses of contemporary society but were met with a firm refusal. The Fascist government – like a number of European nations - preferred more modern streamlined forms to show their own brand of progress. The first period of the Fair featured two rather successful historic villages, the Streets of Paris and A Belgian Village. In the second half of the Fair these were added to with an Italian Village as well as an Old English, an American Colonial, Spanish, Tunisian, Swiss, Dutch and Mexican village. Schrenk, “From Historic Village to Modern Pavilion,” 299-302.

30. As quoted in Doordan, “Exhibiting Progress”, 224. He references the Official Guidebook of the Fair, 1933, with 1934 Supplement, (Chicago, 1934), p. 93. In “From Historic Village to Modern Pavilion,” Schrenk notes that although there were various ‘Official Guidebooks’ neither the 1933 or 1934 editions include this quote.


34. Balbo was an aviator who founded the Ferrara branch of the Fascist Party in 1920. He was one of the quadrumvirs (along with Michele Bianchi, Emilio de Bono and Cesare de Vecchi) who led the March on Rome. Between 1929 and 1933 carried out a full re-organisation of Italy’s Air Force as its Minister. The high points of his career were the mass flights across the Mediterranean (1928 and 1929) and the Atlantic (1930-1 and 1933). Essentially ‘demoted’ to Governor of Lybia in 1933, he died when his plane was accidentally shot down by Italian anti-air squadrons in 1940. *Dizionario Biografico degli Italiani* 3, (1963), http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/italo-balbo_%28Dizionario-Biografico%29/ [Accessed 14 May 2015] & Philip Cannistraro (ed.), *Historical Dictionary of Fascist Italy* (Westport, Conn.: Greenwood Press, 1982), 57-9.

35. Doordan, “Exhibiting Progress”, 224. Amongst Fascism’s top hierarchy there were no less than six directly involved in theatre and it had potential to permeate the fabric of Italian society, naturally as a vehicle for political propaganda. These included foreign minister (and Mussolini’s son-in law) Galeazzo Ciano, Minister for Popular Culture, Alessandro Grandi and hard-core squadrista, Roberto Farinacci. Jeffrey T. Schnapp, “18 BL: Fascist Mass Spectacle,” *Representations*, no. 43 (Summer, 1993), 94.


See also Segrè, *Italo Balbo*, 242-4.

43. -, “Balbo’s Flyers Return Home Italy’s Heroes,” Chicago Sunday Tribune, August 13, 1933, 1 and 23.


The political reforms of the Second Spanish Republic created an environment favorable to the implementation in Spain of modern ideas. Leftist ideology is evident in the works of GATEPAC architects such as Sert, García Mercadal and Torres Clavé; therefore, historiographical accounts often align Spain’s modern architecture of the 1930s with the progressive policies of the Second Republic. Likewise, it is widely believed that the historicism of 1940s Spain resulted directly from Franco’s right-wing conservatism. However, to link the Second Republic with the architectural avant-garde, as well as to tie Franco’s conservative dictatorship to nostalgic historicism, ignores the deep political complexities that accompanied Modern architecture’s arrival in Spain. Secondino Zuazo experimented with Classicism on buildings he designed in the 1930s for the Republican government. Rodrigo Medina Benjumea followed a Rationalist aesthetic in his 1940s design for the Labor University in Seville, which was one of Franco’s pet projects. José Manuel Aizpurúa, a member of GATEPAC and architect of the progressive 1929 Nautical Club in San Sebastián, died fighting for Franco’s Nationalist cause.

This paper challenges the oversimplification that characterizes existing historiographic accounts of the period and portrays the relationship between politics and architecture in mid-century Spain as complex and ambivalent.
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Introduction

In 1965, Spanish architect and historian César Ortiz-Echagüe noted that modern architecture was essentially a socialist phenomenon, in which serialized construction and industrial materials could ease the plight of the working class by providing flexible, hygienic spaces full of air and light. Undoubtedly, this characterization rings true for much of the architecture produced in Spain during the Second Spanish Republic (1931-39). Oriol Bohigas has pointed out that, thanks in part to its progressive politics, the Republic provided a unique environment in which a critical mass of architects, who had previously dabbled in various historicist and modern styles, could finally come together under a unified idea of modernity. As a result, it is tempting to look for cause-and-effect relationships between the policies of the Republic (especially during its latter years) and Spain’s modern architecture of the 1930s.

On the opposite end of the spectrum, some critics attribute the appearance in Spain of historicist buildings, in the years following Franco’s defeat of the Republic (1939), to top-down directives from the autocratic regime or from Franco himself. In 1950, G. E. Kidder Smith reported that historicist buildings designed in Spain during the 1940s were a result of an “official position”, presumably dictated by Franco. More recently, critics such as Terrence Riley have continued to promulgate the idea that Franco, or his subordinates, were directly responsible for the return to Spain’s historic architectural styles.

Miguel Ángel Baldellou openly recognizes that, inevitably, the design of the built environment is subject to the forces of politics and culture, yet to draw a straight cause-and-effect line between politics and architectural form is to oversimplify the situation, and to fall into an ‘ideological trap’. Consequently, this paper establishes that in 1930s and 1940s Spain, the relationships between architectural style and political regime were complex and ambivalent, rather than straightforward and unidirectional. It also uncovers the fact that, under the auspices of both the Republic and the Franco dictatorship, some
architects embraced modern ideas, while others turned to Spain’s historicist styles for inspiration.

**Architecture during the Second Spanish Republic**

Clearly, in the 1930s the most consolidated effort by Spanish architects to bring modern methods of design and construction to their homeland prior to the Spanish Civil War was demonstrated by the Grupo de Arquitectos y Técnicos Españoles para la Promoción de la Actividad Contemporánea (GATEPAC), which operated as the Spanish national branch of the CIAM. With active centers in three of Spain’s geographic regions (Madrid, the Basque Country and Catalonia), it represented a diverse array of cultural backgrounds, as well as the distinct pedagogical models of both schools of architecture then operating in Spain (in Madrid and Barcelona).

GATEPAC’s organizational sympathy with the socialist ideology of the latter years of the Second Spanish Republic – particularly evident in the work of its regional branch in Catalonia (GATCPAC) – is unmistakable in the pages of the organization’s professional journal *AC Documentos de la Actividad Contemporánea*, published between 1930 and 1937. It paralleled the strong rhetoric of other avant-garde journals such as *G, ABC* and *De 8 en Opbouw* with manifestos on modern architecture in service of the proletariat, socialist urban planning ideas and announcements of socialist events held throughout Europe; likewise, the journal’s sympathy with Soviet ideology was unmistakable. Moreover, for the final issue, published after the outbreak of the Civil War, the editors of *AC* abandoned Spanish, which had served as the journal’s – and GATEPAC’s – lingua franca for the previous twenty-four issues, by printing the text of issue 25 entirely in the Catalonian language; this was a direct affront to Franco’s national syndicalism and an attempt to bolster Catalonia’s regional autonomy, which constituted one of the Republic’s quintessential policies.

Historians have accurately cited the Spanish Pavilion at the 1937 World’s Fair in Paris, designed by Josep Lluïs Sert and Luis Lacasa, as evidence of the ways in which the Republic overtly manipulated modern architecture in order to communicate its political agenda. With its steel structure, plasticity of space, faithfulness to Le Corbusier’s *Five Points* and incorporation of modern abstract art, including Pablo Picasso’s *Guernica*, Joan Miro’s *Catalan Peasant in the Revolt*, and Alexander Calder’s mercury fountain and mobile, indeed, the 1937 pavilion proclaimed to the world that the Second Spanish Republic, then literally under attack by Franco’s Nationalist forces, was part of the political and architectural vanguard.

However, other buildings designed during the 1930s for official governmental use by the Republic exchanged the language of modern architecture for historicist stylings. Most noteworthy in this category is Secundino Zuazo’s 1933 design for the Nuevos Ministerios in Madrid. As a critical component of the northward urban expansion of Madrid along La Castellana, this sprawling complex of buildings was designed to house the “new ministries” of the Republic. Unlike his rationalist work of the previous years, such as the 1931 Casa de las Flores housing block, for Nuevos Ministerios Zuazo unapologetically resurrected the forms of Philip II’s sixteenth-century monastery-palace of San Lorenzo at El Escorial, including its grandiose courtyards, arcades and symmetrical organization. In fact, Zuazo himself described the great plaza of Nuevos Ministerios as “a replica of those of Philip II in El Escorial.”

Clearly, modernity was not the only architectural language the Republic used in order to express its political agenda. Furthermore, not all of Spain’s avant-garde architects of the 1930s were sympathetic with socialism or the reformist policies of the Second Republic. Pedro Muguruza, a loyal member of the Falange in the 1930s, collaborated with Casto Fernández-Shaw to design the Edificio Coliseo (1931-33), which borrows heavily from the International Style and modern buildings then being constructed in the United States. Likewise, the brief but productive professional association of José Manuel Aizpurúa and Joaquín Labayen demonstrates that architects sympathetic to Franco’s Nationalism worked adeptly with modern ideas. During the 1930s, both Aizpurúa and Labayen were active members of the Falange; in 1934 Aizpurúa advanced to a position in the Falange’s governing council, and he eventually gave his life fighting in Franco’s Nationalist Army, a fact which was commemorated in 1941 in the first postwar issue of *Revista Nacional de Arquitectura*.

With its whitewashed surfaces, horizontal windows and overt industrial forms, their 1929 Nautical Club was the only building constructed in Spain to...
be included by Philip Johnson and Henry-Russell Hitchcock in the 1932 exposition at the Museum of Modern Art in New York, entitled 'The International Style'.\textsuperscript{11} Furthermore, it is ironic that their activity with the Falange occurred precisely at the same time that they spearheaded the 'Grupo Norte' section of GATEPAC, centered in San Sebastián (Basque Country), which inevitably brought them into close contact with dedicated Republicans like Sert, Mercadal and Torres Clavé.\textsuperscript{12} Therefore, despite the obvious socialist rhetoric of AC, even the membership ranks of GATEPAC represented a diverse array of political ideologies.

**Architecture and the Franco regime**

In 1949 Kidder Smith, one of the most vocal (and biased) defenders of modern architecture, described Spain as opposed to modern developments, thanks in large part to the totalitarian policies of the Franco regime; he remarked that ‘the architectural visitor to the Iberian Peninsula is not apt to find much modern work of interest’.\textsuperscript{13} Perhaps due to this perceived lack of noteworthy specimens, Bruno Zevi, Sigfried Giedion, Nicklaus Pevsner and Kenneth Frampton tacitly agreed with Kidder Smith; in their authoritative surveys of the history of twentieth-century architecture they make no mention of Spain in the 1940s.\textsuperscript{14} More recently, other historians, such as Terrence Riley and William Curtis even claim that the Franco regime actively suppressed modern ideas in the same way that it suppressed regional autonomy and freedom of speech.\textsuperscript{15} If a Francoist, Nationalist or Falangist style of architecture could have been imposed, it would likely have been dictated from one of the offices Franco charged with the oversight of Spain’s reconstruction: the Dirección General de Regiones Devastadas (DGRD) or the Dirección General de Arquitectura (DGA). However, even Muguruza, a committed Falangist and Franco-appointed head of the DGA, stated in 1940 that this type of style could only emerge from the ground up and with the passage of time; it would never result from top-down directives.\textsuperscript{20} Moreover, historian Javier Martínez-González states that, in contrast to Nazi Germany and Fascist Italy, ‘the Francoist regime had neither the economic capacity nor the ideological forcefulness’ to effectively dictate architectural style.\textsuperscript{21}

Evidently, the only construction project in which Franco was personally involved on decisions of style was the Valle de los Caídos, which was designed by Muguruza in 1940; Muguruza claimed that ‘the plans were mine, but the ideas were the Caudillo’s’.\textsuperscript{22} However, thanks to its protracted construction process and to Spain’s growing international relations of the 1950s, by the time of its completion in 1958, it was largely dismissed by Spain’s architectural community as a relic of a dark time.

Antonio Fernández Alba stated that Spain’s tendency towards historicist architecture in the 1940s was largely dictated not by the regime, but by the well-to-do social class that controlled the economic resources needed to reconstruct the country. Therefore, it was the Spanish bourgeoisie that promoted architectural historicism in an attempt to reestablish the conservative social order that had characterized the defunct Spanish Empire. Fernández Alba goes on to point out that the rationalist architects that survived the war abandoned modern sources just to survive, and El Escorial provided them with an easily copied symbol.\textsuperscript{23}
Not only was historicism not, as Kidder Smith described, an ‘official position’ held by Franco or the regime, according to Ignasi de Solà Morales, the DGRD openly promoted modern serialized fabrication for reconstruction even in the earliest years of the Franco regime, primarily because it was the most effective means of producing the mass quantities of homes that were needed to address the post-Civil War housing crisis. This phenomenon is evident in the pages of Spain’s professional journals during the early 1940s. Following a five-year hiatus caused by the Civil War, Arquitectura, published by the Colegio Oficial de Arquitectos de Madrid, was resurrected in 1941 as Revista Nacional de Arquitectura. Two other journals published their first issues during the early years of the dictatorship: Reconstrucción (Madrid, 1940) and Cuadernos de Arquitectura (Barcelona, 1944). In the first pages of their inaugural issues, Revista Nacional de Arquitectura and Cuadernos de Arquitectura are unequivocally dedicated to Franco, to La Patria and to the memory of those who gave their lives in support of the Nationalist cause. Francoist rhetoric abounds in the earliest issues of these journals, yet even as early as 1943, Revista Nacional de Arquitectura began to publish a series of articles on modern developments being accomplished in the USA. Several of these articles are about otherwise unknown, nondescript prefabricated housing projects, shoe stores and shopping centers; the journal even published an article on the installation of centralized laundry systems in the USA. Evidently, during the first years of the Franco regime, the editors of this journal were desperate to publish anything modern they could find.

Given Barcelona’s history as a cosmopolitan port city, it is not surprising to find that, only a few pages after the journal’s dedication to Franco, Cuadernos de Arquitectura, published by the Colegio Oficial de Arquitectos de Catalunya took pains to update readers on the developments of modern architecture of the previous three decades, including the work of Richard Neutra, Walter Gropius, Le Corbusier, J. J. P. Oud and Adolf Loos; conveniently, these journals made no mention of the socialist beliefs that had forced many of these architects into exile in the 1930s. By 1945, even Reconstrucción, which only a few years before had published Luis Moya’s anti-Semitic and anti-modern rants against the Bauhaus, Le Corbusier and ‘all the Jews of the world’, began to publish articles on modern houses designed in the USA as suitable examples for the postwar reconstruction of Spain’s housing stock.

Likewise, Antonio Río Vázquez has pointed out that, under the auspices of Franco’s Ministerio del Trabajo, which was infused with Falangist ideas of national syndicalism, a system of Universidades Laborales was designed and constructed across the country. Since these ‘labor universities’ were intended to provide Spain’s working class – a population that was mostly illiterate and agrarian – with marketable skills suitable for an industrialized labor force, they constituted one of the most important projects on Franco’s political agenda. Luis Moya was hired to design the first of these Universidades Laborales, in the northern port city of Gijón and, not surprisingly, Moya delivered an adeptly studied, keenly imaginative version of historic Spanish architecture that was half historic city and half industrial city. Moya’s original intent was that this quasi-historic style would be used to populate the country with Universidades Laborales inspired in his interpretation of Spanish history. However, the utility of this style for such a modern program was immediately rejected; in 1949 the Ministerio de Trabajo hired a team of architects led by Rodrigo Medina Benjumea to design the second Universidad Laboral in Sevilla. For this project, these architects replaced Moya’s studied historicism with a rationalistic approach to materials, daylighting, function and the total elimination of ornamentation.

Perhaps the most robust, yet often overlooked, body of modern architecture that was produced during the early years of the Franco regime can be seen in the work of structural engineer Eduardo Torroja. By the beginning of the Civil War he had already constructed several innovative buildings, including the 1933 Market Hall (Algeciras), the 1935 Zarzuela Hippodrome Racecourse (Madrid) and the 1935 Frontón Recoletos (Madrid). As Bohigas pointed out, most – if not all – of Spain’s leading modernists of the 1930s were absent in the immediate aftermath of the Civil War. However, Torroja further distinguished himself from Spain’s creative professionals by carrying into the 1940s his modern ideas, which were unaffected by the political turmoil of the Civil War; this is clear in projects such as the 1939-42 Alloz Aquaduct (Navarra) and the 1943 Campo de les Corts Football Stadium (Barcelona). This continuity of modern ideas, unique amongst Spanish intellectuals, is
likely due to three factors. First, he was a structural engineer, not an architect, which may have exempted his work from the debate over style and aesthetics. Second, his projects, both before and after the war, adeptly addressed Spain’s desperate need to modernize its infrastructure. Third, by the late 1940s, Torroja was internationally recognized as one of the pioneers of modern structural engineering.

In 1934 Torroja, together with Modesto López Otero and José María Aguirre, founded the Institute for Construction and Building in Madrid, which, at that time was a private research consortium focused on modern building techniques. Unlike other organizations, this institute actually survived the Civil War, and in 1946, under Torroja’s leadership, it was incorporated into the Spanish Council for Scientific Research; in this new role it became Spain’s leading voice in the promotion of modern construction and design. The institute served as a training ground for many of Spain’s most brilliant modern architects of the 1950s, including Rafael de la Joya and Rafael de la Hoz.

Conclusion

In conclusion, it is clear that the straightforward relationships outlined by critics like G. E. Kidder Smith, William Curtis and Terrence Riley do not adequately represent the complex ambivalence that existed in the relationship between architecture and political ideology in 1930s and 1940s Spain. Neither the political affiliations of individual architects, nor those of associations of architects, presupposed a clear inclination towards a particular architectural style. Prior to the Civil War, Zuazo, a dedicated socialist, manipulated the historic forms of El Escorial in official architecture for the Republic in a self-imposed search for authenticity in Spain’s architectural history. Active members of the Falange such as Aizpurúa and Labayen spearheaded the northern branch of GATEPAC, while the organization’s journal openly expressed socialist and Republican sympathies. Francoist agencies such as the DGRD and the DGA used their journals (Reconstrucción and Boletín de la Dirección General de Arquitectura) to promote modernized serial production as a practical means of addressing Spain’s postwar housing crisis; likewise, by the mid-1940s the Colegio Oficial de Arquitectos, both in Madrid and in Barcelona, used professional journals to update their readers on developments in modern architecture and constructive processes around the globe.

Contrary to the claims of Curtis and Riley, except for the Valle de los Caídos, Franco typically did not involve himself personally in the architectural design of buildings constructed in Spain during the 1940s. For example, El Escorial was chosen as a source for the Ministerio del Aire not by Franco, but by Luis Gutiérrez Soto, who later admitted to being swept away by his own nationalistic sentiment. Likewise, Franco’s official agencies like the DGA and the DGRD were headed by individuals like Muguruza, who admitted that top-down directives on architectural style were useless. On the contrary, it appears that, if indeed such directives truly existed, they were handed down primarily by the Spanish bourgeoisie, whose goal was to reestablish old forms of hierarchy and order from the bygone days of empire.
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Introduction

After the fall of communism in Eastern Europe, the Roma, more commonly known as gypsies, became involved for the first time since their arrival in Europe and West Asia over seven centuries ago (Crowe, 2007) in the systematic planning and production of spaces and buildings. Given the Roma’s status as a minority often described in a parasitic relationship to the host society, this phenomenon presents an opportunity to analyze the emergence of a parallel space within the space of a dominant society.

The Roma have their own language, modes of organization, production and ownership, relationship to the land, history, and even specific forms of narration, concepts of time, and jurisprudence. However, they have often been defined through a negative relationship to a main society. They have been enslaved throughout the Middle Ages, hunted, sterilized and imprisoned during subsequent regimes, mass murdered during the Holocaust, strictly controlled by the communist governments and bitterly hated and discriminated against today. At present, especially in Romania, the European country with the largest Roma population, they are engaging with unbelievable economical and imaginative force in the production of space and of architecture. With a sudden and intuitive understanding of space and architecture’s role in defining relationships, negotiating history and asserting conflicting identities, the Roma are creating urban conditions, building mansions in never before seen styles and inhabiting them in ways unique to their society. Roma architecture and spatial practices offer the opportunity to analyze the emergence of a parallel space within the space of a dominant society. In this context, we argue that the Roma spatial practices represent acts of defiance but also of self-definition against the host political and economic systems which are actualized through the built environment. These acts gave birth to unique conditions that speak as much about the Roma community as about its host society, the nature of urban space, and the social role of architecture. Our analysis will take into account theoretical frameworks of social space proposed by Henry Lefebvre and non-dominant societies.
Theoretical Framework

In 1974 Henry Lefebvre published a groundbreaking book, *The Production of Space*, and linked conceptually two very different notions: space and production. Space is immaterial, pervasive and elusive, while the idea of production implies precise knowledge, a methodology, concrete physical devices and a predetermined aim. The Production Space proposed a framework able to operate between the infinitely intricate non-physical products and by-products of a society such as institutions, relationships, regulations, etc. and that society’s manifestations through the built environment. In Lefebvre’s use of the word, space has a physical component in that it corresponds to an actual place but it also has, by necessity, a social component. Space is connected to the immaterial aspects of a society as “spatial practice consists in a projection onto a (spatial) field of all aspects, elements and moments of social practice”. Furthermore, “social space is what permits fresh actions to occur, while suggesting others and prohibiting yet others”. Social space is thus related to the range of possible actions available to a social group. As such, social space is both a tool of control and, when in control of its creation, of liberation.

Moreover, as a non-dominant society materializes its culture through the production of space, that society acquires a new dimension that can be accessed through analysis and interpretation. Social hierarchies in society privilege some groups over others as some groups hold dominant positions and exercise decision making power (“muted group theory”). The specific position that an individual group holds in society affects the ways in which members of this group view the world and themselves (“stand-point theory”). Members of the marginalized group, ‘outsiders within’, occupy a privileged position to see patterns that escape those in the dominant groups. Therefore, when we analyse the spatial production of the Roma, we witness aspects of their culture previously hidden but their spatial products can also be read critically to see if they reveal any hidden aspects of the host society.

A Visual Puzzle to the Outsider

Lefebvre is deeply concerned with connecting space with social practice and, further, with man himself, in an attempt to present his work as part of a lineage concerning the relationship of subject and object. He notes: “social space thus remains the space of society, of social life. Man does not live by words alone; all ‘subjects’ are situated in a space in which they must either recognize themselves or lose themselves, a space which they may both enjoy and modify.” If a man builds a space in which he is to recognize and enjoy himself, the spaces produced by Roma imply an image of a subject and a corresponding community drastically different than anything around them.

Most Roma architecture and urban strategies confound the gadje (‘the white man’ in Gypsy language). The Roma’s spaces create, permit, suggest and prohibit activities that are not easily understood by an outsider. In terms of the visual character, the flamboyant clash of styles, colors and shapes that can be found in villages where the Roma architecture dominates such as Strehaia village in Romania again defy any relating to the visual language of the surrounding Romanian architecture.

Confounding visuality however is a prevailing phenomenon in the modern, pluralistic society. Lefebvre points out that “the social character of space – those relations that it implies, contains and dissimulates – has begun visibly to dominate. This typical quality of visibility does not, however, imply decipherability of the inherent social relations. On the contrary, the analysis of these relations has become harder and more paradoxical”. The visual shock the gadje experiences while walking down the main road in Strehaia reveals the paradox of a multi ethnic world in which visibility dominates through a code that is increasingly hermetic to members of other groups. The recognition function of architecture of which both Moore and Lefebvre speak in the opening quotes of this article is selectively impaired.

It is interesting to note that while the gadje has always had difficulties in understanding the gypsy culture, the Roma posses an extraordinary ability to read, navigate and manipulate the symbolism of the dominant culture. “There is not one gypsy culture but rather a gypsy world view that produces many variations of gypsy culture depending on the particular environment. Gypsies cultivate multiple repertoires and effectively switch among these cultural codes”. The complexity of the situation we are addressing lies as much with the performer-subjects as with the interpreters and makes the methodological challenge a core concern of any investigation into this topic.
Specific Roma Spatial Practices

The Roma distinguish themselves from the host community in almost all aspects of spatial practice. Artistically, Roma buildings reflect local influences and the financial resources of the community. Most of the time, buildings of note are representative of well to do families that exhibit their love of exuberance and flamboyant detailing as also seen in their choice of clothes. Hand in hand with this preference goes a predilection towards ornamentation, two dimensional design applied to walls, and the employment of traditional craftsmen. The Roma are lovers of kitsch and eclecticism. The visual spectacle that ensues is breathtaking, mesmerizing and nauseating to the outsider.

Urbanistically, strategies observed in Roma communities in Romania and Turkey indicate a preference towards the city center and abandoned or uninhabited lots. Their use of the urban layout reflects their social organization and predilections in inhabiting space. Through observation, we noted that the Roma perceive the in/out spatial relations differently than other communities. Their houses always open to the streets and there are no specific boundaries between private and public spaces. The Roma have a sense of ownership not just for their home but for everything that surrounds it. They live on the streets and on the sidewalks as if they are a continuation of their own houses. Through these practices, they impose a different life style in the neighborhoods where they live and they can be seen eating, playing and chatting at street corners or on the frontiers of their houses.

The Roma’s use of streets and sidewalk – areas labeled as public property and legally off limits for domestic activities and appropriation – allow to them to generate certain relations between the environment and their private life which extend to the organization of their own community. From the outside, they look like a big family even if at times their domesticity is strife with conflict. As the streets serve as a continuation of their domestic realm, the streets become a vessel for family life not just a tool to move people from one place to another. In Turkey for example, they dont have well defined public spaces such as public squares, even though Roma prefer to live outside their house most of the time. The daily unplanned, organic expansion of their domestic space lacks the control required to generate a center like a public square. In the dominating society such centers are produced and reinforced by institutions such as banks, cafes, restaurants, religious buildings and municipalities. The lack of such centers in the organization of Roma life and accompanying space reflects their idiosyncratic urban pattern and resistance to dominance by a regulatory system.

At the building scale, the Roma differ from the host community in the way they place a building on the site, in the arrangement of the rooms inside and in the way they occupy these rooms. The Roma design houses with a large yard where their children can play and where domestic chores are performed. Toilets are almost always separate from the main building. Inside the house, the main difference is the lack of privacy as reflected in the distribution of rooms. The Roma do not design corridors which organize room entrances based on visual privacy. If a large family lives crowded in one apartment, parents often share bedrooms with their children, the siblings can sleep together and the living room generally turns into a sleeping room at night.

Another peculiarity of Roma layouts is the location of a building or apartment entrance inside another apartment. For example, at times internal corridors act as transferring spaces for another apartment. These nested spaces reflect the interconnective nature of their community and the living spaces produced are the expression of the relationship between community members and families. Some examples of layouts reflect daily activities such as looking after the children, cooking, and cleaning. In this shared life, while two women prepare lunch, the others might look after the children. Every member is aware of and dependent on the activity of every other member and contributes to the community in an organic fashion. This situation is drastically different from the modern, atomized organization of society of the Roma’s host countries where great emphasis and resources are placed in defining and protecting physical boundaries and properties lines between individuals, families and groups.

Social Housing for the Roma and Sites of Confrontation

In both communist and post-communist Romania as well as in other parts of Europe we find examples of social housing build by the local authorities to house the Roma. In each case, the Roma community for whom the housing was intended refused or created difficulties in inhabiting these buildings.
From a formal perspective, the housing proposed to the Roma often had the typical rigid elevations of modernist, low budget subsidized apartment buildings destined for the outskirts. The interior layout of individual apartments reflected the assumptions of local authorities regarding the spatial needs of a family. No evidence is easily available of attempts on behalf of these authorities to study the particular family organization of the Roma and the everyday interaction of the members of their community and to translate these findings into new types of layouts. These instances of social housing exemplify not just the dominant power’s lack of interest in the particulars of Roma culture but highlight the fact that efforts at integration were in fact efforts to change the Roma culture into the socio-political norm of a particular regime while also hiding the Roma altogether behind the controlled and rationalized elevations of such buildings. These type of strategies are identified by Lefebvre as a leveling force when he notes that “the state crushes time by reducing differences to repetitions or circularities [...]. It enforces a logic that puts an end to conflicts and contradictions”.9

An article published in The Guardian, a British newspaper, in 2012 calls the government’s attempts to provide housing for the Roma “political suicide” because the Roma find “high levels of claustrophobia in housing” so they leave. According to a psychologist cited in the article, they would not be averse to such buildings “so long as the architecture is sympathetic: “Specifically windows all round, so they can see the children on the site”. Without an attempt to understand the specific needs of the target inhabitants when it comes to minorities, the producers of the space act in accordance with a norm, while the users passively experience whatever was imposed upon them in as much as it was more or less thoroughly inserted into, or justified by, their representational space.10

But these representations found no justification or common ground in the Roma’s practices. The Roma’s specific use of space as described in the previous section is related to a set of cultural practices that are central to both communal and individual identity. The gypsies cannot be gypsies in the apartment buildings provided to them by the government.

All that is left for the Roma is to reject this dwelling offer stirring even further the wrath of local governments and of tax payers. In post-communist Romania, however, they have gained enough economic power to switch from users of space to producers of space and to fashion this environment – both in its exterior and domestic qualities – according to their own representations.

Post-communist Roma Spatial Practices

The unique character of gypsy life can be used to decipher some of the decisions the Roma made in their spatial practices. But an important consideration is the reason they have chosen to invest in such a resource intensive practice as the build environment and, moreover, to build what in Romania is referred to as “gypsy palaces”. Although Roma communities have always left a mark on the spaces they inhabited, the advent of Roma architecture began in the mid 90s.

An important example is the Romanian town of Strehaia. Here, Roma mansions occupy the entire length of the main street. The style and size of the buildings are so extreme that the local state institutions such as the city hall, the post office, and the schools seem small, insignificant and uninspired. The urban strategies of the Roma community have created an urban condition that completely altered the nature of the town.

The lore of the itinerant life style of the Roma is backed by their traditional occupations dependent on new markets and by the violent discrimination they had been subjected to by the local communities and often by the authorities. However, many Roma communities remained stationary because they were enslaved, bound to a certain territory by legislation, or had simply abandoned the nomad life style.11 When stationary, they lived in make-shift dwellings, abandoned places and other liminal spaces they were inhabiting rather than creating. So why the need for an exuberant and expansive spatial practice now? A potential answer lies again with Lefebvre: “Any ‘social existence’ aspiring or claiming to be ‘real’, but failing to produce its own space, would be a strange entity, a very peculiar kind of abstraction unable to escape from ... the cultural realm ... groups, classes or fractions of classes cannot constitute themselves, or recognize one another, as ‘subjects’ unless they generate (or produce) a space. Ideas, representations or values which do not succeed in making their mark on space, and this generating (or producing) an appropriate morphology, will lose all pilt and become more signs, resolve themselves into abstract descriptions, or mutate into fantasies”12.
The gadje, the white man, has unrepentantly ‘mutated’ the Roma and their customs into fantasies for centuries. Without a strong presence in the urban layout, they were colorful apparitions employed as musicians at weddings or fantasy characters in popular songs and stories. With the production of architecture, the Roma are attempting to fashion spaces according to their own needs but also to escape this land of gadje fantasy to which they have been historically relegated to. From the point of view of the host society however, this attempt is a transgression that is hard to accept and is perceived, and rightly so, as a challenge to their dominance.

Further Directions

The emergence of Roma architecture and urban practice is related to changes in the host societies, specifically political and economic changes in Eastern Europe after the 1989 revolution. But a revolution is also meant to bring about change in the production of space. “A revolution that does not produce a new space has not realized its full potential; indeed it has failed in that it has not changed life itself, but has merely changed ideological superstructures, institutions or political apparatuses.” The Roma architecture is one of the most drastic appearances in the build environment after the Romanian revolution of 1989. Aside from the obvious capitalist developments in large cities, all other typologies have remained the same – moreover, they have continues to be built according to the same rules. We should perhaps then be wary of the government’s effort in recent years to eradicate these buildings in virtue of their disruptive and visual presence.

Of central interest to the architectural theorist is the fact that architecture and urbanism were chosen by the Roma as the medium of expression – and ‘weapon’ – in their complicated situation. While daily life in the modern society has been arguably liberated from the strict norms and regulations of the past and building technology has seen great changes, the build environment that surrounds us is still one characterized by boundaries. As Oswald Ungers pointed out, the city is an island of individual properties. Although deeply disliked for their life style, behavior and now architecture, the Roma spatial practices bring a needed challenge to the contemporary urban environment otherwise tightly bound in capitalist, bureaucratic or imperialist rules.
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Introduction

In the recent historiography about Yugoslavia, self-management was recognized as the corner stone of the legitimacy of socialist government that based its policy on the resistance to the Soviet authorities and tended to establish its own approach to socialism. Expulsion from the Cominform in 1948 encouraged Yugoslav state leadership to form the conception of a new policy, guarded from both the West as well as the East, popularly named the Yugoslav experiment. The new approach was found in the concept of workers’ self-management that supposed to establish new social relations through the principles of citizen participation and through the system of work associations. The key idea of self-management was to have political decisions be carried ‘from the bottom up’, that is, from the individual worker, member of the smallest unit of the system of self-management, towards the heads of the government. In the beginning of the fifties, self-management was introduced through the implementation of workers’ councils that in the long run supposed to manage the production and share profit. In the first years it was exclusively related to the economy, but in a short period, social aspect of self-management started to gain importance and was developed through the system of communes. Territorially, the basic unit for realization of self-management in the commune was local community that was the size of one neighborhood. Main question in this paper is in which way local community pretended to legitimate distinctiveness of Yugoslav urbanism through the architectural discourse. Important part of the architectural discourse after World War II in Yugoslavia were scientific conferences where theoretical research of the architects was presented, concerning different problems of architectural theory and practice, often through analysis of planned and realized architectural projects. After almost two decades of the development of ‘local community’ concept, accompanied with numerous realizations of local communities throughout Yugoslavia, a scientific conference named ‘Local Community: Social and Spatial Aspect of Development’ was organized in Belgrade, at the end of September 1978. The goal of this conference was to analyze former experiences and current problems of local community, starting from its constitutional
definition’ and to investigate variations in understanding of this concept among different professions. The conference program consisted of four thematic sections: (1) Social life and needs of local community residents; (2) Urban theory and planning practice of local communities; (3) Spatial and functional organization of local community and (4) Research. In the first group of papers, experts were mostly from the fields of sociology and urban sociology, in the second group experts were mostly urban planners, the third group of papers included mostly architects (presenting realizations of local communities from different cities and villages in Yugoslavia) and the fourth group presented several papers by architects and urban planners about visions and potentials of the local community in the future. Special contribution to the conference, that was part of the third group of papers, gathered studies written by the group of fifteen authors from the postgraduate program named ‘Housing’ held at the University of Belgrade, Faculty of Architecture. Since there were around forty papers dealing mostly with problems of urban planning and sociology, we can roughly calculate that almost one-third of the conference papers were concerning superfluous with problems of architectural discourse. Papers from the Faculty of Architecture were in the form of short reviews, describing the characteristic problems of spatial and functional development of local communities, such as spaces for: activities for elderly, education, environment, humanitarian activities, etc. Distinctiveness of architectural discourse at the conference can be analyzed as a specific response to broader questions about self-governing values that were elaborated in discourses on urban sociology and urban planning.

Self-management policy of the local community

Until 1955 communal system was spread throughout the country and communes and workers’ councils were respectively social and economic representatives of the self-management policy. During the establishment of the first communes, the key question was to find the appropriate size of the community that would be able to achieve local self-government in the place of residence. The first idea was ‘dwelling community’ that was developed in the late fifties in the context of broader international post-war debate on social, political and cultural characteristics of the modern neighborhood. Dwelling community followed the examples of different European city models, but it was essential to maintain the framework of self-managing policy in the process of city planning. According to the federal Constitution from 1963 self-management was sufficiently developed to be legally introduced and the role of local community was defined as a part of municipal self-management with a limited legal personality, even though it had certain independence in the internal management. The following decade, before the adoption of the next Federal Constitution in 1974, was marked by market crisis and social turmoil, prevailing political stance insisted that self-management become the central constitutional issue. Main focus was on two self-management units: for the economy that was the Basic Organization of Associated Labor, which was independent legal subject the size of one sector of the company; and the basic unite for social self-management was the Local Community that included citizens and working people of one neighborhood (part of the settlement) in order to realize common needs and achieve common interests. According to implemented urban hierarchy, city consisted of municipalities, and municipality consisted of local communities. Constitutional definition of local community implied that it was the basic territorial unit in which self-management was to be achieved by enabling all the members of local community to participate in the decision making process. This definition required thorough questioning of current urban planning principles in order to establish collective consensus on the desirable urban environment. In that sense, questions about the spatial and functional organization of the local community were actually questions about the self-governing organization of the socialist city.

Conference ‘Local community’ aimed to review approaches from various disciplines to existing examples of local communities and to provide the guidelines for the future. Some of the basic cultural values of self-management were inevitable part of the narrative about the socialist city in the conference papers. Those values had ambiguous meaning depending on the subject of the paper and theoretical position of the author. However, prevailing theoretical attitude, although not always explicit or elaborated, was Marxist standpoint that urban planning is an expression of mode of production and class structures (Larry Sawyers),

and that space is a social product (Henri Lefebvre). Some of the basic concepts in cultural policy of self-management were socialist democracy, humanism and participation. Those values were to be legitimated through different social practices and public discourses, and one important subject in representation of socialist society was the socialist city. Vision of the new city, that needed to enable adequate environment for development of self-governing man, was conceived primarily in the fields of spatial planning and urbanism, accompanied with the growing influence of newly introduced practice of urban sociology. Therefore, concepts that were discussed in the conference papers on urban sociology and urban planning, such as: ‘socialist democracy’, ‘common good’ (‘participation’) and ‘humanism’, will be analyzed here as a part of architectural discourse of the conference through the corresponding concepts that were, respectively: ‘free creative individual’, ‘collaborative design’ and ‘organic design’. We will examine how the main concepts of self-governing value system were entwined in the narration about the architecture of the local community.

Free creative individual

Among different forms of cultural production architecture is known as ‘the least autonomous one’ mostly because of its contingent nature. There is a wide field of research literature that tends to demonstrate that architectural design is dependent upon numerous factors that can be seen in reference to cultural context and modes of production of a certain society. Self-governing society in Yugoslavia tended to form its own political and economic system, trying to define itself separately from two predominant cultural models embodied in the visions of Western consumerist capitalism and Soviet totalitarianism. The contrast between the East and the West (the Orient and the Occident) has a deep historical continuity which is not related to any stable and concrete reality; therefore, analysis of the East/West conception can be used to present how the Self was being constructed in relation to the Other in the Yugoslav discourse. In the center of our analysis is the vision of the self-governing socialist city, often contrasted with the capitalist city (i.e. capitalist mode of production).

Socialist democracy was the cornerstone of the Yugoslav ideology and it was constitutionally recognized as the official state policy. Democracy supposed to be achieved bottom-up, starting from the base where delegate system would be conducted and every individual should be engaged both in his or hers workplace and place of living, i.e. through basic work organization and through local community. Main subject of democracy in the cultural policy of self-management was an ideal of the socialist man, namely ‘free creative individual’, that is capable to recognize personal needs and to define those needs in the context of common interest. In the conference writings we can find some features of this ‘individual’ necessary for development of the self-management community. Capitalist division of time that was reflected in ‘time for work’ and ‘time for leisure’, was criticized as a cause that made a divided person embodied in two basic roles – producer and consumer. In that context, primary goal of socialism was a synthesis of these two roles in the ‘free creative individual’. The precondition for this synthesis was different organization of the city that would be achieved through the gradual intertwining of spaces for work, life and leisure, in order to overcome segregation of space that is characteristic for modern capitalist cities. However, the goal was not to create the complete equalization of spaces for work and for everyday life, since that would lead to a closed community (the examples were workers’ housing estates in the interwar period). It was more important to find the right balance of functions than to search for specific form. In that context, negative critique was directed towards ‘architectural determinism’, the idea that spatial (re)organization and transformation of physical structure could initiate the change of social relations. The idea that architecture can change society has been seen as outdated and general attitude was that political and urban changes should be simultaneous. Another stance that was seen as wrong is ‘democratic elitism’ that tends to deprive local community of any power and to deny local autonomy. Democratic elitism was seen as characteristic for political context of capitalism, where corresponding approach to urbanism would be the one that raises basic quality of life by shaping the settlements in a way to make an illusion that those are true social communities, in order to disguise actual fragmentation of society. In contrast, participative democracy needs to include not only fulfillment of basic needs but also a possibility that every individual directly controls
his or her own life conditions. Also, releasing creative potentials of people meant that every local community needs to develop in specific social context, in accordance with its distinctive features of geographical position, urban location, historical and cultural context.

For architects, it was of the utter importance to make people come out of their small flats to the collective spaces of the settlement. Problem of alienation of people and uniformity of settlements were seen as consequences of segregation and technical solutions in construction, without identity and artistic experience.\textsuperscript{21} Author of the paper, architect Svetislav Ličina, proposes different levels of collective spaces dispersed all over the territory of local community, that would enable interaction between community members and that would allow to every individual an active role in space utilization. One of the institutions that had important role in culture life of community was ‘house of culture’ that should be open institution with activities that should not be limited only inside of building. As Ličina pointed out, it is necessary to build spaces that ‘should be polyvalent, unfinished in a way, with a possibility of transposition and diverse use’.\textsuperscript{22} The historical role model for these collective spaces was Greek agoras, some kind of focal point of cultural and political life of democratic society.\textsuperscript{23}

**Collaborative design**

In the context of participation was a subject of **common good** that divided opinions of conference participants. Conception of ‘space’ in the conference papers was established as the ‘totality of the natural and built environment on the specific territory’ and it was understood as a common good, therefore, it was necessary to raise awareness of citizens not to see it as something that doesn’t belong to them, or something that is owned by state.\textsuperscript{24} Another group of participants questioned the idea of common good in the context of urban planning. It is suggested that ideal of ‘common good’ should be discarded and the new role of planner should be to define and explicate conflicted interests and to propose optimal and efficient solutions towards the synthesis, as it was defined in the methods of cooperative (or joint) planning.\textsuperscript{25} Another method that was usually recommended was integrative planning,\textsuperscript{26} which implied better integration between center and periphery on the city level, and in broader sense better integration between all urban levels – local community, region and state.\textsuperscript{27} In the same context, the most frequently criticized subject in the conference papers was lack of participation of citizens in the process of conceptualization of new settlements. According to conference papers, meaning of the term ‘participation’ in self-management demanded distinction from historical context of capitalism. According to the analysis in one of the papers, ‘participation on the West’ was proclaimed in the sixties as a tendency of conservative politicians to recruit workers for their political goals and since was used as a ‘tool’ in resolving conflicts.\textsuperscript{28} Even though the meaning was elaborated in the theory of self-management, in Yugoslav practice successful method still wasn’t established despite the enduring efforts to include local community in decision processes of space organization and function in new settlements.

The first urban model of local community was named ‘dwelling community’ and it included various types of residential buildings, developed traffic network, playgrounds, green areas, main health and educational institutions and network of centers with stores and services dispersed around the area.\textsuperscript{29} From the first conception local community included network of centers with services, stores, social centers and communal spaces. However, because of the lack of funds, it was necessary to build in phases and the priority was to build as many apartments as possible for the growing population in the cities. As a result, in the beginning of the seventies a specific problem in newly built neighborhoods was the lack of basic services necessary for residents such as markets, stores and small businesses, which were planned but rarely realized. Also, there was a lack of community spaces, so the new neighborhoods acquired the nickname ‘giant dormitories’. For example, at the time, Block 45 in New Belgrade had 15,000 inhabitants (on the territory of 57ha) and only four small grocery stores. In order to solve this problem in Belgrade 1975, city government came to a decision to design and build 37 prefabricated and standardized centers of local communities until 1980. This decision opened up a lot of questions and was sharply criticized by architects at the conference as reckless and hasty.

The goal of community centers was to make local inhabitants spend their free time out of their flats and to develop social relations and creativity. The proposed solution in the paper by architect Dimitrije Mladenović named ‘Local community centers –
agoras of our time’ was to avoid proposed serial solutions and standardized functions and to make an experiment with local community members. It is important to point out that the term ‘experiment’ was politically legitimated as the term that described self-management in the formatting years – as Yugoslav experiment. The adequate example Mladenović found in a Dutch architectural practice of architect Frank van Klingeren who designed several community centers through cooperation with local community. Community center was usually designed as a large prefabricated membrane (walls and roof) and functions were conceived later, through collaboration with the local community. Most of the solutions were designed on the spot, with potential to be easily adjusted and corrected. Open space system with barriers instead of walls (even between disparate functions such as theater and coffee shop) are made with purpose to encourage cohabitation, tolerance and interweaving of different interests. Overall conclusion was that communal spaces need to be designed as flexible framework where general objectives and society values could be expressed and discussed and which would make them become ‘agoras of our time’.31

Organic design

The main goal in the early conception of local community was to resolve the key problem of city life, namely ‘dehumanization’, that appeared under the pressure of contemporary privatized consumerist society.32 In order to overcome capitalist mentality it was necessary to establish a community based on solidarity and humanist principles. Solidarity was achieved through the neighborhood relationships and communal activities, but the remaining question was how to make environment more human. One important subject was introduction of nature to the city in order to avoid occurrence of need to escape from the city to nature.33 Also, that was a way to control possible unlimited urban sprawl and, combined with urbanization of the country, to minimize the difference between the city and the country. Additional suggestion was development of linear cities that would follow main natural communications, such as big rivers, which would combine ‘corridor development’ with regional planning.34 In the official documents, as in General Urban Plan of Belgrade 1972, the local community was defined as a basic sell of urban organization of the city. In that context city was seen as a ‘complex growing organism’,35 in contrast to previous urban practice that was based on the model of the enclosed city divided to zones. Zoning model was criticized for producing social segregation, disintegration and elitism.36 Although organic model was adopted from western urban planners, it was seen as the appropriate theory for humanist approach and an adequate tool to overcome the difference between the city and the country that would be achieved if system of all local communities would be seen as organic whole. In the conference material was stated that existing territorial division needs to be transformed, but before that, optimal size of local community must be established.37 The goal was to realize ‘natural community’ that wouldn’t be defined only through the obvious parameters such as number of people or the size of the territory, but also by the complex factors that include social strata, urbanization level, possibility of collective decision process, or even categories such as the sense of belonging or ethical characteristics of the population.38 There was a general agreement that the size of local community should not be strictly defined, but only by approximate upper and lower limit. The overall conclusion was that local community should not be territorially limited. Every final bordering was seen as imposition of limits for further development and, in order to enable flexible borders, it was proposed to provide complex and constant monitoring of changes.39 In the context of spatial characteristics, it was necessary that every local community establishes its own documentation base updated regularly (every couple of years), that would include specific parameters of the current state and the analysis of the potentials.40 This flexibility of spaces and activities is seen as necessary in order to keep up with changes of society value system that should be constantly developing.41 Along the same lines was the critique of recently built neighborhoods that were rigid in structure and predefined in content.42 The prevailing attitude that ‘unified design of concrete settlements is outdated’ indicated negative opinion on the modernist settlements, suggesting that principles of modern architecture should be reassessed.43

In the architectural discourse one of the problems of modern urbanism presented by professor Ranko Radović was the urban disposition of central functions which were almost without example centrally located. This approach was criticized as an
exclusive in the European urban practice after World War II, although it was not always the most optimal. Alternate example was found in the plan for the southern extension of Amsterdam, made by Hendrik Petrus Berlage in 1915.\textsuperscript{44} Distribution of central functions was evenly arranged on the network of main streets in the ground floors of buildings. That disposition was seen as more flexible in use and it repeated the old-city dynamic between housing and services. Examples of local communities in Belgrade were criticized in this context, since in the new modern blocks (characteristic example was Block 45 in New Belgrade) central functions were concentrated in one centrally positioned building, while ground floors of residential buildings remain practically unused. The conclusion was that it is necessary to research the possibility of planning central functions all over the territory of local community, more or less homogenously. Also, every local community needs to be different and to gain the value of specific symbol, not by building a relatively expensive ‘center’, but by series of central functions that would follow walking paths.

**Concluding note**

Conference ‘Local community’ was organized in order to analyze previous experiences and to present current achievements in theory and practice of local community. Also, the goal of the conference was to select examples of a good practice, both local and international, and to provide guidelines for further development. However, from today’s perspective it becomes clear that this conference was one of the last attempts to strengthen the idea of local community within urban and architectural discourse. In the following decade plan of the authorities to build a series of community centers was not realized and various proposals by architects in the conference papers remained on paper. Since the insistence on the self-managing policy has faded throughout the eighties, the role of the local community was getting less significant both as a social and territorial unit of neighborhood. Mutual influence of self-management policy and architectural discourse was effective in the sense that principles of self-management served as a flexible framework within which architects were able to explore contemporary design proposals and to conduct up-to-date research. However, by analyzing conference papers about existing local communities, it can be concluded that self-governing relations found more adequate response in the project proposals than in the urban and architectural practice. If architecture is regarded as a cultural practice that can be seen as a part of a dominant society value system, then, according to the conference conclusions, qualitatively new space that would reflect self-management policy could be found in the collective space of local community centers, where architecture would enable for members of the collective to make their own decisions and arrange their activities and spaces.

