

*Globalization* (October 1–30, 2011), included 62 designs by Polish architects for third world countries as well as 11 designs for buildings in Poland, commissioned after their return. The publication that followed the exhibition, in which all of these projects are published, includes a preface, “Post modernism Is Almost all Right,” and short, heavily illustrated (with architectural photographs) essays on “Urbanity” and “Practice,” and an Introduction, “Buildings in Poland,” as well as two more brief essays: “Image” and “Discipline” at the end of the main section. There are also short comments and many illustrations for those projects that were designed for cities in Poland by Polish architects who had worked in Third World countries. These demonstrate the development by these architects of new architectural strategies. For example, the design for the Atrium office complex, one of the first office complexes in post-socialist Warsaw, is an attempt to create a recognizable urban space by referring to the volume, scale and details of the urban context that are a continuation of similar experiments made in Syria by the architects.

The architectural customs adopted by Polish architects during their work abroad were not the only channel of reception for postmodernism in Poland, but this experience is visible evidence of its impact, and this publication allows us to understand the role of professional architects and urban planners in the shaping of a new, capitalistic reality in central Europe after 1989. Contacts with Western investors and contractors and knowledge of advanced technologies and materials gained at foreign construction sites empowered architects such as Wojciech Jarzabek and Edward Lach to take advantage of new opportunities in Poland: their acquaintance with complex functional programs, such as shopping malls and office parks, in Kuwait and United Arab Emirates allowed them to gain commissions for some of the more spectacular department stores in the center of Wrocław.

This book is one of the first attempts to treat postmodern architecture in

Poland in a historical context, and thus it is relevant to today’s architectural practice and current urban designs produced by young architects. The many detailed axonometric drawings of the buildings published here were realized in Poland by architects returning from export contracts, or were made particularly for this book. They highlight the experience of these architects with third-world architecture to their contribution to the development of urbanization in post-socialist Poland.

The export of architecture and urban planning from western countries, such as the work of Walter Gropius and TAC, Jose Louis Sert, and Constantinos Doxiadis is far better recognized than that of these exports from eastern Europe, and has already achieved quite a rich literature, while the work of architects and planners from the socialist countries still remains unrecognized. Both these publications, with their presentation of archival material, demonstrate the importance and scale of this neglected phenomenon and add an important chapter to the history of the cross-fertilization that has taken place in a global architectural networks.

More information on these projects and publications can be found at [www.south-of-eastwest.net](http://www.south-of-eastwest.net)

ALICJA GZOWSKA  
Institute of Art History,  
University of Warsaw

Łukasz Stanek (editor)

**Cold War Transfer: Architecture and Planning from Socialist Countries in the “Third World.”**

*RIBA Journal of Architecture* (vol. 17, no. 3) June 2012.

In 2012, to the two publications of material from the two exhibitions of designs by Polish architects and planners for Africa and the Near East was added the publication in an issue of the *RIBA Journal* of seven articles on the architectural and planning designs of seven central European countries (including the Soviet

Union) for Near Eastern countries. In this issue, the previous focus on the visual presentation of designs by Polish architects and planners was abandoned for a presentation of written, documented research on the collaboration of planning and architectural specialists from these seven countries with Third World countries, and includes the contributions of little-known central European professional agencies, firms, offices and individuals to Third World projects.

In his Introduction to the issue the editor, Łukasz Stanek describes the general topic of the issue. The articles that follow are very different in scope and content: the material is unknown by all but a few scholars, because of this, and because of the significance of the content, brief summaries are given below for each of the articles.

\*

The author of the first article, Elke Beyer, is concerned with the development by Soviet planners working from Moscow in the 1960s of a master plan for Kabul, Afghanistan. She gives a perceptive, penetrating description of the complexities attending the planning, which seems to have been a composite of this Russian plan with a 1960 Master Plan by a French architect, sponsored by the UN, during the fragile period just after the end of World War II but before Afghanistan became the target of Russian ambitions. Political and economic developments would undermine the implementation of these plans, and almost nothing of them was achieved. The conflicts between Afghanistan traditions and Soviet practices in the implementation of housing designed by the Soviets for Kabul are described, as is the ability of Afghanistan to benefit from the “competitive coexistence” of both the French and Russian plans for the modernization of urban space and the designs for living quarters in this country, although only a few were realized before tensions with the Soviet government put an end to the projects.

The author notes that this period of cooperative planning was not limited to its effect (even if mainly theoretical) in Afghanistan. In addition to interchanges

between the Soviets and Afghanists during a period of over one decade, a remarkable degree of integration and exchange between Soviet and Western experts also occurred. The article includes many major issues that will arise in the following articles, and is appropriately placed at the beginning of the group.

