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Abstract

The book proposes a survey of buildings from the first half of the 20th century in Europe. A first article will give an overview of the spread of the buildings from this time in Europe, focusing on a new construction material: the reinforced concrete, on the basis of a chapter from the doctorate thesis of Maria Bostenaru supervised by Cristina Gociman. For the documentation of these, Maria Bostenaru did study trips to investigate the buildings on site in the past 15 years. At the basis of these study trips was the literature review in the field, from which we highlight the references provided by a study seminar at the University of Karlsruhe about architecture in the first half of the 20th century in Eastern Europe and the series of books on 20th century architecture by Prestel. Apart of this monographs dedicated to the countries subject of the research were consulted. The result of the research on site were mostly the investigation through photography of the facade, which displayed a new language compared to the previous period. Where it was possible, this was combined with the investigation of the interior space. Also, sources of the floor plan were looked for, from the references but mostly from archives. As a result, the book includes a review of the study trips documentation, with example images, references and the connection to the online database of photography. The online database built the subject of a common research of Maria Bostenaru with Alex Dill during a short visit funded by NeDiMAH at the Karlsruhe Institute of Technology and the goal of this publication is to document this database. Browsing the database is predeceded by forms on selected architects, for which we present also the biography, along with main works and visual material. In the idea of forms are also the posters of Cristina Gociman about Romanian architects which created cultural heritage during this time. The research thus started at the University of Karlsruhe, where Alex Dill, chair of DOCOMOMO Germany (The association for the documentation and conservation of buildings, sites and neighbourhoods of the Modern Movement) approached the second pillar of the association apart of documentation: conservation. A series of workshops were dedicated to invite specialists from different countries, thematically organised, who were involved in conserving these buildings. The book contains reviews of these conferences and a chapter by Alex Dill about this conservation.
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1. Introduction

This study is a follow-up of a doctoral thesis in the field, which dealt with the buildings from the first half of the 20th century. There was a pre-study on the preservation of historic reinforced concrete housing buildings across Europe, which dealt with decision in seismic retrofit, while the next one dealt with the European features of the spatio-functional organization of buildings from this period. The focus on seismic retrofit led to questions on intervention on and conservation of these buildings. This led to a successful virtual collaboration supported by short visits on the conservation of the Modern Movement. Along with the geographic differences given by the spread of the building typologies in the first half of the 20th century, characteristics in conservation and in spatio-functional organization were researched, too. While thematic essays feature these aspects, the organization in forms gives the parcour of architect’s performance in different countries and of the image of the countries themselves.

1.2 Methodology

The research aimed to document comparatively the spread of mainstream architectural styles along with specifics across Europe. Different typologies, both in their façade and in their interior organization, lead to different needs in conservation. One research method employed was the study on site. For this study trips were organized, as documented in the book. For each study trip an urban route has been designed, based on the information in the literature provided, or on the information from a seminar in Karlsruhe. Apart of the exterior view, to document the façade and style, interior visits were aimed whenever possible. Such tours are sometimes part of raising awareness in the cities towards this heritage and part of the conservation strategy. Along with the geographic tours the vita of the architects active in the respective cities and their main works built material to forms. From urban scale to building scale the interior space was documented in archival research. Another research method was the invitation to experts from the respective countries. For this the second author invited experts to present their conservation approaches in Karlsruhe, both in lecture and in exhibition. The contributions to this book review these approaches. For Bucharest the materials flew into an exhibition related to the historic not geographic development: landmark buildings for each year.
2. Modernism in Bucharest / Maria Bostenaru

The built substance in Bucharest was analysed both typologically and sub-area wide, employing urban area survey methods, which allowed identifying the morphological types in the building stock. The “interwar” building class, that constitutes an architectural landmark, but proved to be the most vulnerable to earthquakes, being founded on alluvial soft soil deposits with high ground water level and having in most cases a seismically inadequate conformation, has potential to prove how early multidisciplinary collaboration resulted in better performance.

Seismic building damage depends on the ground motion (amplitude, frequency, shaking duration) and the building structure (resonance period related to subsoil local transfer) characteristics. The destruction amount in Bucharest was attributed mainly to the so-called “Mexico-city” effect on alluvial soil deposits. This layer amplified the seismic site response in the period range critical for pre-damaged interwar buildings, with structures designed for gravitational loads only, altered unfavourably to later function changes. The fundamental period of the flexible Modernism skeleton structure buildings was 0.7-1.6s, a range which corresponds to the spectral maximum obtained for the only reliable accelerogram recorded in Bucharest during the 1977 Vrancea earthquake.

The hydrostatic level varies from 1–5 m in the meadows to bellow 10 m in the plains. Soil-structure interaction is important also for the problematic foundations of these buildings. The architectonic landmarks of Modernism in Romania, located on unfavourable sites according to seismic microzonation, would perform bellow satisfactory in an earthquake with similar spectral content to the 1977 one.

Rules for seismic design were first introduced in Romania after awareness raised by the damage in the 1940 earthquake. A practicing

---

1. This chapter represents an improved illustration of a part of an article published in Natural Hazards and Earth System Sciences 5, 397–411, 2005 by Maria Bostenaru Dan, under the title “Multidisciplinary co-operation in building design according to urbanistic zoning and seismic microzonation”


engineer, leading one of the enterprises which implemented innovative structural and construction management solutions for this building type, documents\textsuperscript{4} successful engineer-architect collaboration during the boom-time of constructing in Avantgarde style\textsuperscript{5}. Although interrupted during the economic crisis, this was both incentive and opportunity raiser for creative design and technical solutions in constructing with a material new that time. This co-operation made many reinforced concrete building initiatives possible. Far from adopting the simplest ideal conformation, usability and aesthetics strongly influenced the structural solution. An array of success stories is documented in the following.

Bucharest saw 1920–1940, in two decades of intense building efforts, the construction of the buildings which give its face of today, many of them designed by world-class architects. It was a unique time when not the aesthetics governed, but a solution to the problems of the society: the lack of housing suiting the life style. Urban legislation reacted with the 1934 Master Plan to the anticipated impact of economic development in interwar Romania on urban areas. The land-use occupancy ratio was prescribed for the central zone. Numerous multifunctional (housing, office, shops, cinemas) complexes were constructed making maximum land-use, allowed only with 30\% of the total admitted building volume at ground level. The multiple usage of the space through building in the height in urban agglomerations is a concretisation form of the “fight-for-space“ of “urbanforces“\textsuperscript{6} in opposition. The properties of the urban space result from the interaction of social groups modelling it. Bucharest’s central luxurious residences illustrate how a move of interests of the social groups in the urban territory has a parcours, which it follows till finding place. The centre is a special case of the character-of-a-zone. A texture completes spatially another texture when, through organised superposition, they generate mixed assemblies with complex character. In subdivisions of the central area either residential/central functions dominate or dominant residence co-operates with central functions. On the N-S boulevard in Bucharest a spatial co-operative superposition of urban textures with complementary character contributes to a specific zonal ambient. The commercial, cultural, administrative, and residential space complexity expresses a necessity. The

\textsuperscript{4} E. Prager: Betonul armat în România, Editura Tehnică, București, 1979.

\textsuperscript{5} M. Bostenaru Dan: —Early reinforced concrete frame condominium building with masonry infill walls designed for gravity loads only\%, in: EERI: World Housing Encyclopaedia summary publication, Oakland, CA, USA, Report ID 96, 2004a.

\textsuperscript{6} A. Sandu, course material, “Ion Mincu” University of Architecture and Urbanism
afferent space is conditioned through its occupation reported to the “life-way“, with its socio-economic development and the natural environment conditions in the context of a continuous intervention process in time.

The N-S main boulevard in Bucharest is characterised by typological unity. Residential buildings feature the same structural type of reinforced concrete skeleton. Due to their Modernist style, they belong to a common architectural typology. This building class considered displays a socio-architectural type with a certain typology of the housing unit developed that time. Finally there are common characteristics of the type concerning the ownership pattern and eventual economic strategies resulting therefrom.

**Fig. 1.** The plan of the protected constructed zone ZCP 04 “Modernist boulevard” in Bucharest. Grey: listed buildings ([http://www.lexcivitas.ro/images/stories/04_bratianu.jpg](http://www.lexcivitas.ro/images/stories/04_bratianu.jpg))
Fig. 2. Bloc of flats, Nicolae Bălcescu 7-9, Architect Jean Monda (1934-35). Facade drawing and plan from the Town Hall of Bucharest city archives (PMB fond ethnic). Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2015. Listed Cod LMI: B-II-m-B-18104.
Fig. 3. Creditul minier, architect State Baloșin (1937). Facade drawing and plan from the Town Hall of Bucharest city archives (PMB fond ethnic). Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2015.
Fig. 4. The building on Bălcescu 26 „The palace of the Society for the Economic Action of Romania“, architect Leon Silion (1925). Archive photo source Rezistența urbană (http://rezistenta.blogspot.com), archive image source: Town Hall of Bucharest archives (PMB fond ethnic). Listed Cod LMI: B-II-m-B-18106.
Fig. 5. “Wilson” block of flats (Creditul Rural), architect State Baloșin (1934-36). Foto: M. Bosteanu, 2002, archive photo: Rezistența urbană (http://rezistenta.blogspot.com), archive plans: Town hall of Bucharest archives (PMB fond tehnic).

Not all buildings behaved badly – some of them displayed a good behaviour as a result of the collaboration between engineer and architect (Fig. 7). We wrote about this in Bostenaru (2005). Here we include a map and a brief naming of the buildings, together with their photographs and plans.
1. C.A.M. (Fig. 8) (architect: Duiliu Marcu, reinforced concrete project Mihail Hangan, execution: -). Listed Cod LMI: B-II-m-A-19871. New technical prescriptions were strictly applied. Architecturally it is characterised by modernist asymmetry and a subtle neoclassicism in the U-shaped plan, as well as high quality finishings.

2. Casa Magistraților (Fig. 9) (architect: Duiliu Marcu, reinforced concrete project: Mircea Gheorghiu, execution: Mircea Gheorghiu). Commercial, office, residential use. At the first floor a festivity hall required for Vierendel frames and beams in order to sustain the masonry walls of the upper floors. Carefully made execution. The architecture is related to that of a building by Leopold Medilanski, currently in retrofit.

3. Bloc „Patria” with cinema (Fig. at the form on the architect) (architect: Horia Creangă, reinforced concrete project: Cristea Mateescu and Ștefan Mavrodin, execution: -). Listed Cod LMI: B-III-m-A-19116. There were difficult static problems for the balcony and roof of the cinema hall. The lateral and gravitational loads are carried by frames forming both the walls and the roof (with parabolic arcs) of this hall. Missing other lateral load resistance prescriptions, the frames were computed for wind loads, although the hall, half located in the basement and placed in a building interior was very lightly solicited this way. Cristea Mateescu used the method "Cross", introduced in Romania in that year (1934). These computations leaded to sufficient stability at any lateral forces. The balcony is the most important construction of this kind, executed not just in RC but also steel. The foundation lays higher than at neighbouring buildings. This work was a milestone of modern RC buildings. It marked the begin of reshaping the forms of the boulevards. The expressive composition contributed to the rhythm of the boulevard with a tower, which became a typical Romanian modernist corner solution.

4. Hotel „Ambasador” (Fig. 10) (architect: Arghir Culina, reinforced concrete project: Dumitru Maruc, execution: Tiberiu Eremia). Listed Cod LMI: B-II-m-B-19115. The entire assembly presents a judicious structural solution: side bodies, free façade on the courtyard of the upper storeys, decreasing size of the upper storeys. Recesses above a certain "shade"-height were dictated by the urban regulation. Architecturally the building has a monumental appearance, due to symmetry and presence of vertical elements. Urbanistically is a rhythmic point along the boulevard through the set-back courtyard. It forms an impressive complex with the "Patria“ building.

5. Hotel „Union” (architect: Arghir Culina, reinforced concrete project: Emil Prager, execution: Emil Prager). Short terms for execution and
delivery leaded to construction and installation works made simultaneously. The central situation of the parcel generated hard organisation conditions. A special RC work was done because of the higher laid foundation of the neighbouring building: the new foundation was made through a tunnel gallery. Strongly damaged during WWII (4 upper floors and 2/3 of the surface of the building), it could be repaired without further strengthening.


7. Bloc of flats on Calea Victoriei 23 (architect: L. Negoiescu, reinforced concrete project: Jean Hascal, execution: M. Calmanovici). Listed Cod LMI: B-II-m-B-19849. The exterior columns of the skeleton start from the ground floor, being sustained by a concrete wall which constitutes the exterior wall of the basement and which bears the loads from the ground.

8. Bloc of flats on Calea Victoriei 68/70 – “Generala” (Fig. at the form on Richard Bordenache) (architect: Nicolae Nenciulescu, reinforced concrete project: Luigi Cora, execution: Emil Prager). Recently listed, we consulted the dossier. It has two basements and a soft storey. A RC dome over the ground floor widely opened to Calea Victoriei with glass bricks corresponding to the lighting courtyard of the 7 upper storeys. This hole had 10m span. For this purpose a “wall-beam” was constructed within the mezzanine wall of the façade. Other special problems were provided by the functional use, including parking on the whole basement area, residences and offices in the upper floors, commercial use on the ground floor. Executed very carefully, it proved to be easy to maintain.

9. Bloc of flats at the crossing Calea Victoriei – Splaiul Independenței (architect: Nicolae Cucu, and Gheorghescu, reinforced concrete project: Mihail Hangan, execution: Jean Hascal). Listed Cod LMI: B-II-m-B-19839. It consists of two building wings, one of them next to Splaiul Unirii (the street along the Dâmbovița River). It was founded on a general mat at ~6m depth, the one of ground water. A special solution was adopted for a ground column which was removed, being replaced by a RC frame element made with fast casted cement, with only 12h of hardening.

10. Bloc of flats on Splaiul Independenței (architect: Petre Antonescu, reinforced concrete project: Dim Marcu, execution: Tiberiu Eremia). Listed Cod LMI: B-II-m-B-18938. Special solution to avoid having columns at ground floor level: 3 column arrays at upper floors and only 2 at lower floors: RC Vierendel columns over the ground floor in the whole height of the mezzanine – no problems with openings in the party walls of the mezzanine. Columns to the lighting yard were also discontinued at the level be-
tween mezzanine and first floor. They are sustained by a high beam "macaz cu tirant". The skeleton of the upper floors was computed after the German circular from year 1925.

**Fig. 7.** Buildings with reinforced concrete skeleton structure in Bucharest, and special structural solution. Identification of the buildings according to Prager (1979). Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2010.
Fig. 8. C.A.M. Palace. Section and plan: Town hall of Bucharest archives (PMB fond ethnic)
Fig. 9. Magistrates house, architect Duiliu Marcu (1935). Perspective drawing, facade and plan from the Town Hall of Bucharest city archives (PMB fond ethnic).
Fig. 10. Hotel “Ambasador”, architect Arghir Culina (1935), facade and plan from the Town Hall of Bucharest city archives (PMB fond ethnic).
3. Historic development of 20th century Romanian heritage / Cristina Gociman

The cultural project “Romanian architects – creators of cultural heritage” led by Cristina Olga Gociman, was funded initially for the 2012 National Architecture Biennale by the Ministry of Culture, and continued supported by the Romanian Cultural Institute in an international itinerary. The “Ion Mincu” University of Architecture and Urbanism created a permanent gallery for it. The initial panels can be seen at:

https://www.bnab.ro/2012/expo-arh-rom/

The complete list of the panels is the following:

1869 architect Alexandru Orăscu University palace, Piața Universității, Bucharest
1871 architect Alexandru Orăscu Grand Hotel du Bulevard, Bulevardul Elisabeta, Bucharest
1889 architect Ion Mincu House Monteoru-Catargi, Calea Victoriei, Bucharest
architect Ion N. Socolescu House Ionescu-Gion, Str. Lucaci nr. 33, Bucharest
1890 architect Ion Mincu Central School of Girls, Str. Icoanei, Bucharest
1891 architect Ion D. Berindei House Macca, Archeology Institute „Vasile Pârvan”, Bucharest
architect Felix Xenopol Macca-Villacrosse passage, Calea Victoriei/Str. Eugen Carada
1892 architect George Mandrea Fire observatory, Piața Foișorul de Foc, Bucharest
architect Ion Mincu Bufetul de la șosea (restaurant), str. Ion Mincu, Bucharest
architect Ion N. Socolescu Normal school Carol I, str. Mărăști nr. 15, Câmpulung Muscel
1897 architect Ion Mincu House Gheorghe Robescu, Str. Mihai Bravu nr. 28, Galați
1897-1905 architect Ion Mincu Vaults Ghica, Stătescu, Gheorghieff, Lahovary, Cantacuzino, Bucharest
1898 architect Ion D. Berindei House with lions, str. Dianei, Constanța
architect Toma Dobrescu National college „Tudor Vladimirescu”, Târgu Jiu
architect Ștefan Ciocârlan  Palace of the newspaper „Adevărul”, str. Constantin Mille, Bucharest
1900 architect Alexandru Săvulescu  Post palace, Calea Victoriei nr. 12, Bucharest
1903 architect Ion D. Berindei  Cantacuzino Palace, Calea Victoriei nr. 141, Bucharest
1904 architect Ion Mincu  Stavropoleos church, str. Stavropoleos nr. 4, Bucharest
architect Ion Mincu  Administrative palace, Str. Domnească, Galați
1905 architect Cristofii Cerchez  Nicolae Minovici villa, str. Dr. Nicolae Minovici nr. 1, Bucharest
1908 architect Petre Antonescu  Brătianu houses, str. Biserica Amzei nr. 3-5, Bucharest
architect Ștefan Burcuș  Bursa palace, str. Ion Ghica nr. 4, Bucharest
architect Nicolae Mihăescu  House Mița Biciclista, str. Cristian Tell nr. 9, Bucharest
1909 architect Ion D. Berindei  Astronomy observatory Amiral Vasile Urseanu, Bucharest
1910 architect Petre Antonescu  Palace of the Ministry of Public Works, Bucharest
architect Daniel Renard  Casino, Boulevard Regina Elisabeta, Constanța
1911 architect Grigore Cerchez  Odeon theatre, Calea Victoriei, Bucharest
architect Dumitru Maimarolu  Palace of the Military Circle, Bucharest
architect Nicolae Mihăescu  Saints Nicolae and Alexandru cathedral, Sulina
1912 architect Spiridon Ceganeanu  House Gh. Petrașcu, Piața Romană corner with Căderea Bastiliei, Bucharest
architect Grigore Cerchez  Justice Palace, Str. Domnească, Galați
architect Arghir Culina  Cișmigiu hotel, Boulevard Regina Elisabeta, Bucharest
architect Nicolae Nenciulescu  Summer garden Capitol, str. Constantin Mille, Bucharest
1913 architect Petre Antonescu  Casino in Sinaia, parc Dimitrie Ghica
architect Ion D. Berindei Cantacuzino palace – Small Trianon, Florești, Prahova
1914 architect Statie Ciortan Palace Vama Poștei, str. Lipscani nr. 1, Bucharest
architect Ernest Dpondeaud Pavillion of the bathes in Govora
1915 architect Dumitru Maimarolu Armenească church, Bucharest
architect Paul Smărăndescu Vânători villa, Boulevard Carol nr. 43, Sinaia
1916 architect Dumitru Maimarolu Palace of the Chamber of Deputies, Mitropoliei alley, Bucharest
1921 architect George Sterian House of architect George Sterian, Str. Mihai Eminescu nr. 10, Bacău
1923 architect Petre Antonescu Palace of the Marmorosch Blank bank, str. Doamnei nr. 4, Bucharest
1924 architect Virginia Haret „Tinerimea Română” block, str. Schitu Măgureanu, Bucharest
1926 architect Virginia Haret House of the architect, Spătarului entry nr. 8, Bucharest
1927 architect Grigore Cerchez Faculty of Architecture Ion Mincu, str. Biserica Enei nr. 1, Bucharest
architect Cristofî Cerchez Czech embassy in Romania, str. Ion Ghica nr. 11, Bucharest
architect Florea Stânculescu Agriculture palace, Brăila
1928 architect George Matei Cantacuzino Palace of the Bank Chrissoveloni, Str. Lipscani, Bucharest
architect Duiliu Marcu State Theatre, Timișoara
architect Ion D. Traianescu Madona Dudu church, Craiova
1929 architect Paul Smărăndescu Cerbu hotel, Sinaia
1930 architect George Matei Cantacuzino Tudor Arghezi memorial house, str. Mărțișor, Bucharest
architect Octav Doicescu Restaurant in Băneasa forest, Privighetorilor Alley, Bucharest
architect Jean Pompilian Extension of the Belvedere cigarette factory, Calea Giulești nr. 1-3, Bucharest
1931 architect Horia Creangă ARO block, Boulevard Magheru, Bucharest
architect Marcel Iancu villa Jean Juster, str. Silvestru nr. 75, Bucharest
1932 architect Horia Creangă villa Bunescu, Aleea Alexandru nr. 12, Bucharest
architect Nicolae Nenciulescu Royal Palace, Calea Victoriei nr. 49-53, Bucharest
architect Gheorghe Simotta  Block on Str. Atena nr. 20, Bucharest
architect Petre Antonescu  Accademia di Romania, Rome
architect State Baloshin  Block Wilson, Boulevard Magheru nr. 2, Bucharest
architects George Cristinel/Constantin Pomponiu  Orthodox cathedral, Piața Avram Iancu, Cluj-Napoca
architect Constantin Iotzu  Palace of the Association of Veterinary Doctors, Boulevard Elisabeta nr. 53, Bucharest
architect Duiliu Marcu  Block Aleea Modrogan nr. 1, Bucharest
architect Jean Pompilian  Al. I. Cuza University, Iași

architect George Matei Cantacuzino  Bellona hotel, str. Falezei, Eforie Nord
architect Statie Ciortan  Town museum, Câmpulung Muscel
architect Horia Creangă  Elisabeta Cantacuzino villa, Aleea Alexandru corner with str. Tirana, Bucharest
architect Dumitru Ionescu-Berechet  Town hall, Câmpulung Muscel
architect Marcel Locar  Cantacuzino block, str. C.A. Rosetti nr. 43, Bucharest
architect Paul Smârândescu Sanda villa, Balchik, Bulgaria
architect George Matei Cantacuzino  Palace of Industrial Credit, Piața Universității, Bucharest

architect Horia Creangă  Ottulescu block, str. Gh. Manu nr. 12, Bucharest
architect Grigore Ionescu  Toria sanatory, Covasna
architect Toma T. Socolescu  Central halls, Str. Griviței, Ploiești
architect Horia Teodoru  Restoration of the Curtea Veche church, str. Franceză, Bucharest
architect Petre Antonescu  Palace of the Faculty of Law, Boulevard Kogălniceanu nr. 36-46, Bucharest
architect Henrieta Delavrancea-Gibory  House Prager, Boulevard Aviatorilor nr. 32, Bucharest
architect Octav Doicescu  Miorița fountain, Șoseaua București-Ploiești
architect Duiliu Marcu  Special train station Băneasa, Piața Gara Băneasa, Bucharest
architect Paul Emil Constantin Miclescu  Ford factory, Calea Floreasca, Bucharest
architect Tiberiu Niga  |  Block on Calea Victoriei 122, Bucharest
architect Tiberiu Niga  |  Block Boulevard Schitu Măgureanu nr. 53, Bucharest

1937
architect Dumitru Ionescu-Berechet  |  Parcul Domeniilor church (Caşin), Boulevard Mărăştii nr. 16, Bucharest
architect Richard Bordenache  |  Headquarters of the General Association of Engineers in Romania, Boulevard Dacia, Bucharest
architect George Cristinel  |  Athenee of the King Ferdinand I University, Str. Emanuel de Mortonne, Cluj
architect Henrieta Delavrancea-Gibory  |  Cancicov house, Balchik
architect Henrietta Delavrancea-Gibory  |  Vâlcovici house, str. Londra nr. 44, Bucharest
architect Marcel Iancu  |  Vasile Moga block, str. Armenească nr. 16, Bucharest
architect Tiberiu Niga  |  Housing block, str. General Berthelot, Bucharest
architect Gheorghe Simotta  |  Block on str. Blănari 12-14, Bucharest

1938
architect Georghe Matei Cantacuzino  |  Corp Eforiei Kretzulescu, Calea Victoriei nr. 45, Bucharest
architect Horia Creangă  |  ARO block, Calea Victoriei, Bucharest
architects George Cristinel/Constantin Pomponiu  |  Mărăşeşti mausoleum, Vrancea county
architect Henrietta Delavrancea-Gibory  |  Cinema Capitol, Boulevard Regina Elisabeta nr. 36, Bucharest
architect Octav Doicescu  |  Banloc block, Calea Victoriei, Bucharest
architect Octav Doicescu  |  Ministry of Propaganda, str. Wilson nr. 8, Bucharest

1939
architect Dimitrie Nicolae Cucu  |  C.E.C. pension house, Splaiul Unirii nr. 5, Bucharest
architect Arghir Culina  |  Ambasador hotel, Boulevard Magheru, Bucharest
architect Florea Stănculescu  |  Institute of Agronomic Research, Boulevard Mărăşti nr. 61, Bucharest
architect Victor Ștefănescu  |  North Train Station, Piața Gării, Bucharest

1940
architect Horia Creangă  |  Malaxa (Faur) factory, Boulevard Basarabia, Bucharest
architect Radu Dudescu  Romanian National Bank, str. Doamnei, Bucharest
architect Nicolae Nenciulescu  Royal stables, 303 dormitory, Șoseaua Cotroceni nr. 140, Bucharest
architect Nicolae Ghika Budești  Peasant Museum, Piața Victoriei, Bucharest
architect Duiliu Marcu  Miliary Academy, Bucharest
architect Constantin Iotzu  Saint Elefterie Nou church, Piața Elefterie nr. 6, Bucharest
architect Duiliu Marcu  Palace of the Ministry Council, Bucharest
architect Radu Dudescu  Zodiac block, Calea Dorobanți, Bucharest
architect Ion D. Traianescu  Cathedral saint Trei Ierarhi, Timișoara
architect Mircea Alifanti  Airport Aurel Vlaicu Băneasa, Șoseaua București-Ploiești
architects Horia Maicu/Mircea Alifanti/Tiberiu Ricci  Casa Scânteii, Bucharest
architect Tiberiu Ricci  Palace of Radio, Str. Nuferilor, Bucharest
architect Horia Creangă  Obor halls, Piața Obor, Bucharest
architect Richard Bordenache  Palazzo Calcaneo, Piața Palatului, Bucharest
architect Octav Doicescu  National Opera, Piața Elefterie, Bucharest
architect Paul Emil Constantin Miclescu  Free space theatre in Bălcescu park, Boulevard Bucureștii Noi nr. 105, Bucharest
architect Ștefan Balș  Restoration of the Brâncoveanu palace in Potlogi
architect Haralamb G. Georgescu  House Pasinetti, Beverly Hills, USA
architect Constantin Moșinschi  Block of flats/galleries Piața Casei Centrale a Armatei, Bucharest
architect Eugeniu Cosmatu  Block of flats str. Cristian Tell nr. 1-3, Bucharest
architect Sofia Ungureanu  Block La coloane, Piața Romană, Bucharest
architects Horia Maicu/Romeo BeleaSala  Palatului, Bucharest
architect Cezar Lăzărescu  Mamaia resort
architects Tiberiu Niga/Garcia Leon Housing complex, Piața Palatului, Bucharest
1961 architect Nicolae Vlădescu Culture house, Mangalia
1962 architect Mircea Sândulescu Mathematics institute Simion Stoilow, Bucharest
architect Theonic Săvulescu Train station, Brașov
1963 architect Dimitrie Nicolae Cucu Heroes monument, Parcul Carol, Bucharest
1964 architect George Matei Cantacuzino Pavillions of Mitropolei Palace, Iași
architect Ascanio Damian Pavillion of the International Fair, Bucharest
architect Hans Fackelmann Timișoara University
architect Aurelian Trișcu PTTR post office, Eforie Nord
1938-1965 architects Horia Creangă/Ion Rădăcină ARO hotel, Brașov
1967 architect Cezar Lazărescu Europa hotel, Eforie Nord
1968 architect Nicolae Porumbescu State circus Globus, Bucharest
1969 architect Vasile Mitrea Telephone central, Cluj Napoca
1970 architect Cleopatra Alifanti Extension Academia de Studii Economice, Bucharest
architect Mircea Alifanti Administrative palace, Baia Mare
architect Anton Dâmboianu/Gheza Vida Monument of the Romanian soldier, Carei
architect Hans Fackelmann Roman-catholic religious centre, Orșova
architect Ioana Grigorescu Restoration of the assembly of Sucevița monastery
architect Dinu Mihai Hariton Intercontinental hotel, Bucharest
1972 architect Octav Doicescu Politechnic institute, Bucharest
architect Dorin Gheorghe House of culture of sindicates, Ploiești
architect Șerban Manolescu Amfiteatru assembly, Olimp resort
1973 architects Horia Maicu/Romeo Belea National theatre, Bucharest
architect Constantin Săvescu National theatre, Târgu Mureș
architect Nicolae Vasilescu Landing lamp, Constanța
architect Nicolae Vlădescu House of culture of sindicates, Târgoviște

1974 architect Dorin Gheorghe House of culture of sindicates, Sibiu
architect Alexandru Iotzu National theatre Marin Sorescu, Craiova

1975 architects Constantin Dobre/Victor Ivănescu/Toma Olteanu Hotel Forum, Costinești
architect Constantin Rulea Academy Ștefan Gheorghiu, bucharest

1976 architect Gheorghe Leahu Unirea department store, Bucharest
architect Cezar Lăzărescu Parlament palace, Khartoum, Sudan

1977 architect Radu Tănăsoiu Central assembly and prefect headquarters, Brăila
architect Mihail Albert Caffe Elderly dormitory, Str. Jimbolia, Bucharest


1980 architect Emil Barbu Popescu Student park, Student complex Tei, Bucharest
Architect Nicolae Porumbescu Central assembly and town hall, Satu Mare

1982 architect Eugeni Cosmatu București hotel complex, Calea Victoriei, Bucharest
architect Stefan Lungu House of Science and Technique for Youth, Rămnicu-Vâlcea

1983 architect Constantin Rulea Restoration of Hotel Caraiman, Sinaia

1984 architect Nicolae Vlădescu Restoration Cotroceni Palace, Bucharest
architect Dan Sergiu Hanganu Row houses, Parc Quesnel, Montreal, Quebec, Canada
architect Zoltán Takács Postăvăria Română entreprise, Bucharest

1985 architects Gheorghe Nădărag/Dinu Mihai Hariton National Palace of Children, Bucharest

1986 architects Emil Barbu Popescu/Dorin Ștefan House of Science and Technique for Youth, Slatina
Fig. 11. Architects included in the exhibition and their works.
Fig. 12. Architects included in the exhibition and their works.
Fig. 13. Architects included in the exhibition and their works.
Fig. 14. Example of a panel in the exhibition, architect Duiliu Marcu.
Fig. 15. Example of a panel in the exhibition, Monument of the Romanian soldier, Carei.
Fig. 16. Vernisage of the permanent gallery at the “Ion Mincu” University of Architecture and Urbanism, at the National Architecture Biennale 2014.
Fig. 17. The permanent gallery.

Fig. 18. Presentation at the Romanian institute of culture, 2014, one of more of the kind.
4 Geographic spread of early reinforced concrete buildings / Maria Bostenaru, supervision Cristina Gociman

The Modern movement was a global one in architecture, music, arts, physics, philosophy, economy and social theory, and industrialization in the first half of the 20th century. One of the nuclei of the ideology of this movement was the housing programme. This is a traditional programme, still, new technologies brought by industrial development, including reinforced concrete, were employed to investigate innovation. While in modern industrialized European countries the Avant-Garde when in the direction to tackle up the huge load of social housing, in some of the others the new possibilities were seen as an opportunity to give a new image to capital cities, allowing a reorganization of the urban tissue, which denser housing for the middle class in preferred zones. Following the Athens Charter (1933) function became a decisive component in the creation process. Functional requirements start with the social ones till technology. While connecting to the Franch models, a particular condition of the location namely that of seismicity, was neglected. Since then, capital cities where the Modern Movement is represented mainly by housing have been affected by earthquakes, which displayed the vulnerability of those buildings.