**Endnotes**


3. Development of self-management was part of the process of “withering-away” of the state, coined by Karl Marx and Friedrich Engels.


6. Scientific conference ‘Mesna zajednica’ was organized by Urban Union of Yugoslavia (Urbanistički savez Jugosloviјe), and Institute for architecture and urbanism of Serbia (Institut za arhitekturu i urbanizam Srbije).


42 Ibid. 3.


The architecture of the everyday built environment provides an excellent view into the on-the-ground negotiation of socialist modernity, both physically as well as conceptually. Vernacular architecture, however, continues to remain poorly represented in studies of the socialist period for East Central Europe. Insisting on moving beyond the national in vernacular architectural styles, this paper interrogates the discursive construction of this site of socialist modernity by two key professional groups, architects and ethnologists, examines the negotiated reality, and considers the implications of an (un)defined vernacular architecture.

In the late twentieth century, Slovene architects and ethnologists largely understood vernacular architecture as a historical statement on the past lifeways of a former national “folk.” This temporal dislocation of vernacular architecture from the contemporary period did not parallel an erasure and replacement of the existing built environment, however. On the contrary, vernacular architecture persisted as new structures built by non-academically trained individuals proliferated with few references to “national” style or traditional structures. As these new constructions burgeoned, a clear clash emerged between expert definitions, local negotiation of modernity, and the physical reality in urban environments. Unresolved, these competing conceptions introduced complications into local understandings of socialist modernity and its construction.

KEYWORDS: Vernacular architecture, state socialism, Yugoslavia, Slovenia

Introduction
In 1968, a group of local residents in the Rakova jelša neighbourhood of Ljubljana, Slovenia, banded together to form a housing society, a small cooperative that could negotiate on their behalf with municipal agencies and help them realize their dream of building homes. They wished to put up residences in what was still a relatively open, but increasingly populated area just outside the city’s urban plan. Their efforts did not yield fruit, however; blocked by municipal urban planners, the locals’ plans eventually stalled. Later, these Rakova jelša residents would lament being excluded from the housing boom of single-family homes.1

While the vast majority of residences built in Rakova jelša during the socialist period were illegal construction or what Brigitte LeNormand has aptly termed “rogue construction,”2 they offer a good example of socialist-era vernacular architecture and its place in socialist modernity. Vernacular architecture of this type, or everyday constructions that were primarily designed and built by non-professionals, proliferated across East Central Europe under state socialism, but was rarely accounted for in professional discourse and has been absent in recent scholarship.3 Despite this, it figured as a key site for the negotiation of socialist modernity; as the case of Rakova jelša reveals, while left undefined by professionals and so left out of socialist productions, this site was ultimately acknowledged as a part of inhabited socialism and so socialist modernity.

Rakova jelša: Socialism’s Disorder or Vernacular Expression?
Rakova jelša, the most well-known, or notorious, of rogue construction districts in Ljubljana, Slovenia, is today associated in the popular imagination with awful housing, ineffective sewer management, high crime, and a problematic immigrant population, all of which are believed to capture the failings of socialism.4 Unlike the immediately adjacent up-scale Murgle neighbourhood,5 however, Rakova jelša was left out of municipal urban plans until 1980.
and it has hardly figured in any scholarly studies of architecture or socialism. While suffering from a terrible reputation, Rakova jelša is in fact not so unusual in the greater East Central European urban context. Indeed, I would argue it is quite representative of one type of everyday housing.

Lying in a crook of land between the Mali graben stream and the Ljubljanica River, small Rakova jelša is, in fact, a neat, little district. It is marred by the occasional trash pile but graced by a small, unregulated stream and orderly housing. Neatly lining streets on a grid, the houses in Rakova jelša present rows of cream-colored façades of free-standing, two- and three-storey, solid masonry-unit residences. Densely spaced on small plots, the structures generally boast balconies, garages, and apparently solid construction. Today none are works-in-progress, but all are complete, free-standing homes. They are separated by roads, some paved and some still macadam, and allow the visitor to peek through to a few green spaces, the kind Rakova jelša was known for before the Second World War. Stylistically, the Rakova jelša residences share at first blush many traits with other free-standing homes across Ljubljana; none reflect a “peasant style” or re-interpretation of regionally specific, historic rural architecture. Rather, all present as socialist-era, single-family homes, much like other, often legally built ones across Ljubljana.

Vernacular architecture: Search for Definitions

Defining vernacular architecture like that found in Rakova jelša is a challenging task; what are these places of neither formal design nor “traditional” constructions? Vernacular architecture figures as an interstitial topic in both Central European and North American scholarship, and its definition has both disciplinary and methodological implications. Contemporary conceptual differences between North American and East European scholarship on vernacular architecture complicate cross-regional conversations, and this assessment would also hold true for the socialist period. For both East Central and North American scholars, East Central European vernacular architecture most often refers to “folk architecture,” or non-modern, traditional architecture associated with historical peasant lifeways, traditional building methods versus industrialized or modern ones, and regionally established architectural styles. This definition describes structures like farm houses, homesteads, and agricultural outbuildings, and it dovetails closely with the construction of national identity based on a historic, ethnically homogeneous or linguistically unified national folk. While useful, this approach can suggest a national, peasant-based past that is in juxtaposition to the present, and so overlook the everyday structures that burgeoned in number under socialism. This view may also reify East Central European conceptions of a historic “national folk,” as well as an abiding North American focus on the nationality question. However, the structures in question had various relations to folk architecture, were often not in a “traditional” style, were found in urban settings, used modern building materials, and were temporally of the socialist present, all characteristics that do not mesh with the notion of a historic peasant “Folk” and its architecture.

Among North American folklorists, vernacular architecture can refer to traditional or “folk” architecture, or everyday architecture of the present that is associated with a particular community, its aesthetics, and its beliefs. To approach everyday architecture as a site of practices, embodiments, and negotiations in socialist modernity, I propose to extend the North American focus on the contemporary to the East Central European context. Here, while I acknowledge formal design influences, I consider vernacular architecture as built by what Joseph Sciorra has termed “nonacademically trained individuals,” or ones other than design professionals, conforming to identifiable building styles, and dating from the contemporary period. This moves beyond the question of “national style” and a possible assumption of vernacular architecture as primarily a site of resistance, and
instead locates it within socialist productions. This shift also repositions vernacular architectural production out of the romantic or non-legitimate realm, as if it did not contribute to socialist modernity, was necessarily opposed to the state, or primarily represented hold-overs from a distant past, and aligns it with socialist reality.

Slovene Architects: Future-Focused and Modern

Among Slovene architects, vernacular architecture found its way onto some of the first pages of professional publications, but across the socialist period, the primary journals for architecture, urbanism, and industrial design clearly maintained a primary focus on an emerging, new, and modern present that was strongly disassociated from the past. Thus, vernacular architecture enjoyed few references in Arhitekt and Sinteza, almost always figuring something of a curiosity. Most broadly, in the 1950s this type of construction was termed popular architecture (ljudska arhitektura) or, more regularly, population construction (ljudsko stavbarstvo), thus eliminating it from architectural productions. Architects would underscore the simplicity of the Slovene hayrack, perhaps noting its functionalism, but quickly point to its non-contemporary nature. Alternatively, architects might focus on traditional residential architecture in far-away places, like Macedonia, that was presented as clearly pre-modern. While there is a hint of lingering romantic notions of the national folk, the insistence on the modern, socialist kept romanticizations at bay. A few writers praised older architecture, but limited this to very fine design generally found in sophisticated, urban settings that meshed well with contemporary design theory.

Vernacular architecture, associated with the domestic, the rural, and the pre-modern, never figured in architects’ primary areas of concern – design for the contemporary environment, industrialization, or urbanization; rather, it was cast as almost nationally specific, primitive and certainly pre-modern. This focus, coupled with a clear interest in contemporary housing of either multi-unit or single-family construction, cast vernacular architecture as a phenomenon of the past; as such, it was to disappear, as a national, pre-socialist past yielded to a Yugoslav socialist, modern contemporary.

In this, architects were drawing on European-wide legacies of architectural modernism, while adjusting to the new socio-political realities by aligning their profession’s definition of modern with the political one. Fortunately, their profession lent itself easily to potential contributions to an industrialized, Yugoslav socialist, and urbanizing society. For some, political concerns took center stage and appears to have strongly informed this stance. More broadly, popular support for and the readiness to adopt what promised to be a new, exciting interpretation of modern life should not be underestimated for those in the design fields. For a country still full of vernacular architecture in rural settings, architects’ silence was suggestive of a desired future, versus a contemporary reality. This stance, too, pushed vernacular architecture further into the past; its theoretical relevance was relegated to how it would yield to the contemporary, thus de-constructing it out of socialist modernity. In parallel, in this discourse, there was no space for new vernacular constructions and so they equally did not exist.

Slovene Ethnologists: Looking Back and Somewhat “Folksy”

Like architects, ethnologists also defined vernacular architecture based on a fundamental assumption of a break with the past, although they did so for different reasons. Slovene ethnologists entered the socialist period with a strong theoretical and disciplinary foundation, one that focused on a land-based, linguistically unified, national folk, and that sometimes concerned itself with what it understood as disappearing lifeways. In the early 1950s, while architects were clearly casting themselves as aligned with the new state, ethnologists struggled a bit to find a place for themselves and their profession in the new socio-political system. Initially their work had multiple temporal focuses, ranging from the historical, to continuities, to the inclusion of traditional lifeways in the present and eventual socialist future, and this reflected a conceptual tension around the definition of the “folk.” Although ethnological professional publications engaged with vernacular architecture, key journal Slovenski etnograf primarily focused on other well-established topics, such as the verbal arts (oral literature), folk song, and crafts.
By the early 1960s, the retirements of older ethnologists and the emergence of a new cadre ushered in change. In 1962 a young Slavko Kremenšek attempted to shift Slovene ethnology into the realm of what he termed North American cultural anthropology; versus his North American colleagues, however, Kremenšek insisted on a focus on the past, or a pre-socialist history relatively free of a land-based, linguistically unified, national folk. It would be an oversimplification to state that the national or the contemporary were fully erased from ethnological research, but the field overall underwent a shift in tone. Thus, new historical studies of horse racing emerged, alongside research on the Roma, outnumbering studies of traditional villages. This move did not erase the long-standing in ethnology, however, and interesting developments emerged. A few sub-fields, such as folk song, folk arts, and vernacular architecture within folk arts, could not refocus away from the (national) past; thus, studies of national costume, beehive panels, glass paintings of saints, and lace were considered together with peasant furniture, interior architectural decorations, and exterior architectural ornamentation, along well-established typologies. Other sub-fields, including some aspects of folk crafts, shifted to include a secondary focus on the present.

The national Ethnographic Museum undertook numerous fieldwork projects from the 1960s through 1980s, and in the late 1960s held several exhibitions on vernacular architecture, featuring the alpine or Gorenjska house, the Karst house, and the Pannonian house. These perhaps represented some of the most focused studies of vernacular architecture at that time. By centering on the regional, ethnologists neatly eschewed any question of the overtly national; by terming it past, they also reified conceptions of a historic folk and pushed that “folk” and its architecture into the past. Their work should not be misunderstood, however. In 1971, an interesting complication of the “national folk” emerged in an exhibition on kitsch. Described as highly popular, it suggested interrogation of the constructed nature of the “national folk” at any early time, as well as a theoretical probing of the field’s orientation. This exhibition points to ethnologists’ complex position at this time; their disciplinary legacies made them partially unable – or unwilling – to remove the historic national folk from their research. While folk crafts could successfully be modified for the socialist present, vernacular architecture as ethnologists conceived of it could not. With their overall stance, ethnologists pushed everything purely “folk” into the past, including vernacular architecture; new structures built by the nonacademically trained were not considered. Thus, ethnologists echoed the position taken by architects vis-à-vis the vernacular built environment, although with a different temporal focus. Across disciplines, vernacular architecture was assumed to not exist in contemporarystalism.

Locals’ Installation of Vernacular Architecture and Socialist Modernity

Locals in burgeoning urban settings, however did not pay much heed to the writings of either architects or ethnologists when attempting to resolve their housing needs and participate in society. In contrast, they avidly engaged in the production of vernacular architecture and the related imagining of socialist modernity and its inhabitation. Rakova jelša figured as one such site, and it quickly became understood in the eyes of design professionals as unmanaged and unmanageable. However, beyond serving as a ground for power struggles and some resistance to state officials, two topics that have been examined for socialist housing estates, for residents it served as a viable locus for their participating in the installation and negotiation of Yugoslav socialist modernity.

After World War Two, Rakova jelša lay at the very outskirts of Ljubljana, at the margins where the capital met the Ljubljana Marsh and undeveloped land beyond. During early post-war planning, Rakova jelša was classified for “green spaces – reservation,” and this was echoed in the 1966 General Urban Plan for the Development of Ljubljana. A 1976 map of the city, however, offers a very different picture. By then, several houses had sprouted up in Rakova jelša, neatly arranged along at least six streets that ran parallel from the main road, Cesta na Rakovo jelšo (Road to Rakova jelša) to a bend in the Ljubljanica River.

By the mid 1960s, Rakova jelša was emerging as a settlement in its own right. This urban development, however, had unfolded outside the purview of municipal authorities, much to their consternation. According to the 1978 Proposal for the Sanation of Rakova jelša, the area was home to
340 houses that had been erected and 75% of all the structures documented in Rakova jelša were classified as illegal construction. The problematic nature of this situation began to draw the attention of the authorities in the mid-1960s; beginning in 1965, the Ljubljana Urban Institute (LUZ) outlined the problems in Rakova jelša, including illegal construction, lack of municipal services including water and electricity, and unacceptable conditions resulting from lack of sewage management.

Residents, for their part, attempted to resolve their housing situation through multiple avenues, including petitions and attempts to form a housing society, like one in the villa-laden Rožna dolina district. These efforts point to a desire to participate in what historians have called “the Yugoslav dream” and this in a focused, Yugoslav socialist way. Rakova jelša residents appear quite “self-managing” in organizing a housing cooperative, versus rogue or oppositional, and their numerous meetings with municipal planners point to a readiness to work within the system. They even noted to city planners their desire to build legally, criticising neighbours who circumvented the socialist system; this, too, underlines a desire to participate in inhabiting socialism in a socialist way. And, their belief in the dream of a single-family home – as well as seeing this as a realistic expectation – is quite plain. In short, Rakova jelša residents were asking to take part in their piece of the proverbial Yugoslav socialist pie.

City planners considered changing Rakova jelša’s land categorization and so incorporating it into the Ljubljana General Urban Plan, a document they were obliged to follow. But by the spring of 1968, exchanges between residents and municipal urban planners were growing tense as planners refused to give the green light to the housing society and instead introduced a plan to extend municipal services – if funded by residents. Planners expressed clear annoyance at residents’ disrespect for the urban plan, underscoring their own professional expertise as they insisted on the need to follow complex regulations. In their eyes, the issue at hand was not so much the rogue construction, but Rakova jelša residents working outside well-tuned urban plans. Planners never proposed razing any structures in Rakova jelša or forcibly relocating the residents. While this had practical sides, including letting citizens carry the costs of building homes, it is also suggestive of a more profound recognition.

Planners acknowledged that Rakova jelša residents were requesting something completely appropriate in Yugoslav state socialism, housing, and that they were going about this in a locally appropriate way, through a self-managing organization.

However, the debates over the sewer system, water mains, electrical lines, and telephone wires defied resolution. By late 1968, efforts had ground to a halt; the unwieldy bureaucracy and stalling in advance of anticipated legislation seem to be at fault, which proved to introduce significant changes. Little was accomplished until 1978, when municipal urban planners finally proposed a two-phrase improvement plan for Rakova jelša, which was followed by the 1979 Construction Plan for Rakova jelša. Ultimately adopted by the local commune on 16 and 23 July 1980, this plan brought Rakova jelša into the greater Ljubljana city plan. The issue of remedying problematic sewage management, however, would continue for a good twenty years. On the practical front, this step avoided many awkward logistics for planners and the state and was understood as a practical necessity. However, it also suggests that the Rakova jelša neighbourhood was implicitly understood as an expression of a shared socialist modernity.

Concluding note

Scholars have recently noted that some housing estates constructed under socialism were actually quite successful and that rogue construction neighbourhoods in socialist Yugoslavia are surprising not for their existence, but for the quality of construction found there. Certainly this reflected access to materials and tradespeople that was specific to certain populations in Yugoslavia, including some of modest means. However, it also reflects these locals’ readiness and ability to inhabit socialism for themselves. As pointed to in the work of some newer historians of Yugoslavia, there is clear evidence of a shared culture at the republic and federal levels in Yugoslav state socialism, and new vernacular architecture devoid of “national” references figured as one site where this socialism was locally negotiated across the country.
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Here, I am extending the North American focus on the contemporary period, versus the entire North American folkloristic definition of vernacular architecture. My concern falls on methodologically bringing everyday constructions of the socialist period into consideration, versus on proposing a conceptual redefinition – of the national folk.
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Conventional classifications of the built environment – into urban and rural categories, reflected in legislation, planning regulations and capital-oriented mechanisms of space production, render rural areas more and more invisible and powerless in terms of governmental policy and political debates. Besides, in the majority of the scholarship, the grand narratives on spatial transformations mostly focus on the issues of the constructing urban built environment and have ignored the voice of ‘peripheral’ spatial experiences and micro-history on the historical remains. This paper is an attempt to trace and verbalize the voices of people inhabiting rural settlements with complex historical layers, which have shaped their development and daily experience. The window through which this issue will be explored is three case studies in the prefecture of İzmir: Küçükbağçe, Hisarköy and İncecikler.

Küçükbağçe, a coastal village near the Aegean Sea, has been both spatially and demographically defined by the Greco-Turkish population exchange, hence presenting a unique layering of memories as well as abandoned ruinous houses. Hisarköy, located within a castle - archaeological site, demonstrates an example of contemporary inhabitation spatially integrated in the demolished physicality. İncecikler, having a connection with the ancient Acropolis of Pergamon, is a typical example of rural settlement adjacent to the natural park in Kozak Region. These peripheral settlements present an opportunity to examine contemporary socio-spatial experience in its interaction with historical remains. How do their inhabitants interpret the tangible past that shapes their surroundings, and does this interpretation contradict ‘central’ or official versions of history?
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Introduction
İzmir is the third biggest province of Turkey located at the East Coast of the Aegean Region in Turkey¹ and has a multi-layered background of cultural heritage. It houses physical entities and spatial impacts with a spectrum ranging from Ancient Greek to Hittite and from Seljukid period to Republic of Turkey. This palimpsest of İzmir geography develops and hosts a huge accumulation of historical studies based on archaeological and architectural artefacts. However, these spatial studies have little links or slippery touch to the everyday practices of inhabitants who are spending their lives in the particular sites, especially in the periphery of İzmir.² This paper task is to understand the context of the inhabitants who are in the periphery of these historical sites.³ Three specific sites are chosen to emphasise the existing situations and to develop a socio-spatial connection between the historical site and their inhabitants. The first case is Hisarköy, located within a castle – archaeological site, demonstrates an example of contemporary inhabitation spatially integrated in the demolished physicality. The second one is İncecikler, having a strong visual connection with the ancient Acropolis of Pergamon, and is a typical example of rural settlement adjacent to the natural park in Kozak Region. Final case, Küçükbağçe, a coastal village near the Aegean Sea, has been both spatially and demographically defined by the Greco-Turkish population exchange, hence presenting a unique layering of memories as well as abandoned ruinous houses.

The field research is held by a semi-structured interview asking the historical narratives of the rural inhabitants about their own settlement in April 2015 and also based on the field research conducted by the Faculty of Architecture of İzmir Institute of Technology, which produced a rural inventory of 416 rural settlements and their built...
environment between 2011 and 2012 in the İzmir Region. Within the three different rural settlements, totally 20 individual in-depth interviews are performed and documented. Personal stories of the inhabitants and their spatial relationships about the historical neighbourhood are recorded by taking notes.  

Production of Rural Space

Although the production of rural space examined by Henri Lefebvre seems to be a periphery issue or task, his argumentation on the production of space is comprehensive while understanding the link between historical settlement and the inhabitants. He simply claims that “space is a social product” (Lefebvre, 1991). This formulation adds more to the physical evaluation of the space and covers a broader perspective of spatial production and houses the actors and the physicality of the space. Tracing the appropriation and domination in space, he shifts the theoretical route of spatial production and formations.

Before going further to a detailed examination of the settlements, it is important to define the rural settlements and their link to the urban geography which may be seen as a separated spatial formation. It is argued that the urban and rural areas are seemed to be two polar frameworks while considering the built environment in different scales. (Lefebvre, 2003)

The Lefebvrian triology in rural lands is translated into another framework developed by Halfacree (Halfacree, 2006) Understanding the production of rural space as a whole, but focusing on the following aspects: Rural Localities, Formal representations of the rural, and Everyday lives of the rural. She underlines the comprehensive moments of space to relate human settlements. The first covers the spatial practices that include the production and consumption activities in rural settlements, while the second aspect focuses on how the rural environment itself is commoditized by the exchange value. Third inherits the inhabitant’s individual and social life inevitably incoherent and fractured as the cognitive interpretation and negotiation increases. These particular moments and divisions for the rural production of space define the voice-gathering theoretical tool of this survey.

In addition to that, the diversity of the locality is the challenge in reflecting the conceptualisation of historical settlement and inhabitants’ role of the place. Rodman underlines the transactions between locality and the voice of inhabitants while criticising the anthropological studies lacking the voice of the inhabitants. (Rodman, 1992) The approach to the settlements by considering the historical and cultural influence of space and geography is explored and the conditions and relationship of the inhabitants and its spatial background is supported and enhanced theoretically by referring to the varying effects of the platform that the inhabitants dwell on. This particular approach triggers also the novel understanding in the anthropological studies that refers directly to the multi-local and multi-vocal dimension of place and its determining role.

Trajectory: Unvoiced Histories

After this particular theoretical framework that we chose to examine the case studies, for this paper an abstract trajectory is developed to follow and verbalise the different situations during the analysis of the field work in the settlements. Through this trajectory, particular questions for the recent conditions of the settlement and verbalisations of the experiences of the inhabitants located on the historical sites and their socio-spatial outcomes are questioned. These chosen peripheral settlements present an opportunity to examine contemporary socio-spatial experiences with the surrounding historical remains and also to depict the multi-vocality and multi-locality of the place that the inhabitants dwell on in the same region but having different contexts. The main question is: How do their inhabitants interpret the tangible past that shapes their surroundings, and does this interpretation contradict ‘central’ or official versions of history?

To trace the diversity of answers to that question, we have developed a theoretical way of considering and understanding the localities, the everyday life of village settlement and the formal representation of village. The three cases are chosen from the periphery of Izmir. The repeating element in each case is the remaining ruins. The ruins are handled in three aspects. One is to live directly in the ruins with its bureaucratic challenges. Hisarköy is the main case of this kind of particularity. The ruins of the castle are the part of a house and also the part of the village square (Figure 1). The second ruin is the abstract one that affects the everyday life of the periphery, namely İncecikler. By the
impact of Bergama Kermesi (Bergama Festival) and neighbouring remains of Asklepion and Acropolis of Pergamon, the impact of ruin shaped the historical conceptualisation of the inhabitants while constructing the everyday life of the village with various discourses. This conceptualisation finds a little space in the museum of ethnography in Bergama. The third case is Küçükbaşçe. It is a village that is creating ruins because of the historical impact of the forced population exchange and other social and economic forces. The remaining elements of houses and schools develop unique spatial experiences within the village. These three cases are special to discuss the ruins and the impacts of it among the inhabitants living in the periphery of İzmir.

Hisarköy

The rural settlement of Hisarköy of Kiraz became more popular by the newspaper heading in the national press in 2008. The national media attributed a pejorative tone to the dwellings of the settlement as saying gecekondu (squatter) and criticised the inhabitants as they started to live there only 150 years ago compared to the neighbouring castle having approximately 5000 years of age. The national press announced that the squatter village was going to be demolished as it had been a registered historical site since 1985. Hisarköy got its name from the ruinous fortress in the centre of the village (hisar means fortress in Turkish). It has been on a registered historical site since 1985. The castle gives not much information about its history, but it is built in 3000 BC and renovated by Anatolian Seljuks in 12th and 13th centuries. Being 2 km closer to the city centre, the village houses a unique dialogue between this particular historical artefact and the everyday life of the inhabitants. Circular settlement of the village having the half-damaged fortress at the centre, the inhabitants of Hisarköy live within the ruins in the preserved area. However, this local media awareness did not affected much the dwellings on Hisarköy, but became a dominating issue in the agenda of the village.

However, referring to the inhabitants and to the records of the muhtar, only one person is paying the tax to the government called ecirimisil (a special tax that is paid annually as long as the building you are occupying is a state land).

“Here in this village, none of us is paying ecirimisil. It is so expensive for all of us. Since we are not getting any service from the government, we are refusing it. One of our neighbour payed this tax because of his economic activity. Due to the online taxation system of the government, his debt has appeared in the system while he was trying to sell his car. So, he had to pay it.” (Informant H-1)

Since he has to register to the economic system for a trade activity, the online system of the state does not allow him to sell his automobile without paying the former taxes for his own dwelling located within the limits of an abstracted line drawn by the Conservation Committee.

Up to now, in the interior zone of the village, the houses fortunatelly have not been demolished since 1985, however, the fear of taxation and the
pressure of demolition define the everyday life of the inhabitants. Besides, any attempt to renovate the building itself happened to be illegal without any registered conservation projects. So, due to the lack of economical potentials of the inhabitants or of any motivated entrepreneur who wants to regenerate the village, the people in Hisarköy are left to live in the ruins and their houses are decaying.

İncecikler

İncecikler is a rural settlement in the Kozak Region closer to 4 km to the Acropolis ruins and 14 km to Asklepiion. Having a link to Acropolis of Pergamon and Asklepiion historical site, Bergama has joined the World Heritage in 2015. The role of Bergama Kermesi has been the longest festival of Republic of Turkey. It was initiated by Atatürk and organised firstly in 14 April 1938 after his visit to Bergama. The ethnographical studies at the same time have started in Bergama by collecting the artefacts from the village life in late 1930s. The Museum of Bergama was opened just one year after the visit of Atatürk. The ethnographic part of the museum was opened in 1950s. The folkloric dresses and different equipment from the periphery were stored in the newly formed museum. The images and materials of village life have been shown in the cubicles of the museum as the everyday lives in the villages. The decision of Ethnography Museum seems to be an attempt of distancing the rural people from their own tradition and their built environment, namely to their own localities. However, the artefacts are exhibited without the names of the villages that they were taken from. Only the names of the districts like Kozak, Menemen or Manisa but not the names of the villages were mentioned on the information labels of the artefacts like traditional outfits, equipment of vernacular house, household objects, carpets, etc.

On one hand, Kermes becomes a platform for the demonstration of traditional games held in the villages such as Cirit and Cop. These two horse-based games sustained as a traditional part of the whole festival up to 1970. Because of the sad accident that happened during the games, this traditional activity was forbidden for a while. However, since three years ago, it has still been an important part of the festival that is held within the former location of Kozak Region. Rather than a passive demonstration in the ethnographical part of Bergama Museum, with its active participation from the old inhabitants of the neighbouring villages, it has a unique character and place within the novel motivations of festival having popular figures as guests.

“I was good at the game of Cop. One of the best players in our village. I participated in the games more than 10 times in Kermes as my father did. I always got excited when I was playing. But now I am old and not able to join the fest.” (Informant I-5)

The retired officer of Bergama Museum who lives in the İncecikler underlines the promising interest of early years of Republic in the historical artefacts and archaeology. The museum of Bergama has been the symbol of this ideological and pedagogical interest. Starting from the early years of the festival, the rural and its materiality found in the program of the festival. Kermes was the theatrical and performative place for the rural people. The traditional plays of Cirit and Cop with horses were and are still realised in the program of the festival by the participants from the neighbourhood inhabitants of the Kozak region including İncecikler.

The folkloric artefacts are frozen in the cubicles and Kermes having a special case of re-performing the traditional activities with the reference to the village life is critical. Since the major motivation of the festival was to develop a modern citizen having awareness to the historical artefact around Bergama, the failure is explicitly verbalised by the museum officer.

“Our people here in the villages are not very interested in their own history. Moreover, they are not aware of their surrounding built environment. I believe this is because of the lack of education and wrong politics.” (Informant I-7)

The changing program of the festival helped to that failure towards a popular phase that conditioned the relationship of the inhabitants of İncecikler to the former motivation of the festival. Familiar and visible site of Akropolis and Asklepiion set a distance between the historical site and the inhabitants by the conservation politics of the state, but the village itself developed a unique history that has been constructed to their own cultural identity. Early pedagogical function of the Kermes turned into a popular and commercial activity with the invitation of famous figures over time.
Küçükbahçe

Küçükbahçe with its closer link to the Aegean Sea as a shore-village has a unique spatial location and tri-partite history. The oldest part of the village has been housing the remains left by the people who had lived there before. These were the people who left the city of Symrna in the beginning of the 20th century by the population exchange. The houses that they had left were occupied by the people coming from Selanik (Thessaloniki) with the same exchange program.

The settlement inherited different cluster of ruins as they attempted to displaced three times by external influences over time. The second cluster of the empty village has been left starting from the 1990s. The old fashion strategy of the early village settlement to locate the village out of reach of pirate attacks was not effective as the fields were getting harder to reach for the old residence of the village. As the old houses did not satisfy the contemporary comfort conditions, the inhabitants chose to displace the village 3 km closer to the shore and closer to their field and closer to the newly mosque built in 1992. The third part of the village in the recent neighbourhood is now centrally located around the village square adjacent to market and kahvehane.

“Rums left this village two times, one during the population exchange, second during German War.” (Informant K-7)

Although the former muhtar of Küçük bahçe underlined that the displacement of the inhabitants had started with the earthquake in 1949, the registered population movement in the locality had its deeper history and roots. These dislocations are due to the population exchange between two countries (Greece-Ottoman Empire and Greece-Republic of Turkey).

Küçükbahçe inhabitants also witness the population exchange which has happened during the late years of Ottoman Empire and the early days of the republican era. Informant K-7 (born in Selanik) migrated by a ship when he was 2 years old. The people embarked on Selanik and the voyage ended and they unshipped at the shore of Karaburun. The land left by the people who moved to Greece now has different owners. The land is given to the newcomers by the government according to the agreement. The houses that have been left from the early inhabitants are occupied by the people coming from Greece.

“We are still using the spatial names left from Rums: Agorinin Ev Arkası (House-behind of Agori), Garayorgi Fırını (the oven of Garayorgi), Milicçiyanın Ev Yanı (House-side of Milicçiyan).” (Informant K-3)

However, due to the major earthquake in 1949 and the other topographical movements of the settlement, the people were forced to move to a different location which was quite near to the shore, but not exactly at the shore. Due to the lack of the infrastructure of the previous location, the inhabitants of Küçük bahçe change their dwellings. Each time, the inhabitants left a cluster of ruinous houses as a trace of the displacement on the skirts of Karaburun Mountain.

Concluding note

The relationship of the old ruins and inhabitants is examined through the case of İncecikler. Küçük bahçe case is questioned in details to understand both the physical and the cultural remains after and during the population exchange by the inhabitants. (Figure 2). Additionally, Hisarköy is emphasised in terms of conservation politics of the state. The impact of Kermes in İncecikler, population exchange politics with the geographical position of Küçük bahçe and bureaucracy in conservation zones like Hisarköy discern the image of the dominating powers in periphery. However, the tactics of the inhabitants like rejecting the tax payment, sustaining the traditional activities in the festival while giving less attention to the events in the remains of antiquity, keeping the street location names of the former inhabitants develops a spatial tactics that empowers the multi-vocal and multi-local character of these three sites.
As Halfacree develops a framework to uncover the production of rural space, we try to highlight the rural localities of each village, their formal representations of the rural by tracing the ethnography museum and understanding the everyday lives of the rural by verbalising their opinion for the built environment around (Halfacree, 2006). Dominating the aspects of space organisation conditioned by the power struggle, the village inhabitants witness different type of survival tactics. The dwellings and the historicity that they are reflecting are the voices of periphery that are hardly heard in the centre of the power struggle. The administrative decisions, legislation changes and economical determinants influenced the spatial characters and historical conceptualisation of villages in the periphery zones.

In Turkey, and especially in the periphery of İzmir, people interaction with the ruins is problematic in three basic aspects. One is the long and repressive position of bureaucracy due of the lack and gaps in renovation and restorations politics. The recent regulations and implementations with their loaded restrictions are not helping or supporting the inhabitants to live in the remains of the history. If we consider Hisarköy, the inhabitants are having difficulties in their everyday lives, even in their right to dwell. The second aspect is the representation of rural life. The forced ways of representing rural life in museums through problematic techniques of exhibition determine the mainstream understanding of rural space through ethnography. Early modern attempts of representation with its limited information set barriers in expressing the rural real life in the public domains like media and museums. The third is the lack of public interest in ruins. In İncecikler as the museum officer’s voice underlined in this paper, the educational dimension and awareness of the history within the rural areas and the lack of socio-spatial attention to the built environment determine the relationship of inhabitants with the remains of the old civilisations. Besides, the micro-histories and spatial remains as we have witnessed in Küçükbahçe are being verbalised in the mainstream discussions. More multi-local and multi-vocal perspectives with holistic approach of research are needed to understand the geographical and historical dimensions of built environments in the periphery of İzmir.

Endnotes

1 The rural settlements of İzmir with the number of 614 villages have scattered geographically around the mountains of Madra, Yamanlar, Bozadağlar, Dumanlı, Yunt, Bozdağlar, Kemalpaşa, Çatalkaya, Akdağlar, Aydın mostly within the forests, near the seashores of Aegean Sea or on the various plains nourishing with the rivers of Gediz and Menderes. Considering the population statistics of 2010, 342.522 people of the total population of 3.948.848 are living in the rural areas of İzmir. 416 of those villages were administered by the Special Provincial Administration of İzmir. İzmir is one of the oldest cities in Mediterranean Basin with a rich historical background and it is named as Smyrna in the past. According to the recent excavations held in Bayraklı Region of İzmir, there are relevant physical clues of prehistoric ages. Chronologically, the traces of Trojans, Aeolians, Lydians, Persians, Romans and Byzantines, Seljuks, the Sons of Aydin Bey during Principalities Period, and Ottomans are seen in this particular city which is situated in the east coast of Asia Minor. Since the foundation of Republic of Turkey (1923), İzmir continues as a hub for trading activities and cultural interchanges.

2 In the book Osmanlı Dünyasında Köyler ve Köylüler: 19. Yüzyıl Balıkesir Örneği (Village and Villagers in the Ottoman World: Case of Balıkesir in 19th Century), İsmail Arslan, refers to İlber Ortaylı that the lack and difficulty in reaching to the archival material on village histories. Due to the absence of documentation, the records of everyday life in villages are hard to imagine. See İsmail Arslan, Osmanlı Dünyasında Köyler ve Köylüler: 19. Yüzyıl Balıkesir Örneği – Village and Villagers in the Ottoman World: Case of Balikesir in 19th Century (İstanbul: Bilge Kültür Sanat Publishing, 2014).

3 There are two significant academic studies on the relationship of existing village settlement and the archaeological sites held both by German scholars in Aegean District: One is for the Herakleia-Latmos report published in 2011 and other is on Mylasa-Labraunda published in 2010. See Albert Distelrath, Siedeln und Wohnen in einer Ruinenstatte: Ein denkmalpflegerisches Konzept für Herakleia am Latmos – Yerleşim
Understanding the built environment with these three moments develops and enriches the scientific and materialistic perspectives in the spatial disciplines including architectural production. The theoretical position which misses the perceptual and the social aspects of built environment especially in the rural studies decreases and loses its importance and the unity of spatial moments within the rural studies. Besides, the attachment and the state of belonging are questioned through the survey about the inhabitants both to geography and to history. Through the fieldwork, the specific spatial experiences are verbalised by the inhabitants. The research questions were asked to understand the experience and conceptualisation of these two sites while noting their experiences of the inhabitants. These research questions are to understand the belonging to the geography and history of the inhabitants and their personal experience of the neighbouring settlement or the historical remains. Their individual conceptualisation of the historical site is asked to understand the unvoiced histories of the settlement.


6 In Urban Revolution, Lefebvre estimates the merging of agrarian and industrial properties of space production and underlines the dialectical relationship of these two by framing the novel properties of urban. Introducing a spatial and historical model for transformation of the contemporary built environment, he defines a theoretical path and series of scale starting with the agrarian, reach to the industrial and end up with the urban. In the book The Production of Space, he underlines the importance of trialectical and global approach to uncover the spatial relationship between human and rural settlements. Considering both the rural and urban built environments, the production of space develops a theoretical framework leaning on the three major moments of space; physical (conceived), mental (perceived), and social (lived). See Stuart Elden, “Politics, Philosophy, Geography: Henri Lefebvre in Recent Anglo-American Scholarship.” Antipode, vol. 33 (2002): 809-825.


9 The leftover houses are used by the new inhabitants coming from the other side of the Aegean Sea. This movement of people in the Aegean Topography is also seen in the Küçükbaşçe with other form of the school of culture. The modern school in Küçükbaşçe stands in the old part of village as a modernist architectural remain. With its empty and ruinous outlook, it joins to the other buildings in the village. It is one of the 500 schools built between 1923 and 1950 [Kul, Nurşen. “Erken Cumhuriyet Dönemi İlkokul Binaları - Primary School Buildings of Early Republican Era.” Mimarlık, vol. 360 (2011): 66-71.] The phrase on the school’s Atatürk statue is ‘Culture is the centre of the Turkish Republic’. The ruin of the building left to decay in the 1992 due to the administrative shift of unifying neighbourhood villages.
In this paper, I question whether the emergence of Principality towns in Western Anatolia can be regarded as rupture or continuity taking into account the development of the urban form. For this purpose, I reveal the spatial characteristics of these towns with a particular backdrop drawn to shed light to possible interactions of ruling authorities and/or influential factors such as social, economic, religious and administrative styles changing as these authorities alternated. In doing so, I consider the preceding history of urban form in the region (Ancient and subsequently Byzantine settlements) and the concurrent urban and architectural developments in the neighbouring territories (Byzantine and post Seljuk settlements) and those of other encountering political authorities (architecture of the Italian city states). As such, I attempt to point to a scarcely studied facet of a particular geographical region and also address to the discussions on the issue of ‘urban continuity’ in general context of urban historiography.
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Introduction

Western Anatolia, which faces the Aegean Sea to the West and Central Anatolia to the East, has been the homeland of various significant cultures from ancient times onwards. Owing to its critical location at the junction of the sea and land roads, giving way to trade between East and West, the region witnessed a crucial and eventful period between the 14th and 15th centuries. To rule in this part of Anatolia was of utmost importance and to do so there were alliances as well as disputes between the already settled Turkish Principalities replacing the Byzantines, the neighbouring Byzantines and growing maritime forces, the Italians. In these fervent political circumstances Principality towns in Western Anatolia were shaped.

This paper focuses on the spatial characteristics of Principality towns, studies their urban form and questions whether their emergence and formation in urban history can be considered as rupture or continuity. For this purpose, significant urban centres during the Principalities period, namely Ayasoluk (Ephesus), Balat (Miletus), Beçin, and Birgi are analysed. Ayasoluk and Balat were the essential overseas port towns revitalized during the Aydınid and Menteşeid Principalities rule. Beçin and Birgi, located inland, were the capitals of these Principalities and hence flourished under their rule. The urban forms of these towns are comparatively studied from the points of earlier urban patterns before the Principalities, settlement pattern in plan, settlement size in territorial borders, urban image and urban architecture. As such, whether there is a general tendency on the development, transformation, or emergence of Principality towns in Western Anatolia between the 14th and 15th centuries is examined. Finally, concluding remarks are made to the question of rupture or continuity in the development and transformation of their urban forms.

Urban History of Principality Towns in Western Anatolia

Ayasoluk and Balat, the significant Principality ports, lived through their brilliant times in antiquity. Ephesus and Miletus were highly populated cities in ancient times, accommodating intense trade activities due to their natural harbours. They were also situated within a mountainous topography, which provided ease of protection when security needed. The fertile agricultural lands on the banks of Caystros (Küçük Menderes) and Maiandros (Büyük Menderes) rivers and water availability facilitated urban growth and contributed to urban economics.
in these centres. Accordingly, this geographical and socio-economic setting effected and displayed its reflections in shaping the built environment. Both settlements exemplify the characteristics of the elegant, open, regular classical city. Densely populated in ancient times, they had wide territorial borders, well-organized and unified urban planning, and urban fabric enriched with monumental public buildings and open-squares. Especially Miletus is worthy of mention, because the regular planning of its settlement site, with a grid composition of *insula* units are of the earliest examples of rational planning.

The inland Principality towns Beçin and Birgi were less populous, less urbanized and less significant not only in comparison to Ephesus and Miletus but also among other inland settlements centres such as Aphrodisias, Tralles, Sardis, Mylasa etc. in ancient times. Beçin was founded on steep hills close to ancient Mylasa, which was a larger town than Beçin. The hills served well for defensive purposes, however, prevented easy transportation and communication. This resulted in paucity in trade activities and population. Beçin remained a modest settlement in its territorial borders and did not have monumental works of urban architecture. Hypaepa, ancient town next to Birgi was located along the Caystras valley, on the road linking Sardis to Ephesus during the Late Antique period. The town was more advantageous in terms of ease of transport and communication and might have been a more populous and larger settlement centre than Beçin, yet still smaller and less significant than Aphrodisias, Tralles, Sardis, Mylasa, etc.

The subsequent Byzantine rule brought along modifications in these towns both in administrative and socio-economic means and in their physical setting. There were also changes in the geographical conditions of the settlement sites of Ephesus and Miletus. These natural harbours were gradually silting up because of the alluvia of Caystras and Maiandros rivers. Yet, they were still significant ports to transfer eastern commodities to the West and make western trade of the leading Italian city states, reach Eastern lands. However, the open, spacious public spaces, markets of the ancient town were steadily abandoned. The wide, open spaces in between colonnaded streets were replaced by rather narrow streets, on both sides of whose colonnades shopping units were inserted. In this way the Roman ceremonial axis in towns were gradually lost.

Byzantine administrative policy differed from the ancient ones. There was a central authority in Constantinople appointing governors rather than the city councils. The consequences of this system in the urban patterns were the increase in the number of governmental palaces and abandonment of civic buildings of city councils like in Miletus. As city councils were gradually replaced by committees of high-ranking notables led by bishops, the meeting spaces of the administrative cadre shifted from *curiae* to Episcopal palaces. That is why, the building of Episcopal palaces initiated and increased in time in Byzantine centres, like in Miletus, or as called under the Byzantine rule by the Italians, Palatia, named after her renowned palaces. Christianity, as the State religion had its impacts particularly in the urban image and architecture concerning functional aspects. Initially, pagan temples and huge civic structures were converted into churches, and pagan sculptures and statues were replaced with Christian symbols like crosses in the open public spaces. In Ephesus, imperial letters and imperial decrees, those including even some on secular matters, were found in the Churches, which implies that these activities took place inside or in the atria of the churches. As such, former open spaces such as the *agora, fora* were abandoned in time.

These changes in urban modes were accompanied by a major shift in urban form towards the middle and late Byzantine periods. The difficulty for establishing security in those eventful times of Persian, Arab and Turkish attacks, led to transformation of urban centres into fortified and fragmented forms. The regular, rational, unified ancient city now turned into dispersed settlement centres around fortified castles, for the most part on and by hilltop locations, just like in Ephesus and Miletus. Fortifications are of primary urban elements unlike the times under ancient Roman rule for defensive purposes. Such settlements are known as *castra* and *dioikismos*. *Castra* are the settlements centres around fortified castles and *dioikismos* are dispersed settlements. Actually, *dioikismos* can be defined as the process of the disintegration of a town into its component parts. Moreover, as exemplified in Ephesus and Miletus, the medieval Byzantine settlement partially moved and partially overlapped the already existing ancient town in its territorial borders.

Opposed to the shrinkage of Ephesus and Miletus the inland settlement Beçin grew under Byzantine rule because it was already fortified and highly...
defensive owing to its topography. Its population increased and the town expanded in plan. Finally, Byzantine Birgi differs from Ephesus, Miletus and Beçin. Even though these medieval settlements either developed by or extended the existing ancient towns, Birgi grew in a nearby settlement other than the ancient settlement. Most probably, the town Hypaepa, ancient town near Birgi, underwent severe damage and the townspeople moved to nearby smaller settlement of Dios Hieron. Thus, urban continuity concerning location is not strong for ancient Hypaepa and medieval Birgi. Yet, ancient Dios Hieron has turned out to be Christopolis and later Pyrgion, which shows continuity on the location of the settlement site, which for the most part overlapped and extended the ancient settlement.

**Comparison of Principality Towns in Western Anatolia**

Turkish infiltration in this part of Anatolia resulted in a reorganization of the socio-cultural structure and administrative traditions in medieval urban centres under the Aydınid and Menteşeid Principalities authority. These social, cultural and political alterations inevitably prompted adaptations in the urban patterns of these centres. Medieval Ayasoluk and Balat still making use of the steadily silting harbours mostly developed by and partly overlapped the existing Byzantine settlement. Under the Principalities rule Ayasoluk and Balat accommodated a colourful variety of socio-cultural groups. The residential neighbourhoods of Italians, local Greeks, Turks and a few Arab merchants were arranged to occupy differing self-sufficient urban segments in the settlement pattern. Still, the dominating Turkish-Islamic authority was the most effective in establishing the urban image of these towns. Similar to what Byzantines did with the former pagan structures, Turkish rulers commissioned the conversion of basilicas or churches into mosques or had new ones constructed. The ruling elite also initiated the construction of a new set of public buildings of Turkish-Islamic character such as building complexes developed around mosques, madrasas, baths, and masjids, those generated urban growth as important examples of urban architecture.

Considering territorial borders and layout of the town, the overseas Principality ports Ayasoluk and Balat, continued the former Byzantine traditions, in partially maintaining and partially moving the settlement location. They also maintained the fragmented, fortified composition of the urban form. Like in the late Byzantine period, fortifications were of paramount importance within the townscape. As for Beçin and Birgi, they witnessed the most prosperous and vivid times during the Principality rule. In the 14th century, they gradually became attraction spots due to their administrative status as the capitals. It is not surprising to find that Menteşeid and Aydınid rulers instantly commissioned new public structures, monumental edifices such as mosques, madrasas, baths, masjids, and alike. As a result, both Beçin and Birgi thrived and outgrew rapidly, taking into account their increasing population, urbanization and building activities. The evaluation of these settlements in their ancient, medieval Byzantine, and medieval Turkish periods; shows that the most impressive urban development took place under the Principality rule.

These Principality towns can also be studied concerning the relationship with the already settled urban environment. Such an analysis shows that, first, there are Principality towns, which are established overlapping the formerly existing Byzantine settlements. For instance, Menteşeid capital Beçin overlapped the former Byzantine town and expanded the borders still further. Expansion followed the decreasing contours of topography both inside and outside the outer fortifications with foundation of building complexes as well as single public buildings to encourage urban development. The irregularity in plan organization and street network and fortifications guaranteeing defensive needs, which started during the Byzantine period, was maintained in the making of this Principality town. Second, there are Principalities towns, which partially overlap and partially settle next to, adjoined to the formerly existing Byzantine settlements like Ayasoluk and Balat. Due to the gradual silting of their harbours, both Ayasoluk and Balat moved away from the site of their ancient predecessors. The Turkish town continued the previous settlements on high locations protected with fortifications of the Byzantine times, yet expanded further towards the safer and flatter lands. For the most part Principality towns continued the earlier urban form in toto. Fortifications were maintained like in the earlier urban tradition, former public edifices were converted into Turkish ones,
new buildings were constructed, yet in harmony with the existing pattern whether expanding the borders or not. Since trade was enlivened in this territory by the annexation of the Principalities, the Aydınid and Menteşeid rulers encouraged appropriation of space for commercial use. For instance, in Ayasoluk even some parts of the Church of St. John were reserved for commercial purposes. There was probably a big market place, just outside the fortified area, which was architecturally defined with less-enduring, temporary structures. It can be suggested that like the Seljuk and unlike the Ottoman urban traditions, the Principalities in Western Anatolia could not succeed in establishing well-organized, permanent, solid commercial centres within their urban confines. They made a first attempt at setting aside commercial spaces, but the commercial core would only be improved later when urban parcels planned with durable structures were developed under the subsequent Ottoman rule.

Likewise, considering the functional and social organization of urban space, a distinction can be noticed not only in terms of commercial and residential quarters, but also according to ethnic and religious origins – unlike the Seljuk and similar to the Ottoman urban traditions. For instance in Ayasoluk Turks probably settled in the neighbourhoods on the outskirts of the Ayasoluk Hill expanding the fortified area outwards; the Italians namely Venetians were located in the quarters near the medieval harbour; and finally some of the Greek population resided inside the fortified area, some just outside the fortifications and some within the abandoned ancient Ephesus.

In the meantime, Aydınids and Menteşeïds reshaped the urban architecture of the towns they conquered similar to Seljuk and Ottoman strategies of settlement and development. First, they appropriated the existing public structures into Turkish-Islamic ones. Second, the ruling elite commissioned the construction of new public buildings and building complexes to generate new neighbourhoods around. By this way, the founders not only encouraged urban growth and improved urban facilities but also remodelled the urban architecture of these towns by introducing new architectural language and urban image.

