Political Postmodernisms: Architecture in Chile and Poland, 1970–1990

by

Lidia Klein

Department of Art, Art History, and Visual Studies
Duke University

Date:_______________________
Approved:

____
Annabel Wharton, Supervisor

____
Esther Gabara

____
Fredric Jameson

____
Neil McWilliam

____
Alan Plattus

Dissertation submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Art,
Art History, and Visual Studies in the Graduate School of
Duke University

2018

ABSTRACT

Political Postmodernisms: Architecture in Chile and Poland, 1970–1990

by

Lidia Klein

Department of Art, Art History, and Visual Studies
Duke University

Date:________________________
Approved:

____
Annabel Wharton, Supervisor

____
Esther Gabara

____
Fredric Jameson

____
Neil McWilliam

____
Alan Plattus

An abstract of a dissertation submitted in partial
fulfillment of the requirements for the degree
of Doctor of Philosophy in the Department of Art,
Art History, and Visual Studies in the Graduate School of
Duke University

2018

Copyright by
Lidia Klein
2018

Abstract

"Political Postmodernisms" argues that postmodern architecture can be radically rethought by examining its manifestations in Chile and Poland in the 1970s and 1980s. Postmodern architecture tends to be understood as politically indifferent and devoid of the progressive agenda embedded in modernist architecture – a view typically rooted in the analyses of North America and Western Europe. By investigating the cases of Chile during the neoliberal dictatorship of Augusto Pinochet and Poland during the late socialist Polish People's Republic, my project unfolds a less acknowledged narrative—one in which postmodernism is profoundly entangled with the political. Drawing from interviews I conducted with a range of Chilean and Polish architects, as well as analyses of physical buildings, urban development plans, and architectural journals from Santiago and Warsaw, I show how these South American and Eastern European sites reveal an altogether different dynamic between capitalism, democracy, and architecture.

The dissertation is composed of an introduction, four chapters, and a conclusion. The Introduction discusses the current revivalism of postmodernism and its critique, tracing the roots of this criticism in foundational scholarship on postmodern architecture, and analyzing how postmodernism is defined in architectural scholarship. It also discusses why Chile and Poland are chosen as case studies. The first chapter, "Postmodernism and the State: Chile," discusses propagandistic uses of postmodern architecture by Pinochet's regime in Chile, using two case studies – the Plaza de la

Constitución in Santiago de Chile (1980) and the Congreso de Chile in Valparaíso (1987). The second chapter, "Postmodernism Against the State: Chile," examines the practices of architects who were members of CEDLA, an independent collective of Chilean architects established in 1977 in Santiago, who promoted a version of politically and socially engaged postmodernism that could counter Pinochet's neoliberal agenda. Chapter Three, "Postmodernism and the State: Poland," analyzes how the Polish Socialist Party first appropriated postmodernism as a Soviet invention and then used it as a means to appease social tensions in times of increasing unrest. It focuses specifically on state-sanctioned architectural discourse and the Na Skarpie housing estate in Kraków (1985). The final chapter, "Postmodernism Against the State: Poland," discusses Polish architects organized under the Dom i Miasto group (1980–1984), which united postmodern inspirations with agendas that opposed the vision of society imposed by the Polish People's Republic. It also discusses the work of Marek Budzyński, for whom postmodernism created a "third way" beyond socialism and capitalism.

Across these chapters, I argue that Chilean and Polish architecture between 1970 and 1990 complicate the generally accepted view of postmodern architecture as politically disengaged and as an exclusively neoliberal phenomenon, disinterested in any progressive social agenda. In both countries, postmodern currents were appropriated by the regimes for propagandistic purposes and used to oppose the agendas of the State.

Table of Contents

Abstract iv

Introduction 1

Current Postmodern Revivalism and its Critique 5

Critiques of Postmodernism 9

Qualities of Postmodern Architecture and Urban Planning 14

Theorizing Postmodern Architecture and Urbanism 24

Chilean and Polish Postmodernism 32

Recent Scholarship on Postmodernism 40

Scholarship on Chilean and Polish Postmodernism 42

1. Postmodernism and the State: Chile 48

1.1 From Eduardo Frei Montalva and Salvador Allende to Augusto Pinochet: Transformations in Urban Space 51

1.2 Postmodern Architecture as Propaganda: Plaza de la Constitución and Congreso de Chile 66

2. Postmodernism Against the State: Chile 77

2.1 The Origins of CEDLA and Its Emergence in Santiago 78

2.2 CEDLA's Project for Santiago Poniente 87

2.3 Social Housing 95

3. Postmodernism and the State: Poland 102

3.1 The Polish People's Republic and Postmodern Architecture 102

3.2 Architecture and Propaganda 103

3.3 *Architektura* 107

3.4 Na Skarpie (Centrum E) 114

4. Postmodernism Against the State: Poland 124

4.1 Oppositional Postmodernism: Czesław Bielecki and DiM Group 125

4.2 Reforming the System from Within: The Architecture of Marek Budzyński 135

4.3 North Ursynów 137

Conclusion 156

Appendix: Interviews 160

Works Cited 185

Biography 194

Introduction

After a period of neglect lasting roughly two decades, architectural postmodernism is coming back. In addition to a proliferation of postmodern buildings and projects worldwide,[1] the academic world has taken renewed interest in postmodern aesthetics and theory, visible in a range of exhibitions, publications, conferences, and symposia.[2] Recently, this postmodern revivalism has prompted heated critical discussions on its appropriateness in the current social, political, and economic environment. In a recent article for *Dezeen*, Sean Griffiths writes:

> There is one big reason why now is absolutely not the time to be indulging in postmodern revivalism. Its name is President Donald Trump. And while Donald Trump means that golden Baroque remains transgressive, it is now transgressive in a bad way. Bigly so, to coin a phrase. (…) As all good postmodernists know, signifiers – the vessels that convey meanings – have a tendency to become untethered from their moorings. In less dangerous times we can delight in their floating free, reveling in the magical manufacture of meaning that the detachment of the signifier from its signified permits. But the artful twisting of meaning through the gentle massaging of signifier is less appealing when the gaps between truth and representation provide a petri dish for the fake news of the alt-right.[3]

For Griffiths, taking inspiration from a current based on playfulness, irony, and formalist aestheticism is dangerous in the time of fake news and increasingly fragile

---

[1] See recent projects by WAM Architecten, MVRDV, or Adam Furman, for instance.

[2] Notable examples include Reinhold Martin's *Utopia's Ghost: Architecture and Postmodernism, Again* (2010), Léa-Catherine Szacka's *Exhibiting the Postmodern: The 1980 Venice Architecture Biennale* (2016), and exhibitions such as *Postmodernism: Style and Subversion, 1970-1990* in the Victoria and Albert Museum of Art (2011–2012). These and other works and exhibitions are discussed in more detail below.

[3] Sean Griffiths, "Now is not the time to be indulging in postmodern revivalism," *Dezeen,* 30 October 2017, https://www.dezeen.com/2017/10/30/sean-griffiths-fat-postmodern-revivalism-dangerous-times-opinion. Griffiths, a founding member of FAT Architecture studio, built his own career on postmodern revivalism himself. However, he claims that his own uses of postmodernism as an architect were critical and ironic, while the current interest in postmodernism is affirmative and lacks critical distance.

democracy. More broadly, the postmodern obsession with image, superficiality, language, and architectural jokes is misguided in a time when architecture needs to address issues like inequality, urban poverty, or the environmental crisis. This critique joins a broader chorus of anti-postmodern sentiment that understands postmodernism as a style of late capitalist, affluent societies of Western Europe and North America that confirms the neoliberal status quo without consideration of the social problems and inequalities inherent to it.[4]

This dissertation does not mean to join this postmodern revivalism in architecture studies. Its intention is to understand what both its enthusiasts and its critics miss – namely, a side of postmodern architecture revealed by marginal, underrepresented locations, in which postmodernism is not socially and politically disengaged, but quite the opposite. By studying postmodern architecture in Chile under Eduardo Pinochet's dictatorship and in Poland during late socialism, this dissertation challenges both the foundation of current postmodern revivalism and its criticism. It argues that in some locations outside Western Europe and North America, postmodernism was a deliberately political and social project. Additionally, it questions the established link between postmodern architecture and late capitalism by examining

[4] On a similar note, architecture historian Owen Hatherley states, postmodernism should be blamed for the "partly aesthetic, partly political favoring of leaving things as they are," an attitude contrary to the social engagement of modernists. Owen Hatherley, "Postmodernism will not be forgiven lightly for what it did to architectural culture from the 1970s onwards," *Dezeen Magazine*, August 20, 2015. http://www.dezeen.com/2015/08/20/postmodernism-not-forgiven-impact-architectural-culture-legacy-owen-hatherley-opinion/.

its involvement in State politics in late-socialist Poland and as a part of the anti-neoliberal agenda of Chilean architects oppositional towards Pinochet's regime in Chile.

The dissertation is composed of four chapters and an introduction and conclusion. The present section (Introduction) discusses the current revivalism of postmodernism and its critique, tracing the roots of this criticism in foundational scholarship on postmodern architecture, and analyzing how postmodernism is defined in architectural scholarship. It also discusses why Chile and Poland are chosen as case studies. The first chapter, "Postmodernism and the State: Chile," discusses propagandistic uses of postmodern architecture by Pinochet's regime in Chile, using two case studies – the Plaza de la Constitución in Santiago de Chile (Cristián Undurraga and Ana Luisa Devés, 1980) and the Congreso de Chile (1987, Juan Cárdenas, José Covacevic, and Raúl Farrú) in Valparaíso. Both were the results of National Architecture Competitions (Concurso Nacional de Proyectos) organized by Pinochet's administration. The postmodern forms of the Plaza de la Constitución and the Congreso de Chile were used to present a desired image of the State, signaling a new direction in the politics of the country. The second chapter, "Postmodernism Against the State: Chile," examines how postmodern ideas were used by Chilean architects who opposed Pinochet's policies. It analyzes the practice of architects who were members of CEDLA (Centro de Estudios de Arquitectura, Center for Architectural Studies), an independent collective of Chilean architects established in 1977 in Santiago de Chile. Members of CEDLA – most

importantly, Humberto Eliash, Cristián Boza, and Pedro Murtinho – through their projects, magazine, organized conferences, and symposia promoted a version of politically and socially engaged postmodernism that could counter the neoliberal agenda of the regime. Chapter Three, "Postmodernism and the State: Poland," analyzes how the Polish Socialist Party, the governing body in the Polish People's Republic, first appropriated postmodernism as a Soviet invention and then used it as a means to appease social tensions in times of increasing unrest. In addition to discussing state-sanctioned architectural discourse, this chapter analyzes the Na Skarpie housing estate in Kraków (Romuald Loegler, 1985), which reveals how postmodernism was used as a means of propaganda by the State and at the same time by the architect as an opportunity to implement socially progressive spatial solutions.[5] This coexistence of opposing ideological interpretations and contrasting uses of postmodern architecture within a single realization is typical in Polish architecture and is further analyzed in Chapter Four, "Postmodernism Against the State: Poland." This final chapter elaborates on architects who were using postmodern forms and ideas as tools to oppose the vision of society and urban space imposed by the politics of the Polish People's Republic – most importantly, Czesław Bielecki and Marek Budzyński. It analyzes documents issued by Bielecki's architectural group DiM (Dom i Miasto, existing between 1980 and 1984),

[5] By "propaganda" I mean messaging designed deliberately to gain support among a target audience and to persuade this audience to act and think in a desired way.

which united postmodern inspirations with oppositional agendas and Budzyński's practice. The chapter centers specifically on Budzyński's flagship realization – the North Ursynów housing estate in Warsaw (realized from 1975). Like Loegler's Na Skarpie, North Ursynów offers an example of how postmodernism was not only interpreted as a radical anti-government stance (as in Bielecki's case) but also as a tool to achieve social change by slowly transforming the oppressive system from within.

Across these chapters, I argue that Chilean and Polish architecture between 1970 and 1990 complicate the generally accepted view of postmodern architecture as politically disengaged and as an exclusively neoliberal phenomenon, disinterested in any progressive social agenda. In both countries, postmodern currents were appropriated by the regimes for propagandistic purposes and in their efforts to build a positive image of the State. At the same time, they were also used by architects who were oppositional towards the regimes and urban politics promoted by them.

Current Postmodern Revivalism and its Critique

In the *Dezeen* article quoted above, Sean Griffiths begins by describing manifestations of current postmodern revivalism:

> In recent weeks, I have found myself writing references for young American academics who wear bow ties and Bertie Wooster jumpers, and who write about architecture's relationship to literature on the internet in the style of David Foster Wallace. The Chicago Architecture Biennial is full of a renewed and apparently confident postmodernism, of a sort that seems just a little too respectable. The artist, Pablo Bronstein is plastering neo-Georgian all over the RIBA. And who today can switch on the television, read the newspaper or go online without the

> chirpy visage of Adam Nathanial Furman staring back from inside the 24-hour news cycle?[6]

Among the architects mentioned by Griffiths, Adam Furman is the most emblematic. Furman is best known for his design objects (wallpapers, household objects) and small-scale architectural interventions. His most recent works include an installation for the 2017 edition of the London Design Festival, a gate composed of a sequence of colorful arches with openings of different shapes creating a mesmerizing kaleidoscope-like effect. The arches are clad with ceramic tile, as the installation was commissioned by *Turkishceramic*, an association promoting the Turkish ceramic industry. Furman freely juxtaposes tiles of different patterns and traditions, evoking a range of historical references, from patterns used in London Underground stations in the 1970s to traditional Islamic motives used in mosques. Visually attractive, aesthetically and intellectually accessible while offering a wide array of artistic and cultural references ready to be decoded by more culturally competent audiences, Furman's installation provides a perfect example of utterly commercial, populist, egalitarian, and witty postmodern design.

His second famous project, *The Democratic Monument*, designed in the same year, is based on similar qualities. *The Democratic Monument* was commissioned by the 2017 Scottish Architectural Fringe as part of a *New Typologies* exhibition, showcasing visions for future civic architecture. The entrance to *The Democratic Monument* is placed in an

[6] Griffiths, "Now is not the time."

elaborate front façade composed of an inlay of overlapping segments of contrasting colors, textures and materials combined with classical architectural elements such as columns and arches. The entrance leads to a spacious public hall and an office tower. Like the front façade, interior spaces offer a contemporary version of mannerist *horror vacui* with a myriad of historical references, bold patterns, and bright colors. As they fill ceilings, walls, and floors, they result in surreal, dream-like, fragmented, and disorienting spaces, similar to John Portman's postmodern hyperspaces.[7] *The Democratic Monument* offers an updated, revamped, and amplified version of postmodernism for the new generation. Furman generously draws from the classics – ironic projects such as Michael Graves' Disney Hotels, Charles Moore's Piazza d'Italia, and Memphis group furniture design – and combines those elements with more recent references, such as "rave culture" aesthetics of the nineties with its acid-neon colors and eye-confusing visual effects. Furman sees his proposal as an "an expression of urban pride, chromatic joy, and architectural complexity," and "a monumental embodiment of our evolving Liberal democracy as it moves into another new phase of energetic activity and robust intervention."[8] According to Furman, *The Democratic Monument* sends a message of "architectural plurality in compositional unity" as "architectural language and expression can both embody, and reconcile, the perpetual tensions between market &

[7] Fredric Jameson, *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism (*Durham: Duke University Press, 2003), 38–39.
[8] Adam Nathaniel Furman, "The Democratic Monument: Adam Nathaniel Furman's Manifesto for a New Type of Civic Center," *Archdaily*, July 3 2017, https://www.archdaily.com/874860/the-democratic-monument-adam-nathaniel-furmans-manifesto-for-a-new-type-of-civic-center.

state, and minority and majority,"[9] and embodies "the perpetual dialogue in our Liberal democracy between the need for consensus and shared values, and the vital fostering and celebration of minority needs and interests."[10]

Furman's project and the rhetoric of its description recalls Chantal Mouffe's diagnosis of the *post-political*, which she characterized as a predominant "view which informs the 'common sense' in a majority of western societies."[11] Mouffe characterizes this condition as a situation in which the

> 'free world' has triumphed over communism and, with the weakening of collective identities, a world 'without enemies' is now possible. Partisan conflicts are a thing of the past and consensus can now be obtained through dialogue. Thanks to globalization and the universalization of liberal democracy, we can expect a cosmopolitan future bringing peace, prosperity and the implementation of human rights worldwide.[12]

Further, Mouffe characterizes the post-political era as based on "optimistic view of globalization," and "consensual form of democracy," and describes it as an "anti-political vision which refuses to acknowledge the antagonistic dimension constitutive of 'the political.'"[13] *The Democratic Monument* provides a perfect illustration of a building for post-political times. Furman mentions tensions between the market and the state, the minority and the majority, but instead of engaging them in his project, the architect offers a false vision of reconciliation which – as the contemporary crisis of democracy,

---

[9] Ibid.
[10] Ibid.
[11] Chantal Mouffe, *On the Political* (New York: Routledge, 2005), 1.
[12] Ibid.
[13] Ibid., 1–2.

marked by Brexit, the refugee crisis, and a surge of nationalist politics worldwide – is an optimistic and unrealistic view. *The Democratic Monument* affirms the status quo by providing an illusion of unity and harmony and avoids to mention real irreconcilable tensions and divisions. In this sense, paradoxically to its function, it is an example of apolitical architecture deceptively using the rhetoric of pluralism without any serious engagement in its essence. As such, the shallow optimism of *The Democratic Monument* embodies the dangers embedded in the new wave of postmodernism, as seen by its critics. The architectural postmodernism as used by Furman is populist, commercial, and formalist, focused on aesthetics, superficially pluralistic, and disengaged from urban problems closely connected to the current crises in our economic and political systems.

Critiques of Postmodernism

Griffiths is not isolated in his critique of postmodern architecture. Both in architectural scholarship and the popular discourse on architecture, postmodernism is often regarded as the epitome of bad taste and kitsch at a time when architects have lost their sense of good aesthetic judgement. It is also seen as architecture that affirms the reality of late capitalism and abandons the progressive social ideals of the modern movement. In "Design for the One Percent," a recent article in *Jacobin* magazine, Alex Cocotas paints a grim picture of the contemporary architecture of "radical free market urbanism" – one that is fixated on iconic buildings and star-architects, and focused

solely on "aesthetics to the detriment of social context."[14] Not surprisingly, the author sees postmodern architecture as the beginning of this condition and as the time when pro-social and progressive ideals of the modern movement were abandoned in the name of economic profit. For this reason, historian of modern architecture Owen Hatherley states that "[P]ostmodernism will not be forgiven lightly for what it did to architectural culture from the 1970s onwards."[15]

Hatherley's views on postmodernism are based on earlier diagnoses of this current, most canonically those of Jürgen Habermas and Fredric Jameson. Both writers used architecture to diagnose a broader cultural, social, and economic reality. Habermas develops his critique of postmodern architecture in two essays: "Modernity – An Incomplete Project," written in 1980, and "Modernism versus Postmodernism in Architecture," published in 1981. For Habermas, modernism is an "unfinished project" of social, emancipatory character, which should be continued. "Modernity" was written in the context of the first architectural Biennale in Venice in 1980 (under the tile "The Presence of The Past"), which was dominated by postmodern proposals, and uses architecture as a point of departure to diagnose current situation. For Habermas, postmodernism negates and rejects modernist values in the name of relativist language games and the superficial, aesthetic tricks of transforming "department stores into

---

[14] Alex Cocotas, "Design for the One Percent," *Jacobin Magazine*. June 6, 2016, https://www.jacobinmag.com/2016/06/zaha-hadid-architecture-gentrification-design-housing-gehry-urbanism/.
[15] Hatherley, "Postmodernism will not be forgiven lightly."

Medieval rows of houses, and underground ventilation into pocket-book size Palladian villas,"[16] and is based on "the cult of the vernacular and reverence for the banal."[17] Postmodern architects, instead of working in and for the community are "surrealist stage designers"[18] who take part – deliberately or not – in a socially and politically conservative project.

Fredric Jameson presents postmodernism as a product of late capitalism in "Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism," published a few years later in 1984 (and in his expanded book-length study published 1991). Jameson's discussion of postmodernism is in part conducted through architectural examples, since "[o]f all the arts, architecture is the closest constitutively to the economic, with which, in the form of commissions and land values, it has a virtually unmediated relationship. It will therefore not be surprising to find the extraordinary flowering of the new postmodern architecture grounded in the patronage of multinational business, whose expansion and development is strictly contemporaneous with it."[19] Even though Jameson uses buildings (along with movies and art objects) to illustrate his point, he stresses that postmodernism should not be framed as a "style," but rather as "a dominant cultural

---

[16] Jürgen Habermas, "Modern and Postmodern Architecture," in *Critical Theory and Public Life*, ed. John Forester (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1988), 328.
[17] Ibid.
[18] Ibid.
[19] Jameson, *Postmodernism*, 5. Further, Jameson stresses that: "It is in the realm of architecture, however, that modifications in aesthetic production are most dramatically visible, and that their theoretical problems have been most centrally raised and articulated; it was indeed from architectural debates that my own conception of postmodernism – as it will be outlined in the following pages – initially began to emerge." Ibid., 2.

logic" – characterized by the economic deregulation and globalization of the Ronald Reagan and Margaret Thatcher era. Jameson describes "postmodernist positions in architecture" as

> inseparable from an implacable critique of architectural high modernism (…), where formal criticism and analysis (of the high-modernist transformation of the building into a virtual sculpture, or monumental "duck," as Robert Venturi puts it), are at one with reconsiderations on the level of urbanism and of the aesthetic institution. High modernism is thus credited with the destruction of the fabric of the traditional city and its older neighbourhood culture (by way of the radical disjunction of the new Utopian high-modernist building from its surrounding context), while the prophetic elitism and authoritarianism of the modern movement are remorselessly identified in the imperious gesture of the charismatic Master.[20]

Postmodernism, as evidenced in architecture, is "a kind of aesthetic populism," fascinated by the "landscape of schlock and kitsch, of TV series and *Reader's Digest* culture, of advertising and motels, of the late show and the grade-B Hollywood film" and characterized by "depthlessness, which finds its prolongation both in contemporary 'theory' and in a whole new culture of the image or the simulacrum; a consequent weakening of historicity."[21]

The link between late capitalism and postmodern architecture was made in many other seminal works on this current, such *Postmodern, the Architecture of the Post-industrial Society*, written by Paolo Portoghesi in 1982, who argues that postmodernism derives from the conditions of a post-industrial society.[22] Jameson's book solidified the

---

[20] Ibid., 2.
[21] Ibid., 6.
[22] More in: Margareth A. Rose, *The Post-Modern and the Post-Industrial: A Critical Analysis* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991).

recognition of postmodern architecture as an inherent product of late capitalism and as a telling diagnosis of late twentieth-century economy. As critic Justin McGuirk recently wrote, "[w]ith its deceptive surfaces and furniture that doesn't do what it's supposed to, postmodernism is not just the backdrop to but a metaphor for unbridled capitalism, where a plump balance sheet conceals all manner of sins and where marble-effect plastic laminate hides chipboard."[23]

Another influential diagnosis of postmodern architecture was presented in Mary McLeod's article, "Architecture and Politics in the Reagan Era: From Postmodernism to Deconstructivism," published in *Assemblage* in 1989. McLeod analyzes postmodernism as a manifestation of the neoliberal politics of Thatcher and Reagan, and as "the new corporate style": commercial architecture devoid of the revolutionary spirit and social vision embedded in modern architecture in its heroic phase. Postmodern architecture takes part in the neoliberal project not in the form of active engagement but rather in its passive acceptance of the status quo. As Robert Stern, one of the most prolific American postmodern architects put it: "Post-modernism is not revolutionary in either the political or artistic sense; in fact, it reinforces the effect of the technocratic and bureaucratic

[23] Justin McGurik, "Has postmodernist design eaten itself," *The Guardian*, September 12 2011, https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2011/sep/12/postmodernist-design-v-and-a-retrospective.

society in which we live."[24] McLeod uses this quote from Stern as symptomatic of postmodernism in architecture.

Habermas', Jameson's, and McLeod's analyses were decisive for defining postmodernism in architectural scholarship. Their claims provide wide-ranging diagnoses of Western European and North American examples, on which the authors base their theoretical discussions, though largely omit non-Western locations that often complicate this view.