Zahariade8 sees to parallel movements in the Modern Movement:
1. The Western Avant-Garde, focused on the social requirement of the housing problem and the control of urban development of architecture. This includes the many “ism”s.
2. The ones which are also called “other Modernisms”: the evolutive tendency, organically, shapes which are gradually simplified towards those of the Avant-Garde. The local character is maintained, it never has the complete flexibility from the west, but it is adjusted to its aesthetical canons regarding geometry and the employment of the right angle.

Although the 4th CIAM Congress proclaimed in 1933 the Charter in the Greek capital, the Athens Charter has never been successful there. The

---

7 This chapter is adapted from the doctorate thesis of Maria Bostenaru Dan, under the supervision of Cristina Olga Gociman

housing needs requested something else. Without a social contribution the Greek interwar architecture was centered on housing and the apartment blocks are the “public face of Greek cities”\(^9\). The 1930s were a turning point in the history of housing in Greece, when the so-called “appartamentalisation”\(^10\) of Greece begun: the flat in a block became the housing model. Studying housing in Greece in the 20\(^{th}\) century means for Constantopoulos\(^11\) to study the phenomenon of the urban block of flats. New words appeared for these flat typologies. In Greece, like in Romania, there is a nostalgia of that time though, as observes Constantopoulos\(^12\) which found its expression in research projects, publications and doctorates on the topic. We consulted for this work a volume edited by Condaratos and Wang\(^13\). For Romania we looked at monographs of architects such as Creangă\(^14\), Iancu\(^15\), Marcu\(^16\), Delavrancea-Gibory\(^17\) but also at the comprehensive work of Machedon & Scoffham\(^18\). In Romania, the first modern house was published 1927 by Marcel Iancu, but the first to receive an echo was the ARO block of flats by Horia Creanga from 1929, after which the Modern Movement became generally accepted. The 1900s architecture maintained its continuity, so Romanian architects touched more styles, from New-Romanian to Neoclassicism, Art Deco and Modernism. In the earthquake affecting Romania, one Modernist building with cinema collapsed in 1940 (Carlton, 1930-32, arch. G.M. Cantacuzino, which originally balanced the ARO building), and others in 1977 (Scala, ca. 1936, arch. Emil Nađejde,


\(^{11}\) Constantopoulos (1999)

\(^{12}\) Constantopoulos (1999)


\(^{14}\) Zahariade (1992)

\(^{15}\) UAR, Centenarul Marcel Iancu 1895–1995/Marcel Janco Centenary, Simetria: Bucharest, 1996.


balancing the cinema by Fränkel and Casata, ca. 1936, arch. Jean Văleanu, a vertical accent). The buildings replacing them do not have the same quality. An exception was the ARO building, where the cinema was recently restored after a fire. The Ambasador and ARO buildings form an impressive complex maintained after earthquakes and they are protected as monuments according to current legislation. The strategical position of the ARO building was decisive in influencing architects which constructed modernist landmarks on the boulevard. Other buildings have been damaged by the earthquake, for example Turist, before imobilul Palladio (1936, arh. Marcel Locar), the corner of which was reconstructed.

Interwar and earlier architecture in Italy between 1890-1940 was investigated by Etlin. The particular movement of Novecento Milanese was the subject of Burg. For the most important architect of the time, Giuseppe Terragni, we looked to monographs, such as that by Zevi and Libeskind. For Portugal, we consulted a volume edited by Tostões and Wang. We included more references in the study trips part of this work, with the literature used for making the respective tours.

4.1 The emergence and spread of reinforced concrete, from the contribution of industry until the approach to housing

Concrete was known since the antiquity, and it was used at the Pantheon in Rome. The ruins in Ostia Romana tell us this story, of the construction

---

19 Prager (1979)
techniques (opus cartaeicum). According to Prager\textsuperscript{27} the first construction which uses the logics of reinforcing concrete in assembling stone blocks was the Pantheon in Paris, arch. Rondelet (1770).

Unfortunately reinforced concrete is not seen as historical construction material by many researchers, unlike historic masonry. Our work is a contribution to see why the study of reinforced concrete buildings from the pre-seismic-code period is important, in the prewar and interwar times, not only from postwar times, for which research exists.

In the approach in the philosophy of materials, treated by Bostenaru\textsuperscript{28}, the real employment of reinforced concrete deserves a separate approach. At the begin the Hennebique system was used. In the drawing of the patent for the Hennebique system a network of primary and secondary beams out of reinforced concrete is visible. This is a characteristic which was later not kept, when the hierararchy between primary and secondary was mixed. The German language differentiates between this early reinforced concrete (iron-concrete) and the later version (steel-concrete).

In the 19\textsuperscript{th} century more reinforced concrete systems were created after the arrival of Portland cement (1824), based on the invention by Monier (first experiments 1840, patent 1867), but Hennebique got remarked introducing the system of plates sustained by principal and secondary beams which could become a constructive system (patent 1892). The first reinforced concrete building was a deposit (1868 Croissy, France), the first bridge was built 1875 (Chazelet, France)\textsuperscript{29}. The first building entirely in reinforced concrete was on Rui Danton 1, Paris (1889-1900).

Reinforced concrete became recognized as construction material at the universal exhibition in Paris in 1900. After the collapse of the imperial hotel in Nice construction codes were published (Germany 1904, France 1906, Switzerland 1910) and university courses started to be taught (the first at École Nationale des Ponts et Chaussées, in 1897) after which patents were given up\textsuperscript{30}. This would explain the transition to the skeleton structure.

The Hennebique office was based in Brussels and from there spread to Europe and outside it. So, in Italy representative of the Hennebique system

\textsuperscript{27} Prager (1979, p. 43-44)

\textsuperscript{28} Bostenaru (2012)


\textsuperscript{30} Grima et al. (2012)
was Porcheddu, with the headquarters in Turin and active in whole Italy, more so in the North. The Lingotto FIAT factory is one of the examples which gained importance, also through today’s conversion by Renzo Piano and the integration into the Olympic Games. In Genua, a boulevard was traced at the transition from the 19th to the 20th century, with buildings built in the Hennebique system: Via XX Settembre. In Bucharest there is a similar boulevard with reinforced concrete construction, but in skeleton structure, not Hennebique, done in the interwar time, in Modernist style: the Magheru boulevard.

In Great Brittain it was Mouchel and in Germany Züblin who applied the Hennebique system.

Recently, the Technical University in Vienna analysed an example of application of the Hennebique system using also precast elements imported from Belgium outside Europe: the Baron palace in Cairo.

Different from Italy, in Romania the Hennebique system did not spread, reinforced concrete came to be applied at large scale suddenly in the interwar time, with the possibilities of the material not researched sufficiently. An early example of reinforced concrete in Hennebique system is Athenée Palace in Bucharest, by the French origin architect Daniel Renard (1910/1912) and the notable Romanian civil engineer George Constantinescu, a student of Anghel Saligny. This was the first building in Bucharest with reinforced concrete structure. Daniel Renard is also the author of another representative Art Nouveau style building on the territory of the old kingdom in Romania: the Casino in Constanța, on the Romanian seaside (1909). The engineer George Constantinescu conceived also the structure for the first reinforced concrete building in Romania, the moschee in Constanța and for the Casino. Athenée Palace was altered in the interwar time with an intervention leaning at Italian Novecento, by the architect Duiliu Marcu, in 1937 (Fig. 20).

Reinforced concrete was employed for the first time in Romania in 1888 by the engineer Anghel Saligny for the construction of cereals silos in the harbours Brăila and Galați, in Monier system, constructions of particular
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33 http://www.baronpalace-project.net/
importance for the development of Romanian engineering\textsuperscript{34}. The first civil building with multiple floors was the building of the C.F.R. housing in the Sinaia train station\textsuperscript{35}.

Some of the Romanian architects, such as Virginia Haret, the first woman architect, adhered at the New-Romanian style, despite a stay in Italy, before starting the search for Modernism. Interesting the activity of Virginia Haret is the attribution of the first apartment block in reinforced concrete in Romania, the one on Frumoasa street. This block of flats has a different style of New-Romanian and Modernism, is in eclectic style\textsuperscript{36} and so the authorship of the block was contested. Virginia Haret also designed industrial constructions in reinforced concrete at the start of the century, like the water tower in the courtyard of the Faculty of Medicine (1927), demolished later on (Fig. at the form on the architect).

One pioneer woman was also active in Hungary in employing reinforced concrete: Eszter Pécsi.

Reinforced concrete employed first in industrial architecture was also a characteristic of Portugal, the case in which Moreira de Sá & Malevez (MS & M) were Hennebique agents\textsuperscript{37}.

Despite this, the Riga architecture enumerates these industrial buildings in its Art Nouveau heritage, for example the water tower at Agenskalns, on Alises 4 by Wilhelm Bockslaff, an example of National Romanticism (1910) \textsuperscript{38}

Hennebique himself, at the own house, employed shapes of industrial architecture.

In other parts of Romania, such as Transylvania, uses of the Hennebique system in Art Nouveau were found: in Oradea, the city of József Vágo, one of the architects who brought the experience from this place to Italy: the

\textsuperscript{34} Prager (1979), p. 52-58
\textsuperscript{35} Prager (1979), p. 59
\textsuperscript{38} Rigas kultūras agentūra: Art Nouveau in Riga, Rigas Jūgendstila Centrs, Riga, 2008
palace Moskvits Miksa, in Secession München style, the so-called Lilienstil\(^{39}\) (Fig. 21), with close relationships to Hungarian architecture.

Also in Finland Art Nouveau style was practices in this time of history (Fig. 22).

Reinforced concrete, probably in Hennebique form, is documented, also in the archives of the works of Béla Lajta in Budapest\(^{40}\), underlining the light play of the skeleton at the lower levels and of the heavy façade with holes in the load bearing masonry at the higher levels, as in Loos architecture. This can be precursory of the seismically vulnerable flexible ground floor in the Bucharest interwar language. In the 21\(^{st}\) century Italian architecture with Western European Modernist influences inverted this situation of the prototype in L’Aquila of the pillar ground floor in Le Corbusier style, free and with the destination of parking, adapted to a sloped terrain, but presenting seismic isolation at the basis. It is remarkable that mistaken approaches with the jacketing of these columns at the ground floor can lead to ductility differences.

In the Viennaise architecture let us not forget the contribution of Joze Plecnik with the first church in reinforced concrete, with the skeleton placed in the basement, for which the architect found an own language, which brings to expression the difference between a spatial structure and multi-story building. Despite this, in the native city of Ljubljana Plecnik built little in reinforced concrete, there masonry was prevalent (Fig. 23).

In Spain Portland cement existed from the second half of the 19\(^{th}\) century, first time being constructed with it in 1848 in Bilbao on the Northern coast. In August 1884 the Monier patent was recorded for its employment by Lecanda Macià y Compañía for water towers\(^{41}\). The first project in reinforced concrete was such a water tower in Puigverd in Lleida, 1893\(^{42}\). One of the first cement factories was Asland in Barcelona of Eusebi Güell in 1901, the mecene of Gaudi. The Hennebique patent was employed for bridge construction until the own method was patented. The first building fully built in concrete was an industrial one, the mill in Badajoz (1899) and used the Hennebique patent. For the housing buildings which did not have such large spans patents were too expensive at the begin. In Catalonia it was

\(^{39}\) M. Pașca: Arhitecții József și László Vágó la Oradea, Arca, Oradea, 2010 (ed. a 2a)

\(^{40}\) T. Csáki: Lajta Béla Virtuális Archívum http://lajtaarchiv.hu/

\(^{41}\) Burgos (2009), apud Grima et al (2012)

first employed for hotels and shops (1909-1919) but also for housing 1912-1914 through Juan Miró Trepát/Construcciones y Pavimentos S.A.\textsuperscript{43}

Grima\textsuperscript{44} identifies from the 183 patents in Spain that the one of Habrich, from German origin, was the one known to Gaudi. This approach is new, as till then the employment of reinforced concrete by Gaudi was negated, with the argument that Gaudi’s architecture requested traditional materials close to nater. But with Gaudi’s activity being contemporary with the development of reinforced concrete, this could not remain foreign. Reinforced concrete was employed at Bellesguard, the Nativity Façade of Sagrada Familia, but mainly in the Gue\ll park (Fig. 25) as well as the Jardinières viaduct and the Artigas gardens. We underline thus a new employment of reinforced concrete, in landscape architecture. But in facades which would suggest the material tectonics, such as Casa Milà only the envelope was chosen to suggest concrete. In case of the contemporary finishing of Sagrada Familia reinforced concrete is experimented to create the shapes designed by the architect (\).

Reinforced concrete enjoyed an unequal spread in Europe. Such, in Germany, although it was experimented with reinforced concrete, a large spread enjoyed also steel, for which there were resources. Reinforced concrete was more adopted where there weren’t so reach resources. Many interwar buildings in Germany have a steel structure, such as those of Otto Hässler in Karlsruhe (Fig. 26) and Celle, or thos of Mies van der Rohe in Stuttgart. In “Weisse Vernunfft” (White Rationale), an interactive CD ROM of the State School of Design in Karlsruhe the innovative construction techniques in reinforced concrete, steel and glass from the interwar time in Germany are documented. It is to be discussed the relationship between reinforced concrete – steel structure at the retrofit of the Telephone Palace in Bucharest, Romania, and the relationship to metal structure which was typical for Germany in Fränkel’s building Adriatica in Bucharest, the local culture of such a structure. Later on we will see the relationship between the frame structure in reinforced concrete (or metal) of the first half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century compared with the traditional construction with timber skeleton.

With this structure the multistory luxury housing buildings in the centre of some major cities were constructed, such as Bucharest, Milan, Athens, Lisbon. Luxury buildings were not the major current of the Avant-Garde, so also in this field research is needed.

\textsuperscript{43} Grima et al (2012)
\textsuperscript{44} Grima et al (2012)
Before being applied "en masse" in the seismically vulnerable zones of Europe reinforced concrete reached France. A pioneer of the reinforced concrete construction was Auguste Perret, and his contribution is significant because the French typological model of the immeuble de rapport in a built front was also adopted in Romania, with the recesses at higher levels etc. Perret also built the Champs Elysees theatre in Paris, remarkable for the language relationship with one of the authors of the essays about reinforced concrete: István Medgyaszay (Fig. 25). „Immeuble de logements Rue Franklin”, designed and built by architect Auguste Perret, 1903-1904 (Fig. 25) is the forerunner of the most exemplary derivates of the so-called interwar style in Romania. Further on, "immeubles" in Paris at the begin of the century display similar characteristics to the interwar Romanian ones regarding the features of integration in the urban structure and the functional features. And not only. Also, while the employment was usually to do computations according to the norms which came from France (as written by Prager, 1979) or from Germany. The German circular from 1925 was the most used one, although considered by design for gravity loads only. Such, constructions with reinforced concrete skeleton resulted. In Germany, the vulnerability of Romanian interwar constructions was researched from a point of view which combines geology and engineering knowledge. Architectural issues and the portability of the present regulation are not included. „Immeubles du beton” from the begin of the century in Paris, or, in time, from interwar Romania, represent the same architectural features. And they are buildings of cultural value. The DOCOMOMO association has as scope the "documentation and conservation of buildings, sites and neighbourhoods of the Modern Movement". Despite this, again, so few have concrete as structural material of the building, or at least are documented as such. Recent research of the author had little success in looking for such buildings in Slovenia, an earthquake prone country, which gave architects of international dimension of an own style, with elements of the Modern Movement. Especially in what regards housing units. Also in Germany innovative buildings in "pure iron-concrete frames" of the Modern Movement are not known to the author.

The buildings of the modern Avant-Garde were raised in a short time, of 20 or maybe just 10 years, in which many styles co-existed (Fig. 28), also with the newest discoveries in philosophy, sociology, physics but also industrial and technological development. The employment of advanced construction technology of the time was common, but not always the possibili-

45 Sonderforschungsbereich 461 “Starkbeben”, University of Karlsruhe
ties of materials and systems were researched enough. The state of research referred principally to the innovation of the façade, since the Modern avant-garde looked for such a new style. The new technologies brought by industrial development were a central part of the world movement in that time. Such, one of the nucleus of the movement was the housing programme, which was particularly suitable to investigate innovation. While in more industrialized countries ways to solve social problems were looked for, in other European countries the new possibilities were seen as an opportunity to give a more prosperous image to cities, raising the density of housing for the middle class. The followed principles were the refusal of a senseless ornamentation, the employment of modern materials and construction ways, the study of new typologies connected to function and particularly a radical innovation in housing construction. The employment of reinforced concrete skeleton made it possible that different plans are designed at superposed floors. Different of the case of the International Style, the individuality of architecture and of the individual apartment was conserved, also in cases like the stappeled villa or the serial plan.

A lesson to be re-evaluated according to the new understanding is how traditional constructions behaved better in earthquakes that modern structures. This was attributed to the so-called local seismic culture. The new understanding took into account the fact that the urban way of life led deliberately to these improvements. During the earthquakes in Turkey in 1999 the traditional timber skeleton buildings called “himiş” behaved better than the modern structures in reinforced concrete. According to Lachner timber constructions can be classified in bloc constructions, column-beam construction and column-bloc construction. At least the latter two have a frame structure. But the buildings with timber construction are not characteristic for with the earthquake prone zones. In earthquake prone zones, as Romania, bloc typologies were adopted, as in the Tatra mountains and thus without fully using the structural characteristics of timber. In coastal zones like Lisbon and Istanbul it can be due to the industrial vicinity of naval industry.

The blossom of multistory reinforced concrete buildings started in France, like the gothic for churches, and was accompanied by innovative solutions for these, like the landmarks of Le Corbusier. Although churches


47 C. Lachner: Geschichte der Holzbaukunst in Deutschland, E. A. Seemann, Leipzig, 1887.
have a ship structures, at least at the level of spatial organization, the lateral forces, considered in their design (wind) were not always taken into account at the design of reinforced concrete buildings. On turn, in Vienna, reinforced concrete enjoyed priority with regard to timber and steel, invoking a tradition in stone construction\textsuperscript{48}, rather than in timber.

At the level of interior space, the ceiling was modeled in structural dependence of the ship in case of gothic churches. In the stone gothic churches the cage structure to be found in the timber frame of “gaiola” (cage) pombalina from the post 1755 earthquake reconstruction in Lisbon can be recognized in the spaces called “ships” of the building. In the reinforced concrete church Holy Spirit of Jože Plečnik, especially in the most innovatie space, the cripta, more levels of reinforced concrete in spatial frames are prefigurated. The stone constructions in gothical style had in common with the timber structure and previously shown building the structure-frame span. Stone constructions in gothic style, also, had in common with the reinforced construction which followed the same structure-opening span. The philosophy behind the employment of reinforced concrete was different in this case of that of timber. So, spatially, tridimensional structures, as were those in ston in the gothic, are typical for reinforced concrete. The “reinforced concrete skeleton” spread later than the Hennebique structure which was an early structure in “reinforced concrete frame”, before of what we know today in shape of “seismic codes”. Before, the adoption of the frame (in Greece or Italy) seemed to come from the existing urban structures, talking of the regulated frame of parcels.

Two buildings with reinforced concrete structure from the first half of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century in Vienna and Bucharest, the Zacherl house and the Patria bloc of flats have a related stylistic language, but the building in Vienna hast a spatial structure of reinforced concrete frames, different from the building in Bucharest, which has a structure in reinforced concrete skeleton, with secondary beams.

Between the two programmes, sacre and residential, an exchange of architectural and structural language took place. Italy features several churches of the interwar time as the chapel at Sapienzia campus, or that in the north by Piacentini.

The design of spatial structures is similar to a laboratory where the possibilities of the new material are researched and in which lessons for multi-

story constructions are learned. Such lessons for employing the material have to be learned also for concrete.

Another aspect connected to the traditional modern dialogue is the development of national states in the time of Modernity and of the introduction of reinforced concrete. Such, reinforced concrete was also used for the construction of public institutions. Less in Romania, but more in Italy it was also used in the architecture of expo’s, a contemporary occasion to introduce multimedia elements in the perception of memor in intervention, which migrates also towards common buildings.

Fig. 19. Romantic nationalism, one of the Art Nouveau styles in Riga, Latvia. Apartment block, Elzens Laube, Alberta Street 11 (1908). Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2011.
Fig. 20. Athenée Palace, Bucharest. Initial design: Arch. Daniel Renard (1910-12). Converted into interwar architecture by Duiliu Marcu (1925-27). Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2011, archive plan and perspective: Bucharest Town Hall archives
Fig. 21. Moskivits Miksa palace, architect Kálmán Rimánoczy jr. (1904-1905), Oradea. Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2009.

Fig. 22. Art Nouveau neighbourhood in Helsinki, Finland. Urban assembly on the Huvilakatu street. Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2009.
Fig. 24. Parc Güell, arch. Antoni Gaudi (1900-1914). Entrance pavilion, place and viaduct. Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2011.
Fig. 26. Interwar architecture with metal skeleton in the Dammerstock Siedlung, Karlsruhe, Germany (arch. Otto Haessler, 1929). Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2002.

Fig. 27. The entrance of reinforced concrete into interwar Romania.
4.2 The urban and architectural resonance of the introduction of early reinforced concrete

This book presents a comparative overview of the early 20th century architecture in Europe together with conservation approaches to put in value this architecture in the respective countries. A close view is dedicated to the employment of reinforced concrete.

The multistory construction had urban resonance together with the raise of height, in order to satisfy hygiene requirements, promoted among others by the Avant-Garde, the distance between fronts raised, and this way new boulevards were defined, as for example in Bucharest, or it was built in the periphery, in large green spaces, as in the West of Europe. The tracing of new boulevards, superposed on the organic grid of streets led to parcels with irregular contour, reflected then in an irregular grid in the disposition of partition and structural elements of the buildings, cause for their seismic vulnerability in Bucharest. In other countries, such as Greece or Portugal, the boulevards were traced at the extension of the city, for example towards facilities of the time such as the train station, and as such the buildings have a regular structure.
The type of building in our research was conceived to raise density in the center of the cities. More even, Sonne\textsuperscript{49} observes when analyzing the typology of block of flats, that these have a sustainable typology, a viable model for urban development today. Sonne\textsuperscript{50} follows typologies with an atrium, in order to conserve green spaces and a better adaptability to climate change, taking into account the difference in function, although the difference in climate in the countries considered is not highlighted. In the Sonne\textsuperscript{51} research the following typologies in Western Europe and North America are considered:

- Berlin and Germany
- Vienna for Central and Eastern Europe – some examples from Prague, Budapest, Switzerland and Russia,
- Amsterdam and the BeNeLux (namely Rotterdam)
- Copenhagen and Skandinavia,
- Paris and France,
- Milan and Southern Europe, namely Spain,
- London and Great Britain,
- New York and the USA (Chicago).

Our research instead went out from a seminar at the University of Karlsruhe on early 20\textsuperscript{th} century architecture in Eastern Europe. Thus, exactly countries missing in the research by Sonne\textsuperscript{52} are covered, Romania, Greece, Slovenia, Portugal, Estonia, Latvia to name just some examples. Italy is a common point, with the “Novecento” and the “ambientismo” architecture. Hungary is only touched.

The attitude towards the Modern Movement is different in Europe. At the IV Congrès Internationaux d'Architecture Moderne in 1933, the Charter of Athens was proclaimed, and later documented by Le Corbusier. This put the basis for rational cities, the key concept being the strict separation in zones for the four “functions”: housing, work, loisir and circulation. These concepts were employed on large scale for the reconstruction of European Cities after WWII, in the “functionalist” style. In the interwar time, even before WWI, such housing was developed experimentally, in the difficult taks of economic efficiency. New technologies such as reinforced concrete were employed. The begin of the 20\textsuperscript{th} century disposes the difference between the

\textsuperscript{49} W. Sonne: Dwelling in the metropolis: Reformed urban blocks 1890–1940 as a model for the sustainable compact city. Progress in Planning 72 (2), 2009, p. 53-149
\textsuperscript{50} Sonne (2009)
\textsuperscript{51} Sonne (2009)
\textsuperscript{52} Sonne (2009)
non-west of the predominantly Western Modernism. Generally accepted, Modernism is a historical phenomenon manifested in a linear history between two peak moments which define it: the interwar time and the postwar time, even if “other modernisms” continue to exist. Such “other” Modernisms existed also parallelly to the principal modernism flux. It is a question of frontiers, not only theoretically, temporally and aesthetically, but also geographically / cultural barriers. There is a conditioned dependency between the geographic and the chronological limits – this way Eastern Europe had forerunners in the buildings built before WWI in Central and Western Europe. Same happened in the second half of the 20th century, even if the reasons were different, looking for expression. At the same time, Western Europe saw the development of so-called participatory architecture, while during Eastern Europe totalitarianism mass housing was built. Practically, in today’s architecture, we can see the reaction to the architectural approaches differently seen in the spread of functionalism in postwar time, when the ideals from the begin of the 20th century of the Avant-Garde made place to mass housing. The Western architecture of Italian rationalism has in common with Eastern Europe the European Modernism in Greece and Romania, the contextualism: its buildings were not raised at the periphery, but in the city. Milan is a product of the 1930s as are the main boulevards in Bucharest. The section in central Bucharest is unique in Europe, while the Milan works are spread close to the central railway station similarly to Athens, but the position of the building in context builds a difference in approach to Germany, for example. In France, this approach which served as a model for Romania was spread before WWI.

In Western Europe innovation was done in social housing, at the periphery, in the so-called Siedlungs. An exception are the Viennaise Hof's (Fig. 29), but also these are a typology many times neglected in architecture history. A typology close to the Viennaise hofs we find in Warsaw (Fig. 30). Housing was a major contributor to interwar architecture, a pioneering programme, shaping architects’ careers, emancipating society and remodeling the urban tissue, but, for example in Greece, innovation was done also in school buildings.
Fig. 29. Reismann Hof, architects Heinrich Schmid & Hermann Aichinger (1924-25). Matteotti Hof, listed, urban assembly together with Metzleinstaler Hof and Herweghhof architects Heinrich Schmid & Hermann Aichinger (1926/27), Vienna. Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2009.

Fig. 30. Interwar architecture in Warsaw, where there was also a variation of the Viennai-se Hofs (right). Block of flats Ul Jaworzyńska arch. Helena and Szmon Syrkus (1937) (left). Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2011.
5. 7 years dedicated to the conservation of the Modern Movement heritage
The Conference Series “Das architektonische Erbe – zum aktuellen Umgang mit den Bauten der Moderne” (Architectural heritage – about the contemporary approach to the buildings of Modernity
Karlsruhe, Germany
2004-2010 / Alex Dill (conference), Maria Bostenaru (review)53

5.1 Introduction
Between years 2004 and 2010 a series of seven conferences took place in Karlsruhe, Germany, on the conservation of architectural heritage throughout Europe. Aimed primarily at practicing architects, they were organised by Alex Dill, from the Faculty of Architecture, together with DOCOMOMO (international committee for DOcumentation and CONservation of buildings, sites and neighbourhoods of the MOdern MOvement) and Beton Marketing Süd. It was also the framework in which the German chapter of DOCOMOMO was re-launched in 2006 and a declaration adopted. The countries in focus were Germany, Russia, the Netherlands, Italy, Czech Republic, France, Sweden/Scandinavia and Great Britain. The opening and closing conferences focused on Russia, for which lessons should be learned from the functioning practice in conservation in Western and Central Europe. Outreach activities were accompanying exhibitions, books releases, meetings of the DOCOMOMO chapter, and related conferences. In 2011 the series will be discontinued, being replaced by a conference on architecture theory: “Authenticity”.

53 This paper has been first published, under Creative Commons licence, by Maria Bostenaru Dan, in the e-conservation magazine ISSN: 1646-9283, 18, 2011, p. 19-26, http://www.e-conservationline.com/content/view/977
In 2004-2010, a series of one-day conferences, always on Fridays, took place at the University of Karlsruhe, Germany, in cooperation with DOCOMOMO and supported by Beton Marketing Süd, as research initiative of the university. The topic of the conference was how to preserve and use cultural heritage buildings of the Modern Movement which define the face of today in many European cities. Organiser was architect Alex Dill, academic counsellor, from the Institut für Baugestaltung, Baukonstruktion und Entwerfen 2 (Institute for Building Configuration, Building Construction and Projects 2) (2004-2007). Each conference was accompanied by an exhibition focused on heritage of Modernity in the respective geographic zones, the vernissage of which took place in the evening. Starting with 2006 when the German DOCOMOMO committee was redefined, the days after the conference were reserved for the meeting of the committee’s German chapter. The conferences were recognised by the chamber of architects as continued learning events for professionals, although they were also open to the general public. The first three conferences focused on the differences in the approach in Western and Eastern Europe, having in focus a country from each. The following conferences focused on one country each. We attended all conferences, except for the opening and closing ones.

5.2 Russia and Germany

The first conference took place in January 2004 and it focused on the challenges for architecture of Modernity in Russia and Germany in a comparative approach. The approach was, as the conference proved, fundamentally different – the preservation practices from the West did not reach Russia and the buildings of the Russian constructivists, which are of fundamental importance for the history of architecture, were first documented and preserved in form of study models. It was also an occasion to compare the different terms of Avant-garde, Modernism and Modernity. At the time the buildings were erected, there were more common features in the new practice than today in conservation. Of use for the conference was the cooperation between the University of Karlsruhe and Russian specialists, some of which were visiting scientists in Karlsruhe for several years, such as Dr. Sergej Fedorov, also co-organiser of the conference. The conference was advertised on the German internet portal of construction news BauNetz (http://www.baunetz.de/meldungen/Meldungen_Ausstellung_und_Tagung_in_Karlsruhe_15675.html). It was accompanied by an exhibition on architecture models of the Russian Avant-garde, a cooperation project of the students from Karlsruhe and of the University of Stuttgart. The conference
took place on the last day of the exhibition. Among the subjects approached were Russian Constructivist buildings from St. Petersburg and Moscow, the house Schminke in Löbau\(^5\) and the preservation and maintenance of Béton brut (Sichtbeton). Later on, Rüdiger Kramm published a book on this topic\(^5\), as accompanying publication of the conference series.

### 5.3 The Netherlands and Russia

The second conference took place in October 2004 on the subject of the architecture from the Netherlands, with some contributions about Russia and Germany („Rettung vor dem Zerfall. Tagung an der Fakultät für Architektur zur Erhaltung moderner Bauten“, Press communication at http://www.uni-protokolle.de/nachrichten/id/89816/ ). Continuing the intentions of the first conference to facilitate the exchange and encourage the preservation of the buildings of the Modern Movement all over Europe, a delegation of the Moscow Institute of Architecture took part in the conference. The chair of the working group on Technology of DOCOMOMO, Wessel de Jonge, presented the restoration of the Sanatorium Zonnestraal in Hilversum (the Netherlands). From the interesting problematic regarding the restoration of the sanatorium, we can mention the replacement of the windows that had to be made out of a special glass in order to reflect similarly, so the sand to produce them sufficiently transparent even in double glazing was imported from the Baltic states. There was also a presentation of the dean of the faculty Prof. Matthias Pfeifer on structural restoration of buildings in Germany. The corresponding exhibition displayed the work of Konrad Wachsmann, a German architect who emigrated to the US and was a pioneer of the prefabricated construction. The University of Karlsruhe has a database on German architects who were active outside Germany (Architekten im Exil 1933-1945 http://www.ikg.uni-karlsruhe.de/projekte/exilarchitekten/).