The architectural language in Principality towns did not follow common shapes and design principles. Different architectural approaches in terms of mass articulation, plan layout, construction techniques and building materials can be traced in these urban centres. For instance, the İsa Bey Mosque (1375) commissioned by Aydınid İsa Bey at Ayasoluk displays an architectural design which is a combination of Early Islamic mosque plan and local Byzantine building and construction traditions, with more open and extraverted treatment of the exterior like in Ottoman façade designs. The İlyas Bey Mosque Complex (1404) commissioned by Menteşeid İlyas Bey at Balat stands as an experimental example reflecting the pursuit of monumental scale in its single unit mosque design and the grouping of building masses to allow open spaces unlike the Seljuk and more similar to Ottoman style. Also, the use of domes as an alternative to double-shelled conical caps, more open and outwardly-conscious building of walls as an alternative to solid, bare surfaces prevails in these edifices.

Still, these buildings precisely neither follow Seljuk nor Ottoman nor local Byzantine features. Instead, they are unique and different from each other in their architecture in terms of both design principles and architectural details whilst occasionally borrowing from Seljuk and/or Ottoman architecture and at the same time making use of local construction techniques and building materials from Byzantine architectural culture. In Beçin, it is even possible to trace the encounter with the Italians through the architectural elements and ornamentations used in the Menteşeid buildings. In short, Principality buildings in Western Anatolia can be considered as spatial experimentation and exploration seeking a new architectural and urban idiom.

To sum up, the urban image of a Principality town can be visualised as follows. Visitors approaching the town probably saw a townscape dotted with the domes and minarets of the Principality edifices descending along the contours of the land, on the outskirts both inside and outside the fortified area. Most likely the building groups will have been spread with gardens, fields and similar areas dividing the Turkish from the Italian quarters though the Greek ones are not necessarily detached. To walk through a Principality town will have been to experience quarters both attached to and detached from the urban core, the market place. As such, after a neighbourhood developed around a public building or buildings, one would come to green
fields, and then again to a small urban nucleus, another neighbourhood self-sufficient with public buildings of its own. The building complexes and public buildings were probably designed to give onto open urban spaces like the Ottoman style. For instance, at Birgi, the Great Mosque, the tomb of Mehmet Bey, the baths (of which there are only remains) and the madrasa building (on which a later one was built), create an open space at the kink in the main road. This very same node is where social gatherings take place to this day. Likewise, the building façades were designed to keep the connection between inside and outside unlike the Seljuk and more like the Ottoman treatment. Principality façade designs in Western Anatolia were more open and perforated, using local materials and local construction techniques borrowed from Byzantine architecture.

Concluding Remarks

In the end, we can say that all styles coexisted in a Principality town – Byzantine, Seljuk and Ottoman – though it was the Ottoman tradition that prevailed, whilst experimenting with further architectural details and the search for individual styles. In such circumstances, we can discuss whether there is a continuity or, on the opposite, rupture in the formation and/or transformation of Principality towns. As a consequence of our study we can argue that the urban form of Principality towns continuously transformed while at the same time allowed for individual contributions rather than direct formulations of rupture or continuity. In other words, Principality towns in Western Anatolia continuously transformed, either developed, or weakened, or moved, or else. This continuous transformation in the built environment was due to the continuous transformation in social, economic, administrative modes under the changing ruling communities, respectively Greeks, Romans, Byzantines, Turkish Principalities and Ottomans; military occurrences; and also due to possible gradual transformations of the natural setting, the geographical alterations on the settlement sites.
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THE DISCOVERY OF PAST FORMS OF DWELLING AND THE INVENTION OF THE NEO-VERNACULAR

Vernacular architecture was articulated in the early 20th century as the representation of a uniform tradition, shared by all Greeks and reflecting national values. Its popularisation helped solidify the idea of the tripartite schema of national descent (ancient, byzantine and modern Hellenism) by establishing examples of the third phase of Hellenism.

Publications diffused its key concepts and main characteristics, identifying typical forms in several regions of the country. After WW2, official ideology embraced findings of interwar research, as they referred to a safe imagined past, above class or political divisions. Naturalisation of its significance in the cultural identity of the nation, led in the 1950s to statutory protection and promotion of its examples to the status of historic monuments. The assimilation of elements of the articulated traditional culture led to the emergence of a certain neo-vernacular architectural style that combined elements of the identified vernacular with the functionality and building methods of contemporary architecture.

The paper examines the discovery of vernacular architecture as a result of early 20th century rise of folkloristics and its gradual adoption by dominant ideology. It also addresses its interwar and early post-war diffusion to the cultural collective and the emergence of a neo-vernacular style.
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Historical background
The narrative schema of national descent.

The articulation of the narrative on the origins of the Greek nation has been the driving force and the fundamental question of modern Greek historiography since the neohellenic enlightenment in the late 18th century.

Greek national narrative took its final form in the mid-19th century by historian Konstantinos Paparrigopoulos (the father of national Greek historiography), who laid emphasis on the continuity of the nation throughout history. His major work, ‘History of the Greek Nation’ (1860-1874), documented the continuity of the nation in a single but tripartite schema (ancient-meditarranean-modern Hellenism), verifying thus the survival of the ancient nation to the present through its transformation through Christianity. The “History of the Greek Nation” and its gradual acceptance by dominant ideology, signified the transition from the schema of Revival to the schema of Continuity.

The narrative of Revival refers to the place and the appropriation of Antiquity, by establishing direct links between the ancient past and the (national) present. According to it, the nation drew its origins in ancient times, remained dormant for centuries because it was captured by foreign powers, and re-emerged in the late 18th century to resume its place among the other civilised nations. In the narrative of Continuity the nation is implied and the concept of Hellenism is introduced. Hellenism is an abstract notion that relates to the everlasting qualities of the Greek civilisation. According to the narrative of Continuity, the first phase of the nation was the ancient, its second was the medieval and was characterised by the adoption of orthodox Christianity, whereas the third was the present modern. The succession of Hellenisms (ancient-medieval-Christian-modern), helped solidify thus the idea of continuous presence since antiquity. Continuity merged both ancient and Christian pasts to a single narrative that has the nation at its heart and as its main historical subject.
Protection and promotion of the archaeological past, as the sole collective past, is related to the 19th century dominance of the schema of Revival. Inclusion of Byzantine-Chinese paradigms in the state’s heritage lists began to take place during the state’s expansion (1912-1922) and especially after the arrival of the Greek-speaking Christian refugees following the treaty of Lausanne (1923).

The promotion of the concept of the unity and continuity of Hellenism through time became the target and ideological framework of the Greek historiography from the mid-19th century until the fall of the military dictatorship in 1974, with only few exceptions. As an indisputable ‘regime of truth’, it was reproduced by various institutions and public rituals, feeding back into ethnocentrism and safeguarding cultural homogeneity of the nation state.

**Interwar period. Folkloristics and the discovery of traditional forms of dwelling.**

The settlement of Greek speaking Christian refugees in the 1920s would alter social demographics and pose new challenges to the official ideology, as new settlers were carriers of different cultural values than the native populations.

The study of folk culture concerned the identification of common elements between new and old populations, in an effort to culturally homogenise the population. Folkloristics is referred to as a *national science* (i.e. a science concerning the study of the nation) by its main representatives and its aim included the restoration of the timeless unity of the Greek nation and the emergence of a mono-cultural identity. For the dominant Folklore discourse, cultural phenomena were not products of specific historical processes, and therefore *traditional culture* was an a-chronic construct that did not refer to specific spatial and economic parameters, nor did it identify with a specific social class, but referred to a single people. Traditional culture was articulated with reference to a pre-capitalist civilization of pre-industrial rural Greece, it did not correspond to a specific historical period or social reality, and its content outlined a vague, but certainly national, past. Agricultural society was seen to incarnate and to preserve all national values. Its idealised imagery would act as a counterweight to the uncertainties of social change by offering the imagined refuge of traditional rural life.

The study of vernacular architecture, as a special field of folkloristics, was established in Greece by architect Aristotelis Zachos (1871-1939), who examined examples of post-Byzantine mansions in northern Greece, and concluded that they constituted advance designs of previous, less composite forms of traditional dwelling typologies.

Vernacular architecture research focused on the identification of examples that were related to modern Hellenism, the third period in the schema of Continuity of the nation. Modern Hellenism encompasses the late Ottoman period, which includes the period of neohellenic Enlightenment and refers to the national awakening and the birth of the Greek state.

It was argued that one of the principal characteristics of the identified vernacular architecture was that it incorporated elements of ancient Greek and Byzantine typologies and forms, highlighting the perceived continuity of the nation, in accordance to the schema of national descent. For scholars and architects the basic plan layout had remained the same throughout Greek history, despite foreign influences, as the way of living, mores and customs had also remained unchanged.

The roots of the architectural vernacular were seen to stretch back to the almost mythical times of the fall of the Byzantine state.

Dominant typologies were classified according to the form of the main volume (narrow-fronted or wide-fronted, according to the position of the main entrance), as well as the slope of the roof (flat-roofed or double-pitched). Folkloristics indicated two main geographical variations: the vernacular heritage of the Aegean islands and that of mainland Greece. The former was represented by flat-roofed, whitewashed, single space family dwellings (found in the Cyclades, Dodecanese, Crete, Cyprus, Ionian islands, even in parts of mainland), whereas the latter was represented by mansions (found in urban centres of Epirus, Macedonia, Thessaly, Peloponnese, even in some islands). A common quality of both, was their ability to integrate into the natural landscape. 
The diffusion of a national vernacular during the interwar and early post-war period.

Examination of local vernacular built stock of localities such as Aetolia (1925)\textsuperscript{18}, Skyros (1925)\textsuperscript{19}, Thrace (1939)\textsuperscript{20} or Lemnos (1940)\textsuperscript{21}, verified and diffused concepts, such as the perceived cultural unity of the nation. Researchers highlighted the national character of vernacular examples\textsuperscript{22}, pointing out their relevance to ancient and byzantine architecture.

The study of the Folklore and local vernacular architectural examples continued even during the years of WW2 Occupation\textsuperscript{23}. During that turbulent period architects who had the luxury of writing on architecture almost exclusively looked at issues relating to tradition, whereas the fewer that could actually built were experimenting with ‘traditional’ elements, preparing thus the first phase of neo-vernacular’s post-war morphology\textsuperscript{24}.

After the war, there were attempts for wider syntheses on the common vernacular of neighbouring islands or island complexes, as well as broader regions of the mainland. Analyses persisted in the establishment of national commons and consciously avoided social and cultural divisions, such as reference to class, gender, or local cultural specificities.

The identification of traditional forms of dwelling in Rhodes best highlights the political aspect of the promotion of a single vernacular imagery, and constitutes an indicative example of local particularities eradication and enhancement of the national character of the local vernacular architecture in the early post-war period. After the incorporation of the Dodecanese into the Greek state (1948), local and Greek mainland folklorists sought the local vernacular in typologies of the island’s countryside, identifying it with single space built examples owned by Greek speakers, ignoring the region’s longstanding multiculturality. Typologies that referred to city dwelling, non-Christian places of worship, or workplaces were rejected. The selected vernacular paradigms concerned typologies and built forms that are found elsewhere in the Aegean, promoting flat-roofed, single space, whitewashed family houses (already a recognisable form from the architectural vocabulary of the Cyclades) as the island’s only true and authentic heritage vernacular typology.

‘Our vernacular architecture’ (1945)\textsuperscript{25}, examines examples of various regions and islands of south mainland, leading folklorist G. Markopoulos to the conclusion that traditional dwelling typologies are the showcase of traditional culture and verification of the continuity of the nation\textsuperscript{26}. In ‘The Greek dwelling’ (1949)\textsuperscript{27}, folklorist G. Megas studies dominant typologies and compares them to ancient Greek paradigms and contemporary examples from the Balkans, arguing that the latter originate from the former. In ‘La maison grecque’ (1949)\textsuperscript{28}, pioneer folklorist A. Chatzimichali verifies schemata and myths of Greek folkloristics and describes its two most dominant forms: flat roof single space dwelling from the Aegean islands and the mansion types of the mainland. Finally, in ‘The old Athenian houses’ (1950)\textsuperscript{29}, architect A. Konstantinidis examines examples of vernacular dwellings of the early period of the modern history of the capital of the state. He describes typical local forms and argues that interior courtyards, around which spaces are clustered, is a surviving element from ancient dwelling types which verifies cultural continuity through built environment and vernacular architecture’s role in representing the nation’s modern past and the third phase of the schema of national descent.
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\caption{Model of typical dwelling units of Kamari settlement, Island of Santorini. 
Source: Architectoniki 2 (1957), 29.}
\end{figure}
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\caption{Aspect of hotel ‘Meltemi’. 
Source: Architectoniki 10 (1958), 61.}
\end{figure}
Post-war statutory protection and conservation of the vernacular.

Political developments during WW2 Occupation and the Civil war, led to the assimilation of interwar folkloristic interpretative schemata by the dominant ideology. As the latter was reluctant to accept social change and emancipation, it preferred and promoted the harmless character of the idealised a-chronic and classless traditional culture of the interwar folkloristics.

The law of 1950\textsuperscript{10} introduced protective measures, upgrading vernacular built heritage to the status of historical monuments. The acceptance and protection of the vernacular by the state institutions established a new field of built paradigms, which included a wealth of new forms and narrative contents. Both statutory protection and preservation of specific vernacular typologies as historical monuments resulted in the consolidation of specific built paradigms and narratives in the collective conscience.

The Ephorate of Modern monuments was founded in 1963 and was the first state institution responsible for the identification and protection of non-religious paradigms built from the middle ages until the early 20\textsuperscript{th} century. Particular emphasis was given to the systematic research\textsuperscript{31} and diffusion of 18\textsuperscript{th} and early 19\textsuperscript{th} century buildings, belonging to the national awakening era. Some of the ephorate's first restoration projects, in association with the secretary of state's Directorate of Restoration, included iconic vernacular mansions in Ampelakia and Kastoria\textsuperscript{32}.

By 1965\textsuperscript{13}, several buildings, settlements or even parts of towns had already been added to the national register of monuments. Examples of the latter category included the old city of Chania; the towns of Aigina, Amorgos, and Molyvos; or the settlement of Mesta.

The emergence of the neo-vernacular in the early post-war period: some examples.

Gradual assimilation of the significance of vernacular architecture by dominant ideology would also influence the quest for a national architectural language. Although the earliest examples appeared in the interwar period\textsuperscript{34}, a certain neo-vernacular became popular after the war.

Post-war popularisation to middle classes was primarily evident in the design of private holiday cottages. As far as larger scale projects are concerned, similar amalgamation of contemporary and vernacular architectural elements is obvious in the design and construction of new settlements and tourist resorts.

The political significance of this new ‘style’ becomes apparent in the case of the appropriation and hellenisation of the urban space of the city of Rhodes, where the articulation of a new architectural language that would bring together contemporary and vernacular architecture elements was one of the measures that had been proposed\textsuperscript{15} even before the incorporation of the Dodecanese into the Greek state (1948)\textsuperscript{16}.

Indicative examples of the neo-vernacular ‘style’ include the new settlement Kamari in the island of Santorini (image 1) and hotel ‘Meltemi’ (image 2). Kamari, designed and built by the ministry of Transport and Public Works (1964) after the devastating earthquake of 1956, is a characteristic example of large scale housing. The two basic dwelling types that were built had design flexibility for plan variations and extensions. It is argued\textsuperscript{17} that climatic conditions, difficulty in transporting building materials to Santorini, use of local materials, as well as respect for traditional forms led to the adoption of a certain form reminiscent of the local vernacular. Some of the main design features of the housing units include their small size, the vaulted roofs, and the whitewashed surfaces.

Hotel ‘Meltemi’ in Paros (1958) designed by architect Konstantinos Kapsampelis is an indicative example of a tourist resort in neo-vernacular style. The design of the hotel incorporates a number of local decorative and morphological motifs, building volumes are kept low so as to maintain the general scale of the surrounding built forms, dry stone walls are used so as to refer to the island’s imagery, and even heritage buildings (such as authentic windmills) are incorporated into the overall design.

Conclusions / Synthesis

Initial attempts for the articulation of a discourse on vernacular architecture and traditional art forms in the beginning of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century coincide with the territorial expansion of the state and concern the expression of an a-chronic past, supposedly familiar and common to all populations of the nation,
found both in and out of the national territory. The settlement of the refugees from Asia Minor and their cultural assimilation would lead to the systematisation of research on traditional culture, including vernacular architecture, which in turn would lead to the construction of the first built examples in neo-vernacular style. Post-war protection and promotion of vernacular architecture served the identification of paradigms of the nation’s near past and the consolidation of the tripartite schema on national descent, as it gave substance to its third phase. The articulation and naturalisation of vernacular architecture in the collective cultural consciousness served in the visualisation of the third phase of Hellenism, just as medieval Christian heritage served in the visualisation of the second phase of Hellenism, and the ancient heritage of its first phase. The visualisation of the third phase of Hellenism contributes to the naturalisation of the notion of Continuity, the ideological construct that solidifies the nation as the only possible historical subject, contributing thus in the consolidation of national history as the only possible collective past.

Naturalisation of dominant discourses on traditional culture and the (national) vernacular, signified a turn to the quest of a national architectural language that included the assimilation of ‘traditional’ elements. The extensive experimentation on the neo-vernacular style after the war by individual architects and public bodies shows the degree of popular acceptance of the concept of the vernacular, as well as the place of the national narrative in early post-war culture. It also shows the inhibitions of Greek culture of the early post-war period towards the new international cultural framework that was established after the war. Local architecture’s response towards international architecture was through elements of the perceived past, indicating the place of national past in the nation’s future.

Thus, on a broader scale, the example of the articulation and promotion of vernacular architecture and its post-war naturalisation to the Greek collective cultural consciousness help to reveal the more general role of folkloristics and architectural history in the construction of narratives that support specific ideologies and identities.

---
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35 See Dimitris Pikionis, “Το Πρόβλημα της Μορφής” (The question of Form), in Konstantinos Doxiadis (Ed.), *Δωδεκάνησος. Β: Το Οικιστικό και Πλαστικό Πρόβλημα* (Dodecanisos. B: The question of Housing and local architecture) (Athens: Ministry of Reconstruction).
36 The Italian colonial government, controlling the Dodecanese islands between 1912 and 1947, had already devised a similar architectural style that reflected the imagery of the historical buildings of the medieval order of the knights of St John. This particular neo-medieval style highlighted the significance of the medieval period of the Knights, giving substance to the colonial government’s claim of cultural succession. New constructions in this style accommodated colonial state services and filled urban voids that came up after the mass demolition of buildings of the Ottoman era of the city. See Simona Martinoli & Eliana Perotti, *Architettura coloniale italiana nel Dodecaneso (1912-1943)* (Torino: Fondazione Agnelli, 1999); and Monica Livadiotti & Giorgio Rocco, *La presenza italiana nel Dodecaneso tra il 1912 e il 1948* (Catania: Edizioni del Prisma, 1996).
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BETWEEN AFRICAN TRADITION AND MODERNITY – THE LEGACY OF NORMAN EATON (1902-1966)

The architectural oeuvre of South African architect Norman Eaton (1902-1966), expresses a rare encounter between the Modern Movement and Africa. His work – he being based in Pretoria, South Africa – draws strongly on the African monumental past, while denoting both regional and universal consciousness. Local influences are drawn from diverse sources: Cape Dutch architecture, Great Zimbabwe, Eastern Africa and the unselfconscious architectural endeavours of the Ndebele. Eaton used both local craftsmanship and materials in unconventional ways and had bricks and glazed tiles custom-made to deliberately evoke his interpretations of African textural surfaces – purposefully metaphorizing African patterns of grass, weaving, and surface reliefs. Imbued with qualities of resistance and response, sublimination and invention and set within increasingly important values of place, tradition, Modernity and identity, his work is seminal – not only in the South African context, but also in the broader African and international context. This paper follows the lead of Edward Said’s Orientalism and subsequently, Hilde Heynen’s post-colonial interpretation of the work of Loos, Le Corbusier and Rudofsky, by placing Eaton’s work centrally to that debate. His endeavours will be contextualized against the backdrop of apartheid, leftist political sympathies and his criticism of apartheid planning.

KEYWORDS: Africa, tradition, Modern Movement, place, identity

In ‘The Intertwinement of Modernism and Colonialism: a Theoretical Perspective’, Hilde Heynen introduces an architectural argument that originates from Edward Said’s (1935-2003) seminal publication Orientalism; a book that is focused on the power relationships between cultures. Amongst others, Said maintained that the discourse that justified colonialism was not marginal to European culture, but that it formed a core ingredient of European thinking about Modernity. In order to demonstrate the denouement of colonialist thinking in architecture, Heynen explores the notion of ‘the primitive’ in Modernity and highlights the colonialist bias in the work of Le Corbusier (1887-1965), Adolf Loos (1870-1933) and Bernard Rudofsky (1905-1988). She links Loos and Le Corbusier, and derives a thought-provoking comparison where on the one hand the primitive was the pre-rational that has to be overcome for Loos. For Le Corbusier, on the other hand, the primitive was the primary, the original, the authentic – that which has to be reestablished. The primitive is our so-called ‘other’ – Rudofsky involuntarily equates the primitive as the ‘other’ of the Modern, implying that Modern architecture has to regain the qualities it lost, and these qualities are mirrored in primitive architecture. Heynen argues that from a postcolonial perspective, one can undeniably criticize this kind of approach because it implies either a sanitized or romanticized version of primitive architecture. Amongst others, Heynen concludes that hybrid manifestations of Modernity and tradition should be studied ‘that does not necessarily take its cue from the West’.

Perhaps the work of South African architect, Norman Eaton (1902-1966) offers an opportunity as such a kind of ‘hybrid manifestation’, reflecting a rare expression of the space between African tradition and Modernity. His interpretations conceivably (and unthinkingly) deconstruct the resistance between (African) tradition and Modernity in order to derive at an architecture that equitably values place, tradition, and identity.

Set apart from the work of his Modern Movement peers, the architectural backdrop to his evolution as a designer included his early exposure to Cape Dutch architecture; and through a small
group of seminal personalities, the Arts and Crafts movement, the Italian Renaissance and ultimately, Afrikaner Nationalist ideals towards a place-specific architecture. Within the ambit of the Modern Movement, Eaton’s work responded to local circumstance, which contributed to the development of a sophisticated regional modern architecture in Pretoria. Both the physical and cultural landscapes of Pretoria molded sensitivity in his response to site; and a singular approach to the making of architecture in the handling of local materials and craftsmanship. Eaton’s empathy for both African and indigenous Southern African art and architecture was largely the outcome of an intimate association constructed through his travels.

Interestingly, Le Corbusier was amazed to find ‘such youthful conviction ... something so alive in that far away spot in Africa’. He was, of course, referring to the so-called Transvaal Group who had advocated his early architectural doctrine in South Africa. It is thought-provoking to note that Le Corbusier’s work was influenced by the Spanish painter and sculptor, Pablo Picasso (1881-1973). In turn, Picasso was inspired by African art.

In contrast to the dilution of African motif in Le Corbusier’s work, Eaton’s architectural appropriation of his observations in Africa followed another path. He had fastidiously documented visits to East and Central Africa from the early 1940s onwards. Scaled drawings were made of settlement layouts and building plans, textures, patterns, doorways and facades. Unlike the lack of context, descriptions or any form of analysis in the images of Rudofsky’s Architecture without Architects, each of Eaton’s drawings was thoroughly contextualized with annotations, dates, names, and often maps – making his observations both geographically and historically specific. Eaton was well aware of social inequalities and living conditions, evidenced from diary entries, collected newspaper clippings (UP Repository) and his criticism of the ‘European’ way of life in Southern Africa which he described ‘as manifested in ... complex, disharmonious, ostentatious and chaotically ugly ensembles’. Evidently, Eaton was anxious that local architecture should reference the specifics of place. In a 1943-diary entry, whilst visiting Kampala, Uganda, for instance, he described how he tried to ‘persuade’ the local official to ‘do all he could’ to see that their new Houses of Parliament was ‘native in conception and not European’.

Following the advent of apartheid in 1948, South African architecture drew inspiration from Brazilian modernism, with public buildings commissioned by the Public Works Department giving the cue to the new functional idiom. While he had a strong affinity with Afrikaner identity, Eaton was leftist in his political convictions. Even though he was critical of the post-war urban planning of the apartheid government, Eaton was no political activist. During the repressive years of the 1950s, local architects remained ‘as quiet as mice’ which renders Eaton’s criticism(s) as quite noteworthy.

As singular endeavour, Eaton was consciously seeking out indigenous Southern African architecture – the outcome of an intimate association constructed through many visits to the family homesteads of the Ndebele. Describing a homestead at Baviaanspoort near Pretoria, Eaton spoke of the way in which the architectural ensemble was ‘woven out of, and almost wholly dependent upon, the earth and the products of nature from which it drew its materials’. Indigenous architecture held vital lessons for Eaton in responsiveness to nature, simplicity, honesty, pattern and texture.

African sensibility in Eaton’s work was originally through the translation of textures – initially vertical wall renditions, becoming horizontally binding fields between inside and outside and between nature and man-made. Eaton either used locally manufactured facebrick or glazed tiles to

---

Fig. 1: Brick carpet in the courtyard and interior spaces of House Moolman (1961) (Eaton Collection, UP Repository).
emulate woven textures (see Fig. 1). Details take on several forms, most notably differentiated by objects (door handles, furniture, light fittings, water spouts) and surfaces (floors and walls) – which compliment the modernist structure of space. Objects, however, lose their sense of being curios, never falling victim to becoming Disneyfied architectural souvenirs. Eaton was not interested in rhetorical exuberance: objects were rendered in a restrained way and as carefully considered articulation of architectural elements in an overall composition.

Set within a new office building, notably for the South African Police Provident Fund, Polley’s Arcade (1957) is a carpet of mosaic that lines the interior of the pedestrian linkage between two streets. Constructional elements are subjected to the horizontal field of patterns. Visual unity is afforded by the long parallel bands following the direction of the arcade, despite the seeming randomness of patterning. Eaton translated the symbolic Brazilian mural into a metaphor of woven African pattern to give new meaning to surfaces. An African tribal shield evidently inspired the central oval pattern shape, with parallel bands recalling Litema patterns.

Eaton’s Netherlands’ Bank (1960-1965) in Durban is recognized as his masterpiece (see Fig. 2). Central to its design strategy is a re-contextualization of urban modernism within the natural built conditions of the KwaZulu-Natal coast. Interestingly, it was substantially reduced following a sudden economic drive on the part of the clients caused as a result of the Sharpeville tragedy. The consequence was a scaled down ‘pavilion … with a glazed screen all around’. Green glazed hollow bricks were threaded vertically onto steel rods – the entire construction suspended from the flat roof, with the screen woven from the bottom up, recalling African traditions of gathering, marking and weaving.

While Le Corbusier had abstracted the primitive, Loos wanted to overcome the primitive and Rudofsky equated the primitive to a romantic ‘other’, Eaton attempted a consolidation between worlds. Ultimately, Eaton (re)interpreted the poetics of African making, and the space(s) in between an African tradition and a universal culture. His approach to detailing layers cultural and historical expression towards ephemeral place-making. His work mediated the tenets of the Modern, while establishing a response to place that surpassed the immediate political realm towards an architecture that is still relevant today. Well-worth further investigation and debate, Eaton’s work represents a hybrid between the primitive and the Modern.

Endnotes
3 According to Said, there is a drawn distinction between the rational West and the irrational ‘Other’ that paved the way for a European identity that was considered superior to non-European cultures and served as a pretext for domination. Western scholars portrayed the Orient as inferior, regressive, primitive, and irrational, emphasizing the superiority, progress, and rationality of the West. Heynen postulates that the idea of the primitive as the authentic that has to be reinstalled makes up an attitude of primitivism in architecture. From Hilde Heynen, “The Intertwinement of Modernism and Colonialism: a Theoretical Perspective”, do.co.mo.mo Journal 48-2013/1 (2013), 13.
4 Le Corbusier or Charles-ÉdouardJeanneret-Gris (1887-1965).
5 Adolf Franz Karl Viktor Maria Loos (1870-1933).
6 Heynen refers to Loos’ famous essay ‘Ornament and Crime’ (1908) where Loos constructs a comparison between Papuan and European culture as a justification for the superiority of his


8 See endnote 3.


11 In South Africa, the Modern Movement played out differently to its European counterpart. Incentivized in 1925 by the publication of a seminal piece in the South African Architectural Record (SAAR), the future of South African architecture was expressed as a clear understanding of the logic of modernity (Herbert, 1969:26). The latter ideology was taken up by a revolutionary local architect, Rex Martienssen (1905-1942), who was in direct contact with Le Corbusier (Barker, 2012:77), which in turn paved the way for the distillation of Modern Movement tenets mainly in the Transvaal (a northern province of South Africa). Subsequently referred to as the Transvaal Group, Martienssen and a handful of colleagues, forged an allegiance that lead to the publication of their modern movement manifesto entitled zero hour (sic) in 1933, which was sent to Le Corbusier. So impressed was the latter, that he dedicated his 1937-publication Oeuvre Complète (1919-1929) (Le Corbusier and Jeanneret, 1943) to the so-called Transvaal Group (Frampton, 1980; 1992:254; Gerneke in Fisher et al, 1998:209). The Bauhaus influence also captivated the young scions of the Modern Movement in South Africa, and during the 1930s a number of buildings inspired by Gropius, but mostly Le Corbusier, were built in South Africa. The regionalist leanings of Le Corbusier since the early thirties (Joubert in De Beer, Jacobs et al, 2000:118) were seemingly largely ignored during this period. The Second World War caused a discontinuity in the pursuit of the ideals set forth by the Transvaal Group, and, along with Martienssen’s sudden death in 1942, marked the end of the inherited orthodox Modern Movement in South Africa (Barker, 2012: 79).

By 1945, along with a series of criticisms leveled at the Modern Movement, technical problems were becoming apparent in the 1930s modern buildings. Besides the fact that the general public did not favour the new architecture (Herbert, 1975: 230), criticism was strengthened by observations that pre-war buildings designed by architects such as Norman Eaton, who used local materials such as facebrick, thatch, pitched roofs and wide eaves, had lasted very well. As a result of the criticism of the first South African Modern Movement, many South African architects were turning to unexpected sources of inspiration in the immediate post-war period. One small group turned to neoclassicist, rationalist, Perret-inspired revisions of the Modern; and another, to Brazilian modernity, which had a more prevailing and extensive influence. The development of a third Modern Movement in South Africa, as hybrid between the Modern Movement canon and local circumstances, also followed the war. In Pretoria, the work of Eaton reflected a particular response to nature and landscape through the economical use of naturally available and industrially produced materials with a pragmatic response to climate. His work represents a regional ethos, coined by Roger Fisher as the so-called ‘Third Vernacular’ or Pretoria Regionalism (Fisher et al, 1998:123). See Endnote 14.

12 Cape Dutch architecture predominated in the Western Cape during the 17th to 18th centuries. It is arguably South Africa’s only internationally recognized architectural style, and was systematized by sir Herbert Baker(1862-1946); houses in this style were distinguished through ornately scrolled gables, reminiscent of features in townhouses of Dutch style. Houses took on letter-type plans, with the front section of the
During the early forming years of the Afrikaner nation, the search for an Afrikaner Nationalist identity found expression in various forms, which permeated the architectural discipline through a search for an ‘appropriate language’ for monuments and buildings to represent the identity of the, then, young nation (Fisher, 1998: 124). Since the 1920s, another Pretoria-based architect, Gerard Moerdyk (1890-1958), propagated a place-specific architecture rooted in African soil and inspired by African motif in non-satirical acknowledgement of the historical references of place.

Together with the artist Henk Pierneef (1886-1957), Moerdyk advocated an honest domestic architectural language appropriate to the Transvaal through the use of local materials, such as thatch, local craftsmanship and response to climate. Pierneef had been a mentor and friend of Eaton throughout his life. Eaton’s acquaintances also included Pierneef’s godfather, artist Anton van Wouw (1862-1945), also a pursuer of an Afrikaner Nationalist identity (Fisher, 1998: 124). At the time, writers such as Gustav Preller (1875-1943) and Eugène Marais (1871-1936) and Belgian writer, Maurice Maeterlinck (1862-1949) – whose books were all on Eaton’s bookshelf (Eaton Collection, ‘Books on Book case on 24.1.45’, UP Repository) – captured the essence of natural order, inherent in the Highveld landscape, in their respective disciplines.

Most of Eaton’s residential work was located in Pretoria, a city set in-between natural enclosures of repetitive rolling koppies and rivers and, at the time of his early work, still an open, vast landscape. Tree portraits and landscape became a typifying aspect of local art, most importantly that of Pierneef. In the article ‘Art and Architecture’ (Fontein, Vol. 1 no. 1, Winter 1960: 15-17), Eaton later articulated his interpretation and translation of Pierneef’s landscape paintings into an architectural approach of unity with nature. His own architectural pursuit was towards a ‘wholeness’, which he had ascribed to the work of Pierneef, responding to the natural order inherent to place. Over time, Eaton’s work increasingly responded to the idea of a natural order and relationship to landscape.

Also see endnote 11. Pretoria Regionalism, the Third Vernacular, reflects a particular response to nature and landscape through the economical use of naturally available and industrially produced materials with an empirical response to climate, all of which tempered the emergent tenets of the Modern. Fisher indicates that the prerequisites for a regional ethos were all present in Pretoria during the 1940s and 1950s. Building Controls from 1941 to 1946 restricted imported materials and together with limitations on construction technologies architects had to improvise. A rich diversity of local building materials were readily available (such as thatch, slate and brick), and combined with the fact that Pretoria clients were often not financially proficient, more innovative uses of local materials were pursued (Fisher et al, 1998: 123-140).


See endnote 11.

‘O. Joubert, “A contemporary assessment of the genesis of the modern aesthetic – the impact of modern art on modern architecture” (PhD diss., University of KwaZulu-Natal, 1999), 54-60. Picasso’s work influenced some of the most profound buildings of the mid-twentieth century by Le Corbusier. His early work – designs for mass-produced concrete houses, including the Domino House of 1914-15 and the car-like Maison Citrohan of 1925, as well as the first of his famous white villas for artists and collectors – were self-consciously influenced by cubism (Joubert, 1999).

Although he never visited Africa, his interest in its art is well documented, from his discovery of African masks at the Musée d’Ethnographie du


21 Eaton specifically condemned new company towns such as Vanderbijlpark (Iscor), and towns resulting from forced removal and resettlement, such as Atteridgeville in Pretoria. In criticism leveled at apartheid planning, a diary entry from 1951 reads: Talk, talk, talk – theory upon theory – paper plain upon paper plain – reason, cold, commercial reason – based upon the lowest common denominator of collective ideas averaged out of the endless and frustrated work of tired Committees, Counsels, Commissions, Suppressive local Authorities, and what have we got? – Vanderbijlpark, Atteridgeville! What has this to do with Native Art and Architecture? Just this … These two hideous, soulless, lonely eruptions – these cancerous growths upon the violated face of Africa are examples (but two of thousands) of the depth to which our Collective Conceit has brought us … (1951, Eaton Diary in Eaton Collection, UP Repository).


23 Extracts from his 1943-Eaton Diary, Eaton Collection, UP Repository.


26 Significantly, he was a member of the so-called Left Book Club – a key left-wing organization of the late 1930s and 1940s (Clingman, 1998:158). He also designed a house for the renowned South African struggle-activist and Communist – the Afrikaner Bram Fischer (1908-1975).

27 Ivan Schlapobersky et al., "Architects Against Apartheid (AAP)", Architecture SA (March/April 1994), 17.

28 The Northern Ndebele people are a Bantu nation and ethnic group in Southern Africa.


30 The first instance of an African rendition manifested in the facebrick walls of House Van der Merwe (1940), Pretoria. The regularity of the brick courses is broken by panels of vertical patterning – a conscious attempt by Eaton to ‘bear in mind the simple effects in indigenous Bantu bead and basket work’ (Eaton, 1946: 110).

31 Eaton used what he called ‘faggoting’ tiles (with a texture on its surface) to recall African tribal grass in vertical surfaces (Harrop-Allin, 1975:80). The word is defined as ‘a bundle of sticks, twigs, or small branches of trees bound together, word of unknown origin’ (From the online Oxford English Dictionary accessed at http://www.oed.com/viewdictionaryentry/Entry/67623 [Accessed 12/01/2013]).

32 In the immediate post-war period, many South African architects were turning to an unexpected source of inspiration: Brazilian modernity, which swung away from the rigid International Style. Eaton travelled to South America in 1945, which had given him first-hand experience of the Brazilian variant of modern architecture. Eaton had been impressed with the work of Oscar Niemeyer whom he had met along with several other prominent figures (28/8/45 diary entry, Eaton Collection, UP Repository).

33 Litema designs are symbolic surface patterns that originate from traditional Basotho homes.

34 On 21 March 1960 the so-called Sharpeville (a township) massacre occurred when a protest, in which black Africans burnt the pass books which restricted them from going in certain areas, turned violent. Sixty-nine people were killed

35 Eaton’s diary entry 8 September 1961, from the Eaton Collection, UP Repository.
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Juan Caramuel de Lobkowitz's 1678 *Architectura Civil Recta y Oblica* is the first architectural treatise where the intention of compiling a history of architecture appears. The distinction between antiquity and their own time was not made in the Renaissance; therefore authors writing on architectural theory were not concerned with finding continuity between the past and the present. Caramuel's interest, on the contrary, is precisely in showing the continuity between the buildings erected by the first men and those of his own time. The continuity Caramuel seeks in his account is a construct and his arguments for connecting two separate moments are sometimes forced. In order to maintain the continuity his account requires, Caramuel's history of architecture is sometimes inaccurate, and by our contemporary standards, even wrong. Yet for Caramuel for whom absolute truth is otherworldly, in a world ruled by contingency there is the possibility of having several stories or histories, where the articulation of events from the past is held above the truthfulness of the accounts. This paper shows how Caramuel's proto-history of architecture is an attempt to unify different manifestations of the art in different places and times in order to ground the architect's praxis.
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**Introduction**

Juan Caramuel de Lobkowitz was born in Madrid in 1606; his origins were multiple as his parents were immigrants living in Spain. Caramuel's father, Lorenzo, was an engineer from Luxembourg who served the emperor both in the German and Flemish files. He had moved to Spain in 1586 to work for the ordinary ambassador of Rudolph II and in 1556 married Catalina de Frisia, a noblewoman from Antwerp and Caramuel's mother. Caramuel's upbringing put him in contact with both German and Dutch languages as well as Spanish, a language spoken by both his parents. However, his skill for languages did not stop at these three. During his early education at the *Colegio Imperial* in Madrid Caramuel learnt Latin and Greek and his biographers argue that by the end of his life he had mastered over 20 languages including Hebrew, Chaldean, Syrian and Arab. His linguistic ability without doubt helped Caramuel to access sources from the most varied origins, something that could have influenced his heterogeneous texts.

Caramuel's itinerant life started in 1623 when he moved first to Alcalá in order to study philosophy and then to Salamanca where he studied theology under Angel Manrique. It was Manrique who, as Abbot in Salamanca, was commissioned to compile the history of the Cistercian Order in Portugal, France and Flanders. It seems that Caramuel had already demonstrated great skill working with documentary sources, for this reason, between 1632 and 1633, the date is not certain, Caramuel left Spain for Louvain as a historian of his order. Despite the reasons for Caramuel's departure from Spain being conjectural, his publication in Bruges in 1640 of the *In Regulam D. Benedicti Commentarius Historicus, Scholasticus, Moralis, Judicalis, Politicus*, confirms Caramuel's interest and artistry as a proto-historian. Other early texts of Caramuel that betray his interest for documentary sources, history and genealogy are his *Philippus Prudens*, published in Antwerp in 1639, and his *Respuesta al manifiesto del Reyno de Portugal*, published in Ambers in 1642, where through a genealogical reconstruction, Caramuel demonstrates the right of the Spanish king to Portuguese land.

Caramuel's life was spent in multiple places of continental Europe. From Spain he went to Belgium where he stayed until 1644, he then moved to Germany and Bohemia where he spent the next...
eleven years. Caramuel stayed in the Palatinate region of Germany and from there he went to Prague where he became Abbot of the monastery of Emmaus. In 1647 he went to Vienna as Prior of the Monserrat monastery and remained in this city until 1655. Caramuel spent the last part of his life in Italy. He first travelled to Rome, where he stayed until 1657, from there he moved to Naples as Bishop of Campagna y Satriano, an appointment he held from 1658 until 1673. Caramuel finished his days as Bishop of Vigevano, where he died in 1682.

Caramuel travelled around Europe as a reformer monk and as such he met some of the most important scholars of his time, both Catholic and pagan. This experience had an important impact on Caramuel because his close contact with those infidels he was to reform showed him that even among those whose faith deceived them, there were wise men, and how the validity of any given idea was more important than the faith of the person defending it. This position, contrary to what the Roman Church held, is of particular importance in his treatise on architecture, where, as we will see, his sources are multiple and include both catholic and pagan.

Caramuel exchanged ideas with important figures of his time such as the German Jesuit Athanasius Kircher, the French Marin Mersenne, Pierre Gassendi, Blaise Pascal and René Descartes, and the Bohemian scientist Johannes Marco Marci. This list also confirms Caramuel’s varied interests, whose work extended through as many disciplines as correspondents.

Caramuel’s itinerant life had an effect in shaping his interest in multiple views rather than a single canonical one. His travels also informed Caramuel’s ideas on moral theology and his defence of Probabilism. Due to recent discoveries on many fields, Caramuel’s contemporaries were aware of the limitation of man when seeking absolute truth, a knowledge Caramuel reserved to God. Man became aware he was only capable of knowing certainties and for that reason many probable arguments were equally valid since the superiority of one over the others was beyond human reach. In this sense, when dealing with any science architecture included, it was preferable to include as many opinions as possible in order to have a more complete idea rather than limiting the arguments to those traditionally accepted. In the proto-history of architecture that Caramuel included in his treatise

Architectura Civil Recta y Obliqua, Caramuel does precisely that, he puts Renaissance architecture side by side with the Temple of Solomon, the houses of natives in America, as well as other instances of the art such as African and Asian architecture.

Caramuel’s proto-history of architecture

In his treatise Caramuel explains the importance of history at the beginning of the first volume where he includes it among the literary disciplines an architect must know. Quoting from Diego deSaavedra’s Corona Gothica from 1646 he writes:

There is nothing more helpful to men than history when truth and good will govern the pen, and nothing more harmful than when passion or flattery guides it, because it defrauds the glory of heroic actions and exalts vice. From history dangles prince’s honor or infamy. History governs posterity with examples to follow or escape; from history politics draw maxims and documents to govern kingdoms and if the foundations be false, false would be the edifice risen up on top of them. Perhaps it is not enough the good will of the one who writes, who not being able to witness everything, is forced to avail himself of the report of others, and it happens often that the hunger to acquire name and glory of being truthful make them incline to elevate foreign affairs and condemn the domestic, this harm is recognized in Spain, where some of our writers disavow ancient traditions that have been accredited from fathers to sons, which is the higher testimony of history, and in doubtful matters, which give freewill choice, condemn against the King’s glory and against the nation, quick to interpret their actions sinisterly.⁵

Therefore it follows that history is very useful to men when the one who writes is truthful and well-intentioned but harmful if passionate or full of flattery. For Caramuel, who was first a theologian, this means that the moral status of the author matters in the quality of the account. This idea also encompasses architecture, in Architectura Civil Recta y Obliqua Caramuel declares that works made by pious men are better. In the case of the compilation of the history of architecture it is obvious Caramuel considered himself apt for the task.

Caramuel emphasizes the importance for history to be truthful but also recognizes the problem of the
historian who has to rely on accounts of others to document events beyond his place or time. In terms of architecture Caramuel's sources are multiple and they are not limited to the discipline or to canonical authors, he included in his treatise sources of all kinds. Finally, Caramuel values the testimony handed down from fathers to sons as the most important document of history. This valorisation appears also in the treatise on architecture where Caramuel gives genealogy a central role as a way of finding continuity between events or people.

Caramuel closes the section on history as a discipline architects must know with a quote from Vitruvius preface to the seventh book, where he acknowledges the value of antiquity for consigning their deeds into books which allow the moderns to know about past times. Caramuel claims Vitruvius' passage demonstrates the importance of history in general but to specify its importance for the architect he summons book I, where Vitruvius tells the story of the Caryatids and the conquest of Persia by the Spartans. Following Vitruvius, Caramuel sees in the ornament of public buildings elements that communicate historical accounts to the beholder, and so it is necessary for the architect to know history in order to design the appropriate ornament for his works. Moreover, it is in the knowledge of history that the architect can find variations of the canon, something Caramuel will do when dealing with the ornament of the orders.

The proto-history of architecture that Caramuel makes starts with an introductory chapter to his treatise where the history of the Temple of Jerusalem is portrayed (Figure 1). The history of the Temple starts with The Seven Ages of the World continues with a detailed description of the building and finishes with its destruction and reconstruction. This introductory chapter betrays Caramuel's intention to inscribe his account on architecture within sacred history in order to legitimize the art. To do this, Caramuel devices a genealogy of architects that starts with God as the architect of the world and continues with Ezekiel as the receiver of the divine knowledge on the art of building from God himself. After, he puts Hiram and Solomon, the architect and the king, who made possible the construction of the Temple, a building Caramuel considered the paradigm of good architecture.

Despite the sacred nature of the historical account for which Scripture would have been enough as a source, Caramuel uses other sources beyond the Christian tradition and next to them includes Protestant and Jewish authors. This shows how Caramuel never availed himself of a single source but included those he considered possible and from these he picked single arguments he then combined resulting in a difficult to read and disparate text.

Caramuel's proto-historical account stops and the following chapters of the treatise are dedicated to the arts and sciences that Caramuel considered necessary for an architect to know. After that, Caramuel presents the origin and evolution of architecture. This account starts with the most primitive dwellings in caves, continues with the first nomadic and sedentary buildings and communities, and finishes with the invention of brick as a manmade material for building. In as little as two pages, Caramuel manages to expand the Vitruvian account to include examples of primitive architecture in different places and times. He uses the Roman historian Sallust to proof that some of these types of dwellings were also used in regions beyond Europe such as Persia, Armenia, and Africa. The missionary priest Archangelo Lambert i is quoted when describing the ways in which Africans lived at the end of the fifteenth century, Giovanni Botero to explain how nomadic dwellings are still present in regions of Africa and Jean Passerat to tell about Italian peoples who still lived in caves at Caramuel's time. The same encyclopaedic approach continues throughout the whole section, where Caramuel goes on to write about Babel and Babylon as the first cities made with bricks, huts built in the past but also still built in America and Africa, and the evolution of roofs from flat to pitched. After a digression on the architecture of America that takes over four sections of the text, the account

Fig. 1: Reconstruction of the Temple of Solomon according to Caramuel. Source: Architettura civil recta y obliqua.
continues with a discussion on the material of palaces and temples in antiquity, and finishes with Caramuel’s own version of the evolution of stone architecture from its wood counterpart.

Once Caramuel’s account arrives at stone architecture he stops to include his theory on the orders. The section on the orders in Caramuel’s treatise has been dealt in detail elsewhere\textsuperscript{13}; however, it is important to mention here that it is precisely this account the link between the origin and evolution of architecture and the list of worthy buildings we find in the second part the treatise. In the account of the orders Caramuel increases their number from five to eleven. The reason behind this aligns with his intention of bringing together different manifestations of the art. Caramuel places the columns at the entrance of the Temple of Solomon before the five Greco-Roman columns, since he sees in the columns of the Temple the origin and paradigm of architecture. He then argues the five classical columns appeared chronologically and as time went by they evolved. Caramuel finds proof of this in their proportion, which according to him was of 1:6 in the Tuscan, 1:7 in the Doric, 1:8 in the Ionic, 1:9 in the Corinthian and 1:10 in the Composite. After the traditional orders Caramuel adds five more that he sees as modern versions of the Greco-Roman ones. Among these are the Attic with a square shaft, the Mosaic with a spiralling shaft, the Atlantic with human figures as shaft and the Paranymphic where the bodies of men are replaced with allegorical figures.

The historical account gets interrupted in the treatise with the inclusion of Caramuel’s original proposition for an *Architectura Obliqua* and by the arts and sciences ancillary to architecture. It continues in the eighth chapter of the treatise where Caramuel includes the most notable works of architecture of all times. This chapter starts with the Seven Wonders of the Ancient World, then Caramuel includes other buildings that he considered as good as the seven first ones but that were left out of the original list\textsuperscript{14}. He then moves to a section on the buildings of Rome, where he retells the history of that city through its architecture from Roman times to his own. The account starts with the Roman roads and finishes with the history of St. Peter’s, from Saint Anacletus’ chapel in I B.C. to Bernini’s projects for the Fountain and colonnade. The next section is devoted to what Caramuel argues are three remarkable Spanish works. Their selection is an eclectic mix justified, according to the author by the pressure put on by the printer. First are the colossal sculptures commissioned by the Spanish kings; then ship Victoria that circumnavigated the world, and lastly a more pertinent example, the palace and Temple at El Escorial in Madrid (Figure 2). The Escorial represented to Caramuel the highest achievement of architecture since the Temple of Solomon. These two works of exemplar architecture open and close Caramuel’s treatise. Caramuel’s proto-historical account starts with the Temple of Solomon as the paradigm of good architecture and closes with El Escorial, a work where modern architecture has reached its pinnacle. Caramuel’s account bears witness to this evolution and his treatise is the document that will serve as testimony of the principles of the art for the future.