Qualities of Postmodern Architecture and Urban Planning

There is no comprehensive definition of postmodern architecture which can be applicable to every realization considered postmodern. Furthermore, even key postmodern architects (like Robert Venturi) often avoid "postmodern" or outright deny its appropriateness to a description of their works. Perhaps this might be attributed to the "bad press" postmodernism has had.[25] Rather than tracing the appearance of a word, it is perhaps more useful to study postmodernism as, following Jameson, "a conception which allows for the presence and coexistence of a range of very different, yet subordinate features."[26] Rather than a specific "style," it should be described as a current

---

[24] Robert Stern, "The Doubles of Post-Modern," *Harvard Architecture Review* 1 (1980), quoted in Mary McLeod, "Architecture and Politics in the Reagan Era: From Postmodernism to Deconstructivism," *Assemblage* 8 (1989), 54.

[25] For example, Robert Venturi claims that "I first heard the word 'postmodernism' when I was in college. I occasionally used it. But we [Venturi and Denise Scott-Brown] are not postmodernists." Vladimir Paperny, "An Interview with Denise Scott Brown and Robert Venturi," *Architectural Digest* (Russia) (July 2006): 36–41. Also available online: http://www.paperny.com/venturi.html.

[26] Jameson, *Postmodernism*, 4.

or tendency distinguished by the presence of certain theoretical and formal qualities, which can be used selectively.

Postmodernism in architecture is a heterogenous movement founded on the criticism of dogmas associated with modern architecture and urban planning – for instance, modern architecture's pursuit for universal comprehensive solutions with the pretense of objectivity, its emphasis on the primacy of expert architectural knowledge over the actual needs of the inhabitants, its foregrounding of technocracy and standardization, and its disregard for history in name of the affirmation of the present. The first sustained critiques of modernism pointing out these fallacies appeared in the early sixties. Jane Jacobs' *The Death and Life of the Great American Cities*, published in 1961, "marked a transition from modernity to postmodernity in thinking about urban planning."[27] *Death and Life* rejects the city planning dogmas based on the theories of Le Corbusier and CIAM.[28] As a journalist and activist without academic architectural background, Jacobs proposed a bottom-up approach based on specific case studies and a theory constructed from the perspective of an average user. For Jacobs, it is the real cities, not theoretical models, from which "city planning should have been learning and forming and testing its theories."[29] Rejecting the modernist obsession with the separation

[27] Allan Irving, "The Modern/Postmodern Divide and Urban Planning," *University of Toronto Quarterly*, 62.4 (Summer 1993), 479.
[28] CIAM (The Congrès internationaux d'architecture moderne, or International Congresses of Modern Architecture) was an organization existing from 1928 to 1959, which promoted the principles of modern architecture through a series of events and congresses across Europe.
[29] Jane Jacobs, *The Death and Life of Great American Cities* (New York: Vintage Books, 1992), 6.

of functions, Jacobs argues for diversity, intricacy, and complexity: the "[i]ntricate minglings of different uses in cities are not a form of chaos," she writes, but "they represent a complex and highly developed form of order."[30] A well-functioning city offers the "most intricate and close-grained diversity of uses that give each other constant mutual support, both economically and socially."[31] It should be stressed that the need for economic and social diversity – crucial for Jacobs – was rarely (if at all) taken up by future postmodern theoreticians who focused on formal diversity of urban textures, architectural layers, and a mélange of aesthetics effects they produce, commonly disregarding social and economic considerations. According to Jacobs, a well-functioning, healthy city is a palimpsest of people, functions, historical layers, and spatial complexity.

The urban qualities praised by Jacobs were a foundation for canonical postmodern theories developed in the late sixties and seventies. One of such works is *Collage City* by Fred Koetter and Colin Rowe, published in 1978. *Collage City* is a reaction to the totalizing, rationalized city planning of modernism. Instead of using the technocratic language of modernist urban planning, Koetter and Rowe borrow terminology from art discourse (such as collage or *objet trouvés*) to describe their vision of the city. *Collage City* postulates urban forms based on fragmentation, strategies of bricolage, and juxtaposition of various layers of historical tissue, allowing for multiple

[30] Ibid., 222.
[31] Ibid., 14.

interpretations by its users. Koetter and Rowe think of a city as a palimpsest and an open-ended form defined by its users rather than a finished and definite plan outlined on the urbanist's drafting table.

The poetics of fragmentation is central to many canonic documents of postmodernism, including the writings of Robert Venturi. In *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture* published in 1966, Robert Venturi stresses the importance of tradition and criticizes modernism for rejecting complexity in urban planning, which leads to an exclusive, unaccommodating architecture. Instead of grand, totalizing planning visions of modernism, Venturi promotes visual, symbolic, spatial, and functional complexities embraced by architecture and urban planning in the past. In place of Mies van der Rohe's famous dictum that *less is more,* Venturi proposes to recognize that *less is bore*, and turns towards historical examples such as the architecture of Francesco Borromini or John Soane to illustrate his claims. He calls for architecture and urban forms based on the concept of "the difficult whole" – "[a]n architecture that can simultaneously recognize contradictory levels" and is "able to admit the paradox of the whole fragment: the building which is a whole at one level and a fragment of a greater whole at another level."[32] For Venturi, the "difficult whole in an architecture of complexity and contradiction includes multiplicity and diversity of elements in

---

[32] Robert Venturi, *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture* (New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2011), 104.

relationships that are inconsistent or among the weaker kinds perceptually."[33] In *Complexity and Contradiction*, as is typical for postmodern documents, visual material is not reduced to a mere illustration of the text, but is used to develop the author's argument. As Joan Ockman notes, Venturi's book was instantly criticized by the reviewers for "his skirting of social issues" and for a formalistic approach to architecture.[34]

These reservations remained valid decades after the book was published, and are crucial for the critics of current postmodern revival. The lack of social consideration was a subject of criticism also for the second seminal book by Venturi, *Learning from Las Vegas* (co-authored by Robert Izenour and Denise Scott Brown), published in 1972. The authors apply a bottom-up approach based on a case study of Las Vegas, from which broader conclusions are drawn ("learning from the existing landscape").[35] Such an approach is radically different from the "grand narratives" of modernism, which are based on large theoretical claims to which examples are secondary and serve as illustrations supporting general theories (as can be seen, for example, in the writings of Le Corbusier). The case study selected – a vernacular, popular site universally scolded as an epitome of bad design – is an ideological manifestation itself. Judged by the standards set by high

[33] Ibid., 88.
[34] Joan Ockman, "Review: *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture* by Robert Venturi," *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 74.4 (December 2016), 490. Availaible at: http://jsah.ucpress.edu/content/75/4/490.
[35] Robert Venturi, Robert Izenour, and Denise Scott Brown, *Learning from Las Vegas* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1972), 3.

modernism, Las Vegas disregards the cardinal rules of good taste (such as simplicity, clarity, and specificity of medium), functionalism (the principle of *form following function*) or spatial organization (the disregard of CIAM's principles and Athens Charter – such as zoning).[36] Las Vegas ignores not only the formal but also the ethical values of modernism, represented especially by the early heroic phase of Peter Behrens or Le Corbusier. Yet, as the authors want to persuade the readers, Las Vegas can be a valuable lesson. First of all, it answers the real existing (not determined by "the experts") needs of a specific time and place and responds to them leaving out ethical considerations, since "Las Vegas values are not questioned here."[37] Secondly, Las Vegas is an example of how architecture can operate as an effective semiotic system. The authors treat architecture as a signifying device, not limited to the aspects of function and form. To analyze architecture in such terms, they develop a methodology based on images (drawings, photos, charts) and witty, intentionally simplified classifications (such as their most famous juxtaposition: duck and decorated shed which explains the relation between form and function in architecture, illustrated with cartoon-like drawings).[38] They show that the "ugly and ordinary in architecture"[39] should be appreciated because of their

---

[36] Ibid., 7, 9, and 52, respectively.
[37] Ibid., 6.
[38] Ibid., 87. *Learning from Las Vegas* is symptomatic of a broader change in the status of drawing within architectural discourse brought about by postmodernism. Instead of a mere tool for representation and visualization of designs, drawing became a field of architectural experimentation and research. Moreover, for many postmodern architects, the attention to drawing confirmed architecture's position as a fine art rather than a mere technical, pragmatic discipline.
[39] Ibid., 90.

rhetorical and symbolic potential. Las Vegas is analyzed as interdependent system, not a mere set of buildings. The modernist view on architecture as the "masterly, correct and magnificent play of masses brought together in light"[40] is replaced by the city "as a pattern of activities."[41]

The seductive narrative of *Learning from Las Vegas* obfuscates its omissions. Questions on the social and environmental sustainability of an utterly commercial city in the middle of a desert are absent. Moreover, the vernacular and popular in architecture are assumed to be equal with the commercial, reducing architecture to a commodity. Another work fundamental for the postmodern movement in architecture was Aldo Rossi's *The Architecture of the City*, first published in 1966. Rossi shares Venturi's interest in the history of architecture and in the symbolic aspects of buildings and cities, but without the commercialism and populism so eagerly explored by Venturi and other North American architects of his time. Divided clearly into four parts (*The Structure of Urban Artifacts*; *Primary Elements and the Concept of Area*; *The Individuality of Urban Artifacts*; *The Evolution of Urban Artifacts*), with subchapters unfolding and explaining each problem, the structure of Rossi's book resembles a classical architectural treatise known from Italian and French traditions. The core idea in Rossi's theory is the concept of "analogous city," which he defines as "a system of relating the city to established

---

[40] Le Corbusier, *Towards an Architecture* (Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2007), 157.
[41] Venturi et al., 76.

elements" constituted by architectural types.[42] The core tool for the analysis of urban structure is, therefore, typology ("I have given typology the preeminent place, viewing it as the essential basis of design," writes Rossi).[43] It is defined as "the study of types of elements that cannot be further reduced, elements of a city as well as of an architecture."[44] In Rossi's book, the notion of type replaces the modernist focus on function. He rejects the belief "that functions bring forms together and in themselves constitute urban artifacts and architecture"[45] and dismisses "naïve functionalist classifications" of modernist architecture, which presuppose that "all urban artifacts are created to serve particular functions in a static way."[46] While functionalism falsely assumes that the functions of the building should be petrified in their forms (*form follows function*), the history of European cities shows clearly "the multiplicity of functions that a building (…) can contain over time and how these functions are entirely independent of the form."[47] Rossi's interest in typology should not be seen as a return to the Durandian[48] formalistic approach to architecture. He goes beyond the formal, material dimensions of urban elements and considers them as cultural forms, close to the concept of archetypes (for example when discussing the relation between monuments, myths

---

[42] Aldo Rossi, *The Architecture of the City* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2007), 176.
[43] Ibid., 170.
[44] Ibid., 41.
[45] Ibid., 46.
[46] Ibid., 55.
[47] Ibid., 29.
[48] Jean-Nicolas-Louis Durand (1760-1834) developed a system of architectural design using simple modular elements.

and rituals).[49] As Rossi writes, "I would define the concept of type as something that is permanent and complex, a logical principle that is prior to form and that constitutes it."[50] "Architecture," writes Rossi, "is deeply rooted in the formation of civilization and is a permanent, universal, and necessary artifact"[51] while the city is a "great, comprehensive representation of the human condition."[52] His focus on typology can be seen as an architectural version of structuralism, a quest for finding a universal language of architecture, an attempt of decoding urban syntax and revealing urban meaning – a "type is the very idea of architecture, that which is closest to its essence."[53]

Rossi's interest in language is very different from Venturi's fascination with the *pop-parole* of casino neons and road signs as it attempts to reach the level of *langue* – the abstract, preexisting structure helping to understand the true nature of things. The approach to language is not the only aspect marking the difference of Rossi's attitude from American postmodernism. The second major difference lies in its treatment of history. Rather than a subject of blithe pastiche or a source of forms ready to be arbitrarily recombined and assembled, history is treated with seriousness. In *The Architecture of the City*, there is no place for trivialities or architectural jokes. "The study of history seems to offer the best verification of certain hypotheses about the city, for the

[49] Ibid., 24.
[50] Ibid., 40.
[51] Ibid., 21.
[52] Ibid., 34.
[53] Ibid., 41.

city is in itself a repository of history," writes Rossi.[54] Within his project typology and history are complementary: "typology and history come to be measures of the mutations of reality, together defining a system of architecture (…). Thus they are opposed theoretically to the disorder of contemporary architecture."[55] Rossi's reliance on typologies sourced from architectural and urban history is one of the fundamental tropes in postmodernism.

Following Rossi, there was increased interest in typologies and spatial patterns in architectural discourse in the seventies and eighties, exemplified by two books by Christopher Alexander: *A Timeless Way of Building* (1977) and *A Pattern Language* (1979). Alexander (who did not consider himself as postmodernist) advocated against standardized, mass-produced architectural solutions and as a remedy proposed a method of designing based on spatial patterns present in towns, buildings and construction over centuries. According to Alexander: "Each pattern describes a problem which occurs over and over again in our environment, and then describes the core of the solution to that problem, in such a way that you can use this solution a million times over."[56] Rossi's typologies and Alexander's patterns have informed the renewed interest in traditional, historical urban forms essential for postmodernism.

---

[54] Ibid., 127.
[55] Ibid., 179.
[56] Christopher Alexander, *A Pattern Language: Towns, Buildings, Construction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977), x.

This brief discussion of writings formative for theorizing the postmodern turn in architectural theory does not exhaust the immense body of work relevant to this movement, but provide essential context for the Chilean and Polish architects analyzed in the following chapters.

Theorizing Postmodern Architecture and Urbanism

The literature on postmodern architecture is enormous and there are a number of significant attempts to define and theorize postmodernism in architecture. For the most essential attempts to make comprehensive accounts of postmodernism as exclusively manifested in architecture (rather than as a more general cultural phenomenon) we can turn to three authors – Charles Jencks, Heinrich Klotz, and Paolo Porthoghesi – and it is from these three authors that this dissertation adopts the definition of postmodern architecture. Jencks, Portoghesi and Klotz were the most prolific writers on the subject, and – despite minor differences – their definitions coincide regarding the crucial architectural features which they identify as postmodern, as well as in the genealogies they ascribe to postmodern architecture. Additionally, to a large degree they discuss the same body of texts, realizations, authors, and architects as significant to the postmodern turn in architecture. The various architects discussed in this dissertation share and draw upon the understanding of postmodernism established by these works.

In architectural discourse, the term "postmodernism" was to a significant degree popularized by Jencks, whose first work on this notion in architecture appeared in print

in 1975.[57] Jencks traces the beginnings of postmodernism to the crisis of modern ideals which began in the late sixties and seventies; he sets 1972 as a symbolic date of the end of modernist architecture. In his book *The New Paradigm in Architecture: The Language of* Post-Modernism, Jencks writes that "Modern Architecture died in St. Louis, Missouri on July 15, 1972 at 3.32 pm (or thereabouts) when the infamous Pruitt Igoe scheme, or rather several of its slab blocks, were given the final coup de grâce by dynamite."[58] Since Pruitt Igoe – a late modern housing complex designed by Minoru Yamasaki (completed in 1956) – was "a widely recognized symbol of … the failure of modern architecture,"[59] its demolition was a suggestive metaphor for a final collapse of modernist ideas, which gave space for postmodernism in architecture.

Jencks defines postmodernism as *double coding*: "the combination of Modern techniques with something else (usually traditional building) in order for architecture to communicate with the public and a concerned minority, usually other architects."[60] He frames postmodernism as a critical answer to the failures of modernism, such as "cheap prefabrication, lack of personal 'defensible' space and the alienating housing estate"[61] and states that "[t]he main motive for Post-Modern architecture is obviously the social

---

[57] Charles Jencks, *What Is Post-Modernism?* (London: Academy Editions, 1986), 14.
[58] Charles Jencks, *The New Paradigm in Architecture: The Language of Post-Modernism* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002), 9.
[59] Katharine Bristol, "The Pruitt-Igoe Myth," *Journal of Architectural Education* 44.3 (May 1991), 163 http://www.pruitt-igoe.com/temp/1991-bristol-pruitt-igoemyth.pdf.
[60] Jencks, *What Is Post-Modernism?*, 14.
[61] Ibid., 15–18.

failure of Modern architecture."[62] At the same time, postmodernism retains some of the elements characteristic for modernism:

> Modern architecture had failed to remain a credible party because it didn't communicate effectively with its ultimate users – the main argument of my book The Language of Post-Modern Architecture – and partly because it didn't make effective links with the city and history. Thus the solution I perceived and defined as Post-Modern: an architecture that was professionally based *and* popular as well as one that was based on new techniques *and* old patterns. Double coding to simplify means both elite/popular and new/old and there are compelling reasons for these opposite pairings. (…) [A]ll the creators who should be called Post-Modern keep something of a Modern sensibility some intention which distinguishes their work from that of revivalists – whether is irony, parody, displacement, complexity, eclecticism, realism or any number of contemporary tactics and goals.[63]

Postmodern architecture rejects the values of modern architecture such as "'truth to materials', 'logical consistency', 'straightforwardness', 'simplicity'"[64] in the name of playful deceptions, linguistic games, and complexity of meanings, historical references, forms, and materials. According to Jencks, the characteristics distinguishing modern from postmodern architecture "concern differences over symbolism, ornament, humour, technology and the relation of the architect to existing and past cultures. Modernists and Late-Modernists tend to emphasize technical and economic solutions to problems, whereas Post-Modernists tend to emphasize contextual and cultural additions to their inventions."[65] For Jencks, an idea fundamental for postmodernism is pluralism: "the idea that the architect must design for different 'taste cultures' (…) and for differing views of

---

[62] Ibid., 15.
[63] Ibid., 14–15.
[64] Ibid., 19.
[65] Ibid., 23.

the good life."[66] As he writes in *What Is Post-Modernism?*, "Key definers are pluralism, both philosophical and stylistic, and a dialectical or critical relation to a pre-existing ideology. There is no one Post-Modern style, although there is a dominating Classicism, just as there was no one Modern mode, although there was a dominating International Style."

Examples of postmodern architecture frequently analyzed by Jencks are Robert Venturi's *Vanna Venturi House in Philadelphia (1962-64),* Charles Moore's Piazza d'Italia in New Orleans (1978), Michael Graves' Dolphin and Swan hotels in Orlando (1989), and James Stirling's Neue Staatsgalerie (1979-84) in Stuttgart.[67] In *What Is Post-Modernism*, Jencks analyzes Neue Staatsgalerie as an illustration of double coding. On the one hand, the building hides endless references legible for specialists: its plan, composed of a series of connected galleries around three sides of a central rotunda, is a quote from Karl Friedrich Schinkel's Altes Museum in Berlin, its elevation – with stone slabs "fallen out" from the building – evokes the eighteenth-century tradition of artificial ruins. On the other hand, the aesthetics of Neue Staatsgalerie is accessible and inviting not only for experts:

> Virtually every Post-Modern architect – Robert Venturi, Hans Hollein, Charles Moore, Robert Stern, Michael Graves, Arata Isozaki are the notable examples – use popular *and* elitist signs in their work to achieve quite different ends, and their styles are essentially a hybrid. To simplify, at Stuttgart the blue and red handrails and vibrant polychromy fit in with the youth that uses the museum –

---

[66] Ibid., 22.

[67] Jencks identifies also "borderline cases" of architects such as Leon Krier, who is "traditional and straightforward in a manner that Post-Modernism is not." Ibid., 22.

> they literally resemble they dayglo hair and anoraks – while the Classicism appeals more to the lovers of Schinkel.(…) The pluralism which is so often called on to justify Post-Modernism is here a tangible reality.[68]

Jencks' books and articles on postmodern architecture (which comprise over twenty published works) played an essential role in promoting the movement.

Apart from written contributions, a crucial role in disseminating and theorizing the movement was taken by exhibitions. In 1980, the first edition of the Architecture Biennale in Venice was open under the name *The Presence of The Past*. The 1980 Biennale was dominated by postmodern proposals, the most crucial of which was *La Strada Novissima* exhibition curated by Paolo Portoghesi. The *Strada Novissima* was a hypothetical street composed of twenty facades designed by leading postmodern architects. The facades "were in a Free-Style Classicism, a style which used the full repertoire of mouldings, keystones and columnar orders, but usually in an ironic fashion again indicating their place in history after Modernism."[69] Apart from the exhibition catalogue, Portoghesi discusses *La Strada Novissima* in his book *Postmodern: The Architecture of The Postindustrial Society* published in 1983. In *Postmodern*, Portoghesi describes it as architecture which "returns to the condition of the theater, of the stage" and "a machine for thought."[70] In its very concept, the exhibition was symptomatic of postmodernism with its emphasis on artificiality and irony. Stripped of function entirely, the facades are playful quotations of the buildings, embracing their

---

[68] Ibid., 19.
[69] Ibid., 33.
[70] Paolo Portoghesi, *Postmodern, the Architecture of the Post-industrial Society* (New York: Rizzoli, 1982), 31.

superficiality and focus on the aesthetic dimension. Besides analyzing his contribution to the Biennale, in *Postmodern* Portoghesi defines the postmodern movement in architecture and provides short analyses of key postmodern architects. Similarly to Jameson, but without his critical thrust, Portoghesi characterizes postmodernism as a "product of 'postindustrial' society"[71] and a heterogenous, diverse notion based on the rejection of modernism and its

> natural product: the modern city, the suburbs without quality, the urban environment devoid of collective values that has become an asphalt jungle and a dormitory; the loss of local character, of the connection with the lace: the terrible homologation that has made the outskirts of the cities of the whole world similar to one another and whose inhabitants have a hard time recognizing and identity of their own.[72]

Portoghesi describes the postmodern movement as "[a] kind of new renaissance," which refutes modernist values such as the "perpetual invention of and search for the new at all costs (…), perspective decomposition" and "abstract volumetric play," and instead discovers the importance of "the imitation of types" and "the knowledge of rules and canons produced over centuries" and acknowledges the fact that "the character of a place is a patrimony to use and not to mindlessly squander."[73] Unlike critics of postmodernism, Portoghesi embraces, rather than vilifies, the superficiality of postmodern architecture, stating that it is "an architecture of the image for a civilization

---

[71] Ibid., 7.
[72] Ibid.
[73] Ibid., 8.

of the image."[74] Portoghesi puts emphasis on the need for a return to traditional typologies (or "archetypes"), which he sees as a remedy for the decontextualized, homogenous, and alienating architecture produced by modernism:

> The result of the discovery of the sudden impoverishment produced in architecture by the adoption of technologies and morphologies separated from places and traditions has been the reemergence of architectonic archetypes as precious instruments of communication. These archetypes are elementary institutions of the language and practice of architecture that live on the daily life and collective memory of man. These differ greatly depending on the places we live and where our spatial experiences were formed. The Postmodern in architecture can therefore be read overall as a reemergence of archetypes, or as a reintegration of architectonic conventions, and thus as a premise to the creation of an *architecture of communication*.[75]

Along with Jencks and Portoghesi, one of the most important protagonists of the theory of postmodernism was Heinrich Klotz. Klotz started his work on postmodernism in late seventies, when the term was already established and widely circulating. His contributions to this field include books, most importantly *The History of Postmodern Architecture* published in 1988, but also curatorial activity.[76] Klotz frames postmodernism in architecture as a continuation of modernism, aimed to fix its failures rather than make a radical break with it: "postmodern architecture should be seen as a revision of modernism," he writes.[77] The main amendments introduced by postmodernism are "the rich scope of meaning and the fictional content of the message from which the form of

---

[74] Ibid., 11.
[75] Ibid.
[76] Heinrich Klotz was the founder of the Deutsches Architekturmuseum (DAM, German Architecture Museum) in Frankfurt, which opened in 1984.
[77] Heinrich Klotz, *The History of Postmodern Architecture* (Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 1990), xiv.

the building derives its directive"[78] rather than the "functional aptness alone."[79] Klotz formulates the chief postulate of postmodernism as "[n]ot only function but fiction as well!"[80] For Klotz, postmodern architecture – although diverse – is guided by a "common goal: to again conceive architecture as a form that conveys meaning and to view it as a species of art."[81] "The final goal" for postmodern architecture is for Klotz "to liberate architecture from the muteness of 'pure forms' and from the clamor of ostentatious constructions in order that a building might again become an occasion for a creative effort, attuned not only to facts and utilization programs but also to poetic ideas."[82]

The accounts of Klotz, Jencks, and Portoghesi present different views on whether postmodernism should be framed more as a continuation of modernism or a radical break with it, and the authors put emphases on different aspects of postmodern architecture when describing the movement. For example, Portoghesi accentuates the return to tradition and history, while Jencks accentuates playfulness and irony. Klotz understands postmodernism as an evolution of modernism, while Jencks – with his choice of the demolition of Pruitt-Igoe as symbolic starting date – a radical break with modernism. Nevertheless, the core of their argument is the same. They analyze postmodernism as a heterogenous movement held together by two elements: a critique

---

[78] Ibid.
[79] Ibid.
[80] Ibid.
[81] Ibid.
[82] Ibid., 5.

against modernism and functionalism initiated in the sixties and a return to historical ideals, forms, and typologies interrupted by the modern approach to architecture and the city. Postmodern architecture, as outlined by Klotz, Jencks, and Portoghesi is playful, singular, and unique (rather than anonymous and homogenous), ironic, textual (as it provides an abundance of metaphors and references possible to “read” by audiences of different levels of cultural literacy), it is popular (as it acknowledges the *vox populi* rather than solely the opinions of architectural experts), and respects the context and *genius loci* of the place it occupies. It is a form of art rather than a technical discipline focused solely on functionality or a technocratic scientific means for solving spatial problems.