### 5.4 Italy (and Czech Republic)

The third conference took place in January 2006 and it focused on Italy, with Eastern/Central Europe presentations about the Czech Republic. It was the year when DOCOMOMO Germany was newly defined, occasion to


have the vice-chair of DOCOMOMO international, Prof. Maristella Casciato, among the speakers. Maristella Casciato gave an overview talk on the research and practice of restoration in Italy. It was followed by two case studies:

- the case of “Lingotto”, a hierarchical model, by Christiana Chiorino from the Polytechnic University of Turin. The author conducted research on the preservation of Pier Luigi Nervi buildings in the context of the XX Olympic Winter Games held in Turin in 2006, focusing on the approach of reinforced concrete and defining some criteria on which buildings should be preserved for their structural characteristics;5657

- the case of “Ivrea”, a dynamic model, by Enrico Giacopelli. Recent efforts of the presenter, together with Patrizia Bonifazio, are taking place to include the city of Ivrea on the UNESCO World Heritage List58 5960. For this purpose, International Summer Schools focused on the architecture and urbanism are being organised (http://www.issivrea.it). An open sky museum of modern architecture (Museo a cielo aperto dell'Architettura Moderna di Ivrea) exists in Ivrea since 2001 to promote cultural tourism for the valuation of this heritage (http://www.maam.ivrea.it).

After the lunch break, two case studies from the Czech Republic were presented: the Villa Müller in Prague, by Petr Urlich from the Czech Technical University, about research and practice of the restoration; and Villa Tugendhat in Brno, on which two presentations were given. The first was by Iveta Cerná about the history of the building and the other by Prof. Ivo Hammer from the University of Applied Sciences and Arts (HAWK) at Hildesheim / Vienna, whose research is dedicated to the “materiality” of surfaces built of materials of the Modern Movement, such as steel and glass.

In October 2005, before the conference, a team of photographers from the Institut für Baugestaltung, Baukonstruktion und Entwerfen 2 visited the

56 Sergio, Pace; Rosso, Michela and Chiorino, Cristiana, “Italia 61: The Nation on Show”, Umberto Allemande, Torino, 2006
60 Patrizia, Bonifazio and Enrico, Giacopelli, “Ivrea, passato e futuro di una company town” special issue in Parametro 262 Anno XXXVI Marzo/Aprile 2006
Villa Tugendhat, and an exhibition accompanied the conference. Later, a photo documentation of the Villa was published. Three years later, in June 2008, a further DOCOMOMO conference and a chapter members meeting were organised exactly at the Villa Tugendhat (minutes are available online http://www.docomomo.de/attachments/074_01_BRNO%20Protokoll.pdf), accompanied by the Declaration of Brno.

5.5 France

The fourth conference took place in January 2007 and focused on the French architecture. It was organised in cooperation with the Centre Culturel Français at Karlsruhe, Germany.

The overview talk was given by Christiane Schmuckle-Mollard, Chief-Architect at Historic Monuments, Paris. After a discussion about Le Corbusier buildings listed as UNESCO World Heritage by Michel Richard from the Le Corbusier Foundation in Paris, case study presentations followed. The Maison La Roche, where the foundation Le Corbusier is situated, was renovated afterwards, in 2009, as we had the occasion to learn during our visit. More case studies were presented after the lunch break, such as La Maison de Verre, Paris (1932, architect Pierre Chareau), by Bertrand Bauchet. Pierre Chareau was an architect whose interiors are characterized by flexible partitions between the rooms - sliding walls and similar. Maison de Verre (The Glass House) is called this way due to its facade made entirely of glass tiles; La Villa Cavroix in Croix (1932, architect Robert Mallet-Stevens), by Prof. Richard Klein, Lille; La Villa E-1027 in Roquebrune (1929, architects Eileen Gray /Jean Badovici), by Prof. Rainer Franke, Karlsruhe; Cité de La Muette – a vertical garden city (1934, architect Marcel Lods), by Prof. Pieter Uyttenhove from Ghent, Belgium; Le Havre and Auguste Perret, by Prof. Joseph Abram, Nancy / Paris.

There were also talks on Germany, such as the introductory one by Rüdiger Kramm on the approach of the Modern Movement architecture today, detailing the diminishing acceptance for buildings of the 1960s and the return to traditional housing such as Fachwerk.

The conference was accompanied by an exhibition about the city of ROYAN, a “ville nouvelle” of the reconstruction 1947-1959, photographs

---

61 Alex, Dill; Rüdiger, Kramm and Iveta, Cerna with the photographers Christoph, Engel; Thilo, Mechau and Bernd, Seeland, “Vila Tugendhat Brno”, Wasmuth, 2008

by Dirk Altenkirch, Karlsruhe, a city built entirely after the Second World War. This was the only conference after which a publication was issued, containing papers of the presentations in the original language, respectively German, English or French\(^{63}\). In the meeting of the German chapter of DOCOMOMO a “Declaration of Karlsruhe” was released and can be consulted online (http://www.docomomo.de/attachments/113_KarlsruherErklaerung_20070127.pdf).

### 5.6 Sweden (and Scandinavia)

The fifth conference took place on the 25th of January 2008, and it was focused on Sweden. This was also advertised in BauNetz (http://www.baunetz.de/meldungen/Meldungen_Ausstellung_und_Fachtagung_in_Karlsruhe_29466.html)].

The introductory speech about the situation in Scandinavia was given by Ola Wedebrunn, co-chair of the DOCOMOMO International Technology working group from Copenhagen. A second introductory talk was about the 20th century heritage in Sweden. These were followed by case studies such as the Upper School for Girls, by Torbjörn Almqvist, from Stockholm, the Civic Hall from Eslöv, by Mats Edström, who also wrote a book on this subject\(^{64}\), Siedlung Vällingby, by Sven Lorentzi from Stockholm, and the town hall in Göteborg, by Claes Caldenby, among other not so extensively presented case studies.

The accompanying exhibition was entitled “Bellevue - MOMONECO” focusing on the Bellevue, a seaside resort in Denmark, and documented in the frame of the European project MOMONECO “MOdern MOvement NEighbourhood Cooperation, modernist dreams - 4 case studies” (http://momoneco.kotka.fi/) funded through the CULTURA 2000 European scheme. In the project there were 4 sites involved: Sunila in Finland, Bellevue-Bellavista in Denmark, Bat'ovany-Partizánske in Slovakia and Ivrea in Italy. Except for Bellevue, the other three were industrial sites. The Bellevue resort was designed by the architect Arne Jacobsen in the 1930s.


\(^{64}\) Mats, Edström, „Medborgarhuset i Eslöv - Eslöv Civic Hall“, Arkitektur Förlag, 2007
5.7 Great Britain

The sixth conference took place in January 2009 and it focused on Great Britain (figure 1). (http://www.dbz.de/artikel/dbz_Das_architektonische_Erbe_6._Karlsruher_Tagung_Zum_aktuellen_Umgang.mit_70149.html) Immediately after the introduction, the president of DOCOMOMO Great Britain and the editor of the extracts from DOCOMOMO registries65, Dennis Sharp, spoke about the Modern Movement in Great Britain. Overviews were presented by Keyvan Lankarani, from Avanti Architects, London, Igea Troiani from the University of Oxford and Alan Powers from the University of Greenwich. These alternated with presentations of case study as follows: the architecture of Ernő Goldfinger, an Hungarian immigrant less known outside Great Britain and whose centenary took place recently, by James Dunnet, from JD Architects, London; the restoration project of the De La Warr Pavilion (arch. Erich Mendelsohn and Serge Chermayeff), by John McAslan from JMA Architects, London, a project which was also the subject of a book66; and the Flat Roof House, 1934 (arch. C. Lucas), by Yasmin Shariff from DS Architects, Hertford.

The last case study presented was about the Zeche Zollverein Coal Mine Industrial Complex in Germany, listed as UNESCO World Heritage and an example to be followed in the conversion of industrial architecture through the IBA Emscher Park project in Ruhr (European Capital of Culture in 2010).

From the many presentations, one of the most interesting was a peripheral Modern small scale building that was a victim of speculation and was demolished in order to use the property for a higher building, which unfortunately could not be avoided. However, the property was classified as “green belt”, of obviously lower value than the Modernist building. We could learn lessons from this for other countries, such as Romania where recently, at the end of 2009, a low-rise building by interwar architect Henrietta Delavrancea Gibory was demolished for similar reasons.

Another interesting talk was the presentation of the Twentieth Century Society (C20 Society), which seems to take over in Great Britain many of the attributes of DOCOMOMO.

The conference was followed by the vernissage of two exhibitions, one in the well established tradition regarding the architectural potential of modern architecture by DOCOMOMO Great Britain called “British Case Studies” (Fig. 25) and the other regarding the prize of the Wüstenrot Stiftung foundation from Germany concerning projects in context (Fig. 24).

5.8 Russia (and Germany)

The seventh and last conference took place in January 2010 and, like the first one from the series, was focused on Russia and Germany. The overview talk was given by Natalia Dushkina about the Modern Movement Heritage in Russia. The presented case studies from Russia were the Students Commune House (Arch. Nicolaev), project and realization, by Vsevolod Kulish, Moscow, and the Haus Narkomfin (Arch. Ginzburg), a project by Alexey Ginzburg, Moscow.

Among switching between countries there was an interesting overview on the situation in Ukraine by Alexander Bouryak, from Kharkiv (Ukraine).

The case studies presented from Germany were: the Umspannwerk Berlin-Scharnhorst, by Paul Kahlfeld, Berlin; the ADBG Schule Bernau (Arch. H. Meyer), by Franz Jaschke, Berlin; and the Fagus Werk (Arch. W. Gropius and A. Meyer), by Ulrich Pagels, from Hannover.

The results of student studies were also presented, such as the Avant-Garde Heritage workshop in St. Petersburg by Diana Zitzmann, and Alex Dill, as well as the report from the excursion Magnitogorsk - Ernst Mays buildings today by Thomas Flierl, Berlin.

The exhibition was called “Avant-Garde - Defamation – World Cultural Heritage” and showed a contrast between the approaches in the East and the West, Russia and Germany.

5.9 Conclusions

In 2011, instead of the eighth conference from the series, the organizers are planning, together with the annual meeting of the DOCOMOMO chapter in Germany, a conference on architecture theory entitled “Authenticity” to take place on the 28th of January 2011 (http://at.ekut.kit.edu/192.php), in the same tradition as the previous meetings. However, this conference will not be accompanied by an exhibition, which is a loss that adds to the lack of related field trips.

The conferences we participated in were extremely instructive, covering a wide range of countries and presenting detailed case studies. The exhibitions provided a welcomed enrichment of these meetings and were also use-
ful for networking. We somehow feel sorry that there were not more books published to document these conferences and that the only one documenting the presentations is not available online. The speakers were great names in heritage conservation and many of them are published authors with books on the restoration projects they presented at the conference, although sometimes the objects were the subject of books by other authors. Literature on conservation of the Modern Movement buildings (Fig. 26) is generally rare once approaches are also new. Some time ago these buildings were still considered not old enough to be part of the heritage. This was also the reason of the creation of DOCOMOMO, but still the documentation of the history of architecture is better represented than conservation issues in the work of the association in our opinion. Of course the conference could not cover all relevant buildings even of the covered countries and obviously cannot replace the study trips to see the restored buildings. Perhaps the future conferences could be held at various locations in order to allow in situ visits.

Fig. 31. Exhibition at the conference. Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2010.
Fig. 32. Conference in 2010. Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2010.

Fig. 33. Literature to Modernism restoration. Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2010.
6. Technology in the Architecture of Modernism

The architectural heritage
10th anniversary conference in Karlsruhe on architecture – theory and practice / Alex Dill (conference), Maria Bostenaru (review)

6.1. Introduction

The years 2004-2010 marked a series of seven conferences on the topic The architectural heritage – about the contemporary approach to the buildings of Modernity, about which we wrote a review in the journal. In 2011, additionally to their aim on practicing architects, theory elements were introduced. 2013 marks the 10th anniversary of conferences organized by Alex Dill, dealing with the architectural heritage, and was at the same time DOCOMOMO (international committee for Documentation and Conservation of buildings, sites and neighbourhoods of the MOdern MOvement) technology seminar. Unlike the former exhibitions accompanying the conference, this year there were accompanying excursions to conservation and intervention works on sites of the Modern Movement in Germany.

On 25-26 January 2013 the anniversary conference of those dealing with “The architectural heritage”, actually the architectural heritage of the Modern Movement, took place at the Karlsruhe Institute of Technology, in Germany, being at the same time DOCOMOMO (international committee for Documentation and Conservation of buildings, sites and neighbourhoods of the MOdern MOvement) International technology seminar (International Scientific Committee Technology). The conference series are supported by Beton Marketing Süd and as such a number of the lectures enhanced the role of reinforced concrete as material of Modernity. The conferences were also recognised as continued learning events for architects by the architecture chamber, but also open to the general public. As such, after a day of presentations, a day of site visits to EZB Frankfurt or to Dammerstock Karlsruhe followed. Organiser was architect Alex Dill, academic councilor.

67 This paper has been first published, under Creative Commons licence, in the e-conservation magazine http://www.e-conservationline.com/content/view/1097
together with colleagues from DOCOMOMO Germany Uta Pottgiesser and Jos Tomlow. Through generous support of the Getty Research Institute, it was also possible to involve the related ICOMOS (International Committee on Monuments and Sites) related International Scientific Committee ISC20C. Both committees held meetings related to the conference.

6.2 Conference

Different from the first 7 conferences we wrote about, this conference dealt with the influence of material on what is called in German “Baukonstruktion”, the constructive scaffold of a building including its details, this conference featured both contributions of today’s intervention on historic buildings and their materials, as well as studies on the history itself and on employment of materials in the past.

The first lecture introduced the Großmarkthalle Frankfurt, today transformed in the Europäische Zentralbank, which was also one of the sites to be visited in the second conference day. Under the motto “syntheses” Horst Pesecke presented the view of an engineering company, and talked on the history of reinforced concrete, from the view of codes, journals, and other ways of interaction between research and practice, and put the developments of concrete for shell structures at the Großmarkthalle in the context of the contemporary Jahrhunderthalle in Wroclaw and of a new building in Lausanne. As the closing discussion showed, the most important point was the role of the actors from different disciplines in the design process.

The second lecture focused instead on “innovations”. Wolfgang Thöner, an expert in the history of the Bauhaus Dessau talked about the influence of industry on the experimental teaching at that site.

Jan Molema was the next speaker, coming from the Netherlands. In his lecture under the topic “limits” he returned to the role of concrete, presenting the Zonnenstraal sanatorium restoration, but he also went to detailing in other materials, such as the transformation in Maison de Verre. The reason for this is his current ongoing research on Bernhard Bijvoet, Johannes Dui-ker and Jan Gerko Wiebenga, the names of these actors binding the two buildings.

We returned to the start of the conference series with the next one, on “Transfer”. Anke Zalivako from Berlin talked about Russian Avantgarde and the relationship of Constructivismus to technology. Although her detailed studies served the Narkomfin building, the research presented was much more wide and included the relationship between building material,
“Baukonstruktion” and preservation in the Russian constructivist buildings in Moscow between 1919 and 1934.

It can be said that the retrospective on former editions of the conference continued, with a contribution from another country to which formerly a whole conference was dedicated: after the Netherlands and Russia: France. Vanessa Fernandez, doctoral candidate, and Emmanuelle Gallo presented the relationship between façade technology and interior comfort in case of Le Corbusier’s building for the Salvation Army. While a full glazing to the side of the house turned towards the sun lead in winter to costs savings in heating, in summer, for preventing the negative effects, brise-soleil had to be attached. The intervention to improve the quality of the building was not situated at such a long time span from the erection as in the other cases.

The next three lectures were dedicated to architecture from overseas, a new element in the series of conferences. A presentation on earthquake resistant architecture from Japan had to be replaced.

Under the motto “Nonchalance” Danilo Matoso Macedo presented the contribution of the engineer, in this case Joachim Cardoso to Oscar Niemeyer’s architecture. The lecture was therewith an homage to the recently deceased architect. Oscar Niemeyer worked with several engineers, including a graduate from Karlsruhe university, but the special contribution of Cardoso, this time to architecture in concrete, was on the shape of the elements. A rectangle becomes slightly ellipsoidal to mathematically optimize these shapes in the pillars designed by the architect. Parabols were defining the arcades. In the view of the speaker in this case the dialogue between the actors lead to teamwork.

The chair of ICOMOS ISC20C presented the Los Angeles “case study house” programme, an example of “Standardisation”: 25 houses built starting 1948 till the 1960s, an example of the power of a journal such as Arts&Architecture. Kyle Normandin, now project manager at the Getty Research Institute, went into detail for the houses designed by Neutra, Eames and Koenig, from timber to steel prefabrication. Photographs of these buildings by a photographer as renowned as Julius Shulman help the perception of the buildings by the public. Protection of Modernist heritage is differently seen in the USA and in this case the houses can be better preserved thanks to collaborative partnership with Escher GuneWardenA Architecture, the company of the next speaker.

Frank Escher’s talk dedicated on “Futuristic living” was however not related to this work, but presenting the ideosyncratic architecture of John Lautner, the archive of which he served as administrator until 2007, when the archive moved to Getty. Now he serves on the Board of Directors of the
Lautner foundation. John Lautner is best known for his works in concrete, with which he however started only conjuncturally in the 1960s, working before in timber.

Returning to the retrospective, Iveta Cerna talked on “Visions” becoming reality in case of Villa Tugendhat in Brno. There is a close connection between these conference series and the villa, DOCOMOMO Germany holding some of its meetings at that location and a number of its members being also in the THICOM – International Commission of Experts for the Tugendhat House. When the villa was first presented, and the photo album done in frame of the research performed with the conference series (by the photographer of the Karlsruhe Institute of Technology) the restoration has not taken place yet. There has been an old first one in the 1980s, but the second was done 2010-2012 with EU funds and the villa just opened to the public. Iveta Cerna, director of the Museum Villa Tugendhat, presented the history of the villa: building, decay and today’s new glance.

A lecture which explicitly mentioned digital technology was that by Colin Davies on Foster and Rogers and the start of British high-tech. Now high tech means digital technology, but the high tech in architecture was predigital. Prefabricated detailing in miesian tradition was shown, and the beauty of the exposed structure.

The closing lecture was given by Christina Kanstiger-Otto, the daughter and partner of Frei Otto. In a chronological overview of his most important works, including the Multihalle at the Bundesgartenschau in Mannheim, the wandering of the university institute in Stuttgart, and the work in Montreal, she showed how the free forms were developed from model to reality, and the importance of yet another material: the textile.

The closing discussion concentrated on two points:
- the already mentioned importance of actors today, which did not exist in the Middle Ages, when architect, engineer and even investor were one and the same – with the question how the development of technology is influenced by the cooperation between the actors
- the new question if “function follows form”

Returning to the topic of the conference series, it was concluded that preservation also needs inventive people in relation to technology. And because of this innovation regular inspection is needed. Preservation depends on how people are looking to these buildings, not only iconic buildings.

In the second day we participated to the excursion in Dammerstock. The Dammerstock Siedlung was built following a competition won by Walter Gropius in 1929 under the name exhibition “Die Gebrauchswohnung” (the usage house). The second prize was of Otto Haessler, who designed both a
multistory and a single storey rowhouse. The Dammerstock Siedlung is characterized by these rows, called “Zeile” in German.

We had the occasion to discuss the urban planning models from the competition, included in an info pavilion, and to see from inside and outside two reference apartments for which preservation in order to be more energy efficiency (especially relating water usage) is proposed. The first one, the building of Otto Haessler, just at the entrance in the Siedlung, is connected to a washing room, on which we could see the damaged caused by the lack of isolation of the structural parts in metal. Otto Haessler proposed for this building a metal skeleton like at the buildings in Celle, about which we wrote in the World Housing Encyclopedia (link). The intervention proposed among others to assure the way how the staircase connects to the main building replacing the rollos through glazing. The second one was a building by Walter Gropius next to a copy of it from the 1950s. Later interventions on the Siedlung also filled the gap between them with a connection building now used as exhibition place. The office of the architecture office doing the works, Mazke, is situated in the ground floor of the Gropius building and served as an example of the state of today, while a building on the last floor is currently building site. We could see for example the reference bathroom. In this building Gropius used entrances from external corridors, which along the doors are wider, providing for more living space.

6.3 Conclusions

According to the organizers the conference “dealt with the question on how technology was perceived by designing architects and how those were collaborating with engineers and found adequate building material and systems as a part of the design process”. Although numerous presentations dealt with concrete, we saw also the relationship to timber, to which we dedicated some research (link book review). The development of the language started so, according to Henri van de Velde and Istvan Medgyaszay. Attendance to the conference was made possible in frame of a short visit grant from the Network of Digital Methods in Arts and Humanities on the topic “Architectural heritage protection of the central area of Bucharest – mapping ways of visualisation in GIS and archives”, aim of which was to make visible to the general public the early reinforced concrete heritage in Bucharest, topic of our doctorate. Maybe in future editions of the conference also the heritage in Romania will be dealt with, given this opportunity to make it known. Although the aim of the network is to make available research materials through digital means for remote consulting, the site visits
after the conference showed again the importance of perceiving in real 3D a building, and the meetings at the conference the importance of networking through personal contacts. A digital infrastructure shall be the starting point for that important part in the education of an architect which is the study trip.

As we have seen the conference provided selected examples from countries editions previous to the anniversary dealt with: the Netherlands, Russia, France, Czech Republic, England, and of course Germany.

Fig. 34. Dammerstock siedlung rehabilitation. Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2013.
**Fig. 35.** Conference in 2013. Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2013.

**Fig. 36.** Dammerstock siedlung model. Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2013.
Fig. 37. Dammerstock Siedlung excursion, Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2013.
Fig. 38. Damerstock Siedlung excursion. Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2013.
7. About use trails and patina – at the end of the conference „Original and replacement“ / Alex Dill

Each restoration is usually an individual case. Simplified the author could name a restoration as being successful, when the construction work remains conserved and maintained, on the background of a documented construction history, in the sense of its architectural character, taking into account its social claim, its functions, its technology, its materiality and its aesthetics, its basic architectural quality in the whole and in detail as authentically as possible. When a construction work is restored corresponding to internationally recognised standards, goals and requirements from for example UNESCO and organisations such as ICOMOS or docomomo knowledgeable for specialists and successfully, it can be valued as an example. There is no formula for the guaranteed success. According to the author’s experience, a thoroughly construction research and professional documentation are the key for success. A restoration concept which suits the architecture and project concept of the original is the further condition, and an extremely engaged cooperation of all experts and responsible is finally necessary for the success. The successful result is then in any case competitionless and of exceptional and sustainable value.

The newest example of this kind is the Villa Tugendhat in Brno, which was reopened on the 29th of February 2012. The network docomomo conducts a registry with buildings and descriptions of selected buildings of Modernism, and in the latter years there is outstanding literature to the newest examples, like the publication row of the Wüstenrot foundation, which served much in the field of restoration of Modernist architecture. Some exemplary, very impressive and exceptionally interesting examples are the neighbourhoods in Berlin in the 1920s, in the meantime world heritage, the ADGB-school in Bernau, which got the Knoll – Award/World Monument Fund, the House Schminke in Löbau, the Einstein tower in Berlin, the Work office in Dessau and the Henry and Emma Budge dormitory in Frankfurt. Abroad are exceptional, successful restoration for example the library in Vipuri (today Russia) by Alvar Aalto, Maison de Verre in Paris by Pierre Chareau, Sanatorium Zonnestraal at Hilversum by Johannes Duiker, and the Lever Haus in New York, designed by Gordon Bunshaft.

For a desirable approach to the buildings of Modernism, especially the postwar Modernism would be good if the communes, but also the independ-
ent architects and engineers would recognise the potential as architectural heritage and take it seriously, then together with an illuminated public and with the public and private owners would take care of the professional maintenance. In this place there is a lack through the diminution of the monument maintenance offices for the cultivated approach. The objects are on one side not “old” enough in order to be considered historically valuable, and at the same time they serve modified tasks and in case of necessity are not restored by specialists or are immediately victims of a complete new planning and of the higher, speculative exploitation. The investition pressure on the immeubles in agglomeration spaces is enormously high.

These construction monuments differ from those from other times because here it is about industrial construction and new materials and the in the meantime created distance to the current, valid conditions of a building, for example considering the comfort and sustainability. Still the already existing international standards contain guidelines, the existing charter also for these buildings in a fully sufficient way. They must be only employed.

A building does not lose value through aging, but through false maintenance. Patina is here a very positive keyword, and to this belong also the traces of use. The basis for the approach is an architectural knowledge, the findings from construction research and the maintenance or restoration concept. Correspondingly “time windows” remain, the traces of use or the versions from construction time or later ones can be displayed and maintained with sense.

During restoration or change principally all mistakes, which can happen, can happen, for example when employed are original surfaces or architectural elements like facades, staircases, interiors etc. are removed for lack of interest or through replacement of a for example mirrored flat glassing, unsuitable plaster layers, unsuitable energy improvements. Basically it is valid, a fully new function must fit the architecture and not the other way around. It would be false to work against the architectural substance and the character of a building.

The title World Heritage means for a building the guarantee for good success and best conditions, but can also be retracted in case of false behaviour. Connected to it is a contract for retaining, using and maintaining corresponding to the named international standards and goals. A monitoring through experts is compulsory from time to time. World heritage sites have became partially also a tourist attraction, and exactly this is again a serious danger for the buildings or artworks. Many objects, for example private houses and assemblies are not really suitable for mass tourism, but accessible understandably only after registration, in guided groups or with corre-
sponding limitations – for example Maison de Verre in Paris, the house Sonnefeld in Rotterdam, the Villa Tugendhat in Brno and the Villa Müller in Prague.

Different cultures take a different reference to architecture, ist value and its stock. The occidental culture sets since the Renaissance at the latest highly on the value of the original, on the respect of the individuality and on historical conscience. In the orient different cultural values are developed, and in Asia or Africa for example time, duration and temporality are seen and experienced in a different way and with different cultural routes. From here comes that for example in the byzantine culture an icon does not lose value if overpainted. In these cultural difference does the author see also a reason for the ignorance of the responsible in Russia for the not existing monument maintenance of buildings of the Avant-Garde and of Constructivism (for example the housing building by Melnicov) in Russia. Not a single one of these buildings is prepared for a UNESCO list and maintained so, the world is quasi left poorer a piece of common mankind heritage.

The idea, a complete replacement, so an actual copy could be even more advantageous and replace on a much more convincing art built heritage is sadly widely spread. But this sounds sadder as it is. In reality we have never had such a big interest to retain building. Today there is an extremely high attention for monument maintenance, a fast exchange and big precision in application.
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Fig. 39. Villa Tugendhat, Brno, architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe (1929-1930), before restoration. Photo: Alex Dill.
Fig. 40. Villa Tugendhat, Brno, architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe (1929-1930), during restoration. Photo: Alex Dill.
Fig. 41. Villa Tugendhat, Brno, architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe (1929-1930), during restoration. Photo: Alex Dill.
Fig. 42. Villa Tugendhat, Brno, architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe (1929-1930), during restoration. Photo: Alex Dill.
Fig. 43. Villa Tugendhat, Brno, architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe (1929-1930), during restoration. Photo: Alex Dill.
Fig. 44. Villa Tugendhat, Brno, architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe (1929-1930), during restoration. Photo: Alex Dill.
Fig. 45. Villa Tugendhat, Brno, architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe (1929-1930), during restoration. Photo: Alex Dill.
Fig. 46. Villa Tugendhat, Brno, architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe (1929-1930), during restoration. Photo: Alex Dill.
Fig. 47. Villa Tugendhat, Brno, architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe (1929-1930), during restoration. Photo: Alex Dill.

Fig. 48. Villa Tugendhat, Brno, architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe (1929-1930), after restoration, exterior. Photo: Alex Dill.
Fig. 49. Villa Tugendhat, Brno, architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe (1929-1930), after restoration, interiors. Photo: Alex Dill.
Fig. 50. Big Market Hall, Frankfurt. Photo: Alex Dill, 2004.
Fig. 51. Big Market Hall, Frankfurt. Photo: Alex Dill.
Fig. 52. Big Market Hall, Frankfurt. Photo: Alex Dill.
Fig. 53. Big Market Hall, Frankfurt. Photo: Alex Dill.
Fig. 54. Big Market Hall, Frankfurt. Photo: Alex Dill.
8. ORIGINAL + REPLACEMENT / Alex Dill

Virtuality is Reality
Modernity:
Walter Gropius and the Bauhaus Dessau together with the modern movement proclaimed the industrial production of architecture, interiors, furniture and all kinds of things needed in the modern life. Technologie as art was the key to industrial production, in traffic (Junkers Vision of an civil airtraffic), in fields of common and social life together with the vision of a healthy, peaceful, democratic Society under the horizon of an INTERNATIONALISM. So far the two systems of capitalism and socialism, as a consequence of shared knowledge and interest of artists, engineers and scientists in East and West have been in the same competition.

We still are all living and enjoying the fruits of this modernity, trying to avoid the disadvantages and the hybris of exploitation and uncontrollable technological risks, the other side of the medal by fighting for the development of the
“project of civilization”.

Virtuallity:
The Information Science and Technologie now reached a practice in research, production and culture that we can say theirs is a new aera of Reality. It is Virtuality, globalization and a rapid change in the organization and development of the societies, very new possibilities of researching and using material, extreme demands to ecological production and care or fight for resources trying to set up peace and health in so many countries of the world suffering strongly by extreme living conditions.

The young generation is coming up using second life and computer games, virtual reality and international simmultaneous communication as a new cultural chance,
“virtuallity”.

Originality + Replacement depend on culture:
Nomad cultures have a very different practice of life than city cultures. For example soil, nature richness and water rights are free again after the inhabitants have moved and it is not possible to take it and devide it into private ownership. The Tradition of the Occident is different from the Orient. There are different ways of thinking about AUTHENTICITY. In European culture we are thinking of our existing and our surrounding as a
UNIQUE THING. For example since the renaissance a picture or a sculpture of Michelangelo Buonarotti is worthful as the Original, a Rembrandt painting is of high value only if it is authentic and it is very clear that the buildings of the modern movement for example of Le Corbusier or Gerrit Rietfeld today are of big cultural and economic value similar to the art pieces of the Modern Art. The work of Oskar Niemeyer, Brasilia was announced World Heritage in 19.. and the Vila Tugendhat of Ludwig, Mies van der Rohe, became World Heritage Status 2008 together with the challenge to a sophisticated research, documentation and conservation to present its original Materials, the Spirit of the space and the historical Authenticity together with the adventorious History of the house and its users.

The Byzantine Culture allows that the painting of an “IKON” could be covered again without losing its value, it is a religious and so far a spiritual value that rises by the use and the richness of adorations, that means that for the conscious in practice it can have the consequence that Originality in architecture is treated in another way, strictly conservation is not necessary, changes can be welcome, like we can see in many projects in Russia, like the planetarium in Moscow, famous workers-clubs, housing and many other important monuments of the avant-garde.

In Japan and Areas in Tibet we have the Ritual renewal of some very important temples, they are burned down and replaced, demonstrating rebirthing and continuity. This is another conscious of the replacement, the COPY.

Taking all aspects of globalization, new technologies, migration and changes of generation into account it means that the challenge is high developed culture + consciousness advanced EDUCATION, RESEARCH, COMMUNICATION, CULTURE + POLITIC “original heritage”

Fazit:
We are creating new Design, New Architecture, New Cities.
We take part creating a New Culture for tomorrow.
We are building the Architectural Heritage of tomorrow.

Virtuallity as Reality has become the fashion of today. Diversification is the luxury and the punishment of a culture in times of globalization and enormous richness and poorness at the same time.

Original Architectural Heritage is an outstanding cultural value. It is a treasure for every future and we all are the family of hires, that have the privilege to share and the challenge to care for this VALUE.
Fig. 55. Replacement: Expo Pavillion Barcelona, architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe (top – see also the study trip) and original: Villa Tugendhat, Brno, architect Ludwig Mies van der Rohe (bottom). Photo: Alex Dill.
Fig. 56. Big Market Hall, Frankfurt, 1929. Photo: Alex Dill, 2002.