In the explanation of why some of the works considered the wonders at his time were not included in the list of works in antiquity, Caramuel expands on the idea of the impossibility of men to know things as what they are – *quad se* and how we need to work with what they seem to us – *quad nos*. Caramuel explains that at the time the Wonders of the World were declared as such, people did not have better works that could compete with them. Conversely, he claims at his time all the sciences and arts had evolved and man’s works accomplished more than they did in the past. Caramuel excuses the ancient for having left out from their accounts works that they could not see because they were built after. At the same time he acknowledges his own limitation as a compiler of the history of
architecture in accounting for works that because of their geographical location remained unknown to him, even if this meant leaving out works superior to those he is listing.

Caramuel’s short remark serves to round up his idea of the fallacy of man writing a single, absolute and truthful historical account. In fact, Caramuel’s proto-history of architecture is full of inaccuracies. More than truth, Caramuel is looking for possible stories that orient the architect’s praxis. This idea is related to his defence of Probabilism, where in face of the inability of man to know absolute truth his actions have to be based on probable opinions and how over time, we improve our knowledge of the world so our actions get better grounding. At the dawn of history as a documentary science based on facts, Caramuel is already aware that all we can do as humans is to write stories and to improve them over time as our knowledge of works of other places and times increases. Caramuel believes that in order to give the status of absolute truth to any account its author must be God; therefore in his view only the Bible can have the sacred status modern historians claim to their discipline.

Without discussion Caramuel’s attempt to unify different manifestations of the art is futile. His account rather than a seamless narrative appears scattered throughout the treatise. Only when considering the text in its entirety one can discern the intention of its author to unify a disparate reality. Caramuel’s account holds the value of being the first attempt to make sense of the manifold manifestations of the art. Despite the precarious form of his proto-history of architecture, in the text, Caramuel recognizes the challenge the historian faces when attempting to make sense of a past one did not witness. Caramuel understands both the responsibility of the historian’s accounts for the future and the difficulty implicit in choosing his/her sources. Caramuel anticipated that in a world where absolute values can no longer orient our actions, only the history of our deeds can give meaning to our acts and in architecture he saw the value of theory in guiding the architect’s praxis.
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His sources are St. Augustin, the Genesis, the XV century theologian Isidoro Chiari, the Luteran theologian John Saubert, the Spanish Jesuit Benito Pereira, St. Bernard, the bishop Acasio March de Velasco, as well as the church historian Timanno Gesselio. For the history of the Temple he uses Claude Saumaise’s commentary on Pliny the Elder, the Greek lexicon Suidas, Marin Mersenne, Vitruvius and Father Villalpando, however, he preferred the description and interpretation of the temple made by Dutch translator Jacob Judah Leon over that of the Jesuit, and it is Leon his main source for the description of the first Temple. For the destruction and reconstruction of the Jewish building he uses mainly the Benedictine exegete Gilbert Genebrard’s commentary on the Psalms and Gesselio. Included in his sources are also the Old Testament, the genealogy of Agrippa made by the calvinist Johann Heinrich Alsted and Isidoro Chiari and Benito Pereira.

Pliny’s Natural history is Caramuel’s source for the origin of bricks.

ArchangeloLamberti was a misionary Theatine priest who consigned his travels to Africa in Relatione della Colchide hoggi detta Mengrelia, nella quale si tratta dell’ origine, costumi e cosenaturali di queipaesi. Published in 1654.

Giovanni Botero (1544 – 1617) was an Italian author. Caramuel is possibly quoting his Delle cause dellagrandezzadell’elicità, from 1588.

Caramuel quotes some Passeratio, who could be the French author Jean Passerat (1534 – 1602).
THE PARADIGMS IN THE NINETEENTH CENTURY OTTOMAN ARCHITECTURAL HISTORIOGRAPHY

Narratives of Ottoman architectural historiography have been constructed on a well-established scholarly tradition of a great canon. Such narratives have generally been based on the periodization of the empire’s historical progression – namely the periods of rise, growth, stagnation and decline – or the stylistic evaluation of ‘great masters’ and their ‘masterpieces’. The periodization of historical events brings with it another paradigm in architectural historiography; the issue of ‘style’.

Particularly for 19th century Ottoman architecture, the great canon’s reliance on paradigms of ‘style’, ‘westernization’ and ‘decline’ has become a dominant tendency, used to identifying the changes in architectural practice. Both change and ‘decline’ have, in Western historiographical traditions, been discussed with respect to notions of modernization and westernization. Another pattern has been added to the discussion, namely the nationalist approaches in the construction of Ottoman historiography by Turkish authors. How the Ottoman past was treated by Turkish historians is a significant subject for the evaluation of the 19th century Ottoman historiography. The aim of this paper is to discuss architectural historiography on 19th century Ottoman architecture questioning the existing paradigms of decline, style and westernization.
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Introduction

It is difficult to discuss paradigms, accepted notions and biases of ‘architectural historiography’ without looking at overall ‘historiography’. Therefore the places and related implications, cited in the title of this paper, are going to be briefly looked at within the context of 19th century Ottoman historiography. The topic then will be discussed in more detail with a view of 19th century Ottoman architectural historiography.

The narration on Ottoman historiography has been constructed on a very well established, traditional scholarship or a great canon, which is based on the periodization of the empire’s historical progression namely the periods of rise, growth, stagnation and decline. The common agreement on the need for this kind of periodization can be traced back to the principal Ottoman history survey books such as the works of Lewis, İnalcık, Gibb-Bowen and Shaw. All of these works, following this substantial periodization, have called these periods the ‘golden age’, ‘apogee of power’ or ‘age of decentralization’. Even though these labels can be reinterpreted, the labels cannot go beyond a reiteration of the accepted periodization. Inevitably, the name of this periodization forced the discussion of the 19th century Ottoman history on the basis of its decline. The emphasis on this decline paradigm gives a satisfying explanation for the final disintegration of the empire. The territorial losses, fiscal decline, economic difficulties and military weakness have convinced many historians to describe the 19th century as an era of ‘decline’.

Criticism of the Paradigms

One of the first criticisms of this decline paradigm as claimed by Douglas is that the theory of decline rests primarily on the accounts of the 17th and 18th century Ottoman political writers, or the Ottoman intellectuals, who complained about the corruption, venality and incompetence of the ruling government during those years. He also states that after the translation of this literature into Western languages, scholars used these documents in their works without any critical analyses of the ‘already accepted’ decline paradigm. In his article, Quataert agreed with this notion and added that Western scholars used this Ottoman literature with the Western standard of measure that basically discusses the idea of the decline within the
modernization paradigm, such as Lewis’s book, *The Emergence of Modern Turkey*. Western scholars, who in their historical studies focus on the notion that the Western model, believe that the modernization of the empire was parallel with Westernisation of the political system of the empire. The key to Ottoman success depended on its imitation of the Westernisation patterns of change, which are based on the historical path of Western democracies such as Great Britain and France; therefore, the decline of the Ottomans was an inevitable end for the empire due to their inadequate Westernisation process. Neumann called this the ‘paradigm of reform’ in Ottoman historiography, which was incidentally shared by many contemporary European observers, that separates the Ottoman Empire into two factions: the reformists and modernists (the ‘good guys’), from the reactionaries and traditionalists (the ‘bad guys’).

While the ‘decline’ paradigm in Western historiographers’ narrations have been discussed in the context of modernization and Westernisation, another aspect should be included in the discussion, namely the nationalist views in the construction of Ottoman historiography by Turkish authors. How the Ottoman past was viewed by Turkish historians as an important consideration in the evaluation of Ottoman historiography. In her article, Ersanlı summarizes these approaches under four main headings and analyses the dominating ‘official line’ historiography. Based on her argument, the end of the 19th century is accepted as a starting point of a new era that emphasizes the beginning of the secular and national Turkish Republic. Thus, within this linear development, it is often favoured to acknowledge the empire’s last century as a stage of corruption and deterioration in order to celebrate the subsequent reforms of the republic. This tendency for a linear development concluded with a similar narration of decline paradigm, but looking from another perspective. It should be also noted here that over the last two decades, the generic and accepted notion regarding the 19th century Ottoman historiography have started to be challenge by historians dealing with this historiographical issue without a Eurocentric or nationalistic bias.

Paradigms in Architectural Historiography

The architectural historiography also has had similar difficulties in its own narration. The canon or great narration in architectural historiography was also a part of the western architectural tradition, mainly based on the historical periodization and separation of cultures, the stories of great masters and their masterpieces. While canon imposes a hierarchical relationship on a specific group of structures (or objects) and also categorizes them within periods, it usually constructs this relation by defining individual genius and the idea of a ‘masterpiece’. The propensity for the periodization of the historical events brings another paradigm to architectural historiography; the issue of ‘style’. Fletcher’s ‘tree of architecture’ is prominent in architectural historiography as it represents the historical methodology based on stylistic periodization and categorization. Different from the order of the historical periodization (rising-growth-stagnation-decline), in Fletcher’s tree of architecture, the styles are constructed or rooted in a bottom–up approach to describe a continuous progress. Since the tree shows how styles evolved from each other, it shows a linear development in history. The tree, the backbone of the Eurocentric great canon, constructs an architectural history narration based on ‘great masterpieces’, designed by the ‘great masters’ from specific places. In order to understand the linearity of architectural history, the styles help to systematically identify the structures within the certain time period. Consequently, it is obvious that both the stylistic categorization and the style itself are the backbone of the architectural narrative. When it comes to Ottoman architectural historiography, similar paradigms can also be observed in the use of terms like ‘Ottoman architecture’. Is it possible to talk about a universal, common architectural language for Ottoman buildings without mentioning a specific structure, architect, location or time? Fletcher’s tree has such Eurocentric roots that, if an Ottoman architecture tree is drawn, the biggest branch of this tree would be Sinan’s ‘master’ pieces. The main foundation of Ottoman architecture was built on sultanic projects that were attributed to Sinan. Both before and after of the 16th century, Ottoman architecture was stylistically identified by these projects, most of which were built in the capital, except for Selimiye in Edirne. It has been accepted by architectural
Historians that a certain imperial identity, the 'Ottoman way', was established through these buildings built under Sinan's supervision during the 16th century, which is termed 'the classical Ottoman style'. Certain archetypes, codes and canons of this 'classical style' were taken to be the basics that defined idealistic Ottoman architecture as a whole, and it was claimed that these rules for architecture were disseminated all around the entire empire. Historically, the architectural edifices of the 15th century are described as a step towards Sinan's style. Even his own variations from his usual architectural forms were evaluated as deviations from mainstream architecture, such as in his later structures, which is called his mannerist era by historians. Additionally, the 16th century provincial structures were also not considered to be a part of the 'classical Ottoman style' and the provincial architects or builders were held accountable for the dissimilarities of the structures from the 'classical style'.

Under the heavy burden of Sinan's classicism in architectural historiography, the 19th century Ottoman architecture faced with all the paradigms of conventional historiography such as decline, style, Westernisation paradigms, or the hegemony of the 'great masters' or 'masterpieces'. The strongest and universal argument concerning 19th century Ottoman architecture is the loss of the artistic and architectural characteristic and identity of the empire, which was parallel with the loss of the imperial power and the dismantling of the empire. It is believed that the decline of the empire was echoed in the quality of the buildings. The paradigm, which is criticized by this paper, analyses the decline of the architectural taste as a reflection of the decline of the empire. In other words the degeneration of the architectural works is parallel to the political failure of the empire.

This type of a perception embodies both the style and Westernisation paradigms. The architecture of the period is evaluated as being contaminated by European forms (or European-rooted styles) as a result of the Western influence on politics. ‘Ottoman Westernisation’ remains the principle phrase for the interpretation of the 18th and 19th centuries. For example, most of the survey books claim that the architectural ‘originality’ of the empire, the ‘classical period’, has ended with the corruption of classical Ottoman forms. In his book ‘Ottoman Architecture’, Kuban states that the 19th century was an era of European-imported architecture, which was controlled by foreign and non-Muslim architects. He adds that in Ottoman architectural history, the 19th century architecture demonstrated not only the government’s support of the Westernisation and modernization movements but also shows that some parts of the capital, including Sirkeci, Galata, Pera, Haliç and Bosphorus, were colonized by European powers. Kuban supports his claim by giving examples of the implementation of the European popular architectural styles in the Ottoman buildings constructed in the capital. He surveys these structures in two main categories: palaces and mosques. All the mosques researched in his book have been the prominent sultan mosques in the capital, such as Dolmabahe, Teşvikiye, Ortaköy, Pertevniyal and Yıldız Mosques. He primarily defines these mosques as consisting of some recognised styles such as Baroque, neo-classic or neo-gothic.

Similar to Kuban, who is the author of the latest Ottoman architectural history survey book, Aslanapa and Arseven have also a similar theory on 19th century Ottoman architecture. Aslanapa calls the architectural edifices of the period ‘poor’ and ‘worthless buildings in a style alien to Turkish taste’. While he defines Nusretiye, Ortaköy and Dolmabahe Mosques as the examples of Baroque and Empire styles, Pertevniyal Valide Mosque is presented as an example for the eclectic style, which is a mixture of all sorts of styles from Indian to Gothic. He also mentions one of the provincial mosques, the Kütahya Great Mosque, which had its 15th century columns restored and repaired, as a structure constructed in the 19th century, and states that this mosque shows the strongest aspect of ‘classical Turkish architecture’ even in a very stylistically complex period. At the end, he celebrates Kemalettin and Vedat Bey’s buildings as the beginning of the ‘Turkish Renaissance’, which finally brought about the birth of a ‘neo-classical style’. Here Aslanapa uses the terms ‘neo-classical’ and ‘classical Turkish architecture’ with reference to ‘Ottoman classical style’. Similarly, Arseven criticizes the period under the light of ‘style debate’ by describing the monuments with the words ‘without a style, tasteless and rough’. Goodwin, in his survey book on Ottoman architecture, discusses the issue without prejudices of the ‘Turkish Classical Style’ paradigm. He describes the architectural features of the structures in a very detailed manner by focusing...
on the forms that are used. Like the Turkish scholars, he also mentions the styles, yet he tries to understand the purpose of using ‘alien forms’. He emphasizes that the role of the foreign and non-Muslim architects in the empire and attributes the ‘Western’ forms primarily to those architects when he says that ‘the mid-century produced no Ottoman work of value, yet more foreigners arrived and local talent was eclipsed...’ Furthermore, he asserts that ‘the eclecticism and European appearance of the new neighbourhoods of the capital, for which mostly foreign or Armenian architects were responsible, provoked a reaction.’ Montani’s Pertevniyal Valide Mosque is considered to be an example of revivalist movements and as a response to the eclectic style.

New Perspectives

The argument on the revivalism of the ‘Ottoman Renaissance’ has been also supported by Ersoy. In his dissertation, he debates Ottoman revivalism in the term of ‘historicism’ with reference to the architectural text Usul-i Mimari Osmanî (The Fundamentals of Ottoman Architecture), which was published by the Ottoman government in 1873, by Sultan Abdülaziz, under the supervision of Montani, in order to represent the architecture of the empire at the Vienna world exposition. The historical overview of the text, written by Marie de Launay, aims to define the architectural past of the empire by starting with the architectural edifices in Bursa. Launay evaluates Ottoman architecture along the stylistic progression that is based upon the ‘beginning, rise and fall’ of the Ottoman Empire. While the Bursa Green Mosque and the Great Mosque are praised as very sophisticated and stylistically successful examples of Ottoman architecture, Sinan’s era is considered as a time to be most remembered for the unique and mature examples of the empire. The 18th century structures, such as Nur-u Osmanîye or Laleli Mosques, are considered to be deviations from the Ottoman style of the 15th and 16th centuries. The text refers to the structures of the Abdülaziz era as the ‘Ottoman Renaissance’ of architecture. The main objective of Usul was to depict and also advocate an established Ottoman style based on Eurocentric guidelines. The sketches of columns, capitals and arches of the Ottoman structures were categorized under specific instructions such as the müstevi or mücevheri style. There was an effort to find an order based on European influence within Ottoman architecture, the edifices Pertevniyal Valide Mosque were given as examples for the redevelopment of Ottoman architecture, also called as revivalism. Ersoy believes that towards the end of the 19th century, Ottoman architecture aimed to adopt the European concept of revivalism in its own official building program with the new array of forms. He asserts that the 15th century Bursa style was ‘re-invested with meaning within the emergent discourse on artistic change as the Late Tanzimat state’s novel expressions of belonging and difference vis-a-vis the modern West’. His argument brings a new and important perspective to the 19th century Ottoman architectural historiography, which had carried some profound biased perceptions. He continues his argument in one of his articles and claims that Pertevniyal Valide and Yıldız Hamidiye Mosques represent historicism in Ottoman architecture as it searches for their roots in the earlier Ottoman architectural style. The mosques prismatic high mass, single dome heightened with a drum and gothic windows are considered to be a reference to 14th and 15th century Ottoman architecture. Ersoy believes that the revival of early Ottoman architecture both determines the agenda of the new Ottoman eclecticism and reconstructs Ottoman architectural legacy during the 19th century. Even though Ersoy includes in his historiographical account on one of the provincial mosques, this singular example remains unable to support such a generalization. When the other provincial mosques are scrutinized in terms of their formal characteristics, site properties and relation with to their built environments, a significant variety of new captions and conclusive remarks can be added to Ersoy’s examination.

In addition to Ersoy’s contribution, which challenges the Eurocentric and biased perspective in the 19th century Ottoman historiography, Erkmen’s and Çelik’s research also provide a fresh viewpoint by discussing the issue of ‘Ottomanism’ and its connection to architecture. In both of these works, the architectural productions during the second half of the 19th century are discussed with the ideological agenda of the empire. Erkmen scrutinizes Abdülhamid II’s jubilee structures, which were constructed in almost all parts of the empire and in a very wide range of the scale, function, expenditure and quantity. She interprets this construction activity as a deliberate attempt towards emphasizing the power and dominant
ideology of the sultan himself. Similarly, in her research on the architectural productions and urban transformation of the 19th century Ottoman provinces in North Africa, the cities of Maghrib under French colonial rule and the Arab provinces, Çelik explains how the official images of the empire were defined and spread to those provinces. She states that ‘the mapping and repeating of a legible pattern hence promoted and made concrete the centralized control of the empire over its territories’. Both Erkmen and Çelik believe that there was a ‘legible pattern’ in 19th century Ottoman architecture displaying the presence of the government power in the provinces. While Erkmen builds her research on archival documents and keep the formal analysis of the structures in the background, Çelik uses the formal and stylistic details of the monuments to elucidate her claim. In addition to Erkmen’s and Çelik’s research, Akyürek’s PhD dissertation also provides a new perspective to the 19th century Ottoman architectural historiography by discussions on how the discursive field in the West was experienced in Ottoman architectural practice in the capital throughout the Tanzimat era.
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With the post-colonial era in 1980s, Fletcher’s tree was criticized by many architectural historians, yet it is a difficult mission to write an alternative history by separating the canon from historiography itself. The architectural survey book, *A Global History of Architecture* is published as response to this challenge, yet the historical narration of this book is criticized by scholars for the same defects of the other survey books for being another interpretation of the great canon. Mark M. Jarzombek et al., *A Global History of Architecture* (New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons, 2011)


This paper examines the particular reception of Renaissance and antique tradition in the work of Josef Frank and in that of his milieu, discussing the common and diverging meanings that the ‘rebirth’ of classical tradition – to use Frank’s term – had at the same moment in the Viennese context. Even though a reflection on classical tradition is a common aspect of the teachings of the Viennese Technische Hochschule at the beginning of the century, the originality of Frank’s position will emerge through a comparison with the writings and work of his closest colleagues educated in the same context – Oskar Strnad, Oskar Wlach, Walter Sobotka and Viktor Lurje.

In Frank’s writings, the classical principles of varietas, mediocritas and Annehmlichkeit constitute the core of an uninterrupted and geographically well-defined classical tradition and a vivid alternative to the aesthetical principles of German Neues Bauen. His classically based anthropocentrism, focusing on man as an ‘imperfect intention of nature’, moreover, constitutes Frank’s most original contribution to the reception of classical tradition before WWII. This aspect stands in striking contrast to the contemporary reception of classical repertoire as a source of immutable anthropometric ratios and as a model for eternal and univocal order.
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Introduction

The reflection on classical culture informs throughout the theoretical production of Josef Frank (1885-1967), from his education at the Viennese Technische Hochschule (TH) and the writing of his doctoral thesis on Leon Battista Alberti’s religious buildings, in 1910.1 Such reflection is still documented late in Frank’s career, through biographical statements in his correspondence with Walter Sobotka (1888-1972). ‘Lately I have ever more inclination [sic] towards classical culture, for I think that the abandonment of this tradition has caused much evil’.2

In Josef Frank’s writings, the reflection on the meaning of Renaissance theoretical legacy is closely linked to his vision of modern architecture. In 1910, referring to the Albertian triad, Frank uses the terms ‘Schönheit, Festigkeit und Annehmlichkeit’. Literally comfort, ease, agreeableness, benefit, Annehmlichkeit encompassed strong psychological and anthropocentric values and was also the main feature Oskar Wlach highlighted in Frank’s interiors which were first published and reviewed in 1912.3 Frank’s choice is even more original when compared with Max Theuer’s first German translation of De re aedificatoria, published in 19124 – such work originated in the same cultural context of the TH, around Carl König (1841-1915) and his assistants, Max Fabiani (1865-1965) and Karl Mayreder (1856-1935).5 Max Theuer’s attention to Alberti’s Zweckmässigkeit embeds itself in a more conventional approach to classical tradition and discussion about function.

I have previously argued that Mannigfaltigkeit and Lebendigkeit, in Frank’s theoretical approach to Wohnen as well as in the eclecticism of his interiors, could be interpreted as a modern version of varietas taken from a sensible reading of De re aedificatoria.6 An optimistic formal multiplicity of classical matrix constitutes the main feature of Frank’s work from the very beginning. The Schwedische Turnschule and the Wohnung Tedesko (both 1910) proposed respectively (among decorative elements of different cultural matrix) a strigilatum frieze and a pattern from the façade of Santa Maria Novella, that Frank had just finished designing. We could even consider the ‘Bordel Frank’ of the Weissenhofsiedlung (1927) as a twentieth century translation of this classical multiplicity, with strong ideological connotations.8
Frank’s attention to *varietas*, as a lively eclecticism and a true feature of classical culture, possibly depended also on Carl König’s particular reading of the classical tradition at the beginning of the century. From this same context of the Königsschule, the aesthetic (and cultural) relativism could be derived which during the twenties constituted the most powerful instrument of the Wiener Moderne for debunking the German version of functionalism. This relativism is a further aspect which enriches the category of an ‘inclusive’ *Mannigfaltigkeit / varietas*.

In 1931, in *Architektur als Symbol*, Frank refers to an additional aspect of classical culture which, along with *varietas*, defines the particular qualities of his anthropocentrism and gives further evidence of the latent classical matrix of his thought – *mediocritas*. Frank describes the Greek ideal of beauty as a *Mittelding*, ‘a happy medium [between] two extremes’. In Frank’s reading of antiquity, man is a mutable, varying, not universally valid and ‘imperfect intention of nature’ – a statement which is probably his most original contribution in the context of – not only Viennese – reception of classical tradition before WWII. Mittelwerte constitute the authoritative counterpart to the *pathos* of Neues Bauen.

Alas, very few people accept that a pleasant life is always a via media [Mittelweg] between all kinds of ideals – no person has the same disposition all the time – and that shaping a pleasant life as a composite of all these ideals is a matter with goals just as consistent and absolute as the goals of those who strive for a single extreme.

Quoting Homer, Frank considers the attachment to life to be a salient feature of antique culture, adding a further element to his anthropocentrism. Achilles in the Hades confesses to prefer one single day of life spent ‘to serve as the hireling of another ... rather than to be the lord over all the dead that have perished’. With his vivid multiplicity and imperfections, obstructing with his average values and sentimentality the obtaining of a pathetic record, man is the most complex parameter in Frank’s architectural theories. Notwithstanding the declared use of proportional schemes in order to attain a standard and tolerable result, Frank’s anthropocentrism does not mean codified anthropometric rules – even if it is man who gives the scale of architecture, measuring the space with his stride.

As a further introductory element to complete the framework of Frank’s reception of classical tradition, I will mention the non-correspondence between the skeleton and the skin of architecture, an idea which has a well-known Viennese background. Gottfried Semper’s principle of cladding, adopted and adjusted by Adolf Loos and by Carl König, could not be the only reference for this non-correspondence and for a sceptical approach to functionalism. Both are likely to depend also on Frank’s particular classically based anthropocentrism.

Visually the measure of all things, the human body was always and is still the foundation of architecture; the pursuit of symmetry of the façade, for instance, can be explained by the fact that, while asymmetrical inside, the human body has a symmetrical façade; from a functionalist standpoint, this could not be justified.

In a further passage, this duality is enhanced by the opposition between Gothic and classical tradition, which recurs in König’s particular reception of Semper’s writings. For Frank, ‘man has a Gothic skeleton and classical skin; but the skeleton is no truer than the skin’.

Already in his doctoral thesis, Frank highlighted the use of *artifici* in the work of Alberti. As ground principles of classical tradition, *artifici* and the non-correspondence between structure and its image that they imply are a subject of wide reflection in Vienna, above all for Adolf Loos – both in his writings (see the passage on the Parthenon in his 1911 conference on the Haus am Michaelerplatz) and built architecture.

**Varietas. Ideological Implications**

For Frank, the discovery of classical tradition is revolutionary and has no reactionary aspect. Sketched between 1927 and 1931, Frank consolidated the ideological and political connotations of the discourse on *varietas* in his late published and unpublished writings. Vielfältigkeit and freedom are here coherently opposed to the totalitarianism of regimes, Weltanschauungen and stylistic diktats.

If Frank’s political engagement is a well-known aspect of his work, less researched is, however, the political connotation of his reception of classical tradition. Already in 1931, Frank excluded Germans from the evolutionary line of true classical spirit.
In Frank’s reading, the Germans arrived to classical tradition late in its development and they used it as an already codified system of rules – classicism – without participating in the system’s long process of elaboration. Frank confirms, from a different perspective, the idea of classicism as a non-autochthonous system, which was not new in the German Heimatschutz milieu, in the writings of Paul Schultz-Neuumburg, for instance.22

For Austria, arguments are different. The idea of the continuity of a classical tradition of thought is not new in the Viennese context – it was clearly defined by Adolf Loos between 1898 and 191323 and it might have constituted the core of Carl König’s teaching at the TH. In Frank, it acquires stronger and clearer geographical contours, reiterated and emphasized in Architektur als Symbol as an opposition between Gothic and classical tradition, mystic (romanticism) and scientific thinking. In an unpublished document dated probably from the second half of the forties, Frank firmly defines the historiographical position that had informed his critique of German functionalism. Austria belongs undoubtedly to the world of classical culture: The border between old and new cultures roughly follows the border of the roman empire, along the Rhine and the Danube; nations west of the Rhine and south of the Danube belong to the old culture and have traditions derived from antiquity. One of these traditions consists in the unconscious understanding of the essence of form … Lands of new culture started using the forms of antique only after their century long evolution without contributing to its progress and the short time after their adoption was not enough to create a tradition. For this reason, it is difficult for them to create forms that could appear obvious.24

In a further passage, varietas is explicitly opposed to the totalitarianism of aesthetic uniformity, embedding values of democracy and freedom. I do not wish to infer that people who do not have a Weltanschauung do not necessarily have aesthetical preferences, but principles are different and, under certain circumstances, they can also lead to abstract ideas. They reject closed systems because they have more pleasure in diversity and variety (Mannigfaltigkeit und Abwechslung) rather than in absolute beauty. Their political form of state is what we now currently define as democracy.25

Together with democracy, a further attribute of classical tradition is scientific thinking as a counterpart to the mystique of the 20th century, the result of which is totalitarianism.26 In a late writing (post: 1945), Frank still proposes Alberti as a model of rational thinking, quoting a passage of his letter to Matteo de’ Pasti about a window in the façade of San Francesco in Rimini. ‘[Alberti] demands a functional form for the window as symbol of rational thinking, because the form of a window, in a church, has no practical value.’27

If consistent dialectic in the opposition of Gothic / mystic and Renaissance / rationalism are the instruments which Frank uses to defend classical tradition from political appropriation, in the work of his closest circle, for instance Viktor Lurje (1883-1944), we witness, on the contrary, an unconditional surrender to ideological appropriation of classic ‘symbols’. In a sketch of the corpus in the archive of MAK (1943), a man in uniform attends capital executions in front of a Greek temple; Hakenkreuze leave no doubt on the historical setting of the scene.28 This aspect is even more striking if we consider that during the twenties and thirties, Viktor Lurje was the most consistent, among Frank’s closest colleagues, in the use of abstract, light and intellectualised references to classical iconography.29

The ‘kleiner Kreis’ about Classical Tradition

Writings produced in Frank’s closest circle – ‘der kleine Kreis um Oskar Strnad und Viktor Lurje’30 – could help to appreciate the originality of Frank’s particular reception of classical culture.

In general, passages dealing explicitly with classical tradition, with the exception of Walter Sobotka’s writings, are rare. Among Frank’s colleagues and former König’s students, however, classical tradition is commonly considered as an authoritative instrument to intervene in the contemporary Viennese discussion about architecture, because no caesura exists from antiquity to modern times and modern architecture begins with the first Doric column.31

In the first decade of the 20th century, two of Frank’s closest colleagues, Oskar Strnad (1879-1935)32 and Oskar Wlach (1881-1963) both wrote doctoral theses on historical arguments. The ‘intelligent’ paper of Oskar Wlach (1906), about the use of
colour in architecture in the case study of Florentine Proto-Renaissance (sic) polychrome incrustation, is a significant example for the particular link between historical research and intervention in the debate on architecture. In a passage nevertheless strongly influenced by Moderne Architektur, Wlach grounds his critique of Otto Wagner’s Majolikahaus on historical arguments based on the observation of Florentine cladding: ‘we have to remain true to the principle that every cladding element should also represent a decorative element’. 33

In 1912, in the Neue Freie Presse, Oskar Strnad reviews George Niemann’s reconstruction of Diocletian’s palace in Split. He refers to some of the most successful topoi in parallels between antique and contemporary architecture. In Strnad’s reading, the ‘bareness’ of Diocletian’s palace corresponds to the objective (sachlich) and engineer-like sense of form of contemporary concrete and iron constructions, a sense of form that however has the same political background now and then – democracy. 34 Although collaborating in those years and possessing astonishing intellectual affinities, Strnad and Frank explore different and apparently opposite facets of classical tradition.

In his unpublished conference typescripts about Wohnkultur, around WWI, Strnad again uses metaphors based on classical imagery, metaphors which clearly refer to Adolf Loos, who influences throughout Strnad’s reasoning, in the rhetorical penchant for paradoxes as well as in the attention towards Kultur and evolutionary arguments. In fact, for Strnad, the only adequate reference to the ocean liner is the Basilica di Massenzio and the Pantheon is American in its spirit – even if its form encompasses values which are not exclusively democratic. 35

Along with the idea of a belonging to a classical tradition of thought, a second aspect in Wiener Moderne’s reception of classical tradition is its Mannigfaltigkeit as living multiplicity. The attention to a joyful variety was a constant feature of Wiener Moderne’s writings since 1912. In his review of Frank’s interiors, Oskar Wlach enunciates clearly and for the first time the main principles of a Wiener Wohnen. Here he referred to the polychrome variety of ‘Italian Cinquecento paintings, the school of Umbria and Tuscany’, as a model for Frank’s interiors, inclusive of every further modification. Because of a similar richness in the use of colour, Frank’s work is apt to absorb every further intervention, every accidental object the lives of inhabitants will bring in them. 36 In 1921, Walter Sobotka (1888-1972), in an essay on Wohnkultur, explicitly establishes a close link between the variety of forms of Viennese interiors and antiquity as a model, thus adding a further element to confirm the proposed identification of Frank’s Mannigfaltigkeit as classical varietas. In true modern interiors, according to Sobotka, ‘the variety of the antique’ should be translated in modern principles. 37

In 1925, for his Villa Granichstaedten, Sobotka uses – in a light graphic composition – elements derived from a classical repertoire: an Ionic order for the portico on the garden and a broken pediment for the main north entry, following the tradition of Viennese baroque. 38

The latent attention toward classical tradition in the work of the circle was evident for contemporary reviewers, already from the Wintersausstellung 1910-1911 at the k.k. Osterreichisches Museum für Kunst und Industrie. Along with the ‘the noble classical resolution’ that informs the work of Viktor Lurje’s during the twenties, some remarks concerning Oskar Wlach reveal themselves as particularly interesting for our topic. An article published in 1922 and illustrated with Wlach’s design works is a first document of a wider circulation of a particular reading of classical tradition in Vienna. The fascination of antiquity does not lie in ‘its smoothness, its academic exactness’ but in its ‘bumps and scuffs, scratches and carves, traces left by the instrument in its fight against the material’. 39 The prevalent feature of antiquity is not exactness and perfection.

In his conference Kultur und Form (1918), Oskar Strnad proposes the Medici man as ‘the one who stays in closest connection to us’ and his representation – in Masaccio’s frescoes – ‘obvious and modern now as it was then’. Strnad’s man ‘is absolutely not transcendental and absolutely not abstract’. 40 The concreteness of Strnad’s vision excludes universal architectural rules and prompts a gentle pleasure in living, a ‘freundliches Behagen’. The aim is psychological well-being also when discussing anthropometric proportioning, clearness and readability of space. The latter is a current subject of discussion in Frank’s circle, 41 above all in the work of Walter Sobotka, whose continuous references to classical principles – not prescriptions – of proportion demonstrate a deep knowledge of antique and Renaissance treatises and deserve a deeper analysis. 42
Conclusions. Diverging Receptions of Classical Tradition

Frank’s anthropocentrism is based on *varietas*, on the variety of psychological needs and functions and leads to varying solutions and no universal norms. To understand its originality, it is not even necessary to draw parallels with the general European context or with Le Corbusier’s model, largely criticised by Sobotka.

In an article by Rudolf Perco in 1932, in the same Viennese context, the Viennese idea of a cultural belonging to antiquity emerges again, although with different meanings. Modern man has not changed his feelings and thoughts since Ancient Greece. In no other historical period, have antiquity and modern been as close in their intentions and Weltanschauungen as at the beginning of the thirties, because, according to Perco, the ‘fifth’ rebirth of antique started right there, in Vienna, with Otto Wagner at the beginning of the century. Neither Adolf Loos nor König’s students, however, would have shared Perco’s historiographical position.

The image of Greek antique that Perco delineates has no scratches on its surface. Its main characters are rationality and constructivism. Man – even if described as *natürlich* – becomes an immutable meter and cipher, *Zahl*, of the world.

Some Königsschüler thus propose an alternative to Wagnerschüler also in the reading of antiquity that, although with different meanings, constitutes a model also in the Specialschule.

‘With each rebirth of classical architecture, however, its meaning changes’. The reflection on classical tradition at the beginning of the 20th century is not monolithic. In the case of Carl König’s teaching we have no univocal evidence about the references proposed by this Neo-Baroque architect and his students’ opinions diverge on the contents of the courses. If we consider Alberti’s reception, in the same years and in the same context, results are diverging. Alberti’s *De re aedificatoria* influences Frank’s attention to Annehmlichkeit, it gives a model of *Zweckmässigkeit* and it can also be considered as the product of an ‘amateur’, responsible for the worst Neo-Renaissance of the 19th century.

In the broader Viennese context, in a span of four years before WWI, indices are even more disparate. Grandiose monumentality following the model of Fischer von Erlach characterises the work of Perco, whose Italian sketches are published in *Der Architekt* and an abstract classicism is the salient feature of Josef Hoffmann’s architecture. In the same years, if Renaissance models authorise a joyful *varietas* for Josef Frank – with results that have neither formal nor conceptual links with ‘classicism’ – and the Parthenon authorises a shift between actual structure and its image, for Loos, it is always antique that inspires the engineer-like sense of form in the theoretical contribution of Oskar Strnad, an enthusiastic advocate of Loos’ arguments.

Over the span of a few years, classical tradition means perfection and imperfection, reaction and revolution, totalitarianism and democracy.
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38 Photos published in Walter Sobotka, "Familienwohnhaus – Mietwohnung", Innendekoration, XXXVIII, Januar (1927), 2 and 8. For the context of explicit quotes from the classical repertoire of forms among the Wiener Moderne, see Cardamone, Varietas.


41 For the general context of Wiener Wohnkultur, Iris Meder, "Offene Welten, Die Wiener Schule im Einfamilienhausbau 1910-1938" (Ph.D. diss: Stuttgart, 2003); Eva B. Ottlinger (ed.),

Among his sources, Vitruvius (Sobotka, Principles of Design, 240), Nicomaco da Gerasa, De re aedificatoria, Sebastiano Serlio and Andrea Palladio (Ibid., 248). Rudolf Wittkower and Erwin Panowsky, repeatedly quoted in his late work, apparently influence in depth his reception of classical proportioning (Cardamone, Tradizione classica, 240-242). In an excursus about Proportional Theories of the 19th and 20th Century, Sobotka is lapidary about Le Corbusier’s research, as ‘an ambitious project … trying to solve in one stroke all the problems of proportion’. Le Corbusier’s systems – which have ‘received much acclaim (not the least by himself)’ – are considered to be scarcely applicable. Sobotka, Principles of Design, 268.


For Sobotka’s historiographical opposition of Königschule and Wagnerschule, based indeed on a different attitude towards tradition, see Sobotka, Principles of Design, 363: ‘Two schools of architecture flourished at the turn of the century, one at the Academy of Art under the famous Otto Wagner, the initiator of modern architecture in the movement of the Secession (Art Nouveau [sic]), the other at the Technological Institute under the guidance of Carl König, the refined representative of a traditional direction related to the classical principles of the Ecole des Beaux Arts of Paris. The first direction developed into well-known Wiener Werkstätte, led and directed by Josef Hoffmann, the second into a new evolutionary direction based on traditional values and initiated by a group of young architects under the spirited leadership of the ingenious Oskar Strnad, assisted by Josef Frank and Oskar Walch (sic’). Loos saw Wagner as the responsible for the decisive break with tradition. Adolf Loos, “Otto Wagner”, Reichspost, July 13, 1911 in Opel, Konfrontationen. Schriften von und über Adolf Loos, (Wien: Georg Prachner Verlag, 1988), 53.

unverrückbare Richtlinie, den "Verstand". Ibid., 14: 'Denn die Art des Menschen hat sich im Physiologischen und Psychologischen seit der Antike nicht geändert; sein Fühlen und Denken muß noch immer als das der Antike gelten. ... Daher muß für alle Zeiten antike Harmonie und Rhythmus, auf den griechischen Menschen und seiner Zahl füssend, gelten'.


47 Max Fabiani and Karl Holey supply diverging information: Greek art and Italian High-Renaissance, according to Fabiani, French Renaissance according to Holey. See Kristan, König, 26-27 and Cardamone, Varietas, also for the apparent contradiction between a baroque formal language and a teaching on classical models. For a first approach to the question of the contents of König's lessons based on his students' trips in Italy, see Cardamone, Architetti austriaci, 98-102.


49 For Perco's final project at the Specialschule (1908-10), awarded with the Rompreis, see Ursula Prokop, Rudolf Perco. 1884-1942. Von der Architektur des Roten Wien zur NS-Megalomanie (Wien: Böhlau, 2001), 32-42. Prokop points out that, together with Fischer von Erlach, the model for Perco's project for thermal baths could be retraced back to Wagner's Artibus. Among Perco's drawings published in Der Architekt, see the Arch of Septimius Severus, XVIII (1911), 49. A digression on reception of Mediterranean, even in Vienna, is beyond the scope of this paper; see for the general context Benedetto Gravagnuolo, "From Schinkel to Le Corbusier. The Myth of the Mediterranean in Modern Architecture", in Lejeune, Sabatino, Mediterraneo, 15-39, and Ezio Godoli, "Il periodo Viennese di Olbrich", in Joseph Maria Olbrich, Idee. Architetture e interni viennesi (Firenze: 1991), 7-30. For Hoffmann, I just mention here Villa Ast (1909-11), Villa Skywa-

50 'Classicism' is not an adjective to apply to Josef Frank's work: 'I'm not of the opinion that our overaged views are to be called "classistic" rather as being historically conditioned for after all the whole modern European architecture is rather classicistic'. For the general reception of classicism in 20th century architecture, Stanford Anderson, "The Legacy of German Neoclassicism and Biedermeier: Behrens, Tessenow, Loos and Mies van der Rohe", Assemblage, n°15, Aug. (1991), 62-87. In different passages of Frank's writings 'classicism' is not used as praise (Josef Frank to Walter Sobotka, Stockholm January 22, 1962, in Sobotka, Principles of Design, 398); see also above (note 22).
**Introduction**

Along the most part of the last century, the discussion of the Enlightenment as ‘the initial phase of real modernity in the West’ has been related to crucial political themes: among them, the definition of the public sphere, the role of the intellectual, the changing concepts of reason, revolution, utopia. In this context, the emergence of an architecture related to the ‘age of Reason’ has been essential, both in establishing a connection between architecture and political culture, and in shifting the focus of architectural interpretation away from the question of style. From this shift, new classifications as well as new paths in architectural theory have emerged.

This text deals with the complex relationship that developed in Italy during the 1950s and 60s between the critical debate on architecture and the Enlightenment: a chapter in a broader ‘battle of ideas’ where, between 1955 and 1970, ideological positions played a major role in selecting historical themes relevant to the architectural field. In the final years of this period, the publication of Boulée’s *Essai sur l’Art* (1967), the Castelfranco exhibition on the Enlightenment in Veneto (1969), and the Turin seminar on Vittone (1970) clearly demonstrate how an active interest in Enlightenment architecture could be used to fuel the contemporary debate on issues such as rationality, utopia, or architectural autonomy. These exchanges are prepared through a build-up of publications on influential periodicals starting in the mid-1950s. We shall here consider those of Aldo Rossi and Manfredo Tafuri, whose different interpretations pave the way for the wider debate that follows.

**Rossi’s Neoclassical Milan and ‘Enlightened rationalism’, 1956**

In Milan in the early 50s, the concept of ‘Enlightenment architecture’ was still unheard of: neoclassicism, however, was considered as an element of local identity. It was given for granted that neoclassical architecture in Lombardy possessed a ‘character of rationality, sincerity, and moral consistency’. Neoclassical Milan was ‘beautiful, civil and decent’ even for Carlo Muscetta and Gastone Manacorda, chief editors of Società, Italian review of political culture, directly connected to the Italian Communist Party. Aldo Rossi, convinced at the time...
that ‘the big issue is how to fit our work as architects in the general Movement’ had submitted an essay on architecture in the USSR to Società in 1954. His text had been rejected: but Rossi was from Milan, a communist, and a well educated architectural student, and these were good reasons for inviting him to submit another one:

'It would be exceedingly interesting – write Muscetta and Manacorda to Rossi – and brilliant provocatively, to respond to those who consider Milan an unpleasant city by studying the historical significance and the authentic aesthetic values of Milan’s neoclassical architecture, as it developed in parallel to the ascent of a new, modern ruling class in the early years of the 19th century.'

Rossi complies, and writes his 1956 essay on Piermarini and Cagnola with these aims. A purely stylistic approach was out of the question. Architecture was to be linked to the ‘social, political, economical conditions of its development: ‘the main line of neoclassical art’ – as Rossi declares on the first page of his essay – must be connected to ‘Enlightenment rationalism’.

Rossi then develops his interpretation by leaning heavily on the works of other contributors to Società and PCI-related periodicals: Luporini’s ‘Voltaire e le Lettres philosophiques’ and ‘Il concetto della storia e dell’Illuminismo’, as well as Muscetta’s introduction to the literary works of Augusto Monti. From this last text Rossi - following a direct suggestion by Muscetta – adopts the distinction between a progressive, ‘enlightened’ mode of Neoclassicism versus an archaeological and ‘platonizing’ one, defined as ‘counterclassicism’. Equally important is the influence of Giulio Carlo Argan, emerging in the relationship between ‘art’ and ‘life’, as well as in the definition of rationalism as an operational method.

Other themes that will be later developed by Rossi make also their appearance: literary memories (Stendhal, a topical author when discussing Milan), original selections of iconic buildings (Cagnola’s villa at Inverigo), and an interest for the ‘antirethorical’ character of residential architecture. There is, however, a gap between the sophistication and ambition of the political discourse, and the more limited horizon of Rossi’s historical culture. The essay seems in fact to rely on a small number of architectural sources: buildings and architects are all taken from local historiography, with Mezzanotte and Bascapè’s recent publication used as a ‘beautiful’ (Rossi) field guide. The still divided national narratives in architectural history are also a conditioning element. So, French eighteenth century architecture is still only seen in the distance, as an ‘originally national’ experience; and even the ending of the Napoleonic period is considered, only, in function of the development of a ‘new national conscience’.

These limitations allow us to better grasp the impact of Emil Kaufmann’s Architecture in the Age of Reason on Rossi and on Italian architectural culture. Since 1933, Kaufmann’s fame has been amplified by the mixed reactions to his texts. Among his fiercest critics was Hans Sedlmayr whose violent attacks to Kaufmann’s positions, however, ended up by implicitly recognizing their importance. This is also what happened in Italy, where Rossi first discusses Kaufmann’s theses by writing against Sedlmayr’s Revolution in Modern Art in Casabella n. 219, 1958. In this text, where authors and intellectuals such as Adorno, Solmi, Argan, Lukacs are called to participate in a collective act of accusation against Sedlmayr’s ‘inacceptable’ positions, Rossi’s arguments reveal his developing interests in Enlightenment topics. For example, Sedlmayr’s attack on the supposed ‘cult of Reason’ is rebuked by quoting Ludovico Geymonat’s Essays in neo-rationalist philosophy: ‘it matters little that the word raison does not have a solid grounding in Enlightenment thought (…) What counts is the “remarkable progress” that was produced by that line of thinking’.

And yet, among the authorities assembled in the text, the absence of Kaufmann (still untranslated in Italy) stands out. Rossi does not seem to have any knowledge of the Age of reason or the Three Revolutionary Architects. In fact, Rossi gives to Sedlmayr what is really Kaufmann’s: among the few qualities he sees in Sedlmayr’s work, there are the discussions of the role of Ledoux and of the eighteenth-century roots of modernity. This mistake, however, is amended in just a few months, when Rossi, deepening his readings on the subject, discovers Kaufmann’s texts, and publishes an essay fully acknowledging their importance.
Casabella 222, 1958: ‘K.’and the Enlightenment

The first public discussion of the work of Max Dvořák’s pupil is published in Italy on Casabella, 222. Since its title, where ‘age of Reason’ becomes ‘Enlightenment’ (“Emil Kaufmann e l’architettura dell’illuminismo”), anticipating the Einaudi translation, the text opens to a wide range of topics. Rossi is not so much interested in Kaufmann’s 1933 pamphlet celebrating the ‘modernity’ of Ledoux, as in the complexity of the later works. On the one hand, in the general framing of his interpretation, Rossi’s early obsession with realism is still at work: the modernity of Kaufmann, for him, is in the reflection of the ‘real’ and ‘objective’ conditions of life and society in architecture. On the other hand, realism is only one among the themes that emerge in the essay. Rossi appreciates Kaufmann’s interest for artist’s autobiographies (the way ‘the best artists... have transformed their own cultural experience in a life practice [dato di vita] …); his study of the development of building types; his idea of an architectural design ‘that controls [the] different parts in reason of their reciprocal position (Zusammengetz) and not following an organic growth’. And finally, the importance of reason as an operational tool, fostering an evolution in architectural theory from Blondel’s ‘precepts’ to the ‘vrais principes’ of Durand, ‘necessary elements in modern culture’. Rossi’s text closes with an almost ideal scenario, inspired by the Age of Reason but in fact transcending it: that of a late eighteenth-century moment of ‘balance’, expression of the ‘extraordinary and unique period of political and cultural hegemony of the nation, that will have its peak in the Revolution’. The word ‘perfection’ is even used, not referred by Rossi to the stylistic perfection of Gabriel’s classicism or to the refined art de vivre of the Enlightenment élites, but to the progressive movement of architectural reform developing simultaneously in the bourgeois art of England, in revolutionary architecture in France, and in Italian ‘civil architecture’ and theoretical writings. Rossi’s narrative appropriately ends in Milan at the beginning of the 19th century, where he celebrates, once again, the ‘new and highly dignified, way of building, never to be repeated in the history of modern Italy’. But ‘neoclassical’ Milan is now framed in a European scene, unthinkable without Kaufmann’s ambitious and informed last book.