\*

The second article, by Ákos Moravánsky is concerned with an assumed affinity of Hungary to Third World African countries through a shared "peripheralization," and with the reverence by both to elements from the past. He associates the revival of these views in Hungary in the early 20th century with the similar post-war situation in Africa, and later in the century with the Hungarian architect Károly Polónyi and his work in Africa, maintaining that Polónyi considered the Third World, like Hungary, to be composed of countries on the periphery of major political forces, attracting and absorbing external influences, as they made their transition from colonial to independent states.

Of all the architects and planners mentioned in this issue, Polónyi appears to be the most absorbed into African life. An internationally-known architect and planner, he moved to Ghana in 1963 to work for the Ghana National Construction Corporation with an international team of planners and architects. In addition he became a Professor at the architectural school of the Kumasi University of Science and Technology, where he was able to share his philosophy and his practice with his students, whom he assigned evaluations of both real projects and hypothetical development schemes, and implanted in them the philosophical goals and the practical experience that would shape urban development in Kumasi until the end of the century. After 1969 he worked in Kaunas, the capital of Nigeria, as head of a large Hungarian-Nigerian team commissioned to develop the Master Plan for Calabar, the capital of the new Nigerian state. His work as architect and planner did not have the lasting effect of his teaching: much of the Calabar design was later modified as African govern-

ments began to take control of these projects. By 1980 Polónyi was re-established in Budapest, where his idealistic philosophy, based on an inherited tradition confronted by the necessity for growth and alteration, mainly due to the need to accommodate external political, social and economic change, but this became more and more unrelated to contemporary mercantile-oriented development.

\*

In the third article Lucasz Stanek expands comments he made in his previous publications on the relationship of Third World countries (represented by Poland) to the Socialist bloc during the second half of the 20th century. His topic is the Master Plan for the city of Baghdad, for which Poland's design was selected by Iraq over competitive projects from other countries, including Western ones. The reasons for Iraq's choice were manifold. First, there was a preference in Third World countries for central and eastern European rather than western European or American participation. Too, Poland was one of the first of the ex-Soviet central Europe countries to export technology and expertise abroad, giving that country visibility. And, finally and importantly, Polish architects and planners had already been engaged in post-war reconstruction in Poland, giving that country the experience to undertake this large project. The Polish firm Miastroprojekt, which had been involved in the reconstruction in Poland, was selected by Iraq to prepare a Master Plan for the city of Baghdad. The two plans of Miastroprojekt for the city of Baghdad are described in detail by Stanek, as is Miastroprojekt's later project for housing in Iraq. But, as Poland represents the early dominance of central European countries in the modernization of cities in the Third World, it also represents the decline in the dominance of central European countries in this work, beginning in the late 1970s, when Polish contractors were unable to keep abreast of "current professional innovations," including the new post-modern designs of Western architects (such as Bofill, Erickson and Venturi) or to compete financially with Western

firms, and began to return to Poland. But Stanek goes on to note that those architects who remained in Iraq into the 1990s absorbed the new technical knowledge and design ideology, which they, in turn, brought back to Poland, where, he suggests, they were able to introduce them. This is a detailed, pragmatic examination of the history, background, causes and results of the "transfer" of technical ability, and of its limitations, backed by considerable documentation.

\*

The following two articles on West and East Germany are concerned with the opposing positions of these two political entities that had until recently been a single country.

In his article on West Germany, Tom Aevermate selects the exhibition as the instrument by which the desires of not only the planners but also of the inhabitants for their new country could be expressed.

He notes that the West German exhibits projected an idealized version of life in the West, while the East German ones projected a negative view of life in the West: both aimed at the Third World in their displays. The first exhibition, *Neue Architektur in Afrika*, was planned in 1966 by West Germany. It was countered by East Germany's exhibition, *Architektur und bildende Kunst*, that included models and photographs of architectural projects throughout the GDR, as well as some realized in Zanzibar, including blocks of flats similar to 20s and 30s anonymous architecture and erected according to Soviet building methods. Also included was an idealized master plan for the reconstruction of a large section of the African city of Ng'ambo in Zanzibar, according to a typical Soviet solution. But the most important of these exhibits was the West German mobile exhibition that was sent to Africa from 1961 to 1963. Known as "The German Village on Wheels," it was shown in thirteen African countries as a kind of "goodwill tour." Its emphasis was on an idealized life style for an entire population, rather than on monumental architecture for a state or a corporation. The exhibition was seen by

more than one million people, and had a much greater impact than would have been achieved by the design for a single building or area. Aevermate connects this type of exhibition with anonymous rather than "heroic" or "monumental" architecture, and suggests that the exhibit demonstrates that planning and architecture are players in such fields as politics, economics, society and culture.