Fig. 57. instead of protection / two different fire attacks Photo: Alex Dill.
9. Modernism in Europe
„About the role of Werkbund neighbourhoods in European context“ - Werkbund neighbourhoods in contemporary Europe / Alex Dill

9.1 The Werkbund neighbourhoods in Europe

Are today in Poland, Czech Republic, Austria, Switzerland and Germany unique architecture monuments from my point of view and cultural heritage which deserves a common European recognition as cultural heritage in any case.

This is because of the character of the neighbourhoods as exhibitions of the Avant-Garde. They were this already early at the begin of the 20th century. This was European spirit while the national states were still deep in their ego interests and developments. On the difficult way in a common Europe of democratic states they were successful as inspiring example of international cooperation of progressive artists and architects. The experimental housing neighbourhoods, which were created at the initiative of different Werkbund groups were not only an important cultural and social engagement. In the shortest time new possibilities and findings were presented in public and discussed as timely limited exhibitions and as current future prototypes and model neighbourhoods. “The model neighbourhoods were, apart of specialist journals, the megaphone of a new building culture” (W.). They prove at the same time the high expectations of quality in architecture, in product design, in shaping the environment of housing in community. The Werkbund neighbourhoods articulate all discussions which stayed in the centre of the work of Werkbund. They are single testimonies of the creativity of the architects, initiators and builders, of their international cooperation and of social start.

This chapter will give detailed thoughts to the following keywords:
1. The Werkbund
2. Modernism as cultural heritage in Europe
3. Building culture in international comparison
4. The international exchange and the expertise

The author is himself member of the Werkbund, because this association of artists, architects, designers and creators of culture responses to current questions in a big openness and tries as group of engaged specialists to edit
valuable contributions to the development and shaping of our environment. Although it was funded more than 100 years ago, the Werkbund remained actual for these reasons, also in contemporaneity which is more characterised by initiatives and networks or for examples NGOs.

Julius Posener talked very suitably about this:

„The titles may be others, which can be written about the activity of the Werkbund, the contents are basically the same. They were tensioned further than the narrow and dry concept of an industrial culture.

The topic of the Werkbund is, in the widest sense, culture critique. It has never been different“ (in „Lexikon der Architektur des 20. Jhdts., 1983, Hatje Verlag)

9.2 The Werkbund,

founded 1907, is no association of interests. It has always been open for the most actual questions of its time, and non dogmatic. Its members didn’t have to have a common opinion, they quarreled and fought with each other, and it did not go for this reason a straight way in the run of the time. It was inspired by the Arts and Crafts movement, but the most important differentiation characteristic was that the Werkbund was together with industry and not against it towards responding to the difficulties of the coming society, the mass production, which may lead to feeling foreign. It has been understood that not against but with the quickly progressing industry solutions could be found. And the industrials have understood this as well, as in case of for example Walther Rathenau, the son of the founder of AEG, which gave over all development and conformation tasks about the world company to Peter Behrens, from writing, over the architecture till the smallest product. The workers had to be proud of their firma, of their factory and their products and had to be an important exporter on the basis of their superior quality and have success in the international competition. The Englishman Robert Ashbee has already formulated 1908 this way, quality in the product and in that one, who produces. (L.Burckhardt, Der Werkbund)

WWI ended the enthusiasm for the victory way of German industry. Tessenow remembers this in the book “Manual work and small town”. On the height of the blood in the last war year, senselessly extended and commanded by military people like Erich F. W. Ludendorf and the regents, he writes that the hell did not start first with the genocide. He means also the arming not known before. The power loss of the German industry is felt like a redemption.
1919 Poelzig talks about the fact that at the begin the Werkbund was brought to life by a spiritual and not an economic movement. It was a “Return to arts” (Adolf Behne) and it has been always about a rational position towards machine aesthetics and to industry design around “constructive culture critique”. – But the industry was not destroyed and the Werkbund was put opposite to new, mainly socio-economic challenges.

The Bauhaus was a step from the new direction for an industrial production, tot he Bauhaus the workshops of a new lab fort he editing of models for industrial production. Typisation was the key word. The architecture of new rationality was created, the “Neues Bauen” (new construction), the architecture of functionalism. „L’Esprit Nouveau“, finally the Modernism, which should make world wide furors as international style. How close was the architecture of Modernism to the Werkbund is shown by the fact that Le Corbusier, the Dutch Mart Stam and Pieter Oud participated at the Werkbund neighbourhoods. Le Corbusier, Mies van der Rohe and Gropius have already met in the planning office of Peter Behrens, the founding member of the Werkbund, in 1907.

With all differences and contradictory views a goal has been always common: the testimony to quality.

The Werkbund neighbourhood to Stuttgart Weißenhof was releaser of internationally important developments such as CIAM, already one year later.

The Werkbund oriented itself always towards new, upcoming topics, housing as social basic problem and task, tot he processes of further development of a society of consum and information, to the “endangering of life quality”, yes of the “basis of life”, the protection of environment in the conference and action under the somewhat old title 1959 “The huge land destruction”.

Today the name of Werkbund is still Werkbund. It has been years long engaged fighter and guaranty ... “for beauty, taste, shape, dignity and for the noble making of manual work, of the commodities and of the people who use it” (conference presentation Okt 1959) ?

He critiques the industry and the politics where it is where it is appropriate, and does not work anymore hand in hand with the production, which was decoupled since long, as well as the planning activity of cities and the community. New topics appear and the communes and communities take on with pleasure sometimes critical analysis and proposals, new ideas. Even if it is more silent in the Werkbund and to the same time louder and faster in the net of information and the spread of important and non important trends. The Qualities of everyday reality of the citizens, their life and work conditions and their environment remained constant question and challenge, and
the goal of a further development of the forms of democracy in a global society of new so far not yet known technologies and new economy forms.

Peter Behrens AEG, 1908, / German Werkbund exhibition Coeln 1914, Lilli Reich + Ludwig Mies van der Rohe 1928 3. Exhibitions for the textile industry, Exhibition Marcel Breuer 1926, Appartment 1931, Brussel, World Exhibition, German Pavillon 1958, Egon Eiermann + Sep Ruf,

Otl Aicher, Günther Behnisch; Olympiad Munich, „The merry games“

9.3 Modernism as (common) cultural heritage in Europe

has a very intensive tradition, in which artists, architects, musicians and practicians and science inspired each other their work, influenced themselves, worked together, travelled, stayed in competition but before everything were invited to different places of cultural happening and got tasks.

In Modernism they was for example painter, grafician, architect and designer El Lissitzki (Lasar Markowitz Lissizki) from Smolensk who studied at the TH Darmstadt (1909-14). After the Russian Revolution he took the new situation in Russia as departure and took as one of the young Avant-Garde artists the role of a cultural ambassador of the still young revolutionary Russia. He was sent to travel in whole Western Europe and was known in the European scene and integrated therein, with some in close friendship and so he stayed in exchange with Theo an Doesburg and the De Stijl members and many artists in remaining Europe. Ginzburg studied in Milan and had been always best informed about Western news and findings. Le Corbusier visited his Narkomfin house and asked for detail drawings of the facade.

Eileen Gray, the designer born in Ireland, who is world known till today with the own showroom in Paris and an own, from Le Corbusier admired house and very Avant-Garde furniture, had let to be sent to her immediately after appearance the Futurismus manifesto from Italy, and was very interested in extravagant material employment. She studied Japanese lack art and was interested in all news regarding material employment up to light airplane construction. Surprisingly, she was one of the creative and independent women with worldwide perspective and connections in a field, which was that time fully dominated by men.

The Bauhaus of the Russian Avant-Garde schools for example Whutemas, its architects and artists had frequent exchange. This way it came without saying also to common or parallel efforts, exhibitions, projects, which, without the one to one inspirations wouldn’t have been so excep-
tional, pioneering and renowned – European destinies / European cultural performance.

This all talks for the commons of a European heritage of Modernism.

One can also say, that we are a heritage community, which hast o pre-
serve a common priceworthy heritage well and in common.

(How impulse giving for international exhange it was has been shown already in the small example of the artists colony in the author’s residence city Darmstadt. The Mathildenhöhe in Darmstadt, one of the three important Art Nouveau centres in Europe, was not initiated or done by the citizens of Darmstadt, but the release were impressions and influences from England around the young, modern prince raised in England and the creativity of artists around Joseph Maria Olbrich from Vienna (first exhibition 1901): Ol-
brich was in Vienna already a star when he was called to Darmstadt. He was afterwards also very successful also with buildings in Germany, ex. De-
partment store in Düsseldorf, taking influence on the architecture develop-
ment in Europe. Also the “Russian-orthodox church” in Darmstadt, planned and fabricated in St. Petersburg (inauguration in Darmstadt on he Mathil
denhöhe, 1899) was designed by the court architect Louis Benois and trans-
ported to Darmstadt in huge boxes which were assembled there.)

9.4 Building culture in international comparison (European cultural heritage / world heritage)

The UNESCO has in the meantime now 981 world heritage sites in about 160 states. It is differentiated between cultural and natural monuments. The current number shows 759 cultural monuments and 193 natural monuments. An international comparison of buildings or assemblies which are certified today as UNESCO world heritage or for which it has been applied for show, that there are big differences in the application and in the recognition and listing.

In Russia and in some GUS states there is little certified cultural heritage, in states with active monument protection, in Western Europe in the mean-
time really many.

Exactly the Modernism is not represented at all in the East, which has purely political reasons.

Modernism in the West, with the Bauhaus sites Weimar and Dessau (1919-33) Rietveld-Schroeder-Huis (Utrecht,NL, 1924-25), Haus Tugend- hat (Brno, Czech Republic, 1930), Zech Zollverein (Essen, 1928-32), Re-
construction of Le Havre (1945-64), Century hall Breslau (1911-13),
Neighbourhoods of Modernism in Berlin (1913-1934) Fagus Works (Alfeld, 1911)

The unilateralty oft he listing of works oft he 20th century means that the problem here is not the research or the expertise of the specialist world but that there is still need for important changes and orientation on political level in order to reach progress here.

Different mentality and different understanding of the value of an original or of authenticity in East and West is in the same time a problem, since in the byzantine tradition, in the orthodox art an artistic work, for example a saint icon, may be repainted or reshaped without losing value through this. Translated to architecture this means in the powerful institutions in Russia that demolition and replacement with construction materials from today is propagated as value increasing mean in the conservation of important cultural heritage.

On the background of an international comparison of cultural heritage of Modernism in Europe and exactly on the background of the current international experience it is a very important project to define the Werkbund neighbourhoods as European cultural heritage and to make a common application for recognition.

Naturally there are many outstanding, exemplary models for modernism neighbourhoods in Europe, for example in the Netherlands with Out, in France with Lurcat and naturally Le Corbusier, in Copenhagen with Jacobsen and in Frankfurt with the architects of Neues Bauen around Ernst May. Naturally the ideas of the Werkbund members or those of those architects and designers engaged in the other projects cannot be separated from one another. It remains an common inspired being and an action influenced by one another.

The Werkbund neighbourhoods had from the begin a land spanning approach for international cooperation and exchange, the role of prethinker with prototypes, with special programme topics and the approach, to invited some of the best international specialists quasi in competition for the best solutions. This happened paralelly and in accordance with the developments of Moderns and to the meetings and results of the CIAM.

Also in the years after 1945 there were known international building exhibitions, with invitations to artists and architects from different countries and with progressive questions. The maybe best known ones in Germany are the Interbau Berlin 1957 and in recent times the IBA Emscher Park 1998-99. Also in the Werkbund there were always new efforts to mix in with a new application and for example a new Werkbund neighbourhood. But the Werkbund had after 1945 to deal with much more questions than
before and the growing critique on the developments of the industry and the developments in architecture and urbanism asked for larger and larger discussions. It was not anymore possible to do a comparably influential, only from the Werkbund out, “Building exhibition”, so that the Werkbund neighbourhoods remain the only built examples in the name of the Werkbund.

(„UNESCO stays for United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization, It is one of the 16 legally independent special organisations of the United Nations. To time there are 195 member states represented in the UNESCO. It has the headquarters in Paris.

The leading idea of UNESCO is: „since wars begin in the minds of men, it is in the minds of men that the defences of peace must be constructed“. This stays in the preamble of the constitution which was signed on the 16th of November 1945 in London.

From the experience of WWII the following lessons was drawn “a peace based exclusively upon the political and economic arrangements of governments would not be a peace which could secure the unanimous, lasting and sincere support of the peoples of the world, and that the peace must therefore be founded, if it is not to fail, upon the intellectual and moral solidarity of mankind”

UNESCO hast he task „to contribute to peace and security by promoting collaboration among the nations through education, science and culture.“ 4th November 1946 the Constitution of UNESCO was legally binding.)

9.5 International exchange and expertise

In the above it was demonstrated how the international cooperation of artists, the one another inspiration, the competition, the exchange have led first to the huge richness in arts and architecture. In what regards the architecture of Modernism, there are a number of organisations such as ICOMOS but also NGOs such as for example MAPS or networks, such as docomomo or Twentieth Century Architecture Society. These can work only so well and strong as the politics, the specialists world and the public, for example the civil society want and promote. Since many years there is the international exchange to the heritage of Avant-Garde architecture of the Soviet Union. Numerous meetings, workshops, excursion and publications, not to last the big common international conference “Heritage at risk” of ICOMOS and DOCOMOMO and with more than 300 participants from all over the world have created a huge potential on research results, expertise and big media interest and publications, but in the aftermath no substantial progress.
This was 2007. Still it is valid the information received 2004 from the author in new York from a Russian architect that, that what is moving us, to preserve the buildings of Modernism for us and for the world after us as architecture heritage, is not of interest for the power who do not decide the opposite but follow other interests.

Best example is the former city major Luschkow who defamed the building of Modernism as wrong development, but in opposition wanted to be world heritage the reconstructed Christ Saviour church as first building of 20th century. International exchange and expertise are not automatically possible and must be sometimes fought for.

The role of politics is not to be valued enough, since often it is determinant in some states.

As the Villa Tugendhat in the year 2008 was already publicly accessible but before a conservation action, for the call of which there were formal problems, which led to civil processes and a worldwide attention, the house remained for years in a waiting position. The foreign specialists felt themselves always with less power regarding the depreciation of the building and the city came at the same time more under pressure because of the growing critique. Finally international meetings, the openness of the local responsible of the director and the higher preservations and international conferences for example the docomomo exchange or the conference Materiality led to the first understanding and finally determinant steps of the city to the solution of juridic problems.

Since it was about world heritage and 2/3 of the costs were EU funding money the city decided to have an international experts advisory board with knowledgeable experts in the field of research and preservation of the buildings of the Modernism, abbreviated with THICOM.

This should prove as a fortunate case in the whole process of the restoration, as the already commissioned firm UNISTAV had not sufficient experience and the Villa Tugendht was in danger through restoration to loose even more original substance (ex. All plaster surfaces). Almost all recommendations of the expert team were confirmed at the end by the city board and executed. The commissioned, stone, timber and metal conservators and specialist firms were carried away and performed on the basis of high expertise partially exceptional work. The specialist authority of the responsible on site is usually not sufficient. It was the enthusiastic influence of the international experts, the interested public and the specialist intensive, international exchange which was directed towards success which could be finally achieved. There were the confer-
ences/exhibitions/publications/lectures/excursions/films/workshops which led to success.

Expertise on one side / politics on the other side are indispensable.

The newest findings, the best result can be edited according to the author’s experience, step by step, despite competition, resentiments or contradictory specialist positions and attitudes.

Usually it needs intensive research, expertise, intensively as it can be done discussions or the debate about the concept and the contents and the details of the preservation of the built cultural heritage.

But it needs first the understanding of the politically responsible, their conviction, their sustainable support.

The author hopes, that the Werkbund neighbourhoods not only one day, but already in the close future will be a common European cultural heritage.

### 9.6 Chronology

- 1927 Werkbundsiedlung Stuttgart „Weißenhofsiedlung“
- 1928 Werkbundsiedlung Brünn „Nový Dům“
- 1929 Werkbundsiedlung Breslau „WUWA“
- 1932 Werkbundsiedlung Wien
- 1932 Werkbundsiedlung Neubühl in Zürich-Wollishofen
- 1932/33 Werkbundsiedlung Prag „Baba“
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Fig. 58. Narkomfin building, Moscow, architect Moisei Ginzburg with Ignaty Milinis (1928-1932). Photo: Alex Dill.

Fig. 59. Narkomfin building, Moscow, architect Moisei Ginzburg with Ignaty Milinis (1928-1932). Photo: Alex Dill.
Fig. 60. Narkomfin building, Moscow, architect Moisei Ginzburg with Ignaty Milinis (1928-1932). Photo: Alex Dill.
Fig. 61. Rusakov Workers' Club, Moscow, architect Konstantin Melnikov (1927-28). Photo: Alex Dill.

The book Mendelsohn - Der Einsteinturm. Die Geschichte einer Instandsetzung [Mendelsohn – the Einstein tower. The story of a restoration], editor Norbert Huse, provides the documentation of a restoration endeavour in the last decade of the 20th century of the Einsteintower in Potsdam, Germany. Known as a iconic build of reinforced concrete Avant-Garde, the book explores the use of concrete in the building, the limits in employing it and the damages which resulted from the inhomogenous employment. Through this employment of new materials for that time a building which will have to be maintained at regular intervals resulted. The restoration was done 1997-1999 and to the time the book was published no similar documentation material on a building of the Modern Movement existed. The chapters in this edited book present not only results, but also the considerations which led to conservation decisions.

Mendelsohn - Der Einsteinturm. Die Geschichte einer Instandsetzung.  
Editor: Norbert Huse  
Published by Karl Krämer Verlag Stuttgart + Zürich  
and  
Wüstenrot Stiftung, Ludwigsburg  
2000  
ISBN 3-7828-1512-2  
Price: 25 €  
Language: German  
Series Baudenkmale der Moderne  
In the same series  

tion] was edited by Norbert Huse, professor at the chair for art history of the Technical University of Munich and published by Karl Krämer (Stuttgart, Zürich) in cooperation with the Foundation Wüstenrot (Ludwigsburg). The Foundation Wüstenrot is known for its engagement in promoting good practices in conservation and restoration, but also in sensible building in historical context. The book documents the renovation of the renowned Einstein-tower of the architect Hans Scharoun in the Science Park “Albert Einstein” in Potsdam, which became a landmark of Modern architecture through its free shape which suggests building out of concrete. That it is not so, we will find out reading this book. The book was published in 2000 in German language. It is the first book in a series called “Baudenkmale der Moderne” [Monuments of Modernity], in which series appeared also the story of renovation of the house Schminke by Scharoun (2002), of the Meisterhaus Muche/Schlemmer by Walter Gropius (2003) and of the coupled house by Le Corbusier/Pierre Jeanneret in the Weissenhof Siedlung, Stuttgart (2006). We hope to provide reviews of these books in the following numbers of the journal. The book consists of 12 chapters, preceded by 4 introductions, written by 17 authors and followed by a chronic of the restoration works and a technical cassette. The chapters are not subdivided by subtitles; they only have numbered parts in the shape of essays. The authors are both from academic field and from conservation practice, and they are architects, restorers, engineers, art historians, landscape architects, monument preservers. The book has 208 pages and numerous illustrations.

In the introduction, Georg Adlbert from the Wüstenrot Stiftung tells that the endeavour was conceived as a pilot project. Pilot projects are punctual actions thought give an example which spreads and becomes a better routine. As a pilot project, so Adlbert, research took place parallel with the performance of the works in order to learn lessons which can be transferred to other constructions of Modernism, which was possible through the scientific accompaniment of the whole process in an interdisciplinary team.

A second foreword is given by Peter A. Stolz, administrative leader of the Astrophysical Institute Potsdam.

A further foreword is given by Detlef Karg, director of the Office for Monuments of the state of Brandenburg, where the Einsteinturm is located. Karg points the attention to the fact that the Einsteinturm needed maintenance immediately after construction, due to its problems of construction physics, as we will see in the chapters of the book.

The final foreword is given by the editor, highlighting the way how research and practice went hand in hand in this multiannual endeavour. To the time when the works were finalized, no other monument of Modernism was
so well investigated as this one. But, so the editor, all investigations were
done with the purpose to serve conservation. At the same time, so points out
Huse, the Einsteinturm is a unique piece, and, as such, experiences and con-
cclusions cannot be transferred so easily to other works, but the pilot project
served to test if the monuments of Modernism can be approached with the
conceptional and practical instrumentarium of monument conservation,
what seems to be proved.

The first chapter is written by Norbert Huse as well. It serves to show the
“facetes of the monument”. One important aspect Huse investigates is the
dependence of the shape of the Einstein Tower and the material reinforced
concrete – employed or rather not. More “facettes” serve to display one: the
discrepancy between request and realization. Huse underlines that the Ein-
steinturm is a “monument of the theory of the relativity” Huse quoted Men-
delsohn about the not-employment of reinforced concrete: “the formwork
should have been done by ship constructors”. This was observed later on
also by Hilberseimer, quoted by Huse, that the shape of the Einsteintower
does not correspond to the laws of construction in concrete. In this approach
he is not alone: he sees, so Huse, the anticipation of a reinforced concrete
architecture in the works of Ernst Maria Olbrich, whose works in Darmstadt
are illustrated, which were, however, built in timber and material. The next
one quoted is Henri van de Velde, where he finds concrete in Jugendstil, as
search for the shape, for morphology. He underlines a topic of today, of
“nature and technique”, the former giving the theme and the later the mor-
phology. The archive research of Huse finds enquiries from Mendelsohn
asking for the dependence of the building shape not only from the function,
but also from the material. Of course, this chapter only approaches the theo-
ries on building in reinforced concrete and its morphological language with
which Mendelsohn was confronted, and not others known to us, such as
Medgyaszay in Hungary with the theatre in Veszprém, or the tectonics the-
ory of Kenneth Frampton68.

The second chapter is written by Christine Hoh-Slodczyk about the de-
velopment from the sketch to the tower, from sketching to constructing.
Also Hoh-Slodczyk remarks the characteristic of the photos which inspires,
through its monolithic shape and the uneven surface, the execution out of
concrete, which spread in literature and was never contradicted by Mendel-
sohn. Also, so Hoh-Slodczyk, the grey colour of photographs suggested

68 Kenneth, Frampton, “Studies in Tectonic Culture. The Poetics of Construction in
concrete – contradicted by the fact that the tower was coloured. We wish to add that even as late as in 2006 we found the Einstein Tower presented as case of concrete construction at the fib international concrete congress in Naples 2006. This again was a characteristic of the time – the same mistakes in literature are made regarding other buildings known to us, such as the building in the Népszinház street by Béla Lajta in Hungary. The uneven plaster surface was, according to the investigations by Hoh-Slodczyk, however, replaced in 1930 with an even one. The research of Hoh-Slodczyk spans not only the published drawings and archive photographs, but also letters and the construction descriptions of Mendelsohn. So Mendelsohn in the letters wishes a reinforced concrete construction, has, however, his doubts because of the lack of cement, and in later letters it is presented only as mixed construction, as it was constructed at the end: the lower part of the building would have been in reinforced concrete, the tower itself in brick masonry. The research of Hoh-Slodczyk goes further in analyzing the documents due to which the material for the execution changed from concrete to brick masonry: documents on costs estimations in both materials. With run of the time Mendelsohn renounced also at the intention to do the window part in concrete (Hoh-Slodczyk), which, as we will later see, led to problems in construction physics. The analysis of written documents is completed by that of the drawings of models and of building authorization plans, which, at some moment, show wooden floors. A return to the initial reinforced concrete

model vision is seen by Hoh-Slodczyk in their partial replacement with steel-stone floors, the so-named Kleine’sche floors. These type of floors we wish to add that they were usual in Germany at that time, as we documented in a report about housing of Modernism69.

The next chapter is written by Christine Hoh-Slodczyk as well and is about damages and repair works 1927-1995. It shows in a first page size photo the building site at the Einstein tower during the first reparations in 1927-28. So the first reparation measures were necessary much earlier than intended, after five years only. Again, archive search of affirmations displayed that the damages are caused not by execution mistakes, but by concept mistakes. One of the causes, so the findings of Hoh-Slodczyk, was that the masonry was thinner in some places, a cause for building damages till

today. Another reason was the connection between reinforced concrete and masonry and shotplaster which did not protect well from weathering. It is quoted how it was prescribed to replace some reinforced concrete parts, such as the parapets, against which Mendelsohn protested. 1945 the tower was damaged again, through an explosion, damages which were repaired in the years after the war, so the author. Other photos, first published 1966 and republished in this book, taken 1964, show damages on the façade from humidity, and the building site for reparations in 1978. In 1998 the tower was damaged by a fire, also documented by a photograph.

Robert Graefrath and Jörg Limber wrote a chapter on notes from the monument protection on the contemporary repair. They begin with the principle of substance preservation: in a repair process it must be evaluated if the element is part of the monument protected substance from the point of view of technique and building history. The authors see that given the renowned shape of the tower the water could never flow away properly. Also, the solution of mixing concrete and masonry led to a technical non-optimal solution and consequently to damages. One of the advantages, so the authors, is the public ownership of the tower, which simplified the cooperation among the actors in the restoration process: it made possible, among others, a detailed documentation of the substance and of the former reparations, in frame of which the monument protection concept was developed. We want to point here to the fact that in a book by Nägelle about the restoration of the Weissenhof Siedlung70 detailed matrixes about the wishes of the different actors involved in monument protection are presented. The monument protection concept presented by the authors was focused on the fact that the shape of the Einstein Tower determines the largest part of its monument value. Two examples of applying the monument protection principle are given: the parapets of the windows and their metal part and the colour of the tower.

Sabine Schmidt-Rösel wrote a chapter about the savings of construction costs through competence. One preliminary observation of Schmidt-Rösel is that architects and engineers, paid for work on a monument according to HOAI (the honorary order for architects and engineers) don’t have always the necessary knowledge of building physics, chemistry or biology; this must be transferred to specialist laboratories. Experts are necessary, so Schmidt-Rösel in case of a historic building, other than at new buildings, because today expertise in materials usual earlier in time is not given. Ex-

---

amples are given: the decision about plaster outgoing from the wish to pro-
tect from weathering, the need for specialists for concrete technology, in or-
der to determine the causes for rifts or for landscape architecture, as some
parts of the building are covered by vegetation. Schmidt-Rösel concludes
that from an economic point of view a project as the restoration of the Ein-
stein tower needs cooperation among the partners.

The next chapter is written by Gerhard Pichler and it is called “Baukon-
struktion or why does the Einstein tower remain a maintenance case”. 
“Baukonstruktion” denominates in German the construction process as well
as the result, how the building elements are connected in the construction. It
is the chapter which presents which parts of the building are in reinforced
concrete and which in masonry, in coloured drawings based on the drawings
of Mendelsohn from 1930 publications. Pichler affirms that Louise Mendel-
sohn spreads a theory that in the years after WWI there was not enough
steel for the reinforcement. This, however, contradicts the use of steel for
the Klein’sche floor – much more, in Germany when the Ruhr zone was in
blossom, steel was much easier to find than reinforced concrete and it was
common for the structure of modernist buildings\(^71\). Also Pichler gives the
Mendelsohn quote given earlier in the book by Huse that for the formwork
of the concrete ship buildings would have been necessary. Pichler develops
further the idea that round shapes are possible in reinforced concrete, as
Saarinen built the airport building in New York, but in a mathematically de-
signed shape where formwork out of straight wooden boards was possible.
We would like to suggest as further reading an article published after this
book about the use of formwork in Gaudi’s Sagrada Familia\(^72\). The defi-
ciencies of the Einstein Tower are caused, so Pichler, by the fact that the
 technique was too new. Pichler explains that with the concrete technology
of today the resistance to water is also possible, and highlights that the de-
gree of reinforcement in Mendelsohn’s tower was 1/10th of what would be
considered today. The questions Pichler documents that there were put in

\(^71\) Maria, Bostenaru Dan, “Prefabricated metal construction of the Modern Move-
ment”, in World Housing Encyclopedia- summary report 2004, ed. Svetlana, Brzev, Mar-
jorie, Greene, EERI, Oakland CA, 2004, report 95. Al-so available at http://www.world-
housing.net/ (22. December 2010)

\(^72\) Josep, Gómez-Serrano, Ramón, Espel, Rosa Grima, Marc C. Burry, Antonio
Aguadoa: “Evolution of the Formwork Used in the Temple of the Sagrada Familia”, in
(22. December 2010, free because of most cited status)
the “Baukonstruktion” investigation were exactly these: which are the materials, where are the junctions between brick masonry and concrete, what is the reinforcement, which are the causes of the rifts. From a structural point of view the building is well done, so the result of the investigations Pichler presents to us, and the rifts are given by thermal causes, and by changes of material or corrosion of the reinforcement. After the investigation it was proposed for the repair a mortar enriched with cement (Polymer Cement Concrete) and for the damages from different temperatures an injection resin was used. The measures are illustrated with pictures. The main problem was, in the conclusion of Pichler, the inhomogenous building: thick and thin, masonry and concrete.

The next chapter is written by Uwe Erfurth and is about the plaster. The plaster was, so Erfurth, altered by reparation, and damages from fire, explosion, humidity. A necessary investigation was the compatibility between the plaster with cement content and the brick material. Plaster was extracted from more places: 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 8, 9, 14 and 17 are documented in the chapter. Several photos at the microscope are shown. Given the frequent changes of material of the structure, it is very difficult also today to design a unitary concept for the plaster, so Erfurth, especially because reinforced concrete was largely unknown at the moment of construction, so in the new plaster concept the transitions between masonry and concrete have to be designed. Proposed was a new plastering, but from monument protection point of view it was asked the original cannot be kept. After investigation of similar cases, parts of this could be kept, documents Erfurth, and also the removal of non-historic plaster was a challenge not to damage the masonry.

The next chapter is dedicated to plaster as well. It is written by David Hoolly and Gert Th. Mader, and is about mapping of plaster. In the beginning the authors remark that this brings together the “historical” building research (that of the historical construction) and of newer building research (research of materials and damages). The damages, so Hoolly and Mader, are determined by the material, construction but also the passing of time. The authors worked with the written and photographic documents given by Hoh-Slodczyk, but no photographic documents were systematic. Hence, they document that the method of stratigraphy proved more reliable, and that photogrammetric measurements were used as well. As this is dependent on light, a stereometric view can improve a lot, so Hoolly and Mader. The mapping of the rifts in plaster is illustrated. A dense photogrammetric scaffold proved too expensive, so on a photogrammetric grid it was proposed to use hand work (Hoolly and Mader). The result was useful to determine where interventions are necessary, conclude the authors: the longer the time
passed since the intervention, the more lessons can be learned on where
damages are worsening and where the situation is stable, or about the work
style of Mendelsohn in order to elaborate a conservation solution.

The next chapter is about a related topic, the colour and is written by
Werner Koch. Remains from the original shotplaster were looked for and
categorized, microscope photographs are shown, and the categorization of
colours in different rooms, based also on the grey shades in historic photo-
graphs.

The next chapter is a report “from a modern construction barrack” about
the renovation, written by Helge Pitz. The look for the causes and the repara-
tion went hand in hand, so Pitz. The concept of “construction barrack” in-
cluded daily discussions between the architects and the construction work-
ers which assured a feedback principle so some decisions had to be
reviewed in the light of new findings. The renovation is not seen by the au-
thor as the last one, but as one of the reparations of the tower, documented
and foreseen with an intervention plan and regular controls. Examples given
are the windows, where the beams did not respect the laws of building phys-
ics. Another subchapter is dedicated to the concrete. Numerous damage
photographs and drawings of technical details of construction measures are
provided. A further subchapter is dedicated to the plaster. It is documented
to which percent the original plaster could be kept, bound or not, including
in coloured drawings. New materials were also employed, for example
polymers to protect the metal coverings. The reversibility of such measures
is however not proved. A recent research wishes to prove the contrary73.
Another subchapter is the colour. The final chapter is dedicated to the main-
tenance. The Einstein tower is seen as a patient, so Pitz. It is yet another
concept taken from medicine, as diagnosis and pathology, both used in con-
struction and restoration. The building has, according to the author, in itself
the tendency for self-destruction: heat bridges, for example, and the new
materials must be investigated on durability, so controls are done 1-2 times
a year and the heating of rooms is limited.