Casabella’s 1958 endorsement of Kaufmann deserves more than a footnote in the development of an Italian interest towards the architectural lumières. Even if the Viennese scholar’s texts were still not recognized ‘as important in their own way as those of Riegl... and Giedion’18, and Einaudi’s translation will lag on for a number of years, Rossi’s article makes Kaufmann unavoidable in any discussion on the origins of modernity. Among the early commentators of Kaufmann we will find authors such as Ezio Bonfanti19 and Manfredo Tafuri; they, too, will be interested in what Edoardo Persico in 1936 had criticized: the connection between ideas and forms of eighteenth-century architecture, and the theories, and ideologies, of a politicized architectural modernity.

Dialectic of the Enlightenment: Tafuri 1963-1965

Since the early 1960s the question of ideology is firmly on Tafuri’s agenda. In 1964, the words ‘critical rationalism’ and ‘new utopianism’ give the title to a critical review of the entries for the architectural competition of Tel Aviv’s historic nucleus of Jaffa20. In the same year Tafuri publishes an article whose translated title reads “Symbol and Ideology in the Architecture of the Enlightenment”21. The place of publication is now Adriano Olivetti’s monthly political and cultural magazine Comunità. This
is not the first and only article published by the Roman architectural historian in what is considered the mouthpiece of Olivetti’s communitarian utopia22. And indeed Olivetti’s ‘enlightened’ pioneering experiment in architectural design and town planning will be at the centre of his Storia dell’architettura italiana where the German word for Enlightenment – Aufklärung – titles Tafuri’s intensely critical assessment of Adriano’s ‘communitas of intellect’23.

‘Incertitude’, what Tafuri immediately singles out as the constituent character of the Enlightenment, emerges right from “Simbolo e ideologia”’s very first words in the quotation of Quatremère’s entry “Architecture” for the Encyclopédie Méthodique, where the author points out the French theorist’s hesitation between opposing strands of thought, and uses it to identify the ‘entire architectural culture of the Enlightenment’24. The composite and often contradictory nature of artistic cycles is an obsessively recurrent motif of Tafuri’s ‘historical project’. We find it for example in a study on late Roman Baroque appeared in the same year, “Un ‘fuoco’ urbano nella Roma barocca,” where at the centre of the historian’s argument is not the conventional high Baroque of Bernini but an apparently unorthodox work, in which the historian detects the crisis that would ultimately lead to the ‘revolution of the Enlightenment’25. The name of Emil Kaufmann, as we will see, will frequently recur – mainly as a negative term of reference in Tafuri’s analyses, where the work of the Austrian art historian on the ‘revolutionary architects’ will be repeatedly assessed as ‘formalist’26. The first important distinction Tafuri makes between his own approach and Kaufmann’s work concerns the recognition of the Enlightenment as a cultural context within which the investigation into architectural history finds place. For Tafuri, the Enlightenment has primarily to be considered as an intellectual climate, a ‘cultural attitude more than an artistic cycle’ that needs to be evaluated against the backdrop of those ‘broad ideological and political movements that since the second half of the eighteenth century have revolutionized thinking and the social-political conditions of Europe’27. What the historian must undertake is the accurate, meticulous reconstruction of this climate: by asserting the need to maintain critical distance from the object of historical investigation, Tafuri clearly dissociates himself from what in Teorie e storia he would subsequently define as ‘operative criticism’, or a history that forces links between past and future to support particular design strategies28.

Crucial to Tafuri’s Enlightenment is the relationship between art and society, the fundamental terrain on which a series of revolutions would definitely undermine the power and authority of the well-established western tradition of art culminating into the ‘demolition’ of enduringly persistent ‘myths’29. However, in Tafuri’s terms, these revolutions are far from being resolute remaining greatly unaccomplished and leaving ‘the fundamental problem … undefined and not even posed in its most authentic terms’30. In this picture of an imperfect, incomplete project, from which further myths would eventually spring, Tafuri includes Le Camus de Mezières’s theory of sensations and Boullée’s architecture parlante. To strengthen the argument of the intrinsic contradictoriness of the Enlightenment, a thesis that he opposes to Kaufmann’s forcedly unified, compact and monolithic notion of an ‘architecture in the age of reason,’ the historian goes as far as to admit the ‘failure of Boullée and Ledoux’s revolution’31. “To analyse the factual relationship between Boullée and Ledoux and the culture of Enlightenment in all its limits,’32 is what he proposes to do, thus counteracting Kaufmann’s operative reading and re-asserting the scientific autonomy of the historical work.

Despite this outspoken repudiation of ‘operative criticism’, Tafuri never refrains from relating his historical analyses to his own present. As it has already been noted, past and present continually coexist and intermingle in the architectural historian’s work: Tafuri’s examination of non-contemporary epochs is constantly accompanied by analogies with certain aspects of the existing condition33.

What kind of history is Tafuri proposing here? In what sense, then, his historical investigation would be a non-operative history?

It is clear from “Simbolo e Ideologia”, as from subsequent studies, that the phenomena of the past that the historian wishes to analyse are not only scientifically interpreted, but made active elements of the present. By operating these shifts Tafuri is careful to avoid any easy transposition or anachronistic return: his links between past events and present conditions, unlike the militant histories of the modern movement, do not lead to any reassuring picture of accomplished or positive historical development.
Moreover: ‘the romantic-enlightenment dialectic that the utopianism of forms expresses at the highest degree of tragedy’ discloses the disturbing nature of any kind of utopia, the recognition of the ‘deficiency of its instruments’, which ‘turns future into myth’, a ‘promised land of not entirely confident expectations’. The tipping point of this dialectic is represented by debate on the authority of the ancients as mirrored in Piranesi’s *Carceri* (1750-1761) and in the ‘poignant linguistic lacerations’ contained in the tables accompanying his *Parere sull’architettura* (1765) where the very notion of Architecture ‘is torn to shreds’.

The article’s conclusion – ‘it will still be from the principles introduced by the Enlightenment that the movement of which we are living one of the most dramatic phases will fundamentally derive its stimulus’ – already contains all the fundamental arguments that Tafuri will further develop in subsequent writings: an Enlightenment whose dramatic lacerations and seemingly irreconcilable tensions are not so much the resigned metaphor of his own present but rather a tool to dissect its crisis, the understanding of its roots and very foundations.

A further writing that we would like to consider is Tafuri’s review of Paolo Marconi’s book on Giuseppe Valadier published the following year in the literary and cultural magazine *Marcatré*. Here, the projection of the past onto the present is announced right from the very first sentence: ‘there exists a history that is still entirely to be written of what could be defined the ideological misrepresentations of the Italian artistic culture since the middle of the eighteenth century until the present’. The reference to the contemporary scene and the search for historic reasons that elucidate the current condition of crisis, are once again the focus of Tafuri’s attention: ‘the checkmates and defeats that follow one another in the history of Italian modern architecture are the result of ambiguity, of oscillation between revolt and scepticism, of a misunderstood problematicism’. In this framework, such distant figures as Antolini, Valadier and Jappelli, Basile, Albini and Gardella, are detected as the exponents of a possible genealogy of modern Italian architecture intended as a history of ‘permanent crisis’, an ideal cycle that has not yet been closed.

**Conclusion**

Between 1958 and 1965 Rossi and Tafuri are authors of a deformed and instrumental interpretation of the architecture of the Enlightenment. Far from being a systematic object of study, the Enlightenment acts for both of them as an emblematic condition to return to, in an attempt to analyse and problematize a wide range of issues surrounding the meaning of architecture and its relation to society. Two are the main strands of thought within which this investigation finds place. The first one derives from Kaufmann’s theory of architectural autonomy as exemplified by his *Three Revolutionary Architects* and *Architecture in the Age of Reason*, an interpretation which is more congenial to Rossi but remains an important point of reference for both authors. The other stems from that re-discussion of the philosophical basis of rationalism inaugurated by Horkheimer and Adorno’s *Dialectic of Enlightenment*, a text crucial to Tafuri published in 1944 and translated in 1966, and whose reception in Italy is mediated by the magazine *Contropiano* and the works of Asor Rosa, Cacciari, and Rella.

Across their respective critical itineraries both Rossi and Tafuri are careful to avoid that optimistic faith in the potential of critical thought that other Italian intellectuals, as Leonard Sciascia, would continue to propose as a possible legacy for the present, especially in political terms. For Tafuri, as well as for Rossi, the Enlightenment is a tool to dissect the architect’s work, his operational methods as well as his crises. What emerges in their writings
is an Enlightenment acknowledged as one of the different possible sources of modernity; the object of an investigation not resolved in itself but motivated and made urgent by questions and doubts posed in the present; an Enlightenment whose contradictory phenomenology seems to provide if not a solution, at least an acceptable explanation, to a present that is still perceived as unsettled.

**Endnotes**

1. This paper stems from common research and reflects topics discussed within the Ph. D. program in Architectural History at Politecnico di Torino. ‘Introduction’, ‘State of the art’, ‘Casabella 222’ are by Edoardo Piccoli; ‘Dialectic’ and ‘Conclusions’ by Michela Rosso. All the translations of Aldo Rossi’s and Manfredo Tafuri’s original texts into English are by the authors.


5. The judgement is truly a *lieu commun*, as Giovanni Muzio stated in 1921: ‘Scrivere di architettura milanese dei tempi trascorsi può sembrare a taluno ozioso, data la diffusa nomea che ha Milano di città brutta’ (Giovanni Muzio, “L’architettura a Milano intorno all’Ottocento”, *Emporium*, LIII, 1921, 241-258; p. 241).


12. Argan defines ‘rationality’ as ‘a method that allows to locally define and solve the problems that existence is continuously producing’ (Giulio Carlo Argan, *Walter Gropius e la Bauhaus*, Einaudi: Torino, 1951, p. 16); Rossi echoes him when discussing Piermarini’s rational approach to design as a way of ‘finding within the [architectural] program and its practical limitations… the solution to the problems that gradually emerge’ (Rossi 1956, p. 476).


14. ‘With … the violent end of French occupation… a modern conscience developed … through citizens participating the administration of public matters, and preparing a basis … for the new national conscience’, Rossi 1956, p. 482.
The book was defined by Giulio Einaudi, who flagged it for translation in 1958, an ‘excellent’ example of ‘cultural history’; even Bruno Zevi, whose own critical positions were far away from Kaufmann’s, had to recognize its importance. See the correspondence between Einaudi and Zevi in Archivio di Stato, Turin, Papers of Giulio Einaudi Editore.
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MULTIPLE IDENTITIES, CONFLICTING IDEOLOGIES IN OTTOMAN ISTANBUL AND REPUBLICAN TURKEY: THE CASE OF ALEXANDRE VALLAURY

This paper discusses the conflicting identities and works of Alexandre Vallaury (1850-1921) – an Ottoman Levantine with Italian roots, a well-known architect with Ecole des Beaux Arts education, a French citizen born and lived in Istanbul – will be evaluated through different lenses. This study examines several accounts on Vallaury’s background and architecture, which started in the Ottoman Istanbul; continued in Paris; and came to an end in the Republican Turkey. As the founder of the first architecture school in Turkey and designer of numerous significant buildings that were famous for their historicist and eclectic agenda, Vallaury is a prominent figure in the late Ottoman cultural and architectural realms.

The collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the foundation of the Turkish Republic empowered the nationalist and anti-cosmopolitan agendas, and tools for self-representation and national identity were redefined. With an urge to “re-discover” Turkish architecture and its pure forms, exclusion of “foreign” items became an instrument for nation building strategy. A historiographical survey of the Republican era confirms that many architects and scholars of the young Turkish Republic rejected the architecture of the nineteenth century and labeled it as a period of “decline” and “corruption”, marked by the works of foreign and non-Muslim architects, such as that of Vallaury’s.
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Introduction

This article is tracking the story of a European family who has moved to the Ottoman lands during the mid-19th century. This complex story of de-territorialization and re-territorialization took place in various places during the late 19th and early 20th century: Torino in Italy, Smyrna and Constantinople in the Ottoman Empire, Paris and Grasse in France, Istanbul and Ankara in the Republican Turkey. This article discusses the issues of nationalism, historicism, and cosmopolitanism through the case of an Ottoman Levantine architect, Alexandre Vallaury.

The first member of the Vallaury family to come to the Ottoman Empire was Francesco Vallauri, who moved to Izmir from Torino in 1842.¹ He was of Italian² origin and after his initial settling in Izmir, Francesco moved to Istanbul in 1849. Francesco was already married and had two kids when he arrived to the Ottoman Empire, but in Izmir he met Helena Moro Papadopulo and the couple lived together until his death and had six children with Helene.³ After moving to Istanbul in 1849, Francesco Vallauri opened a pastry shop in Beyoğlu. He owned renowned Café Vallaury located on Grand Rue de Pera and catered several official events, receptions, and openings for the Ottoman state. He turned out to be a famous pastry-cook in Istanbul and became the official confectioner of the Ottoman Palace. His letters found in the Ottoman archives were addressed directly to Grand Vizier Ali Pasha, in which he claimed the unpaid debts of the palace and gave detailed information about his expenses. Around 1860, he gained a city-wide fame and became the chief confectioner of the palace. Francesco Vallauri died in 1867 and the family business was continued by his wife Helene and probably by his elder son Pietro.⁴ His daughter Caroline – from his first wife – also came to Istanbul, and she was later married to Edouard Lebon in 1856.⁵ The Family tradition of confectionery has continued with Café Lebon, which would later be converted into legendary Markiz Patisserie of Pera as stated in Journal de Constantinople on January 12, 1861: “It is possible to find the brightest shows of confectionery in the stores of Monsignor Lebon, Monsignor Baltzer and Monsignor Vallaury who was the chief-confectioner of the Sultan.”⁶
The son of Francesco Vallauri, Alexandre Vallaury, was born in Istanbul on April 2, 1850. There are no certain findings about his childhood, except for the fact that he was sent to Paris for education in 1869. He started his architecture education in the world famous Paris Ecole des Beaux Arts on April 23rd, 1870. His name was written as “Alexandre Vallaury” in the school files and he studied architecture in the studio of Monsignor Coquart until 1877. After returning to his country in 1879, like many of its international students; he became a representative of Beaux Arts school, which dominated the architectural circles of the era.

The foreign students of Beaux Arts, after going back to their countries, more often than not, gained the reputation as architects or as instructors. Alexandre Vallaury was no exception, after his return to Istanbul in 1879, he attracted the attention of Osman Hamdi at an exhibition. Osman Hamdi praised the works of Vallaury, those of which included architectural projects, measured drawings and models.

After meeting with Osman Hamdi, Vallaury designed the Sanayi-i Nefise Mektebi (School of Fine Arts) and became the founding instructor of the architecture school. Following this physically and symbolically prestigious structure, Vallaury enhanced his career and designed many buildings of economic, politic, or symbolic significance. It is not an exaggeration to argue that Vallaury was one of the most prominent architects of the 19th century and his works reflect the socio-political picture of the late 19th century. It is important to note that, Vallaury was not only a professional architect but also an official architect of the Ottoman Government. He had several Sultan’s medals and was considered an officer in the Ottoman documents. As far as we know, many of his projects were commissioned by the Ottoman Government, including the Sanayi-i Nefise Mektebi (1882), Hidayet Mosque in Eminönü (1887), Turkish Tobacco Pavilion for the Paris International Exposition (1889), Mekteb-i Tibbiye-i Askeriye-i Şahane (1903) and Müze-i Hümayun (Imperial Museum) Buildings (three phases, 1891-1907).

Alexandre Vallaury owned an architectural bureau as well, practicing professional architecture especially in the last decades of the 19th century and in the beginning of the 20th century. As a Levantine architect with formal “Beaux Arts” education, he gained recognition among various sections of the society, including the Ottoman elites, the members of the non-Muslim community and among the Europeans living in Istanbul. Neo-classical Cercle d’Orient Building (1884) located on Grand Rue de Pera; Abdülmecid Efendi Mansion (1901) an interpretation of residential timber structures of Istanbul; Ridvan Paşa Mansion; Afif Paşa Yalısı (1901) combining vernacular and oriental elements; and Osman Reis Mosque (1903) are among the most prominent buildings that he designed for the Muslim/Turkish Ottoman elites and bureaucrats. He constructed several structures for the non-Muslim and European communities living in Istanbul as well. Greek Orphanage in the Prince Island (1890-1900) being the largest timber structure in Istanbul; Osmanlı Bank Headquarters Building (1892) (Figure 1) setting an architectural benchmark for the future buildings of Vovvoda street; the first international luxury hotel Pera Palas (1893); Decugis House (1895) a typical masonry structure with hybrid elements; Union Française (1896); and Düyun-u Umumiye (1897) built for the European governments to collect their debts are some of the most renowned buildings designed by Vallaury.

Fig. 1: Bank Imperial Ottoman published on popular newspaper of the era (Source: Servet-i Fünun)
Alexandre Vallaury worked on a large scope of building types and combined different architectural features in his designs. The façade designs were representing different styles ranging from neo-classical to Ottoman baroque; and from neo-renaissance to neo-Ottoman. As in the case of Pera Palas (1893), the rationally planned hotel structure, adorned with the latest technology, had a neo-classical façade but its ostentatious interior was designed with orientalist features. The Haydarpaşa Medical School (1903) that he designed in collaboration with Raimondo D’Aronco (Figure 2) had a hybrid character, combining Beaux Arts planning principles with neo-Ottoman and orientalist features in a grand scale. Another interesting building was the Ottoman Bank (1892), whose Northern façade, facing the Voyvoda street, was designed in a pure neo-renaissance manner; while the southern elevation of the building, facing the Historic Peninsula, had a totally different morphology. Düyun-u Umumiye Building (1897) reflected the search for an Ottoman revivalist style by combining Islamic, Ottoman and even Seljukid features with contemporary planning principles and Beaux Arts façade arrangement.

The search for a new Ottoman style, combining several historical features and traditional forms in new building types, and creating an eclectic style were characteristic features of Vallaury’s architectural language. Eventhough the impact of Beaux Arts architecture was almost always evident in his architecture; he freely used “Ottoman” traditional and/or historic forms together with “European” and “Islamic” elements. Apparently, Alexandre Vallaury, an Ottoman resident with French education and a French citizen with Italian background, well represented the hybrid identity of a Levantine in Istanbul. His architecture, as one might expect, was a reflection of his “hybrid” and “in-between” status, with neo-Ottoman and neo-classical interpretations, which were widely accepted and appreciated in the late 19th-century context.

In a similar fashion; the architect was shifting back and forth among the various identities that he owned. The architect’s father, François Vallaury, was defined as Italian (İtalyalı Fransova Valori) in the Ottoman official records but he wrote several letters addressing the Sublime Porte in French. Interestingly, his son Alexandre Vallaury, was defined as a subject of the French government in the Ottoman archival documents. Alexandre, has changed the spelling of his last name from “Vallauri” to “Vallaury” during his architecture education in Paris. He inscribed his name as “A. VALLAURI ARTE” on the façade of Decugis House dating 1895. However, on the South East corner of Ömer Abed Han, the name “A. VALLAURY ARCHITECTE” could be seen. The architect held his various identities without conflict in the multi-cultural and cosmopolitan environment of the late 19th century. He could be defined as Ottoman, Italian, French, or simply as a Levantine, none of which actually contradicted with his ambiguous status. Nationality was a flexible, permeable, and optional quality in the stratified but intermingled social context of the Ottoman capital. The precise segmentation of nations and the strict definition of the “other” were not yet completed in the 19th-century Istanbul context.

**Perception of Late 19th Century Ottoman Architecture by Nationalists Architects**

With the collapse of the Ottoman Empire and the foundation of the Turkish Republic based on nationalist and secular Kemalist ideology; not only the political or economical status of the country but also its social structure has severely transformed. The tools for self-representation and national identification were redefined in the first half of the 20th century. History, language, culture, art, and architecture started being reevaluated with new lenses, under the light of the “nation building” strategy. With the promotion of “Turkishness”, the notion of Ottomanness and Ottoman heritage...
attained an ambivalent position. According to ideologically manipulated official history, all organic connections with the recently collapsed empire were eliminated and an idealized “golden age” belonging to remote past was identified with Turkishness. In another saying, parallel to the decline theory, the more recent history of the Ottoman Empire especially 18th and 19th centuries were identified with corruption and decadence; and the 15th and 16th centuries were accepted as genuine and superior ages of national advancement.

**Decline Theory:**
According to the decline paradigm “the military setbacks, territorial contradiction and/or economic deterioration of the Ottoman empire, came to represent an overarching category that subsumed every aspect of society, polity and culture”. This anachronistic theory arguing that all institutions of the Ottoman Empire, as parts of a pre-modern and non-Western entity were sentenced to fail, when compared to the enlightened and industrialized Western Europe; was adopted by the Republican ideology as well. Architectural history, resonating with the official historical discourse, also embraced the decline theory to explain the corruption of Turkish architecture – which was once pure and superior – in relation to the political and economic deterioration of the empire. In the search for a “genuine” national style, the political necessity for rejecting the Ottoman heritage was the major dilemma for the Republican architects. They tried to resolve this paradox by adapting an architectural decline theory: accepting 15th and 16th century Ottoman architecture as “classical and national”; and by rejecting the 18th and 19th centuries as eclectic, superficial, and imitative. Being one of the most renowned architects of late Ottoman era, Vallaury and his buildings were believed to represent the typical features of the 19th-century architecture. He was mostly defined as foreign and imitator; while his buildings were labeled as ornamented, cosmopolite, characterless, and fake. Especially Duyun-u Umumiye, a building representing the economic dependence of the Ottoman government on European powers and which became a symbol of decline and corruption both economically and politically, was the main target of criticisms. The article by Aptullah Ziya, considered Melling and Vallaury as the scapegoats of the 18th and 19th centuries respectively, exemplifies this perspective.

**Eclecticism, Imitation, Ornamentation:**
World-wide domination of the Modern Architecture in the early 20th century influenced the architectural style and education in Turkey as well. Several European architects such as Ernst Egli, Bruno Taut, and Clemens Holzmeister, mostly of German ecole, were invited to Turkey starting with 1930s. These architects, who were commissioned the majority of the public buildings and were assigned as professors of architecture schools, were highly influential in the transformation of the architectural milieu in Turkey. The pure and un-ornamented forms of modern architecture and its revolutionary discourse were widely acknowledged by the state (against the revivalist forms of the First National Style) as a tool for rejecting the Ottoman heritage. These modernist architects being invited to Turkey revolutionized the architectural education in Turkey and introduced the basic discourses of modern architecture, which could simply be summarized as: emphasis on the purity of the forms, functionality of the design, rejection of traditional forms, and avoidance of ornamentation. Under the light of the modernist perspective, rejecting revivalist and eclectic forms, Turkish architects discredited the formalist and façade oriented architecture of the 19th century. According to canonical modernism imitation, ornamentation, and eclecticism were accepted as great sins of architecture. The debate on imitation versus pureness was one of the major topics of discussion for the architects of the Republic as well. Architects Behçet and Bederettin questioned, who can or can not be called as an architect. Their basic criteria were imitation and ornamentation.

Early Republican architects were in search of a genuine Turkish architecture, from which, they were hoping to generate an international, modern, and rational style. Aptullah Ziya’s article titled as “Yeni Sanat” compares the originality of “real” Turkish architecture with the historicism and imitation of the 19th century.

**Education:**
Alexandre Vallaury, apart from being a professional architect, was also among the founders of the School of Fine Arts. As the designer of the school building and being the first instructor of the architecture department; he was held responsible for the program and educational system of the school. The architecture education was based
on the *Ecole des Beaux Arts* principles which was declared as outdated by the modernist architects of the 20th century. The architects of the Turkish Republic who were searching for a modern, national but a universal style in architecture were critical of Sanayi-i Nefise education as well. Vallaury was held particularly responsible for the “miseducation” of architecture students before the republican reform in architectural education.

**Cosmopolitanism:**

The question, whether multi-ethnic and multi-religious Ottoman Empire was a cosmopolitan entity, is still a matter of debate among scholars. The concept of cosmopolitanism, generated from the Greek words *cosmos* and *polis* meaning the ‘citizen of the world’, has developed and transformed, attaining new meanings and implications within the course of history. Late 18th century, enlightenment thinkers approached cosmopolitanism or world citizenship as a problem of universal justice for the human race regardless of their political, ethnic or religious affiliations.

The early Republican intellectuals’ perception of cosmopolitanism was quite different. Stripped from all its positive and universal values, the term was used as a synonym for “rootlessness”, “foreignness”, “hybridity”. The state ideology searching for the genuine Turkishness and pursuing the national essence, found its reflection in the architectural discourse as well. Cosmopolitanism in architecture was identified with the corruption of the pureness of the Turkish architecture with the introduction of alien forms by foreign architects. The relation between nationalist ideology and architecture was directly stated in the article of Sedat Çetintaş, as he praised the purity of the ancient Turkish architecture while condemning cosmopolitan forms introduced by Armenian master builders.

Apparently, cosmopolitanism in architecture was used synonymously with historicism and eclecticism of the 19th century. One of the prominent figures of the early Republican architectural milieu, Behçet Ünsal, criticized the cosmopolitan character of the late Ottoman architecture, presenting Vallaury’s architecture as the peak-point of corruption. Ünsal argued that Kemalettin Bey and Vedat Tek started the consciousness for nationalizing architecture.

**Nationalism:**

The conflicting ideas of cosmopolitanism, universalism, and nationalism found its reflections in the artistic productions and the architectural morphology of the 19th century. The complex and layered architectural language, together with the intellectual discourse lying beneath architectural productions of the age, cannot be solely reduced to a question of ideological representations; but architectural forms tell a lot about the dominant intellectual understanding of the era as well. Historicism in architecture was a common form-generating tool for displaying different ideologies and perceptions. Nationalism, as a romantic discourse, tries to establish a connection between the transcendental past and the immanent present. Romantic nationalists search for their true identity within the roots of their history or with Smith’s words they “yearned for a homogeneous whole and seamless nation, expressing a single authentic soul.”

The transnational character of Levantines, belonging to more than one ethnic community was conflicting with the idea of a homogenized nation. An etymological and lexicographic analysis of the word “Levantine” by Edhem Eldem would help us understand the in-between, non-classified, and ambivalent state of this loosely defined community. Derived from the French word *lever*, Levant means the East, and the word *Levantin* simply refers to the Eastern. This relatively more inclusive and neutral definition of the word started referring the Near East, namely the Ottoman lands by the late 19th century. By the 20th century, the word started gaining its negative connotations. Edhem Eldem, in his article, argues that during the Republican era, with the rising reaction against the “cosmopolitanism” of the Ottomans, the word Levantine was synonymous with the term Sweet Water Frank, both of which were identified with comprador bourgeois expressing the term’s all negative implications. In his renowned book *State and Class in Turkey*, Çağlar Keyder emphasizes how ethnic diversity overlapped with class distinction in the Ottoman lands during the 19th century. Keyder argues that, one of the reasons behind the reaction against non-Muslim minorities in the early Republican era depended on the sharpening socio-economic class struggle within the emerging capitalist order. Arus Yumul, also emphasized the in-between and hybrid identity of this group.
and argued that due to their un-categorizational character, Levantines were accused of being “nationless” and “cultureless”. Even though Eldem questions the “cosmopolitanism” of the Ottoman Empire; Yerasimios argues that behind the harsh criticisms directed against Levantines, lies their cosmopolitan character. The nationist view simply does not go together with the idea of cosmopolitanism. Cosmopolitan people, without fixed identities or nationalities, were the citizens of the earth and this concept stood against the idea of a world divided into homogeneous nations. Not only the very being of this hybrid group but their works and establishments were also disapproved and labeled as the “other”. Architecture, was of course no exception; the buildings designed by Levantine architects were severely criticized and even rejected. In the case of Vallaury, it is likely that the search for a “national style” by a Levantine architect, with his undefined nationality, was against the common understanding of the time. The article by B.O. Celal, published at Mimar in 1932 as the featuring article of the issue, summarizes the common perspective against foreign architects and presents the construction of the “other”.

**Conclusion**

Architectural history, as presented above, was no different than the official historical discourse in terms of nation building. Early Republican architectural discourse was based on the idea that Turkish architecture has reached its climax during the age of Sinan and it has started degenerating, especially due to Western impact, starting with the Tulip Period in the early 18th century. The appearance of non-Muslim, Levantine, or foreign architects and later their unquestionable domination of the profession was believed to be the sole reason of corruption in architecture. Especially the works of Armenian architects such as Balyans in the early 19th century and of Levantine and non-Muslim architects such as Vallaury and D’Aronco in the late 19th century were accepted as a “stain” in the Turkish architectural history. The article written for the Tenth Year celebrations of the Republic at Mimar magazine clearly summarizes the common ideology of the early Republican era: “However, this great art was devastated with the influence of the Western art introduced to the country through the projects brought by the French envoy for /in) Sadabad. During the era of Selim III, Mahmut I, and Aziz, bastard arts such as Baroque and Empire dominated the artistic milieu of the country. This failure (error) in the field of art created Beylerbeyi, Dolmabahce and Yildiz Palaces, Medical School and finally today’s Beyoğlu. These dark and dull piles of stone having/carrying the marks/ (signs) of foreign foremen accumulated on the most beautiful spots of the city.”

Still, considering the official “Westernization” ideology of the young republic, one can question why Turkish architects rejected the non-Turkish architects of the Ottoman era. Many European architects such as Henri Prost, Hermann Jansen, Bruno Taut, Clemens Holzmeister, Ernst Egli were invited to Turkey, given important posts in architecture schools, implemented significant projects, and defined the architectural language of the young republic. Prost was responsible for the planning of Istanbul, while Jansen won the urban planning competition of Ankara, Holzmeister designed the parliament of Ankara together with many other official buildings, and Taut was one of the directors of the School of Fine Arts. Even though this seems like a controversy, republican architects had the tendency for rejecting the hybrid architectural style of the 19th century and accepted modernist architecture as pure and young, very much in line with the ideology of the young Turkish Republic, willing to break its historical, political, artistic and architectural bonds with the Ottoman Empire. Additionally, most of the reaction was directed towards the non-Muslim -such as Greek, Armenian and Levantine- architects of the Ottoman Empire rather than the ones who were raised and educated in Europe.
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The research project Picturesque Modernities. A Transcultural Enquiry into the Formation of Regionalist Styles in Architecture between Europe and Asia (1900-1950) is embedded in the Cluster of Excellence ‘Asia and Europe in a Global Context. The Dynamics of Transculturality’ of Heidelberg University. It is aimed at overcoming the territorial determinants of nation-states and to evolve a multi-polar concept of space in global architectural history. By investigating the Euro-Asian colonial arena between 1900 and 1950, with a focus on French Indochina, British India and the Dutch East Indies, it recognises colonies not as mere containers for European-style imports, but as highly innovative laboratories for architectural neo-styles that themselves were constitutive for regionalist styles in European metropoles. As a special case, this paper focuses on two ephemeral exchange/test platforms – we call them contact zones – where both colonial and regionalist styles were negotiated in one locale: the Universal and Colonial Exhibitions of Paris 1931 and 1937.
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A short introduction: contact zones, auto-ethnographic expressions and architectural regionalisms

In her 1992 book Imperial Eyes, Marie Louise Pratt asked a) how ‘travel books by Europeans about non-European parts of the world went about creating the “domestic subject” of Euroimperialism’, how these ‘metropolitan modes of representation were received and appropriated on the periphery’, and b) how, vice versa, ‘auto-ethnographic texts of colonized subjects to represent themselves in the colonizer’s own terms […] engaged with metropolitan reading publics.’ Calling this mode of ‘transculturation’ to create ‘planetary consciousness’ a ‘phenomenon of the contact zone’, the latter was defined by Pratt as ‘a space of colonial encounters, […] of spatial and temporal copresence […], in which peoples geographically and historically separated come into contact with each other and establish ongoing relations, usually involving conditions of coercion, radical inequality, and intractable conflict.’ Transferring Pratt’s approach of calling both European travel writing on Non-Europe and Non-European self-representation in European terms a transcultural contact zone to our focus on a global historiography of architecture, we investigate how ‘transculturation’ worked in the temporary contact zones of Colonial/Universal Exhibitions, in our case those in Paris in 1931 and 1937. Here, the representation of the Non-European Other and the European Self was synchronously negotiated – we call it a theoretical contact zone – in conferences and their proceedings, and – within a physical/architectural contact zone – in side-by-side clusters of ephemeral pavilion structures. In this exhibitionary, time- and space-compressed copresence, a surprisingly similar mode was used to represent both colonial and metropolitan worlds alike: what Pratt had called the mode of ‘auto-ethnographic expression’, was here materialized in regionalist style formations in architecture. However, the prefix ‘auto’ in the term ‘auto-ethnographic expression’ refers here not to indigenous voices of the colonized itself, but to the colonizer who imposed his (European) regionalist solutions to ‘re-present’ (temporarily stage) localist expressions of the (Asian) colonized.
The Congrès International de l’Urbanisme aux Colonies et dans les Pays de Latitude Intertropicale of 1931: A theoretical contact zone on global regionalisms

The 1931 Exposition Coloniale Internationale in Paris was the largest and one of the last events of that type in the European history of international exhibitions, which had emerged in the second half of the 19th century Europe. As the architectural language of the different sections and their pavilions was concerned, the exhibition brought a) the old-fashioned polarity of the civilized, modern, progress-oriented and contemporary spheres of the metropole, and the seemingly eternal, pre-modern pastness of the represented Non-European colonies to an apogee. However, colonial and metropolitan spheres with their styles of representation overlapped with each other also discursively in the Colonial Congress of Urbanism in the Colonies and in Intertropical Countries. It took place on 10-15 October 1931 as a kind of theoretical contact zone within which urban planners, architects and politicians from French, British, Dutch and Belgian colonies from Africa to Asia shared their visions and experiences. The results were published in 1932 and 1935 in L’Urbanisme aux colonies et dans les pays tropicaux, edited by Jean Royer, architect, urbanist, administrative director of the École spéciale d’architecture et secrétaire général of the congress. Within the second volume of 1935, the first part was entitled ‘Les œuvres sociales et l’urbanisme colonial – Les questions d’esthétique aux colonies’, and represented a rather unique contact zone of aesthetical thought where regionalist architecture both from the colonies and their European motherlands was negotiated. For the French hemisphere, Ernest Hébrard reported on colonial building activities in Indochine, and Léandre Vaillat spoke about mainland France. In his contribution L’architecture locale et les questions d’esthétique en Indochine, Hébrard praised the results of the 1931 International Colonial Exhibition per se for its ‘picturesque and animated reproductions of all the particular buildings representing each people of our [colonial] possessions’, but criticised the architectural solutions:

After this great spectacle, one might be surprised at how long it took us to see the advantage, from an aesthetic as well as from a useful point of view, to study the local arts of the different regions under our domination. In North Africa, in Algeria and Tunisia, we were happy for a long time to simply import the models from France […] these pastiches have totally satisfied the authorities and most of the visitors remarked, with quite some pride, on the civilizing push from the metropole. In the Far East, in British India, and in French Indochina, it has been the norm to follow, for the latest construction projects, the styles and types in use in the metropole, with the consequence that we have built, in a tropical climate, discomforting and even uninhabitable buildings, and now we are shocked to find ourselves in a totally strange context.

What Hébrard called for was no less than a paradigm change from this one-directional transfer of building typologies from the metropole to the periphery, towards a greater appreciation of a regional-traditional language for the development of architectural styles in French overseas possessions: ‘now, it is the indigenous architecture which indicates to us the path to follow.’ Playing out the French-styled post office of Saigon and even the Governor’s palace in Hanoi against a new provincial church in Phat Dhiem built by ‘indigenous craftsmen’, he favoured greater ‘respect of the characteristics of the people, their skills and traditions’, detailed studies of historic monuments of Indochina, towards a ‘living architecture [architecture vivante]’. For this goal, – and therefore still colonial – ‘the indigenous [were to be] directed [my emphasis] on a path which conforms with their traditions, temperaments and aptitudes’. Concluding, he criticized the archaeological, 1:1-scaled replica of the Cambodian Angkor Wat temple from the 12th century AD within the 1931 Exhibition, and pre-defined a pavilion of Indochina ‘for the next colonial exhibition’, with a neo-traditional resp. neo-regionalist ‘Indochinese style’, which he had already tested in his own building projects in Hanoi.

His metropolitan counterpart, Léandre Vaillat, argued in an astonishingly similar way in a regionalist direction. In his contribution L’esthétique aux colonies in the same conference, he emphasized the value of rhythm and harmony of architecture, colour and identity of materials, suggested ‘to employ indigenous arts for the construction of buildings, and to utilize local craftsmen for modern architecture’, altogether to ‘facilitate an entente cordiale between the indigenous art and the
contemporary *arts décoratifs* of the motherland. Following Hébrard’s idea of an Indochinese style
pavilion for an upcoming colonial exhibition (it never took place), he favoured ‘travelling
exhibitions between the *Métropole* and France d’Outre-Mer’, so that ‘it will happen that the
colonies, being conservatories of Oriental life, will also be laboratories of Occidental life.’
Arguably as never before in French-colonial history, a stylistic entanglement of colonial and metropolitan
architecture in a regionalist mode had been proclaimed more prominently.

This rather reflexive, regionalist turn towards a
greater appreciation of local cultures, and the
artistic customs of the people in the colonies,
mirrored – aesthetically and architecturally – what
a French-colonial policy change from *assimilation* to
*association* which was being propagated at about
the same time from a cultural-political perspective.
As a matter of fact – and this is our main ground
for arguing for a *globally* entangled historiography
of architecture –, it had its striking analogy in
the metropolitan context of France itself, with
Léandre Vaillat at centre stage. To strengthen this
observation, it is useful to compare his statement
of colonial architecture during the 1931 Exhibition
with his early article *La Maison en Savoie*. It was
published in October 1912 in the French journal
*L’art et les artistes*, which was intended to foster
the French movement of architectural regionalism
with its broader appreciation of, and research into
France’s own cultural self-understanding. ‘Yes’, he stated, ‘regionalism was à la mode. […] But in
this masked ball of provincial costumes little is
understood. […] we must follow up in studying the
provincial facts with the rigorous method that Jean
Brunhes applied in his remarkable work *Géographie
humaine*. ‘What he meant with this in the early
1910s insinuated similar architectural parameters of
a vernacular built environment which Vaillat would
use, two decades later, for local craftsmanship in
French colonial contexts from Indochina to North
Africa: The perception of ‘provincial, rural houses
as images of their inhabitants, […] as they mirror
the physical milieu and the disposition of materials
of the region’, further the focus on ‘contrast,
harmonious colouring’, materials such as ‘stone
and wood’, and the localist ‘reaction to climate’
(compare Hébrard’s above-quoted statement).
Comparing a published illustration of the 1935
publication [Fig. 1b] with a photo from his 1912
article [Fig. 1a] exemplifies the striking similarities
in the *mise-en-valeur* of regionalist qualities of
architecture and its people, both in colonial and
metropolitan peripheries.

In France, *regionalism* emerged around 1900 as
a multi-layered movement to foster a) political,
economic, and administrative decentralization and
deconcentration, b) awareness of the country’s own
regions and vernacular culture, c) nationalist cultural
pride in concert with an anti-industrial movement,
and d) trends to advocate the protection of cultural
landscapes, architecture and regional costumes.
Its leading figure was the poet, writer, teacher

Fig. 1a (above):Photography from Vaillat’s 1912 article *La maison en Savoie*. In: Vaillat 1912, 39.
Fig. 1b (below): Unspecified photography in the 1935 publication with the added comment: “The city planner
as well as the architect must know the overall variations of indigenous craftsmanship [la table des matières de
l’artisanat indigène]. And the indigenous arts like these in Marocco or Cambodia should be used by the public
services.” In: Royer 1935, 24.
and political thinker Jean Charles-Brun, who had founded the Fédération régionaliste française in 1900, formulated its manifesto in 1901, and initiated the journal L’Action régionaliste. More a political than an aesthetic treatise, his oeuvre Le régionalisme appeared in 1911. A passage in its third chapter about Le plus grande regionalisme sounded like a ready-made agenda for what Vaillat formulated just a year later for his visions of regionalist architecture within France, and then in 1931 for the French-colonial context ‘far away’ from the métropole:

One is regionalist, even not using the term itself in a virtual way, if one loves his own piece of earth and his church spire [son coin de terre et son clocher] – this love is the sentimental foundation of regionalism – even if one is far away [my emphasis]. One is also regionalist, if one is interested in his past with its monuments and landscapes; and if one regrets the [lost] picturesqueness of our old provinces, their costumes, dialects, legends, and songs. Or better said: It is these regrets as they were formulated by poets and artists that have prepared the soil for the regionalist movement all over France.

In his book of 1911, Charles-Brun called – comparable to Vaillat in 1931 – for an exhibitionary space where artistic, stylistic, architectural and cultural concepts of regionalism could be represented and negotiated: his proposal of a centre régional to stage the different idioms of the region would indeed materialize in the 1937 Exhibition with him as a leading protagonist.

However, if the political, legal and aesthetic concept of built cultural heritage [patrimoine culturel] was gradually exported from the métropole of France to the colonial peripheries, the concept of staging regionalism itself was prefigured in French-colonial sections as ‘occidental laboratories’, as Vaillat had termed it in 1931) of Universal and Colonial Exhibitions, in order to represent indigenous arts and crafts of the French overseas possessions. Only in a second step – and in a kind of self-reflexive turn towards the colonizer’s own culture – did the colonial-regionalist mode of la plus grande France migrate back to the motherland, and materialize architecturally – as Charles-Brun had called it in 1911 in a rather political context – in the form of ‘la plus grande régionalisme’ within France proper.

The **Exposition internationale des arts et des techniques dans la vie moderne (Paris 1937): a physical contact zone of regionalism between the métropole and its colonies**

The concept of free-standing national pavilions emerged for the first time in France’s second Universal Exhibition of 1867. From this moment onwards, the medium of architecture was instrumentalized for the trend to create style- and scale-compressed essentialist stereotypes of whole cultures and nations, both European and Non-European. However, it was only at the Universal Exhibition of Paris in 1889 that France staged its first decidedly colonial section. Besides other pavilion structures from Morocco to Indochina, it was the Palais central des colonies to introduce a pan-colonial hybrid of different regionalist styles from all over the French-colonial hemisphere. The Exposition des arts décoratifs et industriels modernes of 1925 in Paris introduced a new, three-levelled stylistic differentiation of pavilions to visualize civilizational categories: besides the modern-avant-garde pavilions of advanced nations (like France, adding Le Corbusier’s Pavilion de l’esprit nouveau), and colonial France in the old-fashioned mode of replicated cultural heritage stereotypes, a village français was staged in a regionalist style and combined vernacular elements in a contemporary interpretation. It may have been this experience in his motherland which let the colonial architect Hébrard later formulate his above-quoted vision of an ‘entente cordiale’ between the indigenous art and the contemporary arts décoratifs’. In this sense, the above-mentioned International Colonial Exhibition of 1931 indeed failed to reconcile colonial and metropolitan building styles with each other.

Only six years later, the situation was totally different. A strong leftist political regime came to power, financial crises affected France, and anti-colonial resentments brought the cultural-political programme of regionalism centre stage with a metropolitan and colonial approach. Already in 1935 Edmond Labbé, the commissaire général of the upcoming Universal (International) Exhibition of 1937 (it was France’s last one), formulated this paradigm shift. Now he labelled the colonies not as mere receivers of metropolitan on-way trend exports, but as creative sites of new inspirations to re-assess the motherland’s own traditional and vernacular heritage canon:
An Exhibition is an immense architectural, artistic and technical laboratory […] I have confidence in the future of regionalism [and] its technical aspect of craftsmanship [artisanat]. Let us remember the success of the festivities during the 1931 Colonial Exhibition […] They constituted the visions of our Overseas Empire, with great attention paid to veracity in the reconstitution and the picturesque, which served alike as a unique spectacle, practical instruction and fruitful propaganda. Why could our French regions not offer a similar tableau of colour and living reality? [my emphasis] The Regional Centre will be the clou of the 1937 Exhibition. It will be picturesque, but also fecund in economical and social instruction. Since 1934, the famous regionalist architect and theorist Charles Letrosne had become the Chief Architect of the exhibition (but retired later for health reasons). In his earliest vision, the French colonies were not even considered, and a Centre régional for France’s own provinces was prominently placed next to the Eiffel Tower and discussed by Léandre Vaillat. Already in a personal preface to Letrosne’s 3-volume Murs et toits pour les pays de chez-nous (1923-26), with its large series of regionalist solutions for town halls to schools and rural habitations, Vaillat had voted for a replacement of ‘chimerical palaces’ and ‘picturesque falsifications’ with serious provincial building types following the true characteristics of the French regions. This had consequences for the Regional Centre when his 1935 critique in the public journal L’Illustration helped to turn the initial project of a ‘folklorist village into an architecturally authentic regionalist centre’ to become one coherent entity with different regionalities. Once materialized in reality, not only did the French-provincial and the French-colonial versions of architectural regionalisms (in plural) almost come to an overlap in one contact zone along the Seine river; the formal and stylistic approach in general, and the decorative solutions of the pavilions in particular became so similar, that in a few cases they became almost interchangeable. [Figs. 2a,b] As a consequence, the old avant-garde attitude for the French-metropolitan and the ‘primitive’ or ‘stuck in ancient archaeological heritage’-attribution for the supposedly backward French colonies was more or less dissolved.

Concluding comment: Global regionalism from Paris to Hanoi

All this brings us to the last observation of this paper and back to the protagonist of the search for a regionalist style in French Indochina: Ernest Hébrard. What he had called a style indochnois during the Colonial Congress in Paris in 1931, may
be best exemplified in his project for the Musée Louis-Finot in Hanoi in the late 1920s/early 1930s. Chronologically a colonial forerunner, it was structurally and stylistically astonishingly close to what his regionalist colleague Léandre Vaillat had later fostered in the Regional Centre in the 1937 Exhibition for the French-regional pavilion of La Champagne. In both cases, a clear roof structure, the entry section, the rhythm of the windows, etc. were counterbalanced with only a few decorative elements and patterns with a concrete regionalist connotation. Both projects demarcated comparably valid visions of architectural regionalisms which materialized almost simultaneously 10 000 km apart from each other, at both ends of the French imperial hemisphere. At this moment of the 1937 Exhibition in Paris, the divide of the metropolitan and the colonial, and the central and the peripheral, was dissolved towards a truly transcultural entanglement which represented multi-sited and multi-centred picturesque architectural modernities. The inquiry into these multiple modernities (in the plural) should, as the basic message of this paper, replace the old-fashioned, narrative, based on area studies and fixated on the nation-state, of one architectural modernity (in the singular) which was just transferred from Europe to its colonies.

Endnotes
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Introduction

Cetinje is closely linked with Petar II Petrović Njegoš (1813-1851) and his work. Time of Njegoš reign is the period of spiritual romanticism which will flare romantic nationalism and lead to the establishment of the new national states, influence formation of the middle class, also will reflect in the development of literature and arts, more precisely in the development of culture and art in Montenegro. It is the period when Montenegro opens towards the world, establishes fundaments of cultural-educational development, the period when the construction of the settlement begins - first houses in Cetinje - also the period of changes in the state administration. Radivoje Petrović, Petar II Petrović Njegoš, Vladika (Bishop) Rade, ruler and poet, was born on November 13th 1813 in the village Erakovići, on the southern edge of Njeguši field and in the northwestern slope of Lovćen. He continued with the work of his uncle, Petar I Petrović Njegoš – Saint Peter of Cetinje, in the fields of culture and education, giving them even stronger significance and treating them as powerful political and diplomatic weapon of a small, not yet internationally recognized European state.

Special inspiration brought by romanticism to Cetinje and its ruler is reflected by a characteristic presence of myth, branching in two equally important directions – one towards the myth of history, and the other towards the myth of sensitivity. The art of European romantics is closely tied to the development of civil society, where political engagement is present in its social component. Katun nahija (district) believed in myths of its religion and nation, lived with them and for them, so it was only natural to modify these myths into ideas, in the realistic program of Montenegro struggle against Turks. In such a way, the struggle against the enemy got an additional component, raised on the level of the cult in Montenegrins. Njegoš revives Montenegrin national renaissance and shows the equal interest for arts and for the European literature of that time. The illustration is his visit to Pompeii when a house was discovered in his honor, having his name even today „Casa del Principe di Montenegro“.
Lovćen and Njegoš

Mount Lovćen is identified with Jezerski vrh, although lower than Štirovnik, because Njegoš has chosen it himself as the place of his eternal rest, the place where he erected the Chapel dedicated to his uncle Petar I Petrović Njegoš. From that period on, Lovćen becomes the symbol of Montenegrin, also of the Serbian and Yugoslav struggle for freedom, independence and unity. Due to a set of various circumstances, his ashes would be transferred several times from Lovćen to the Cetinje Monastery, and that is the period when two controversial rearrangements of the edifice for Njegoš eternal rest were realized, unfortunately it still does not exist, due to the rival state-political ideologies and national identities. In 1845, situated on Jezerski vrh in the site Crkvine, Petar II Petrović Njegoš built the church and dedicated it to his uncle Saint Peter of Cetinje. This is the first sacral building dedicated to the new saint, after he was declared a saint by Njegoš in 1834. By his own wish, he expressed verbally before his death, Njegoš was supposed to be buried in this church. Because of the fear of Turks and their retaliation, the executors of his last will think that the moment was not convenient for the funeral in Lovćen. That is why he was temporarily buried in the Cetinje Monastery, on the third day after his death in 1851, in the crypt of Petar I Petrović Njegoš. The second funeral of his remains took place in September 1855, when his wish to be buried in Lovćen in the Chapel of St. Peter of Cetinje was fulfilled. In August 1855, remains of Njegoš were transported to Lovćen by the Prince Danilo (1826-1860) and Princess Darinka (1837-1892). During the reign of Nikola Petrović (1841-1921), ruled (1860 - 1918) Chapel in Lovćen was the symbol of independence, also the symbol of the Orthodox Christianity and long waited for the Serbian and South Slav struggle for their union.