As with any architectural movement, these qualities attributed to postmodern architecture are rarely all present together within the same work. Nevertheless, they are operative terms which allow us to identify examples to be considered as postmodern – terms that take on some different resonances when we turn to Chilean and Polish postmodernism.

Chilean and Polish Postmodernism

The postmodern architecture discussed in this dissertation relies on concepts introduced by Rossi, Jameson, Venturi, Scott-Brown, Izenour, Rowe, and Koetter as well as on qualities identified as postmodern by Jencks, Portoghesi, and Klotz. At the same time, Chilean and Polish architecture departs significantly from Western examples discussed by these authors. The main difference is that Chilean and Polish

postmodernism lacks the irony, humor, and distance typical for Western realizations. In Chile and Poland, under nondemocratic regimes, building postmodern architecture brought stakes higher than the generation of profit. As Chapters 1 and 3 show, Postmodernism was used as a platform for propaganda by, respectively, the authoritarian government of Pinochet in Chile and the socialist regime in Poland. In buildings such as Congreso de Chile (1987), postmodern strategies of free juxtapositions of different historical references, textures, and patterns do not result in the playful, frivolous architecture we recognize from Graves' hotels or Moore's Piazza d'Italia, which use analogical stylistic effects. Instead, they are used to create a building that is "austere, dignified and transcendent"[83] and as such in line with Pinochet's propaganda. Similarly, in late socialist Poland the function of postmodern architecture as used by the government was to – as architect Romuald Loegler described it – "appease dangerous social unrest"[84] with the use of inviting popular postmodern forms applied in State-funded housing estates.

Chilean and Polish architects who used postmodernism as a means to fight their government's agendas (discussed in Chapters 2 and 4) also source their postmodern inspirations selectively. Their interest in postmodernism can be described in three ways;

---

83 "Resumen de Presentación del Fallo. Primer Premio," *CA* 60 (1990), 29. Quoted in Francisco Díaz, "Los arquitectos y la falta de memoria," *Bifurcaciones: Revista de estudios culturales urbanos* (online journal), June 5, 2013. English version (unpublished): "Architects and the lack of memory: the project as alibi to forget. The José Domingo Gómez Rojas Park in Santiago and the Congress Building in Valparaíso, Chile," final paper for Contested Grounds: The Spatial Politics of Memory course (prof. Mabel Wilson) at Columbia Graduate School of Architecture, Planning & Preservation, December 2012, 11.

84 Romuald Loegler, interview by the author, Warsaw, Poland, July 1 2017 (published in Appendix).

first, through their methodology. These architects utilized, for instance, bottom-up approaches thorough case studies of local architecture and targeted solutions instead of general abstract claims to solve very different spatial problems. Secondly, these architects drew from postmodernism in their departure from the rationalized technocratic treatment of architecture prevalent in modernism in favor of the understanding of architecture as a symbolic, meaningful form. In a Western context, this aspect of postmodernism is often explored in a way that turns buildings into playful, ironic, and surprising forms referring to various sources, from pop culture to quotes from architectural history. In the locations explored in this dissertation, the symbolic potential in architecture is deprived of ironic dimensions, but rather perform more serious social and political roles. Thirdly, these architects revived historical spatial solutions – specifically, traditional typologies like urban squares, piazzas, and streets – understood as elements vital for social life and not merely utilitarian. The postmodern influence is especially visible in their emphasis on the importance of streets as social forms, irreducible to "simple connectors,"[85] as had been utilized in modernist urban planning. Therefore, their main theoretical references are authors such as Aldo Rossi (especially in the Chilean cases, due to personal contacts between Rossi and the CEDLA group) and Jane Jacobs, who – although her main works were published in the peak of modernism in architecture – set the directions taken up by postmodern authors.

---

[85] Czesław Bielecki, interview by the author, June 9 2017 (published in Appendix).

In this sense, Chilean and Polish postmodern architects are populist, but in a fundamentally different way than the commercialized populism of Western architects evident for example in *Learning From Las Vegas*. In accordance with the postulates of Western postmodernists (such as Jencksian "double coding"), Chilean and Polish architects reject the reliance on expert culture and turn to the average, non-specialist user by using historical and traditional forms rather than the refined abstract forms of modernism praised by critics but often rejected by users. In some cases – like Budzyński's North Ursynów – they also engage future users in the design process. Unlike in Venturi et al., the deployment of architectural populism by Chilean and Polish architects is founded on the philosophical commitment that architecture needs to be connected to the community – a politically vital position in the context of Chile and Poland in the seventies and eighties. Both Chilean and Polish governments (despite their official rhetoric) encouraged the atomization and alienation of individuals within society, and architecture was one way of achieving this. In a charged political atmosphere, especially in the times of increasingly widespread dissent and social unrest in the seventies and eighties, social organizing and community building was dangerous to the regimes.

Both Chilean and Polish architects often underline these differences between Western postmodernism and their practices. Marta Leśniakowska, Polish architectural

historian engaged in oppositional architectural circles sums up this difference in a following way:

> [f]or us, in Poland, the interest in postmodernism was different than in the West. It was a chance to revive the traditions of Polish architecture instead of the universalist, international language of modernism. Postmodernism wasn't for us a matter of form, a matter of façade, we were interested in how the city works, we wanted to return to traditional urban forms such as streets, quarters or squares. (…) For us, the form was an expression of ideological and political attitudes. We understood postmodernism as a chance for the renewal of architectural vocabulary. We believed that the return to detail, to human and urban scales (…), to traditional thinking about urban fabric – very different from the oppressive character of late socialist architecture – would shape new kinds of social relations.[86]

Very similar statements are made by architects engaged in CEDLA. Pedro Murtinho says that that for CEDLA postmodernism was primarily an exploration "of our roots, and of how our cities function."[87] Analogically, Cristián Boza clarifies that CEDLA didn't understand postmodernism in a formalist, stylistic way within the group:

> postmodernism was not only about columns and friezes. It was about regaining our identity. (...) We did not agree with the military government. We were talking about liberation, about bringing our country and its respective architecture back.[88]

The degree and character of political engagement of architects discussed in this dissertation varies from overt and direct (as in the case of Czesław Bielecki, whose career in architecture is parallel to his underground oppositional activity) to attempts to

---

[86] Marta Leśniakowska, interview by the author, Warsaw, Poland, June 5 2017 (published in Appendix).
[87] Pedro Murtinho, interview by the author, Santiago de Chile, Chile, August 30 2016 (published in Appendix).
[88] Cristián Boza, interview by Joaquín Serrano in *Editar para transformar: publicaciones de arquitectura y diseño en Chile durante los años 60s y 70s, en el marco de la exposición Clip/Stamp/Fold*, edited by Pablo Brugnoli and Fernando Portal (Santiago: Capital Books, 2015), 165.

"make politics through architecture"[89] as Humberto Eliash described his engagement in Chilean group CEDLA.

The professional trajectories of Chilean and Polish architects discussed in this dissertation offer an opportunity to address broader questions: Can architectural practice be a form of dissent? If so, under what circumstances? Chilean and Polish postmodernism allows the productive investigation of what "oppositional" means for an architect who wishes to remain practicing her profession. Some of the architects, like Romuald Loegler, decided to engage in projects endorsed and funded by the State, which politics they opposed. While taking part in the governments' propagandistic efforts, in their designs they included spatial solutions which were part of an oppositional agenda (as in the Na Skarpie housing complex, discussed in Chapter 3). Such complexities are even more visible in Chilean architecture, for example in the practice of Cristián Boza. While he was one of the founders of CEDLA – a group the program for which was focused on urban solutions intended to counter Pinochet's neoliberal policies – Boza was one of the architects who took part in the government competition for the Chilean Congress in Valparaiso. Boza's studio was also one of the most prosperous during Pinochet's regime and realized numerous commissions for thoroughly neoliberal spatial formats.

[89] Humberto Eliash, interview by the author, Santiago de Chile, Chile, August 23 2016 (published in Appendix).

Chile and Poland represent very different geopolitical realities, yet they allow for a productive juxtaposition. Postmodern architecture in these two countries had a similar trajectory in terms of timeline and in terms of the ways it was used as a politically and socially engaged project. In Chile, postmodernist ideas infiltrate architectural discourse around 1977 when the CEDLA group was founded. In Poland, although the term is first used in 1979, first widespread discussions around postmodern ideas can be noted in architectural press in 1978, as analyzed in Chapter 3. In both countries, postmodern architecture was used both by governments as a form of propaganda and by architects for whom postmodern spaces brought the promise of architecture that could actively challenge the politics of their respective governments. While still not recognized in scholarship, politically and socially engaged postmodern architecture was a common phenomenon in undemocratic countries; both Eastern Europe and South America offer rich examples.

One of the most spectacular examples can be found in Argentina, with La Escuelita, an independent research institute established by Tony Díaz, Ernesto Katzenstein, Justo Solsona, and Rafael Viñoly operating from 1976 to 1983 during the dictatorship of Jorge Rafael Videla. Banned from the university, the architects pursued their independent educational endeavors through studio exercises, seminars, and lectures of invited architects – most importantly, those of Aldo Rossi, whose studies on typologies and the city were crucial for La Escuelita's philosophy. In projects such as the

study for Avenida de Mayo (1978), La Escuelita used postmodern forms and ideas to design spatial solutions with a potential of political agency. However, while La Escuelita exemplifies practices similar to those described in Chapters 2 and 4, it is not clear whether Videla's government was interested in using postmodern architecture as a platform for propaganda. Analogically, in Eastern Europe we can find isolated cases of socially and politically engaged postmodern architecture, for example in Czechoslovakia or Soviet Union, but there is no body of research that suggests that these projects form a consistent or meaningful trend.

However, what is unique to Chile in Poland, is that in both countries postmodern architecture was utilized both by governments and architects with oppositional agendas. The regimes in power in Chile and Poland in the seventies and eighties represented contrasting political and economic philosophies – of neoliberalism and socialism. Therefore, this juxtaposition reveals that the political and social engagement of postmodernism is not limited to any particular economic reality. Contrary to common belief, postmodernism not only was a manifestation of the "logic of late capitalism" but, as the example of Poland shows, also was taken up to suit the needs of a late socialist State as well. Meanwhile, in Chile, as discussed in Chapter 3, architects utilized postmodern theories and forms, believing that they could be used to counter Pinochet's neoliberal agenda.

The study of the complex relations between the State, architects, and built environment in both countries shows that postmodernism in Chile and Poland was deeply embedded in clashing social and political visions and had very different trajectories than those of the democratic capitalist societies of North America and Western Europe. As such it challenges the established narrative on postmodernism in architecture based on Western examples.

Recent Scholarship on Postmodernism

The last decade has brought a surge of interest in the historization and theorization of postmodern architecture. The vast majority of these efforts are limited to Western architecture, as is visible in the most widely discussed books – most significantly, Reinhold Martin's *Utopia's Ghost: Architecture and Postmodernism, Again* (2010), K. Michael Hays' *Architecture's Desire: Reading the Late Avant-Garde* (2009), Aron Vinegar's *I Am a Monument: On Learning from Las Vegas* (2012), Martino Strieli's *Las Vegas in Rear View Mirror* (2013), Léa-Catherine Szacka's, *Exhibiting the Postmodern: The 1980 Venice Architecture Biennale* (2016), and *The Klotz Tapes*, edited by Oliver Elser (2018). In addition to these publications of scholarly nature, more popular, visually attractive titles addressed to broad audiences include Judith Gura's *Postmodern Design Complete Design, Furniture, Graphics, Architecture, Interiors* (2017) and Terry Farrels' and Adam Nathaniel

Furman's *Revisiting Postmodernism* (2017).[90] Additionally, exhibitions such as *Postmodernism: Style and Subversion, 1970-1990* in the Victoria and Albert Museum of Art (2011-2012), *Memphis/Milano: 1980s Italian Design in the Design Museum (2014)*, and *Postmodernism 1980–1995* in the Helsinki's Design Museum (2015) are symptomatic of the return to theorizing the postmodern. The publications and exhibitions mentioned above continue the practice of treating Northern American and Western European architecture almost exclusively. More recently, the lack of attention to other global areas in architectural knowledge on postmodernism has been recognized by scholars of architecture and urban studies, as is evident in conferences and panels such as "Socialist Postmodernism: Architecture and Society under Late Socialism" (EAHN Turin, 2014), "Re-framing Identities" (ETH Zurich, 2015), which focused on the relations between Eastern and Western European architecture between 1970 and 1990, "Publicly Postmodern" (SAH Glasgow, 2017), which examined postmodern architecture beyond its most well-known settings of North America and Britain, and an anthology of texts, *Re-framing Identities: Architecture's Turn to History, 1970-1990*, edited by Ákos Moravánszky and Torsten Lange (2016). The most recent example of this interest is an anthology of essays edited by Vladimir Kulić, *Second World Postmodernisms* (forthcoming by Bloomsbury Press). Besides casting light on marginalized locations ignored by existing accounts on the period, these academic endeavors unfold the complexity of

[90] For the sake of brevity, this list excludes monographs of selected locations or buildings such as Elain Harwood and Geraint Franklin's *Post-Modern Buildings in Britain* (London: Batsford, 2017).

relations between architecture and the State that complicate existing accounts on postmodernism.

Scholarship on Chilean and Polish Postmodernism

The literature on Chilean and Polish postmodern architecture is limited. Chilean and Polish scholars rarely view postmodern architecture in their countries as a field worthy of scholarly investigation. It is indeed common to marginalize its importance or even deny its presence, for postmodern architecture in these countries has come to represent a repressed past. Polish critics mention postmodern architecture as the epitome of bad taste and as imperfect copies of Western designs. As postmodern architecture was especially visible in the first ten years after the systemic transition from socialism to capitalism in 1989, critics deride it as architectural evidence of the clumsiness and awkwardness of provincial early capitalism. Similarly, Chilean architect and critic Smiljan Radic states that postmodernism was "associated with the neo-liberal economic policies of Augusto Pinochet" and thus "imposed on Chile."[91] In an interview following his appointment as the curator of the Architecture Biennale in Venice, Alejandro Aravena goes further and says that Chile was "protected from postmodernism,"[92] disavowing its role in the country's architectural history completely.

---

[91] Smiljan Radić, quoted in Carolina Miranda, "Rough, yet poetic: Chilean Architecture has its moment," *Los Angeles Times*, May 17, 2015, http://www.latimes.com/entertainment/arts/miranda/la-et-cam-chilean-architecture-goes-international-20150515-column.html.

[92] Alejandro Aravena, quoted in Christopher Hawthorne, "Pritzer winner Alejandro Aravena on Pinochet, postmodernism, and building a house for $7,500" (interview with Alejandro Aravena), *Los Angeles Times*,

The conception of postmodern architecture in both countries revealed in such scattered remarks is based on misunderstandings, suppressions, inaccuracies and conflicting accounts.

Only very recently has postmodern architecture in Chile and Poland begun to be treated as a field worthy of scholarly investigation. The first broader attempt to investigate Chilean postmodern architecture was undertaken in 2008, when group of architecture students at La Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile created *Docoposmo* – a website (in Spanish, currently inactive, not archived) with a goal to document postmodern architecture in Santiago de Chile. The group printed an abbreviated guide in the form of a leaflet with a map and short descriptions of postmodern buildings in Santiago. Despite its popular, non-academic character *Docoposmo* should be mentioned as a pioneering effort of recognizing Chilean architecture of the seventies and eighties as worth investigation. One of the *Docoposmo* founding members, Francisco Díaz, is the author of two other significant publications – an essay on Chilean architecture and memory, which large portion is devoted to Congreso de Chile in Valparaíso, and a second, yet unpublished article on Chilean postmodern architecture and neoliberalism (in Spanish).[93] Díaz's twelve-page article analyzes Chilean postmodernism as complicit in Pinochet's neoliberal project, and does not discuss projects analyzed in this

---

January 13, 2016, http://www.latimes.com/entertainment/arts/culture/la-ca-cm-pritzker-winner-alejandro-aravena-hawthorne-interview-20160113-story.html.

[93] Díaz, "Los arquitectos y la falta de memoria"; Francisco Díaz, "Arquitectura y postmodernidad en Chile: complejidad y contradiccion en la dictatura" in *Arquitectura en el Chile del Siglo XX*, edited by Fernando Pérez Oyarzun (Santiago: ARQ Ediciones, forthcoming), pages unnumbered in unpublished draft.

dissertation. There are no books focused on Chilean postmodernism, although two recent publications – *Portales del Laberinto. Arquitectura y ciudad en chile, 1977-2009* (an anthology of essays edited by Jorge Francisco Liernur, in Spanish) and *Editar para transformar* (a collection of interviews about architectural Chilean magazines in sixties and seventies) – discuss the postmodern group CEDLA briefly.[94] Additionally, CEDLA is analyzed in the context of Chilean architectural culture in the seventies and eighties by Fernando Carvajal in his current doctoral dissertation, "Los extramuros de la disciplina. Tres controversias del CEDLA para la reconstitución del campo disciplinar 1977-1989," prepared at La Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile (started in 2014, in Spanish).

In comparison to Chilean postmodernism, Polish postmodern architecture is better represented in existing scholarship. However, it should be noted that the effort to analyze postmodern architecture has appeared only in recent years. Previously, analyses of Polish postmodern architecture had been rare and, in the case of studying the late socialist period, nonexistent. It had been commonly believed that postmodern architecture started with the systemic change of 1989 when the newly adapted capitalist system enabled unlimited absorption of Western (especially American) culture.[95] One of

---

[94] Jorge Francisco Liernur (ed.), *Portales del Laberinto. Arquitectura y ciudad en chile, 1977-2009* (Santiago: Universidad Nacional Andrés Bello, 2009); Brugnoli and Portal (eds.), *Editar para transformar*.

[95] For example, Adam Nadolny in his essay on postmodern architecture in Poznań published in 2012 notes that "postmodern architecture appeared in Poland only at the end of the 1980s and at the beginning of the 1990s. That delay was caused by the communist system that prevailed in Poland." See: Adam Nadolny,

the first scholarly works concerned with Polish postmodern architecture under late socialism was Piotr Bujas and Łukasz Stanek's exhibition, *Postmodernizm jest prawie w porządku: polska architektura po socjalistycznej globalizacji*[96] (Postmodernism Is Almost Alright: Polish Architecture after Socialist Globalisation). Bujas and Stanek's exhibition traced the activity of Polish architects who spent time working in North Africa and the Middle East in the 1970s and 1980s. In these countries, the architects had a chance to experiment with postmodern forms, which they then used in their realizations in Poland, upon return to the country. This exhibition was accompanied by a catalogue (in Polish and English) and followed with a comprehensive, scholarly article authored by Stanek.[97] Another effort to document and analyze postmodern architecture in Poland was an anthology of commissioned essays *Postmodernizm polski – architektura i urbanistyka* (*Polish Postmodernism: Architecture and Urbanism*, in Polish),[98] edited by myself. The book was complemented with an anthology of interviews with key Polish postmodern architects, *Postmodernizm polski – wywiady* [*Polish Postmodernism: Interviews*], edited by Alicja Gzowska and myself (in Polish). These books covered the period between 1970 and 2000, though discussed late socialist architecture only briefly. The

---

"Postmodern architecture in the historical quarters of Poznan as a shaping element of the city's cultural environment," *Architectus* 2.32: 49, http://www.architectus.arch.pwr.wroc.pl/32/32_08.pdf.

[96] Łukasz Stanek, *Postmodernizm jest prawie w porzadku / Postmodernism Is Almost All Right: Polish Architecture After Socialist Globalization* (Warsaw: Fundacja Narodowej Kultury Bęc Zmiana, 2012).

[97] Łukasz Stanek, "Mobilities of Architecture in the Global Cold War: From Socialist Poland to Kuwait and Back," *International Journal of Islamic Architecture*, 4.2, (October 2015): 365–398.

[98] Lidia Klein (ed.), *Postmodernizm polski – architektura i urbanistyka* (Warsaw: Wydawnictwo 40000 Malarzy, 2013).

most recent research project devoted (mostly) to postmodern architecture is *Architecture of the 7th Day*, an exhibition and catalogue authored by Kuba Snopek, Iza Cichońska, and Karolina Popera (in Polish). Their project documents Polish churches built in the seventies and eighties and analyzes them as expressions of anti-government resistance.

In the last two decades, architectural scholarship has been particularly invested in redefining the canon of architectural knowledge from the position of peripheral, non-Western locations. In the field of twentieth-century architecture, these efforts are focused on modern architecture. Postmodernism outside North America and Western Europe has been subject to a double exclusion from architectural discourse, because of its geographically peripheral status and because of a more general lack of interest in postmodernism among architecture historians from the late 1980s until recently. This dissertation is a part of larger efforts to fill gaps in knowledge regarding architectural peripheries and while doing so, change familiar assumptions about postmodernism. Chilean and Polish architecture reveals how postmodern architecture does not necessarily need to be focused solely "on aesthetics to the detriment of social content,"[99] and that postmodern architects cannot be described as merely "surrealist stage designers"[100] taking part in socially and politically conservative project. In Chile and Poland, postmodernism wasn't "the new corporate style" or a "movement (…) that affirms a status quo" characterized by "passivity vis-a-vis economic and political

[99] Cocotas, "Design for the One Percent."
[100] Habermas, 328.

power."[101] In these locations, as well as in many more countries outside Western democracies, postmodernism was used as a means to challenge the status quo, and to produce social and political change through spatial and architectural solutions. Chilean and Polish postmodernism shows that peripheral locations have the potential to challenge established truths based on Western architectural canon of texts and buildings. This dissertation then analyzes peripheral architecture not only to add their histories to existing scholarship on architecture, but to challenge the dominant narrative of postmodern architecture from the position of peripheries.

---

[101] McLeod, 29, 38.

1. Postmodernism and the State: Chile

With the coup d'état that put Eduardo Pinochet in power on September 11, 1973, Chile's political system shifted from democratic to authoritarian and its economic system shifted from socialist to neoliberal. Following the coup, a military junta composed of Pinochet, Air Force General Gustavo Leigh, Navy Admiral José Toribio Merino, and Carabinero Chief General César Mendoza was established as the country's supreme authority. The junta maintained legislative authority in the country after suspending the constitution and the Chilean Congress in 1973. The junta banned political parties and trade unions, imposed a curfew and restrictions on gatherings, and assumed control over the media. A month after the coup, the government established Dirección de Inteligencia Nacional (DINA, National Intelligence Directorate) – a secret police force authorized to detain, torture, and murder individuals suspected of any activity against the regime. The militarization of the government and its apparatuses was combined with a strong agenda of privatization and deregulation, such that the social and economic efforts of Pinochet's administration were focused on reversing the pro-social policies of the previous governments of Eduardo Frei Montalva (1964-70) and Salvador Allende (1970-1973).

Pinochet's shift towards a radical free market economy and the dismantling of social welfare institutions built by previous administrations also had significant impacts on Chilean urban space and architecture. The privatization-oriented policies and

economic reforms of the new government led to the emergence of architectural formats new (or at least not previously popular) to urban space in Chile. Just as the eras of Frei and Allende were represented by late modern social housing and public buildings, the architecture of Pinochet's era was defined by banks, hotels, headquarters of private (or newly privatized) companies, and shopping centers. As these buildings, burgeoning in the seventies and eighties, were mostly designed according to the newest, postmodern trends, for Chilean architects and architectural critics, postmodernism became widely interpreted as a style of Pinochet's time.[1] Moreover, as many critics point out, Chilean architecture of the seventies and eighties not only reflected economic and social changes implemented by Pinochet, but also actively contributed to these transformations. In his article about postmodern architecture in Chile, Francisco Díaz claims that not only were populist postmodern "historical and picturesque forms" used "for maximizing economic profit" but also that "[n]ew types – office buildings and commercial centers – (…) were used to generate the image of progress which the neoliberal economy used to validate itself in our society."[2] For Díaz, postmodern forms manifested in banks, hotels, and other commercial buildings and spaces populating Chilean cities in the seventies and eighties aided the government's political agenda as they helped to normalize painful neoliberal reforms and create an image of prosperity and progress. Liliana de

---

[1] For example, see opinions of architects Smiljan Radic and Alejandro Aravena in Miranda, "Rough, yet poetic."