The next chapter is about the exterior assets, written by Joachim G. Ja-
cobs and Petra Hübinger. The sketches of Mendelsohn, so Jacobs and
Hübinger, show an intense preoccupation of the connection the basement

73 Georgos, Karydis, “Advanced Strengthening Systems for Conserving 20th Century
Concrete Heritage: The ethical justification of utilizing Fibre Reinforced Polymer (FRP)
Composites”, in Proceedings of the 2nd fib Congress, June 5-8, 2006 – Naples, Italy
(CD), paper #0209; Condensed paper (extended abstract) in Volume 2 of printed proceed-
provides between the tower and the environment. The plan with the slopes covered with vegetation was done by Richard Neutra, who worked together with Foerster and Amman, some of the best specialists in Germany that time, according to Jacobs and Hübinger. The chapter documents the view in different timepoints, and also the fact that through the reparations after WWII some of the original concept of Mendelsohn and Neutra went lost. In frame of the renovation project the exterior assets were documented and photographed in 1998. It was a reconstruction process, dictated by the necessity to renovate the building and supported by the fact that not much original substance of the exterior assets was kept, so Jacobs and Hübinger.

The last chapter is written by Jürgen Staude about the instruments of the Einstein tower, how were they and how are they used. The scientific use of the Einstein tower, so Staude, is an important part of the restoration concept. A museum like use was not wished for and 75 years later the Einstein tower was foreseen to contribute to the astrophysics in Potsdam, is the optimistic concluding paragraph of the book, as no conclusion chapter is provided.

The book is very well written, well illustrated with colour and black and white figures and line drawings. It is recommended to everyone who works in the research of how to conserve and restore today buildings of the Modern Movement. Particularly in countries where this is rarely undertaken, it proves a unique resource to learn from experience from Western Europe. The research on the employment of reinforced concrete is particularly insightful, as this is a field research has been done only rarely: the historic concrete. Lessons seem to have been learned, as, when we visited the sites of Giuseppe Terragni’s buildings in Como, Italy, in 2009, we saw the same studies of stratigraphy as presented here. We wish that more lessons are being learned.

A drawback of the book is that it is written in German, which makes it accessible for a limited audience. Also, since the time we bought it, in the summer of 2006, it seems to be out of stock. We hope to have provided a comprehensive review which would encourage further literature research in this direction, maybe through contacting the contributors to learn more about the work they have done.
Fig. 62. Einstein tower, Potsdam, architect Erich Mendelsohn (1919-1922), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2002.
11. Forms / Maria Bostenaru

In this work we filled three kinds of forms. The first two kinds were filled by Maria Bostenaru.

The first bunch of forms regards architects of Modernism throughout Europe. 13 forms have been filled after the model of the Routledge REM encyclopedia.

The second bunch of forms regards the ones filled in the seminar at the University of Karlsruhe on new construction in the 20th century in Eastern Europe. Here we present the forms filled by Maria Bostenaru for Hungarian early rationalism architecture. The forms filled by colleagues were useful into finding addresses of first half of the 20th century architecture in Eastern Europe, an aspect not covered frequently.

11.1 Branco, Viriato Cassiano (1897-1970)

Photo at: http://www.rtp.pt/rtpmemoria/?t=Vida-e-Obra-de-Cassiano-Branco.rtp&article=3279&visual=2&layout=19&tm=46

The Portuguese architect Cassiano Branco studied first at the School of Fine Arts in Lisbon but changed to technical-industrial training from where he graduates. After travels to Paris, Bruxelles and Amsterdam rejoins the School of Fine Arts. Continues to travel, until he starts and architecture career with the first building on Avenida da Liberdade. It is followed by a couple of studies for cinema “Eden”, which, at the end, is built differently from the plan and strongly modified in the 1990s to include a courtyard behind the facade with green elements. His main works were raised in the 1930s. In this time Art Deco and Modernism influenced his work. The 1920s were marked by the introduction of reinforced concrete in Portugal in building in the work of the architects of Modernism. However, his architecture is kept simple and is simple to imitate. It is recognised that numerous imitating works were raised in the Portuguese capital (Tostoes, 1997).

However, the floor plans were not particularly innovative. The buildings are situated in the norths-western part of the centre, where the city extended with Avenidas Novas, still on the hilly part of Lisbon close to the Parliament. He was an opponent of the “New State” (Estado Novo) of Salazar and thus excluded from work in the postwar time (however, Portugal was not involved in the Second World War and as such the division in interwar and postwar is somehow artificial). Another large scale public work which was finished by others as the cinema Eden was the Coloseum in Porto. His in-
fluence in these buildings is however clear. Grand Hotel de Luso and the building at London Square show a difference in his approach of Modern Architecture, with a link to tradition, which may be attributed to long time work on Portugal of the Little Ones, where he displayed national typologies across Portugal in miniature.

List of works
1928 Car Stand Rios de Oliveira, Avenida da Liberdade, Lisbon, Portugal
1929-32 Projects for Cinema Theatre “Eden”, Lisbon, Portugal
1933-1936 Several buildings and villas in Lisbon (Av Alvares Cabral; Avenida António José de Almeida, nº 10, 14, 16, 24, etc.), Portugal
1934 Victory Hotel, Avenida da Liberdade, Lisbon, Portugal
1937 Buildings in Av Defenders Keys, Rua Nova de S. Mamede, etc., Lisbon, Portugal
1937-1962 Portugal for the Little Ones, Coimbra, Portugal
1938-1940 Grand Hotel do Luso, Lisbon, Portugal
1939 Coliseu do Porto, Rua Passos Manuel, Porto; Portugal
1940 Plan of urbanization, the Portuguese World Exhibition, Lisbon, Portugal
1951 Building on the London Square, Lisbon, Portugal

References and further reading


Visual material:
Fig. 63. Hotel Victoria, architect Cassiano Branco (1934), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2013.

Fig. 64. Building on Alvares Cabral avenue (1935), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2013.
Fig. 65. Building on Rua Nova di Sao Mamede (1935), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2013.

Fig. 66. Cinema Eden, architect Cassiano Branco. Photo: M. Bostenaru (2013).
Fig. 67. Location of the extension of Lisbon with Avenidas Novas and (blue dots) where are situated the Cassiano Branco buildings Victory Hotel and Alvares Cabral and Sao Mamede blocks of flats. Cinema “Eden” is next to Baixa. After Bostenaru and Dill (2014).


To be compared with real architecture, ex.
Fig. 68. Combination of white plaster and volcanic stone in a church in the Azores architecture, Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2008

Traditional houses

Coliseu of Porto

Grand Hotel Luso

Building at London square
http://pt.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ficheiro:Pra%C3%A7a_de_Londres_Cassiano_Branco_6837.jpg

Richard Bordenache (1905-1982), graduate of the Architecture School in Bucharest (1929) and scholarship holder in Rome 1930-32 made studies about the Santa Trinita di Venosa church, published in Ephemeris Dacoromana VII (1937, p. 1-76). The work contains numerous building survey plans and photographs, completed with the reconstruction of the demolished parts. The church presents architectural influences from the time of the entrance of nomads in Italy. Although Bordenache returned and activated as architect mainly in Romania, but also in frame of the Commission for Historic Monuments, being professor at the “Ion Mincu” Architecture Institute (1944-71), his son, also an important architect, emigrated to Karlsruhe, Germany. The nephew is a digital artist. In the interwar time Bordenache built works like the AGIR block of flats, a functionalist building plated in stone, like the Italian Rationalism works of Terragni. Among numerous interior design works is also the extension of the building of the Romanian Cultural Institute in Alexandru alley. From the villas designed we name the one for important and mobile art historian Tzigara Samurcaș. In the postwar time remarkable is a so-called palazzo on the southern part of the Palace/Revolution square, thus covering the brand wall of the Generala interwar block of flats, a new Italian influence, but of Novecento. Later on, from inner city locations, Bordenache turned towards the lakeside of Bucharest, with interventions in Snagov, Mogoșoaia and Floreasca. Building at water was prize awarded for again a classicistic building, the Loisir house for Communist nomenclature. Bordenache was also active in interwar time post-disaster reconstruction outside Bucharest, with the Corbeni intervention in Argeș county after a flood. Remarkable in interwar time are also the industrial buildings.

Works in Bucharest
1933 Costea house, parcelarea Basarab
1934-36 interior design National Art Museum, Kiseleff avenue
1935 Ursescu house, Roma str., eng. Portocală house, parcelarea Basarab, The school of conductors at the Ministry for Public Works and Constructions
1936 Prof. eng. Nicolau house, Dr. Lister street, Eng. Epure house, parcelarea Basarab
1937 Th. Emandi house, Clucerului str., block of flats AGIR, Eminescu street, painter A. Jiqidi house, Neculce street, interior design of the house Boteanu-Pipidi, Calomfirescu street
1938  IOR factory Sos. Vergului, interior design eng. Slăvescu house, Paris street, interior design, furniture and special installations, former Morțun-eng. Malaxa house, Alexandru alley, dr. Palada villa, Otopeni, k. 18, eng. Dumitrescu house, Colentina
1939  eng. Runcan house, Mogoșoaia, Devechi house, Floreasca lake, Oiaga house, Domeniilor park, restoration and interior design of the Girls school of Ion Mincu, modification prof. eng. Vasilescu-Carpen house, Domeniilor park, design of the exhibition of the Pipe factory, N. Bălcescu boulevard
1941  block of flats behind AGIR
1942  extension of IOR factory
1945-46 interior design of the flat of eng. Holzer, Sf. Apostoli street; interior design of the block of flats in Beldiman street
1947-48 interior design and installation Panduri hospital, dormitory for disciples 23 august factory
1948-49 transformation of the reunion hall and the central body of the RPR Academy

In frame of design institutes:
1951-52 „Generala” brand wall, Calea Victoriei, Loisir house in Snagov (prize awarded work), interior and exterior design Otopeni sanatorium, landscape design and decoration Snagov assembly
1953  restaurant building for the Youth Festival Șoseaua Viilor

Visual material:

Fig. 69. Richard Bordenache. Building survey Santa Trinita di Venosa (Ephemeris Daco-romana, VII/1937, Fig. 22)
**Fig. 70.** Richard Bordenache. Functionalist architecture. AGIR/ASIT palace (1935-37). Photos: M. Bostenaru, 2012, 2014.
Fig. 71. Richard Bordenache: An Italian type palace, closing the brand wall of General Building (1954). Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2012. The original Generala building. Archive plans from the Town Hall of Bucharest city (PMB fond tehnic)
Fig. 72. Richard Bordenache: Flood reconstruction in the village of Corbeni, Argeș county. Landscape, community building and a villa. Photos: M. Bostenaru, 2012. Archive plans and facade, Arges county archives.
11.3 De Finetti, Giuseppe (1892-1952)

The Italian architect and urban planner Giuseppe de Finetti was trained first in Berlin and then in Vienna as student of Adolf Loos. The studies were interrupted for the war. In 1920 returns to Italy, first Bologna, then Milan. Although from Adolf Loos he learned to renounce at decoration and work with volumes (“ornament is crime” used Loos to say) he finds a home in the Milan Novecento and its classicism leaning to the 18th century. Annegret Burg sees the Novecento developing along him together with Giovanni Muzio. His first preoccupations were dedicated to the architecture of hotels. They included unrealised projects, an intervention on an existing buildings, and theoretical contributions to a book. 1922 marked also his beginning interest for urban planning, participating to a competition for an island on Como lake.1924 he buys a terrain to build a neighbourhood according to the urban plan of 1912, in which he intends to preserve both the garden and the existing buildings. From the whole complex only two buildings were erected, his only housing buildings. One of these, Casa della Meridiana, releves the teaching of Adolf Loos in the composition of volumes, the so-called stappeled villa, a multifamily housing disposed like superposed one family housing. The stappeld concept was however dictated by the preservation of an ancient tree on the site. In 1927 with A. Alpago Novello, T. Buzzi, O. Cabiati, G. Ferrazza, A. Gadola, E. Lancia, M. Morelli, A. Minali, G. Muzio, P. Palumbo, G. Ponti, F. Reggiori wins the second place in the competition for the urban plan of Milan. His urban planning works were occasion for writing, and for participation to congresses. His theoretical work was interrupted by the work, but 1945 he founds the magazine La città. 1951 he founds Istituto di studi urbani e regionali (Institute of urban and regional studies), in frame of which he starts a study of urban geography of Milan. His contributions are remarkable in the theoretical field, together with a number of unrealised projects (both housing and mainly urban plans), while built works are scarce.

List of works
1922 Restructuration of hôtel Diana Majestic in viale Piave, Milan, Italy
1924-1925 Casa della Meridiana, Milan, Italy
1929-1930 Casa di via S. Calimero, Milan, Italy
1938 Villa Crespi, Vigevano, Italy
References and further reading


http://www.treccani.it/enciclopedia/giuseppe-de-finetti_%28Diizionario_Biografico%29/

Visual material:

**Fig. 73.** Casa della Meridiana, architect Giuseppe de Finetti (1924-25), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2010
11.4 Fränkel, Rudolf (1901-1974)

Photo at http://kg.ikb.kit.edu/arch-exil/320.php (small size)

The German-Jewish architect Rudolf Fränkel was the son of Louis Fränkel, a government architect who studied architecture at the Royal Technical College in Charlottenburg while receiving practical training from his father.

Soon after opening an office in Berlin in 1924 he worked on his first major commission, the Gartenstadt Atlantic, a Siedlung of the type garden city in an inner-city location (for which reason it was prize-awarded) now protected as monument and which underwent recent renovation (2005). One of the landmarks of the development was the Lichtburg cinema (an architecture of light), which no longer exists. Yet the Gartenstadt Atlantic is different from German Modernist architecture exactly through its way of adapting the garden city to the inner city: it has blocks and not the well known German “Zeile” (row), and the interiors are rather classical and do not display the innovation in the communication of spaces. Fränkel built some other residential buildings in the following years, which are not listed in this article. Fränkel was invited to join the Bauhaus, but declined. 1933 with the raise to power of the Nazis, he emigrated to Bucharest, where he built first a property including his studio (Dr. Roth), a metal structure office building (Adriatica), some other family and collective housing as well as industrial buildings, and two spectacle buildings – the Comedy Theatre and the Scala Cinema. It is the corner of CA Rosetti street and Magheru boulevard which displays 3 Fränkel buildings: the Malaxa (together with Horia Creanga), the Scala cinema and another one, which has been recently reshaped by removing the interior and keeping only the facade. The multifamily housing developments in Bucharest prove to suit well Fränkel’s style, as they are integrated in the context of innercity blocks. In the interwar time Bucharest displayed housing in the newly populated N-S boulevard in the city centre, instead of periphery like in (Western) Europe. Obviously he had no write to sign his own projects as the archive drawings show. The last buildings in Bucharest were raised 1936, and 1937 Fränkel moved to London, where he continued to design residential and industrial buildings. 1950 Fränkel finally emigrated to the USA to teach at the Miami University in Oxford, Ohio. Here he started the first urban planning programme in America which he led until he was retired, not being tenured (as foreign national), and he was ac-
tive in developing Master Plans. Miami University staff Gerardo Brown-Manrique is the best informed researcher on his work, while some original drawings and period photographs are kept at the Canadian Centre for Architecture in Montreal, Canada. The University of Karlsruhe (TH) used to maintain a directory of German speaking architects in exile, reporting also on Fränkel’s buildings and archiving of material. Recently an NGO based in Berlin dedicates time to German Jewish architects in exile. Fränkel through his career was a unique example of moving from Western Europe to Eastern Europe and can serve as role model for the EU today.

List of works
1924–1928 Gartenstadt Atlantic settlement, Gesundbrunnen, Berlin, Germany
1927–1929 Lichtburg cinema at Gartenstadt Atlantic, Gesundbrunnen, Berlin, Germany
1933 Dr. Roth Property (including Fraenkel studio), Bucharest, Romania
1933 Adriatica office building, Bucharest, Romania
1934 House Pop, Bucharest, Romania
1934 Velvet Textile Factory (demolished), Bucharest, Romania
1934 Block of flats Pop, Bucharest, Romania
1935 Comedy Theatre, Bucharest, Romania
1935 Vaida-Comșa House, Bucharest, Romania
1935/6 Scala Cinema, Bucharest, Romania
1935 Building Malaxa (with Horia Creanga), Bucharest, Romania
1936 Villa Flavian, Bucharest, Romania
1936 Property Magheru 1-3 (altered), Romania
1937–1938 Frankel house, Outer London, UK
1946–1947 Suflex Ltd. Factory, UK

References and further reading
http://kg.ikb.kit.edu/arch-exil/320.php
http://svrdam.cca.qc.ca/search/bs.aspx?langID=1#s=rudolf%20fr%C3%A4nkel&p=1&a=kw&nr=1&nq=1
Visual material:

Fig. 74. Gartenstadt Atlantic, Photo: M. Bostenaru 2012

Fig. 75. Dr. Roth block of flats (including the flat f Fränkel) 1933. Archive plan from the Town hall of Bucharest (PMB fond tehnic). Photo: M. Bostenaru 2011
Fig. 76. Adriatica building, Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2011. Plan: Town hall of Bucharest archives (PMB fond tehnic).
Fig. 77. Scala cinema. Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2011 and 2013
11.5 Ponti, Gio (1891-1979)

No free portrait, Wikipedia links to this one http://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/File:Gi%C3%B2Ponti.png

The Italian architect, designer and publisher Gio Ponti studied architecture at Politecnico di Milano, from where he graduated 1921, after having also served in the First World War. 1923-27 he partnered with Novecento architects Mino Fiocchi and Emilio Lancia and then till 1933 with Emilio Lancia only, a time from which date some emblematic Novecento Milanese buildings. The Novecento Movement was the counterpoint of the Rationalism of Gruppo 7 (around Giuseppe Terragni). Its architecture marked two periods, both started by Giovanni Muzio, one of decorative Novecento and one of geometric Novecento. Both leaned to the typical Milan palazzo, and were a sort of classic revival. However, as early as 1934 he built a Rationalist building in the Città universitaria in Rome (the Mathematics building). After Lancia he partnered with engineers, and, in 1950, won the commission for the Pirelli tower in Milan (1955-58) for which he partnered with no less than Pier Luigi Nervi. The 52 storeys (127m) high tower is the highest one in reinforced concrete in the world. The curtain wall is hold by a central structure. It is then when he truly turned towards Modernism. The tower attracted international attention and commissions from other continents (Venezuela, Hong Kong, USA) came. But he built abroad before, in the interwar time he built Casa Tataru in Cluj-Napoca, Romania, which retains the original furniture. One masterpiece which was built after this was the 1971 Denver Art Museum. The museum was extended twice since, and a new extension is the Hamilton pavilion by Daniel Libeskind. When comparing the original museum with the extension the adequacy for exhibition space lets Ponti’s design be the winner (Taisto Mäkelä). He continued to work for Milan as well, with a series of churches.

As industrial designer, Gio Ponti did furniture, glass and ceramicsware, including lamps from the beginnings of 1923 on, when he participated at the Bienalle in Monza. He also did scenographic arrangements. In 1928 he founded the today successful Domus magazine, the show-off magazine in architecture and arts of Italy, which he led as editor with intermittences. He was professor of his Alma Mater, the Polytechnic of Milan (1936-1961).
Gio Ponti’s work was praised by a number of awards: "Commander" of the Royal Order of Vasa in Stockholm, Accademia d'Italia Art Prize, gold medal from the Paris Académie d'Architecture and hold o honorary doctorate from London Royal College of Art.

List of works

1925 House in Via Randaccio, Milano, Italy
1927 Monumento ai Caduti (Monument of the Fallen) in Piazza Sant'Ambrogio, Milano, Italy
1928 House in Via Domenichino, Milano, Italy
1931 Typical houses: Domus Julia, Domus Carola and Domus Fausta in Via De Togni, Milano, Italy
1933 House Rasini, Porta Venezia, Milano; Italy
1933 Torre Littoria, Parco Sempione, Milano, Italy
1934 Math School, Città Universitaria, Roma, Italy
1935-1938 First Palazzo Montecatini, Milano; Italy
1938 Villa Tataru, Cluj-Napoca, Romania
1939 Palazzo Ferrania (then Fiat), Milano, Italy
1947–1951 Second Palazzo Montecatini, Milano, Italy
1952–1958 Istituto Italiano di Cultura (Fondazione Lerici), Stockholm, Sweden
1956–1961 Pirelli skyscraper, Milano, Italy
1955-1960 Church San Luca, Milano, Italy
1970 Cathedral Gran Madre di Dio, Taranto
1970-1971 Denver Art Museum, Denver, USA.

References and further reading

Gio Ponti archives http://www.giopontiarchives.org/
Taisto Mäkelä, Denver professor for history of architecture http://z10.cgpublisher.com/proposals/146/index_html

Visual material:
**Fig. 78.** Casa Tătaru, Cluj-Napoca (1938). Arch. Gio Ponti. Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2012. Visit by permission of the owner.
Fig. 80. Ideal zonification at Novecento apartments in Milano. Block of flats in Via Domenichino, arch. Emilio Lancia and Gio Ponti. Photo: M. Bostenaru 2007, Bostenaru (2011).

11.6 Cantacuzino, George Matei (1899-1960)

Photo at the Faculty of Architecture in Iasi which bears his name http://www.arhitectura.tuiasi.ro/?page_id=703&lang=en

The Romanian architect and writer George Matei (GM) Cantacuzino was born in Vienna with a diplomat father and a mother descending from the Romanian ruling family. After childhood in Vienna and school years in Switzerland (with vacations in Romania), and war years, he is admitted to study in Paris in 1920, when he also starts working on the restoration of Mogoșoaia palace. The decision for France comes on the background of Romanian francophonie, while the decision to study architecture comes on the family background of seing the begin of works at Mogoșoaia palace (under the Venetian architect Domenico Rupolo, who might connect the idea of loggias to those of Ca d'Oro in Venice). Mogoșoaia palace is one in the vicinity of Bucharest, built in Brâncovenesc style, by voivod Constantin Brâncoveanu. Afterwards he founds an office with August Schmiedigen, whom he met on the Mogoșoaia building site, with whom he builds in Palladian style (urban palace of the Chrissoveloni bank). According to Teodorovici this also reflects his childhood memories of Viennaise architecture. Actually he writes a study on the work of Andrea Palladio in 1928. In 1929 he graduates and moves back to Romania. In 1930, with opening of an own office with three collaborators, he turns towards functionalist architecture with the resort buildings at the Black Sea. In the field of functionalist architecture he collaborated with another big name of Romanian functionalist architecture, Octav Doicescu, in the industrial buildings of IAR and at the exhibition pavilion in New York (where the later remained). Another functionalist buildings are the blocks of flats in the centre of Bucharest and another hotel on the seaside designed together with Vasile Arion. A block of flats planned only by him in functionalist manner on Magheru boulevard is the Carlton block of flats, which collapsed in the 1940 earthquake. It is the only building from interwar time to collapse in this earthquake, but a precursor of the numerous collapses of interwar buildings in the 1977 earthquake due to their conformation with accentuated corner buildings. The collapse suscitated an active discussion about its cause, misused by the legionary dictatorship. However, also the interwar years are marked by in parallel designing in Renaissance style and in Brâncovenesc style (villas, and a markant building at Piața Universității, the Industrial Credit Company building). An interesting approach is the corpus near Crețulescu church, and
stay back from the big architecture gesture to put in value the church (which was in line for his history preoccupations for churches). The architecture, although Palladian, has thus the simplicity and lack of ornament of functionalism. It is an urban planning approach. The co-existence of these three directions (Renaissance/Palladian, New-Romanian/Brâncovenesc and Functionalist) led to place his architecture between tradition and Modernism. The classical approach, result of his travel studies, was as much part of his attitude as functionalism. In parallel with building activity he also did publication work: architecture history, theory and criticism. Notable are his issues of Simetria. Apart of architecture designing and writing he did architecture drawings with which he opened several exhibitions in interwar but also in postwar time. He does a number of architecture travels, incl. in the Orient. The taste for travel came during study years, when he travelled between Bucharest and Paris to see whole Europe. He works also on the urban plan of Bucharest of 1934 along with other big names of interwar architecture. After the war he built one more major building in the centre, and restored a manor (return to Palladio) before being forced by the communist regime to resign from designing. 1948 he is imprisoned for being a prince, till 1953. He worked 1953-1956 at the Monument Protection Office cataloguing church heritage before being obliged to resign also from there and moved to the places of his childhood in Northern Moldavia, where he restored monuments, a direction his career took also in better years. Notable is the building of pavilions for the Mitropoly, which was done under false name.

List of works (selection):

1920-1930 Restoration of the Mogoșoaia palace; Mogoșoaia, Romania
1923-1928 The Chrissoveloni Bank Palace, Bucharest, Romania (with August Schmiedigen)
1925 Housing for the employees of Chrissoveloni Bank, Bucharest, Romania (with August Schmiedigen)
1925-1928 Restoration and extension of the former Palace of Queen Elisabeth of Greece, Bucharest, Romania (with August Schmiedigen)
1930-1933 Villa complex on the Black Sea coast, Eforie Nord, Romania (incl. Villa Aviana 1933, Villa George Bibescu, 1930-31, Villa Crinul 1933 and many other Egreta, Anemona, Flora, type villas etc.)
1930-1934 Hotel Bellona, Eforie Nord, Romania
1930-1933 Industrial complex of the aircraft factory IAR (later Tractorul) – assembly hall (collaboration with Octav Doicescu), Brașov, Romania
1932 Block Carlton, Bucharest, Romania (collapsed in the 1940 earthquake)
1930-1933 Villa N. Mavrocordat, Bucharest, Romania
1932 Tudor Arghezi residence, Bucharest, Romania
1934 Collaboration at the Master Plan of Bucharest, Romania
1934-1935 Office building of the former Industrial Credit Company, Bucharest, Romania
1934-1935 Block of flats Emanoil Kretzulescu, Bucharest, Romania (with Vasile Arion)
1934-1935 Block of flats D.D. Bragadiru, Bucharest, Romania (with Vasile Arion) (next to Horia Creangă Barbu Dimitrescu building with the office of the architect)
1934-1935 Villa Florica Policrat, Bucharest, Romania
1936 Villa Nae Ionescu, Bucharest, Romania
1936-1940 Hotel Rex, Mamaia, Romania (with Vasile Arion)
1938 Octavian Goga Mausoleum, Ciucea, Cluj county, Romania
1938 Corpus of the Kretzulescu Church Wardenship, Bucharest, Romania
1938-1940 Church Adormirea Maicii Domnului, Flămânda, Argeș county, Romania
1939 Romanian pavilion at the World exhibition in New York, USA (with Octav Doicescu)
1938-1940 Restoration of the Drugănescu Manor, Drugănești-Stoenești, Giurgiu county, Romania
1945-1948 Gas and Electric Company Building, Bucharest, Romania
1957-1960 Restoration of the Mitropolia, Iași, Romania
Restoration of monuments in Northern Moldavia (incl. Biserica Trei Ierarhi, Iași), Romania

References and further reading

Visual material:

Fig. 81. Block of flats D.D. Bragadiru (1934-35), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2014

Fig. 82. Block of flats Emanoil Kretzulescu (1934-35), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2014
Fig. 83. Corpus of the Kretzulescu Church Wardenship (1938), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2014

Fig. 84. Office building of the former Industrial Credit Company (1934-35), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2014
Fig. 85. Gas and Electric Company Building (1945-48), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2014
11.7 Delavrancea-Gibory, Henrieta (1894-1987)


The Romanian pioneer woman architect Henrieta Delavrancea-Gibory was the fourth daughter of the writer Delavrancea, born in a family of artists, her older sister Cella being a renowned musician (piano). She started studying architecture in 1915, and graduated in 1927, after an interruption of eight years of the studies (till 1924) due to service in the infirmary during the war as well as marriage (1919) with an officer from the mission of the French general Berthelot. Soon after graduation she wins the project competition for the district hall (prefectura) in Oravita, in New-Romanian style. At the time of her graduation the New-Romanian style still existed in Romania, but there were also French influences of Modernism, since the Romanian Modernist architecture was mostly marked by this, with the blocks with recesses in the spirit of Auguste Perret and Henry Sauvage. Henrietta Delavrancea started an architecture which combined the spirit of the place with Modernism. Although Bucharest features a number of her buildings, including residential, but also sanitary buildings (with one competition of this kind she won against the team of renowned architect Horia Creanga, but the building, one of her first designs, was finished only 1942), her main field remains resort architecture. She constructed on the Romanian (in Eforie), but mainly on the Bulgarian seaside (from 1934 on, the first one, the villa Vanturile, valurile [Winds and oxides], being demolished in 2009). The 17 villas in Balchik, then Romania, today Bulgaria, are the peak of her architecture, which she achieved at the age of over 40 years. They include a villa in the garden of the Royal Palace of Queen Maria, hence pioneer woman architect and pioneer investor. As an architecture, they combine stone with modern materials painted in white, for which reason her works are cited for combining traditional and modern. Also 2009 was demolished one of her modernist villas in Bucharest, the villa Prager. The villa Prager in Bucharest was the only one there reminding the architecture of the villas in Balchik. After the war, she further designed, remarkable for this time being the hospital buildings (Fundeni), and then in collective work in design institutes. She also worked in history of architecture research, doing studies for the restoration of churches, and promoted her fellow women architect colleagues from the pioneer time. Records of her memories were published in the magazine Arhitectura, and her main monograph on the topic remained
unfinished. In 1972 she received the prize of the Romanian Union of Architects for her whole activity. Starting 1977, over 80 years old, when the earthquake triggered an excuse for demolishing buildings for the Comunist power, she was involved in efforts to save monuments of Bucharest, but without result.

List of works

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Project Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1925-26</td>
<td>Own house, Eminescu str., Bucharest, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1927</td>
<td>House Iosipovici, Bucharest, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1928</td>
<td>House Blanche Bernay, Bucharest, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1930-33</td>
<td>Medicine Institute “dr. N. Lupu” (now in ruin), Bucharest, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932-39</td>
<td>Institute of Public Health and Hygiene, Bucharest, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1932-34</td>
<td>Villa “Vanturile, valurile”, Balchik, Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>House Prof. Gavrila, Bucharest, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Villa “Turnul lui Mugur” (Mugur’s tower), Balchik, Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Casa Balcica, Balchik, Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934-35</td>
<td>Villa “Lupoaicei”, Balchik, Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934-35</td>
<td>Villa poet Ion Pillat, Balchik, Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1934</td>
<td>Villa Eliza Bratian, Balchik, Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Tea pavilion of Queen Maria, Balchik, Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Tobacco debit, Balchik, Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Fruit shop, Balchik, Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>Villa “Cuibul lui Roman”, Balchik, Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1935</td>
<td>House M. Serbescu, Bucharest, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Town hall, Balchik, Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Pavilionul Granicerilor (Frontier keepers pavilion), Castle, Balchik, Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Villa Grigore Iunian, Balchik, Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Villa Misterioasa, Balchik, Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Villa ing. Prager, Bucharest, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Villa “Ghiul Hane”, Balchik, Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Villa “Ghiul Serai”, Balchik, Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Villa Mircea Cândicev, Balchik, Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936-37</td>
<td>Villa prof. Vilcovici, Bucharest, Romania</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1936</td>
<td>Villa “Casa cu terase in mare” (House with terraces in the sea), Balchik, Bulgaria</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Villa Cantuniari, Bucharest, Romania</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
1937-38  Block of flats general Glatz, Bucharest, Romania
1938    Facade of the cinema Capitol, Bucharest, Romania
1936-37  Snagov palace of Prince Nicolae (modified 1970),
         Snagov, Romania
1938-39  Block Grig Arapu, Bucharest, Romania
1946-48  Block of flats Brezoianu str., Bucharest, Romania
1949-59  Fundeni hospital, Bucharest, Romania
1950-60  Oncology Institute, Filantropia hospital, Bucharest, Ro-
         mania
1982-87  Contribution to the restoration of the church of Sf. Gheor-
         ghe, Bucharest, Romania

References and further reading
Sion, M. (2009) Henrieta Delavrancea-Gibory arhitectura 1930-40, Bu-
charest: Simetria.
Urban routes in Bucharest and Balchik, in Arhitectura http://arhitectura-
tects in Romania, IAWA NEWSLETTER, International Archive of Women
in Architecture Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Fall
and Urbanism (in work)

Visual material:
Fig. 86. Villa Ion Pilat, Balchik (1934-35), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2010

Fig. 87. Vila Ghiul Serai, Balchik (1936), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2010
Fig. 88. House Cantuniari, Bucharest, Romania (1937), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2010. Plans from the Bucharest city archives.
Fig. 89. Pavillion at the Queen castle, Balchik (1936), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2010.