Aevermate suggests that these exhibitions created a receptive attitude among new African nations toward West Germany, and were a cause of the selection of West German planners and architects for such designs as housing, including single family units and a "modern bungalow." It appears to have been believed that not only would these prefabricated dwellings be a promising development for the West German construction industry, but also that this type of housing advocated a non-collective life, in which the family unit could live independently, apart from external restrictions—indeed, that it was a version of the Western way of life that could be applied in Africa.

\*

In the following article, on the role of East Germany in the Republic of Zanzibar, the author, Ludger Wimmelbücher, discusses the role of the Deutsche Afrikanische Gesellschaft (DGA) in Africa, where East Germany's aspirations were inhibited mainly by the fact that it was not diplomatically recognized as a country—even in Nigeria, for which it made extensive planning studies, the most important of which were for the capital city of Zambia, where most of its projects were located. Impeding these studies was the fact that two sections of the capital city had evolved—one, which had housed the British colonialists, was composed of permanent stone buildings (and had a protected monument status); the other, the business center of the city, was composed of cramped, temporary dwellings. Three projects were planned for the city by the East Germans during the 1960s, the first of which the Germans at least partially financed. However, gradually the role and decision-making powers of the President of Nigeria grew, while

those of the East German advisors diminished. They finally abandoned their hope of financial and political gain through these projects: most of them had departed by the early 1970s.

\*

Of all the central European countries which exported planning and architecture to Third World countries discussed in this issue, Romania appears to be the most politically and developmentally similar to them, according to Dana Vais, the author of this section. Romania, like other export countries, produced designs for two types of buildings: prestigious public ones, among which was Romania's major design project, the Parliament Building in Khartoum, built between 1972 and 1978 by a major and internationally recognized Romanian architect, Cesar Lăzărescu, which is very sympathetic to its environment. But most Romanian export designs were for prefabricated mass construction, including farms, large housing estates and urban developments, similar to those in Romania, where from 1974 the entire country became, in the words of the author, "one big construction site," as the head of state, Nicolae Ceaușescu, determined to re-shape traditional Romania by building or replacing existing facilities with new developments. The type of architecture and planning that was "exported" relied on Ceaușescu's policies, and was similar to that of projects built in Romania at the time. Owing to this, but also and mainly because, as a gravely indebted country, Romania needed to work for profit rather than prestige, by the late 1970s Romania turned to Libya and other African states for more profitable commissions, which included farms, large housing estates and urban developments.

But not all of Romania's work was concerned with large planning projects, or with prefabricated units similar to those developed at home. Designs were made also for building types that could be erected in many different places, with the actual building being undertaken by local workers and supervisors. And some Romanian projects were adapted to local

conditions. A "specificity" division of the universalist design mandated by the government produced some buildings in which local construction and design were translated into concrete, and even designed some wooden buildings. Also included in this group were some 'token buildings,' especially educational institutions but also government constructions—one of the most prestigious of these being the Khartoum Parliament Building. However, the vast majority of designs provided by Romanians were indistinguishable from those being produced in Romania.

Vais maintains that the strong African nationalist agenda, which discouraged Western architects and planners from remaining in the Third World, also discouraged the Romanians, and, as in the case of most of the Second-World countries, most returned to their own country during the 1980s.

\*

In the final article, Grigor Doytchinov presents Bulgaria as the most efficient socialist country to participate in the exchange program. In the 1960s Soviet-backed support for Bulgarian architectural exports included the engineering work on military, transportation, irrigation and infrastructure projects for seven African and East Asian countries: and later for six more countries. From the 1960s a development away from Soviet influence, and toward a revival of overseas contacts and an interest in modern architecture began, although this activity is seldom mentioned, according to the author, even in Bulgarian literature.

In 1964 the Bulgarian Ministry of Construction established Technoexportstroy to specialize in architectural construction and design abroad, and by 1973 had established an independent planning office, Bulgarprojekt, with headquarters in Sofia and branch offices in nine African and East Asian capitals. These offices were state-controlled, linking architectural export to construction, and permitting architects to acquire a knowledge of not only the technologies of the profession but also to acquire an introduction to market practice, thus creating a free mar-



ket abroad—in contrast to the socialist economy at home.