[2] Díaz, "Arquitectura y postmodernidad," pages unnumbered in unpublished draft.

Simone, architectural critic writing on new types of commercial centers in Pinochet's Chile describes them in a similar way—as signs of "awaited and expected progress, imbued with the discourses of modernization advocated by the military regime."[3] Following Díaz and de Simone, we can understand Chilean postmodern commercial architecture as an active agent responsible for normalizing and validating dramatic social, economic, and political change.

At the same time, Pinochet's government did not formulate any direct program regarding architecture. Just as in other domains, architecture was supposed to be regulated by the market forces exclusively, and freed from any influence or control from the government. Despite the lack of any direct guidelines regarding architecture, Pinochet's government had a clear preference for postmodern forms. This is apparent in the results of public architectural competitions organized during Pinochet's reign. The idea of a government-funded architectural competition was contrary to the newly adapted philosophy of neoliberalism, which assumed minimal involvement of the State in culture. For this reason, there were only two National Architecture Competitions (Concurso Nacional de Proyectos) organized by Pinochet's administration. Both of them concerned symbolically and politically charged sites of high significance – the Plaza de la Constitución in Santiago de Chile (1980) and the Congreso de Chile (1987) in

---

[3] Liliana de Simone, "*Caracoles* comerciales y otras especies en vías de extinción: La evolución del proto-mall en Santiago de Chile y su vigencia actual," *Bifurcaciones: Revista de estudios culturales urbanos* (online journal), September 24 2012, http://www.bifurcaciones.cl/2012/11/caracoles-comerciales/.

Valparaíso. Both of the winning proposals were designs based on postmodern forms and ideas. This chapter examines the relation between postmodern architecture in Chile and Pinochet's State, discussing urban policies with direct impact on architecture, as well as these two national commissions resulting in postmodern realizations.

1.1 From Eduardo Frei Montalva and Salvador Allende to Augusto Pinochet: Transformations in Urban Space

Beginning in the mid-nineteenth century and into the twentieth, Chile experienced intensified migration from rural areas to cities, which resulted in a deficit of urban housing. The first major effort to alleviate the lack of housing was passing the Ley de Habitaciones Obreras (Law For Worker's Housing) in 1906 under the presidency of Germán Riesco (1901-1906). After that, Chile created various institutions and organizations devoted to the challenges of urban renovation caused by increasing metropolitization. These had a special focus on government-supported housing, which was supposed to replace growing *campamentos* (shanty towns). The most significant effort in this respect was undertaken during Eduardo Frei Montalva's presidency. In 1965, the government created the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development (MINVU, Ministerio de Vivienda y Urbanismo). Along with MINVU emerged four affiliated organizations: COU (Corporación de Obras Urbanas, Urban Works Corporation) responsible for urban infrastructure, CORHABIT (Corporación de Servicios Habitacionales, Corporartion for Housing Services), CORVI (Corporación de Vivienda, Housing Corporation) dedicated to social housing, and CORMU (Corporación

de Mejoramiento Urbano, Corporation of Urban Improvement), focused on urban renewal. Among these newly established organizations, CORMU played an especially crucial role in shaping the architecture and urban planning of Chile, and became a symbol of the government's efforts to modernize the country and reduce its housing shortage. CORMU's mission – long-term improvement of cities – was characterized by a holistic approach to integrating interventions in architecture, infrastructure, and social vision. CORMU operated by acquiring deteriorating sites in strategic locations (such as downtown Santiago) with the goal of transforming them into sustainable urban environments, in which people from different socioeconomic statuses can intermingle.

Its two showcase realizations were the San Louis housing project (1970-73) designed by Miguel Lawner – converting rural terrain in Las Condes in Santiago into an urban space – and, most importantly, the Remodelación San Borja housing complex (1966-73) by Sergio Miranda Rodriguez, Carlos Buchholtz Galigniana, and Eugenio Salvi Rosende. Remodelación San Borja is located in the center of Santiago de Chile and includes twenty housing towers accommodating ten thousand people, distributed loosely in an urban park. These buildings are connected with a network of elevated walkways (realized only partially) and surrounded by vast area of greenery. San Borja constitutes a homogenous "superblock" uninterrupted by traditional typologies, such as streets. As each tower follows the same format – a twenty-story tall building, with six

apartments per floor – San Borja is subject to the repetitive, rational geometry that defines many orthodox modernist housing projects across the globe.

Remodelación San Borja offers a representative example of the urban philosophy of CORMU, which was based on the postulates of Le Corbusier and the Charter of Athens, published in Chile in 1946.[4] Like other urban interventions realized by CORMU, San Borja was based on the idea of separation of functions within the city, the isolation of pedestrians from vehicular traffic, and the typology of towers.[5] As Rodrigo Perez de Arce writes in his study on CORMU's working method and San Borja as its example, "[a]t CORMU, the tower was defined as an a priori element. … [T]he tower was valued as an instrument to liberate the ground, making the city permeable and generating large green areas. (…) CORMU kept to the canons of modern urbanism by adopting spatial fluidity and the prevalence of green spaces as generic objects." This "unitary, formal, totalizing intention of modern urbanism and its heroic period, leaning on geometry and formal relationships" visible in San Borja corresponded with the design methods of CORMU's studio. As Perez de Arce describes, "the very mechanisms used to represent the city corresponded to those urban aspects privileged in the project: volumes were more important than any other concern. Furthermore, the presence of large urban

---

[4] Rodrigo Perez de Arce, "The Garden of Intersecting Paths: The Remodelación San Borja and the Schools of Architecture," *ARQ* 92 (2016).

[5] Ana Maria Rigotti, "El otro cruce de los Andes: Megaformas proyectadas en Argentina para Santiago" in *Sudamérica moderna: objetos, edificios, territorio*s, edited by Hugo Mondragón and Catalina Mejía (Santiago: Ediciones Arq, 2015): 206–226.

models would give the studio a character similar to the strategy room of a high military command: a stock of towers was always available."

Another project representative of the urban philosophy of CORMU was the proposed revitalization of the Western area of central Santiago, Santiago Poniente, which was expected to begin at the end of 1973, but which was permanently halted by the coup d'état in September of 1973. In 1972, CORMU announced an international competition for the revitalization of Santiago Poniente, which is located between the Mapocho River and the Bernardo O'Higgins promenade, and composed by predominantly nineteenth-century architecture. In the second half of the twentieth century Santiago Poniente had experienced a gradual disappearance of its population, and the deterioration of the neighborhood was worsened by the construction of La Avenida Norte-Sur (completed in 1975) highway, which cut it off from the city center.[6] The area to be developed included roughly sixteen blocks of Santiago Poniente, stretching between Santo Domingo street as its Northern limit, Agustinas street as Southern border, Amunátegui containing it from the East and Almirante Barroso from the West. The winning proposal, designed by a group of Argentinean architects associated with la Universidad Nacional de La Plata (Emilio Sessa, Enrique Bares, Santiago Bo, Tomas García y Roberto Germani) was a rational, modernist plan laid out on a clear grid imposed on the intricate existing urban fabric of Santiago Poniente. The

[6] See: María Isabel Pavez Reyes, *Diseño urbano inclusivo para Santiago Centro: Concurso internacional 1972 Santiago de Chile* (Santiago: Universidad de Chile, Facultad de Arquitectura y Urbanismo, 2015), 132–140.

architects reorganized the neighborhood into four larger blocks, separated car and pedestrian traffic by adding two elevated pedestrian circuits, and added underground parking spaces. Existing historic urban tissue was made more dense by adding high rise housing. Like Remodelación San Borja, Santiago Poniente became a symbol of urban planning and architecture under Eduardo Frei Montalva and Salvador Allende, both in terms of the social ideologies underlying the project and the late modern forms in which it was designed. In both of these cases, the late modern forms promoted a rationalized vision of the city that was organized and efficient, attentive to the social good if also alienating in its social effects.

After the coup, the radical political and economic transformations enabled and encouraged by the administration of Pinochet would bring about significant ideological and formal changes to architecture. Pinochet's vision for the country's development was based on the neoliberal paradigms associated with Milton Friedman's economic doctrine. A group of Chilean economists who trained at the Department of Economics at the University of Chicago, known as the "Chicago Boys," brought these principles to Chile as they returned to their home country and assumed prominent positions in Pinochet's government. Since 1960s, the Chicago Boys had been working on an economic program for Chile, which they had hoped to pursue if Jorge Alessandri Rodríguez, the candidate of the Chilean right-wing party, were to become president in the elections of 1970. After Alessandri lost to Salvador Allende, the Chicago Boys

continued working on their economic plan for Chile. This plan became known as *The Brick* (*El Ladrillo*), due to the size of the document in which it would be presented.[7] Because the Chilean economy was in a state of deep crisis during the time of Allende's government, marked with hyperinflation and significant shortages of basic consumer goods, the Chicago Boys pushed *The Brick* as a plan to recover the country's economy, promoting it among Allende's political opponents. In 1973 they presented their plan to the Navy Admiral José Toribio Merino, who would later be a part of the junta which overthrew Allende. After the coup, Pinochet – who was initially undecided regarding an economic plan for Chile – endorsed the ideas of the Chicago Boys and ultimately put the principles of *The Brick* into practice. The Pinochet administration undertook efforts of economic liberalization, including removing tariff protections for local industry and banning trade unions, as well as privatizing social security and state-owned enterprises. These policies resulted in a period of economic boom described by Friedman as the "Chilean miracle."[8] Economic growth did not benefit all Chilean citizens equally, however, and resulted in high social costs paid for by the most vulnerable members of society. While neoliberal reforms protected and benefited the interests of private enterprises and newly privatized national companies, at the same time they significantly

---

[7] Sergio de Castro, *El Ladrillo: bases de la política económica del gobierno militar chileno* (Santiago de Chile: Centro de Estudios Públicos, 1992).

[8] The boom was interrupted by two crises—the first lasting from 1975 to 1977 (with a 20% unemployment rate), and the second from 1982 to 1985, during which unemployment reached 30%.

worsened the conditions of the working class, and contributed to deepening social inequality and poverty among those who were already the least affluent.[9]

The welfare state model that existed under the governments of Frei and Allende—which held the objectives of universal access to state-provided health care, education, as well as housing—was replaced by a radically different model. Pinochet sought to sharply limit state assistance in providing these services, resulting in moves towards deregulation, privatization, and the gradual destruction of state institutions. Education, health care, and housing ceased to be considered as rights, and instead were treated as commodities which individuals should purchase using their own resources. Radical reforms were combined with strategies of political terror initiated by the military coup, involving kidnappings, torture and the murders of citizens accused of socialist sympathies. Pinochet's politics have been described by Naomi Klein the "shock doctrine" – the "brutal tactic of using the public's disorientation following a collective shock – wars, coups, terrorist attacks, market crashes or natural disasters – to push through radical pro-corporate measures."[10]

This new laissez-faire direction of Chilean politics resulted in a radical change in approach to urban space and institutions devoted to its development. As part of a broader effort to dismantle state organizations created under Frei and Allende, in 1976

---

[9] For more on the worker's situation under Pinochet see: Peter Winn (ed.), *Victims of the Chilean Miracle: Workers and Neoliberalism in the Pinochet Era, 1973–2002* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2004).

[10] Naomi Klein, "How Power Profits From Disaster," *The Guardian*, July 6 2017, https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jul/06/naomi-klein-how-power-profits-from-disaster. More: Naomi Klein, *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism* (London: Penguin, 2008).

Pinochet's administration restructured and regionalized MINVU (Ministerio de Vivienda y Urbanismo; Ministry of Housing and Urban Development).[11] CORHABIT, CORMU, CORVI, and COU were terminated and replaced by a new single institution – SERVIU (Servicios Regionales de Vivienda y Urbanización, Regional Service of Housing and Urbanization) – which took over the responsibilities of these bodies, but in a reduced and decentralized way. SERVIU embodied the philosophy that the provision of public services should operate like a private market, on a cost-effective basis, and that the role of regional, municipal governments should be to deliver only necessary services; it was not involved in decision-making. SERVIU branches were created in each region of Chile to undertake housing construction and urban maintenance services, but the organization did not have the capacity to develop any regulatory or housing plans.

Another change introduced by Pinochet's administration crucial for urban space was the National Urban Development Policy (Política Nacional de Desarrollo Urbano) announced in 1979.[12] The basic principle of this document was that "urban land is a resource which can be traded freely."[13] According to the new policy, zoning laws should be shaped by the demands of the market, "caused by economic and social activities of

---

[11] Pertinent legal decree: Decreto Ley No. 1305.
[12] Ministerio de Vivienda y Urbanismo, División de Desarrollo Urbano, *Política Nacional de Desarrollo Urbano*, Publicación No. 114 (March 1979). Full document accessible online: http://politicaurbana.minvu.cl/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/Politica_19791.pdf. In 1985, the document was replaced with a new National Urban Development Policy, in which the State took more responsibility for urban planning. The change was almost entirely symbolic as it wasn't followed by concrete actions or tools allowing the State to take actual active role. For more see: Abraham Shapira, "Renovación Urbana: en busca de Consenso," *AUCA* 50/51 (1986), 17.
[13] Ministerio de Vivienda y Urbanismo, *Política Nacional*, 11.

the population" and should be guided by "observation and rigorous study of market behavior."[14] This shift towards radical privatization was solidified with the new Chilean constitution introduced in 1980. This document, replacing the earlier constitution effective from 1925, was approved by Chilean voters in the government-controlled plebiscite of October 05, 1988. The constitution of 1980 was subjected to the principles promoted by the Chicago Boys' school of economic thought. One of the most distinctive elements of the new constitution was a strong focus on the protection of private property, which had serious consequences for urban space. The new constitution, unlike the previous, did not impose limitations on private interventions in urban spaces that were harmful to the public interest. Likewise, urban regulation plans at the local level were subject to easy repeal if shown to be too restrictive and harmful to the interests of private owners.[15]

Another crucial aspect of the privatization of architecture and the city under Pinochet's dictatorship was its post-1973 approach to housing, which contributed greatly to the increasing segregation of Chilean society. Housing ceased to be considered as a universal human right protected by the State. It was, instead, ruled by the principles of supply and demand. Following the National Urban Development Policy announced in 1979, the role of the State in providing housing was limited to people living in extreme poverty. The government's solution for the housing crisis was characterized by

[14] Ibid.
[15] *Constitución de Chile de 1980* (Article 24) (Barcelona: Linkgua 2018), 27.

the displacement of the urban poor to the peripheries. Moreover, as government agencies such as CORMU and CORVI were terminated, the construction of housing was awarded to private companies. The main criteria of obtaining a commission for new housing were price and realization time, not quality. As a result, Pinochet's responses to the housing crisis were oriented towards immediate, makeshift solutions instead of creating holistic urban environments contributing to a healthy, balanced society in the long term.[16]

As a consequence of these new policies, between 1979 and 1985, around 30,000 families living in *campamentos* located in the otherwise wealthy north-east area of Santiago were displaced and the land was sold to private owners. They were moved to South and North-West areas of the city, creating neighborhoods consisting solely of inhabitants living in poverty. As many researchers have shown, the urban policies implemented under Pinochet had severe and long lasting social consequences. Large scale displacement undertaken by Pinochet's government created "homogenous communities, thereby accentuating the already extreme level of residential segregation in the city."[17] In this sense, as historians Cristián Palacios and César Leyton argue, the free market approach to urban space resulted in displacements that had disastrous social consequences. These can be seen – much like the concentration camps built by the

---

[16] See: Rodrigo Hidalgo Dattwyler, *La vivienda social en Chile y la construcción del espacio urbano en el Santiago del siglo XX* (Santiago de Chile: PUC, 2005).

[17] David A. Preston, *Latin American Development: Geographical Perspectives* (New York: Routledge, 1996), 268; see also: Alberto Gurovich W., "La Pintana: la ciudad interminable," *Revista INVI* 9 (1990): 5–19.

regime for members of the opposition – as spatial manifestations of Pinochet's biopolitics.[18] Pinochet's approach to housing quickly led to a situation in which citizens with the lowest income were able to afford only housing in the peripheries, mostly without adequate infrastructure and lacking access to resources and opportunities available in more desirable locations, populated only by those from the middle and upper middle classes.

In addition to transforming housing policies according to the principles of the free market, Pinochet's administration also introduced changes that affected the ways that architects worked and exchanged ideas. Pinochet's regime oversaw the liquidation of professional associations (Colegios Profesionales) – organizations whose goal was to ensure standards of ethics and integrity among active professionals. Colegios Profesionales had the power of granting (and revoking) professional titles in professions such as law, medicine, journalism and architecture. Membership in these associations was mandatory for each professional working in Chile. One such entity was the Colegio de Arquitectos de Chile (Chilean College of Architects), established in 1942.[19] For Pinochet's advisors, such organizations operated against the principles of the free market – they created monopolies by benefiting their members only and by disallowing individuals with more competitive services to enter the market. In 1981, as a result of a

---

[18] Rebolledo, Mauricio Becerra, "Las olvidadas erradicaciones de la dictadura" (interview with Cristián Palacios and César Leyton), *El Ciudadano*, December 17 2012, https://www.elciudadano.cl/entrevistas/las-olvidadas-erradicaciones-de-la-dictadura/12/17/.

[19] For more information on architectural organizations in Chile see: Cristián Jara Jara, *Ciudad, sociedad y accion Gremial: los arquitectos de Chile en el siglo XX* (Santiago de Chile: LOM Ediciones, 2015).

new regulation (Ley 3.163) introduced by Pinochet's government, professional associations were transformed into Asociaciones Gremiales (professional unions). Like Colegios Profesionales, these organizations also grouped individuals of the same profession, but they were no longer authorized by law to grant and revoke professional titles. The Colegio de Arquitectos de Chile was turned into an Asociación Gremial. Although still operating under the same name as before the reform, it ceased to have any actual, legal power to ensure that Chilean architecture would benefit society rather than simply generate profit for developers and designers. The Colegio's power and independence were also crippled by the government's intervention in its structure. Before the coup, the management of the organization (including its president), was elected by members of the Colegio. After the coup and before the regulation in 1981, Pinochet's Ministry of the Interior and Public Security replaced the democratically-elected vice president and president with their own nominations (Adela Celis and Cristián Fernandez). This form of governmental direct influence on Colegio's structure would remain in place until 1982, when the Colegio turned into an Asociación Gremial and lost its legal power to control the architectural market in Chile, and at which point direct intervention became unnecessary.[20]

[20] More in: Jara Jara, 61–63. When discussing the condition of the Colegio under the regime, one cannot forget the kidnappings and murders of its members accused by the regime of leftist affiliations, which occurred with Pinochet's intensified efforts between 1973 and 1976 to rid the country of the opposition.

Despite these interventions, architectural circles under Pinochet's rule were not entirely controlled. Architects were still able to hold professional meetings of a formal and informal character. More generally, the question of censorship was complicated during Pinochet's rule, and changed over the course of the 1970s. Initially, with the coup in 1973, the government established La Dirección Nacional de Comunicación Social (DINACOS, National Directorate of Social Communication), which was in charge of supervision and censorship of all media, as well as of managing official government messages sent to the press and television. Radio, television, as well as newspapers and magazines published in Chile were screened and revised by DINACOS, and if the content was considered inappropriate, the publication needed to be corrected and send back for revision. However, as historian Steve J. Stern describes, with time, "direct censorship of all media had begun to give way to a more subtle and layered pattern of control."[21] Thus, outlets such as magazines or minor radio stations "would evolve through self-censorship and an inconsistent, unpredictable government vigilance. The result, by 1976-77, was the appearance of a limited media pluralism."[22] Despite continual arrests and repressions – such as harassment and threats – of journalists, waning intensity of censorship made it possible to publish even harsh critiques of the government – a phenomenon that often baffled international observers. In 1986, New

---

[21] Steve J. Stern, *Battling for Hearts and Minds: Memory Struggles in Pinochet's Chile, 1973–1988* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2006), 62.
[22] Ibid.

York Times correspondent Shirley Christian reported that, to her surprise, "the kiosks of Santiago were selling a variety of newsmagazines whose splashy covers accused the Government of terrorism and torture and showed a caricature of President Augusto Pinochet sprouting horns."[23]

In this context, it is easy to see how the content published in architectural magazines or presented during exhibitions could be critical of the government, while also self-regulating. Indeed, architectural magazines and exhibitions were not directly censored by the government. Neither of the two major architectural magazines in Chile during this period – *CA* (Revista Oficial del Colegio de Arquitectos de Chile), published semiannually from 1968 by the Colegio, and *AUCA* (Arquitectura, Urbanismo, Construcción, Arte), a particularly left-leaning independent magazine existing from 1965 to 1986 – was subjected to censorship.[24] For one thing, it is important to realize that despite the fact that the government used architecture for propagandistic purposes (as we will consider in the cases of Plaza de la Constitución and the Chilean Congress) and imposed restrictions on Chilean architects (visible in the control over Colegio's management), architecture was not in fact seen as a particularly dangerous discipline. As a technical and pragmatic profession, architecture was considered generally as a politically innocuous field and the government's interventions in it were concerned

---

[23] Shirley Christian, "Chile's Handcuffed Press can Still Jab at Pinochet," *The New York Times*, September 4 1986, http://www.nytimes.com/1986/09/04/world/chile-s-handcuffed-press-can-still-jab-at-pinochet.html.
[24] For more on *AUCA*, see: Pablo Fuentes Hernández, "La revista AUCA, 1965-1986: divulgación de la arquitectura y contribución disciplinar en el epílogo de la modernidad," *Arquitectura Revista* 7.2 (2011): 126–141, http://revistas.unisinos.br/index.php/arquitetura/article/view/arq.2011.72.04/638.

mainly with minimizing the role of state support in architectural enterprises, and in ensuring that the field operates under the principles of the free market.

At the same time, the broader context of censorship and persecution of members of the opposition affected architectural discourse in subtler ways. Just as Steve J. Stern described a shift from "direct censorship of all media … to a more subtle and layered pattern of control," magazines like *CA* and *AUCA* became to a certain extent self-regulated by architects themselves. As architect Humberto Eliash recalls,

> There wasn't explicit censorship of architectural publications or debates. But, for example, I remember that during a lot of the discussions during the Bienial de Arquitectura [an architectural event in Santiago, organized from 1977 by the Colegio – lk], the public, especially the students, was voicing critical opinions against the government. Discussions which were part of the Bienial were then published in the *CA*, but excluding these voices. So there was a form of internal censorship within Colegio, and people were careful about what they were publishing.[25]

Thus with its radically different economic and political agendas, Pinochet's regime brought about a range of changes to architecture and urban design in Chile. Restructuring the Ministry of Housing and Urban Development (dissolving organizations like CORMU) and replacing it with SERVIU, left behind the uniform model of late modernist housing and prioritized the protection of private property and the privatization of housing. Additionally, the changes to professional organizations and to censorship drastically changed the nature of architectural discourse, which, while not directly censored, adopted modes of self-censorship. The government's relationship

[25] Humberto Eliash, interview by the author.

with architecture can be described on the one hand as hands-off, based on the philosophy of laissez-fare and showing no official interest in architecture. On the other hand, Pinochet's administration's regulations and policies had a significant effect on architecture, and the boom in commercial architecture of the seventies and eighties provided tangible evidence of the country's growth. Moreover, new architectural realizations commissioned by the government – the Plaza de la Constitución and the Congreso de Chile – marked two of the most significant political events in the post-coup history of Chile. Both of them were postmodern designs.