Fig. 90. Nicolae Lupu medicine institute (1930-33), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2011.
Fig. 91. Block of flats on Brezoianu street (1946-48), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2010.
Fig. 92. Villa Prager (1936, demolished 2009), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2009
11.8 Creangă, Horia (1892-1943)

Portrait by Marcel Janco

The Romanian architect Horia Creangă was the grandson of great Romanian writer Ion Creanga. He started studying at the Bucharest Architecture School before moving to graduate in Paris in 1916. He returned to Romania in 1926 with his wife Lucia, born Dumbraveanu, also architect. 1929 was his breakthrough, with the win of the competition, in collaboration with his brother, Ion, and his wife, for the ARO building (Romanian Assurance), which is considered the manifesto of Modernist architecture in Romania. Further collaborations shaped his career, opening 1935 an office with young architect Haralamb Georgescu, who later made an important career in the USA, and with Nicolae Nedelescu. He designed industrial and residential buildings for ARO (in blocks in Bucharest and a hotel in Braşov), for Malaxa industries (both industrial and residential) and for the Bucharest City Hall. The Malaxa industries building (later FAUR, a while 23rd of August) is one of the most notable ones, which drew attention in encyclopedies of modern architecture.

Characteristic for the work of Creangă in highrise housing and office building are: the horizontal window bands with background columns, which alternate with foreground profiles of the parapets, the side recesses, the recessed upper floors, and the facade layers in different depths. 1929 still marked connections to Haussmannian style, having built a building with bow-windows (Pop and Gheorghiu building). Although the horizontal became characteristic for his chef d’oeuvre, the late years, when a totalitarian regime came to power in Romania, marked a return to the vertical accents of this, as we see in the ARO building on Calea Victoriei, which features vertical bands. Apart of high-rise housing Creangă built also low-rise housing, either for the privilledged (villas) from which the best known is the Bunescu villa, or even what is so rare in Romanian architecture but common for Modernism, cheap housing. Several coupled houses by him are part of the complex of Vatra Luminoasă, in what became today also a central part of Bucharest. Close to them is the school building he designed.

The Ottulescu building (1934-35) builds a notable highlight: “the most modern and interesting approach in the whole Romanian interwar architecture” (Machedon and Soffham, 1999). It is an example of a free plan in a
collective apartment block, not in the sense of the flexibility of spaces, but in the disposition of the apartments across the floors. The structural grid is not completely regulated and neutral, as one would expect for a perfect “free plan” example (see the Le Savoye villa by Le Corbusier), but, even if simple and clear, dictated by the spatial order of the 1st and 2nd floor. A two story duplex on ground floor and mezzanine, recessed from the street, takes advantage of the reinforced concrete structure.

Although the ARO building resisted remarkably well to the 1977 earthquake, due to the renovation recently before of the cinema in the lower floors, some buildings by Creangă such as Barbu Dimitrescu are listed Risk category I and need retrofit. Not only seismic retrofit endangers potentially the look of the buildings, but also thermal isolation. For example in the Malaxa-Burileanu building, for which he cooperated with Rudolf Fränkel, the original steel profiles of windows are being gradually replaced with plastic „termopan“.

Apart of industrial and residential building is remarkable his involvment in temporary architecture in frame oft he Herăstrău park, a park along the belt of lakes of Colentina, and the furnishing of which was characteristic fort he interwar time. The approach continues what has been started 1906 with an exhibition in the Carol Park. Exhibition architecture was more common for other European countries (Mostra d’Oltremare in Italy) and is unique through this in the Romanian one.

List of works
1929 Pop and Gheorghiu block, Bucharest, Romania
1929 ARO building, Bucharest, Romania
1930-1931 Malaxa factory, Bucharest, Romania
1932 Bunescu villa, Bucharest, Romania
1932 Davidoglu building, Bucharest, Romania
1933 Barbu Dimitrescu building, Bucharest, Romania
1933-1939 ONEF Stadium (disappeared), Bucharest, Romania
1934 Cinema for the ARO building, Bucharest, Romania
1934 Elisabeta Cantacuzino villa, Bucharest, Romania
1934-35 Elena Ottulescu building, Bucharest, Romania
1935-35 Nedioglu building, Bucharest, Romania
1935 Cristea Mateescu villa, Bucharest, Romania
1935-36 Malaxa factories – extension, Bucharest, Romania
1935-37 Burileanu-Malaxa building, Bucharest, Romania
1936 Malaxa factory, administration pavilion, Bucharest, Ro-
1936-37 ARO Palace, Calea Victoriei, Bucharest, Romania
1937 Veturia Goga villa, Bucharest, Romania
1937-39 Cultural Palace, Cernăuți, Ukraine
1937-1942 Central market hall Obor – Bucharest
1937 Cheap housing, part of Vatra Luminoasă, Bucharest, Romania
1937 School building, Maior Coravu, Bucharest, Romania
1937-38 Hotel Aro, Brașov, Romania
1938-1940 Exhibition “Luna Bucureștilor” (the month of Bucharest) – transforming some pavilions by Octav Doicescu and new pavilions (today disappeared), Bucharest, Romania
1939 Pavillions of the exhibition “Munca și Voe buna” (Work and Joy), Herăstrău park, Bucharest, Romania
1940 Nedioglu villa, Breaza, Romania
1942 Milk factory, Alba Iulia, Romania
1942 Milk factory, Burdujeni, Romania
1942 Milk factory, Simeria, Romania
1942 Transformation of the amphitheatre of the Central School for Girls (by Ion Mincu) into what today is the Toma Caragiu hall of Bulandra Theatre, Bucharest, Romania

References and further reading

Visual material:
Fig. 93. Aro (today Patria) building (1929) – the manifesto of Modern in Bucharest, Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2002 [http://photo.net/photodb/photo?photo_id=17688155&size=lg](http://photo.net/photodb/photo?photo_id=17688155&size=lg). Archive images from the Town hall archives of Bucharest (PMB fond tehnic)
Fig. 94. Barbu Dimitrescu building (1933), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2002. Archive images: Town hall archive of the city of Bucharest (PMB fond tehnic)
Fig. 95. Burileanu-Malaxa building (with Rudolf Fränkel) (1935-37), Photo: M. Bostena-ru, 2011

Fig. 96. ARO Palace, Calea Victoriei (1936-37), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2002
Legend:

- Bedroom / night zone
- Living room, including dining
- Corridors / circulation zone
- Bathrooms, toilets
- Kitchen
- Hall / vertical circulation
- Deposit / external circulation

Fig. 97. Functional plan and photo of the Elena Ottulescu building (1934-35), After M. Bostenaru (2009)
11.9 Janco (Iancu), Marcel (1895-1984)

Photo at
http://ro.wikipedia.org/wiki/Marcel_Iancu#mediaviewer/Fi%C8%99ier:Marcel_Ianco.jpg

The Romanian architect, theorist and painter Marcel Iancu (spelled abroad Janco) studied at the ETH in Zürich (1915-17). In Zürich he met again his lyceum colleague Tristan Tzara and together with him and Hans Arp founds the Dadaist movement. 1922 Janco returns to Romania, where he remeets his other lyceum colleague with whom he worked before, Ion Vinea, and joins his circle in the journal “Contimporanul”. It is through this circles that he participates to the Avantgarde movement (notable names, among them Kassák, were published in Contimporanul when less known), and also publishes a manifesto for a modern capital. Along with his architecture activity he has painting exhibitions. 1941 when Bucharest became dangerous for those of Jewish origin he emigrated to Palestina, where he continued to paint. Interest for Romania’s Modernist heritage raised with the Horia Creanga centenary (1992) and the Marcel Iancu centenary (1995) and is continued since.

Marcel Janco’s architecture buildings are residential, small scale, either family houses or middle rise blocks of small flats, similar size to the Modernism in Athens. The buildings are places either in South-Eastern central Bucharest or in the villa quarter in the North. With some exceptions, like in the West of the centre, built shortly before emigration (Naum Ghica building) or the first white box building in Romania and his breakthrough, the Villa Jean Fuchs. The influence from his painting is visible in them, in the play with different layers in the facade (ex. Paul Iluta building), as on a canvas. Recently Augustin Ioan published a study on the morphology of the architectural alphabet of Marcel Ianco, explaining the play with separation elements and volumes to achieve different spaces. The association e-card, when issuing the urban route map, also did a film on the Solly Gold building. Marcel Iancu’s buildings promoted the functionalist version of Constructivism or Cubism (Sandqvist). Some of the buildings were recently renovated, such as the Clara Iancu building (to its disadvantage) and the Jean Juster villa. The latter was damaged in the 1977 earthquake loosing part of the cantilevered roof which gave a lot to its appearance. Some other are listed category I risk to earthquakes and should undergo strengthening (Naum Ghica building, building on Luchian street).
List of works
1926  Block Herman Iancu
1927  Villa Jean Fuchs
1928  Villa Maria Lambru
1929  House Poldi Chapier
1930  Villa Florica Chihaescu
1931  Villa Paul Wexler
1931  Villa Jean Juster
1931  Block Clara Iancu
1931–1935  Villa Paul Iluta and laboratory
1933  Block Jacques Costin
1934  Block Solly Gold
1935  Block Bazaltin
1935  Block Frida Cohen
1935  Block Poldi Chapier
1935  Block on Luchian street
1935  Block Alexandrescu
1936  Villa Florica Reich
1937  Villa Hermina Hassner
1937  Villa Emil Patrascu
1938  Block Naum Ghica

References and further reading
“Contiperanul” digital archive
http://dspace.beuculj.ro/handle/123456789/13576
UAR (1996) Centenar Marcel Iancu / Marcel Iancu Centenary (1895-1995), Bucharest: Simetria
20th century architecture in Romania featured on the UIA webpage
http://www.archi.fr/UIA/rechercheSimple.php?langue=en&objet=pays&numero%5B%5D=26

Visual material:
Fig. 98. Solly Gold building (1934), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2002
http://photo.net/photodb/photo?photo_id=12330240

Fig. 99. Paul Iluta building and laboratory (1931-35), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2002
http://photo.net/photodb/photo?photo_id=12330244
Fig. 100. Naum Ghica building (1938) Schema of the building site organisation for the Naum Ghica building (1938), after Bostenaru (2006), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2002
Fig. 101. Clara Iancu building (for his second wife), before restoration (1931), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2002 http://photo.net/photodb/photo?photo_id=12294807

Fig. 102. Jean Juster villa (1931), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2002
Fig. 103. Marcel Iancu buildings (marked with red) in the context of Modernist buildings in the centre of Bucharest, After Bostenaru (2006)
11.10 Muzio, Giovanni (1893-1982)

Photo at http://www.arte.it/artista/giovanni-muzio-99

The Italian architect Giovanni Muzio was the son of a practicing architect. After service in the First World War, he opened an office with Giuseppe De Finetti, Giò Ponti, Emilio Lancia e Mino Fiocchi in 1920. In 1922 he built what was the best known example of the Novecento movement, a classicizing movement in rivalry with the Italian Rationalism: the Ca’ Brutta (Ugly house). The wish was to break with this house with the eclectic use of classicist elements through an element reordering. Although it was a scandal that time, today it enjoys a high recognition. Annegret Burg names the Milanese Novecento movement (which later spread also to other cities, such as Rome or Naples) a movement around Giovanni Muzio and Giuseppe De Finetti though. The Novecento in the 1920s was characterised by leaning towards the typical Italian palazzo, with classicising details, but at the same time making use of the technological advances of the time. The flats were large and comfortable, and the buildings technically well executed, for which reason few of them need renovation today. In 1935 it was Muzio again to revolutionise the Novecento, building Casa Bonaiti, which was the begin of geometrical Novecento. It in the phase of decorative Novecento the classicising details were placed without an order on the facade, attracting so the name of “ugly house” to the manifesto, in the geometric Novecento apparent brick many times accentuates the play with different layers in the facade.

Apart of residential buildings, he was also active in urban planning, participated to competitions (including for the EUR), and, especially after the Second World War built churches. Muzio’s churches lean towards romantic churches, and many times are part of a multifunction complex. The most mature church development is the last one, in Nazareth, Israel. Among his public buildings is the Catholic University of Milan, which marked the begin of this development, but also some public palaces. His interest in urban planning was reflected in the carefull placing of his buildings in context, which was a common point of the Italian interwar movement and which he kept also for the postwar churches. Through the most notable urban development works is the Arengario in the Dome place in Milan, designed with co-authors. He was teaching in Milan and In Turin.
List of works

1922 Block Ca' Brutta, Milan, Italy
1931-30 Apartment building via Giuriati, Milan, Italy
1931-1932 Catholic University Sacro Cuore, Milan, Italy
1933-34 Apartment building Via Longhi, Milan, Italy
1935 Blocks Bonaiti-Malugani, Milan, Italy
1934-36 House for Journalists Via Monte Santo, Milan, Italy
1937 Palazzo della Cassa Di Risparmio delle Province Lombarde, Milan, Italy
1937-42 Giovanni Muzio, Enrico Griffino, Pier Luigi Magistretti, Piero Portaluppi Arengario
1938-42 Palazzo Popolo d’Italia Piazza Cavour, Milan, Italy
1939-1947 Convento di Sant'Angelo and Angelicum, Milan, Italy
1942-1950 Church of Santa Maria Mediatrice, Rome, Italy
1954-1955 Church of the Four Saint Evangelists, Milan, Italy
1955-1957 Monastery Clarisse, Gorla/Milan, Italy
1955-1964 Sacntuary of S. Antonio, Brunella di Varese, Italy
1956-1958 Church of San Giovanni Battista, Creta a Milano, Italy
1958-1960 Church of Madonna di Caravaggio, Pavia
1959-69 Basilica dell'Annunciazione, Nazareth, Israel

References and further reading


Visual material:
Fig. 104. The begin of decorative Novecento, Ca’ Brutta 1922 Via Turati and Via Moscova, Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2007 http://photo.net/photodb/photo?photo_id=5983936

Fig. 105. The begin of Geometric Novecento, Casa Bonaiti 1935-36 Piazza Fiume (today Piazza della Repubblica), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2007 http://photo.net/photodb/photo?photo_id=5983967
Fig. 106. Giovanni Muzio with the engineer Pier Fausto Barelli Entrance building Università Cattolica Sacro Cuore, Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2007 http://photo.net/photodb/photo?photo_id=5983976

Fig. 107. Convent Sant’Angelo and culture centre Angelicum 1939-47 Corso di Porta, Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2007 http://photo.net/photodb/photo?photo_id=5986864
Fig. 108. Palazzo Popolo d’Italia 1938-42 Piazza Cavour 2, Via Vecchio Politecnico, Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2007  http://photo.net/photodb/photo?photo_id=5986879

Fig. 109. Giovanni Muzio, Enrico Griffino, Pier Luigi Magistretti, Piero Portaluppi Arnegario 1937-42, Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2007  http://photo.net/photodb/photo?photo_id=5984022
Fig. 110. Apartment building 1933-34 7 Via Longhi, Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2007
http://photo.net/photodb/photo?photo_id=5984008

Fig. 111. Casa Malugani 1936 Piazza della Repubblica, Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2007
http://photo.net/photodb/photo?photo_id=5983954
Fig. 112. House for Journalists 1934-1936 Via Monte Santo, Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2007 http://photo.net/photodb/photo?photo_id=5986860

Fig. 113. Apartment building 1931-32 (built; designed 1930) Via Giuriati, Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2007 http://photo.net/photodb/photo?photo_id=5984007
11.11 Haesler, Otto (1880-1962)

Photo in archinform http://media.archinform.net/m/10000052.jpg

The German architect Otto Haesler was trained in craft of building and as bricklayer before starting to work as an architect. 1906 he started to work independently in Celle, a city the image of which he influenced in the first third of the 20th century. Situated in the West of Germany, the geographic vicinity and the vicinity of style led to discussions between the architecture of Haesler and the Dutch models. 1925 he became member of Deutscher Werkbund. 1927 he became member of the research society for economic efficiency in housing building. It was in this research society where he tried to prove the efficiency of steel skeleton.

Before the war Otto Haesler used the style of the time – Jugendstil and neoclassicism. “Neues Bauen” marks the Aera of the Weimar Republic, the one during which his career developed. With the “Siedlung” Italian Garden he makes the first coloured neighbourhood of “Neues Bauen”. Georggarten, the second siedlung, was to make another innovation, the “Zeilenbau” (row housing).

Along with Bauhaus architects like Walter Gropius and Ludwig Mies van der Rohe he is considered an important representant of the so-called “Neues Bauen”. As such, he was proposed to lead Frankfurt am Main after Ernst May. In this context his works are concerned with social housing. In order to improve social housing he employed steel skeleton, something rare in housing building, but economically efficient for Germany, a country rich in this resource. Another mean was the typisation of the floor plan, with the goal of industrial production. He was the first to introduce the typical for Germany “Zeilenbau” in industrial production – parallel rows of blocks of apartments. It was the Zeilenbau which raised discussion in the postwar aera as not feasible for large housing areas. As such, Haesler introduced a type of urban organisation before Le Corbusier stipulated the building in the green and inversed the background and foreground in what is the built texture and what not in urbanism. Another innovation he introduced was the flat roof, which raised discussion.

As a reaction to the raise of National Socialism (Nazi) power, he opted for interior emigration. After the war he led the reconstruction of Rathenow. 1946 he moved into the sowjet led zone of Berlin. In Berlin he acted as professor of social housing, then leader of the department for industrialisation.
List of works
1924 Siedlung „Italienischer Garten“ (Italian garden), Celle, Germany
1925 Siedlung Georgsgarten, Celle, Germany
1929–1931 Siedlung Rothenberg, Kassel, Germany
1929 Some buildings in the Siedlung Dammerstock, Karlsruhe, Germany
1930-1931 Siedlung „Blumläger Feld“, Celle, Germany
1946-1953 Buildings in Rathenow

References and further reading

Visual material:
Fig. 114. Highrise building of the type during the building process. (archive photo presenting such a succession in the construction process can be seen on the example of Kassel-Rothenberg, architect Otto Haesler, in Haesler: Mein Lebenswerk als Architect. 1957, on page 33), Redrawing by M. Bostenaru included in World Housing Encyclopedia
Fig. 115. Building process (archive views of steps in building Dammerstock Gruppe 16, architect Otto Haesler, can be seen in Stein Holz Eisen. 1929. on page 769), Redrawing by M. Bostenaru included in World Housing Encyclopedia
Fig. 116. Otto Haesler buildings in Dammerstock, Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2002 (highrise) and 2013 (lowrise)
Fig. 117. Key load bearing elements: Variant 2 (a structure of this type is to be seen in Kassel-Rothenberg by architect Otto Haesler in Haesler: "Mein Lebenswerk als Architekt". 1957. Page 32), Redrawing by M. Bostenaru included in World Housing Encyclopedia.

For a photo of Italian Garden see Wikipedia http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Italienischer-Garten_2.JPG
11.12 Plečnik, Jože (1872-1957)

For a photo see http://commons.wikimedia.org/wiki/File:Jo%C5%BEe_Ple%C4%8Dnik_%281943%29,_Zbirka_upodobitev_znanih_Slovencev_NUK__Crop1.jpg

The Slovene architect Jože Plečnik worked as was trained as a carpenter before studying and then being trained in architecture in Vienna under the guidance of Secession architect Otto Wagner. Ljubljana belonged that time to Austria-Hungary, so he went to study in the capital city. He worked next in Vienna, but did remarkable works also in Prague (from 1911), influencing Czech Cubism, and working on the castle (1920-1935) and finally in his home city of Ljubljana from 1925 on. Instead of teaching in Vienna he taught in Prague. When moving to Prague, this belonged not anymore to collapsed Austro-Hungaria either, still Plecnik returned to finish work there till 1935.

In Vienna his most valuable buildings are the Zacherl house (1903-1905) and the Holy Spirit church (1910-13). In the later he looked for a language for the interior spatiality in reinforced concrete, being the first church of this kind. The Zacherl house featured innovation in the facade as well, its language can be put in dialogue with Modernist buildings emphasizing the vertical, such as the ARO/Patria building by Horia Creanga in Romania.

In Ljubljana he worked on defining the face of the city. After gaining national independence the face of city of Ljubljana was a question of pride in Slovenia, and the city rejected Master Plans by Max Weber and Camillo Sitte in favour of national ones. The Plečnik architectural tour is one of the first of this kind to promote the work of an architect instituted in a European city. Here not anymore the reinforced concrete he got used to in Vienna was the defining one. The buildings are, unlike the housing buildings of the Modernist Avantgarde, mainly office buildings or churches. We note here a building on a narrow lot between two streets (the Flatiron building of Ljubljana). From the high rise buildings remarkable is the National and University library (1930-36) and from the cityscape the “Three bridges” (1929-32). Other works include bridges along the river as well as a dam. Works include the reshaping of the cemetery.

Remarkable about Plečnik’s work is that it cannot be considered belonging to one style. Although starting with Secession, it includes also national, and own elements. The national elements put him in the row of those bringing to dialogue modernism and tradition, but also with the contemporary
style to Secession the National Romanticism. In a time when the innovation in architecture and building all anew was dominant, he turned towards restoration. This does not refer only to the Prague castle, but also to buildings in Ljubljana – churches, monasteries (open air theatre in the inside the courtyard of the former Monastery of the Holy Cross). Through these works, but also through the cemetery works, and the style we can see him as a precursor of Carlo Scarpa.

His work was recognised by numerous awards and honorary citizenships (Ljubljana) and doctorates (Vienna, Ljubljana), membership in Academies and of the RIBA. His not realised project of the Slovene Parliament building is on the 10 cent coin, while the old paper money displayed his portrait.

List of works
1900-1901 Langer House. Vienna, Austria
1903-1905 Zacherlhaus, Vienna, Austria
1908-1913 Church of the Holy Spirit, Vienna, Austria
1920-1934 Prague Castle (various projects). Prague, Czech Republic
1924-31 Church of St. Francis, Ljubljana – Šiška, Slovenia
1925-1927 Chamber of commerce, work and industry, Ljubljana, Slovenia
1928-39 Mutual Assurance Building, Ljubljana, Slovenia
1929-1932 "Tromostovje" or the Triple bridge, Ljubljana, Slovenia
1929-1932 Trnovo Bridge, Ljubljana, Slovenia
1930-1941 National and University Library, Ljubljana, Slovenia
1931-1932 Cobblers' Bridge (Čevljarski or, more accurately, Šušarski most), Ljubljana, Slovenia
1932-1934 "Peglezen", the "Flatiron" house, Ljubljana, Slovenia
1933-35 Adaptation of defence wall on Grajski grč (the castle hill), Ljubljana, Slovenia
1933-38 Adaptation of church of St. Bartholomew, Ljubljana – Šiška, Slovenia
1933-39 Sluice gates on the Ljublanica River, Ljubljana, Slovenia
1937-1940 Žale Cemetery, Ljubljana, Slovenia
1939-1942 The Fish Market, Ljubljana, Slovenia
1939-1940 The Ursuline gymnasium, Ljubljana, Slovenia
1952-56 Adaptation of Križanke, Ljubljana, Slovenia

References and further reading
Visual material:

Fig. 118. Triple bridge in Ljubljana, Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2008
Fig. 119. Intervention on existing buildings Križanke (open theatre) (1952-56) and Bartolomew church (1933-38), Photos: M. Bostenaru, 2008
Fig. 120. High rise buildings in Ljubljana (Assurance building, Flatiron building, Ursulines, National and University library), From Bostenaru and Dill (2014)
Fig. 121. Holy Spirit church (1908-13), Vienna, Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2005

Fig. 122. Zacherl house, Vienna (1903-05), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2005
11.13 Terragni, Giuseppe (1904-1943)

Photo for example at http://paperarch.wordpress.com/the-danteum-of-giuseppe-terragni/

The Italian architect Giuseppe Terragni, who attended the Polytechnic in Milan (1921-26), then opening an office in Como with his brother Attilio 1927, was a pioneer of a style called Rationalism. Rationalism was a contextual Modernism. Buildings were built in the city, next to older buildings, not in the periphery in the green like in other Western countries. Through this Rationalism can be called “another Modernism”. The style was contemporary with another movement in interwar Italy, the Novecento, represented not so much in Como, but in Milan, where Terragni also constructed, in cooperation with Pietro Lingeri.

Late 1927 and early 1928 an approach related to the Rome picturesque movement of Marcello Piacentini became known through the work of the Società degli Amici e Cultori d’Arte of Como, including initiatives of the later best known 1920-1940 architect of Italy, the young Giuseppe Terragni, “Terragni’s participation in the Sittesque movement of contextual design at a moment when he was also assisting the birth of Italian Rationalism” [Etlin, 1991, p. 121]. In December 1926 seven young Milanese architects (Gruppo 7) introduced in Italy the International Style under the name of “razionalismo” through a manifesto in Rassegna Italiana (Etlin, 1991, p. 225) and formed a movement, the Movimento Italiano per l’Architettura Razionale. “Italian Rationalists were intent upon creating a contemporary architecture particularly attentive to functional requirements and constructed with modern materials made into forms that evoked the spirit of a machine civilization. As in many other countries, these architects also attempted to imbue this international avant-garde with a national identity grounded in tradition” [Etlin, 1991, p. 226]. Modern materials such as concrete and glass were combined with materials typical for Italy such as stone (in its polished white form for Rationalism). In the first phase the functional solution for the housing issues of an ordinary person stayed in foreground, although these aspects is not so widely known [Etlin, 1991, p. 226-229]. Rationalist architects participated at the IVth Congrès Internationaux d’Architecture Moderne in Athens in 1933 and in the subsequent competition for the 1934 regional plan for Como [Etlin, 1991, p. 228]. As the column and the arch built the vocabulary of the last centuries, the Gruppo 7
looked for the vocabulary of rationalist architecture and found [Etlin, 1991, p. 250]:

1. the lack of decoration;
2. the proportion and abstract rhythms;
3. the expression of the structural skeleton (“la construction apparente”);
4. the cantilevered balcony;
5. the corner window;

which were different of those five enounced by Le Corbusier for modern architecture.

In Como, the modern buildings of Terragni are dispersed through the city. The masterpiece of Terragni in the city of Como is undoubtedly Casa del Fascio (1932-36). Casa del Fascio was due to promote new architecture adequate for the regime of Benito Musolini (Fascism). But also other buildings are remarkable, such as Casa Giuliani Friggerio, which inspired Peter Eisenmann in post-war design through morphogenesis. The Novocomum in Como (1928-29) by Giuseppe Terragni is the first modern housing building constructed in Italy. It uses a nautical imagery (was called “oceanliner”) which reminds the imagery of the Arkadenbazar by József Vágo in Hungary. The five residential buildings in Milan designed together with Pietro Lingeri further applied the functional criteria, with rooms possible to merge by opening of sliding doors, and prismatic geometry seen at Novocomum. The reinforced concrete skeleton builds an integral part of the concept and in case of Casa Rustici the boxlike aspect creates the mentioned parallel to the Italian palazzo [Etlin, 1991, p. 271].

List of works
1926-27 New facade of Metropole Suisse, Como, Italy
1927-29 Novocomum, Como, Italy
1931-32 Monumento dei Caduti (Monument of the Fallen), Como, Italy
1932-36 Casa del Fascio, Como, Italy
1933-35 Casa Rustici, Milano, Italy (with Pietro Lingeri)
1933 Casa Toninello, Milano, Italy (with Pietro Lingeri)
1933 Casa Ghiringhelli, Milano, Italy (with Pietro Lingeri)
1934 Casa Lavezzari, Milano, Italy (with Pietro Lingeri)
1935 Casa Rustici-Comolli, Milano, Italy (with Pietro Lingeri)
1936-37 Villa Bianca, Seveso, Italy
1936-37 Kindergarten Sant’Elia, Como, Italy
1939-42 Block of flats Giuliano Frigerio, Como, Italy
References and further reading


Visual material:

Fig. 123. Asilo Sant Elia, Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2009
Fig. 124. Novocomum (view from the interior to Monumento dei Caduti), Photo: M. Boștenaru, 2009
Fig. 125. Casa del Fascio, Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2009
Fig. 126. Spread of Terragni buildings in Como, After M. Bostenaru (2014)
Fig. 127. Spread of Terragni buildings in Milan, After M. Bostenaru (2014)
11.14 Andreescu Haret, Virginia (1897-1962)

Photo small size at https://www.bnab.ro/2012/expo-arh-rom/17/

The Romanian architect Virginia Andreescu Haret, the first woman architect in Romania and at least one of the first of the world, was born in a family of artists, the brother of her father being the painter Ioan Andreescu. Along with the School of Architecture, she attended the School of Beux Arts, and the Romanian Academy Library holds a collection of her stamps. She graduated 1919 from the School of Architecture after which she went, on her own, as the Romanian School in Rome was funded afterwards, to continue studies in Italy, where she worked under the guidance of archaeologists. Probably from this stay is her taste for research, being then present at conferences abroad, but also doing history of architecture studies (ex. building surveys with Ghika-Budesti). She married in 1928 the son of the scientist Spiru Haret, Spiru Haret-Gold, civil engineer, and they had a son. One of the issues in researching the work of women in architecture is that it was possible for her to profess and design more than 30 built projects because of the good cooperation with her husband. She worked first at the Technical Service of the Ministry of Education, for which reason she did numerous and important projects for schools, in Bucharest (Şincai and Cantemir Lyceum) as well as in the country (Bărlad, Focşani). Side by side with buildings of large dimensions, many of them protected as monuments, she also designed houses for one or two families. Both the small houses and the multi-family houses also included cheap housing. The cheap family housing on Hristo Botev street is monument protected, while in what regards small houses Virginia Haret designed two groups of villas. At the begin these small size houses were built in the New-Romanian style, and many of them in the neighbourhood of Cotroceni. Later on she renounced at this style and moved towards Modernism. Notable for this is that her first house was in New-Romanian style, the house of the family however was Modernist. Movement to Modernism also was marked by the move to new technologies, building in reinforced concrete. From her New-Romanian time dates one of her best projects was Block Tinerimea Română. Outside Bucharest, where most of these buildings are, a notable building is the Cinema-Casino in the resort city of Govora.

The Danish architect and designer Arne Jacobsen first trained as a bricklayer before studying architecture at the Royal Danish Academy of Fine Arts, Copenhagen (1924-27). Under the auspices of the director of furniture
design, Kaare Klint, Jacobsen explored what would become hallmarks of Nordic Modernism – refined texture, integrity of form and advanced workmanship. After graduation, a successful architectural career was launched, yet it is Jacobsen’s furniture design, especially his chairs, which have brought the prolific designer international acknowledgement on a larger scale. Researching her work is not only important for gender issues, as it does today the COST action genderSTE, but also for early mobility of architects, from Romania to Italy and back, in the context of the EU.