In addition to the many engineering services, housing projects and model plans, Bulgarprojekt produced the designs for prestige leisure and entertainment architecture, creating such innovative and advanced structures as the Tunis Olympic Sports Complex (1965–1970), the tourist bungalows in Sousse, and the Nigerian National Theater in Lagos (1973–1975).

Doytchinov maintains that an “exhaustion of ideas” (but possibly also a change in design strategy) resulted in less adventurous designs in the 1980s. In 1989 a political change, ending socialism and heralding the decline of export architecture, occurred in Bulgaria. It was also a moment which, although Third World countries were still important clients for foreign architecture, they would no longer turn for it mainly to the post-Socialist countries.

\*

In the Coda, titled “Cold War architectural modernism,” Tom Aevermaete points out the significance of this publication, stating that the discovery of this style (or movement) is one of the first attempts to uncover “one of the major ‘blind spots’ in architectural historiography.” He describes the movement as a “reciprocal” transfer of architectural and urban opposites between European countries and Africa, the Middle East and Asia during the Cold War, and states that “Architecture [is now] a collective work of professionals from diverse fields,” composed of organizations with strong links to the worlds of politics, business and production. He notes that the role of international organizations in urban and architectural politics in the second half of the 20th century is largely unexplored, and that the “growing importance of international organizations in development will play an important role in expanding urban and architectural activities on a transnational scale.”

He notes also that in the arts not enough attention is paid to reception from the Third World, and he challenges us to “re-think how the actual practices of

professionals are embedded in macro- and micro-politics.” What was the extent of the Cold War’s impact on the “instruments and methods” of architects?—or of the role of architecture and urbanism in Cold War politics?

In conclusion, the development of “transculturation” in the “contact zones” of architecture and urban planning resulted in an interaction between cultures and the breaking down of cultural boundaries—and new perspectives.

\*

A helpful short appendix on African architecture book reviews, by Oda Uduku, follows.

\*

The material discussed above includes a variety of ways that these seven countries reacted to the opportunity to export their architecture abroad: each article presents a unique response, and a unique development of the opportunity. There is no doubt that this method of research, applied to the fields of architecture and planning—and perhaps expanded to the field of art—demands further study. The field of architecture is re-seen here, as composed of many entities—political, financial, social, and, above all, bureaucratic—but, perhaps just because of its scale and impersonality, also permitting independent, creative problem-solving. The methods developed in these studies could be applied to other, more conventional, architectural topics, so that we could begin to view the field of architecture (and of the related arts) more broadly, and with a deeper, more intricate, understanding. This issue of the *RIBA Journal* is highly recommended as an alternate approach, at least for contemporary architecture and planning, to a traditional field of scholarship.

DORA WIEBENSON  
*Centropa*

Katerina Bilokur  
In two volumes.

**Vol. 1: An Artist’s Creed**

(Compiled by N. Shamruk and O. Shestakova. Kyiv); Rodovid Press, 2010. 200 pages. 138 ill. in color. ISBN 978-966-7845-66-7

**Vol. 2: Outsider, Folk Artist, Fine Artist?**

(Editor Lidia Lykhach. Kyiv); Rodovid Press, 2011. 208 pages. 97 illustrations, 70 in color. ISBN 978-966-7845-67-4

Kateryna Bilokur (1900–1961) is considered to be one of the most remarkable Ukrainian artists of the 20th century. The number of articles and books (even novels) that have been published about this semi-literate peasant self-taught artist and her elaborately sophisticated works far exceeds those about her well-educated contemporaries in the arts. Her paintings and, in particular her life, are still a subject which elicits contrasting and mixed thoughts and judgments from a host of authors.<sup>1</sup>

She spent the whole of her 60 years in her native village of Bohdanivka, which lies 120 km east of Kyiv, living in the most basic of conditions, with no family, no money, sometimes even no firewood to keep warm in winter. As a young girl she tried to enter an art school, but was rejected on the basis that she did not have a primary school education. At the same time, starting in 1940, Bilokur participated in all the main local and all-Ukrainian art exhibitions. In a very unique way her oil paintings combined the realistic depiction of nature (mostly local flora) with a deep symbolism and a very personal form of expression. Bilokur’s works were readily acquired by government art galleries and appreciated everywhere in international exhibitions—from Russia to China, Bulgaria and France. According to media reports, Pablo Picasso also admired her work. Incidentally, a couple of her pictures were stolen in Paris from the very same exhibition that Picasso had visited in the 1950s.

This two-volume edition (Ukrainian and English parallel texts produced under