1.2 Postmodern Architecture as Propaganda: Plaza de la Constitución and Congreso de Chile

The Plaza de la Constitución (Constitution Square) occupies one hectare north of the entrance façade of the neoclassical presidential palace Palacio de la Moneda in the heart of Santiago de Chile. It is surrounded by other government and State buildings, such as the Chilean Central Bank and the ministries of Justice, Finance, and Foreign Affairs. Due to its prominent location, Plaza de la Constitución was also used as a space for social and political manifestations, but on a day-to-day basis served as a large parking lot for cars. From 1973 on, Plaza de la Constitución increasingly took on new meanings. During the coup, the Palacio de la Moneda was bombarded by Chilean air forces, and Allende – who refused to leave – committed suicide or (according to other sources) was murdered by the military junta. After the coup, La Moneda no longer served as a presidential seat, and its basements were used to detain and torture political

opponents. For years after the coup, the regime used spaces underneath Plaza de la Constitución as a secret torture chamber known as "El Hoyo" ("The Hole").[26] In 1980, the Municipality of Santiago announced a national, public competition for the renovation of Plaza de la Constitución.[27] It was won by the office of Cristián Undurraga and Ana Luisa Devés – architects known both for their postmodern preferences and for being well positioned with prominent figures connected with the government.[28]

Their project was based on a simple layout with a clear reference to traditional urban typologies. According to the new design, the square is divided into four parts by two diagonal lines constituting pedestrian paths. As a result, the Plaza de la Constitución was divided in four triangles. The triangle before the entrance to La Moneda is paved, and the remaining three are covered with grass. An additional pedestrian path runs perpendicularly towards the façade, which emphasizes the bilateral symmetry of the design. The paths are connected in the middle with a circular, paved plaza. The utterly traditional form of the Plaza de la Constitución – bringing to mind an array of historical associations, from idealized Italian renaissance urban designs

---

[26] Julia Talarn Rabascall, "Chile's presidential palace basement was Pinochet's torture chamber," *Agencia EFE*, October 16 2016, https://www.efe.com/efe/english/world/chile-s-presidential-palace-basement-was-pinochet-torture-chamber/50000262-3069436.
[27] Cristián Undurraga, and Ana Luisa Devés, "Plaza de la Constitución," *CA* 41 (1985), 193–194.
[28] Undurraga & Devés was one of the most successful architectural firms in Pinochet's Chile. In addition to Plaza de la Constitución, the architects received a prestigious and lucrative government commission for urban furniture and small architecture in major Chilean cities. In their interviews, architects Pilar Garcia and Fernando Pérez Oyarzun both mention that Cristián Undurraga was well connected with Pinochet's administration. See Pilar Garcia, interview by the author, Santiago de Chile, Chile, September 1 2016 (published in Appendix); Fernando Pérez Oyarzun, interview by the author, Santiago de Chile, Chile, September 6 2016 (published in Appendix).

to the regularity of French baroque formal gardens – corresponds with the neoclassical form of the palace. Because of the simplicity of the design, traditional typologies – path, plaza and court – are exposed and presented in a distilled, purified form. For these reasons, the Plaza de la Constitución is often described as one of the most consequently postmodern realizations in Chile.[29]

Undurraga's and Devés's design effectively erased the democratic character of the previous space. Unruly and unregulated, the pre-1973 Plaza de la Constitución responded to citizens' needs – from manifesting dissent and opinions on current political events to performing the mundane and ordinary function of providing parking spaces. The new design did not maintain any connection with the people, its ceremonial and official character resembling more of a baroque *cour d'honneur* than a civic space. More importantly, the historicizing design of Undurraga and Devés erases memory, covering up the darkest history of the space with clean, elegant forms. Historian Steve Stern interprets Plaza de la Constitución in the context of the introduction of the new Chilean constitution, and describes this new urban realization as a "part of the military regime's institutionalization project and celebration of a new Constitution," which deliberately silenced the collective memory of this space.[30] The significance of the new design for the Plaza de la Constitución was well captured by a representative of the

[29] Francisco Díaz et al., *Docoposmo: Documentacion y Conversaciones Sobre el Posmoderno* (guide in the form of leaflet), Santiago 2008.
[30] Steve J. Stern, *Reckoning with Pinochet: The Memory Question in Democratic Chile, 1989–2006* (Durham: Duke University Press, 2010), 266.

Human Rights Watch who in 1988 was delegated to report on the human rights situation in Chile:

> I looked down on Santiago's famous Plaza de la Constitución, where citizens historically gathered to praise or protest the actions of their government. At first the expanse of grass in the plaza was pleasing, it was so green and neat. Then I remembered that it was Pinochet's poorly paid minimum-work program for Chile's large unemployed population that kept the parks so clean, indeed among the cleanest in the world. Pinochet had changed the layout of the plaza. More than two thirds of the traditional cobblestone public space was now subdivided into a series of well-kept elevated grassy sections. Citizens could walk along the guarded pathways but not congregate in the plaza—discouraging to protest.[31]

The Plaza de la Constitución's postmodern character then differs dramatically from the forms of postmodernism normally studied in Western Europe and North America. Its classical references to the Italian renaissance and the French baroque serve to destroy the democratic character of the original site (as well as to literally cover up the murders and torture that had taken place beneath its ground) and to boost a specifically political image of grandiosity and civilization. Rather than playful in its use of historical references, here the references are projected as conscious indications of authority and power utterly without irony.

If the establishment of the new constitution in 1980 was one significant political event that Pinochet's administration symbolically signaled through a work of postmodern architecture, then the Chilean national plebiscite in 1988 was another, as it would be accompanied by the new building for the Chilean Congress. The constitution

---

[31] Alfred Stepan, "The Last Days of Pinochet?," *The New York Review*, June 2 1988, http://www.nybooks.com/articles/1988/06/02/the-last-days-of-pinochet/.

had established eight years in advance the 1988 plebiscite, which could result in two scenarios: If Pinochet were to be approved for another eight years, parliamentary elections would take place nine months after he is sworn into office. Alternatively, if Pinochet were to lose, both presidential and parliamentary elections would follow. In the years following the new constitution, Pinochet's administration introduced legislative changes in preparation for future democratic elections. Most importantly, two laws, one which allowed the creation of (non-leftist) political parties, and another, which opened national registers to voters, both passed in 1987. The return of democracy assumed reinstating the Chilean National Congress, which had been dissolved by Pinochet in 1973.

As the old, nineteenth-century Congress Building located in Santiago needed renovation, planned elections sparked discussions regarding the space the congress would occupy in the future. In 1987, Pinochet's administration announced the decision to erect a new building instead of renovating the old one. Moreover, it was decided that the new building would be located in Valparaíso, the decaying port city located 77 miles from Santiago.[32] The official reasons for the move were the intention to decentralize power in Chile and to initiate urban renewal of Valparaíso. As Francisco Díaz mentions in an article about the new congress building, both stated reasons are ultimately unconvincing: the constitution ratified by the military government in fact reinforces the

[32] As a result of Law N°18.678 signed in December 24th of 1987. See: https://www.leychile.cl/Navegar?idNorma=30064&idParte=.

centralization of power, and the government did not plan to undertake any efforts to stimulate Valparaíso's development besides the Congress. Additionally, it was clear that the congressmen would commute to Valparaíso from Santiago (especially since the highway between Santiago and Valparaíso had been recently improved), rather than move there permanently, thereby potentially stimulate the process of revitalization of the city. Since Pinochet hoped to still hold power after the elections, both the declaration of decentralization of power and the implied message that the president cares about the forgotten parts of the country were intended to improve Pinochet's image among voters. Indeed, following Díaz, we can then understand the motives behind the decision to build a new edifice for the Congress in Valparaíso as primarily strategic, political, and propagandistic. Further, Díaz argues that an additional factor behind the decision to move the Congress was the rise of anti-government riots in Chilean capital cities (which had intensified especially in 1987), making "Santiago seem like a city under the constant threat of social upheavals."[33] If Pinochet were to win the plebiscite, the Congress would likely be a place that would attract the opposition's riots in the next eight years of his term. Valparaíso, as a more peripheral location, would be less likely to face protests or to attract public attention. Another explanation provided by Díaz: in a de facto "centralized state, the idea of sending the only institution able to monitor the actions of the government as far away as possible, might have seduced more than one within the

[33] Díaz, "Los arquitectos y la falta de memoria."

Regime." As the Congress was one institution capable of monitoring Pinochet's regime, the physical distance could minimize the capacity for such oversight.[34]

The national competition for the Congress building was announced at the end of 1987, and the results were announced on June 30 1988, three months before the plebiscite's results. The organizers (Dirección de Arquitectura de Ministerio de Obras Públicas – Architecture Department at the Ministry of Public Works and Colegio de Arquitectos de Chile) received 539 projects. The winning entry was a design of the team of Juan Cárdenas, José Covacevic, and Raúl Farrú – designers of the UNCTAD building, one of the most important examples of Chilean modernism (realized in 1972). In the statement discussing the results, the organizers stated that Cárdenas', Covacevic's, and Farrú's "project fully fulfilled the requirements asked in the commission: to project over Valparaíso's plan a building of national and monumental character, and also austere, dignified and transcendent, able to house the Chilean National Congress."[35] The edifice is constituted by two parts of monumental scale: a long nine-story horizontal volume that contains the two chambers (chamber of deputies and chamber of senate) and the plenary room, and a twenty-story vertical part that houses the offices for the congressmen. The latter is a large cuboid with a square-shaped opening in its lower middle part. The entrance is located in the center of the horizontal volume and

---

[34] Ibid.

[35] "Resumen de Presentación del Fallo. Primer Premio," *CA* 60 (1990), 29. Quoted in Díaz (his translation), "Los arquitectos y la falta de memoria," 11.

emphasized by a large portico. The portico is covered with a massive grid-like roof supported on twelve columns with plain shafts resembling Doric order and stylized, terracotta-red capitals loosely evoking Egyptian temples or art deco architecture with its geometricized forms. An additional four oversized columns with shafts clad with charcoal tiles and red, cuboid-shaped capitals flank the entrance, two on each side. The postmodern edifice juxtaposing various historical references and freely mixing different colors and materials (dark-red stone, charcoal tiles and ochre concrete) pleased not only the jury, but according to architect Pablo Allard, also Pinochet himself, who said, "since I saw the models, I knew this was the winner."[36]

Some of the architects who decided not to take part in the competition (as Díaz points out, if we include interns working on the entries, the number comes to approximately 2,000 participants, which adds up to half of the architectural companies registered in Chile) openly criticized those who decided to get involved. Among them was Victor Gubbins, who interpreted the high interest in the competition as a sign of ethical crisis within the profession: "Are we the architects called to fulfill a political and public role in our country?" Gubbins asked. "What is the perception that people and authorities have about our profession? What is the perception we have of ourselves?"[37]

---

[36] Pablo Allard, "Traslademos el Congreso," *La Tercera* (April 9, 2012), 38.

[37] Victor Gubbins, "Mesa Redonda: Descentralización, Edificio y Entorno," *CA* 60 (1990), 68. Quoted in Díaz, "Los arquitectos y la falta de memoria," 10.

Fernando Pérez Oyarzun, another prominent Chilean architect, asked similar questions regarding the competition:

> What is the reason behind the success in participation in a competition on a topic like moving the Congress to Valparaíso that boosted so much criticism from public opinion as well as from the architects themselves? The first, and certainly the less comfortable [answer], might be that as architects we abandoned any conviction, or at least we put them in doubt, in front of the chance of a commission as significant and interesting as this competition…[38]

Díaz describes the propagandistic function of the new building of the Chilean Congress as an effort to signal "a new beginning for Chilean political history" and an attempt to "clean up the past by merging it with the future."[39] In this way the Congress building is analogous to the the Plaza de la Constitución in its effort to "clean up the past" through its classicizing design. Like the Plaza de la Constitución, the Congreso de Chile's postmodern design evokes the grandiosity of classicism and thus responds to the commission's request for a project that is "austere, dignified and transcendent," in this way departing in intent from the ironic playfulness of Western European or North American postmodern projects. However, the Congreso's evident referentiality plays a significant role in projecting a crafted image of Pinochet's regime as well. With its obvious throwbacks and recuperations of various styles, the building projects an aesthetic dynamism and an innovative and modern spirit to the Pinochet government. This self-consciously crafted perception inherent to Cárdenas's, Covacevic's, and Farrú's

---

[38] Fernando Pérez Oyarzun, "Notas críticas sobre el concurso del Edificio del Congreso," *CA* 60 (1990), 41. Quoted in Díaz, "Los arquitectos y la falta de memoria," 10.
[39] Díaz, "Los arquitectos y la falta de memoria," 6–7.

design undoubtedly appealed to Pinochet's commission, as projecting a more democratic and modern character was an essential goal of the government in the years leading up to the plebiscite.

Pinochet's efforts to improve his image with a spectacular, architectural symbol of his new, pro-democratic orientation proved to be unsuccessful. In June of 1989, when it was already known that Pinochet would be stepping down, the dictator travelled to Valparaíso to visit the construction site of the new Congress building. He was welcomed by a crowd of workers chanting "que se vaya!" (leave/get out of here). As recorded in the footage documenting the visit, Pinochet asked the team assisting him to take close-up pictures of protesting workers to identify them later.[40] These commands were in fact nothing but empty threats, echoes of Pinochet's former power, as it was clear that Chile had entered a post-dictatorial era.

The two architectural realizations commissioned by the government during Pinochet's reign, one which marked the 1980 constitution and the other which marked the plebiscite, both employed postmodern forms in explicitly propagandistic and political ways. By sincerely evoking grandiosity and authority through its classical designs and by utilizing references to project a spirit of innovation, the Pinochet government made postmodernism compatible to its aims. In the very same years,

[40] Video available online: https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=i9MagkfOYPg.

postmodern forms and ideology were also used by architects who opposed the dictatorship and its politics, as the following chapter explores.

2. Postmodernism Against the State: Chile

If postmodernism functioned as propaganda for the government of Pinochet, in the same years, postmodern ideas were also utilized by Chilean architects who opposed Pinochet's policies. The most significant example of designers who used architecture to foster social and political change against Pinochet's regime was CEDLA (Centro de Estudios de Arquitectura, Center for Architectural Studies), an independent collective of Chilean architects established in 1977 in Santiago. The group was formed as an independent effort to reflect on architecture and urban planning in Chile under the military government. After the coup, Pinochet's government replaced the authorities and some of the faculty of major Chilean universities, which, beginning in October 1973, began to be governed by military officers appointed by Pinochet.[1] Additionally, professional associations (including Colegio de Arquitectos) were infiltrated by governmental nominations. Therefore, as the institutions that had previously provided space for architectural discourse were restricted, CEDLA emerged out of a need to create an alternative platform for architectural thought, less inhibited by political operatives.

In an important sense, the group was formed as a critical response to the neoliberal vision of urban space and architecture promoted by Pinochet. However, at the same time, CEDLA rejected the orthodox modernist approach to city planning favored

[1] Legal decree: Decreto Ley 50, October 1, 1973. Full text: https://www.leychile.cl/Navegar/index_html?idNorma=5702.

by the previous governments of Frei and Allende, even as it embraced their pro-social postulates including the conviction that architecture is a social service rather than a commodity driven by profit. CEDLA used postmodern forms and theories in architecture and city planning in order to explore the possibility of formulating an alternative socially conscious architecture that embraced neither the anonymity of modern design nor the neoliberalism of Pinochet.

2.1 The Origins of CEDLA and Its Emergence in Santiago

CEDLA was founded in Santiago de Chile in 1977 by Humberto Eliash, Cristián Boza, and Pedro Murtinho.[2] The history of the group dates back to 1975 when Eliash and Boza met at the Architectural Association in London. Eliash was a fresh graduate from Universidad de Chile and Boza had an adjunct teaching position at the Architectural Association. In England, Eliash and Boza established contact with Fernando Castillo Velazco, one of the most prominent proponents of modernist architecture in Chile and the former president of Pontifica Universidad Católica de Chile (1967-1973), but who had been removed from office in 1973 by Pinochet's government and forced to leave the country because of his socialist beliefs. The idea of CEDLA evolved during frequent meetings and discussions between the three architects, but the group was only materialized when Eliash and Boza decided to return to Santiago in 1975 to establish

[2] Other members include: José Gabril Alemparte, Pablo Astaburuaga, Cristián Boza, Fernando Boza, Miguel Catillo, Ricardo Contreras, Hernan Duval, Humberto Eliash, Luis Gonzáles, Eugenio Guzmán, Gullermo Hevia, Jose Larrain, Teresa Lima-Campos, Carlos Lopez, Roberto Lopez, Jorge Luhrs, Ignacio Martínez, Pedro Murtinho, José F. Muzard, Rodolfo Opazo, Andrés Pinto, Santiago Raby, Eduardo Walker, and Diana Wilson (as listed in the editorial page of the 1977 issue of *CEDLA*).

their professional practices. Castillo Velazco could not join them, as he remained in political exile.[3] Another figure who influenced CEDLA's emergence and program was Fernando Montes – Chilean architect working in France, who in 1977 established contact with Boza and proposed to give a series of presentations on postmodern architecture and theory to the CEDLA circle.

In London, Boza and Eliash had discussed the paradigms for architecture and urbanism that departed from the modernist approach that had shaped their education as architects and their early careers in Chile. For these architects, that approach was represented by CORMU's flagship designs – namely, Remodelación San Borja, and the winning proposal for the Santiago Poniente competition. Cristián Boza, who had briefly worked at CORMU after graduation, describes the experience working there as one of the experiences that caused him to reconsider his approach to architecture as well as his future interest in postmodernism:

> One day in 1972, my director at CORMU asked me and my friend to go and buy wooden blocks. We had no idea why we were doing this, but we got the blocks and returned to the office. When we came back we finally learned what they were needed for – they were used as models for buildings, he just took these blocks and arranged them evenly on the ground. I thought he must be joking! How can you build the city from wooden blocks like that? At this moment I really started to think about what 'the city' is and what 'city planning' is.[4]

Boza's experience at CORMU, in his telling, prompted a desire to think about architecture and urbanism differently. Although the CEDLA members criticized

---

[3] Eliash and Boza underline the importance of Castillo Velazco's support for the emergence of CEDLA. See interviews with Humberto Eliash and Cristián Boza published in Appendix.

[4] Boza, interview by the author.

CORMU's modernist paradigms and reductive approach to the city, at the same time they shared one view fundamental for the organization – namely, that architecture is a social service. Pedro Murtinho, another founding member of CEDLA, summed up the group's attitude towards CORMU as following:

> San Borja and Santiago Poniente were symbols of CORMU's approach to the city based on the worst paradigms of modernism and Le Corbusier's urbanism based on the isolated tower as a solution to urban problems. There was no thought behind it and we were against it. (…) We stood with CORMU's message of building for the people, working for the people, instead of subjecting architecture to market rules. But their approach to planning wasn't well thought through.[5]

Similarly, Eliash states that "CORMU promoted something we wanted as well – urban renewal – but they realized it in a fundamentally different, modernist, way. But we were supportive of the idea that the State takes responsibility for planning, and doesn't give the city entirely to private hands as we saw under Pinochet."[6] CEDLA's criticisms of CORMU's realizations were not based on disagreements with the view of urban planning as a social mission with a long term goal of creating just and egalitarian urban environments, since, as Boza said, "CEDLA shared with CORMU a pro-social idea of the city."[7] The disagreement was based on the design philosophy applied to achieve these goals. For CEDLA, modernist solutions such as high rises and the elimination of the street were alienating, antisocial, and incapable of building community through architecture. Postmodern forms and theories offered a vision of an inclusive city – a

---

[5] Pedro Murtinho, interview by the author, Santiago de Chile, Chile, September 01 2016 (published in Appendix).
[6] Eliash, interview by the author.
[7] Boza, interview by the author.

need especially urgent in times of Pinochet's regime – while avoiding the failed promises of modernism.

While founded on the criticism of modern paradigms embodied by the design methods promoted within CORMU, the crucial impulse for the emergence of CEDLA arose in response to the neoliberal policies of Pinochet. As the free market philosophy was applied to urban space, Santiago and other Chilean cities became populated with architectural formats harmful to urban social life. A characteristic example of this are *caracoles* (literally, "snails"): commercial centers adapting the form of Frank Lloyd Wright's Guggenheim Museum in New York for retail purposes, and which were built abundantly in the seventies and eighties in Chilean regional capitals, especially Santiago. With small stores owned or rented by separate individuals and arranged around a spiral pedestrian ramp unfolding around a central void, caracoles created isolated spaces separated from the city while appropriating the traditional functions of the street[8]. In order to attract customers, the architecture of caracoles was spectacular and clearly distinguished from its surroundings – examples vary from two massive, connected cylinders of Dos Caracoles (Sergio Larraín García-Moreno, Ignacio Covarrubias and Jorge Swinburn, 1978) to a bizarre form resembling an Aztec pyramid in La Pirámide del Sol (1977, Octavio Soto de Angelis, both in Santiago). Their interiors,

---

[8] The buildings were owned and administered by individuals or companies who were responsible for their maintenance. Individual retail units within caracoles were either rented or owned. In the latter case, owners paid monthly maintenance fees to the building's administration.

with gaudy, sculptural chandeliers, colorful neon lights, abundance of gold and colorful tiles, were designed to evoke luxury and the image of a "Western" commercial center. Caracoles were a social phenomenon and not just an architectural type. As a result of the rapid rise of unemployment caused by the market opening to imported goods and broader financial crises sweeping the country, many Chileans opened their own small business (stores and services) as a way to survive under this new economic reality. Caracoles arose as an architectural response to this need. At the same time, as architectural historian Liliana de Simone noted, caracoles were "symbolic constructions" and symbols of the "awaited and expected progress, imbued with the discourses of modernization advocated by the military regime."[9] While they performed pragmatic architectural functions as retail spaces, caracoles were also monuments of the new, neoliberal society with individual entrepreneurship as its foundation. As Germán del Sol noted in *ARS*, an architecture magazine run by the CEDLA group,

> A walk through Santiago and other [Chilean – lk] cities is enough to notice the appearance of new architecture (…) Mayan and Aztec pyramids covered with stainless steel, [with] clean facades of crystal and bright mirrors which (…) hide the building and defy gravity giving it an ethereal appearance. This architecture, which is being realized with many, often excessive, means (…) seems to have borrowed the principles which govern them from the laws of the market, transforming it into a merchandise ready to be consumed.[10]

---

[9] de Simone, "*Caracoles* comerciales."

[10] From interview with German del Sol in "Vanguardia y Post Modernismo en Chile," *ARS* 4 (1981), 28.

Del Sol's statements are concluded with Eliash's cartoon showing *La Pirámide del Sol* building and two people standing in front of it. "Maya?" – asks the first figure. "No, Friedman" – answers the second.[11]

For CEDLA, caracoles were symptomatic of the destruction of public space, and the elimination of its social and community-oriented potential, under Pinochet's rule. As caracoles gradually took over urban space and replaced typologies that had traditionally fostered egalitarian social interactions between people of different incomes and social statuses – for instance, streets or city squares – they became symbols of new Chilean urban space ruled by profit and accessible only by people of a certain economic status. CEDLA's interest in the postmodern revival of traditional typologies was a statement against the commodification of urban space – urban space turned into "a merchandise ready to be consumed"[12] – as embodied by new commercial spatial formats.

Before the coup, Boza and Eliash's intention was to connect their career work as practicing architects in Santiago with pedagogy and conceptual work, and they planned to pursue these goals within university structures. However, upon returning to Chile, they found that the politicized character of post-1973 educational institutions made that goal impossible. In Chile, they were joined by Pedro Murtinho, who shared their interest in architectural theory and who already had an established position in Santiago as a co-owner of Larraín Murtinho y Asociados studio (founded in 1963). As a group of three

---

[11] Ibid.
[12] Ibid.

they established the scope, goals, and structure of CEDLA. The group disseminated its ideas through publications, exhibitions, conferences, and meetings held at a townhouse located on Pedro de Valdivia 872 – the main seat of the group. Between 1977 and 1990, CEDLA managed to invite major South American and international architects (Justo Solsona, Juvenal Baracco, Michael Graves, Aldo Rossi, Peter Eisenman, Sue Rogers, among others) for discussions and lectures, with the intention to undo the isolation of Chilean architectural discourse during the dictatorship.

Reflecting on the main goals of CEDLA and its emergence in Santiago, Boza, Eliash, and Murtinho emphasize its political character and its strong anti-government position. Murtinho described CEDLA's goals as such:

> CEDLA was a critical movement concerned with architecture, but also with the state of the country. It brought strength and energy to criticize the current situation – the situation reduced to consumerism, mercantilism and capitalism. I am not a communist. But the Chicago school that took over the country together with the start of the dictatorship was terrible. We weren't political in the sense that we weren't linked to any political party, but CEDLA was a social project. It was a statement against the neoliberal treatment of the city as commodity, and in this sense it was oppositional.[13]

Eliash described the political nature of the group in a similar way:

> CEDLA was a political project. We treated architecture as a social agent. Chilean society at that time was very divided and the neoliberal politics produced two things we were strongly opposing. The first was segregation, which pushed low income people outside the city limits and welcomed only the middle and upper middle class in the city center. The second was that Pinochet's neoliberalism produced isolation, the society was becoming increasingly disintegrated and people were losing a sense of community. In this sense, CEDLA and Santiago Poniente were social and political statements, statements against that.[14]

---

[13] Murtinho, interview by the author.
[14] Eliash, interview by the author.