List of works

1920-25, 24-28 Lyceum Gh. Șincai, Bucharest, Romania
1922 Housing block Calea Victoriei corner Str. Frumoasă, Bucharest, Romania
1923 House Stănescu, Bucharest, Romania
1924-27 Palace Tinerimea Română (Romanian Youth), Bucharest, Romania
1925-26 Lyceum Dimitrie Cantemir
1926 Deposits, administration, staff housing, Banca Viticolă, Bucharest, Romania
1926 House, Intrarea Spătarului, Bucharest, Romania
1927-34 Chuch Holy Trinity, Bucharest, Romania
1928 House Rosetti-Solești (extension), Bucharest, Romania
1928 Cinema-theatre, casino, Bâile Govora, Romania “Cheap housing” palace Piața Rosetti, Bucharest, Romania
1928 House A. Opran, Bucharest, Romania
1929 Group of 7 villas with each two apartments for the employees of a bank, Bucharest, Romania
1931 House Haret
1933-34 House Radu & Elena Perianu, Bucharest, Romania
1936 House Constantinescu, Bucharest, Romania
1936 House Panait Mazilu, Bucharest, Romania
1936-37 House Dumitru Stoica, Bucharest, Romania
1935 House Nestor, Parc Panduri, Bucharest, Romania

References and further reading


Visual material:
Fig. 128. Family Haret house (1931), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2011. Archive plan and facade: Town hall of Bucharest city (PMB fond tehnic).
Fig. 129. Tinerimea Romana block (1923-27), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2012. Archive plan, facade and section: National archives of Romania.
Fig. 130. Industrial building in reinforced concrete. Water tower (1927). Town hall of Bucharest archives.
Fig. 131. Group of villas (1929), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2011

Fig. 132. Villa eng. Dumitru Stoica (1937), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2011
12. Forms for architectural guide Eastern Europe – example: Hungary/ Maria Bostenaru

These forms serve as example for how forms were organized in the architecture guide for Eastern Europe from the seminar in Karlsruhe, used as literature for some of the routes.

12.1 DER NATIONALSTIL

12.1.1 Ödön Lechner
1845 Pest - 1914 Budapest

1865 Architecture studies TU Pest
1866-68 Architecture studies Bauakademie Berlin
Workshop in Budapest together with Pártos
1875-78 Collaboration in Paris - arch. C. Parent (castle restoration)
1889 Study trip to England (oriental art collections)

Main works
1883-84 Town hall, Szeged
1883-84 Block of flats of the railway company, Budapest
1888-84 Thonet-Haus, Budapest
1890 Town hall, Kecskemét
1891-96 Applied art museum and school, Budapest
1893-96 Church St. László, Budapest
1895 Own house
1896-99 Geological institute, Budapest
1898 Block of flats with workshop, Budapest
1899-1901 Post bank office, Budapest
1900 Villa Zala György, Budapest
1905 Villa Sipeki, Budapest
1907-13 St. Elisabeth church Bratislava

He developed a strong national style (Hungarian national style) as a result of his impressions through the London travel.
Predecessor: Frigyes Feszl.
Followers: S.Baumgarten & Zs.Herczegh, M.Komor & D.Jakab, G.Márkus. The followers are not successful in developing his own style.
Fig. 133. Post bank office, Budapest, architect Ödön Lechner (1899-1901), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2003.

Fig. 134. Applied art museum and school, Budapest, architect Ödön Lechner (1891-96). Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2003.
Fig. 135. Geological institute, Budapest, architect Ödön Lechner (1896-99). Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2003.

Fig. 136. Cifra house, Kecskemét, architect Géza MáRKus (1902). Photo: M. Bostenaru, 1999.
12.2 JUGENDSTIL

12.2.1 Hungarian architects of Art Nouveau.

The floral Art Nouveau of French origin has only an important representative in Hungary: Ede Magyar

1906-07 Palais Reök, Szeged

Fig. 137. Palais Reök, Szeged, architect Ede Magyar (1906-07). Photo: M. Bostenaru, 1999.
More expressive is the building of Frigyes Spiegel:

1897 Block of flats in the Isabella street, Budapest

**Fig. 138.** Block of flats in the Isabella street, Budapest, architect: Frigyes Spiegel (1897), Photos: M. Bostenaru, 2003 and 2006 (before and after restoration).
12.2.2 The Viennese architects Otto Wagner and Josef Hoffmann build only a few buildings in Budapest.

Works of Otto Wagner:

1870-72 Synagoge in the Rumbach Sebestyen Street, Budapest
1882 Project for the Parliament building

![Synagoge in the Rumbach Sebestyen Street, Budapest, architect Otto Wagner (1870-72). Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2003.](image)

Works of Josef Hoffmann:

1909-10 House Dr. Pickler, Budapest
1922 Villa Duckel, Budapest
12.3 IRON CONCRETE CONSTRUCTION and HOUSING CUBES

12.3.1 István Medgyaszay (original name: Benkó)
1877 Budapest - 1959 Budapest

1900-03 Study in the school of Otto Wagner as scholarship holder of the TU Budapest
1904 Architecture diploma at TU Budapest
1904-06 Occupation with the Hungarian popular architecture
1906-07 Study trip to Munich, Berlin, Paris
1907 Work in the office Hennebique, Paris
1908 Lecture on the VIIIth Architecture Congress in Vienna about the artistic features of reinforced concrete architecture
Starting 1925 Privatdozent at TU Budapest

Main works:

1904-06 Housing of the artistic colony, Gödöllö
1907-08 Theatre building, Veszprém
1908-10 Catholic church, Rárosmulyad
1909 Theatre, Ódenburg (transformation)
1910 Housing in the Elek Street, Budapest
1911-12 Catholic church, Ógyula
1914 Block of flats in the Dohány Street, Budapest
1916 Pavillons oft he war exhibition in Lemberg
1921 Church, Püspökladány
1925 Main urban housing neighbourhood in the Budaörsi way, Budapest
1926 Theatre, Nagykanizsa
1927 Sporthotel, Mátaháza
1929 Reformed Lyceum Baár-Madas, Budapest

He innovated the construction art through the new employment of reinforced concrete.
Medgyaszay built his main work before WWI.
His architecture cannot be categorised in any style.

Fig. 140. Theatre building, Veszprém, Architect: István Medgyaszai (1907-08). Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2003.


12.4 NATIONAL ROMANTICISM

12.4.1 Aladár Árkay
1868 Timisoara - 1932 Budapest

Study at TU Budapest
Visit of the B. Székely and K. Lotz painting schools
Work in Paris
Work in Vienna (Fellner and Helmer)
Collaboration with Hauszman
Collaboration with Mór Kallina (father in law)

His works are differently influenced by Historismus, Jugendstil, National Romanticism.
After WWI: expressive, modern Style

Main works:

1905 Villa Babochay, Budapest
1908 Own workshop, Budapest
1912 Reformed church, Gorki alley, Budapest
1912 House Tarnay, Budapest
1910-13 Neighbourhood of the judges and lawyers, Budapest
1923 Catholic chappel, Budapest
1929 Catholic church, Győr
1931-33 Catholic church, Budapest (with son: Bertalan Árkay)
1933 Foundation church, Mohács

Other representatives of the National Romanticism (the so-called „Youngs”, architects trained at the TU Budapest were: Károly Kós, Béla Jánszky, Denés Györgyi, Dezső Zrumeczki, T. Szivessy, V. Mende, E. Thoronczay-Wigand
Fig. 141. Reformed church, Gorki alley, Budapest, architect Aladár Árkay (1912), Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2003.
Fig. 142. Zoo. Architect Károly Kós with Dezső Zreumeczki, Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2003.
12.5 THE FACADE OF BLOCKS OF FLATS AND SHOPS
SOCIAL HOUSING

12.5.1 Béla Lajta (original name: Leitersdorfer)
Budapest 1873 - Wien 1920

1896 Architecture diploma at TU Budapest
Work at Hauszman
Study trip to Italy, Spain, England and Germany (Architecture studies
middle ages and early Renaissance)
Study trip through France, Spain, Morocco
1897-98 Work at Messel (Berlin)
1898-99 Work at Norman Shaw (London)

Main works:
1905-06 Villa D. Malonay
1905-08 Institution for the blind, Budapest
1906-07 Entrepreneur portal Hecht, Budapest
1906-07 Dormitory for the elderly, Budapest
1908 Jewish cemetery, Budapest
1908-09 Night bar Parisiana, Budapest
1909-10 Main urban commercial school, Budapest
1911 Banc in the Elisabethcity, Budapest
1911 Block of flats in Népszínház Street, Budapest
1912-13 House Rózsavölgyi, Budapest
1914-30 Gymnasium, Budapest (with A.Hegedűs)

His first works are under the influence of Lechner. Influence of the
Northern European Jugendstil. The last works are influenced by Rational-
ism, where the ornaments are employed only for the underlining of individ-
ual elements and the shapes vocabulary belongs already to Modernism.
Fig. 144. Block of flats in Népszínház Street, Budapest, architect Béla Lajta (1911). Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2003.

Fig. 145. Gymnasium, Budapest (architects B. Lajta with A.Hegedüs 1914-30). Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2003.
12.5.2 József Vágó
Oradea 1877 - Paris 1947

1900 Architecture diploma at TU Budapest
1900 Work with Ödön Lechner (2 churches in Preßburg)
1902 Scholarship abroad
1902 Till 1911 office, together with his brother László (urban planner, theatre constructor)
1918 after WWI member of the central council for housing
1919 President of the directorate for construction
1926 After the failure of the Republic of Councils emigration to Italy
1926 1930-38 I Prize at the competition for the UNO in Geneva
1930-38 buildings in Budapest, but has permanent residence in Paris

Main works:
1905 Block of flats at Boráros Place, Budapest
1906-07 Gutenberg dormitory and Intim theatre
1908 Arkadenbasar, Budapest
1916 Villa Grünwald, Budapest

In his architecture there is a synthesis of the Hungarian national ambitions and the geometrical shapes language of Hoffmann.
The Arkadenbasar is characteristic for the development of the new facade of the blocks of flats and shops.

Characteristic examples for this development are:

1911 D.&Zs.Jónás Ware house Szénássy and Bárczai, Budapest
1912 Béla Lajta Rózsavölgyi House, Budapest
1912 B.Málnai&Gy.Haász Block of flats, Irány Str., Budapest
1912 B.Málnai&Gy.Haász Czech-Hungarian industry bank, Budapest
1913 E.Töry&M.Pogány ADRIA Assurances, Budapest
Fig. 146. Buildings of József Vágo in Switzerland (designed during the stay in Rome: the ONU palace, 1926), Italy (Rome: Hotel de la Ville, 1922), Romania (Oradea: Darvas La Roche palace, 1909-1910) and Hungary (Arkadenbasar, Budapest, 1908). Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2006, 2009, 2014.
Fig. 147. Ware house Szénássy and Bárczai, Budapest, architects D.&Zs.Jónás (1911), Block of flats, Irány Str., Budapest, architects B.Málnai&Gy.Haász (1912), Czech-Hungarian industry bank, Budapest, architects B.Málnai&Gy.Haász (1912), ADRIA Assurances, Budapest, architects E.Töry&M.Pogány (1913). Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2003.
12.5.3 Béla Málnai
1878 Budapest - Budapest 1941

1901 Architecture diploma at TU Budapest
From 1901 Work at Ödön Lechner
Till 1907 Work at Béla Lajta
1907 Office together with Gyula Haász
1908-11 Redacteur at the magazine „A ház“ (The house)
From 1909 Member of the art association KÉVE
1919 Hungarian Republic of Councils: Member of the advising
gremium of the artistic directorate
from 1925 designs new Baroque buildings
in the 1930s designs functionalistic blocks of flats

Main works (together with Gyula Haász); since 1908 also independent:

1903 Business house in Budapest
1909 Villa Szedő, Budapest
1909-10 Block of flats Hungária Ring street, Budapest
1910 Block of flats Eötvös Street, Budapest
1910 Block of flats Visegrádi Street, Budapest
1911 House, Budapest
1912 Czech-Hungarian Industry Bank, Budapest
1927 Block of flats, Budapest
1931 Villa Mende, Budapest

Málnai dealt in first line with questions of housing construction.
The English social world of thoughts has influenced him strongly.
Together with Gy. Haász he designed an own block of flats type, with
cœur d’honneur
But the most important remains the renounce at ornament, the economic
efficiency.
Fig. 148. Block of flats Hungária Ring street, Budapest. Architects: Málnai and Haász (1909-10). Photo: M. Bostenaru, 2003.
12.6 THE AVANT-GARDE IN EXILE

12.6.1 Lajos Kassák
1887 Ereskujvár - 1967 Budapest

1899-1907 Autodidact education, while working in metal works, engagement in the workers movement
1907 Walking Budapest-Paris
1909 Paris: contacts to Apollinaire, Delaunay, Picasso, Modigliani
1912 Writing
1915 Magazine "A Tett"; will be prohibited later
1916 Founding of group "MA" with S. Bortnyik and B. Uitz
1919 Emigration to Vienna
1920 Organiser of the Avant-garde in Vienna (magazine MA).
1920-25 6 issues of MA appear
1921 Individual exhibition in Galerie Würtel, Vienna
1926 Return to Budapest
1927 Activistic magazine "Dokumentum"
1928-38 Magazine "Munka"
1922 "Buch neuer Künstler" (Book of new artists)
1950 Freelance artist (surrealist Collages)

Main works:

1920-30 Collages
1924-26 Advertisement projects
1922 Bildarchitektur II (Project of an advertisement kiosk), guache, today in Nürnberg
1922 Buch neuer Künstler
1923 Image architecture, pencil on paper, today in Nürnberg
1923 MA-Book, Kassák-poetry, Berlin, Der Sturm Verlag

"Wir können uns in die gegebenen Rahmen der Gesellschaft oder der Kunst nimmermehr fügen.
Und wir wollen aus Altem kein Neues komponieren.

Die neue Form ist die Architektur.
Das gründliche Aufräumen.
Die Stärke des Willens.
Die Einfachheit des Sicherheitsgefühls.
Die neue Kunst aber ist einfach, wie die Güte des Kindes, kategorisch und sieghaft über alle Stoffe."

Vienna, 31 May 1922 Ludwig Kassák

Preface to Buch neuer Künstler Vienna

12.6.2 Laszló Péri
1899 Budapest - 1967 London

1918 Adherance to the artist group MA
1918 Emigration over Vienna to Paris
1920 Move to Berlin
1922 Adherance to the group "Der Sturm"
1924-28 Turning towards architecture
1928 Change to realistic, engaged plastic
1933 Move to London
1938 Move to Camden
From 1939 British citizen
From 1950 Turning towards Quäkertum

Works with architectural focus:
1920-21 Spatial construction III, painted concrete, 527x408mm,Slg.Herzogenrath,Köln
1922 Spatial construction IV, painted concrete, 730x570, Slg.v.Bartha, Basel
1923 Spatial construction VII, painted concrete, 620x680, Slg.Laszlo, Basel
Posters, cover projects

12.6.3 Vilmos Huszár
1884 Budapest - 1960 Paris

Studies in Budapest
Studies in München
Studies in Voorburg

1917 Founding member of De Stijl
1918 First interior designs: house of the industrial magnate Bruynzeel

12.6.4 Fréd Forbát
1897 Pécs - 1972 Stockholm

1914 Architecture study TU Budapest
1918 Entrance in the circle Galilei
1918 Move and study at the TH München, at Theodor Fischer
1920-22 Work at the Bauhaus in Weimar
From 1923 Freelance architect
1925-28 Chief architect Sommerfeld-Konzern in Berlin
From 1928 Own office in Berlin, citizen of the German imperium
1929 Rejection of a professorship at the Bauhaus, Dessau
1930 Teacher at the private artistic school Itten. CIAM member
1932-33 Works in the UdSSR, with Ernst May
1933-38 Freelance architect in Pécs, Hungary
1938 Emigration to Schweden
Till 1942 Urban planning tasks in Lund and Stockholm
1959-60 Urban planning professor at the TU Stockholm

Works during the exile:
1920-21 Abstract compositions: Paintings, landscape with houses
1921-22 Design of a house in Stadthagen, Berlin-Dahlem
1922 Design of a one family house, Bauhaussiedlung, Weimar
1922 "Baukasten im Großen" (construction cube in big), project with Walter Gropius
1922-23 Project of a workshop house at Horn, Weimar
1923 Project for a two family house, Guthenberg street, Weimar
1929-30 Sport-Club Charlottenburg, Berlin - Eichkamp
1931 Large neighbourhood Haselhorst, Berlin – Spandau

12.6.5 László Moholy-Nagy
1895 Bácsborsód - 1946 Chicago

1913-18 Law studies in Budapest
1914-17 Military service in WWI
1917 Meeting the circle of MA
1918 Turn towards art
1920 Emigration to Vienna, later Berlin
1921 Participation at the van Doesburgs constructivits congress, Weimar
1922 Exhibition gallery "Der Sturm" with L. Péri
1922 Representance oft he 1. German Artistic Exhibition, Moscow from 1923 Professor at Bauhaus
1928 Short stay in Budapest
1934 Emigration to London over Amsterdam
1937 Move to USA, Director of the "New Bauhaus", Chicago
1938 Founding the "School of Design" (since 1944 "Institute of Design")

Main works:
1920-28 Compositions, Image architecture, sculptures
1922 Cinetic constructive force system
1922-30 Light requisit for an electrical scene
1929 Scenography projects and scene photos for "Hoffmanns stories"

Die Überlagerungen von Metalldetails und Schatten. Wiederauftauchender Schatten; plötzlich der Schatten eines Ballons, umgeben von starkem Licht,
der sich über dem ursprünglichen Schatten auf- und abbewegt. Das Lichtrequisit dreht sich; es wird von oben, von unten, von vorn, von hinten sichtbar; in ruhiger,
in beschleunigter, in verzögerter, in gegenläufiger Bewegung.
Eine Fülle von Details.
Ein dicker schwarzer glänzender Ball rollt von links nach rechts.
Von rechts nach links. Unaufhörlich.
Positive und negative Bilder, Aufblenden, Prismen;
sich immer wieder auflösend.
Bewegungen, seltsam sich verschiebende Raster.
"Betrunkene" Filter, Gitter.
Blick durch kleine Öffnungen; durch sich automatisch verändernde Blenden
Blendende, sich bewegende Licht-Blitze. Kreisende Spiralen, die immer wieder auftauchen. Alle feste Formen lösen sich in Licht auf.

In Vision in Motion, Chicago 1947

Poetry to the light game
Black-White-Grey
13 Study trips to interwar and turn of the century (forerunners) architecture / Maria Bostenaru

This part builds the core of the digital work. Printing all the image material would not have been possible, hence a digital database was created. The material was systemased as part of the Marie Curie European Reintegration Grant PIANO (http://cordis.europa.eu/result/rcn/86705_en.html), and the online image archive made in frame of the NeDiMAH short visit. As for now photos are uploaded on photo.net, where Maria Bostenaru has an account, and partially till transfer on Facebook. The database will be enriched with adding addresses as in the tours, and maps, building descriptions, and grouping by geographic position will be done. Historical network research will look also for other connections than geographical. The addresses will be refered to as google maps. An example of tour is already available for Virginia Haret as we saw. Also, the digital version permits enrichment over time. The images were first uploaded on the facebook account, then transferred to the more professional on http://www.photo.net. On how a digital
tour is a certain city has to be made talks an article of the first two authors in the book “Planning and Designing Sustainable and Resilient Landscapes”, a concept result of the NeDiMAH short visit, available under http://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-94-017-8536-5_12 (“Spatial Street Network and Urban Routes Around the Modernist Boulevard in Bucharest” by Maria Bostenaru Dan and Alex Dill). The concept can be applied for any other route.

- **Trips after the reintegration grant**
- **Trips during the reintegration grant**
- **Trips during the main Marie Curie Fellowship**
- **Earlier trips**
13.1 Trips after the reintegration grant

http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079080
Brno, Czech Republic.

This study trip was done in conjunction with the participation to the EGU GA in 2015 for which funding was provided by the postdoc scholarship of project POSDRU/159/1.5/S/133391 (structural funds).

Works to be visited:
House of service, Brno, Vladimir Karfik, 1930-31
Circle illness assurance, Zahradnikova 2-4, Brno, Jindrich Kumpost, 1922
House Kumpost, Barvicova str. 15, Brno, Jindrich Kumpost, 1923-24
Life assurance building of Mohren province, Mozartstr. 3, Brno, Arnost Wiesner, 1920-25
Czech Union bank, Beethovenstr. 4, Brno, Arnost Wiesner, 1920-24
Crematorium. Gihlavska Str. 1, Brno, Arnost Wiesner, 1925-30
Ceremony chappel of the central cemetry, Konevora 198, Bohuslav Fuchs, 1925-27
Row houses in the Masaryk neighbourhood, Barvicova 4-14, Bohuslav Fuchs, 1923-24
Urban apartments Husovice, Novackova str. 49-55, Bohuslav Fuchs, 1926-27
Cafe Zehman, Kolist Park, Brno, (reconstructed 1964), Bohuslav Fuchs, 1925-27
Villa Tugendhat, Cerna-Pole-Bezirk (black field), Brno, Mies van der Rohe, 1928-30
Hotel Avion, Ceska-str. 20, Brno, Bohuslav Fuchs, 1927-28
Villa Münz, Pisarky Hroznova 19, Brno, Arnost Wiesner, 1924-26
Villa Neumark, Pisarky Vinarsky 38, Brno, Arnost Wiesner, 1928-29
House, Klacelova 8, Brno, Jan Visek, 1926
Café ERA, Zemedelská nr. 30, Brno, Josef Kranz, 1927-29
House, Kotlárska-str., Brno, Jindrich Kumpost, 1929
Block of flats for the construction society „Stavog“, Pod Kastany-str. 26-30, Tábor str. 28, Leninova str. 93-97, Brno, Jindrich Kumpost, 1928-29
Block of flats, Obrancu miru 80, Brno, Otto Eissler, 1930
Block of flats, Botanicka str, Brno, Otto Eissler, 1931
Children hospital, Cerna Pole 9, Brno, Bedrich Rozehnal, 1947-53
Villa Fuchs, Hvezdárrenská str 2, Brno, Bohuslav Fuchs, 1927-28
House J. Kranz, Alesova 24, Brno, Josef Kranz, 1933
House of J. Kroha, Sedlakova 45, Brno, Jiri Kroha

This study trip took place in conjunction with the Marie Curie Fellows Association Annual General Assembly, for which funding was provided by the Marie Curie Fellows Association.
Interwar architecture in Zagreb. Photos: M. Bostenaru, 2014
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1078646

This study trip took place in conjunction with the NeDiMAH steering committee meeting, for which funding was provided by ESF.
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1074572
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.10203544033864026.1073741892.1310055151&type=1&l=634186175c

This study trip took place in frame of a DOMUS scholarship in Budapest, Hungary in March 2014. Funding was provided by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences. Documented were the modernist buildings at Pasaret and in Lipotváros and Újlipotváros.
In image „Dunapark“ House, Budapest, Béla Hofstätter, Ferenc Domány, 1937

Literature:
András Ferkai: Buda építészete a két világháború között, MTA Művészettörténeti Kutató intézet, Budapest, 1995
András Ferkai, Branczik Márta, Hajdú Virág, Molnos Attila, Oláh Éva: Pest építészete a két világháború között, Modern Építészetért Kht., Budapest, 2001
Further objectives are:
Villa, Szépvölgyi str., Budapest, József Fischer, 1935
„Atrium“ House, Budapest, Lajos Kozma, 1934
Factory building Stühmer, Budapest, Aladar & Victor Olgyay, 1941
Woman architects in Italy. Photos: M. Bostanaru, 2014.
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.10205114778171652.1073741936.1310055151&type=1&l=33ec5a2aa7
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079081

This study trip took place in conjunction with the participation to the genderSTE COST action „Engendering cities“ conference in Rome, for which funding was provided by the Marie Curie Fellows Association.

See also EUR for Maria Teresa Parpagliolo landscape architecture and Mostra d’Oltremare for Stefania Filo Speziale contribution.
Interwar churches in Italy. Photos: M. Bostenaru, 2014.
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.10205114529845444.1073741934.1310055151&type=1&l=9ffda18a2a
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079082

This study trip took place in conjunction with the participation to the genderSTE COST action „Engendering cities“ conference in Rome, for which funding was provided by the Marie Curie Fellows Association.
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.10205114819172677.1073741937.1310055151&type=1&l=be85b17bd9
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079083

This study trip took place in conjunction with the participation to the genderSTE COST action „Engendering cities“ conference in Rome, for which funding was provided by the Marie Curie Fellows Association.
This study trip took place in conjunction with the participation to the Euro-Science Open Forum 2014 in Copenhagen, for which partial support was provided by the Marie Curie Fellows Association.
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.10203537130331442.1073741891.1310055151&type=1&l=511049a25d
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079084

This study trip took place in frame of a DOMUS scholarship in Budapest, Hungary in March 2014 for which funding was provided by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.10203673761987148.1073741897.1310055151&type=1&l=f25d42335a
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079085

This study trip took place in frame of a DOMUS scholarship in Budapest, Hungary in March 2014 for which funding was provided by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

Reference:
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.10203532803943285.1073741889.1310055151&type=1&l=90838a67f0
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079086

This study trip took place in frame of a DOMUS scholarship in Budapest, Hungary in March 2014, for which funding was provided by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

Literature:

Further objectives are:
Villa, Lejtő str., Budapest, Farkas Molnar, 1932
Villa and block of flats, Trombitás str., Budapest, Farkas Molnar, 1936
House, Csévi str, Budapest, Farkas Molnar, József Fischer, 1935
Housing complex of the OTI Pension assurance, Budapest, architects team Molnár, Fischer and Ligeti, 1934
Employees dormitory of the OTI workers hospital, Budapest, Molnár, Fischer, 1936
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.10203532892265493.1073741890.1310055151&type=1&l=7fb71920e8
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1069943

This study trip took place in frame of a DOMUS scholarship in Budapest, Hungary in March 2014 for which funding was provided by the Hungarian Academy of Sciences.

The research was deepened with archive material from the Budapest city archives (see next page), interviews of contemporary architects and the training of a student on the topic.
Gellért bath plan and section, courtesy of the Budapest city archives.
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.10202617031729552&type=1&l=e68e359fcf
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079087

This study trip took place in frame of an invited STSM in Romania. Funding for the STSM was provided by COST.
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.10202943911501342.1073741881.1310055151&type=1&l=5995e1f5ec (and other sightseeing)
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079392

This study trip was done as vacation trip and hence involved no extra costs.

Literature:
Lucrări de arhitectură 1907-1942 [Album] / Paul Smărândescu, Tipografia Universul; București, 1942

Paul Smărândescu designed the master plan of Sinaia and a number of villas in it.
For works in Bucharest, see http://paul-smarandescu.blogspot.ro/
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.10202541651565095.1073741873.1310055151&type=1&l=db195a2daa
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079088

This study visit took place in conjunction with an evaluation session at REA, for which funding was provided, in the free time.
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.10202541332517119.1073741872.1310055151&type=1&l=4d04c28de1
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079089

This visit of an exhibition took place in conjunction with an evaluation session at REA, for which funding was provided, in the free time.
Meisterhäuser Dessau, Friedrich Ebert Alee, Walter Gropius, 1925-26
Photos: M. Bostenaru, 2013.
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.10201418065996158.1073741850.1310055151&type=1&l=980fbd3059

Photos: M. Bostenaru, 2013.
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.10201416870766278.1073741849.1310055151&type=1&l=ba621056d7
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079090
Literature:

These study trips took place in conjunction with the participation at the Digital Landscape Architecture conference as post-conference tours, for which partial support has been provided by the organisers.
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.10201606329262622.1073741857.1310055151&type=1&l=d203a2cb44
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079091

This study trip took place in conjunction with the Marie Curie Fellows Association Annual General Assembly in Rome for which funding was provided by the Marie Curie Fellows Association.
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.10200144341793849.2199006.1310055151&type=1&l=d2334ec31d
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079092

This study trip took place in conjunction with the Marie Curie Fellows Association Annual General Assembly in Rome for which funding was provided by the Marie Curie Fellows Association.
Accademia di Romania a Roma. Photos: M. Bostenaru, 2012
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.10200142302182860.2198963.1310055151&type=1&l=d882054eb0
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079093

This study trip took place in conjunction with the Marie Curie Fellows Association Annual General Assembly in Rome for which funding was provided by the Marie Curie Fellows Association.
20th century architecture in historic context in Faro, Portugal. Photos: M. Bostenaru, 2012
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.4678992775362.2191421.1310055151&type=1&l=d8d31e0297
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079094

This study trip took place in frame of an excursion during the Short Term Scientific Mission at the University of Algarve in Faro, Portugal, in frame of the TU0801 COST Action „Semantic enrichment of 3D city models for sustainable urban development“ for which funding was provided by COST.

Reference:

Main works:
City Hall, Rua do Municipio 13, arch. Jorge de Oliveira 1945 (facade), building from 1883
Palace of Tears, Praca Alexandre Herculano 15-21/Rua Rebelo da Silva 42-50/Rua Castilho 37-41B (Sec XIX, ALT 1924)
The Alexandre da Fonseca’s Family House, Largo D. Marcelino Franco 2 / Rua da Misricórdia 58-60 (Sec XIX, ALT 1937, AMP 1940)
Belmarco Palace, Largo D. Marcelino Franco 1 / Rua de Sao Francisco 13-15 / Rua José Maria Brandeiro 12-14, arch. Norte Junior (1912)
Tomás Cabreira School, Rua Dr. Manuel Arriaga 2, 1918 Liceu
Casa dos Azulejos, Rua de Sao Pedro 45, arch. José Barros (1926)
Bank of Portugal, Praca Dr. Francisco Gomes 12, arch. Adaes Bermudes (1926)

Vivenda Marilia, Rua Dr. Justino Cumano 15-17/ Rua Almeida Garrett 44-52, arch. Jaime Ruivo (1930)
Café Aliança, Rua Dr. Francisco Gomes 7-11 / Rua da Marinha 8-12, 1930
Palacete Guerreirinho, Rua Ventura Coelho 31-33, arch. Norte Junior (1936)
Social Housing, Bairro dos Centenarios, 1940
Casa do Poeta, Rua General Humberto Delgado 59, arch. Jorge de Oliveira (1944) IIM
Faro High School / Joao de Deus Secondary School, Largo do Infante, arch. José Costa e Silva (1948)
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.4646287877760.2190499.1310055151&type=1&l=af9863705d
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079096

This study trip took place in frame of an excursion during the Short Term Scientific Mission at the University of Algarve in Faro, Portugal, in frame of the TU0801 COST Action „Semantic enrichment of 3D city models for sustainable urban development“, for which funding was provided by COST.
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.4611434486447.2189538.1310055151&type=1&l=32d0d86c33
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079097

This study trip took place in conjunction with the Junior Summit „Water“ for which funding was provided by ESF.

https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.4598079392578.2189182.1310055151&type=1&l=7bbaac2919
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079098

This study trip took place in conjunction with the Junior Summit „Water“ for which funding was provided by ESF.
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.4597828906316.2189172.1310055151&type=1&l=9c7a451aee
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079099

This study trip took place in conjunction with the Junior Summit „Water“ for which funding was provided by ESF.
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.4495320023658.2186149.1310055151&type=1&l=980db0b0a1
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079100

This study trip took place on the occasion of the opening of a cultural centre at this location. As an invited speaker for the event funding was provided by the Architects’ Order.
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.4522603265722.2187069.1310055151&type=1&l=42a326389f
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079101

This study trip took place as vacation trip and involved no special funding.

2013 a trip to the archives to consult the design took place also as vacation trip.

Currently research for a book funded by the “Ion Mincu” University of Architecture and Urbanism on this topic is being done.
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.4443405085817.2184769.1310055151&type=1&l=c2c3c9f53a
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079102

This study trip took place as vacation trip and involved no special funding.
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.4360791180521.2182637.1310055151&type=1&l=0a9d10310d and
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.10200090635771232.2198057.1310055151&type=1&l=f1f2544496
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079103

This study trip took place in conjunction with the NeDiMAH steering committee meeting and the EuroScience Open Forum participation, both in 2012 for which funding was provided by ESF and respectively the Marie Curie Fellows Association.