During the First World War in 1916, Austro-Hungarian military government mostly demolished the church and ordered that the remains of Njegoš should be transferred to Cetinje, what was the third funeral of his ashes.

In September 1925 after the First World War the fourth funeral of Njegoš’ remains took place, when they were transferred from the Cetinje monastery to Lovćen and buried in the new Chapel, reconstructed according to the project of the architect Nicolai Krasnov, at the expense of the King Aleksandar Karadjordjević (1888-1934) and under the surveillance of the army. (Figure 1)

The initial wish of the King Aleksandar was not the reconstruction of the existent heavily damaged Chapel, hard to be restored, but the construction of a new structure in the same place, supposed to symbolize new ideology materialized in the South Slav unity in the newly established Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. With such intention king Aleksandar invited the sculptor Ivan Meštrović to do the job. Draft project for the Njegoš’s Mausoleum in Lovćen Ivan Meštrović designed in 1924, his drawings were exhibited in New York the same year. (Figure 2).

Meštrović suggestion was faced with disapproval and rejection of the Metropolitan of Montenegro and Coastlands Gavrilo Dožić (1881-1950), later patriarch of the Serbian Orthodox Church, also with the obstacle of inaccessible terrain and severe climate in Lovćen, increasing costs for the realization of his idea, what altogether caused abandoning of the project in 1924.

The remains of the initial church were demolished and the new renewed and reconstructed church was built in 1925, according to the project of Nicolai Krasnov – leading architect of the king Aleksandar, Russian, academic, employed in the Ministry of Constructions – at the expense of the king and in honor of his son’s Petar birth, future crown prince of Yugoslavia. The architect Nicolai Krasnov kept the initial place, base, shape and used more than half of the construction materials taken from the existing remains of the old Chapel.
During the Second World War in April 1942, Italian army bombarded the Chapel with cannon grenades, believing that it is the shelter of partisans. Damages are repaired fast.

After the War in the occasion of hundred years from Njegoš death the idea about the construction of the Mausoleum of Njegoš was born. Ivan Meštrović was engaged for that project in 1952, who was working on the project of Mausoleum of Petar II Petrović Njegoš in Lovćen back in 1924. The works are started in 1959 by perforation of tunnel and construction of the access stairs. Since then up to 1974 when the Mausoleum was completed and the Chapel removed from Jezerski vrh in Lovćen, lasted a fierce media campaign and the struggle between opponents of the Mausoleum erection, mostly intellectuals from the whole Ex-Yugoslavia and supporters of the then political regime, strictly standing for that decision till its final realization. Exactly half of the century after the Meštrović project designed on demand of the king Aleksandar in 1924 and more than ten years after Meštrović death, by far more expensive and monumental Mausoleum was realized, this time the patron was Josip Broz Tito (1892-1980). Nullifying reconstruction done by the architect of king Aleksandar, politicians have chosen the project of Ivan Meštrović and his associates, Harold Bilinić and Dušan Murgaški. Mausoleum does not reflect the time of bishop, ruler and poet Njegoš – it is the relict of the Yugoslav nation conception from the second decade of the 20th century. It is closer to the period of the King Aleksandar Karadjordjević reign and its ideology, than to the period of SFRJ, and to the rule of Josip Broz Tito and his associates, Marxist intellectuals and communists.

Conclusion

The Church dedicated to Saint Peter of Cetinje (New Chapel) is not in Jezerski vrh – Lovćen anymore. It is removed from that space to make the place for the construction of the Mausoleum of Njegoš, the act that denied the inseparability principle of the monument and the place of its creation. Remains of the Church, marked construction material stone by stone, together with floor panels, is left to lie outside in the open near the church in Ivanova Korita. The modern doctrine of protection does not approve dislocation of structures, more precisely it excludes it in cases of the monuments, memorials and memorial graveyards. In accordance with it, there exists an obligation that all the measures of protection and adequate presentation of the Church remains should be undertaken, with archives material and technical documentation in the form of detailed reports with following technical and photo documentation. Before archiving, such documentation must be presented in the exhibition space and published, aiming to popularize it and to enable transparency of work on the future renewal and construction of the demolished Church of St Peter of Cetinje in Jezerski vrh, what is in harmony with the modern environmental theory and practice, within the context of mutual dependence of nature, building heritage and modern life, and as a part of urban renewal strategy.
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POLITICAL USE OF ARCHAEOLOGY AND ARCHITECTURE IN THE IMPERIAL FORA IN ROME

In the centre of Rome (Italy) an archaeological area has survived urban developments, changing and modelling its shape over centuries. Here, from the Roman period until the present time, “architecture”, intended both as creation and destruction, has been employed to express social and political ideas, moving the connotation of the area from public to private several times. Construction of buildings to express emperors’ power during the Roman era, creation of a new district to provide better conditions of life in the sixteenth century, archaeological excavations to reinforce the idea of national identity in the nineteenth century, “disembowelling” to give the city a new light in the twentieth century: these are some of the uses of “architecture” in this area. The result today is an over-stratified area where ancient and modern, constructions and destructions weave together modelling the present shape of this space.

Recalling the different stages of the urbanistic evolution in the area, the proposed paper wants to investigate the use of the excavation process, reading it as a cultural expression of architecture, as a means that shaped spatial entities and socio-cultural ideas.
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Introduction

The present paper is part of a PhD research in Management and Development of Cultural Heritage that aims to investigate the perception of ancient Roman structures of the Imperial Fora in Rome after the classical period.

During the research, one of the main issues about this area today stood out: the present shape of this space, which is the result of much activity of construction and destruction carried out over centuries, from the Roman period until the last century, and driven by urbanistic reasons and political ideas.

It is immediately clear that the distinctive trait of this area is twofold: on the one side, the same space has been used to express different political meanings over centuries; on the other side, both the action of construction and destruction were used for this purpose.

The present paper aims to analyse how these activities, often consisting in the appropriation of the architecture of the past, have been used to convey particular messages over centuries. At the basis of this analysis will be the idea that the creation of an empty space and the destruction of architecture are part of the architectural process and lead to the creation of new meanings and values, exactly like construction activities.

Architecture as destruction and creation of empty spaces

The area of the Imperial Fora has been characterised, since the Roman era, by the use of architecture for the definition of a space in order to express power.

Architecture, considered as the combination of the alterations and changes in a landscape¹, also implies dealing with the relationship between constructions and the surrounding space as well as with empty spaces between constructions.

Discussions about empty spaces are common among dialogues concerning modern architecture. The mixture between empty and full is in fact an important element in modern architecture. Moreover, contemporary cities are the stratification of several decades of history and the result of creation and destruction processes; because of this, they are frequently characterised by voids².
In this paper, we are not going to discuss abandoned, obsolete and unproductive spaces, but instead the voluntary process of creation of an empty space, where ruins play the role of a lost past reminding us of what is absent.

We can define the contemporary urban space as ‘a theatre of destruction’, because what we see in a contemporary city today is ‘a mixture of unfinished spaces, hybrid and stratified buildings, works in progress, defined or undefined voids, building to be completed, […] archaeological areas, traces of previous buildings’.

This definition gives a clear panorama of what the area of the Imperial Fora is in contemporary Rome: the result of decades of different activities, where the human intervention occurred in this continuous stream of construction-destruction. It is, at the same time, an archaeological area to be preserved, and a portion of the contemporary city to be lived and used: in this area, ancient past, recent past and present time live together and intertwine with each other (Fig. 1).

The landscape of this site is extremely difficult to read today because these activities have caused huge changes in the perception of the space over centuries. It is almost impossible for a new visitor to the site to recognise the shape of the ancient Roman city or to understand to which period the ruins belong to.

Taking into account these reflections, we can consider architecture here as a sequence of destruction and construction (if we focus on the process) and as a sequence of empty and full spaces (if we focus on the result). To analyse architecture in the area of Imperial Fora, we should investigate both processes and results: the destruction of a district to create empty spaces around ancient monuments, for example, and the construction of new architectural elements to frame them.

Under the same idea of architecture, we can also consider the scientific excavation process, started by the Municipality and by Universities at the end of last century, to investigate the history of the site.

“Uses” of architecture in the area of the Imperial Fora in Rome

Archaeology is frequently entangled with the present, through its politicised engagement with the past and with the issue of identity. Social Archaeology, an approach to archaeology developed at the end of the last century, focuses its attention on archaeological narratives in the service of the state and study the use made of archaeology to foster, for example, ideas of identities, colonialism and power.

Through the case study of the Imperial Fora, we will discuss the application of some of these approaches to the same site, in different periods, with different aims and we will investigate the relationship between architecture and the expression of political-ideological ideas throughout the history of the monument.

Both under the Roman Empire and under the Fascist Regime, the political powers legitimized themselves by connecting their history to historical myths and legends. Architectural activities, resulting in a new landscape fixed in the memory of the society, were used in both cases as a means of propaganda, and were combined with the process of excavation, in the case of the fascist regime. The same use of archaeology also occurred at other points in the history of the site, between the Roman Empire and the fascist regime.

Construction of buildings to express emperors’ power during the Roman period

The construction of the five Imperial Fora had a huge impact on the landscape. The fora were big squares surrounded by colonnades hiding small hemicycles; there was usually a temple dedicated to a god close to the emperor in the focal point of the shortest side of the square, thus making the public space a sanctuary of the emperor.

Fig. 1: The area of the Imperial Fora in Rome: Roman level (in black) and modern level (in red). Source: Roberto Meneghini, I Fori Imperiali. Gli scavi del Comune di Roma (1991-2007) (Roma: Viviani, 2007), 4-5.
Before the construction of the imperial squares, this area, crossed by chariots since the end of the second millennium B.C., was characterised by a network of small streets between residential and commercial buildings. This district was born in the area in the eighth century and expanded until the first century B.C., when it was destroyed to make space for the first big monument in the area. Caesar’s Forum was built to extend the Roman Forum on the slopes of the Capitol Hill in 44 B.C., destroying the previous landscape made of domus, tabernae and commercial spaces. Caesar wanted this monumental space to represent himself and to show his power in contrast with Pompey, who had just built the biggest theatre in the city. In the Forum, the temple of Venus Genitrix, with the statue inside, recalled Venus, the protective goddess of Caesar’s family, while a statue of Caesar in the middle of the square and other statues in the whole area made the forum act as a museum: like in the Hellenistic monarchies, Caesar wanted to express his power through architecture and art objects.

Augustus built his forum between 42 and 2 B.C., to celebrate his victory over the two other triumviri and to create a new space for legal trials, as Suetonius says.

As Caesar before, he had to buy and destroy private houses in the area to make space for his new monument that was a centre for political administration and a museum. The forum in fact hosted sculptures about the mythic origin of Augustus in the hemicycles and a bronze statue of the emperor in the middle of the square. The temple dedicated to Mars was huge and impressive, with statues in the pediment telling stories about Augustus’s mythic ancestors. Inside the temple, statues of Mars, Venus and Caesar stressed Augustus’ lineage from Venus.

About 70 years later, Emperor Vespasian built another forum, dedicated in 71 A.D., (after the Jewish war and the pacification in the East) and completed in 75 A.D. There was not any temple in this forum, but the statue of Peace was hosted in one of the shortest sides of the forum, behind some columns protruding from the wall.

In the square there were 6 channels with water and plants surrounded by many artworks by Greek artists to show, here again, the emperor’s power through the exposition of the arts.

This square, in contrast to the others, was used for administration of the territory and as a place for thought and study. Emperor Domitian (81-96 A.D.), Vespasian’s son, started the construction of another square, completed by Emperor Nerva in 97 A.D. and used as a connection between the previous squares. The forum was built in the space left between Augustus’ and Vespasian’s squares. Since this space was quite narrow, the temple of Minerva (to whom Domitian was devout) was placed against the main hemicycle of Augustus’ Forum and no porticoes were built on the sides of the square, but colonnades protruding from the wall. Over the colonnade, there was an entablature with a long frieze showing scenes of the myth of Minerva and an attic with personifications of populations defeated by Romans.

Trajan’s forum, chronologically the last one, was realised in the northern area between 105 and 112 A.D. to celebrate the victories of the emperor in Dacia (102 and 106 A.D.) and to create a space for new pretorii. To build this forum, 35 m of the slope of the Quirinal was excavated, in height: the same height as the Trajan’s column.

Over the columns of the porticos, there were an entablature and an attic bearing statues of Dacian prisoners, together with circular shields with a portrait of a member of the imperial family, while the niches in the two hemicycles were decorated with gryphons, a symbol of power. In the middle of the square stood a statue of the Emperor. In the northern side, on the external façade of the Ulpian Basilica, statues of Dacian and panels with arms were placed. No temples have been found in this forum, but some researchers have recently proposed that a temple could have been located in the free space behind the column.

Beside the use of huge and massive architecture and the creation of spaces based on axiality, also the figurative system had an important role in expressing the power of the emperor and in conveying messages to the citizens.

Images on public monuments usually represented events and themes well known by the population. An example is the theme representing barbarians subdued by the emperor, which was presented in a complete program in Trajan’s Forum (in the column, in the statues on the top of colonnades and in
the reliefs of the northern portico)\textsuperscript{14}. In this case, showing the subjugation of enemies, the emperor guaranteed safety, fertility, peace and harmony to the state\textsuperscript{15}. In the other fora instead, other elements celebrated the magnificence of the emperor: the statue of the emperor, the representation of symbols of power and the atmosphere of a museum.

**Creation of a new district in the sixteenth century**\textsuperscript{16}

After the classical period, the monuments were partially destroyed, and churches, private houses and new communication roads were built, transforming the area from a public to a private space. In the sixteenth century, the area was reclaimed and new streets and buildings were realised: the so-called Quartiere Alessandrino was born and it existed until the beginning of the nineteenth century, when the first big transformation occurred.

**Demolitions and isolation of monuments to give a new look to the city of Rome**

During the Middle Ages, ancient monuments had lost their original meanings and their power as images. A re-evaluation of them occurred at the beginning of the nineteenth century when, under the Napoleonic Regime first, and under Roma Capitale and the Fascist Regime later, ancient monuments were taken into account in the process of creating new architecture for the area.

Under the Napoleonic Regime in Italy, between 1805 and 1814, ancient ruins of the Imperial Fora started to be considered as the symbol of “romanità”, and were linked to the history of the present. Napoleon said that “Rome has to be the second city of the empire. The historic centre needs to be developed because it has monuments that are the symbol of the ancient city”\textsuperscript{17}. Camille de Tournon, the Prefect in Rome, said that in the city “Squares are missing. Monuments are surrounded by buildings with no value any more […] Ruins in Rome need to be freed by the terrain around them and linked by comfortable streets with trees”\textsuperscript{18}. There was a strong interest in ancient monuments: they had to be isolated through the creation of a vacuum so that they could be exalted and admired.

Nevertheless, for economic reasons, only Trajan’s Column was isolated and a square following the shape of ancient Roman structures was realised around it\textsuperscript{19}.

**Roma Capitale: demolitions and isolations of monuments to reinforce the idea of national identity in the nineteenth century**\textsuperscript{20}

When Rome became the capital of the new state in 1870, the administration of the city wanted Rome to be a beautiful and modern city through the creation of new districts and streets connecting symbolic places. Using the regulatory plan as a tool, in a country as Europe dominated by ideas of nationalism, the myth of ancient Rome as a term of comparison came to the light.

Although, at this moment, no transformations occurred in the area for economic reasons, the idea of the isolation of monuments and of their connection through new streets was born in this period. Antiquities were therefore used as symbols with a political meaning (nationalism and national identity), to the detriment of the ruins themselves and of their topographic meaning.

**“Disembowellings” to give the city a new light in the twentieth century**\textsuperscript{21}

The complete isolation of monuments was realised only at the beginning of the twentieth century when, under the Fascist Regime, Via dell’Impero was inaugurated (October 28th 1932)\textsuperscript{22}. To realize the new street, the medieval and early modern districts were destroyed, and ancient ruins from the Roman period were brought to light again: it was the same process of destruction as the one that had led to the construction of the Imperial Fora in the Roman period (Fig. 2).

---

**Fig. 2:** Photographer unknown, Via dell’Impero and the latest demolitions. From the top of Trajan’s Column, 1933, Silver bromide gelatine, mm 174 x 230 (Roma, Museo di Roma, Archivio Fotografico Comunale, Fondo Demolizioni). Source: Rossella Leone et al. (eds.), *L’invenzione dei Fori Imperiali: demolizioni e scavi: 1924-1940*, Exh. Cat. Roma, Musei Capitolini 23 luglio – 23 Novembre 2008 (Roma: Palombi, 2008), 38.
Thanks to these works, as Mussolini said, Rome obtained an appropriate street for the big military processions organised by the Regime. Even if the original motivation behind the project was to solve traffic and circulation problems, after the creation of the street, monuments such as the Colosseum or the Basilica of Maxentius, which had been screened by other buildings for ages, could finally be admired from the street.23 Ancient monuments stand out along the street, while small gardens covered the ruins of medieval structures that had not been destroyed by the pickaxe of the Regime.

In this context, archaeology and “romanità” did not have any scientific value: the idea of “romanità” was considered by Mussolini as a tool to control and influence people, giving them a model for identification and Rome was just a myth which had to coincide with contemporaneity, avoiding everything in between the myth and the contemporary period.

Roman culture and the architecture carried out in the area in this period were therefore essentially elements for fascist ideology: they were used to support the new power that loved to represent itself as a revolutionary and popular one and to improve its image. The propaganda, based also on a parallel between Mussolini and Augustus aimed to justify the antidemocratic setting of Fascism.24 The idea behind demolitions was to tear away the city associated with the liberal monarchy after 1870 and to reveal ancient Rome, forcing Italians to forget about the history of the previous century.25 Under the Fascist Regime, we witness the isolation of monuments, as it happened in the previous period; together with isolation, we witness the destruction of what the government of Roma Capitale had created in the previous century, in order to reinforce the idea of fascist power in the citizens.

For these reasons, demolitions realised under the Fascist Regime made the city unrecognizable, with an effect of a real rupture in memory with the past.26

**Conclusions**

The idea of architecture as the formation of empty spaces and as the creation of an equilibrium between different elements of the city is a frequent topic in the contemporary discussions on architecture. We have seen how, in the area of the Imperial Fora, this idea of architecture was used in the Roman era to testify to political power and in the last century to support political power, to emphasize a specific moment of the past having a symbolic meaning and to connect the elements left from the excavations.

In a stratified city like Rome, it is impossible to talk about empty spaces, preserving the real equilibrium of all the components of the landscape. Since empty spaces are created privileging one époque and destructing the others, we are not able to consider them without damaging the rest. Nevertheless, in the contemporary city, the vacancies made by emperors to build the fora, by the French to isolate monuments and by the Fascists to create Via dei Fori Imperiali, tend to lose their political value, to acquire the status of elements of memory.27
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ON THE TRAIL OF BALTAZAR CASTRO, A PORTUGUESE RESTORER IN INDIA

In 1950 the architect Baltazar Castro arrived to the Portuguese Estado da Índia, commissioned to co-ordinate restorations to its monuments. Baltazar Castro was the former director of the Service of National Monuments from the DGEMN (the Portuguese state entity responsible for public works). The Portuguese dictatorial regime of that period used the ‘great national Past’ as a propagandistic instrument and, therefore, the architectural monuments, to be easily recognized and identified, had to recover their ‘original pure shape’ by reintegrating and removing from them ‘spurious additions’ obstructing or deforming their perception. This kind of patrimonial intervention began to be criticized, especially from the end of the 1940s onwards, coinciding with Baltazar Castro’s retirement from the DGEMN and his commission into the Estado da Índia. This article focuses on Baltazar Castro’s interventions in India, reflecting his previous practice in Portugal: in some works, an idealized image was intended to be recreated for the monuments, causing their adulteration by acquiring an image that they never had before. His action had a huge impact on the architectural heritage of Old Goa, some of it classified today as World Heritage by UNESCO.
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Introduction

Baltazar da Silva Castro (1891-1967) joined in 1929 the General Bureau for National Buildings and Monuments (DGEMN) in its division of the Directorate of Monuments – North, when this institution was created, assuming its interim management one year later. His meteoric ascension led him, in 1936, to be director of the Section of Monuments (Service of National Monuments from 1947 onwards) in Lisbon, in the DGEMN headquarters1.

Along with DGEMN’s general-director, Henrique Gomes da Silva (1890-1960), Baltazar Castro became the main person responsible for technical and theoretical orientations concerning the safeguarding of Portuguese architectural heritage. It was under Baltazar Castro’s leadership that the DGEMN had its golden age, namely the architectural heritage restorations in Portugal happened under the dictatorial regime of the Estado Novo (1933-1974).

Baltazar Castro and the patrimonial actions in Portugal

The Estado Novo2, a nationalist and conservative dictatorship lead by António de Oliveira Salazar (1889-1970), used to consider architecture as a fundamental symbolic element of the Portuguese identity, as well as identification landmarks controlling the territory. This made monuments important components for the Portuguese regime, not only because of their artistic and historic values, but also for being carriers of ideological messages from the Estado Novo.

The DGEMN assumed from the regime its ideological directives, concerning patrimonial actions3. Nevertheless, there were no disciplinary guidelines (criteria and action principles) created by the DGEMN for practices in classified monuments to be followed by its technicians. Only in some texts were a few acting precepts mentioned, but with a non-binding dimension. For instance, general-director Gomes da Silva advocated the recovery of the pristine shapes of monuments lost over time. Considering ruins and architectural distortions as visible effects from the decadent ages that affected...
Portugal before the establishment of the Estado Novo, the regime imposed a messianic imperative to recover the original shapes of monuments. Thus, the ancient national glories were also regenerated.

This lack of previously established official norms provided a varied set of results, from minimalist interventions to the most radical ones (only in specific cases), according to the existing circumstances. The projects for architectural monuments usually had a double character deductive (interpretation of remains) and inductive (typological analogies).

In general, the ranking order of the tasks performed were: structural consolidation, sometimes dismantling structures with reduced stability and reconstructing them using the same materials (occasionally reinforced with concrete); repairing wall plaster and painting it, but in some cases removing the plaster from monuments; demolition of structures considered as spurious, frequently from subsequent periods, as for instance gilded woodcarvings and tile panels in medieval monuments; repairing and replacement of roofs, floors, rain spouts and other elements; partial reconstruction of dilapidated structures, preferably by anastylosis and reusing materials; replenishment of architectural elements through shape and constructive analogy, using ancient techniques; and finally, the overall reconstruction. Only in a few cases were inventive reintegration principles used to finish monuments, originating shapes that never existed before, or to rearrange or improve architectural structures.

Miguel Tomé mentioned that the apparent methodological unity seen in the DGEMN’s activity resulted from similarities in the planned work programmes for the different monuments, centralization of decisions, tight institutional control, and longevity of the activity from DGEMN’s technicians. Despite the ideological directives coming from the regime, the DGEMN usually guided its actions by pragmatic criteria of efficiency and ease of execution.

Due to pursuing its activities in a collective way, avoiding individual authorship by its technicians, it is hard to find who did what in most of the DGEMN’s interventions in architectural heritage. In addition, documentation about projects became progressively more simplified and objective, with general ideas that would guide works. Jorge Rodrigues mentioned precisely the example of Baltazar Castro, whose empiric beliefs required his continuous presence at the worksites; while leading the works, he used to draw adjustments or new solutions for the projects directly on the ground of the sites, using the tip of his stick or his shoe. These practices and his omnipresence in many DGEMN patrimonial works make it very hard to discover at which monuments Baltazar Castro played a role and what he did there.

Arrival of Baltazar Castro to the Estado da Índia

Despite the apparent methodological unity observed in the DGEMN activity, there was an evolutionary path over the time. By the end of the Second World War the previous DGEMN monumental restorations – several of them characterized by extensive reintegrations, inventive options or with demolition of ‘spurious elements’ – became increasingly criticized. As operational mentor of the DGEMN, Baltazar Castro and his standards became more and more criticized.

This led to his progressive retirement from the DGEMN, and in 1948 he was moved to the Superior Council for Public Works, removing him from projects connected with architectural heritage. Finally, around 1949, he went to the Ministry of Colonies as chief inspector of public works of the Portuguese colonies; two years after this he was most probably assigned to collaborate with the public works in the Estado da Índia.

This Portuguese colony was living through a delicate time: the independence of India in 1947 and its claims over the Indian territories under Portuguese administration contributed to a substantial inversion in the colonial policy of the Estado Novo. The Portuguese overseas territories began to be regarded as overseas provinces instead of colonies; with that, the regime propagated Portugal as a pluricontinental nation, justifying the union between all territories under Portuguese administration.

Several actions were taken to support the Portuguese pretensions to the Estado da Índia. By promoting socio-cultural and historical studies of the territory, the propagandistic orientation of the Portuguese regime promulgated an ‘Indo-Portuguese’ culture as a paradigm of lusotropicalism, exhibiting a coherent fusion between Portuguese and Indian cultures.
the Estado Novo, this specificity, resulting from the ‘Lusitanian colonial originality’, allowed a Portuguese Estado da Índia completely distinct from India.

Commemorative celebrations were justifications to exalt the ideological imperialistic propaganda of ‘lusitanism’, also using the architectural heritage as a powerful ideological instrument of propaganda. Indo-Portuguese monuments were considered physical and visual landmarks, evidence of the ancestral Portuguese rule in India; showing this ‘lusitanized’ territory allowed the regime to declare that it was closer to Portugal than India. With the intention of treating its colonies as part of the ‘great Portugal’, there was an increase of public works in overseas territories.

Baltazar Castro arrived in the Estado da Índia in this context, probably commissioned to fill the vacuum caused by the dissolution of the Permanent Commission of Archaeology in 1950, and to coordinate the restorations of monuments in Old Goa, preparing them for the celebration of the Quadracentennial of Saint Francis Xavier’s Death (SFX celebration). Despite the enormous fame he had as an eminent restorer, Baltazar Castro was a private person. Just as happened in Portugal, where his ubiquity in DGEMN projects make it hard to reconstruct where and what actions he was involved in, his activity in the Estado da Índia is not easy to follow. Only through secondary sources has it been possible to trace his trail in the Estado da Índia.

Contextualization of Baltazar Castro’s preliminary activity in Goa

By 7 June 1950, D. José da Costa Nunes (1880-1976), Patriarch of the East Indies, gave an interview to the *Diário da Noite*, referring to his desire to repopulate Old Goa by restoring its ancient monastic buildings and installing religious institutions. This would complement the sanitary actions begun in the 1940s, and at the same time allow preparations for the SFX celebration in 1952. Old Goa would become, therefore, a religious city attracting new people and growing moderately.

In a telegram from 23 April 1951, the General Government of the Estado da Índia informed the Ministry of Colonies that, advised by Baltazar Castro, the budget allocated for the pilgrim accommodation would be used to restore convents to Old Goa, in order to adapt them to accommodate pilgrims. By 13 October 1951, another telegram from the General Government of the Estado da Índia asked when Baltazar Castro would arrive in Goa, and asked for instructions to complete the works already under way. An accompanying photo, showing the excavation at the bottom of the walls of the Bom Jesus Basilica in Old Goa, stated on the reverse side that the excavation was ordered by Baltazar Castro.

D. José da Costa Nunes gave another interview to the *Heraldo* in 1952, informing about the imminent arrival of Baltazar Castro, with a specialized team, to restore the religious monuments of Old Goa. Baltazar Castro was supposed to restore convents at Old Goa to accommodate pilgrims and high dignitaries. Consequently, it is possible to infer that Baltazar Castro was already working in Goa in 1951, returning again in 1952.

The *Diário da Noite* brought, in its edition from 26 June 1952, one of the rare interviews given by Baltazar Castro. Mentioning that he had already supervised several works on monuments in Old Goa before, Baltazar Castro referred to his return from Portugal with a team specialized in restoration. His goal was to consolidate and reconstitute monuments in Old Goa.

Baltazar Castro did not hide his aims: he intended to substitute every roof from the monuments, replacing wooden roof structures to give them back their original shapes, and replacing the roofing tiles to avoid floods from the monsoons. Giving the Saint Catherine Chapel as example, Baltazar Castro stated that its miserable condition of conservation demanded that almost everything should be demolished and then reconstructed according its original shape; the monument would be purged from most of the later additions.

Disappointed with the condition of the architectural heritage in the Estado da Índia, Baltazar Castro focused his initial efforts on the monuments involved in the SFX celebrations in Old Goa. But he also had plans for the future restoration of other monuments in the Estado da Índia. Finally, he made a plea for the absolutely essential creation of a public section exclusively dedicated to architectural monuments in the Estado da Índia.

Side by side with Baltazar Castro’s interview was an article from Redondo Junior, exhorting the efforts of Baltazar Castro in Old Goa and defending the reintegration of the ancient city in its architectural
purity. The author advocated the removal of lime plaster and whitewash in some monuments, restoring their (supposed) original image. The same purpose can be seen in another article by Carlos de Leiria, in the *O Heraldo* from 11 September 1952: the author urges Baltazar Castro to recover the original shape of Portuguese fortifications in the Estado da Índia, transforming them into places to attract tourists.

**Patrimonial interventions of Baltazar Castro in Old Goa**

It is possible to track and analyze the activity of Baltazar Castro (and his collaborators) on the Old Goa monuments through some sources mentioned above. The documented patrimonial interventions in the architectural heritage of Old Goa with Baltazar Castro’s direct engagement are the following, listed in order from the most simple and consensual (repairing and painting on all the selected monuments) to the most complex and polemical ones:

1) Archbishop’s Palace – repairing and painting, as well as sanitary infrastructures.

2) Saint Francis Xavier Chapel – execution of benefications and paintings.

3) Saint Cajetan Convent – sanitary facilities were built for the Archaeological Museum placed there; repairing and painting.

4) See Cathedral – the image of Saint Catherine of Alexandria on the altarpiece (main chapel) had under her feet the Sabayo (ruler of Goa at the time of the Portuguese conquest), but after Baltazar Castro’s intervention the Sabayo was replaced by a cloud; the two images of St. Peter and St. Paul, formerly placed in front of the altarpiece, were moved to new lateral niches introduced in the main chapel.

5) Saint Francis of Assisi Convent – the cross in the churchyard was consolidated and had its lime plaster removed, and the stone columns (which came from the ruins of Saint Dominic Convent) were partially removed.

6) House of Bulas – repairing and painting to convert it to a health center.

7) Saint Monica Convent – a military barrack had been installed here since the mid 1940s, and several works were undertaken here to adapt it; Baltazar Castro’s team dismantled and reconstructed the gateway of the external vestibule of the convent and the vault of the Our Lady of the Candles Chapel; the lime plaster from the walls of this chapel was removed, revealing an ancient pulpit; in addition, repairs and painting were carried out as well as sanitary infrastructures.

8) Saint John of God Convent – this former religious edifice was a partial ruin before Baltazar Castro’s intervention; the actions taken were the rebuilding of the stone gate using old stones, the repairing of roofs and other elements and some painting, in order to adapt it to use as a military barrack.

9) Saint Paul’s College – Baltazar Castro was never mentioned in documents regarding this location, but by comparing this restoration with others and by comparing photos from before and after his activity in Old Goa, it is possible to conclude that the ruins of the church façade underwent an intervention that substantially changed its image; the remaining ruin was consolidated and strengthened through two lateral structural reinforcements, leading to the suppression of side elements of the façade.

10) Bom Jesus Basilica – the first reference to Baltazar Castro’s activity in the Estado da Índia was the excavation at the bottom of the walls of the basilica, intending to recover the initial floor level; besides that, sanitary infrastructures were renovated, roofs were fixed, and repairs and painting were done inside the building; the tower, placed beside the main chapel, was consolidated and its roof was removed and substituted by a rooftop; a new cross was built on the back of the basilica; the major change in the religious complex was the removal of the lime plaster from the exterior façades of the basilica, leaving the stone (laterite) exposed to weathering effects and, at the same time, drastically changing its image.

11) Saint Catherine Chapel – in partial ruins previous to the restoration, a radical change was made to its image: excavations around the chapel tried to recover the original road, and wooden roof structures and the choir were replaced; the main façade was substantially modified by removing the lime plaster from several elements (pilasters, plinth and cornice), and the first story frieze was eliminated; the former chaplain house attached behind the chapel was demolished; finally, the main chapel vault and the south wall were dismantled.
and rebuilt using the same stones, but with some modifications, such as the lack of plaster covering the walls, the opening of a narrow window in the main chapel, and the introduction of two new crosses on the roof\textsuperscript{31}.

12) Arch of Viceroy – intending to reintegrate the monument to its supposed initial shape, a very different image was given to the arch; besides the excavations around it to find the original path, the upper niche with the statue of Saint Catherine of Alexandria was eliminated (with only the lower niche with the statue of Vasco da Gama remaining), and all the lime plaster was removed; the walls flanking the arch were suppressed and replaced by two lateral structural reinforcements, and the two existing buttresses in its back were removed (as can be seen in Figures 1 and 2)\textsuperscript{32}.

There is no doubt about the impact of Baltazar Castro’s patrimonial activity on architectural monuments of Old Goa, and it was initially broadly accepted. Nevertheless, the local elites demanded more comprehensive interventions concerning the heritage of Old Goa, such as improvement of the road system, public illumination, afforestation and beautification of streets, revivification of the city by installing religious institutions, implementation of archaeological excavations and investment in tourism\textsuperscript{33}.

Baltazar Castro effectively tried to comply with these demands: an article from \textit{O Heraldo}\textsuperscript{34} mentioned that he wanted to define a protection zone for Old Goa\textsuperscript{35}. It is possible that the plan presented in 1959, in the context of the ambitious project for the ‘Reintegration of the City of Old Goa in its Historic, Archaeological and Religious Ambient’, had been inspired by Baltazar Castro’s ideas; after all, Naguesha Pissurlencar, one of the closest collaborators of Baltazar Castro in Goa, was the architect responsible for the elaboration of that plan.
Concluding note

By 2 August 1953, the recently restored Arch of Viceroy fell down during the tempestuous rains of the monsoon. It was a hard blow for the Portuguese propagandistic expectations in the Estado da Índia, especially due to the symbolism of this commemorative monument. Despite the prompt intervention of the Portuguese authorities, limiting access to the monument and rapidly rebuilding it, the damage caused casualties, one of which was Baltazar Castro.

The objections against the criteria adopted by Baltazar Castro in the restorations of Goan monuments increased among Goan society, even penetrating slightly in the censored press. Regarding the plaster removal from the Arch of Viceroy, it was possible to read a veiled criticism of the option of favouring the aesthetic perspective rather than the historic one: lime plaster was always used to protect laterite stone from monsoon rains. Without the protection of plaster, the rainwater infiltrated the stone and caused the collapse of the monument. The same care was valid for the Bom Jesus Basilica and the Saint Catherine Chapel, which had parts of their plaster removed.

Because of these criticisms, Baltazar Castro did not return to Goa again. Works were executed under direction of his collaborators in Goa, and until 1957 he continued giving advice to patrimonial works in Old Goa, but at a distance from his location in Lisbon. An official notification from that year, sent by the General Government of the Estado da Índia, insistently asked him for advice concerning the plastering of the Bom Jesus Basilica, subtly suggesting restoring lime plaster to walls to protect them from monsoon rainwater.

His interventions in Goan monuments reflected his previous practice in the DGEMN, namely the intention to recreate an idealized image for some monuments, causing their adulteration since they acquired an image they never had before. And as had happened before, after an intense and fruitful activity in Old Goa, frequently repeating what was no longer allowed in Portugal, Baltazar Castro was again criticised – this time by the Estado da Índia, forcing his final retirement.
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10 The Permanent Commission of Archaeology was created in Goa in 1895, intending to survey, research and classify monuments in the Estado da Índia, as well to propose measures to conserve, repair and restore them. Nevertheless, not until 1932 were some buildings of Old Goa classified as national monuments.

11 This celebration had special symbolism for the Portuguese dictatorial regime’s propaganda: Saint Francis Xavier was venerated by millions of Catholics in the East, and with this commemoration not only was a hero connected with Portugal celebrated, but also Catholicism...
itself was solemnized, contributing to the propagandistic agenda of the Portuguese regime by showing a Catholic Estado da Índia, different from the Union of India.

12 These sources include news in the local press consulted in the Goa State Central Library in Panjim, namely the most disseminated newspapers like *Heraldo, O Heraldo,* and *Diário da Noite*; some appointments in a report from Naguesha Pissurlencar (from the Luís Benavente fund, in the National Archives of Torre do Tombo in Lisbon), related with the *Comissão A Velha Goa;* a few work files found in the Overseas Historical Archive – Institute of Tropical Scientific Research in Lisbon; a couple of notes in the book *Resumo Histórico da Exposição das Sagradas Relíquias de S. Francisco Xavier em 1952,* from Francisco Xavier da Costa; the comparison between photos taken before and after the stay of Baltazar Castro in the Estado da Índia, namely the ones taken in 1951 during the Study Mission on Monuments of Goa, Damão and Diu (consulted in the Mário and Alice Tavares Chicó fund, in the Mário Soares Foundation), and the ones taken by the photo reporter Emile Marini in 1957 (existing in the Overseas Historical Archive in Lisbon); and, finally, some information acquired in direct interviews made with people who interacted with Baltazar Castro in Goa, especially Mr Percival Noronha and Mr Rafael Viegas.


14 Official notification (typewritten) from the Overseas Historical Archive, Fund of the former Minister of Overseas, collection ‘Estado da Índia’, file no. 63192.

15 Official notification (typewritten) from the Overseas Historical Archive, fund of the former Minister of Overseas, collection ‘Estado da Índia’, file no. 63202.


18 Bom Jesus Basílica, Saint Francis of Assisi Convent, Saint Monica Convent, Saint Cajetan Convent, Saint Francis Xavier Chapel, the most damaged Saint John of God Convent and Saint Catherine Chapel, and the ruins of Saint Paul College and Our Lady of Mount Carmel Monastery.

19 Baltazar Castro mentioned the churches of Carambolim, of Saint Anne Church in Talaulim, and of Reis Magos Church, the Pilar Convent, the fortifications of Reis Magos, Aguada, Mormugão and Chaporã (all in Goa), the fortifications of Big Daman and of Saint Jerome (both in Daman), and the fortifications of Saint Thomas, of the Sea and the defensive city wall (in Diu).


25 Francisco Xavier da Costa also mentioned that inside the convent complex, the damaged wooden floor and ceiling were replaced, some pavements were cemented, walls were rebuilt in some cells, modern sanitary facilities were built, and the convent was partially painted. Strangely, Costa stated that the convent’s vaulted undergrounds and their arches were
restored, but so far these undergrounds are unknown in the convent; perhaps he was referring a vaulted chapel existing under the novitiate, which Ricardo Michael Telles mentioned as having been built to sustain partially the novitiate, due to the irregular ground existing there. Cf. Francisco Xavier da Costa, *Resumo Histórico da Exposição das Sagradas Relíquias de S. Francisco Xavier em 1952* (Bastorá: Tipografia Rangel, 1954), 17-8; Ricardo Michael Telles, *Igrejas, Capelas, Conventos e Palácios na Velha Cidade de Goa* (Nova Goa: Imprensa Gonçalves, 1931), 31.


27 For instance, some walls were painted, some pavements and walls were demolished, and some works of art were removed.


35 This intention was corroborated personally by Mr Percival Noronha, a young public employee who interacted a couple times with Baltazar Castro.

36 It is important to remark a text published in 1952 and an article from 1953 published in the *O Heraldo*, both after the initial intervention in the Arch of Viceroy by Baltazar de Castro, mentioning the excavations made around it, as well as the two storey with niches that were still there; another article from 1953, published in the *Heraldo* after the collapse of the arch, mentioned that three statues were found in the middle of its rubble (the ones existing previous to the radical change in the shape of the arch).

37 Mr Rafael Viegas, a young public servant in the public works (who was employed after the departure of Baltazar Castro), mentioned personally that Baltazar Castro applied a chemical product to the stone after removing the plaster, in order to protect the laterite.


39 In the following year Luís Benavente (1902-1993), another architect and restorer coming from the DGEMN, was commissioned to work in heritage preservation for the Ministry of Overseas, implying that Baltazar Castro was no longer working there.

40 Facing Baltazar Castro’s delay in replying to the request, his immediate superior Eugénio Sanches da Gama demanded his advice, telling him at the same time that he did not agree with the replacement of the plaster, for aesthetic reasons. Official notification (typewritten) from the Overseas Historical Archive, fund of the former Minister of Overseas, collection ‘Estado da Índia’, file no. 63202.
EDIRNE’S GREAT SYNAGOGUE REVISITED: ARCHITECTURAL RESTORATION AND THE POLITICS OF MEMORY

The abandoned and ruined Great Synagogue of Edirne—a former Ottoman capital in Turkey—was renovated and re-inaugurated in 2015. The restoration was led by governmental bodies to monumentalize Edirne’s Jewish past, and to enhance memory tourism in the city. It was widely considered a compensation for the anti-Semitic incidents in the history of Edirne, and the synagogue. However, during the restoration, a declaration by Edirne’s governor, that was widely seen anti-Semitic, cast doubt on this consideration. The declaration carried the synagogue to the center of polyphonic debates, questioning the exclusive mentalities surrounding Turkey’s ethnic groups. The synagogue’s opening ceremony was a powerful political performance, and it was loaded with symbolic meanings related to multiculturalism. Our study gives a historical reflection of the bulding starting from its construction in 1906 as the representation of a modernized Jewish identity, and its becoming a target to anti-Semitism following the 1930s. Then, it critically investigates discourses surrounding the restoration and its opening ceremony in 2015. Overall it discusses the relationship between memory, power and cultural difference; and how architecture might be a stage for their representation or rearticulation.
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Introduction

“Memories are always recollected and articulated in the context of asymmetries of power, made tangible by struggles against, within and between various agencies and governmental bodies that seek to regulate meaning.” (Greig Chrysler)

“There is no ideal ensemble of the past buried underneath the contemporary city, only infinite fragments. The ideal city exists only in architectural models and in the new total restorations.” (Svetlana Boym)

This study deals with the politics of memory in Turkey, focusing on a synagogue restoration. In the 1990s, Turkish cities started to showcase their multicultural pasts. Multiculturalism, previously a taboo, became a value, and a focus of selective restoration. In Freudian terms, this was the return of a suppressed meaning in the cityscape. But such a return is never direct and unproblematic. As echoed in numerous recent studies, history and memory are never fixed and objective, but they are “constructed from specific, socially situated positions in the present, and are by extension embedded in, and productive of power relationships.” Selective restoration—a sort of history writing in the city—is thus deeply intertwined with power. Making “the final selection of” how the past is officially remembered in the city, it turns the city’s past into a political playground, and opens it to negotiation.

In 2004, a collaboration of governmental and private forces were set to work on the restoration of the ruined Great Synagogue of Edirne; a former Ottoman capital at the Greek border. The collaborative enterprise was a rare case in Turkey, where governmental bodies led and financially supported a synagogue renovation. A major motive was to enhance international and national tourism in Edirne by highlighting its previous multiculturalism. Nevertheless, the intervention was widely considered as a significant step towards respecting the memory of ethnic groups in Turkey—as Edirne was heavily marked by anti-Semitic incidents between the 1930s and 1980s, in particular in 1934.
The building was restored to become an occasionally used synagogue – as there was no Jewish community left in Edirne -, and a museum and exhibition space. Although the restoration project was already in the public eye, it became a hot topic of discussion in 2014, with a declaration by Edirne’s governor Dursun Ali Şahin, just before the synagogue’s expected inauguration. Enraged against Israel’s inconsiderate attitude towards the Al-Aqsa Mosque in Jerusalem during the 2014 war, the governor precluded the use of Edirne’s renovated synagogue for religious services. While Israel was using Al-Aqsa Mosque for military exercise, he implied, it was nonsensical for the state in Turkey to take part in synagogue restorations. Such a comparison was met with a multiplicity of opposing voices, and aroused numerous questions about the way Turkish Jews were perceived by the society and the state in Turkey. The synagogue’s opening in 2015 was crowded with Jewish community members, foreign and local politicians, journalists and other citizens. It was loaded with numerous meanings on the official and personal levels. As a political performance it staged tolerance and multiculturalism. And on the other side of the coin was a multiplicity of Edirne’s old residents who crowded the opening in order to compare the restored building with the place in the memories of their youth, and to situate themselves on this spot where their ancestors had been.

What did the restoration narrate about Edirne’s Jewish past; and what did it mean for whom? What was the relationship between official and personal representations attached to it? How did the restoration relate to the sorrows of the past? Was it really a compensation for the exclusive mentality that had long since surrounded the Jewish life of Turkey? Did it really mark a shift in the way Turkish Jews were perceived in Turkey? In the light of such questions, our study presents a critical history of Edirne’s Great Synagogue. It first addresses several moments in the history of the building, which was constructed in the early 20th century as a manifestation of a modernized Jewish identity, and later became subject to anti-Semitic attitudes and attacks. Then it gives a reading of the rhetorics surrounding the restoration in the 2000s. It shows how a single building became a scene of profound political statements and debates; and a stage for the construction and negotiation of identity and memory. Our study concludes with brief remarks about the mentalities involved in the restoration; and addresses broader questions on the relationship between architecture and the representation of memory, power and cultural difference. The historical versions of the orthodox accounts of Turkish history on ethnicity are only now taking place, and it has to be said that this is a process of revision. While the present study contributes to this revision, its findings occur within a debate that is rapidly developing at the present, and in which all conclusions appear provisional.

Fig. 1: Edirne Synagogue in the 1980’s and later, before and after its roof collapsed. 
Source: 1.1: Photograph by Laurence Salzman, 1.2: Photograph from ‘restorasyonforum.com’.
The Great Synagogue of Edirne

Edirne’s Great Synagogue was built in 1906. The construction of this unprecedentedly large and expressive synagogue was permitted by Sultan Abdülhamid II, when 13 synagogues of Edirne were devastated in a conflagration. The fire known as ‘Harik Kebir’ destroyed a major part of the Kaleiçi area, the historic urban center of Edirne surrounded by city walls, which was occupied mostly by non-Muslims. The disaster turned Edirne into a focus for modern urbanism. Edirne’s government replaced the partly burnt historic urban texture with an ordered grid plan; converting the historic center to the modern center of the city. Edirne’s Great Synagogue was designed to be part of this modern urban texture, and reconstructed the identity of the Jewish community: it was a representation of a more ‘modern’ and ‘westernized’ group of Jews. The building was designed by a French architect called France Dépré, taking two synagogues in Vienna as models. It followed a simple classicist style, which was associated with ‘modernization’ at the time. It was unique with its scale and ‘visible’ facades – as for a short while during and after the Ottoman reform period, Jews gained the right to openly represent their identities in Ottoman public space.

The synagogue was inaugurated in 1907, with the name Kal Kados ha Gadol (Great Sacred Synagogue). It was large enough to accommodate 1200 people, and was actively used not only in the Ottoman period but also after the transition to the new republic in 1923. However, during the second quarter of the 20th century, most Jews left Edirne due to anti-Semitism around the region. The Thrace Pogrom of 1934 was one violent manifestation of this anti-Semitism, initiating the massive emigration of Thracian Jews. Half of Edirne’s Jewish population abandoned the city after this event. Leaving the built environment that was the product and basis of their culture, they spread across the world, mainly in Istanbul and Israel. Many considered themselves as exiles, cherishing their homeland in memories and stories. The Thrace Pogrom of 1934 was not the only anti-Semitic incident in Edirne’s history. In 1988, it was Edirne’s decaying Great Synagogue that was the target of collective anger, although there were almost no Jews left in Edirne. Due to some news about the cruelty of Israeli soldiers towards a Palestinian civilian, the synagogue was plundered by a group of Edirne locals. Its causes and frameworks were transformed, but anti-Semitism was still prevalent in Edirne up to the 1990s.

The synagogue was barely used by a few remaining community members until the early 1980s when it was totally abandoned. The unmaintained building swiftly decayed. In 1995, it was assigned to the Directorate General of Foundations, similar to a large number of ethnic community properties around Turkey. Although the decaying synagogue’s restoration was discussed a few times in the 1990s, economic limitations prevented its realization. The synagogue gradually became a ruin; plants covered its remaining components. As of the 2000s, only one facade of the synagogue remained standing. Edirne’s Jewish past was also wiped off from the city’s collective memory. As shown in recent investigations of Zeynep Kaşlı, a Turkish researcher; despite the significance of the Thrace Pogrom in Edirne’s history, almost no one in Edirne remembered it to be mentioned; not even the oldest people.

In 2004 the government officially decided to renovate Edirne’s Great Synagogue, and the synagogue once again became a stage for identity construction – this time under the aegis of tourism. In 2006, an article in the Milli Gazete (the National Newspaper), entitled: “First a Church, and Now a Synagogue?” explained the purpose of the project with a 3-4 billion TRY budget as “opening it (the synagogue) up for faith tourism”. Narratives surrounding the restoration spoke of Edirne’s multiculturalism and praised the government’s interest and good will; as the restoration was not initiated by the Jewish community or others, but by governmental bodies. Şalom Newspaper emphasized the prospective contribution of the project to Edirne’s image: “Once the restoration is completed in 2012, Edirne will represent a city of tolerance, embracing three religions.” The restoration was an identity reformulation for the Jewish community, for Edirne and the state.