The major platform that expressed the importance of postmodern theories for CEDLA – and more generally the major platform for communicating all ideas and projects developed by members of the group – was a magazine released approximately once a year. Its first issue appeared under the name of *CEDLA* in 1977, and the following were published as *ARS: revista latinoamericana de arquitectura Chilena*. *ARS* had eleven issues, published between 1978 and 1990. The magazine was distributed among architectural circles in Chile and other South American countries, and was financed from the resources of CEDLA members as well as from advertisements of companies operating in the Chilean architecture industry.[15] *ARS* published articles written by CEDLA members as well as invited contributors. The scope of texts included general reflections on theory of architecture and urban planning, but held an especially strong focus on postmodern theories, discussions of recent realizations and projects in Chile, as well as analyses and critiques of the government's approach to urban space. In the final two issues (in 1989 and 1990), *ARS* began to expand its scope to look at Latin America more broadly, but primarily the magazine focused on Chile, analyzing the possible architectural solutions that could counter the neoliberal ideology gradually destroying Chilean cities and society. As one essay authored by CEDLA from a 1984 issue of *ARS* reads, "In a few years we have experienced the boom and decay of a neoliberal

---

[15] In 1979, CEDLA tried to implement a different way of financing the magazine. With the distribution of third issue, CEDLA attached a letter asking the recipients to pay for the magazine, but as it proved unsuccessful, the architects continued to finance it through advertisement and their own money.

economic system, based on the apparatus created by the military regime (…) For architectural culture, this period (…) may have been more damaging than the inexorable scarcity of resources (economic and architectural) that we always struggled with."[16] In the same issue, Cristián Fernandez Cox diagnosed this situation as the time of "populist ethics and aesthetics (…), the aesthetics of the market."[17]

The postmodern theories promoted by the CEDLA members were presented as possible tools for countering architecture shaped by the neoliberal ideology of military government. As its members emphasize, CEDLA's interest in postmodernism was not primarily formalist or commercial in orientation, as was common among Western architects of the seventies and eighties. Postmodernism for CEDLA signified not the repetition of historical forms, but an exploration "of our roots, and of how our cities function."[18] In Boza's words, for CEDLA,

> postmodernism was not only about columns and friezes. It was about regaining our identity. (...)We did not agree with the military government. We were talking about liberation, about bringing our country and its particular architecture back.[19]

This manner of embracing postmodernism as a way of "regaining identity" can be contrasted with the signaling of classical grandiosity and of dynamic referentiality in the cases of Plaza de la Constitución and the Congreso de Chile. While in those cases,

---

[16] "Arquitectura e identidad cultural," *ARS* 5 (1984), 7.

[17] Cristián Fenandez Cox, "Universalidad y peculiaridad en la dimension simbólica: un marco teórico," *ARS* 5 (1984), 15.

[18] Murtinho, interview by the author.

[19] Boza, interviewed by Joaquín Serrano in *Editar para transformar*, 165.

postmodernism's aesthetics of the surface functions as a means of propaganda, for Boza and CEDLA, postmodernism would be envisioned as a means of reviving the character of Chile through typologies that encouraged social interactions across class.

This approach to postmodernism can be seen in CEDLA's flagship project, an alternative design for Santiago Poniente area. According to Eliash, Santiago Poniente represented CEDLA's goals to avoid the "segregation, which pushed low income people outside the city limits," and "Pinochet's neoliberalism [which] produced isolation" and a disintegrated sense of community:

> In our projects, like in Santiago Poniente, everything happens on the street, activities are mixed, society mixes, the architectural heritage is protected and intermingles with new buildings. We simply saw the city as integrated on many levels, both in a formal and social sense.[20]

The revitalization of Santiago Poniente, which drew upon postmodern design principles, was the first project developed by the group. It was presented in the first issue of *ARS*, and became widely known as a manifesto of the group's principles and design philosophy.

2.2 CEDLA's Project for Santiago Poniente

In 1972, Allende's administration announced a competition, organized by CORMU, for the Western area of central Santiago (Santiago Poniente). The winning proposal, a rational modernist plan designed by a group of Argentinean architects associated with la Universidad Nacional de La Plata (Emilio Sessa, Enrique Bares,

---

[20] Eliash, interview by the author.

Santiago Bo, Tomas García y Roberto Germani), was abandoned with the coup in 1973 (see discussion of this design in Chapter 1). Several years later, in 1976, Patricio Mekis, the mayor of Santiago, announced plans for the revitalization of Santiago Poniente. Using the occasion of the first edition of La Bienal Nacional de Arquitectura exhibition, organized in 1977 by the Colegio de Arquitectos in Santiago, the members of CEDLA presented their own vision for the revitalization of this neighborhood. While they were still in London in 1975, Boza and Eliash had prepared a critical response to the results of CORMU's competition – the modernist design of Sessa, et al. – and sketched an alternative proposal for the revitalization of this area. That initial design served as the basis for the project that CEDLA developed two years later in 1977 and introduced to the broader public at the Bienal Nacional.

CEDLA's project for Santiago Poniente embodied its philosophy and was treated as a manifesto of the group both by its members and the broader public. The proposal was designed using methodologies taken from the canon of critical texts on postmodernism, such as *Learning from Las Vegas* and *The Architecture of the City*, deploying the postmodern revival of traditional typologies and spatial solutions. The revitalization plan included housing for 38,000 people, 300 offices, 400 commercial enterprises (such as stores and services), five daycares, two schools, and two community centers, all distributed in the surface of 69 hectares and with density between 550–600 inhabitants per hectare. On the formal level, the main idea behind the project was to

create continuity with the existing architecture of the site by relying on traditional spatial typologies and using historical architectural forms and materials. At the same time, CEDLA emphasized the social potential of these postmodern techniques, and saw the role of historical forms not only as respecting the context and history of the neighborhood, but above all as enabling community building and the identification of inhabitants with the space they lived in. For CEDLA, historical models provided more familiar and relatable environments than abstract, modernist forms, and thus responded better to the social challenges of post-coup Chile – namely, to the increasing social segregation based on economic differences. In CEDLA's interpretation, traditional typologies known from historical cities, revived by the postmodern movement, were the means of fostering a more egalitarian society. In Boza's words,

> Our position was: no to segregation, yes to the interchange of people. We tried to achieve this by creating public spaces based on traditional typologies, like street or square, and ensuring mixed-use spaces that encouraged people to interact. The design of Santiago Poniente was based on three typologies: the street, the square, and the boulevard as places where people can meet, discuss, integrate and mingle. (…) Our goal was to defend the old tissue and to foster integration of the people in the city, we were against the segregation and against the fact that poor people were pushed to the peripheries of Santiago. We wanted to mix people with different incomes.[21]

The first step was a careful study of the site (presented both in *ARS* and exhibited at the Bienal) in the form of drawings, photographs, and descriptions. The architects began by documenting the architecture of twenty-seven blocks constituting Santiago Poniente in drawings and photos and creating an isometric representation of the site. Subsequently,

---

[21] Boza, interview by the author.

CEDLA discerned typologies basic for Santiago Poniente: manzana (block); plaza (square); cité (housing unit with continuous façade); plazuela (little piazza); edificio patio (courtyard building); rambla (boulevard); and pasaje (passage). Each of the types were documented and described in terms of its history, its place in the development of Santiago and other Latin American cities, and the role it played for the community on different scales – for example, plazas and plazuelas as spaces of meeting and exchange between inhabitants from different parts of the city, or courtyards of edificios patios as spaces guarding the privacy of families dwelling in them. The broad characterizations of spatial types essential to Santiago Poniente was supplemented with detailed studies of their elements, such as crossings of the passages or connectors between buildings and streets. This detailed study of Santiago Poniente was an essential part CEDLA's proposal, as the leading principle of the design was to "achieve typological continuity with existing site"[22] and consequently to preserve and create spaces focused on building community and fostering social bonds in a city with increasing separation between inhabitants of different economic classes.

The spine of CEDLA's plan for Santiago Poniente is la Rambla – a commercial boulevard of approximately fifty meters width, stretched between Plaza del Mercado from the North side and Basilica del Salvador from the South, and interrupted by plazas and squares. In the plan, La Rambla consists of existing buildings, renovated and

[22] "Remodelación Santiago Poniente," *ARS* 1 (1978), 15.

adapted to commercial purposes, and newly constructed five-story buildings, the lowest level of which houses stores, offices, and services. Streets parallel to la Rambla lead to manzanas (blocks) of Santiago Poniente, occupied by existing and new buildings of edificio patio (courtyard building) type, as well as small urban parks, piazzas, and interior passages connecting housing and services with squares and piazzas. CEDLA's aim was to achieve high urban density without the use of high rise architecture while preserving existing architecture. In order to blend with historical tissue in scale and proportions, the proposed buildings were between two and six stories high. In their project description, CEDLA emphasized the role of traditional typologies in community building and creating platforms of interactions for inhabitants. "Small and big squares," reads the project description, "generated from existing typologies are forms of organization and identification on the scale of the neighborhood or block. They are sites of encounters par excellence."[23] A crucial element in the typology used by CEDLA was the street, which the architects regarded as an essential urban element that constitutes the city understood not only as architectural but also as social form. One of the major goals of Santiago Poniente was thus to "recuperate the concept of the street as a channel (…) of activity more than just a simple connector."[24]

---

[23] "Proposicion para Santiago Metropolitano, Area Poniente: Anteproyecto Santiago Poniente," *AUCA* 34 (1978), 74.
[24] Ibid.

The integration of people of different social and economic status declared by CEDLA members as one of the main goals of Santiago Poniente was, to large degree, only aspirational, as it could not be realized without the support of urban development strategies undertaken by the State. The emphasis on public space and traditional urban forms such as piazzas and streets were supposed to stimulate social interactions between usually separated groups of people, but under the reality of Pinochet's policies that displaced the urban poor out of prominent urban locations, these goals were unattainable. As Eliash comments,

> in our vision of the city, we wanted to mix uses, functions, and, most importantly, different economic strata of society. But we didn't have the actual tools to make it happen. It was more of wishful thinking, within the market-driven reality of that time and in the reality in which the military government was cutting limbs of the state and giving more and power to the private sector. Only years after the fall of the dictatorship did I manage to put these ambitions of social integration into practice, for example in my social housing projects.[25]

Even though Santiago Poniente could be materialized only in models and visualizations, it was nonetheless a strong gesture against the dominant ideologies of city planning in Chile of that time, and a critique of urban injustice caused by the commercialization of city space.

CEDLA's projects, especially Santiago Poniente, generated heated debates and animated Chilean architectural circles in times that were unfavorable to questioning the status quo regarding both the organization of urban space and – more generally – society. The presentation of Santiago Poniente, both in *ARS* and the Bienal, provoked

[25] Eliash, interview by the author.

contrasting reactions. As Boza recalls, "while the students were mostly very enthusiastic, the older generation of architects was mostly against, and I remember some of them literally throwing shoes at us during the Bienal."[26] The Chilean architectural establishment, predominantly represented by architects sharing the modernist approach to urban space, reacted to the emergence of CEDLA and Santiago Poniente as the group's project-manifesto with hostility, or at least skepticism. In 1978, the twenty-second issue of *CA* (Revista del Colegio de Arquitectos Chile) – one of the two major architectural magazines during this period (see Chapter 1) – began with a welcome note to CEDLA. The editors of *CA* made clear that although they wished CEDLA luck, they "don't share [the group's] proposals." "[T]ogether with these sincere wishes of success and following postulates of plurality which inspire *CA*,"[27] the editors decided to "give space to the opinions of Monserrat Palmer, which are radically different than those of CEDLA."[28] Palmer, a consistent proponent of modernism in architecture, did not mention CEDLA specifically in her contribution, but criticized recent interest in reviving older historical architectural forms as articulated in the theories of Aldo Rossi or Leon Krier. Palmer diagnosed the appearance of these forms in Chile as misguided and not suited for the specificity of local context: "[T]hese are their problems. Not ours," stated Palmer as a conclusion for her article.[29] The addressee of these criticisms was clearly

---

[26] Boza, interview by the author.
[27] "Saludamos a ARS," *CA* 22 (1978), page not numbered.
[28] Ibid.
[29] Monserrat Palmer, "Urbanismo, ideologias y dependencia," *CA* 22 (1978), page not numbered.

CEDLA, as CEDLA was the only group in Chile advocating an urban philosophy openly based on postmodern paradigms and theories.

Despite the skepticism expressed by the Colegio de Arquitectos in their official magazine, both the presentation of Santiago Poniente during the Bienal and events (such as meetings and discussions) organized by CEDLA in their headquarters attracted large numbers of followers. CEDLA was supported mainly by students, but appealed also to a few established architects previously associated with the institutions of Allende's era. Apart from Fernando Castillo Velazco, who, according to Boza and Eliash took a critical part in the foundation of the group, one of the most prominent architects sympathizing with CEDLA was Nicolas Garcia, a former director of CORMU during Allende's presidency. According to Eliash, the involvement of architects such as Castillo Velazco or Garcia was not surprising, and confirmed that despite their differences in formal approach, "there was an affinity in spirit between CEDLA and CORMU."[30] As mentioned before, for Eliash, Boza, and Murtinho, CEDLA was guided by the same pro-social agenda CORMU once had. This "affinity of spirit," however, should not be overstated, because of the fundamental difference in scope and nature of these two organizations – an independent research institute on the one hand, and a state-funded organization responsible for urban development on the other.

---

[30] Eliash, interview by the author.

2.3 Social Housing

One of the fields severely impacted by the neoliberal policies of the military government was social housing.[31] State agencies developed under Frei and Allende governments with the goal of implementing long-term strategies of providing affordable housing solutions were dissolved by the Pinochet administration. Typically, social housing projects commissioned by the newly established state organization – SERVIU – were makeshift solutions in remote locations lacking proper infrastructure and characterized by low quality architecture. Built by private construction companies, these projects were designed to maximize profit rather than to promote the social good. Between 1985 and 1986, CEDLA formulated their response to the critical situation of social housing in urban peripheries and published it in the sixth and seventh issues of *ARS*.

As a point of departure, the architects provided an extensive analysis of social housing settlements commissioned by SERVIU in peripheral regions of Santiago, such as la Granja or San Joaquin. They highlighted its main problems, from poor infrastructure and lack of access to education and services to the low quality of architecture. SERVIU did not favor any particular typology or design solution and their housing commissions were to a large degree dictated by cost optimization rather than any preexistent design philosophy. In CEDLA's words, housing realized by SERVIU was focused on the "mere

[31] By social housing (*vivienda social*), I mean affordable housing solutions provided by the State with the goal of remedying inequalities. The term overlaps with and is often considered to be synonymous with public housing.

production of built square meters [in order] to feed the statistics."[32] Settlements were typically laid out on a uniform grid with identical, barrack-like single family housing units devoid of any public space. Another typical example of SERVIU housing realized in Santiago's urban peripheries was made up of monotonous multi-family housing units formed by identical cuboid blocks. An example of the latter type was the El Pinar settlement located in the San Joaquin neighborhood of Santiago, which was analyzed by CEDLA in one of their case studies. In the seventh issue of *ARS*, El Pinar was described as

> nothing more than a human archive, where people are stored and live piled up. [Such housing] has no character, identity or space. For a lot of people, it is the loneliest place in the world (…) A [housing] block on the outskirts of Santiago is the symbol of the lack of communication where nobody knows anyone. These blocks are errors of the city planners who did not have an idea for development that went beyond the economic variable….[33]

CEDLA described the poor conditions of social housing realized by SERVIU as a consequence of "real estate speculation, of the venality of some professionals, of the economic voracity and of social insensitivity which are (…) the result of the mechanistic application of a policy that does not care about the number of victims sacrificed on the altar of the Market."[34] CEDLA stated clearly that the root of the problem lay in the political situation in Chile, which "allows for the domination of a very small elite and

---

[32] Ricardo Contreras Arriola, "Editorial," *ARS* 7 (1986), 7.
[33] Derry Healy, "Los arquitectos deben perder el tiempo," *ARS* 7 (1986), 30.
[34] Arriola, "Editorial," 7.

marginalization of the majority."[35] At the same time, the group criticized not only the authorities for implementing the politics of social and urban segregation, but also the architects who, instead of creating decent living spaces, took advantage of the flawed social housing system under Pinochet. "Architects," reads *ARS*, "need some ethical reflection on our actions in the urban periphery":

> It is a fallacy to declare that our discipline has little capacity to [act in that matter]. (…) [N]ew constructions are signed by professionals, and a big majority of them is, regretfully, a result of the absence of thought and dedication to this kind of work.(…) It is our responsibility to acknowledge the difference between what is legal and what is just. Many of the disturbances permitted by building norms could be eliminated with an internal sense of decency.[36]

CEDLA's efforts were focused on what could be done within the existing models of the housing market, as a necessary change of direction in state policies was unachievable in near future.[37]

The next step of addressing the problem of social housing was to provide tools for its improvement. For CEDLA, postmodern theories and design tools were helpful in tackling the problem of low quality housing within the existing framework. In the seventh issue of *ARS,* CEDLA emphasized the need for a better understanding of Chilean urban peripheries as a first step towards better designs respecting the specificities of local contexts. CEDLA intended to challenge the common notion that "the

---

[35] Ibid., 8.
[36] Ibid.
[37] As Hernan Duval writes, "Every proposal to overcome the current urban crisis needs to be supported by systemic solutions based on participation and cooperation, to which appropriate architectural typologies and urban solutions can be applied." Hernan Duval, "Periferia metropolitan: algo mas que arquitectura," *ARS* 7 (1986), 10.

characteristic qualities of urban periphery are its amorphous nature and lack of defined structural elements" and encouraged approaching the "disorder of the periphery" as "the order which we don't understand" and as an "internally organized cosmos."[38] In a series of drawings following these statements, CEDLA analyzed the urban peripheries of Chilean cities by distinguishing their basic typologies – from different forms of organization of streets to the nodes of social importance for the community (such as soccer fields). This approach is clearly indebted to seminal postmodern theories, from the attention to commonplace spatial patterns present in *Pattern Language* to *Learning from Las Vegas*, the latter revealing the deep order lying beneath the seeming chaos of the strip. As in these works, CEDLA used drawing as a crucial tool for spatial analysis.

Not only were CEDLA's proposed solutions to housing problems drawn from postmodern ideas, but so was CEDLA's diagnosis of the problem itself. "No doubt there is a crisis of communication between the codes used by the inhabitants of the peripheries and those of the architects trained academically with different aesthetic and cultural values," reads the seventh issue of *ARS*.[39] The recognition of the lack of understanding between educated, refined experts and the "common people" with different cultural backgrounds and expectations –bridging the gap between "low" and "high" culture, described by Charles Jencks as "double coding"[40] – was one of the founding paradigms

---

[38] Humberto Eliash, "La periferia dibujada," *ARS* 7 (1986), 11.
[39] Ibid.
[40] Jencks, *What Is Post-Modernism?*, 14.

of the postmodern turn. To a large degree, double coding functioned as a marketing strategy in North America and Western Europe. The over-sized swan on top of Michael Graves's hotel for Disney or the playful Italian Renaissance and Baroque references in Charles Moore's Piazza d'Italia were relatable and understandable both for architectural connoisseurs and for the "common people." Since the designers were able to communicate with very different audiences, they also maximized their chances for commercial success. CEDLA likewise emphasized the need to operate within the codes of experts and users, but did so in a completely different non-commercial context, deploying the postmodern concept of double coding in order to solve a particular social problem.

In the seventh issue of *ARS*, CEDLA presented several specific built examples of low-cost housing which realized the group's postulates of providing better quality living space rooted in postmodern ideas. One of them, the Parque Santa Elvira settlement for 3,200 people, was located in the La Florida neighborhood on the southeastern outskirts of Santiago and was realized in 1985 by a team of architects led by Pedro Murtinho (Ricardo Contreras, Luis Gonzales, Humberto Eliash and Santiago Raby). The neighborhood was dominated by old country estates and farm houses and the architects wanted to create a settlement which, unlike the homogeneous units formed by identical cuboid blocks as built by SERVIU, would respect and revive the rural character of the site. The site was divided into ten blocks. Each of the blocks consisted of two-story,

single-family housing units grouped around a central square with leisure and recreational functions (such as playgrounds). Additional housing units were distributed in five blocks separated from the ten main blocks by a narrow passage (Pasaje Los Sauces) with greenery. The architectural design was based on the postmodern principle of using local materials (clay bricks and wood) and spatial forms traditional for the site (low rural houses with enclosed courtyards). As in other projects designed by CEDLA, a crucial part of Parque Santa Elvira was the existence of common public spaces, which were lacking in the vast majority of low-cost housing built during Pinochet's times. Due to financial issues, in the final realization these public spaces were drastically reduced: "In this project," says Murtinho, "we really fought hard with the investor. We fought because he didn't understood our principles of urbanism and social dwelling, and he was interested only in the commercial aspect. When we said that we wanted 30% of the project to be taken by public space he simply said no way and insisted that it needs to be reduced to 5%."[41] Even though the original program was drastically curtailed, the architectural quality of Santa Elvira housing stands out among low-cost housing realizations in Chile under Pinochet. After the fall of the dictatorship, the La Florida neighborhood gained increasing popularity among more affluent families and Santa Elvira became populated by middle class inhabitants.

[41] Murtinho, interview by the author.

CEDLA's approach to low-cost housing is marked by respect for local tradition (in form and material), drawing as a means of spatial analysis and double-coding as broadening access to architectural understanding. These practices were drawn explicitly from postmodern principles in order to design higher quality living spaces that countered the monotonous and utilitarian designs of SERVIU. Similarly, its use of traditional typologies (plazas, squares, the street) in its design for Santiago Poniente exemplifies a form of postmodernism dedicated to the social good, opposing the forms of city planning that arose out of the neoliberal logic of the free market new to Chile. In this way, for CEDLA, throughout the twelve years of its existence, the postmodern turn in architecture brought a promise of a socially engaged architecture able to contradict and reverse the destructive policies of Pinochet's regime.

3. Postmodernism and the State: Poland

3.1 The Polish People's Republic and Postmodern Architecture

The notion of state-supported postmodern architecture in any socialist country sounds counterintuitive. In cultural and architectural theory, postmodernism is framed as following the "cultural logic of late-capitalism" (following Fredric Jameson's characterization) or "the architecture of post-industrial society" (after Paolo Portoghesi's description). Following these widespread assumptions, it is logical to deduce that in Poland, postmodern architecture could appear only in the nineties after the transition to a free market economy. If postmodern architecture is inseparably connected to capitalism, the political and economic context of Poland – which between 1947 and 1989 was a socialist country functioning under the name of Polish People's Republic (Polska Republika Ludowa, PRL) – did not provide appropriate conditions for postmodernism to develop. Moreover, the ruling Polish Socialist Party had a clear vision for official architecture supported by the State. In its first years, the official style of the PRL was described as "socialist realism," which in the late fifties was replaced by industrialized late modernism. Therefore, when postmodernism appeared in the international architectural scene in the late sixties, Poland was not only a country with an industrial, socialist economy, but was also a country where the official vision for architecture was based on technocratic, late modernist ideals opposed by western postmodernism. Despite these conditions, postmodern currents were not only present in Polish

architectural discourse and practice since the seventies, but also were embraced by the Party and used for propagandistic purposes. This official acceptance of foreign, western architectural trends allowed their circulation and eventually – contrary to the government's intentions – made possible their use against the State.

3.2 Architecture and Propaganda

As postmodern forms were very different from the industrialized building styles promoted as the appropriate architectural expression of the socialist republic, the State authorities needed to provide a rationale for their use. In order to better understand the conditions under which postmodern notions were introduced on Polish ground, it is crucial to outline the basic mechanisms of State propaganda in socialist Poland. The intensity of State propaganda efforts in the PRL has varied throughout its history. Especially powerful in the first years after the end of World War II, the machine of cultural propaganda noticeably slowed down after Stalin's death in 1953. In the late 1940s and early 1950s, during the early years of the Polish People's Republic, the Polish Socialist Party expressed a strong interest in culture as a tool capable of shaping the minds and attitudes of citizens. For every field of cultural production, from architecture to painting, literature, film, and graphic design, the Party issued manifestos with guidelines providing clear rules to be followed in order to create artworks compatible with the official ideology of socialism. Each work of art was supposed to carry socialist content and use realist forms comprehensible to the working masses, thereby

representing the goals of the new style of "socialist realism" (socrealizm).[1] Architecture and urbanism were seen as especially important pieces of this project because of their scale and public character. In the decades following 1953, cultural propaganda was less forceful, its power gradually waning.