Works visited:
1900-15    Iveagh-Buildings, McDonell and Ried, Joseph and Smithem, Kaye Parry and Ross
1903-04    Guinness Store House, Market street, A. H. Hignett
1937-41    Airport terminal, Collingstown, Desmond Fitzgerald
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.4364753839585.2182752.1310055151&type=1&l=07f6962276
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079104

This study trip was done in conjunction with the NeDiMAH workshops at the Digital Humanities conference in Hamburg for which funding was provided by ESF.
http://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.3749194050975.2171286.1310055151&type=3&l=c148a34ac6
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079105
This study trip was done in conjunction with a TU0801 COST meeting (Semantic enrichment of 3D city models for sustainable urban development) in Madrid for which funding was provided by COST.

Literature:

Works visited:
- Art Nouveau
Hospital San Francisco de Paula, Calle Raimundo Fernández Villaverde 18, Madrid, Antonio Palacios Ramilo, 1908-16
Association of Beautiful Arts, Calle Alcalá 42, Madrid, Antonio Palacios Ramilo, 1919-26
School house Menédez y Pelayo, Calle Méndez Alvaro 16, Madrid, Antonio Flórez, 1923-29
Banco de Vizcaya, Calle Alcalá 45, Madrid, Manuel Galindez / Fernando Arzadún, 1930-32

- interwar
University city, Madrid from 1927, Modesto López Otero (leadership)
Cinema Barceló, Plaza de Barceló 11, Madrid, Lluis Gutiérrez Soto, 1930
Capitol, Gran Via 41, Madrid, Luis Martinez Feduchi / Vicente Eced, 1931-33
Siedlung El Viso, Madrid, Rafael Bergamin, 1933-36
Casa de las Flores, Calle Hilarión Esteva, Madrid, Secundino Zuazo, 1930-31
Block of flats, Calle Miguel Angel 2-6, Madrid, Luis Gutiérrez Soto, 1936-41
Horse riding La Zarzuela, Madrid, Carlos Arniches / Martin Dominguez / Eduardo Torroja (engineer), 1935-36
http://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.3617697123634.2168510.1310055151&type=1&l=4b8b48fca2
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079106

This study trip was done in conjunction with an evaluation session at the REA and involved thus no additional costs.

Literature:
Brussels guide
Mies van der Rohe pavillion in Barcelona, 2011
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079259

This study trip was done in conjunction with an ESF conference participation in Saint Feliu. Partial funding was provided for the conference only.

For interpretation, see the contributions on „original and replacement“ by Alex Dill in this book.
http://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.2815190061459.2152805.1310055151&type=1&l=81e9339fb3  
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079107

This study trip was done in conjunction with an ESF conference participation in Saint Feliu. Partial funding was provided for the conference only.

Literature:

Works visited:
Block of flats Sant Jordi, Carrer Pau Claris 81, Barcelona, Francesc Folguera, 1929-31
Block, Carrer Muntaner 342-348, Barcelona, Josep Lluís Sert, 1929-31
Block, Via Augusta 61, Barcelona, Germán Rodríguez Arias, 1930-31
House Bloc, Paseo Torres i Bages 91-105, Barcelona, Josep Lluís Sert / Joan Bautista Subirana / Josep Maria Torres Clave, 1931-36
http://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.2815345905355.2152808.1310055151&type=1&l=f19c435cab
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079108

This study trip was done in conjunction with an ESF conference participation in Saint Feliu. Partial funding was provided for the conference only.

Literature:

Works visited:
Hospital Sant Pau, Avinguda Sant Antoni Maria Claret 167, Barcelona, Lluis Domenech i Muntaner, 1902-12
House Terrades, Avinguda Diagonal 416, Barcelona, Josep Puig i Cadafalch, 1903-05
Palau de la Música Catalana, Sant Pere Més Alt 13, Barcelona, Lluis Doménech i Muntaner, 1905-08
http://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.2815270343466.2152806.1310055151&type=1&l=da48fadf2a
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079109

This study trip was done in conjunction with an ESF conference participation in Saint Feliu. Partial funding was provided for the conference only.

Literature:

Main works visited:
Park Güell, Barcelona, Antoni Gaudi, 1900-14
House Batlló, Barcelona, Antoni Gaudi, 1904-06
House Milà, Barcelona, Antoni Gaudi, 1905-10
This study trip was done in conjunction with an ESF conference participation in Saint Feliu. Partial funding was provided for the conference only.

This study trip was accompanying programme of the Culture funded project “Art Nouveau and Ecology”. Partial funding was provided by the project.
Riga, Latvia, National Romantic architecture. Photos: M. Bostenaru, 2011
http://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.2576967746050.2147510.1310055151&type=1&l=12417245f7
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079111

This study trip was done as accompanying programme of a meeting and Transport conference in Riga, Latvia, in frame of the COST action TU0801 (Semantic enrichment of 3D city models for sustainable urban development) for which funding was provided by COST.
http://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.2576864463468.2147497.1310055151&type=1&l=e840c2327a
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079112

This study trip was done as accompanying programme of a meeting and Transport conference in Riga, Latvia, in frame of the COST action TU0801 (Semantic enrichment of 3D city models for sustainable urban development) for which funding was provided by COST.

Buildings include:
A Kenins School, Terbatas iela 15/17, Riga, Konstantins Peksens, 1905
Alberta Str, Riga, Michael Eisenstein
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079112

This study trip was done as accompanying programme of a meeting and Transport conference in Riga, Latvia, in frame of the COST action TU0801 (Semantic enrichment of 3D city models for sustainable urban development) for which funding was provided by COST.
Warsaw, Poland, interwar architecture. Photos: M. Bostenaru, 2011.
http://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.2492241547948.2144761.1310055151&l=3c04c6a528&type=1
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079113
This study trip was done in conjunction with the participation to the Marie Curie Conference in Warsaw under the Polish presidency for which funding was provided by the European Commission.

Covered buildings:
WSM Rakowiec, Warsaw, Helena & Szmon Syrkus, 1930
House, Ul. Estonska, Warsaw, Jadwiga Dobrzynska/Zygmunt Loboda, 1932
House of the architect, Ul. Niegolewskiego, Warsaw, Zoliborz, Barbara and Stanislaw Brukalski, 1927
Block of flats, Ul. Mickiewicza, Warsaw, Zoliborz, Julius Zorawski, 1937
Three family house, Ul. Kattowicka, Warsaw, Bohdan Lachert/Josef Szanajca, 1928-29
House, Ul. Francuska, Warsaw, Lucian Korngold/Hendryk Blum, 1935
Block of flats, Ul. Jaworzynska, Warsaw, Helena and Szmon Syrkus, 1937
WSM colony IV, VII, Ul. Mickiewicz, Warsaw, Zoliborz, Barbara and Stanislav Brukalski, 1929-31, 1930-34
Sfântu Gheorghe, Romania, Károly Koos architecture. Photos: M. Bostenaru, 2011
http://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.2295065418668.2136802.1310055151&l=88b296d876&type=1
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079114

This study trip was done as vacation stay and involved no special funding.

This study trip was done in the free time and involved no extra costs.
This study trip was done connected to different events: the TIEMS conference, the Arts et paysage exhibition of the French Institute, the visit of a Japanese Marie Curie fellow, and hence being also in the home city involved no costs.
http://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.2075043678262.2127233.1310055151&l=6a2de0c325  
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1003651

This study trip was done in the city of the author. It was the consequence of giving a radio interview about the architect as first woman architect.

Later on, the research was extended with funding from the Architects’ Order to a route:  
http://virginiaharet.blogspot.ro/

Also archive research has been performed.

The research will continue in following the trace of the architect in Italy during a Romanian School in Rome stay.
http://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.2075112479982.2127237.1310055151&l=c2b9f808b7
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1004885

This study trip was done in conjunction (weekend after) with the participation to a TU0801 COST meeting (Semantic enrichment of 3D city models for sustainable urban development) in Brussels for which funding was provided by COST.
13.2 Trips during the reintegration grant

http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=994308

This study trip was done in the home city of the author and involved no special funding.

The map provided by the association e-card was used.
This study trip was done in the home city of the author and involved no funding. For the identification of the building 3 sources were used:


- The archive research in the Canadian Centre of Architecture in Montreal, which involved original drawings and for which funding was partially provided by the CCA and partially by the Marie Curie European Reintegration Grant PIANO.

- Archive research at the Bucharest Town Hall for building plans.
This study trip involved a tour in the home city of Maria Bostenaru Dan and there was no funding for it.

Doing the tour involved using a map provided by the Architects’ Union.
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079116

The study trip to Balchik was done as vacation trip and there was no special funding for this.
The study trip to see interior spaces of Giuseppe Terragni buildings in Como was organized in conjunction with the participation to the PRECOMOS conference on “Preventive conservation” organised in Como. Funding for this participation was provided by the Marie Curie European Reintegration Grant PIANO.
The study trip to Cernobbio was organized in conjunction with the participation to the PRECOMOS conference on “Preventive conservation” organised in Como. Funding for this participation was provided by the Marie Curie European Reintegration Grant PIANO.

The study trip to Ljubljana was organised in conjunction with the participation to the CHRESP conference (Cultural heritage research meets practice) funded by a EC conference funding programme which provided partial support, the rest of the support being covered by the Marie Curie European Reintegration grant PIANO.

A report on the conference can be found here https://www.uauim.ro/cercetare/chresp/en/

Main works:
Church of Hl. Franziskus, Siska, Ljubljana, Joze Plecnik, 1925-31
Tromostovje (Three bridges), Ljubljana, Joze Plecnik, 1929-32
National and university library, Ljubljana, Joze Plecnik, 1936-41
Zale central cemetery, Ljubljana, Joze Plecnik, 1938-40
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=995087

The study trip to Porto was organised in conjunction with the participation to the conference “Structures and architecture” in Guimaraes, Portugal. Funding for this was provided by the Marie Curie European Reintegration Grant PIANO.
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079117

The study trip to Paris was organised in conjunction with participation to the Marie Curie Fellows Association Annual General Assembly in December 2010. Funding for this trip was provided by the Marie Curie European Reintegration Grant PIANO.

Literature:
The study trip to Czech Republic was organized as a vacation trip in conjunction with a pilgrimage to Lourdes. There was no special funding for this.

Shops building „To the Black Mother of God“, Ovocny trh 19/569, Prague, Josef Gocar, 1911/12
Forthcoming:
Office and shops building „Riunione Adriatica di Securita“ (heute Palast Adria), Jungmannova 31/36, Prague, Pavel Janak, 1921-25
Bank of the czech-slovak legions, Na porici 24/1046, Prague, Josef Gocar, 1921/23
Villa under Vysehrad, Libusina 3/49, Prague, Josef Chochol, 1911/12
Three part house, Rasin Quai 6/42, 8/47 and 10/71, Prague, Josef Chochol, 1912/13
Block of flats, Neklanova 30/98, Prague, Josef Chochol, 1913
Community housing, Elisky Krasnohorske 10-14/1023, 1021, 1037, Prague, Otokar Novotny, 1919/21
Cemetery entrance, Dablicka, Prague, Vlastislav Hofman, 1912/13
Werkbundsiedlung BABA
Villa Janak, Nad Patankou 16, Prague, 6 Dejvice 1785, Pavel Janak, 1931/32
Villa Maule, Nad Patankou 18, Prague, 6 Dejvice 1786, Josef Gocar, 1931/32
Villa Cenek, Na Babe 11, Prague, 6 Dejvice 1722, Ladislav Zak, 1932
Villa Zaoralek, Na Ostrohu 54, Prague, 6 Dejvice 1708, Ladislav Zak, 1931/32
Villa Herain, Na Babe 3, Prague, 6 Dejvice 1782, Ladislav Zak, 1928/32
Villa Hain, Na Vysocanskychvinicich 32, Prague, 9 Vysocany 404, Ladislav Zak, 1932/37
Villa Suk, Na Ostrohu 49, Prague, 6 Dejvice 1794, Hana Kucerova-Záveská, 1932
Estonia - Tallinn interwar architecture. Photos: M. Bostenaru, 2009
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=994310

The study trip to Tallin was done as a one day trip in conjunction with the participation to the STREMAH 2009 conference in Tallin, Estonia. Funding for this was provided by the Marie Curie Reintegration Grant PIANO.

Reference:

Main works include:
Parlament building, Tallin, Herbert Johannson and Eugen Habermann, 1920
House Tompiiestee, Tallin, Herbert Johannson, 1929
Fire brigade, Tallin, Herbert Johannson, Ca. 1935
Assurance building, Tallin, Robert Natus, 1928
House of the artistic association, Tallin, Anton Soans and Edgar Kuusik, 1933
Rauastr, Tallin, Anton Soans, Ca. 1937
Kino Gloria Palace (Vene Draamateater), Vabaduse väljak 5, arch. Fridrihs Skujins (Riia) (1925-26)
Kaapultstega elamu, Kinga 6/8 Raekoja plats 8 / Mündi 1,3 / Pikk 12, architect Artur Perna (1923-24), Eugen Habermann (1929-30)
EKA maja (Tallinna Linnavalitsus), Vabaduse väljak 7, arch. Robert Natus (1929-31)
Elu- ja ärihoone, Pärnu mnt. 6, arch. Eugen Habermann (1932-34)
Kunstihööme, Vabaduse väljak 8, arch. Anton Soans, Edgar Johan Kuusik (1933-34)
Koolimaja, Kerutzwaldi 25, arch. Herbert Johanson (1933-35)
Majaomanike Pank, Vabaduse väljak 10, arch. Elmar Lohk (1934-37)
Elu- ja ärihoone, Pärnu mnt. 8, arch. Eugen Sacharias (1936-37)
Tuletormajoone, Raua 2, arch. Herbert Johanson (1936-39)
Kino Soprus, Vana Posti 8, arch. Peeter Tarvas, August Volberg (1950-55)
Kirjanike Maja, Harju 1, arch. August ja Heili Volberg (1958-63)

The study trip to Vienna was again in conjunction with the participation in the European Geosciences Union General Assembly, for which a Young Researcher Travel Award was given by the organisers and the funding completed by the Marie Curie European Reintegration Grant.

Literature:

Main works:
Karl Marx Hof, Vienna Heiligenstadt, Karl Ehn, 1925-30
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.10202073043530187.1073741866.1310055151&type=1&l=41acab1f81
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=994981

The study trip to Vienna was again in conjunction with the participation in the European Geosciences Union General Assembly, for which a Young Researcher Travel Award was given by the organisers and the funding completed by the Marie Curie European Reintegration Grant.

Literature:

Main works from the time:
House Stonborough Wittgenstein, Vienna Landstraße, Paul Engelmann / Ludwig Wittgenstein, 1926-28
Workers illness assurance, Vienna Landstraße, Fritz Judtmann / Egon Riss, 1926-27
Haus Moller, Vienna Währing, Adolf Loos, 1927-28
Tension work, Vienna Favoriten, Eugen Kastner / Fritz Waage, 1928-31
House Beer, Vienna Hitzing, Josef Frank / Oskar Wlach, 1929-31
Workers office, Vienna Liesing, Ernst Anton Plischke, 1930-31
Werkbundsiedlung, Vienna Lainz, Josef Frank (leading), 1930-32
Skyscraper Herrengasse, Vienna centre, Siegfried Theiss /Hans Jaksch, 1931-32
Crematorium, Vienna Simmering, Clemens Holzmeister, 1921-23
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1051134

The study trip to the Netherlands was done in conjunction with the training school of the SemCity (Semantic enrichment of 3D city models) COST action TU0801 for which funding was provided by COST.
The study trip to the Netherlands was done in conjunction with the training school of the SemCity (Semantic enrichment of 3D city models) COST action TU0801 for which funding was provided by COST.
The study trip to this city was done as a one day trip in conjunction with the vacation stay in Cluj with no special funding.
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=985150

The study trip to Oradea was a vacation trip with no special funding.

References:
Mircea Pasca, Palatul Episcopal Greco-Catolic din Oradea, Editura Muzeului Tarii Crisurilor, 2009
Mircea Pasca, Arhitectul Frigyes Spiegel la Oradea, Editura Arca, 2010
Mircea Pasca, Palatul Ullmann, Tipo MC, 2005
Mircea Pasca, Arhitectii József si Laszló Vágo la Oradea, ed. 2-a rev., Editura Arca, 2010
Mircea Pasca, Palatul Vulturul Negru, Oradea, Tipo MC, 2007
Romania – Cluj Károly Kós architecture. Photos: M. Bostenaru, 2009 and 2012
http://www.facebook.com/album.php?aid=2108047&id=1310055151&l=c2e4709092 and
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.4443457127118.2184773.1310055151&type=1&l=ef4edee627
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=1079114

The study trips to Cluj to Károly Kós architecture were vacation trips with no special funding.
Estonia - Tallinn turn of the century. Photos: M. Bostenaru, 2009
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=994311

The study trip to Tallin was done as a one day trip in conjunction with the participation to the STREMAH 2009 conference in Tallin, Estonia. Funding for this was provided by the Marie Curie Reintegration Grant PIANO.
Reference:

Main works:
Kauplustega elamu, Pikk 18, architect Jaques Rosenbaum (1909-10) (in photo)
Kauplustega elamu, Pikk 23/25, architect Jacques Rosenbaum, ins. Ernst Boustedt (1908-09)
Aadli klubi (Nukuteater), Lai 1, arch. Nikolai Thamm Noorem, Arthur Hoyningen-Huene (1904-07)
Pangahoone, Harju 9, arch. Jacques Rosenbaum, inst Ernst Boustedt (1908-09)
Saksa teater (Eesti Draamateater), Pärnu mnt. 5, arch. Nikolaj Vassiljev, Aleksei Bubor (Peterburi) (1906 (concurs) – 1910)
Pangahoone-üürimaja, Pärnu mnt. 10, Eliel Saarinen (Helsingi) (1911-12)
Pangahoone, Suur Karja 7, arch. Aleksander Jaron (1911-12)
Kauplustega üürimaja, Viru 4, arch. Karl Burman, Artur Perna (1913-14)
Pangahoone, Suur Karja 1 / Vanaturg 2, arch. Wilhelm Neumann (Riia) (facade), Otto Schott (1902-04), Juurdeehitus (1922-24 Bielenberg & Moser (Berlin))
Pangahoone – üürimaja, Suur Karja 18, arch. Artur Perna (1921-23)
Kauplustega elamu, Pikk 10 / Kinga 10, Ümberehitus 1922-23 Ernst Kühnert
Oleviste gildi (Mustpeade) maja, Pikk 24, Ümberehitus 1919-21 Ernst Kühnert
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=994312

The study trip to Helsinki was done as a one day trip in conjunction with the participation to the STREMAH 2009 conference in Tallin, Estonia. Funding for this was provided by the Marie Curie Reintegration Grant PIANO.
13.3 Trips during the main Marie Curie fellowship

For the buildings of Giuseppe Terragni in Milan several special trips were done from the host city of Pavia to the close city of Milan. Funding was provided by the Marie Curie Intra-European Fellowship with the project CA’REDIVIVUS.
For the buildings of the Milanese Novecento several special trips were done from the host city of Pavia to the close city of Milan. Funding was provided by the Marie Curie Intra-European Fellowship with the project CA’REDIVIVUS.
For the buildings of the Rome Novecento a special trip was done in December 2006. Funding was provided by the Marie Curie Intra-European Fellowship with the project CA`REDIVIVUS.
For the buildings of Giuseppe Terragni in Como a special trip was done under funding by the Marie Curie Intra-European Fellowship with the project CA’REDIVIVUS, since Como was close to the host city of Pavia.
The study trip to Naples, Italy, took place in conjunction with the 2nd fib Congress which took place at Mostra d’Oltremare. Funding for this participation was provided by the Marie Curie Intra-European Fellowship with the project CA`REDIVIVUS.

Reference:
http://www.facebook.com/album.php?aid=2022224&id=1310055151&l=af00d70cf4 and
http://photo.net/photodb(folder?folder_id=994457
Study trip to Athens, Greece, took place in conjunction with the 4\textsuperscript{th} EWICS workshop in Thessaloniki in 2005. Funding for this participation was provided by the Marie Curie Intra-European Fellowship with the project CA REDIVIVUS.

Literature:

For the works visited the DOCOMOMO registries database was used. The edited book on Greece includes some more school buildings and also the following highlights, from which some have been documented:
Army Share Fund Building, Athens, Vasileios Kassandros / Leonidas Bonis, 1928-38
Apartment building, Ipsilantou and Ploutarchou streets, Athens, Constantinos Kyriakidis, 1933
Small Apartment Block, Athens, Dionysiou Areopatiou str., Vasileios Kouremenos, Ca. 1930
The “Blue” Apartment building, Exarcheia Sq., Athens, Kyriakos Panayotakos, 1932-33
Apartment building, Zaimi and Stournari streets, Athens, Thoukydidis Valenits and Polvios Michailidis, 1933-34
Apartment blocks for refugees, Alexandras Ave, Athens, Kimon Laskaris / Dimitrios Kyriakos, 1933-35
Rex Cinema, Panepistimioi str., Athens, Vasileios Kassandros / Leonidas Bonis, 1935-37
Apartment block, Navarinou and Mavromichali streets, Athens, Vasileios Douras, 1936
Multistorey car park, Kanari str., Athens, Rennos Koutsouris, 1936-38
Portugal - Lisbon interwar. Photos: M. Bostenaru, 2005
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=994458 and
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.4598311078370.2189194.1310055151&type=1&l=b3595025e7

The first study trip to interwar architecture in Lisbon was done in conjunction with the 250 years anniversary conference of the 1755 Lisbon earthquake for which funding was provided by the Marie Curie Intra-European Fellowship with the project CA`REDIVIVUS. Later on 2 STSM funded by COST led to prolonged stay in Lisbon and more study.

References:

Main works:
1935 Block of flats, Avenida de Alvares Cabral 44-48, Casiano Branco
1934-36 Hotel Victoria, Avenida da Liberdade, Casiano Branco
1935 Bloc of flats, Rua Nova de Sao Mamede 3a-9a, Casiano Branco
1938 Nosa Senhora de Fatima church, Porfirio Pardal Monteiro
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=994309

The study trips to Budapest Secession architecture were done during the return trip from the SEEE conference in Skopje, Macedonia for which funding was provided by Graduiertenkolleg „Naturkatastrophen” (DFG).

A short film with a central place on this architecture will be provided at https://www.youtube.com/user/mbostenaru

References:
Ákos Moravánszky: Die Architektur der Donaumonarchie (Budapest: Corvina; Berlin: Ernst & Sohn, 1988).
Ákos Moravánszky: Die Erneuerung der Baukunst. Wege zur Moderne in Mitteleuropa (Salzburg, Wien: Residenz Verlag, 1988)
The study trips to Vienna took place as the participation to the European Geosciences Union General Assembly, as this moved to Vienna after Nice.

Literature:
Annette Becker, Dietmar Steiner und Wilfried Wang (eds.) Architektur im 20. Jahrhundert. Österreich, Prestel (München/New York)

Including:

Stadtbahnpavillon, Karlsplatz, Vienna, Otto Wagner, 1899
Metro stations, Vienna, Otto Wagner, 1894-1900
Secession building, Vienna centre, Joseph Maria Olbrich, 1897-98
Church St. Leopold, Vienna-Penzing, Otto Wagner, 1902-07
Postsparkasse, Vienna, Otto Wagner, 1903-06
Church at Steinhof, Vienna, Otto Wagner, 1906
Block of flats, Neustiftgasse 40, Vienna, Otto Wagner, 1910-12
House at Michaelisplatz, Vienna, Adolf Loos, 1909-11
Siedlung Heuberg, Vienna, Adolf Loos, 1912
Winarsky Hof, Vienna, Josef Frank, 1924
House Wildbrandtgasse 3, Vienna, Josef Frank, 1914
Housing and shops building Portois&Fix, Ungargasse 51-53, Vienna, Max Fabiani, 1899-1900
Zacherl House, centre, Vienna, Joze Plecnik, 1903-05
Holy Spirit Church, Ottakring, Vienna, Joze Plecnik, 1910-13
13.4 Earlier trips

The study trips to Modernist architecture in Bucharest took place during the travel for the SFB 461 building survey in April 2000, funded by the DFG.
The study trips to Modernist architecture in Bucharest took place during the travel for the SFB 461 building survey in April 2000, funded by the DFG.
The study trips to Modernist architecture in Bucharest took place during the travel for the SFB 461 building survey in April 2000, funded by the DFG.
http://photo.net/photodb/folder?folder_id=995147
https://www.facebook.com/media/set/?set=a.10200466509927851.2204280.1310055151&type=1&l=7906eebc64

A film with Weißenhof Siedlung and a film with Einsteintower, Potsdam will be made available at https://www.youtube.com/user/mbostenaru

The study trip to Weißenhof Siedlung took place during the XXI UIA Congress, Resource Architecture, at the pre-congress meeting on Modern architecture in Stuttgart in 2002.

Study trip to Einstein tower, Potsdam, took place with the excursion of the Graduiertenkolleg „Naturkatastrophen” 450 also in 2002.

The views of Dammerstock Siedlung in Karlsruhe were renewed during the stay in Karlsruhe 1996-2006. 2013 during the NeDiMAH stay a guided tour was done subject of another album.

Funding was provided by the Graduiertenkolleg „Naturkatastrophen” (DFG).
References:
Einstein tower – book review at
http://bostenaru.natkat.org/project_results/bookreview_einstein.html
(funded by PIANO reintegration grant) – also in this book as a chapter
CD ROM Weiße Vernunft – review on Amazon
http://www.amazon.de/exec/obidos/ASIN/3791321242/

Winfried Nerdinger and Cornelius Tafel (1996) Architekturführer
Deutschland. 20. Jahrhundert, Birkhäuser Verlag (Basel, Berlin, Boston),
ISBN 3-7643-5287-6
Architektur im 20. Jahrhundert. Deutschland, Prestel (München/New York),
ISBN 3-7913-2293-1

Main works visited:
Siedlung Römerstadt, Frankfurt am Main, Ernst May, 1925-30
Weißenhofsiedlung (Jacobus Johannes Pieter Oud – Reihenhäuser, Josef
Frank – Doppelhaus, Mies van der Rohe, Le Corbusier), Stuttgart, 1925-27
Deutscher Pavillon, World exhibition Barcelona 1929, Ludwig Mies van
der Rohe
Zeche Zollverein XII, Essen Katernberg, Fritz Schupp and Martin
Kremmer, 1927-32
Hauptbahnhof Leipzig, William Lossow / Max Hans Kühne, 1902-15

The study trip to Mathildenhöhe was done during the architecture internship in the Kramm & Strigl studio, 1998-1999.

A film will be made available at [https://www.youtube.com/user/mbostenaru](https://www.youtube.com/user/mbostenaru)

Hochzeitsturm und Ausstellungsgebäude, Darmstadt Mathildenhöhe, Joseph Maria Olbrich, 1905-08
The study trip to Sweden was done during the first EuroScience Open Forum, 2004, for which funding was provided by the Marie Curie Fellows Association.

Literature:
Birkhäuser Architekturführer Skandinavien

Visited:
Woodland cemetery, Stockholm, Gunnar Asplund/Sigurd Lewerentz, 1915-40 (in image)
Stockholm city hall, Ragnar Östberg, 1902-23
The street Kungsgatan, Stockholm, Sven Wallander, Ivar Callmander, Ernst Stenhammar, Cyrillus Johansson etc., 1915-33

More landmarks:
Train stations, Stockholm-Västeras-Bergslagen, Erik Lallerstedt, 1900-07
Adolf Fredriks Norra Folkskola, Stockholm, Georg A Nilsson, 1898-1902
Stadion, Stockholm, Torben Grut, 1909-12
Villa Geber, Diplomstaden, Stockholm, Ragnar Östberg, 1911-13
Engelbrektskyrkan, Stockholm, Lars Israel Wahlman, 1905-14
Liljevalch artistic hall, Stockholm, Carl Bergsten, 1913-16
Stockholm Enskilda Bank, Stockholm, Ivar Tengbom, 1912-15
Svenska Tändsticksaktiebolaget, Stockholm, Ivar Tengbom, 1926-28
City library, Stockholm, Gunnar Asplund, 1918-28
Stockholm exhibition 1930, Gunnar Asplund etc.
Row housing, Alstensgatan, Bromma, Stockholm, Paul Hedqvist, 1932
Community housing, John Ericssonsgatan 6, Stockholm, Sven Markelius, 1935
The Lyceum at Sveaplan, Stockholm, Nils Ahrbim / Helge Zimdal, 1936
This study trip was done in conjunction with the building survey in Mysłakowice, Poland, for which funding was provided by the University of Karlsruhe. Unfortunately the photographs were lent and not given back.

Main works:
Century hall, Wroclaw, Max Berg, 1911
Shop and office building in the Junckern str., Wroclaw, Hans Poelzig, 1911
House on the art industry exhibition, Wroclaw, Hans Poelzig, 1904
Department store Petersdorf, Wroclaw, Erich Mendelsohn, 1926-27
House in Stifter str., Wroclaw, Adolf Rading, 1921-22
Reconstruction of the Mohren farmacy, Wroclaw, Adolf Rading, 1925
Further references

Maria Barelli, Produzione edilizia e architettura. Il cemento armato e lo "stile nuovo", ATTI E RASSEGNA TECNICA - SOCIETA' DEGLI INGEGNERI E ARCHITETTI IN TORINO, 1992
Patrizia Bonifazio and Enrico Giacopelli: Ivrea, passato e futuro di una company town, special issue in Parametro 262 Anno XXXVI Marzo/Aprile 2006
Roberta Ingaramo, "Riutilizzo di strutture ricettive inizio ‘900: l'Hotel Miramare a Genova", La cittár e le regole. / CHIARA DEVOTI A CURA, pp. 59-61, Celid, TORINO, 2008
Elisabeth Károly, “Refurbishment or Demolition? The Fate of a 1930s Housing Complex in Athens Remains Pending”, Docomomo Journal 37, September 2007, 64–67.
Marieke Kuipers & Panayotis Tournikiotis (guest eds.): Other Modernisms: A Selection from the Docomomo Registers, Docomomo Journal 36, March 2007
Tullia Iori: Il cemento armato in Italia dalle origini alla Seconda Guerra Mondiale, Edilstampa, Roma, 2001
Mauro Mezzina si Giuseppina Uva: R.C. technology in Italy at the beginning of the 20th century: a historical journey through the work of Porcheddu society, Proceedings of the 2nd fib Congress, June 5-8, 2006 – Naples, Italy, paper ID 20-8
LORENZO MINA, IL cemento armato e lo stile nuovo, in "L'Artista Moderno", IV, n.5, 1905,pp.73-78.
Anna Maria Nicoletti, Elena Manara, Gianni Bozzo, Genova. Il Palazzo della Nuova Borsa. SAGEP, 1999
Nicolae St. Noica: Emil Prager - un model, VreMEA, Bucharest, 2010
Marcello Piacentini: Il momento architettonico all’estero, in Architettrura e Arti Decorative 1 (May-June 1921), p. 32-76
Stefano Podestá, L. Scandolo: La valutazione della sicurezza nelle strutture storiche in c.a., Progettazione Sismica, No. 3, 2010
Carmen Popescu (ed.): Spatiul modernității romanesti 1906 - 1947, Simetria, Bucharest, 2010
Sergio Poretti, IL RESTAUR O DELLE POSTE DI LIBERA, GANGEMI, Collana : ARCHITETTURA E COSTRUZIONE, 2002
Michele RODA: Il restauro delle facciate del Novocomum, I BENI CULTURALI tutela, valorizzazione, attivitá culturali, architettura contemporanea e bioarchitettura, 1/02 Gennaio/Febbraio
A. Saggio, Sul restauro della Casa del Fascio a Como in: Industria delle costruzioni, 1991,239 page 70–71
Sorin Vasilescu: Arhitectura Italiei fasciste, Arhitext, Bucharest, 2011