Several members of the Jewish community collaborated in the restoration process, which was directed by governmental bodies. While the prospective function of the synagogue was being discussed, the Jewish community asked for permission to hold occasional prayers and weddings in the restored synagogue. Their application was well accepted: the building was going to be a museum, but would also be open for occasional religious ceremonies.
Restoration as a Scene of Political Debate

The restoration was almost completed in November 2014, when a declaration by Edirne’s governor Dursun Ali Şahin carried the synagogue to the center of a fiery debate. The governor declared that the restored synagogue ought to be used only as a museum, and not for prayer; as a response to Israel’s hostile attitudes against Al-Aqsa Mosque. He said:

“...those bandit-like people bring winds of war into Al-Aqsa Mosque, use it for military exercises and murder Muslims there, and here we are repairing their synagogues. I am saying this with great animosity... This synagogue whose repair is almost done will be registered only as a museum...”

The declaration was met with a multiplicity of criticisms. Many writers and citizens criticized the governor’s words for equaling or associating the Turkish Jewish community with the Israeli government; and for underestimating their role in the restoration, as well as their right to the building.

Adnan Ertem, the manager of the Directorate General of Foundations also reproved the governor’s words, and argued that the right to decide on the synagogue’s new function belonged to the foundation. He claimed that the building was undoubtedly going to serve religious services. He said, just like the Süleymaniye and Sultanahmet Mosques, it was going to be used for prayer, as well as being a museum – and being open for anyone who wishes to witness this “largest synagogue of Europe”. Several people went so far as to invite the governor to quit his duty in order to protect his reputation. The great rabbinate of Turkey declared the community’s sorrow and expectations:

“Anti-Jewish discourses and practices have come to a peak in the last months. We hope they are urgently fought down, with the sensibility and effort of the society, the justice and the government. We trust our state...”

The governorate, in return, made a written statement, and confirmed that the decision about the synagogue’s function was up to the Directorate General of Foundations. The statement argued that the governor only intended to “draw attention to the dreary events in Al-Aqsa Mosque”. Yet the governor’s statement was not the only response to the Al-Aqsa occasions, which targeted the Jewish community of Turkey. In order to protest Israel’s actions, a group of people from Alperen Ocakları (a far-right Islamist group) walked to Neve-Şalom Synagogue in Istanbul, instead of Istanbul’s Israel Embassy. Such occasions unveiled that the exclusive mentalities which generated the Thrace Pogroms in the early 20th century were still alive in Turkey.

Fig. 2: Edirne Synagogue during its re-opening in 2015.
Source: 2.1: Photograph from ‘edirnetv.com’, 2.2: Photograph by Roysi Ojalvo.
The Opening: “Rebuilding Tolerance?”

The restoration was completed by 2015. The collapsed roof of the synagogue was removed, the remaining facade and foundations were strengthened, other parts of the synagogue were rebuilt. All floors and walls were neatly plastered and painted. The building looked brand new. There was no remaining trace of decay. If the ruin ambiguously represented hostility, violence, abandonment and other issues; the restoration cleared the dusty past, and restored a shiny image. The restoration and its opening ceremony in March 2015 made the synagogue an officially recognized showcase of Edirne’s multicultural past, and ‘made peace’ with it. It replaced the ambiguous ruin with a narrative based on friendship and tolerance.

The opening was surrounded by numerous narratives and symbolic meanings. Heads of Jewish communities from all around the world, Turkish politicians and state representatives, religious functionaries, journalists, and Turkey’s Jewish community, natives of Edirne and others crowded the event. Edirne’s municipality placed a banner on the way to the synagogue, which said “our old friends, welcome to your home.” Edirne’s governor was also present at the ceremony; although he did not make a speech. The ceremony consisted of speeches of government representatives emphasized the solidarity between Jews and Turks, the importance of non-Muslim heritage, and the symbolic importance of the opening. Underlining the long history of anti-Jewish attitudes in Turkey, the head of Turkey’s Jewish community, İshak İbrahimzadeh spoke of “rebuilding tolerance.” For a multiplicity of writers, the opening marked a milestone toward increased tolerance for Turkey’s Jews. Jewish writers expressed their gratefulness, joy and excitement; and wished the continuity of this ‘air’ of acceptance. Riva Hayim, a Şalom Newspaper writer said: “Edirne’s public is embracing us with our identity, just as it was before.” For Karel Valansi, another Şalom writer, the opening had turned Edirne “back to its multicultural, polyphonic days, even if for a short while...” The speeches and newspaper articles on the opening referred also to Sultan Abdülhamit, who had permitted the construction of this synagogue in the beginning of the 20th century. In his speech, the head of the Directorate General of Foundations claimed that the synagogue was “a legacy of Sultan Abdülhamid”.

Besides all those narratives depending on the symbolic meanings surrounding the synagogue; there were narratives of old locals of Edirne who crowded the event, placing the synagogue in their personal memories and family histories. They eagerly talked about the bygone neighbourhood life and customs of Edirne; how they emigrated from the city, and how connected they remained to it. Expressing how “their hearts always remained in Edirne”, they were thankful that they were now invited in this city as honored guests, and grateful to reunite with the regenerated synagogue. Hayim Kan, the last person who had a Bar-Mitzvah in the synagogue wrote to his late brother: “Dear Marsel, you wouldn’t believe where I am now. I am at the same spot where my parents got married 53 years ago, where you did your Bar-Mitzvah speech 39 years ago, together with a thousand precious friends”.

Ida Romano from Israel yearningly talked about her childhood in Edirne; she explained how they used to prepare their houses before each Passover, how they went to the synagogue to celebrate holidays, and how they baked the traditional walnut pastries (borekitas). She said, “Sometimes a taste, a smell reminds everything. So, whenever I want to remember my life in Edirne, I bake walnut pastries to my friends.”

Listening to their narratives, one could realize a gap between official representations of the past, and the multiplicity of ways it was remembered or cherished on the personal level.

A Review

After many centuries when Jewish architecture in the Ottoman Empire was silent and introverted, Edirne Synagogue had openly placed itself in Edirne’s public space when it was first constructed in 1906. It had showcased a transformed, modernized Jewish identity. In the 2000s, after decades of hostility and exclusion, it was again a showcase, this time of Edirne’s Jewish past. The decayed building’s Jewish identity was returned. In both cases, it was the central authority who ‘permitted’
the representation of Jewish identity in Edirne’s public realm – as a favor, and who determined the limits and methods of this representation. This power relation was taken for granted in most discourses surrounding the synagogue’s restoration. Vexed discourses – such as the governor’s, and contented discourses – such as the ones praising the increased tolerance of the authority – shared a common mentality: All of them (still) conceived the Jewish community in Turkey as a group of “thankful guests” whose existence depended on the sympathy of the state. They were here because the authority allowed them to be, and they were represented as long as the authority allowed them to be. Thus, if we consider multiculturalism not only as “revaluing disrespected identities”, but also as “changing dominant patterns of representation and communication that marginalize certain groups”, the case of Edirne’s Great Synagogue was just the beginning of a long path.

Endnotes
1 This paper is a part of Roysi Ojalvo’s ongoing Ph.D. research, pursued at Istanbul Technical University, under the supervision of İpek Akpinar. With special thanks to Semra Aydınlı and Bülent Tanju for their critical comments during our preliminary discussions on the topic; and to the discussants at the ARENA Architecture Research Moments 2015 meeting at KU Leuven, whose comments made a great contribution to this paper. With special thanks to Hilde Heynen, the Architecture Faculty of Université catholique de Louvain, Susan Klaiber, Minna Rozen, Laurence and Han Salzmann, Rubi Asa, Hayim Beraha, and the staff of Şalom Newspaper for their valuable contributions and support.
4 With reference to Sigmund Freud’s “return of the repressed”.
8 The late 19th – early 20th centuries were marked by intensifying relationships between European and Ottoman Jews; swiftly transforming the languages and habits of everyday life of Jews in Ottoman lands. The urge of European Jews to educate their eastern coreligionists resulted in the establishment of institutions for ‘Europeanization’ in Ottoman cities, such as Alliance Israélite schools. One of the first Alliance Israélite schools was established in Edirne in 1867, and was active until 1937. The Great Synagogue was a manifestation of such a transforming community. (See: Naim Güleryüz, Tarihte Yolculuk: Edirne Yahudileri (Travelling in History: Jews of Edirne) (İstanbul: Gözlem Yayınları, 2014); Erol Haker, Edirne, Its Jewish Community, and Alliance Schools, 1867-1937 (İstanbul: The Isis Press, 2006).)
10 And not Moorish style, as many of its European contemporaries.

11 This style was commonly used in the period’s educational buildings in Edirne – an aspect of Abdulhamid’s education reforms. (Büke Uras, 2015)

12 Modernization reforms took place in the Ottoman Empire in the 19th century.

13 During numerous earlier centuries, Jewish architecture in the Ottoman Empire was intraverted. In most cases, high walls surrounded the synagogues, rendering them almost invisible from urban space. Their facades were mostly silent.

14 Also known as ‘Trakya incidents’. Motivated by anti-Semitism, Jewish settlements all around Turkish Thrace were vandalized by groups of civilians. See: Rifat Bali, 1934 Trakya Olayları (1934 Thrace Incidents) (İstanbul: Libra, 2012).


17 The Directorate General of Foundations in Turkey was established in 1924, in order to take over a multiplicity of Ottoman Foundations, whose managers and trustees had not remained in the historical process.

18 In 1997, Trakya University volunteered for financially supporting and carrying out the restoration, but soon retracted, as the building’s roof unexpectedly collapsed. In 1998, an event was organized in Istanbul’s Atatürk Cultural Center with the intention of collecting donations for the synagogue’s restoration, but could not answer the purpose.


20 The news was first transmitted from the period’s minister of finance Kemal Unakıtan (who, himself was from Edirne) to Silvyo Ovadya (the chair person of Turkey’s Jewish community at the time). (Silvyo Ovadya, “Edirne Büyük Sinagogu’nun Restorasyonu için Neler Yapıldı” ("What Has Been Done For the Restoration of Edirne’s Great Synagogue"), Şalom, June 9, 2010).

21 According to the article, “the authorities expected that Jews from all around the world –first and foremost from Israel- would visit Edirne, once the synagogue was repaired.” ("Kiliseden Sonra Şimdi de Sinagog mu?" ("First a Church, and Now a Synagogue"), Milli Gazete, February 22, 2006). The ‘church’ mentioned in the title is Akdamar Church in Van, which was also renovated by governmental bodies.

22 “Tarih yeniden can buluyor, Edirne Sinagogu Restore Ediliyor” ("History is Being Revived, Edirne Synagogue is Being Renovated"), Şalom, November 24, 2010.
23 Rubi Asa, an architect and a member of the Jewish community prepared the initial restoration project with Habitat Architects. He and several other community members remained as active social actors during the restoration.

24 “İsrail’e Kızdı Sinagogu İbadete Kapattı” (“He Got Angry with Israel, He Closed the Synagogue to Worship”), Birgün, November 23, 2014.


26 Zeynep Kaşlı, 2014.
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31 Edirne was once a major center of Maftirim music tradition.


34 Riva Hayim, “Edirne’de İlk Dua” (“First Prayer in Edirne”), Şalom, April 1, 2015.
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Introduction

This paper intends to make a contribution to EAHN Belgrade conference by exploring the role played by the modernist architectural discourse in generating social, cultural, and political identities in the local environment of Split—a city rich in architectural and urban history, but, which was nevertheless, an example of artistic ‘periphery’. The concept of periphery is here used according to the theoretical framework set by the Croatian archeologist and art historian Ljubo Karaman (1886-1971), who developed his theory to explain the transfer of artistic ideas by defining specific positions within a network of international artistic contexts. Karaman identified three distinct contexts of artistic production: that of centre, province, and periphery. The context of periphery as well as the context of province implies the acceptance of artistic models coming from the centres. However, according to Karaman, those two contexts differ greatly in their modalities of application of imported models. While artistic production in the province exists in the shadow of one strong centre and tends to be influenced exclusively by its cultural production, the periphery is influenced by multiple cultural centres. Also, the periphery is located at a certain distance from these centres, what allows local artists the access to their artistic production and influence, but at the same time providing them with a creative position that is unburdened by the authoritative power of the centre. While the provincial art relies on imitation, the peripheral context offers the freedom to synthesise influences from the centres and transform them to independent artistic approaches.¹

The ideas of architectural modernism reached Split from different European milieux, most notably from Prague, but also from Paris and Vienna. These ideas were brought by the architects who had completed their education in these centres. The absorption of architectural modernism in the local environment passed through different stages of acceptance and refusal. In the course of this alternating process marked by oscillations, which started in the late 1920s through a conflict with tradition, modernist architecture established itself in the 1950s and 1960s as a new tradition and the agent of an identity. It is this apparently paradoxical turn that proved crucial to maintaining the continuity of modernist thought despite the discontinuity of social and political circumstances. This research focuses on the process of absorption of modernity through three historical stages, defined by significant changes in the political and
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CONTINUITY OF THOUGHT IN THE DISCONTINUITY OF HISTORY: ARCHITECT ZLATIBOR LUKŠIĆ AND SOME ASPECTS OF MODERNISM IN SPLIT (1930-1965)

Based upon an insight into the parts of the oeuvre of Split architect Zlatibor Lukšić, this paper aimes at presenting some key aspects of modernism in Split (Croatia). The work of Lukšić, who studied architecture in Belgrade, spent time in Paris and worked in Split, is analysed in order to examine two key questions. The first question tackles the ways in which a specific architectural thought stemming from another and different geographical context was implemented into, and developed within, the local context of a city with a rich architectural and urban history, but with all the characteristics of a ‘periphery’. The second question concerns the strategies and specific design tools that enabled the development and survival of the inherited thought in spite of the change of political and value systems that directly affected it. By examining various architectural strategies in their interaction with different political and social circumstances, this paper focuses on the potential that autonomous, deeply specific design tools and strategies have to enable architecture to construct social and cultural meaning, as well as local identity.
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Introduction

This paper intends to make a contribution to EAHN Belgrade conference by exploring the role played by the modernist architectural discourse in generating social, cultural, and political identities in the local environment of Split—a city rich in architectural and urban history, but, which was nevertheless, an example of artistic ‘periphery’. The concept of periphery is here used according to the theoretical framework set by the Croatian archeologist and art historian Ljubo Karaman (1886-1971), who developed his theory to explain the transfer of artistic ideas by defining specific positions within a network of international artistic contexts. Karaman identified three distinct contexts of artistic production: that of centre, province, and periphery. The context of periphery as well as the context of province implies the acceptance of artistic models coming from the centres. However, according to Karaman, those two contexts differ greatly in their modalities of application of imported models. While artistic production in the province exists in the shadow of one strong centre and tends to be influenced exclusively by its cultural production, the periphery is influenced by multiple cultural centres. Also, the periphery is located at a certain distance from these centres, what allows local artists the access to their artistic production and influence, but at the same time providing them with a creative position that is unburdened by the authoritative power of the centre. While the provincial art relies on imitation, the peripheral context offers the freedom to synthesise influences from the centres and transform them to independent artistic approaches.¹

The ideas of architectural modernism reached Split from different European milieux, most notably from Prague, but also from Paris and Vienna. These ideas were brought by the architects who had completed their education in these centres. The absorption of architectural modernism in the local environment passed through different stages of acceptance and refusal. In the course of this alternating process marked by oscillations, which started in the late 1920s through a conflict with tradition, modernist architecture established itself in the 1950s and 1960s as a new tradition and the agent of an identity. It is this apparently paradoxical turn that proved crucial to maintaining the continuity of modernist thought despite the discontinuity of social and political circumstances. This research focuses on the process of absorption of modernity through three historical stages, defined by significant changes in the political and
economic contexts and social values. It is to these three historical stages that the paper has attached three corresponding stages in the development of architectural modernism. The first stage, identified as the ‘instilling phase’, pertains to the period between the two world wars. The second stage is characterised as the ‘testing phase’ and pertains to the period immediately following WWII, while the third stage is associated with the 1950s and 1960s, representing the ‘final affirmation phase’ of modernity. Although the discontinuity in political and social circumstances undoubtedly affected the conditions of architectural practice, modernist architectural thought showed a surprising continuity, even at the time immediately following the war, when the political circumstances were overtly unfavourable. What were the architectural strategies and specific design tools that enabled the development and survival of architectural modernism in Split?

The research methodology is based upon an insight into the parts of the work of the Split architect Zlatibor Lukšić. The purpose of this paper is not to present Lukšić’s work as such: rather, its aim is to explore through selected examples some aspects of modernism in Split. In local architectural historiography, Lukšić was primarily associated with the Parisian school, despite the fact that he had actually studied architecture in Belgrade (1919-1924). However, after his studies in Belgrade, Lukšić spent some time in Paris and it is this Parisian period that exerted the strongest influence upon Lukšić’s formation as an architect.

Zlatibor Lukšić’s work has been selected for two reasons. Firstly, Lukšić is the only architect who was active continuously and almost with equal intensity through all three stages of architectural modernism in Split that are the subject of this research. Secondly, although Lukšić was often mentioned as a significant participant of the local architectural scene, his oeuvre has so far not been the subject of any scholarly research and no publications or studies on him are available.

**Instillation of modernity**

After WWI and the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, political position of the City of Split significantly changed. In the newly formed Slavic state, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes, Split was given a role of the regional administrative and governing centre, as well as that of the largest seaport on eastern Adriatic coast. The change of the geostrategic position of Split was followed by intensive economic development.

At that time, soon after the return of the first post-war generation of architects educated in different European centres, architectural realisations representing local responses to foreign modern models were slowly emerging in Split. It seems that modern architecture in Split was accepted very quickly, especially as the City administration commissioned several projects of public buildings from these architects. The City administration chose Modernism almost as its official style, with the intention of constructing the image of an open and progressive city. Besides public buildings, modern expression was desirable for another architectural typology: that of the family villas, which were being built on the outskirts of the historical town. Apparently, it was the modern villa that was chosen to represent the comfortable life of the new local bourgeoisie.

However, although the local environment of Split seemed extremely open to the new architecture, an intensive public dispute casts a different light concerning the local attitude towards architectural modernism. The polemic started a couple of years after Lukšić’s return from Paris, when a very influential local paper published a sequence of articles with arguments in favour of, and against, modern architecture, respectively. The polemic focused on the controversy about the implementation of modern architecture in the historical centres of Dalmatian cities, environment rich in valuable urban history and architectural heritage.

The dispute was led by two eminent local public figures, Vinko Brajević and Kosta Strajnić—the former being the editor-in-chief of the main local newspaper, and the latter being engaged as the Deputy Head of the Conservation Office in Dubrovnik. While Strajnić passionately supported the arrival of modernist architecture in Dalmatia, Brajević expressed serious scepticism. Brajević divided local responses to modernist initiatives into those more inclined to tradition, and those more avant-garde, of evident international provenance, labelling the former as ‘right-wing’, and the latter as ‘left-wing’. Although these labels implicate political connotations, they actually merely represent two different fronts of relation towards
tradition. The conflict between the architectural ‘right’ and ‘left’ is perceived by Brajević as stone opposed to concrete, small windows vs. large glazing, slanting roofs vs. flat roofs, the traditional architectural logic vs. imported forms. In Brajević’s view, the ‘left’ represents a discontinuous shift and an interruption, whereas the ‘right’ stands for continuity and architecture based upon local values. He supports the thesis that ‘this style of the most modern left which disrupts any connection with any architectural tradition and which strives to affirm its originality by this very interruption’ should have no place whatsoever in historical locations. According to Brajević, architecture could participate in the formation of cultural identity only by establishing the continuity with tradition. This in turn is impossible for modern architecture, as it runs contrary to the very ideological premises of Modernism. The polemic Brajević-Strajnić thus confirms the ‘peripheral’ position of Split, but also reveals exceptional local awareness of the value of its architectural and urban heritage.

Having experienced Paris, young Lukšić found Strajnić’s attitude closer to his own. One of his earlier Split projects in fact represented homage to Lukšić’s architectural role model – André Lurçat, with whose work Lukšić got acquainted in Paris. It is in this charming architectural miniature that Lukšić uncompromisingly incorporated elements of Lurçat’s architectural inventory: a composition of rectangular and rounded elements, smooth plastered façade, corner window, roof terrace. In terms of form, the house represented a direct import of a foreign model. However, Brajević-Strajnić dispute will evidently have influence on Lukšić’s later work, as well as the work of his contemporaries.

In the years to follow, Zlatibor Lukšić was to develop his design method by subtly approaching Brajević’s ‘right’, but never crossing fully to that side. Moreover, Lukšić’s design operations will manage to blur the demarcation lines of Brajević’s architectural ‘left’ and ‘right’ and re-examine the thereby declared conflict between ‘concrete’ and ‘stone’. This became first evident in Lukšić’s projects of interpolations. These buildings, modern in their formal vocabulary, very carefully entered into interactions with the existing urban layers and spatial situations. Sometimes it is the composition of the façade elements that adjusts to adjacent objects, or the choice of materials that makes a narrative reference to the spatial context (Štambuk corner building). Lukšić approaches each of these situations with new creative vigour so his designs of the interpolations are marked with astonishing diversity.

It is in these terms that Lukšić’s most mature work in the inter-war period is represented by the business and residential corner house Ivanšević. That building represents an inception of new façade lines, which, in a manner of stage scenery, were aimed at screening from view the peasant suburb located immediately behind, which is why its proportions stemmed from such urban planning directions. Lukšić articulated the ground floor with large glass windows, while the passage seems to affirm the existing pedestrian path of a peasant settlement. The stereotomic and formally reduced façade characterised by exceptionally refined architectural details is freed of its structural role, what represents a novelty in local architecture, as well as is the skeleton structural system of the entire building. However, the lining in stone (from the nearby island of Brač) is to be viewed as a link with the local architectural tradition.

Testing of modernity

The completion of the Ivanšević building coincided with the onset of WWII. The end of the War was to mark a radical change in social and political circumstances. A clean break with all pre-war practices became a crucial propaganda motif in creating a new society. Architectural modernism was also considered one of those pre-war practices that needed to be rejected and substituted with the Soviet model of socialist realism. The political loyalty to Stalinist ideology and the economy based upon the five-year plan were responsible for radical changes in architectural practice. Apart from the official imposition of socialist realism, the Soviet model, in its pronouncedly centralised structure of the State, implied that architecture was to become merely one of the services: it literally became a part of the bureaucratic apparatus. The designer’s efficiency tended to be increased by a systematic suppression of individuality by removing as many designer’s decisions as possible from the proper author. This was executed by decisions and regulations decreed from the so-called planning commissions, bureaucratic bodies that usually had no architects involved. Those decisions, often referred to as ‘decisions from
above’, directly interfered with technical and design solutions. This was particularly evident in housing projects. Apart from various regulations decreeing technical solutions, proportions, types of windows, materials, and types of roofs to be applied on housing buildings, there was an official catalogue of acceptable types of flats that the designers all over the country were obliged to use. Thereby the design process was reduced to a selection and composition of ready-made catalogue solutions. The main purpose of that official design strategy was to rationalise and cheapen housing construction. However, the strategy resulted in producing anonymous and plain dwelling houses, which neither in terms of quality or quantity represent a significant layer of Split urban structure. To analyse the architecture created between 1945 and 1951 therefore means to reconstruct a genesis of designers’ decisions within the context of numerous decrees coming from ‘above’. The authorship of the majority of these buildings is impossible to establish from the available archives. Even if it were possible, it would have no bearing upon the analysis.

However, this valorisation cannot be applied to housing development on Kaštelanska cesta that was, at the same time, designed by Zlatibor Lukšić and his colleague Dinko Vesanović. Upon his return from the War, bearing partisan war experience, Lukšić was employed in the Municipal Office and was assigned to design this housing settlement on Kaštelanska cesta – at the time an undeveloped area leading towards the shipyard. Six housing blocks, arranged in the zeilenbau manner, were placed by Lukšić and Vesanović parallel to the decumanus of Diocletian’s Palace. Such position of apartment buildings represents an example of Lukšić’s design decision that creates an affirmative reference to the existing urbanity. Nevertheless, these buildings should also be analysed within the context of restrictions and decrees coming from ‘above’. The authors here accepted all the decreed canons – the slanting roof, materials, the prescribed dimensions of windows, and flat arrangements, all in keeping with the ordered norms. However, all these elements were used in such a way that the final product is not at all alike the already seen and desirable catalogue solutions, but rather a purified abstract form. As in the case of the Ivanović building built earlier, the stone lining of the façade reflects a powerful influence of the local architectural tradition, while the geometric purity of the volumes, regular arrangement of the openings and the frames of loggias protruding from the façade surface, undoubtedly disclose the buildings’ modernist inclination. Considering the period when it was created (1946-1949), this architecture was at first labelled by the public as socialist realism, although in terms of aesthetics it had nothing to do with it. However, in order for Lukšić to actually realise such a modern building at a time when the political circumstances were overtly favourable towards architectural modernism, it was the incorporation of the traditional elements that proved to be crucial. In that immediate post-war period that was characterised by shortages of building materials and qualified construction labour, it was the design strategy of formal reduction, together with using stone as local building material and local workers who had skills to work with it, that justified Lukšić’s strategy as the most rational and most logical. In this way, by making a very pragmatic response to an official request of construction rationalisation, Lukšić realised a housing settlement that represented a clear inception of the Split post-war modernism, at the same time forming a continuity of the pre-war modernist thought.

This peculiar subversion is an example of how architectural skill in using autonomous tools from its own specific repertory, is able, even under the most difficult of circumstances, to realise the potential of architecture to be instrumental and to clearly express its attitude towards the inherited and current values, even to convey, albeit indirectly, a political message. Although Lukšić had always been dedicated solely to architectural practice proper, his political position remaining unexpressed, the housing development on Kaštelanska cesta reveals a strong awareness of the values of his own architectural heritage, as well as the resistance to the imposition of the Soviet model in architecture.

**Final affirmation of modernity**

Following the dramatic events on the political scene of 1948 and Tito’s break with Stalin, the social, economic and political context was again to witness very radical changes. The conditions of architectural activity significantly changed due to the process of decentralisation and the country’s opening towards the West. By loosening the ties of political discipline, a spirit of new creative freedom was beginning to emerge in the architecture of the 1950s. For architects it meant a more open and freer reliance upon western modernist models. This
was the time when Lukšić designed the building of the Court of Justice, later to be converted to the Faculty of Law. Along the creative lines drawn earlier with the housing complexes on Kaštelanska cesta, the design of the Court of Justice further developed the modern thought through a dialogue with local architectural elements and materials.

Lukšić’s creative line was to see its definite affirmation in the early 1960s with the realisation of the anthological case – the office building on Diocletian’s Peristyle. This building was actually designed by another architect, Neven Šegvić, but Šegvić’s own design approach is compatible with the one Lukšić developed in his work, and it can be placed along the same creative line. On Peristyle, Šegvić uses modern language of architecture, but adjusts this language to fit among the surrounding historical buildings. By the controlled proportion of the object and its stone façade, as well as the choice of the slanting roof, Šegvić’s building respects the authority of the demanding location. Precisely because of such design approach, it was in this ultimate venue of the local architectural heritage that modern architecture would undoubtedly be accepted and affirmed as an active participant of the historical succession, as well as an agent of the relationship between modern architecture and tradition will thus be concluded.

In the years to follow, modernism, with all its future crises and challenges, was to represent a well-trodden course of Split architecture and urban planning. Lukšić participated in many of contemporary local architectural and social themes, winning the competition for the design of standardised flat intended for the mass housing construction. Lukšić’s last significant design was the headquarters of the publishing firm ‘Slobodna Dalmacija’, containing the flats for the employees. Designed in the manner of pure functionalist modernism, this building represented in fact a peculiar departure from the designing strategies that Lukšić developed throughout his career.

Conclusion
This paper suggests that the modernist discourse played an active role in generating social, cultural, and political identities of Split in the period between 1930 and 1960. The crucial issue in the process of absorption of modernity in the local context of Split was a question of attitude towards architectural heritage and tradition. The process is therefore based upon a need for the imported architectural model to be creatively and critically imported and added to the local architectural values and traditions. Such critical addition subsequently proved to be the most enduring and resilient design tool in establishing and maintaining a continuity of modernist values in face of the discontinuity of historical circumstances, exactly as it could be seen in Zlatibor Lukšić’s oeuvre.
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Mid-20th century Cyprus was intricately tied to the turbulent political landscape resulting from competing political aspirations between the two main communities of the island, which were in turn exacerbated by external influences by Greece, Turkey, Britain, and larger Cold War politics. In this intense climate, new educational institutions for technical training began to be established, and these were charged with cultivating ethnic reconciliation as much as they were expected to provide the foundations for the Island’s socioeconomic reform.

This paper focuses on the first technical schools on the Island, which were built during the transition from British colonialism to independence, and examines the complex entanglement of architecture and education with socioeconomic reform and ethnic conflict. Three schools were built in the 1950s by the British, and one was designed in 1968, soon after Cyprus’s independence: but all were established as ‘bi-communal schools,’ in stark contrast to previous ‘communal’ schools, whose students were divided along ethnic lines, and with a clear task to cultivate a sense of national identity. The paper examines the design, and subsequent reception of these schools to highlight the role of educational institutions in larger anti-colonial struggles, decolonization processes, geopolitical conflicts and nation-building.
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right after it, reforms that targeted educational institutions reshaped both the educational and the physical conditions of schools. This paper focuses on school buildings and related social visions during that period of transition from colonialism to the establishment of the Republic of Cyprus. It focuses on two types of schools which were bi-communal, and which emerged in stark contrast to the typical, ethnically separated schools that had dominated the educational system. The first type is secondary schools for technical training that materialized in the 1950s; the second type was the Higher Technical Institute for post-secondary technical education that was created a few years after independence, in 1968. Both types of new schools advanced a new mode bi-communal coexistence and reconciliation, to foster a sense of shared national pride, as much as they aimed to provide the foundations for the island’s socioeconomic reform.

By examining the design, political priorities, and subsequent reception of these schools just before and just after independence, the following analysis uncovers important nuances in the design of vocational schools, within the larger context of colonial as well as postcolonial architecture, and within the peculiar political and architectural circumstances of post-independence Cyprus. Ultimately, the paper highlights the complex connections between educational institutions and anti-colonial struggles, decolonization processes, geopolitical conflicts and nation-building.

Colonial era technical schools: Seeking an alternative nationalism

The colonial government established the technical schools for vocational training as part of a five-year development programme that began in 1955, the same year when the Greek-Cypriot anti-colonial struggle began. Technical training seemed important not only because this tool for transition to modernity was practically ‘nonexistent’ up to that point, but also because it seemed as a vehicle for curbing the local population’s insurrection.

As Lord Balniel argued in the British Parliament in December 1955, a few months after the outbreak of the anti-colonial struggle, technical education was important not only for its ‘intrinsic value’ but also because it ‘enables us to put education on a national basis instead of a racial basis [authors’, emphasis].’ In other words, the establishment of technical schools was directly linked to political expediencies. Technical schools were to respond to emerging needs for cultivating the technical skills of the local population, and simultaneously, they would counterbalance the ethic separatism of communal schools. The governor of Cyprus himself expressed his concern with the educational system to date arguing that Greek-Cypriot communal schools were indoctrinating young people and hatching rebels, leading them to join the guerrilla-struggle of the Greek-Cypriot organization, EOKA. Contrary to these communal schools, bi-communal schools had the potential to reshape the local youth. This bi-communal character was a perfect fit for the new genre of technical schools, because ‘at the moment neither of the racial groups could possibly afford the expense of technical education.’

It was precisely this logic that led to the planning of technical schools for all major cities of Cyprus. Ultimately three of them materialized: the technical schools of Nicosia, Limassol (Figure 1) and Lefka.

At the time when the technical schools were being constructed, the British interrupted the operation of around 450 Greek-Cypriot schools, because of alleged involvement in the anti-colonial struggle. Images of Greek-Cypriot community schools with military blockades, roadblocks, or anti-British graffiti were quite common. Similarly common were Greek-Cypriot student street protests in favor of unification with Greece. Communal schools had become a hub for anti-colonial struggle and the British government was searching for alternatives.
The political expediencies that led to the first technical schools for vocational training also influenced strategies for their architectural design. Even though communal schools had typically been designed by local architects or by the colonial government’s Public Works Department (PWD), the educational buildings for the new type of technical training were all assigned to private British architectural firms. This significant break from standard practice bypassed local Greek- or Turkish-Cypriot designers and the problems that would emerge if one or the other community was favored for the design of a bi-communal school. Further, the turn to private sector bypassed all other (British or local) architects connected to the colonial bureaucracy. Even the PWD, which had up to that point undertaken the design of most public buildings, was now characterized by colonial officials as ‘unable to undertake any of this work.’ Perhaps the reason was that the PWD already had to coordinate many projects at that time; but the removal of PWD from the picture was also an opportunity to bypass the standardized practices of a government bureaucracy locked in a particular design culture that was not necessarily in tune with the emerging reforms. Even architects within PWD, which was increasingly stuffed by young professionals, had by that time begun to set aside government design manuals and experimented with new references and standards set by international trends.

The government itself was also in search of new ideas, as it soon assigned the design of more public institutions to private British firms. The colonial preoccupation with appearing impartial towards the two main ethnic groups also extended to the aesthetic preferences of the building. All three technical schools avoided references to past history or local vernaculars that would remind of identities and conflict. For example, contrary to many Greek communal schools that gravitated Greek revival to allude to a ‘greekness’ in the island’s roots, the new technical schools favored a modernist aesthetic. The only references to the locale, in the case of the technical schools, were related to the materiality of building elements (such as the sea-pebble veneers on some exterior walls, or the use of local limestone). This aversion to historical references and aspirations to universalism may perhaps explain why the request of the Nicosia School’s designers to exhibit antique sculptures in the building’s open spaces was rejected. The modernist aesthetic also served to demonstrate a break from the formal language of the British Colonial architecture, which, from the 1920s onward, had been searching for a ‘Cypriot’ character, that, as Given described, consisted of ‘a mélange of Byzantine, Medieval, Ottoman and colonial stylistic traits.’ This historicist mix had been seen as a means to override the nationalist uses of stylistic revivalism; but by the 1950s when local uprising emerged, the British started abandoning this search for a Cypriot motif, as though the colonial government wished to put aside colonial policies that had that fueled the local pride. A modernist aesthetic appeared to better highlight the colonial power’s interest in modernization and presage the Island’s industrial development.

All three technical school buildings were organized around discrete volumes that formed atriums or large courtyard spaces. These open common spaces were seen as a means to enhance students’ socialization and improve their ‘behavior, courtesy and discipline.’ Echoing colonial self-constructions as ‘civilizing’ agents, a report by the Inspectors of the Education Department diagnosed students as ‘rather rough and noisy in manner and speech’ and put emphasis on the quality of facilities, as a way to cultivate better behavior, and also to make these schools more attractive than community schools. Laboratories, which would constitute the core of technical education, were equipped with the state-of-the-art machinery, comparable to that of the contemporary western schools, as government officials boasted.

The buildings also exhibited other contemporary novelties such as shading systems – for example brise-soleils in the schools of Lefka and Limassol. All these aspired to introduce students to a new way of life. For all its extravagance, however, the building program did not take into account the limited economic means of the students. This forced the colonial government to make modifications after construction, so as to be able to provide room and board to students who could not otherwise afford their enrollment.

Schools without students

The purpose of technical schools as instruments and symbols of a new life, (or even as spaces of control for the Greek-Cypriot youth) became quickly understood. A strong campaign against technical
schools eventually developed, resulting in attacks against the schools. One such attack occurred in Nicosia when the school was under construction, leading to the barbed-wire enclosure of the construction site and the installation of police guards. Similarly, the Limassol school was bombed in 1957; and this led to the conversion some building space into an outpost for armed police. Such acts were far from unusual, and Greek-Cypriots students saw them as their contribution to the anti-colonial struggle. Their strongest resistance was expressed in the form of student boycotts. A typical example is the Technical School Limassol, which had a capacity of 900 students, but it received only 12 Greek students in its first year of operation in 1956, only 14 in 1957 (losing 8 of them during the school year for political reasons), and only 5 in 1958.

The low student attendance, the conversion of classrooms into dorms, and the policing of buildings, had certainly not been anticipated, either by the colonial government or the architects, and this proved that the rulers of the island were no longer able to control, as they had been accustomed, the colony and its structures; nor were they able to succeed in their reforms which came too late and under the pressure of local uprising.

**Postcolonial establishment of the Higher Technical Institute – Designing again for both communities**

After the British left Cyprus, the constitution of the new independent state that was established in 1960 demanded that education be provided separately to the two communities, a policy which resulted to all three of the above technical schools being ethically divided and, filled with students! In the postcolonial atmosphere of the 1960s, the population accepted and used the infrastructure of the colonial technical schools, while undoing, however, the policies that had created these infrastructures – that is, the policies favoring the coexistence of the two communities under the same educational roof and the construction of a common national consciousness.

Even then however, the experiment in connecting bi-communal schools with technical education did not come to an end. It was repeated in another case: the Higher Technical Institute (HTI) created in 1968. (Figure 2) The political climate was again charged due to the Cyprus Republic’s decision to join the Non-aligned Movement, a decision which caused the unease of the West, given the delicate balances in the region of the Middle East, in the context of Cold War bipolarities. The situation was further exacerbated by the uneasy coexistence of the two communities in Cyprus, which had clashed violently in 1963, resulting in the withdrawal of the Turkish-Cypriots from the State government, in 1964. It was under these conditions that three five-year development programs were developed between 1962-1976, with the goal to develop the country’s economy, redesign its infrastructures and form modern citizens. These programs were to facilitate the participation of both communities, but this goal fell apart when the Turkish-Cypriots withdrew from the government in 1964. The establishment of HTI was thus part of efforts to find new ways for easing inter-communal disputes, and this is why the Government excluded this technical college from the larger policy of ethically separated education. The shaping of HTI as a bi-communal school was certainly palatable to the West not only because it responded to its professed desire for an improvement of the relationships of the two communities, but also for many reasons that will be explained below.

The establishment of a western and English-speaking educational institution had initially been advanced by the United States as part on an economic aid program that would maintain American influence on the Island ‘at a high level’
so as ‘to counter the communist threat’ among other things. In his 1962 meeting with the Cyprus Republic President Makarios, John F. Kennedy even discussed the possibility of an American University in Cyprus, to offer, according to the Cyprus Ambassador in the USA ‘a useful western influence into Cyprus.’

A Western institution was a crucial counterbalance in a country that professed sympathies to the non-Aligned Movement, and where a large wave of young Cypriots studying in countries of the Eastern Block at the time. By 1963, plans for a Polytechnic began to form as part of an American Aid program for the Island during a period that the Soviet Union had also expressed willingness to offer financial support to Cyprus. These plans were interrupted after the inter-communal tensions of 1963; but this idea planned to be materialized in another form in 1965, as a “Higher Technical Institute.” The focus remained on technical education because this was considered more ‘vital to the expanding economy of Cyprus’ but the institution would now be funded jointly by the Special United Nations Development Fund and the Republic of Cyprus. British and American officials saluted the engagement of the UN for this project, and so did Turkey. The United Nations had already been involved in several modernization and peace building projects in Cyprus, almost since the inception of the Republic. In the case of HTI, the design and construction happened through the cooperation of UN expert architects with the local “Technical Works Department” of the Ministry of Education.

Much like in the case of the technical schools discussed earlier, modernism seemed to offer a means of expressing the new educational vision being advanced. HTI adopted the modernist principle of the grid, and spaces were organized around semi covered circulation areas and a central atrium, which again dominated the design as a place of socialization among students of both communities. The design also provided for a row of monumental double height mushroom columns for the building’s main entrance, highlighting the importance of the new institute in the State’s educational system. Again, there were no architectural elements that might refer to the island’s history and competing national identities, except from an abstract allusion to the local climate. Notably, the same modernist aesthetic was by now adopted by the government in all its public buildings. The modernization of the state, the industrial development and the decolonization that were attempted at the time, demanded a clear break from the colonial past (if not from the colonial technical schools) and once again, modernism seemed to offer the best expression of this new beginning.

**HTI operation**

HTI was inaugurated in 1971, although the institute had begun to operate two years earlier, being temporarily housed in the Technical School of Nicosia, (which ironically, revived the initial intentions of that colonial building). As far as student response, the roles were reversed in the case of HTI. In the colonial era, the problems had been caused by Greek-Cypriots wanting to change the political status quo; conversely, in the post-colonial era, the problems were created by the Turkish-Cypriots protesting their limited participation in the institution. They wished to ‘sabotage’ the government’s project, after their community’s departure from the central Government.

The participation of Turkish-Cypriot students was at a low 5% and this was not unrelated to the Turkish Government’s policy to offer Turkish-Cypriots scholarships for studies in Turkey. The low participation of Turkish-Cypriots in the institution was highlighted in a UN Secretary General report, in 1973, a year before the 1974 war, which divided the two communities so dramatically.

**Conclusion**

The technical schools built by the British during the onset of anti-colonial struggle, created a shift in the colonial architecture in Cyprus both in terms of form and in terms of program. The emphasis on bi-communal coexistence, the provision of state-of-the-art facilities, the involvement of foreign expert architects, and the embrace of a modernist aesthetic claimed a break with the past and projected an aura of reform in hopes to manage conflict, promote ethnic reconciliation, and ultimately sustain the colonial power. Conversely, the modernizing gestures of the subsequent independent Republic of Cyprus tried to nurture the unification the two communities as a way to maintain the new state. These political experiments that accompanied the formal and social reforms, along with the slow implementation
of development policies, and the explosive political climate of the time, brought the result that, even the new type of institutional buildings, that promised to be free from baggage of the past, would once again become an arena of political conflict.
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NEOCLASSICISM IN COLONIAL TUNIS: EXPLORING THE DEPLOYMENT OF A MYTHOLOGIZED TRADITION

Classical antiquity served as a powerful reference for European colonizers in North Africa who sought to control and cultivate an identity largely through urban interventions. Neoclassicism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries represents a particularly tangible manifestation of this phenomenon on a large and visible scale. While scholars have studied the deployment of ancient history as aesthetic model, socio-cultural inspiration, and colonialist political instrument, consideration of these practices within the context of early French colonization of the Mediterranean basin has largely been limited to Algeria. The architectural products of these perspectives, when acknowledged, have typically been treated as relatively minor precursors to more explicitly orientalist and then modern architectures. It appears that associations with contemporary European models and earlier more theoretical understandings of neoclassicism only partially explain the popularity of retrospective architectures throughout the region. Indeed, the self-aggrandizing nostalgic mythology that motivated French authorities and inspired Tunis' architects took on a particular potency when set amidst omnipresent vestiges of the region's distant past. This essay introduces the case of Protectorate-era Tunis (1881–1956) through focused presentation of several early architectural and urban projects. Exploring the regionally specific significance of an appropriated classical heritage fundamental to colonialist identities, it engages the complex correlation between antiquity and its imagery, and modern neoclassical aesthetics.
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Introduction

Classical antiquity served as a powerful reference and inspiration for European colonizers in North Africa who sought to control and cultivate an identity largely through architectural and urban development and imagery. Neoclassicism of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries represents a particularly tangible manifestation of this phenomenon on a large and visible scale. While scholars have variously studied the deployment of ancient history as aesthetic model, socio-cultural inspiration, and political instrument used by imperialist powers in Europe and abroad, these practices have yet to be substantially investigated within the context of early French colonization of the Mediterranean basin beyond Algeria. It appears that associations with contemporary European models and earlier more theoretical understandings of neoclassicism only partially explain the popularity of such retrospective architectures. Indeed, the self-aggrandizing nostalgia that influenced French authorities and motivated Tunis' architects took on a particular potency when set amidst omnipresent vestiges of the distant past, and further exploring this regionally specific meaning is the chief goal of this ongoing inquiry. Where scholars have considered the 'scientific, religious, literary, and mythical' appropriation of antiquity by French colonizers, the architectural ramifications of such processes have been typically treated as a relatively minor step along the way towards studying more explicitly orientalist or modern – that is to say emphatically non-neoclassical – architectures. Through the presentation of a series of public buildings and monuments erected in Tunis by French administrators during the early years of the Protectorate period (1881–1956), this essay presents the use, and considers the meanings, of appropriated Punic, Roman and Byzantine heritage by colonizers. Towards this end it draws upon examples – some built and some unbuilt – from Tunis, setting them within their architectural, rhetorical and socio-political contexts. Stemming from fieldwork and archival research conducted in both France and
Tunisia since 2008, this developing study concludes with a brief reflection on more recent classically inspired manifestations, thereby demonstrating the sustained relevance of the appropriated heritage beyond the context of colonialism.

By the time France had formally occupied Tunisia in 1881 it had well established itself as a regional power in North Africa from its nearby base in Algiers (conquered in 1830). Substantial urban development there had aggressively altered the city’s form, utilizing Metropolitan architectural styles that would have been familiar to any Western observer. Grand neoclassical structures with imposing facades exemplified the authoritative style du vainqueur or ‘conqueror’s style’ and reflected French tastes and an imperialist hubris.

With the advent of the Tunisian Protectorate, administrators built a new, modern city befitting its changed status that was efficient, productive, and comfortable for resident Europeans and visitors, while demonstrating the mission civilisatrice. Though generally abstaining from the aggressive ‘Haussmannization’ processes that had been deployed in early colonial Algiers, European engineers and architects in Tunis continued to impose upon the growing capital buildings in contemporary Western styles as they extended their ville nouvelle across the marshy plain adjacent to Tunis’ walled medina. Described by an 1896 visitor as a quarter ‘growing every day into a veritable city’ with buildings ‘magically tall,’ the urbanized area spread from the old city’s eastern edge.

The architecture of the tree-lined Avenue Jules-Ferry, the so-called ‘Champs-Elysées of Tunis,’ reinforced the city’s connection to the métropole in both form and function, and tourists appreciated the sensation of being ‘en pleine France’ across the sea. (Figure 1)

Classically Inspired Protectorate-era Tunis

The general neoclassical aesthetic employed by architects in the early decades of the Protectorate had been relatively standard in earlier Western-built structures there, as it had been elsewhere in European colonized territories. Column-clad balconyed buildings framed the Place de la Bourse just inside the medina, the critical point of elision with the growing Avenue Jules-Ferry between antithetical cities, old and new. When French authorities received permission to build a new consulate outside the city’s walls in 1860, a pivotal move that would propel they Tunis’ extramural development toward the coast, a restrained neoclassicism was used. It conveyed a sense of modern grandeur and power. Applied to the building’s central core were lateral pavilions are pedimented window frames, slim pilasters, and a columned entryway built by architect-engineer Pierre Colin (according to plans by Philippe Caillat).

Its exotic crenellation notwithstanding, these elements made clear the fact that the building was different, European, and a rather stoic administrative center. Expanded over the years it became the headquarters of the French colonial government during the Protectorate era (Résidence Générale) and remains the embassy of France today – still the iconic image of French influence at the heart of the postcolonial capital.

The choice of a monumental neoclassicism for Tunis’ Hôtel des Postes, or postal headquarters, remains the city’s most pronounced, however. Built in 1891, Henri Saladin’s imposing beaux-arts complex covered most of a block not far from what was, and still is, the city’s chief train station. The central feature of its tripartite façade was its double-height triple arched mass on Doric columns, the glazing of which allowed for the illumination of the building’s voluminous main hall. Flanked by shaded arcades on either side and an attic above, the triumphal arch-like feature included laurel wreaths in the spandrels, and made clear a victory for European systems and architecture. (Figure 2) Images from its 1892 inauguration banquet show the interior space divided into bays by full-height arcade moldings, the central of which included a massive painted map of Tunisia, thereby underscoring geographic relationships and communication networks. Sculpted cornucopias and caduceus motifs complemented the message

Fig. 1: Tunis’ Avenue Jules-Ferry and cathedral, ca. 1925. Source: Author’s collection.
Though arabisque patterns and ‘RT’ ciphers (for ‘Tunis Regency,’ the formal name used to identify the nominally sovereign Tunisian state within the Protectorate system) appear secondarily, the supremacy of the French administration is unmistakable. Saladin, about whom relatively little is known, was an archaeologist and an architect who appreciated both ancient forms and the local vernacular. His many published reports on the territory’s antiquities make clear his enthusiasm for antiquities and in part explain the academic precision with which he executed his grandest architectural achievement in the Protectorate.

Explicitly classicizing architectures, such as the Hôtel des Postes, are relatively few in Tunis, particularly when compared to earlier colonial cities such as Algiers and Calcutta. More quotidian references, such as those made by the apartment blocks and shops along Tunis’ principal avenues, created a general neoclassical and Parisian ambiance in Tunis. The reimagining of existing landmarks as a classical-type monument furthered this image. Decades of negotiations, expropriations and demolition resulted in the ‘liberation’ of the city’s seaward gateway from adjacent structures, resulted in its isolation as a free-standing arched monument. The frequent depiction of the structure emblazoned with the ‘RF’ cipher (for République française, the French Republic) rendered it an arc de triomphe of sorts – a repurposed monument, once Tunisian and thence imperialist French, commemorating the mastering of the ‘traditional’ city beyond. The process is reminiscent of some of Haussmann’s ‘preservation’ tactics in Paris and further linked the periphery to beaux-arts metropole. Even Tunis’ decadent art nouveau Municipal Theatre (1902) by Jean-Émile Resplandy participated; it presented the Avenue Jules-Ferry with sculpted marshmallow-like reliefs of Apollo and two muses above its shaded loggia.