In March 1956, during a meeting of the Association of Polish Architects (Stowarzyszenie Architektow Polskich; SARP), socialist realism was declared to be no longer the official style of the PRL. From then on, state-commissioned buildings needed to be erected using industrialized construction methods based on prefabricated concrete elements and a quick assembly schedule. The primary goal of Polish architecture was defined as providing mass housing to the working class, and modern industrialized building was seen as a mean to realizing this postulate in the most efficient way.[2]

The late socialist State did not produce declarations as strong and straightforwardly written as the early manifestos. This does not mean, however, that culture – and especially architecture – ceased to be of interest for the Party. Throughout the entire period of the existence of Polish People's Republic, all cultural production was controlled for ideological suitability by the Main Office for the Control of Press, Presentations, and Public Performances (Główny Urząd Kontroli Prasy, Publikacji i Widowisk, GUKPPiW), an institution existing between 1949 and 1989. Documents

---

[1] The manifesto of the architecture of socialist realism was issued in 1949 as "Rezolucja Krajowej Partyjnej Narady Architektow w dniu 20-21 czerwca 1949 r. w Warszawie" in *Architektura* 6–8 (1949): 162.
[2] *Ogólnopolska Narada architektów. Materiały do dyskusji. Zeszyt 3*, (Warszawa: ZG SARP, 1956), xviii. See also materials from *IX Plenum P*ZPR in 1954, where the issue of the industrialization of building was raised.

regarding architecture and urban planning were screened by GUKPPiW and required the censors' approval before publication. Even though the majority of architects were not Party members, the official statements of SARP were always carefully worded to affirm architecture's role in building socialism. For example, in the resolution accompanying SARP's centenary in 1977, the Association declares that

> …we are aware of the weight of our responsibilities. (…) [Our] activity in the People's Republic of Poland started with the realization of all the postulates of architectural circles, which could not be fulfilled in capitalism. Thus we advanced the development of architecture as an art serving the whole society. Urban planning has been advanced, housing has become common for everyone. The State patronage of architecture opened possibilities for realizing programs of scale and content unimaginable before. Moreover, architects and the SARP contributed to, first, a rebuilding of the country [after the war], and then to the process of building a country already chasing the top ten industrialized countries in the world. (…) The bond present in SARP solidifies this awareness of the social responsibility of the profession of architecture, as well as the sense of our responsibility for the realization of social commissions for architecture that serve the needs of the people and the socialist development of Poland. (…) [W]e will continue to improve the art of architecture for the good of our socialist homeland.[3]

Two years later, on the occasion of the 35th Anniversary of the People's Republic of Poland, similarly flattering words were made by Polish architectural circles:

> In this year we are celebrating the 35th anniversary of the People's Republic of Poland. During these years our architecture has attained the status of a social service (…) The change in political system has freed us from the nightmare of building speculation, while at the same time has created the conditions for controlling spatial development. The material base was provided for by economic growth. The State organizations for designing – design offices – were called into being, thus putting an end to the prospect of unemployment, once

[3] "Nadzwyczajny Walny Zjazd SARP w stulecie organizacji polskich architektow 13-15 maja 77, Kraków," *Architektura* 5–6 (1977), 8.

> very drastic in the architectural milieu. Never before in Polish history had we built so much, and never has the outlook for the future been so propitious.[4]

Open declarations like these affirming close ties between the government and architects were not as frequent in late socialist Poland as they were during the early years of PRL, but their presence attests to the close connections between politics and architecture even in the seventies and eighties. Architecture was a powerful tool for the Party throughout the entire history of the Polish People's Republic. Due to its connection to economy and industry, it was seen as an important element in forming the image of the state, as it demonstrated progress and advancements of the living conditions of the PRL's citizens. New architectural realizations, such as settlements, factories, or public-use buildings provided tangible proof for how the country flourishes under socialism. New projects were eagerly presented by state-controlled media and outlets such as the Polish Film Chronicle (Polska Kronika Filmowa) – a propagandistic 10-minute long newsreel obligatorily shown in cinemas before each film screening. These resources leave no doubt as to the Party's interest in architecture as a propaganda tool, even in the absence of manifestos or directives outlining its socialist goals. The most valuable and revealing accounts of continued State pressure are interviews with architects active in that period and the architectural publications in late socialist Poland. These latter

---

[4] Zygmunt Zwoliński, "Biuro Projektów Budownictwa Ogólnego 'Budopol'w Warszawie," *Architektura* 383–384 (1979), 4.

sources provide evidence that the government was not indifferent towards new architectural tendencies, and that it appropriated them for its own ideological goals.

3.3 Architektura

A document crucial for understanding the architectural discourse of the period is the journal *Architektura*. *Architektura* was published by the SARP on a monthly basis between 1947 and 1980, and bimonthly from 1980 through 1989. *Architektura* was the most important and widely read architectural magazine in socialist Poland, and functioned as the country's major platform for architectural discourse. As with every book and magazine published legally in socialist Poland, each issue needed to be checked for the appropriateness of its content and authorized. Each issue was sent to the GUKPPiW and waited upon approval by the censors. After positive review, the magazine was sent back with a censors' stamp of approval authorizing its publication. If the content was not approved, depending on the gravity of the problem, the consequences varied from resubmitting the issue to more serious actions, including the possibly of a publishing ban, possibly of several years, for the author of the material. Although bans for publications were more common in the early years of the PRL, it remained a real possibility as late as the 1980s, as is demonstrated by the case of architectural historian Marta Lesniakowska, who was assessed a five-year ban in 1981.[5] As a result, even though most of the editors and contributors were not members or even

[5] Leśniakowska, interview by the author.

supporters of the Party (and some of them, like Czesław Bielecki, were active in the underground opposition), the content of the magazine had to recognize the ideological line of the government.

In the Polish architectural press, the term "postmodernism" was first used in 1979, in the May-June issue of *Architektura*. The cover featured a large photograph of Charles Moore's *Piazza d'Italia* in New Orleans – the first time that a contemporary building appeared on typically abstract covers of this magazine. Below the photo, contrasting sharply with its white background, was a caption in black reading, "what next?" The cover announced the main goal of the publication: to diagnose the situation of contemporary architecture and reflect on its future. As the editor's opening note reads:

> When we observe the development of contemporary architecture, we ask the above question [what next? –LK] more and more frequently. Although a whole new language was created to define the phenomena occurring in architecture, a radical solution does not seem to be at hand. As a continuation of the same subject, *Architektura* wishes to present the achievements of a group of architects who are said by critics to have surpassed the threshold of Modernism. (…) Some misgivings about solutions introduced into world architecture by Post-modernism may arise when we go back to the beginnings of Modernism. (…) Therefore (…) we are publishing a picture of the creative path of several classics of Soviet architecture – the Romantic Modernists.[6]

Although works by postmodern architects had been presented occasionally in *Architektura* before, the May/June 1979 issue not only mentions for the first time the term "postmodernism," but also provides a characterization of the movement, mainly

---

[6] Andrzej Bruszewski, "Editor's Note," *Architektura* 379–380 (1979), 23.

through reprints of two articles on contemporary architecture published in magazines *Baumeister* and *Time*. However, the editors of *Architektura* complemented these Western accounts on postmodernism with the audacious suggestion that postmodernism had Soviet origins. An article on the Soviet "Romantic Modernists" by Yevgeny Myelnikov in this issue presented the major works of the Vesnin brothers – Aleksey Shchusev, Konstantin Melnikov, and Boris Iofan.[7] Myelnikov praised their "colorful individuality," "influence of national traditions," "creative individuality," and a search for "new artistic forms in architecture" – elements that would fit very well into most descriptions of postmodern architecture.[8] Buildings like Konstantin Melnikov's Rusakov *Workers' Club in Moscow* (1928) indeed resemble the later formal experiments of postmodern architects. Of course, a similar argument could be made using Le Corbusier's chapel of *Notre Dame du Haut* in Ronchamp (1954) or the works of German expressionists such as Erich Mendelsohn or Hans Poelzig. The journal does not mention any of those Western examples, rather choosing to focus on Soviet architecture exclusively, in effect sending a message that postmodernism originated in the USSR. As this issue of *Architektura* was planned as an introduction of postmodernism to Polish architects, the decision to suggest its Soviet genealogy is a meaningful gesture. By demonstrating that postmodernism was invented in Soviet Moscow rather than "learned from Las Vegas," the editors made it possible to view postmodern architecture not as a potentially

---

[7] Yevgeny Myelnikov, "Romantic Modernists," *Architektura* 379–380 (1979): 75–88.
[8] Ibid., 77, 82, 85, and 86, respectively.

dangerous Western, imperialist, and capitalist imposition, but as a phenomenon of close, familiar, and ideologically suitable roots.[9]

A similar effort was undertaken by *Architektura* a year prior. Although it did not mention the term "postmodernism" explicitly, issue 3-4 of 1978 was devoted to the discussion of the crisis of modern architecture. Half of the issue is comprised of a fifty-page essay, "Continuity in Architecture" by Czesław Bielecki, which praised cities of the past and criticized twentieth-century cities for the destruction of urban tissue.[10] Bielecki's argument is developed both by the text (with numerous references to authors such as Christopher Alexander, Jane Jacobs, Kevin Lynch, Robert Venturi, and Umberto Eco) and by dense visual material – schemes, drawings, and illustrations of architecture from the past. In a Venturi-esque style, the images flow in a continuous stream usurping page space and dominating the text. Both the message and the form of a visual/textual collage earned the essay's reputation as the "Polish manifesto of postmodernism."[11] In the "Afterword" to the issue, the editor Jerzy Bruszewski made sure that the potentially dangerous content of Bielecki's essay would not be understood as a statement against the socialist state. As the continuity in architecture praised by Bielecki was broken by the industrialized late modern architecture chosen by the socialist State as its architectural expression, the essay could easily be taken as oppositional. In his afterword, Bruszewski

[9] A similar suggestion appeared two issues before; the works of soviet architect Ivan W. Zholtovski were juxtaposed with those of Philip Johnson. See Ivan V. Zholtovski and Yevgeny Mielnikow, "The Classics of the Soviet Architecture," *Architektura* 375–388 (1979): 82–85.
[10] Czesław Bielecki, "Continuity in Architecture," *Architektura* 3–4 (1978): 25–75.
[11] Leśniakowska, interview by the author.

stresses the merits of modern architecture in providing housing for the masses while also acknowledging its flaws — "uniformity, clichés, shoddiness, low standards."[12] Further, the editor remarks that although Bielecki's theses might seem controversial, his "main claims are true" and that they are a remedy for the technocratic and demiurgic ambitions of contemporary architects.[13] Bruszewski concludes his afterword by reassuring readers that Bielecki's postmodern postulates fulfill the intentions of the Party:

> The return to the game rules in architecture suggested by Bielecki instead of the technocratic "fixing" of our neighbors is also characteristic of our times. In Polish conditions, this means a consistent trend resulting from permanent improvement in the functioning of socialist democracy in all domains of the country's life, evidently including also the sphere of architectural creation.[14]

Bielecki's architectural practice cannot be separated from his underground oppositional activity in the seventies and eighties. His architectural criticism of centralized, industrialized architecture was a direct statement against the political system that had implemented this oppressive mode of architectural expression. As he stated in 1991, "standardization and prefabrication was a method of communization."[15] Architectural efforts against those forms represented oppositional activity against the regime. Architectural circles were well aware of Bielecki's engagement in the opposition and his unequivocal criticisms of socialism; likewise, Bruszewski's remarks in the "Afterword"

---

[12] Andrzej Bruszewski, "Editor's Afterword," *Architektura* 3–4 (1978), 76.
[13] Ibid., 77.
[14] Ibid.
[15] "Architektów kłopoty z wolnością. Rozmowa z Cz. Bieleckim" (conversation between Tomasz Jastrun and Czesław Bielecki), *Architektura-Murator* 1 (1994), 28.

did not have any real persuasive power to convince the magazine's readers that Bielecki's statements corresponded with the efforts of the Party. Those empty, purely rhetorical remarks were, nevertheless, enough to obtain the censorship's seal of approval and maintain the safe status of *Architektura* as a magazine expressing ideologically correct values. This is a perfect example of what Alexei Yurchak described as a "performative shift," which he considers as characteristic of late socialism – a condition in which "the performative dimension of ritualized and speech acts rises in importance (it is important to participate in the reproduction of these acts at the level of form), while the constative dimension of these acts become open-ended, indeterminate, or simply irrelevant."[16] Both Bruszewski and the readers of *Architektura* took part in a performative ritual of State observance while being perfectly aware of Bielecki's real intentions.

The two issues of *Architektura* discussed here provide valuable leads for the reconstruction of the Polish socialist State's approach to postmodern architecture. We can find further evidence of the relation between the State and these new architectural currents by attending to the words of architects who worked in late socialist Poland. One of the most active architects in that time was Romuald Loegler. He describes these relations:

> After 1981 (…) one could observe social and political changes aiming to "humanize" the present system. The government (…) started to articulate the need to humanize architecture. It was associated with the critique of mass housing units (…) in order to show that the Party cares about the people. That

[16] Alexei Yurchak, *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation* (Princeton: Princeton University Press 2006), 26.

> was the first moment when I noticed the government starting to declare the need to move away from concrete slab housing. There were opinions that one way to achieve that is to return to the city, to the philosophy of architecture returning to historical forms, in other words the notions used by postmodernism. (…) Simultaneously with such declarations of the Party, one could notice an increased interest in notions such as the street or the piazza in the city within architectural circles.[17]

Loegler emphasizes that for the socialist Party the stated interest in the citizens' well-being was strictly propagandistic and instrumental. He believes that while the architects were interested in new, postmodern currents for various reasons, this interest was eagerly appropriated by the Party's propaganda:

> From one side, architects were looking for new paths, but from another, the Party was eagerly using this as an occasion to create its image as caring and citizen-friendly. (…) Those efforts were a part of the general directive which the Party realized in every voivodeship [collection of counties] in order to strengthen the bond between the nation and the Party. The real threat for the government was not the attitude of ten architects, but thousands of angry people.[18]

The last line from Loegler's statement reflects an essential element of the role of postmodern architecture in late socialist Poland: postmodern architecture—which introduced a human scale, focused on spaces fostering social interaction, and created more visually exciting architectural environments—was a perfect tool in the Party's effort of appeasing "thousands of angry people." Although in the 1970s and 1980s architecture was rarely a tool for direct propaganda as it had been during the Stalinist times, it was still important for the government as a "relief valve," helping to ameliorate growing social tensions.

---

[17] Romuald Loegler, "Interview with Romuald Loegler" in *Polish Postmodernism: Architecture and Urbanism, vol. 2*, edited by Alicja Gzowska and Lidia Klein (Warszawa: 40000 Malarzy, 2013), 154.
[18] Ibid., 155.

3.4 Na Skarpie (Centrum E)

The appropriation of postmodern architecture by the late socialist State, which in turn needed to interpret this architecture in an ideologically safe way, can also be seen in architecture competitions. One example of this can be seen in an invitation-only competition for a housing settlement "Na Skarpie" (Centrum E) in Kraków's eastern-most neighborhood, Nowa Huta. The competition was organized in 1985 by Kraków's SARP and commissioned by the Cooperative Housing Association DZB Budostal. Romuald Loegler, the author of the winning proposal states that

> …[t]hanks to the postmodern design philosophy, which permeated not only Polish architectural circles, but as I mentioned also the Party, projects such as the competition for Nowa Huta could emerge.[19] [The rules of the competition] were defined by the Main Architect, a man willy-nilly associated with the Party, defined in a way which fitted into the propaganda of humanizing architecture, about which I talked before. For example, there was a recommendation to include pitched roofs, or that the buildings should have some architectural detail, like a "historizing" railing in the balconies.[20]

The goal of the competition was to design a housing settlement providing necessary services (grocery stores, daycare center) and recreational spaces (buildings for culture and leisure). Additionally, because the city planned for the creation of a lagoon connecting Na Skarpie and the Vistula river (less than a mile away), the organizers requested a proposal for an architectural program of the hypothetical future riverfront.

Nowa Huta was a site of particular interest and significance for the Party. It was designed in 1949 by a team of architects and urbanists led by Tadeusz Ptaszycki for the

---

[19] Ibid., 173 and 157–160.
[20] Loegler, interview by the author (published in Appendix).

workers of the Lenin Steelworks steel plant. Nowa Huta was built as a socialist ideal city and was erected by the working class for the working class. It occupied a prominent role in political propaganda, was described as "the pride of the nation," "the forge of our prosperity," and "a work of Polish-Soviet friendship."[21] As it was designed according to the principles of socialist realist urban design, Nowa Huta's plan and architecture is based on traditional forms. Its fan-shaped layout with hierarchical streets leading to the main square, Plac Centralny, and buildings with abundant references to renaissance and classical architecture makes Nowa Huta one of the most complete examples of socialist realist urbanism. Three decades after its design, Nowa Huta would be transformed from the icon of socialist planning and social engineering to a symbol of social unrest, and became a hub for the rising opposition. In the eighties, Nowa Huta was one of the crucial strongholds of the Solidarity movement and a site of massive protests and manifestations of the workers and students, especially intense between 1981 and 1983.[22] The competition for Na Skarpie was used by the Party to show its concern with the well-being of Nowa Huta citizens and to tame popular discontent through attractive design that would contrast with the monotonous landscape of late socialist Polish housing architecture. As Loegler recalls, the competition's role was "to appease dangerous social

---

[21] From Anders Aman, *Architecture and Ideology in Eastern Europe During The Stalin Era: An aspect of Cold War History* (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press 1992), 151.

[22] Marek Lasota, Malgorzata Ptasinska, and Zbigniew Solak, "Malopolska i Swietokrzyskie" in Antoni Dudek (ed.), *Stan wojenny w Polsce 1981–1983* (Warsaw: Instytut Pamięci Narodowej, 2003): 217–285.

unrest among the workers and the Party wanted to show that they care about Nowa Huta."[23]

Notably, in contrast to other architectural competitions in late socialist Poland, the rules for Na Skarpie did not mention the use of prefabricated systems as an obligatory condition. As for the construction method, it specifies only that "all building materials and the construction technology needs to be generally available for realization in Cracow."[24] Loegler explains that the organizers did not mention the prefabricated building technology explicitly, because "it had really bad press, it was an epitome of everything bad and evil in Polish architecture at that time. They obviously avoided mentioning 'prefabricated technology' deliberately, as the goal was to create an impression of breaking up with the inhumane architecture, not continuing it."[25] Although the competition in its written, official form does not mention any particular design philosophy or "style" as preferable for the future realization, invited architects received clear directions from the organizers in that regard. Loegler states that

> …[t]he competition was organized in a moment when the people knew already that the system is fragile. The Party tried to resolve social tensions showing its caring side and declared its attention to the people by the attempt of "humanizing" architecture. (…) Zbigniew Zuziak [Main Architect of Kraków, 1984-91] informed the organizer, the Cooperative Housing Association, that the entries should be postmodern proposals. (…) It was stated unofficially and was not a part of official guidelines because everybody knew that postmodern

---

[23] Loegler, "Interview with Romuald Loegler," 154.

[24] Romuald Loegler, "Konkurs SARP na rozwiazanie zespolu mieszkalnego i koncepcji programowo-przestrzennej 'Skarpy' w Nowej Hucie. Dyskusja pokonkursowa," *Architektura* 429 (1986), 53.

[25] Loegler, "Interview with Romuald Loegler," 154.

> architecture is expensive – for example, due to its attention to detail and building materials.[26]

Meanwhile, Loegler pursued his own ideological agenda in the winning proposal for the settlement, prepared with his team (Wojciech Dobrzański, Ewa Fitzke, Michał Szymanowski). The designers organized the Na Skarpie plan in a comb-shaped layout. The main body of the comb is formed by seven-story housing blocks which opens to the vast areas of wild greenery and, in the background, the river. Na Skarpie is adjacent to the busy Jana Pawla avenue and Nowa Huta's main square – Plac Centralny (to the northwest). Along the avenue, Loegler's team placed a lower passage of retail buildings providing necessary services which supplement the extant infrastructure of Nowa Huta (such as schools). It also performed as an acoustic barrier for the housing complex. Additional services—stores, cafes, restaurants, daycare facilities—are placed in the tall first floors of housing buildings. Five-story housing buildings are also placed between the main blocs, forming a curved line parallel to the river bank.

Usually, the rules for competitions for new housing complexes in late socialist Poland limited the building method to "wielka płyta" ("large slabs"). Wielka płyta provided economic efficiency and short construction times due to its high level of standardization as the basic modules were large concrete panels with pre-cut elements such as windows. Loegler's team decided to use "wielki blok" ("large block") – a more open system in which basic modules are smaller and more diverse, allowing for more

[26] Ibid.

flexibility. Thanks to the use of the relatively flexible system of prefabricates, the architectural forms used in Na Skarpie could be diversified. Buildings on the South end, facing the river, are supported on thin round pillars with a slightly curved avant-corps and separated by skylights. The façades of the buildings facing the city on the North end have lower parts cut with simple rectangular arcades, housing stores, and services. In most of the buildings, staircases are accentuated by avant-corps, glass bricks, or panel windows. Details, such as precast balconies with geometrical cuts or gable roofs supported by asymmetrical diagonal beams, add to the formal complexity to the space of Na Skarpie. The monotony of grey concrete slabs is broken by the use of color (pink and blue). While colorful façades are abundant in Western postmodern architecture of the seventies and eighties, in the Polish building industry, color was seen a luxury, which increased costs without improving function, and were thus superfluous. Because of the unavailability of outdoor façade paints on the Polish market, Loegler's team used poster colors as pigments added to regular white paint. As Loegler recalls:

> …[expectations were] confronted with the scarcity of available materials. (…) In that time (…) elevations needed to be painted using one, the only available, white paint which then was pigmented with poster paint in the chosen color. After one big rain, everything was washed down.[27] I recently told this story at a conference in Berlin and the audience simply did not want to believe it possible, they thought I was joking. Well I wasn't joking, it was definitely possible in socialist Poland.[28]

---

[27] Ibid., 160.
[28] Ibid.

While quite unthinkable to architects unfamiliar with the market reality of Eastern Europe under late socialism, this is a telling example not only of the "shortage economy," but also of the do-it-yourself approach common for Polish architects in late socialism.[29]

The simplified, geometrical shapes and classicizing design solutions of Nowa Huta recall the realizations of Aldo Rossi, Mario Botta or the Krier brothers. The complex borrows from baroque urban plans by creating theatrical, scenographic effects. The diverse planes of façades and their sculptural details unfold slowly while walking from the North to the East end. Since the hierarchical, axial composition of baroque cities was one of the most common references for planners of socialist realist cities, including Nowa Huta, this way of composing Centrum E was another method of linking the new development with existing architecture forms in a postmodern and playful way.

Loegler's original (not realized) plan included an "urban loggia" – a square, roofed area defined by simple classicizing arcades. The loggia was intended as a space for spontaneous, social activities and interactions integrating the local community. As Loegler describes it,

> [t]he intention was to create a new version of public spaces for interactions and gatherings known from historical cities – a nucleus of the urban. In our project, it was designed as an urban theatre, a free and open platform for spontaneous activities, mainly for the local community, as well as a space for pre-planned shows or concerts. But the main point was that it's a place where people can

---

[29] Hungarian economist Janos Kornai coined this term to characterize socialist centrally planned economies of the eastern block. For Kornai, chronic shortages typical for late socialist states in the seventies and eighties were flaws embedded in the system itself rather than results of singular planning mistakes.

> meet and talk without forcing them and without imposing anything, a place which simply invites to be there. (…) It was a symbolic way to give this space to the people and to encourage them to interact and cooperate without imposed regulations or rules, to free them from how people were taught to act in socialism, always on command, in a pre-programmed way.[30]

The loggia was linked with Nowa Huta's Plac Centralny – the district's monumental, representative square, designed as a site for parades and carefully choreographed marches praising the communist state. The concept of the representative square was one of the dominant examples of how socialist realist urbanism became subordinated to propagandistic aims. Loegler's loggia enters into a dialogue with Plac Centralny by its use of simplified classical forms, although in a notably critical way. Its modest, approachable scale is an antithesis of the pompous monumentality of socialist realist representative city squares. Its politics is also very different in its emphasis on spontaneity and bottom-up initiative. As Loegler says:

> Plac Centralny was formed according to the ideology of its period. (…) It was planned as a social space, a site for mass manifestations showing the power of the working class people. (…) This was our point of departure, as we decided to reinterpret its programmed content and refer it to a different scale. [We wanted to] give this space a different meaning: to reject banners, mass marches, and replace them with the ordinary person, in his natural scale, cleaned from all this pompousness.[31]

In the one of the first plans for Nowa Huta in the late 1940s, its designers planned to situate a theatre building on Plac Centralny. "We," recalls Loegler, "replaced it with an unprofessional theatre initiated by the people themselves."[32] For Loegler, the "urban

---

[30] Ibid.
[31] Loegler, "Konkurs SARP na rozwiazanie zespolu mieszkalnego," 61.
[32] Ibid.

theatre" was not restricted to high-brow cultural events, but included "actions of various types, actions which would help to bring back natural, urban tendencies. All that is needed is the right scale to attract vendors, buyers, or even casual drunks – all this is normal, human, it happens in cities and should be happening in Nowa Huta too."[33] The urban loggia was never realized, as "[n]obody wanted to invest in an empty space without a clear function assigned to it."[34]

Na Skarpie was therefore seen as an agent of change both by the architects and by the government, though through fundamentally different agendas. Nowa Huta was intended to demonstrate the Party's openness and its will to improve the living conditions of the working class in times of increasing social unrest, threatening the existence of socialist state. The new housing development in Nowa Huta was a chance to show the Party's caring face and to appease the inhabitants of the neighborhood, which was a site of major worker's strikes between 1981 and 1983. At the same time, Loegler's team took advantage of the relatively flexible competition rules as an occasion to create a more democratic design:

> [W]e tried to create spatial remedies for social atomization and the anonymity of living in a mass-produced, homogeneous housing estate by focusing on common spaces. Our goal was to create a bond between the people, and also identification of the inhabitants with the place they live in.[35]

---

[33] Ibid.