Old Empires Restored

‘Carthage may rightly be reckoned among the metropoleis of antiquity, on a level with Athens, Rome, Alexandria and Constantinople/Byzantium,’ said archaeologist Ronald Docter, an historical fact of which the colonizing French were keenly aware. Founded, according to legend, by Phoenician queen Dido in 814 BC, hometown of Hannibal whose elephants terrorized Italy, and upon its reestablishment by Julius Caesar a century after the Third Punic War (149–6 BC) a Mediterranean city second only to Rome itself, Carthage cast a long shadow from its site just 17 km northeast of modern Tunis. The multifaceted identity of the city – Punic, Roman, Christian – variously suited the interests of colonizing factions, and was exploited as such.

French conceptions of North Africa had been for generations largely informed by classical texts on the region’s Roman history and the long-lost supremacy of its agricultural productivity. Among the most celebrated early accomplishments of the French administration was the renovation of the defunct Carthage aqueducts by Pierre Colin (who had built the Résidence Générale) and the establishment of an antiquities museum on the site of the excavated Carthage acropolis under the direction of Dr. Louis Carton. Celebrations in honor of the opening of Tunis’ modern port facilities in 1893 included a special song replete with self-aggrandizing language further demonstrating this general affinity. Praising ‘the sons of Gaul’ who, ‘raising Carthage once again…follow in its path…[to] rebuilt the Roman Empire,’ the verse effectively captured the imperialist attitude perceptible in early colonial policies and built environments. Other cultural events, such as theatrical performances hosted by the Institut de Carthage in Carthage’s Roman theatre in 1906 and 1907, further indicate that a larger (neo)classical culture existed and demonstrated the profound resonance of such proximate heritage. Tourism at the time was motivated by Orientalist fascination with Arab and Islamic culture, and by a strong attraction to the region’s ancient history. Early tourism infrastructure catered to the latter in hotels built near archaeological attractions, the names of which...
Judging from contemporary political rhetoric, literature, and art, it is clear that the region’s history, specifically its Roman past, resonated profoundly with French colonialists whose leaders likened their presence to a restoration of the Roman Empire. Studying connections between colonial Algeria and ancient Rome, historian Patricia Lorcin identified ‘Rome as a cultural idiom for French domination,’ highlighting its consistent use in ‘nearly all French accounts of Roman Africa.’

It was very much a tool for ‘justification, admiration, and emulation’ the veracity of which was not always the paramount concern. Indeed, the period rhetoric was unambiguous. ‘...The French Africa of today is the Africa of Rome that continues to live, that never ceased living, even during the most troubled and most barbaric of times,’ claimed French novelist Louis Bertrand in 1921. French Morocco’s relatively culturally sensitive governor Hubert Lyautney concurred. ‘Here, in North Africa, we find everywhere the traces of Rome beneath our feet, which proves that we belong here, in the front lines of civilization’ he declared in 1924. Such sentiments echoed across Tunisia as well, where built environments reflected and reinforced these mythologized claims on multiple levels.

Though by 1900 no longer the uncontested aesthetic standard in Europe, neoclassicism remained a popular choice and in a colonial context through the end of the century and almost certainly took on special meaning. In a region rich in ancient history and ruins, the choice of neoclassical architecture was more than just a default one. It came with added symbolic potency that placed it well within the larger colonial project as a valuable tool for not only accommodating colonialists and impressing competing European powers, but also establishing a clear European identity in Tunis. While archival material related to Tunis’ civic projects and their adoption of the neoclassical style explicitly appears limited, with regard to major monuments of the Catholic Church it is quite clear that officials manipulated material and stylistic links to late antiquity very intentionally and with strategic calculation.

The architectural image of the Catholic Church in Tunis exploited another critical facet of Tunis’ distant past – its existence as a regional epicenter for a nascent Christianity in North Africa. Birthplace of influential theologians Tertullian and St. Cyprian (St. Augustine hailed from a town just over the Algerian border too), Carthage had become the seat of Africa’s most esteemed early Christian bishops. Clergy, like many politicians, in the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries were well aware of the symbolic potential of the hallowed site – ‘Carthage… a prestigious name! What memories! What dreams for the future!’ one said. In stressing the pre-Arab past and the re-Christened present many presented the current period of Arab Muslim dominance in the region as an interregnum to be corrected by the restoration of Christian authority. Reflecting the religious and political perspective of the colonialist Church, architects of the cathedrals both in downtown Tunis and suburban Carthage stressed a selective continuity. They composed eclectic styles in order to situate their works within the late Roman, Byzantine, and subsequent brief Crusader periods of the region’s history while generally overlooking the long Arab-Islamic era.

(See Figure 1) An emphasis, particularly in the case of the Tunis cathedral, was placed on the building’s visual relationship to Roman basilica forms, and material links made via the use of stones from Roman-era quarries, water from Roman-era springs in the concrete, and historicist mosaic decorations. While these references to early Christian antiquity were strategically made as oblique justifications for French, that is to say theoretically Catholic, rule, the eclectic nature of the resulting architectures problematize their being labeled 'neoclassical' in the standard sense. That they played a part in the larger use of particularly potent neoclassical imagery is clear, however. The explicitly religious deployment of such antiquity-tied rhetoric seems to have far outlived its secular political counterpart once more sensitive, less triumphalist, associative colonial policies took hold after the turn of the century.

Used during the 1880s and 1890s, colonial neoclassicism in Tunis thus fell within a late stage of the style’s larger popularity, well beyond the period of its intense intellectual or academic theorization and usage in Europe. The neoclassicism of colonial Tunis signified several things. It indicated hierarchical difference within a colonial system fundamentally dependent on the constant delineation of ‘us’ and ‘them.’ It reinforced the idea of political continuity and legitimacy for those in power more so than a generic accumulation of columns, pediments and allegorical figures.
would have elsewhere if removed from the very present material reminders of Tunisia’s classical past. The imagery made sense in light of the larger colonial mission in the region, making the French presence appear both logical and appropriate, both traditional and modern.

**Associative Shifts, Constant Cores**

In 1903 a controversial proposal for the installation of a monument ‘to the glory of France and the Protectorate’ on the Place de la Résidence between Colin’s Résidence and the cathedral sparked debate in Tunis’ city hall. Some were skeptical, deeming the expenditure wasteful and such a commemoration inappropriate after only 22 years of rule, particularly when far more important quality of life issues required the administration’s attention. Following significant deliberation and some public criticism, the project was abandoned. Thus the enthroned allegorical female in Roman armor, reaching down from high above a base of verdant landscape and swirling waves, ox, horse and natives, went unexecuted. Photographs of the models prepared by the sculptor Belloc are all that remain. Exact circumstances of the project’s demise remain unclear, but it does seem like the pompous imagery itself was partially to blame for its failure. The neoclassical revival had passed its prime.

In surveying extant architectures in Tunis and the historical record, it is quite evident that the preferences of French colonialists there shifted decisively not long after 1900. As administrators pursued a somewhat more conciliatory policy of association, official architectural imagery was given a more indigenous appearance. Architecture that Béguin would label the ‘style of the protector’ stemmed from a revised approach that Gwendolyn Wright has identified as an ‘aesthetic strategy of inclusion, with…[an] emphasis on cultural interplay’ that nonetheless reinforced the position of power held by the colonizers. Such work has also been described as arabisant in style and was the specialty of several French architects who established careers in Tunisia merging typical European architectural programs with whitewashed facades, horseshoe arches, crenelated rooflines and minaret-shaped clock towers. The power of the neoclassical image, evocative of both Paris and Rome had become seen as too much, too imperial. The shift away from such references demonstrated an acknowledgment of architecture’s power. So decisive was this change that Béguin characterized the new image as the second of ‘the two faces of France’ in its colonies.

When bold classicism staged a resurgence in the west in subsequent decades it failed to find a place in North Africa, further confirming the perceived impropriety of columns, pediments and imperialist allusions.

**Conclusion: Postmodern Neoclassicists in Contemporary Tunis**

Compelling questions remain with regard to the deployment of antiquity during the early colonial era in Tunisia. Correlation between archaeological interests and neoclassical tastes among colonialists seems both logical and evident, though of course they are not mutually exclusive perspectives. Given the context, each contributed to a larger neoclassical culture, the degree to which the architectures themselves were seen to embody socio-cultural and political ideas explicitly tied to antiquity notwithstanding. Fully assessing the nature of association between conceptions of ancient history and contemporary architecture warrants sustained attention, as lamentably little information definitively addressing many of the era’s architects’ intentions and users’ particular responses to their buildings has come to light. Still, their products spoke, and speak, loudly.

In today’s postcolonial and postmodern context one finds a resurgence of antiquity-based imagery in Tunisia. Divorced from the period of French rule, the classically inspired styles have found new resonance through the blending of new architectures with extant historical ones, reinforcing references to antiquity for contemporary identity making and tourism. Disaggregating history, myth, and materials is not easy, given that they have been complexly intertwined during recent decades. Former president Ben Ali, ousted from power during the first wave of the so-called ‘Arab Spring’ in 2011, had projected an image of cosmopolitan sophistication for both domestic and international audiences. Among Tunisians he aimed, according to classicist Katherine Samuels, to inspire ‘heritage citizens’ through active excavation, preservation and management of Roman sites in Tunisia, wanting to shape ‘individuals into tolerant citizens of the world’ for what are ultimately economic and political purposes. Carthage’s iconic Hannibal was frequently pressed into state service. To political
scientist Waleed Hazbun he came to function as a ‘distinctive, territorially rooted identification for the nation’s external image’ presented in what amounted to a strategic ‘dovetailing of tourism development and image making with national identity formation and mythmaking.’ Highly publicized sites, including a cartoonish ‘Carthageland’ themepark in coastal Hammamet’s tourist zone and a recent US$12.7m expansion of the world-famous Bardo Museum in Tunis, represent the gamut of antiquities-driven touristic activities.

Less spectacular still, however, is the more subtle revival of pseudo-neoclassical architectures with less obvious connections to ancient material. On the central Avenue Habib Bourguiba (ex-Avenue Jules-Ferry), one finds several projects inspired by colonial-era architecture geared towards compatibility along Tunis’ iconic boulevard. During a major reconfiguration of the celebrated boulevard from 2001 to 2003, several buildings that were deemed ‘without a doubt decayed or unrepresentative’ were razed and replaced with structures that based on the ‘interesting and significant architectural elements’ contributing to a desired ‘coherent urban landscape.’ Several of the more postmodern among them make use of classically inspired motifs. The designation of the street as zone touristique in 2002 and its more recent function as the epicenter of the Arab Spring movement confirms the profound importance of the streetscape. Elsewhere ancient history remained relevant. In the wake of the 2011 revolution, the Tunisian tourism ministry sparked controversy in its attempt to lure weary tourists back to its celebrated antiquity sites. ‘The say that Tunisia is in a state of ruins. Come and find out for yourself,’ officials suggested with imagery of green fields and Roman ruins.

The special significance of antiquity-inspired forms, whether directly employed for contemporary heritage tourism or for historic preservation efforts, demonstrates the significance of neoclassical, and neo-neoclassical aesthetics and imagery. In many ways still part of actively mythologized and politicized heritage, these references have maintained their potency and need to be considered. Further research and ongoing analysis of their original deployment in early protectorate-era Tunisia should enrich our understanding of the country’s and region’s modern history, as well as its present identity, challenged and contested as it is by current post-revolution events.

Endnotes

1 For present purposes the terms ‘classical antiquity,’ ‘antiquity,’ and ‘ancient’ will be used, unless otherwise qualified, in the broadest sense to collectively identify historical periods of Tunisian history including the Punic (12th–2nd centuries BC), Roman (146 BC – AD 439), and Byzantine (AD 534-705) eras.
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PORTUGUESE PLAIN ARCHITECTURE:  
WHEN HISTORY CREATES A MYTH

This paper will focus on the slight metamorphoses of architectural discourse accompanying Portuguese political and social context in the last four decades, and how the concept of Plain Architecture, as defined by the American art historian George Kubler plays a role in this progression.

Kubler traveled and lived in Portugal between, during the country First Republic dictatorship, during the mid 1950s and the late 1960s, doing research for what came to be the book Portuguese Plain Architecture: between spices and diamonds 1521-1706 (1972). The premise of the book is the analysis of the architectural production during a moment of political and economical crisis.

The timing of Kubler’s book publication in the early 1970s — on the brink of the 1974 revolution — accompanied a radicalization of the Portuguese architectural discourse. Kubler’s ideas were recovered in the 1990s in Portugal, not long after the tardy publication of the Portuguese translation of Kubler’s book in 1989, and became ubiquitous. More recently, in the aftermath of the global economic crisis of 2008, reemerged the attractiveness towards the small, the peripheral, and the radical. Eduardo Souto de Moura described his own work within the Portuguese Plain tradition. Portuguese Plain became a myth of origin.
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Introduction

In 1955, American writer Mary McCarthy wrote an extended article about Portugal for the New Yorker Magazine. The article gives the impression that she was invited by the ‘propaganda chieftain’, to describe Lisbon as the pretty capital of a ‘benevolent dictatorship.’ She noted the marked difference between the construction of the image of a sophisticated capital and the rest of the country that seemed poorer and backward. She also captured many international influences, manifested in various things, from manners to art.

It is interesting to analyse McCarthy’s essay, since it presents the perspective of a foreigner visiting Portugal in the 1950s, around the same time that George Kubler, the American art historian, began to travel around the country with the objective to study its architecture, as part of the research for one of his contributions to the Pelican History of Art collection.

Kubler’s research about Portuguese architecture lead up to the publication of the book Portuguese Plain Architecture: Between Spices and Diamonds, 1521-1706 (1972). Given the timing of this publication the book became an influence in the characterization of Portuguese architecture by historians and architects from the mid-1970s onwards.

Portuguese Social Context 1950s

Mary McCarthy, while visiting Lisbon, admitted that the Portuguese capital seemed nice enough, but she noted many worrying details, such as the unavoidable sights of manifestations of poverty. Visiting the ‘popular’ neighbourhood of Alfama, that served as a display of ‘local colour’ for tourists to enjoy, McCarthy was impressed by the signs of abject poverty, shown to her as typical characters: “The Lisbonese[sic] are proud of Alfama, which resembles the worst pages of Victor Hugo. Rags, smells, and emaciation team here; the narrow cobbled streets, where the leaning houses almost meet overhead, are dirty and full of verminous-looking dogs; every orange in the stalls has been felt
of his attention, the objects he found interesting – also vernacular and contemporary architecture. But mostly they reflect the character that he defines as Portuguese Plain, as well as the omnipresent poverty that also impressed Mary McCarthy.

Portuguese Plain Architecture

In Portugal, the historian Mário Chicó, who had also been a pupil of Henri Focillon, introduced Kubler to the term Plain Architecture. Plain Style – *Estilo Chão* in Portuguese – was a term that was first used by Julio de Castilho, referring to the unornamented architecture in Lisbon in the sixteenth century, when even palaces and noble houses had simple structures, lacking sophisticated decorations. Kubler, borrows the concept of *plain* defining a moment in the history of Portuguese architecture: Portuguese Plain Architecture. Plain becomes a concept aiming to translate the character of the architecture developed in a period of crisis and austerity between 1500 and 1700 and that resulted in the abandonment of ornamentation. Kubler associates Plain Architecture’s character to the modernist movement in the twentieth century.

For instance, when describing Portuguese ‘hall churches’ Kubler makes a direct comparison with modernist features: “The effect at Jerónimos in Belém, at Arronches or at Freixo de Espada à Cinta was not unlike the mushroom columns in twentieth-century reinforced concrete construction as used under curved shells” (Kubler 1972, 30).

The idea of Plain Architecture implied that there was a conscious decision to build simple structures rather than sophisticated designs. It is based on the belief that this was a matter of choice rather than condition, since it seemed farfetched to believe that an imperial country did not have the resources – material and intellectual – to build more erudite and opulent designs. This position is, up to a point, a recreation of a myth, that characterizes Portugal as a society that is not poor, but chooses to be humble, that is erudite but chooses to be simple, that is invulnerable to foreign trends while trading with many other countries in the world. In sum, that there is a national character that is manifest in many ways, including architecture, and that this character reveals itself in a preference for simple and austere forms.

For Kubler, Portuguese Plain architecture was a hybrid between erudite and popular architecture, manifesting certain essential architectural
properties. This seemed to have a causal connection with the economic and political context of the time, a period of crisis that called for understated buildings and the optimal use of scarce resources for great effect: “The Portuguese plain style is like a vernacular architecture, related to living dialect traditions more than to the great authors of the remote past” (Kubler 1972, 3) and “corresponds to an experimental attitude among designers who were nourished on Renaissance theory and yet were able to disregard its prescriptions in the quest for useful and inexpensive building” (Kubler 1972, 165). Kubler’s thesis implied that the nature of Portuguese architecture did not fit in any of the already defined categories of art history, and thus was an appropriate case study to demonstrate the thesis that Kubler had put forward in his book The Shape of Time (1962).

The process of writing and publishing the book Portuguese Plain Architecture was long, so that it was only published in 1972. At the time the book was well received in Portugal, it was mentioned as one of the most important publications of the year by the historian and critic José Augusto França and won the Academia de Belas Artes prize. Gradually, the book was a catalyst for a change of perspective of art history and in architectural practice in Portugal, because of its emphasis on the specificity of Portuguese architecture.

After the Portuguese revolution in 1974, Portugal became very present in the foreign press, and consequently in international architecture publications too. At the time, left-leaning political ideologies were connected with the image of the country, as Jean-Luc Godard’s film Comment Ça Va (1978) might attest. The film, an essay on the production of images as ideological signs, chooses an image of a Portuguese protest as the centre of its thesis. This is also evident in architecture, and it is manifested in publications such as the Architecture d’Aujourd’hui special issue about Portuguese Architecture in 1976, or the publication of Álvaro Siza’s SAAL project S. Vítor in Porto in an issue of the Italian journal Lotus International in 1978.a Siza’s article reported the process of participation and the relationship between the architects and the population. It presents the project as a radical proposal to maintain the character of popular housing in new developments, adopting the pre-existent self-built typology named ilha operária or proletarian’s islands: “Industrial development in the second half of the nineteenth century in the area to the East of S. Victor, brought about the filling in of the courtyard gardens with workers’ houses on one or two floors, giving maximum exploitation of the lands available. This ‘island’ type invaded the ring around the city centre” (Siza 1978, 80).

The main idea of the project was to maintain the memory of the place while maintaining the proletarian’s island type, creating an interpretation of the character of the place. This was contested by the inhabitants who felt that the stigma of the self-built islands would remain in their new homes: “The image of the island is therefore something that the inhabitants repudiate en mass. But to repudiate this image, which means, implicitly, segregation and poverty, does not necessarily mean refusal of systems of adaptation and whatever is positive in that community life” (Siza 1978, 87).

This emphasis on the recovery of the proletarian’s islands, even against the inhabitants will and thus weakening the participation process, is parallel to Kubler’s description of Plain Architecture: “...a vernacular architecture, related to living dialect traditions more than to the great authors of the remote past” (Kubler 1972, 3).

In 1979, emerged a direct analogy between Plain Architecture, as defined by Kubler, and contemporary Portuguese architectural practice, in an article in the magazine Arquitectura dedicated to the work of architect Vítor Figueiredo, written by the architect Duarte Cabral de Mello. Figueiredo’s projects were mainly State-funded social housing, built with very tight budgets. Given the social and political context of Figueiredo’s works, Mello shaped the analogy with Plain Architecture. According to Mello, Figueiredo’s projects part of the tradition of Portuguese architecture as Kubler presented it, quoting Kubler’s association between Plain Architecture and vernacular architecture.

Like the plain buildings of the seventeenth century, Figueiredo’s projects had great effect using scarce resources. Rather than modernist references, the projects recalled plain spaces where “the interiors were enriched only by proportional refinement, and the coolly rational exteriors of those buildings subsisted without further ornamentation for about a century...” (Kubler 1972, p. 4) Figueiredo's architecture evoked, fifty years later, the sparse and abstract qualities of early modernist projects, and related to the scale and budget of a small peripheral country.
This pairing of comparisons – Kubler compared Portuguese Plain to Modernism, and Cabral de Mello compared VitorFigueiredo’s projects to Portuguese Plain – presents a circular argument where Modernism is positioned in the centre being related to a ‘Portuguese’ way of building and a fundamental quality of national architecture.

This thesis was recovered in the 1990s in Portugal, not long after the tardy publication of the Portuguese translation of Kubler’s book when Kubler’s work gained importance within Portuguese art history scholarship in the graduate program at Universidade Nova de Lisboa. The subject of Plain Architecture eventually migrated to the architectural academic context, when in the 1990s Paulo Varela Gomes, a graduate of the Universidade Nova, expanded the thesis of the Portuguese Plain. The political latency of Kubler’s book, as Varela Gomes read it, was certainly marked by the context of the time of the book’s publication. Although the project started in the mid-1950s, it was only published in 1972, after the countercultures of the 1960s affected the status quo. This timing might have contributed to the perception of Kubler’s project as radical.

In the early 2000s the subject merited an issue in Jornal dos Arquitectos [JA] where its contemporary relevance was discussed in interviews and essays. In this issue Varela Gomes presented Kubler’s thesis as mapping Portuguese architecture in a nonaligned position. By nonaligned he meant that it satisfied the search for a political autonomy with a peripheral nature. According to Varela Gomes, the historiography of architecture in Portugal had been forced to conform to the categorization of European art history according to orthodox sequences of styles: Gothic, Renaissance, Baroque, and so forth. Kubler’s book, with its evident dismissal of the ideal of style, became instrumental in defining an authentic Portuguese architecture: “The concept of plain style presented itself as the true denegation of periphery: it allowed Portuguese architecture some autonomy in relation to the dominion of Italo-centric concepts. Portuguese plain was a new concept that could be as relevant as Renaissance, Mannerism and Baroque.” (Varela Gomes 2001, 6)

In the same JA issue, Alexandre Alves Costa, associated Kubler’s thesis to Fernando Távora’s (1923-2005) scholarship and teaching, stating that “Kubler encouraged us, Távora motivated and taught us and thus, in between travels and conversations, talking with historians rather than reading their books (…) we formulated a premise: there is a Portuguese architecture.”

More recently, in the aftermath of the global financial crisis of 2008, the attractiveness towards the small, the peripheral and the radical re-emerged. Eduardo Souto de Moura inscribed his own work within the Portuguese Plain tradition. In 2012 Siza’s S. Vítor project featured in the exhibition 9 + 1 Ways of Being Political: 50 Years of Political Stances in Architecture and Urban Design at the Museum of Modern Art in New York [MoMA]. The description of the project is latently indebted to Kubler’s idea of an architecture that used scarce resources for great effect, where architects interpreted the vernacular tradition: “This housing project in Porto is one of Siza’s most politically engaged works – due to the architect’s sensitive relation to the existing urban context and the involvement of the population in the process of design. (...) Part of a greater planning intervention intended to renovate a densely packed neighbourhood in the historical centre of the city, the row of twelve houses fills the small site, adapting itself to the locale and offering an alternative for tabula rasa approaches to urban renovation. Poetically blending regional and modern references, the project demonstrates that a scarcity of resources can result in a resonant cultural and political architectural statement.”

Concluding Note
The ideas that were manifest in Kubler’s book about Plain Architecture have a long genealogy. Paradoxically, given the book’s late publication, what was tainted by a nationalist inclination was well received by the new generation of architects, working on the brink of the 1974 revolution, who eventually became internationally established architects.
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THE ‘OHRID SCHOOL’ – CRITICAL REGIONALISM IN SOCIALIST MACEDONIA?

The Ohrid School is a tentative category proposed in the 1980s to capture the architecture built in regional Macedonia in the 1970s. The Letnica Restaurant (1972) by the Hadzieva sisters makes a distinct break by referring to Ohrid’s notable architectural heritage. Traditional Urban Architecture in Ohrid (1982) by the late Prof. Čipan and Prof. Grabrijan’s The Macedonian House (1955/86) had built a case for the region. Complicated by the ‘mediterranean language’ of the Yugoslavian socialist hotel architecture extending along the coastline of Lake Ohrid, this points to the multiplicities of modernism and their entangled histories with critical regionalism.

Popovski’s design for the Pensioners Centre in Ohrid (1973), articulated a different canonical question: at what point can shifts in architecture be identified collectively? The Ohrid School is signified through the cultural geography of Ohrid, but it does not signify the Ohrid region specifically. Popovski became an educational activist leading a rediscovery of pre- and modern rural/town/village architecture. By coining the term, he challenged the discipline/practice at the time to learn to read neglected sites and forgotten references.
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Introduction

The Ohrid School is a tentative category but a discourse around it was examined in an article by the late Živko Popovski in the second issue of the journal Arshin in 1996, after the disintegration of Yugoslavia. Živko Popovski, a progressive Macedonian educator and architect, reviewed the debates in Yugoslavia of the 1970s and 1980s, and considered the critical role of the Ohrid School within architectural identity production in the Socialist Republic of Macedonia. This retrospective examination has opened a terrain where potential historical threads and links may be considered. Over a decade prior, in 1983, Živko Popovski organized a roundtable discussion focused on the question ‘Does Macedonian architecture exist?’ The question was structured in a particular way, and was integral to the idea of the Ohrid School. Shifting the cultural and political geography from Skopje to Ohrid inscribed a question about whether architecture produced in Macedonia was identifiable as such. Many of the speakers point out that this was an important theme of discussion. Its publication in the first issue of the journal A: Journal for Cultural Space (with Popovski as editor) illustrated that the journal A; like the journal Arshin, set the stage for a discursive agenda about then contemporary architecture, focusing on Macedonia, though both were shortlived.

“Does Macedonian architecture exist?”

In Skopje in 1983 Živko Popovski invited key architects and academics to a roundtable discussion focused on the question ‘Does Macedonian architecture exist?’ Professor Boris Čipan adds the word ‘socialist’ to the question: ‘does Macedonian socialist architecture exist?’ Čipan critiques postmodernism in architecture, arguing that unlike in art where it was anti-conformist, in architecture it took on a particularly commercial agenda and drew inspiration from the advertising world. Čipan, and many of the participants of this round table, differentiate postmodernism from the question at hand, and its association with regional identity. Aligned with then interest in
the northern European regionalism, reference to Alvar Aalto (whom Janko Konstantinov worked for) and Asplund, and the Scandinavian and the Dutch, inspired by the Slovenian educator, Edvard Ravnikar provide complex layers to the regionalist reorientation in Macedonia. Popovski and Čipan, like Ravnikar were leading figures in architecture and also held key positions in the university in Macedonia. It was the intelligent and talented architect, Mulićkovski that proposed to make the question distinct: It is not the same as the question ‘Is there a Macedonian architecture?’ [постои ли Македонска архитектура] or ‘Architecture on the territory of Macedonia’ [Архитектура на тлото на Македонија]. Mulićkovski introduced the idea of creativity and whether there was an ‘oeuvre of works’ that can provide the foundation or basis for the identification of Macedonian architecture. Importantly that idea does not vanish. In the 1996 Arshin article, Popovski proposed the Ohrid School was initiated as a first, spontaneous but creative action, or activation, about what was occurring in Ohrid at the time, but was also a reminder of ‘the roots, origins and seeds’ of the architecture existing as part of the historical development of towns like Ohrid. The Ohrid School as category was inscribed through the cultural geography of Ohrid, its strong heritage and embedded traditions, and its exemplary Byzantine architecture, meandering urbanism and archeology. Ohrid is listed as a World Heritage Site for both cultural and natural heritage. But Popovski developed a critical/creative position activated by the Ohrid School: critical that architects did not know how to ‘read’ or ‘observe’ the environment, and could not recognize their identity in the architecture. The proposal was a renewed way of observing and looking, more literally a ‘school’ as a practice of learning to read and recognize the value of existing architecture.

The name ‘the Ohrid School’ presents a historical knot. The prominent Yugoslav architectural critic Zoran Manević, supported by Janko Konstantinov, humours the idea of a Macedonian architectural tradition, and affected its negative reception. The low position of SR Macedonia in a hierarchical political geography of the republics in the Federation of Yugoslavia is one undercurrent to the debate of the Ohrid School. Macedonian architects were generally subservient to the frameworks established in Belgrade and Zagreb. Several factors stage a different scenario in this case. During reconstruction after the 1963 earthquake, Skopje became an experimental field where exceptional architecture was produced by international, leading Yugoslavian, and local architects. Macedonian architects returning from study in prominent schools in the United States (made possible by UN scholarships) further increased the architectural agenda in Macedonia. Popovski had worked for Bakema, was informed of architectural movements and stood up to Manević. Turning Manević’s ridicule into irony, Popovski pointed to the theorist, Bruno Zevi who had identified exactly ‘romantic connections with the region and the Byzantine cultural traditions’ in Konstantinov’s well-known Telecommunications building (Skopje 1979).

Popovski referred to the formation of the Ljubljana School in Slovenia as a precedent for the Ohrid School. Slovenia and Macedonia were at the opposite ends of the hierarchical spectrum of Yugoslavia but their particular geography and cultural histories pull each beyond the centralized ideology. Kulić outlines the case in Yugoslavia as ‘a country that inherited abundant and highly diverse traditional settlements, and yet was on the way to a fast and all-encompassing modernization.’ Modernism had swept through Yugoslavia as a method and ideology of effective modernization/industrialisation such that regional specificity was largely submerged within its overarching agenda. Popovski is presumably referring to the ‘Plečnik School’ as a genealogy of his prodigious students, especially the influential architect and teacher Edvard Ravnikar whose striking works illustrate sensitivity to tectonic production. Rather than arguing that the Ohrid School mimicked the Slovenian case, Popovski was highlighting that Slovenian architects have grasped their genealogy – it was a call for Macedonian architects to articulate a position. There is not extensive publicity of critical regionalism in Yugoslavia, and complexities arise in relation to the entry of postmodernism in Yugoslavian architectural discourse in parallel with a period of consumerism and expansion via Yugoslavian export architecture. This is still a largely unstudied area in Yugoslavia’s architectural history, and works such as the White Mosque by Zlatko Ugljen (199-79, Visoko) support Popovski’s proposal.

The format of Popovski’s 1996 review article included images of architecture parallel to the written extracts of his diary providing a response to the question of creativity and oeuvre. A
dominance on the architectural scene in Macedonia cannot be underestimated. Skopje sucked up all the talent from the other towns, who went to study in Skopje and invariably remained there. Many Macedonia towns such as Bitola that had enjoyed prominence in the 19th century and Ohrid that was historically positioned as a key to Macedonian civilization, were neglected, if not completely elided from the central interest in Skopje. The mass exodus from villages in the transition from an agricultural to an industrial economy resulted in the abandonment of rural life. Nature was rewritten from one associated with peasants and labour to a countryside for leisure and pleasure evident in the expansive construction of hotels and resort architecture in Yugoslavia.

In the early 1970s the Faculty of Architecture of Ss Cyril and Methodius University developed a summer programme by holding a summer school in Ohrid. Thus in 1971, 1972, and 1973 a summer school that ran for three to four weeks was held beside the exemplary St. Sofia Cathedral in Ohrid. This shift of geographical location served to introduce the new generation of students from all schools of architecture in Yugoslavia to Macedonian architectural heritage, and illustrated both the effect of continuing decentralization of the Yugoslav republics, and an awareness of a distinct heritage as platform for a review of its identity. For reasons not known, the Ohrid School discontinued, and its role in the critical regionalist discussion was displaced.

Books, debates, exhibitions, and buildings of the architectural scene and discussion at the time serve as historical tracings and trajectories of the Ohrid School. Two key buildings built in Ohrid have been noted to be the markers of a differentiated regional field of Macedonian architecture. The Letnica Restaurant (1972) by the Hadžieva sisters made a distinct break from both the international modernist agenda and brutalism prominent in Skopje after Kenzo Tange’s master plan. The Hadžieva sisters, Sofija Mizova-Hadžieva and Margarita Trendalfilovska-Hadžieva, are ‘Ohrigani’. Their Ohrid origins has given the question a stranger sense of identity than might be intended by the term. Even though the Letnica Restaurant experimented with an ornamental visual language to partially produce this break it was not interpreted as an example of postmodernism. While there were examples in the 1980s that claim postmodernism as

The Ohrid School: Books and buildings

Like many intricate historical trajectories, the Ohrid School was not a self-conscious architectural movement in practice, but an open idea that was about learning how to do architecture in Macedonia beyond the platform of socialist modernism. Two historical events mark its awakening. In 1974 the Macedonian Association of Architects produced an exhibition entitled Macedonian Architecture that was shown in the Museum of Contemporary Arts in Skopje. Noting that this is approximately a decade after the post-earthquake reconstruction in Skopje, and a decade prior to the roundtable discussion, it is a pivotal historical moment. In the decade between 1963 and 1974 the international focus on Skopje, and a decade prior to the roundtable discussion, it is a pivotal historical moment. In the decade between 1963 and 1974 the international focus on Skopje gave rise to the transformative role of modern architecture, differentiating Skopje from the other towns in S.R. Macedonia. Since Skopje became the capital of the SR Macedonia after WW2, its panoramic view of Ohrid at the end of the 1950s with the Palace Hotel in the distance introduced this visual essay. Images reveal contradictions and questions. For example a description of the uniqueness of the fishing settlement at Kaneo tied to its location between the rock cliffs and the lake is followed by two images – of Kostur (in Northern Greece) and Ohrid – illustrating how they look alike and of the same place. Entangled geographies encounter layered histories. Both the old modernist motel and the new Desaret Hotel in Peštani (P. Mitkov 1973) are shown, as are both the old hotel (V. Antolic, 1952), and the new Gorica Hotel (Kliment Zarov 1971), and most intriguing the old ‘Letnica restaurant’ by the pioneering educator and architect Ljuben Najdenov and the new restaurant by the Hadzieva sisters. In contrast to the catalogue of the 1974 exhibition on Macedonian Architecture that followed a chronological list as an official state agenda, Popovski’s position provided the framework for consideration of critical regionalism, both in 1983 and again in 1996. Popovski was proposing that the Ohrid School include the topographical and topological texture of the cascading hilltown and the modernist Palace Hotel (built as it was on swampland), tracing exemplary architecture designed within the parameters of socialist Yugoslavia. This was intended as critical regionalism that highlighted layered and intersecting histories.
an interest, the Letnica Restaurant seems to have preceded this by a decade. At about the same time, Popovski’s Pensioners Centre was also built in Ohrid (1973). The supergraphics on this building (in the most popular image of the building) also lends itself to a postmodern idiom, but again the influences were more likely to have come from the late 1960s graphic explorations in Italy than the historicist communicative agenda of postmodernism. The design of this proposal deviated radically from anything else that had been built up to that point in Macedonia. Previous attention to form and formalism gives way to a series of parts or typological fragments assembled together into a hybrid whole. (Figure 1)

Both buildings above are in Ohrid, and different to surface béton brut treatment motivated by ornament and symbol that introduced an expressive brutalism in Skopje.26 The hotels that extended along the coastline of Lake Ohrid were complicated by the ‘mediterranean language’ of the Yugoslavian hotel architecture and point to the multiplicities of modernism.27 Ohrid is hardly on the ‘mediterranean sea’ but the tectonics and use of timber produced both a local and regional reference. By including 1950s modernist models, Popovski was pointing to a tradition/trajectory as key to a regional cultural understanding. The example of Anton Ulrih Tourist buildings in Oteševo, 1950, their stone base and arc form, might be the complementary modernist reference to the precise rationalism of the Palace Hotel in Ohrid.

Professor Boris Čipan was a significant figure in this trajectory of critical regionalism and the role of tradition in architecture, and like the Hadžievi sisters, Čipan is also from Ohrid.28 His seminal book, *Traditional Urban Architecture in Ohrid* in 1982 (first published in 1955), along with his book, *Macedonian Towns in the 19th century: their urban perspective* (1978) preceded the roundtable discussion.29 (Figure 2) Čipan was a pioneering socialist architect in Macedonia, but his old school scholarship is evident in the comprehensive research of these two books. He was instrumental in the restoration of the Cathedral St. Sofia in Ohrid in the 1950s under the tutorship of Italian experts (when most

---

Fig. 1: The Pensioners Centre, Živko Popovski, Ohrid 1973

Fig. 1: Cover of Boris Čipan, *Traditional Urban Architecture in Ohrid*, 1982
others were keen on demolition), and published his lifetime work on that structure. Čipan’s focus on the urban context shifted the vernacular study of village or rural architecture, but in effect legitimated traditional architecture as a field of investigation.

In the 1950s, the Slovenian educator, Dušan Grabrijan (1899-1952), also student of the Slovenian master architect, Jože Plečnik, investigated the traditional houses in several regions in Macedonia, including: Štip, Strumica (east Macedonia), Ohrid, Kruševo, and Veles in the summers of 1946, 1947, 1949, and 1950. From his studies and sketchbooks, The Macedonian House was published after his untimely death in 1952. Unlike Architecture of Bosnia and the way Towards Modernity, (1957), its approach followed a modernist appreciation of traditional architecture with an emphasis on spatial qualities and how the house mediates the inside and outside. At the height of the nationalist narrative in socialist Yugoslavia these publication both appropriated the Bosnian/Macedonian difference into a modernist framework and also produced an agenda for a regional/modernist Balkan architecture. Grabrijan’s (1955/1986) and Čipan’s (1955/1978/1982) books influenced a generation of professors, establishing a significant reference for students and architects in S.R. Macedonia. History subjects on the traditional architecture of Macedonia were developed.

The Ohrid School and the position of Popovski, and Čipan’s production, speak again to this dialectic between tradition and modernism.

Articulating the (historical) question

Geography prompts the question of the Ohrid School, but it is essentially a historical question that illustrates entanglement with physical and cultural geography. Zooming out of S.R.Macedonia, it is interesting to note that in 1983, the same year as Popovski’s roundtable, Kenneth Frampton published the essay, ‘Prospects for a Critical Regionalism.’ Its emphasis on the ‘regional schools’ develops a serious distinction from a nationalistic agenda, and makes the story of the Ohrid School more pertinent: “The term critical regionalism is not intended to denote the vernacular, as this was once spontaneously produced by the combined interaction of climate, culture, myth and craft, but rather to identify those regional “schools” whose aim has been to represent and serve, in a critical sense, the limited constituencies in which they are grounded.”

In 1981, Alexander Tzonis and Liane Lefaivre had published their important essay ‘The Grid and the Pathway,’ proposing a critical regional development within modern architecture by examining the work of the husband and wife architect team, Antonakakis. This work and field is geographically close to Ohrid and to SR Macedonia, and it is likely that Macedonian architects, Popovski and Čipan, both well travelled, informed, erudite professors, would be familiar with it. Frampton had read and interpreted this essay, and his focus on the work of Siza and Ando exemplified that critical regionalism was both dispersed internationally while executed by particular architects in a particular place. The argument of Tzonis and Lefaivre outlined the layered narratives of nationalist neo-classical expression in the Grid, and critical effort to overcome the division between the village and the city, or the peasants and the urban elite – the Pathway. However, the Pathway, captured as it was in visual photographic fragments, and in plan, appears to be very close to the more organic Ottoman urban tradition and illustrates why Ohrid and Kostur look and feel similar as an architectural and urban place.

Is this what Popovski was exploring? His design for the Pensioners Centre in Ohrid (1973) is not a monumental, symmetrical building, but an assembly of parts. It exemplified in design what was articulated in the canonical question: architecture needs to shift due to new and pertinent observations that affect its self-recognition and specific place in history, and the references it puts to the community. The Ohrid School contained this revived focus on the site, but ‘site’ was not only a spatial or geographic reference, it referred to history – both past and present. The name Ohrid School was not arbitrary, but compelled to constitute that architectural trajectory out of a layered and multiple history. For Popovski a regionalist architecture was: “to build with that in mind, and to explore how the meaning of building is tied with the meaning of that kind of specific action in the site or place; and that this might be more important than the function of the building.”

From the perspective of the protagonists Popovski and Čipan, the Ohrid School stands for an awakening of the different position of Macedonia within the Federation of Yugoslavia. Architectural modernism came from the centres – Ljubljana, Zagreb and Belgrade. The Ohrid School attempted to delineate a distinct trajectory by tying the
regional tendencies within modernism, with the traditional architecture that had evolved from other histories, and in that moment in 1983, not only as site specificity but also as question of identity. The Austro-Hungarian Empire and its huge influence on the north/western republics of Yugoslavia cannot explain the histories of Macedonia, Yugoslavia’s most south/eastern republic. Ottoman oriental urbanism and architecture, an extensive and significant Byzantine tradition, and its proximity to Greece provided for Macedonia different conditions for critical regionalism.

The Ohrid School was a shortlived idea. However, Popovski became an educational activist leading a rediscovery of pre-modern and modern rural/town/village architecture and developed a curriculum of history, theory and design studio tied to particular sites in Macedonia. By coining the term, he challenged the discipline/practice at the time to learn to observe, read and recognize neglected sites and forgotten references. This always passed through a critical framework about identifying the role of architecture and how to identify projects/works of significant value: a lesson that is overlooked in the present historicist frenzy again centred on Skopje.
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3 Participants included Petar Muličkovski ( Communist Party Central; Ss. Kliment Library), Slavko Brezovski (Workers Housing), Mimoza Tomić (key member for the reconstruction of the Old Turkish Bazaar), Janko Konstantinov (Telecommunications Building), and Boris Čipan (key role in conservation and heritage). And two (then) young academics Mitoš Hadži-Pulya and Jasmina Siljanovska that have gained profile in the current generation. Vangel Božinovski, a member of the editorial of the journal A: argued, "Architectural criticism is a weak side of Yugoslav architecture and a sore point of Macedonian architecture." Vangel Božinovski, A: 1/(1983), 5 (the only page translated into English). Not surprisingly, Božinovski is one of the architects behind the current surge of the pan-historicist erection of facades and structures that has effectively erased Skopje’s modernist/socialist landscape.

4 Qualifying this with reference to Henri Lefebvre and his small book, The Urban Revolution, translated R. Bonnono, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, 2003 (originally published 1970), in which according to Čipan, Lefebvre states that the socialist nations roam/wander in the capitalist world.

5 Contrasting perspectives evolve in the discussion, including a matter of fact approach, highlighting data: 3000 architectural technicians from the polytechnics; 251 planning and construction organisations with 58,000 employees; architectural awards including, ‘Borba,’ ‘11 October,’ ‘13 November’ followed by the areas and volumes of buildings in the period 1968-1980; and finally the exhibition of Macedonian Architecture in Belgium in 1980.

6 This reiterated by Mumford’s Bay region style

7 A point repeated by Popovski in his 1996 retrospective essay.


9 Vlatko Korobar, the editor of Arshin invited Popovski for a review of the ‘Ohrid School.’ Popovski provides contextualization of the issues surrounding the activation of the term ‘Ohrid School’ and proceeds as a memoir of his thoughts and experiences extracted from diary notebooks at various intervals from 1966 onwards. In the contextualization he notes that the formation of the Ljubljana School was a cultivated and considered response to the question of regionalism. (Popovski refers to the journal Arhitektura 176 + 7/1981, Zagreb).


11 In 1979, the UNESCO Committee decided to inscribe the Ohrid Lake on the World Heritage List under natural criteria (iii). In 1980, this property was extended to include the cultural and historical area, and cultural criteria (i)(iii)(iv) were added. http://whc.unesco.org/en/list/99.
Many of the first generation architects were educated in Belgrade, Zagreb, and Ljubljana; but once the Faculty of Architecture was established in 1949, students left their hometowns to study in Skopje.


Živko Popovski (professor and Dean), ‘Fifty Years Architecture Faculty,’ in *50 years Architecture Faculty*, Jubilee catalogue 1999: 8-9.

By 1974 the school was characterized as ‘liberal technical’ and unable to continue work in the future. The idea of a regional summer school was also abandoned until a similar idea was revived in the early 1990s, but this time in Kriva Palanka, a much smaller town north-east of Skopje (near border with Bulgaria). This was held in the extraordinarily sited Monastery St. Joachim designed by the acclaimed master mason Andreja Damjanov. Kriva Palanka does not have the same prominent place in the history of Macedonia as Ohrid, and the shift gave rise to creative explorations but diminished the regional question. This shift of geography displaced the regional question.

Muličkovski’s Ss. Kliment Library and Centre for the Communists, and Čipan’s MANU building in Skopje, or Muratovski’s Cultural Centre in Tetovo.

See presentation of several other buildings in Popovski’s 1996 retrospective essay.

The theoretical teachings in the post second world war period of Professor Sotir Tomovski on then contemporary architecture, and Professor Boris Čipan on the history of art, contributed to establishing a foundation in enquiry and investigation about the practice of art and architecture (Popovski 50 years :7).

Popovski first delivered a presentation titled, ‘The young/new Macedonian architecture’ to BIMAS (Macedonian Architecture Association annual meeting, February 1981). The Macedonian architectural community was mixed, reserved or negative.

In the IT Newspaper (no. 959.30.3 1984) Zoran Manević framed the 1983 roundtable discussion as an adventure with the heading ‘Macedonian record experiment’.

However, frail, the Ohrid School and Popovski’s question, ‘Does Macedonian architecture exist?’ is complicated as it contains a philosophical question of existentiality as in ‘dwelling’ as the literal translation is ‘dwelleth’.

Manević used almost the same words and narrative to describe the changes to the modernist idiom of Yugoslavian architecture. Manević in Vladimir Kulić, Maroje Mrduljaš and Wolfgang Thaler, *Modernism in-Between: The Mediatory Architectures of Socialist Yugoslavia* (Berlin: Jovis Verlag, 2012), see Part 4 (74-118).

Popovski refers to the journal *Arhitekturna* 176 + 7/1981, Zagreb


The Palace Hotel, a modernist masterpiece designed by the pioneering Slovenian architect, Edo Mihevc became the focus of several images.

Now abandoned and falling into disrepair this building exemplifies the tragedy of Macedonian architects and Macedonia not rising to the challenge of Popovski’s call, especially after the disintegration of Yugoslavia.


In the decade between 1963 and 1974 the influx of an international community of architects (and other experts) and architecture, the sheer quantity of architectural production, and the escalation of standard and aspiration, all focused on Skopje.

Many of the first generation architects were educated in Belgrade, Zagreb, and Ljubljana; but once the Faculty of Architecture was established in 1949, students left their hometowns to study in Skopje.
I Makedonska kyќa ili preod od stara orientalska vo sovremena evropska kyќa, Ljubljana: Državna založba Slovenije, 1955). Dušan Grabrijan (1899-1952) was a student of the Slovenian master architect, Jože Plečnik, and with Juraj Neidhart (who worked for Le Corbusier), fascinated by the modernist characteristics of the traditional Bosnian house, published Architecture of Bosnia and the way Towards Modernity, (Dušan Grabrijan and Juraj Neidhart, Architecture of Bosnia and the Way Toward Modernity, (Ljubljana: Mladinska Knjiga, 1957).

31 Grabrijan's study is methodologically rigorous but in approach, recalls an earlier seminal travel study, Le Corbusier’s Journey to the East. Le Corbusier travelled through the Balkans in 1911, and his emphasis on the ‘white room’ of the traditional house in the Balkan region found its evolution into a modernist idiom. (Le Corbusier, Journey to the East; edited and annotated by I. Žaknić ; translated by Ivan Žaknić with J. Gery and N. Pertuiset (Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 2007).


33 Historian Jasmina Hadzieva-Aleksievska’s dissertation on Why the Veles House is called the Macedonian House, strengthened historical investigations in the Faculty in Skopje, and this was established through texts/guide books on traditional Macedonian architecture.

34 Critical regionalism has been keen to distant itself from a traditionalist approach to architecture especially one prompted by nostalgia towards the loss of traditional architecture in the processes of modernization. Yet the ‘Ohrid School’ and the parallel transitions in education and publication, illustrated that a new way of looking at tradition, both architecturally and historically, was integral to considering regionalism critically.


38 Could the architectural effort be towards a historical reconciliation after 400 hundred years of Ottoman urbanism? In addition, the pathway is a strange reminder of the oblique view referenced to Le Corbusier in his journey to the Acropolis, influential within modernism.

39 The Ohrid School is differentiated from the Debar School, the former defining a critical regionalism after modernism, and the latter a tradition of architecture in the region of Debar extending to other parts due to the mobility of the master masons that took their skills to projects (Krum Tomovski, ‘The Master Builders of the ‘Debar School,’ in The Macedonian Review: History, Culture, Literature, Arts, (Skopje: ‘Kulturen život” (Cultural Life),vol. II/1 (1972). The latter defines a master mason tradition that established the skills, tectonics, materials and construction processes within Debar, a region in west Macedonia not far from Ohrid.


42 Modernism was manifested through influential iconic modernist structures and the first Professors in Skopje.

43 One observation in Čipan’s book is that the old town of Ohrid lies between two mounds, and not as is often believed on a hill. It is the same approach as the observation of Popovski when he encountered the fishing village at Kaneo, where the dwellings mediate the rock outcrop and the lake of Ohrid.
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