[34] Loegler, "Interview with Romuald Loegler," 160.

[35] Ibid.

The construction of Na Skarpie started two years after the competition, in 1987 when the downfall of the old system was already imminent. The persuasive power of bold postmodern forms proved to be weaker than the rising social dissent in Nowa Huta and the rest of the country. The sculptural façades and bright elevations painted with poster colors failed to convince the people of the Party's concern with the citizens' well-being and failed to restore their faith in socialism. A year later, in May 1988, Nowa Huta was the site of a much more immediate form of persuasion than architecture – the government's brutal suppression of the Lenin Steelworks' workers' strike.

When changes caused by the crisis of Modernism and by the rise of postmodernism in architecture and urban planning permeated Polish architectural circles, the Party reacted wisely. It was safer to introduce postmodernism as "a consistent trend resulting from permanent improvement in functioning of the socialist democracy." Rather than a capitalist, potentially reactionary, import, it was represented as home-grown. Postmodernism helped the government formulate a necessary response to the growing criticism of mass-produced housing and to renew the Party's image as caring for its citizens. These efforts to "humanize" architecture (as Loegler characterized it) with the use of postmodern principles appeared in a precarious political moment of social unrest. Acceptance or – as the competition for Na Skarpie shows – even the promotion of postmodern architecture offered the Party a chance to salvage its paternal image.

Ultimately, postmodern architecture proved incapable of appeasing "thousands of angry people," but the government's positive attitude towards postmodern currents made postmodernism in Polish architecture possible. The official acceptance of postmodern notions, in turn, allowed their use by architects in anti-communist statements (as Chapter 5 shows).

4. Postmodernism Against the State: Poland

Paradoxically, postmodern architecture in late socialist Poland could present anti-government statements not just despite but because of its acceptance by the government. As the Party embraced postmodernism as "a consistent trend resulting from permanent improvement in the functioning of socialist democracy," postmodern ideas could circulate freely in architectural discourse as ideologically safe.[1] This, in turn, allowed their use by architects with anti-communist sentiments. As the example of Romuald Loegler's Centrum E shows, this coexistence of opposing ideological interpretations and contrasting uses of postmodern architecture was possible even within a single realization.

The architects using postmodern forms and ideas as tools to oppose the vision of society and urban space imposed by the politics of the Polish People's Republic cannot be described as a homogeneous group. Some of them – like Czesław Bielecki – translated postmodernism into a strong, oppositional message against communist and socialist values. Others, like Loegler or Marek Budzyński, opposed the Polish socialist government, but not socialist principles. For them, postmodernism was a tool to achieve social change by slowly transforming the oppressive system from within. This chapter explores these diverse practices and shows how postmodern architecture was used as a

[1] Bruszewski, "Editor's Afterword," 76.

political platform by architects who believed in social and political change through architecture.

4.1 Oppositional Postmodernism: Czesław Bielecki and DiM Group

In late socialist Poland, it would have been hard to find a more politically engaged architect than Czesław Bielecki. Besides his architectural practice, Bielecki had and has a parallel career in politics, beginning as an oppositional activist in socialist Poland and, after the political transformation of 1989, becoming a conservative, right-wing politician. Bielecki strongly opposed not only the Polish socialist government, but also the industrialized architecture of late modernism, which he saw as "a method of communization."[2] With articles such as "Continuity in Architecture," which introduced Polish readers to key postmodern concepts, Bielecki became one of the first proponents of postmodern ideas in Polish architecture.[3] As Loegler states, "Czesław Bielecki used postmodernism as an anti-systemic statement against the government. He was able to translate it [postmodernism] in a political way and create a manifesto that fitted right into the time of tremendous changes."[4]

Since the seventies, Bielecki was an active member of the anti-government opposition. From 1979, he was a collaborator of *Kultura Paryska* ("Paris Culture") – a

---

[2] "Architektów kłopoty z wolnością," 28. Bielecki himself, despite his reputation as one of the most recognized postmodern architects in Poland, insists on describning his architectural practice as "eclecticism," not "postmodernism."
[3] Bielecki, "Continuity in Architecture."
[4] Loegler, "Interview with Romuald Loegler," 156.

leading Polish-émigré cultural magazine published in Rome and then Paris, which was an important platform for the anti-communist opposition.[5] He was also active in various anti-government underground movements and organizations in the country, including Polska Walcząca (Fighting Poland) between 1970 and 1979 and Polskie Porozumienie Niepodległościowe PPN (Polish Accord for Independence) from 1979 to 1980. From 1980, Bielecki was also a member of the Solidarność (Solidarity) movement. Arrested in 1968, 1983, and 1985 (with one of the charges being an attempt to overturn the political system), Bielecki became the most vocal opponent of the regime in Polish architectural circles. In 1980, Bielecki was the main initiator of the DiM ("Dom i Miasto" ["House and City"]) group, which emerged after discussions held during one of the SARP's meetings in Gdańsk, and existed for roughly four years. While the group comprised of over twenty members, its most active figures were Jacek Cybis, Wojciech Szymborski, and Jacek Zielonka. The group's name was intended to signal a postulated shift in design priorities – from concrete panel housing units and large-scale housing settlements to architecture and urbanism rooted in traditional forms such as "house" and "city." DiM did not produce any actual urban or architectural designs and their theories were presented only in forms of documents.

---

[5] Bielecki was publishing his articles under nickname (Maciej Polecki) and was never identified as their author by Polish socialist government. Besides *Kultura Paryska* he was collaborating with several underground oppositional magazines in Poland (*Mały Konspirator* and *Tygodnik KOS*, among others).

During the International Congress of Architecture, which was hosted by SARP in Warsaw in 1981 (referred to hereafter as "the Congress"), the DiM group curated an exhibition on the reconstruction of Warsaw after WWII and distributed their manifesto – a single-page document entitled *DiM Charter*. DiM's participation in the Congress was officially supported by "Solidarność," and the Charter was printed by the organization with its stamped logo.[6] The document was distributed to visitors of the Congress as a large-format leaflet, available in in English, Polish, German and French. The *DiM Charter* does not mention postmodernism explicitly, but its critique of modernist architecture and urban planning is saturated with ideas fundamental for the postmodern turn in architecture. The title is a polemical reference to *The Athens Charter*, which the authors blame for "breaking the continuity of culture" and "the destruction of traditional city."[7] Through ten paragraphs of the document (Architecture and Politics; Between Collectivism and Individualism; The Responsibility for the Crisis in Architecture; Continuity in Architecture; Urban Planning, Monumental Architecture and City Fabric; Architecture is Art; The Language of Architecture; Social Role of the Architect; Memento), the authors reveal their vision for architecture and the city as standing in "fundamental opposition to the documents issued by the Association of Polish

[6] Solidarność did not have any specified beliefs regarding architecture or urban space. Nevertheless, Bielecki mentions that many of their core members – such as Zbigniew Bujak, Wojciech Kulewski or Krystyna Zachwatowicz – recognized the importance of architecture and its connection to politics. Bielecki, interview by the author.
[7] Dom i Miasto group, *DiM Charter*, pamphlet, Warsaw 1981.

Architects SARP."[8] The *DiM Charter* begins by characterizing architecture as a socio-political problem and describes contemporary architecture as dominated by "totalism,"[9] due to its reliance on standardization and prefabrication. As a remedy, The *Charter* states that "it is necessary to bring the continuity in architecture back, finding the meaning of [forgotten] words from the architect's toolkit, such as style, modus and canon," for "[t]he goal of practicing architecture is not the creation of new terms, but the reinterpretation of the eternal phenomena of house and city."[10] Besides this return to history and traditional values in architecture, the *DiM Charter* draws on an array of postmodern theories, although without referring to specific authors or books. Echoing works such as Rowe and Koetter's *Collage City* or Venturi's *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*, *DiM* claims that "[t]he city is simultaneously a composition and a collage. The ideas of monumentality and urban fabric exist as a contrast."[11] In the following passages, the authors state that the modernist "concept of architecture as science of technology deprives it from its role as culture generator and myth creator" and that "[a]esthetic functions are architecture's raison d'être." Further, indirectly referring to Alexander's *Pattern Language*, the authors state that "[r]educing architecture to function deprives it of its role as a medium in social communication. In the moment when the pattern language was substituted with newspeak of precast concrete houses, settlements

---

[8] Czesław Bielecki, email message, July 9 2016.
[9] Obsolete word for totalitarianism.
[10] Dom i Miasto group, *DiM Charter*.
[11] Ibid.

and pavilions, the city started to be illegible, monotonous, and death for its inhabitants. It is possible to build a city only using the elementary patterns of interiors, houses, streets and piazzas as a basis."[12] In the *DiM Charter*, architecture is framed as an artistic (rather than purely technical) discipline and a communication act playing an important cultural and social role due to its myth-making potential.

These views, fundamental for the postmodern turn in architecture, were for the DiM group inseparable from its anti-socialist message. The authors argue against "[n]ationalization in the name of fighting the chaos" and call for the respect for private property, stating that "[u]rban planning is auspicious for social life only when it is paired with the ownership of one's territory" and that "[i]n the name of aesthetic coherence the architect cannot deprive individuals the right for expressing their personality, for spontaneous actions, for choice."[13] In DiM's manifesto, the right for aesthetic choice, limited or non-existent in the reality of the uniform, state-funded architecture of late socialist Poland, is inseparably connected with politics and economics. The optimal conditions for architecture are guaranteed by the free market economy, as artistic freedom can be achieved only by "the limitation of the state monopoly in building, [fostering] healthy competition among the professionals, [having] the possibility to choose the client and the architect." Architectural freedom is a social and political postulate as "[i]n a democratic society there cannot be art without

---

[12] Ibid.
[13] Ibid.

competing artistic agendas." This message is amplified by the concluding paragraph of the *DiM Charter* ("Memento") stating that "[t]he solidarity against the totalitarian threat of the individual and nation reminds us today that architecture can be humane and beautiful only when it is created by free citizens serving a free society."[14]

The openly political, anti-government character of the *Charter* makes it a unique document in late-socialist Polish architecture. DiM's anti-communist message, which "fitted right into the time of tremendous changes," combined with attractive ideas of postmodernism, resonated among Polish architects and contributed to Bielecki's reputation as actively engaged in both pro-capitalist, political activity and the dissemination of postmodern theories.[15] DiM's postulates were noticed and interpreted as political statements both by Polish architectural circles and international observers. In his introduction to "Postmodern", Paolo Portoghesi argues that "postmodern theses have deep roots in the present human conditions," which

> is confirmed today in the document on architecture issued by the Polish union Solidarity. This text accuses the modern city of being the product of an alliance between bureaucracy and totalitarianism, and singles out the great error of modern architecture in the break of historical continuity. Solidarity's words should be meditated upon, especially by those who have confused a great movement of collective consciousness [postmodernism] with a passing fashion.[16]

---

[14] Ibid.
[15] Loegler, "Interview with Romuald Loegler," 156.
[16] Portoghesi, *Postmodern*, 8.

The document mentioned by Portoghesi was the *DiM Charter*, which he had a chance to read during the Congress.[17] Similarly, in *The Story of Post-Modernism*, Charles Jencks mentions that the Solidarity Movement had been in touch with him in 1981 when he visited Warsaw. Jencks mentions Poland as one of the countries "behind the Iron Curtain where Modernism was at its most virulent and mandated as a total approach to the environment."[18] He recalls that Polish, Hungarian, and Czech architects became especially interested in postmodernism and that soon after "by the mid-1980s just about every country with a totalitarian apparatus, and underground, joined the movement."[19] Jencks doesn't specify who exactly was in touch with him during his visit in 1981, but Bielecki confirms that he and other members of the DiM group met with him during the Congress and discussed the group's manifesto.[20]

During its four years of existence, the DiM group issued a few more documents on architecture and urban planning. Apart from the *DiM Charter*, the crucial one was *Ways to Solve the Housing Problem* (Drogi Rozwiazywania Kwestii Mieszkaniowej), published between 1981 and 1984 and, analogically to *DiM Charter*, distributed as a leaflet with the Solidarność logo.[21] Analogically to the *DiM Charter*, the document

---

[17] Since none of the members of DiM preserved English version of the "DiM Charter" in their private archives, the author uses her own translation of the Polish document.

[18] Charles Jencks, *The Story of Post-Modernism: Five Decades of the Ironic, Iconic and Critical in Architecture* (Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley, 2011), 250.

[19] Ibid.

[20] Bielecki, email message.

[21] Dom i Miasto group, *Drogi Rozwiazywania Kwestii Mieszkaniowej*, pamphlet, Warsaw 1981–1984, page not numbered.

considers “the city as a result of socio-economic processes” and links modernism (which denied the “traditional city with houses built along streets and squares”) with “totalitarian systems.”[22] According to this document, the disastrous condition of architecture in late socialist Poland can be repaired only by a radical shift towards capitalism: “[t]he introduction of free market mechanisms” will allow “all social and economic subjects to take part in the free market game” and make space for “social and economic initiatives, which are now paralyzed by the existing state monopoly. (…) It is time to stop supporting unprofitable behemoths and accept the existence of small private initiatives and cooperatives.” This postulated change from the socialist economy to the free market model is again tied to the shift from modernist paradigms of design to the traditional urban forms promoted by postmodernism. More so than in the *DiM Charter*, Ways to Solve the Housing Problem stresses that urban design should be focused on the question of street as “the street unites the vital functions of living, trade, services and communication in the most economical way. Meanwhile, the most oppressive quality of [late modernist] settlements is the separation of functions contrary to our tradition and psychological expectations; real streets cannot be materialized in them as they lead “from nowhere to nowhere.” In contrast to the politics of the late socialist Polish housing models focused on collectivity (multi-family housing units), the document prioritizes individuals, their families, and their need for personal space.

---

[22] Ibid.

Instead of anonymous settlements, the politics of housing should be based on "houses for many generations, [which] reduce the need of social housing in the future. [The owner] is responsible for the maintenance of building and surrounding greenery (…). Therefore, with an aid of an appropriate strategy of mortgages, we should create conditions optimal for the development of individual houses." This model is possible only "under the condition of decentralization, when freedom of choice will be possible."[23] DiM univocally rejects the Party's efforts towards the "humanization" of architecture, which – as Loegler's example of Centrum E shows – were used by the architects as an occasion to pursue their own, progressive design ideas within state-funded investments. For DiM, late-socialist architecture and its politics cannot be simply changed or improved but should be rejected altogether: "as long as the pluralism of social and economic life wont develop freely, architecture is doomed to monotony. Sculptural forms of buildings or murals and other efforts to 'humanize' architecture are, in the centralized economy, only treatments of symptoms without curing the real disease."[24]

DiM's reflections on architecture and urban space were continued by an informal seminar group organized by Bielecki after his release from prison in 1986. Its participants, meeting once every few months in Bielecki's workshop in Warsaw, were mainly practicing architects, architecture critics, and intellectuals invested in urban

---

[23] Ibid.
[24] Ibid.

space. The group did not have any formalized structure or program, but the discussions were focused on postmodern architectural theories read and interpreted in political contexts. The political agenda of the meetings was clear. As Marta Leśniakowska (architecture critic and one of the participants) put it, the meetings were "pleasant seminars during which we were saving the world, architecture and the homeland from the commies."[25] As Leśniakowska says, "the seminars had a strong political dimension. The closer it was to the downfall of communism, the more chances we saw in creating new social forms/facts with architecture and urbanism. It was strongly political."[26] The participants discussed readings of Alexander (one of the members, Jacek Zielonka, was in the process of translating "Pattern Language"), as well as canonical postmodern texts by authors like Venturi or Jencks. Leśniakowska stresses that the members of the group were not interested in postmodernism as a new style, based on superficial, ironic, and formalist references to history. Instead, postmodernism was a way to think about the city in a radically different way than it was promoted by the Polish socialist State. As she describes,

> [f]or us, in Poland, the interest in postmodernism was different than in the West. It was a chance to revive the traditions of Polish architecture instead of the universalist, international language of modernism. Postmodernism wasn't for us a matter of form, a matter of façade, we were interested in how the city works, we wanted to return to traditional urban forms such as streets, quarters or squares. (…) For us, the form was an expression of ideological and political attitudes. We understood postmodernism as a chance for the renewal of architectural vocabulary. We believed that the return to detail, to human and

[25] Marta Leśniakowska, email message, July 8 2016.
[26] Leśniakowska, interview by the author.

> urban scales (…), to traditional thinking about urban fabric – very different from the oppressive character of late socialist architecture – would shape new kinds of social relations.[27]

After the transition of 1989, as the political context changed radically, the seminars were no longer organized. The discussions held during the seminars weren't transcribed and there are no sources documenting the meetings. Nevertheless, Bielecki's most known book, *The City Game* (published in 1996), which its author characterizes as "written in the shadow of post-totalitarianism and postmodernism," is based on key ideas developed during these meetings.[28] *The City Game*, described by a critic as "an optimistic manifesto of liberal politics, in which the authorities, architects and investors build a consensus and create a new, better, marketized living space,"[29] provides an accurate summary of the anti-socialist and free market oriented ideology of both DiM and the seminars led by Bielecki. For Bielecki, postmodernism provided a chance to materialize these ideas in urban space and to create architecture that would eventually generate new, anti-communist forms of social life.

4.2 Reforming the System from Within: The Architecture of Marek Budzyński

No other figure or group used postmodern currents as part of an oppositional strategy in so strong or evident a fashion as Bielecki and DiM. Although the majority of architects and urbanists, as well as of artists, academics, and intellectuals, was

---

[27] Ibid.
[28] Czesław Bielecki, *Gra w Miasto* (Warsaw: DOM Dostepny, 1996), 185.
[29] Rafał Woś, "Gra w miasto," *Dziennik Gazeta Prawna*, October 10 2013.

supportive of the anti-government opposition and the Solidarność movement, the State remained their major employer. The centralized, State-controlled nature of the profession of architecture in socialist Poland limited the possibilities of real oppositional engagement to strictly underground activity if one wished to remain a practicing architect. Moreover, not everyone wanted a radical overturn of the system or believed that socialism should be rejected all together. It was common to believe that the desired and long-awaited social and political change did not necessarily mean the rejection of socialist values and the unequivocal acceptance of the ideology of western capitalism. Such opinions were expressed widely, also within the Solidarność movement, with Karol Modzelewski or Jacek Kuroń – both leading oppositionists in the People's Republic of Poland – as the most prominent examples.[30] It was also not uncommon among the intelligentsia, including architects, to look for possible changes in the political and economic system that would have an evolutionary rather than revolutionary character and would incorporate, instead of unequivocally reject, socialist ideas.

One of the architects who believed in the possibility to reform the system from within and placed his hopes in the formulation of a "third way" between socialism and capitalism was Marek Budzyński. As Budzyński stated when describing his activity in the seventies and eighties,

---

[30] For more on socialist beliefs within members of Solidarity movement see: Jadwiga Staniszkis, *Poland's Self-Limiting Revolution* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1984); Alain Touraine, *Solidarity: The Analysis of a Social Movement: Poland 1980-1981* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1983); Jan Sowa, *Inna Rzeczpospolita jest możliwa! Widma przeszłości, wizje przyszłości* (Warszawa: WAB, 2015).

> I was very socially engaged, I was organizing workshops on local democracy and this has always been my passion. I believed that we [Poland] could be a real model of connecting socialism and capitalism. Despite the opinions that they are completely contradictory, I think that they can be united in a creative way, just as I believe in the union of contradictions in general. At that time, I believed it would work out, but the problem was, I think, the fact that we – both the elites and society – weren't prepared to formulate a socio-liberal system. Making use of the democracy, we gave ourselves over to neoliberalism, which destroys democracy.[31]

Reflecting on his architectural practice in late socialist times, Budzyński expressed his belief in the political dimension of design and placed his efforts within a broader attempt to fix the imperfections of socialism:

> [D]esigning, both then and now, has a political or even macroeconomic character. We were living in the times of real socialism, which didn't have much in common with the ideas of true socialism. But in the seventies, there was a strong will to modify the system.[32]

For Budzyński, postmodern concepts were useful tools to create a bridge reconciling contradicting systems of communism and capitalism. The city served as a possible platform for such union.

4.3 North Ursynów

The most important example realizing Budzyński's theories is the North Ursynów estate in Warsaw, designed for 40,000 inhabitants in collaboration with Jerzy Szczepanik-Dzikowski and Andrzej Szkop as well as a vast team of assistant architects and sociologists. The construction began in 1975 and the first residents moved there in

---

[31] See: Marek Budzyński, "Interview with Marek Budzyński" in *Polish Postmodernism: Architecture and Urbanism, vol. 2*, edited by Alicja Gzowska and Lidia Klein (Warszawa: 40000 Malarzy, 2013), 58.
[32] Marek Budzyński, "Architekt jako urbanista" (interview by Katarzyna Bilik and Karolina Matysiak), *Rzut* 6 (2015), 73.

1977. Ursynów was planned as a "city within/in the city" – an urban unit independent from Warsaw, but connected to it with a subway. The self-sufficient character of Ursynów was achieved by providing all infrastructure and functions necessary for its inhabitants, such as schools, daycares, a post office, numerous stores, street markets, and other services. It was also planned to provide a sizable number of workplaces for its residents. Ursynów was one of the flagship projects realized in late socialist Poland under Edward Gierek's leadership. The government strived to present North Ursynów as evidence of successful governance, a thriving economy, and overall progress and advancement. The construction of the settlement was covered in numerous articles in magazines and daily newspapers, as well as by the Polska Kronika Filmowa (Polish Film Chronicle).[33] In one of the materials produced by the TVP (Telewizja Polska, the only TV station in socialist Poland), Ursynów is visited by Edward Gierek and the delegation of Party representatives. Walking through the construction site, Gierek says, "I am observing the construction of this settlement from the very beginning. We don't know how [the buildings] will look on the inside, but if it will be as pretty as it is on the outside, I think that the people will be happy." "Comrade secretary, it is likely that the interiors are even prettier!" one of the construction supervisors quickly adds.[34] The Ursynów estate received special attention from the government and itself functioned as a tool for Party propaganda just as much as the Polska Kronika Filmowa and TVP

---

[33] Two episodes of Polska Kronika Filmowa were devoted to North Ursynów: PKF 27/1979, PKF 3/1988.
[34] *Edward Gierek na Ursynowie* (TV documentary), aired on January 08 1977, TVP.

newsreels did themselves. Gierek, by overseeing the construction site himself, showed his personal involvement in the living conditions of the inhabitants of North Ursynów and – by extrapolation – Polish citizens in general. Through the design of a new citizen-friendly settlement with experimental urban solutions, the Party had a chance to refresh its image in times of rising social tensions and dissatisfaction with the deteriorating economy.

Gierek liked to emphasize the importance of architecture for the Party and praised Ursynów as an example of architecture focused on social needs. On June 1st 1977, the SARP delegation was received by Gierek for a consultative meeting before the VII Plenary Session of the Party organized under the slogan, "For a Better Quality of Work and the Life of the Nation." The introduction to *Architektura* 5-6 1977, written by SARP's president, Jerzy Buszkiewicz, was devoted entirely to the meeting. Architects presented their "views on the problems of new housing" and, as Buszkiewicz stressed, Gierek "listened to them with understanding." In his presentation, Gierek emphasized the need to

> preserve the beauty and functionality of historical cities, and the continuation of this historical tradition in new urban forms. (…) Comrade Gierek spoke approvingly about the results of some of the last housing realizations, for example settlements in Wroclaw or Warsaw, such as Ursynów. This approval pertained to [the architects'] endeavor to create settlements of distinct character and achieving a diversified and [more] intimate dimension of prefabricated building technologies. Comrade Gierek emphasized that housing architecture is a national problem. (…)

> On behalf of SARP, I reasured the First Secretary of KCPZPR, comrade Edward Gierek (…) that Polish architects are consistently engaged [in this mission].[35]

The plan for the North Ursynów estate emerges therefore in the context of the Party looking for ways to improve its perception by the people, but also within a specific milieu in Polish architecture, marked by a growing dissatisfaction with prefabricated mass housing. The first major presentation of the design for North Ursynów appeared in *Architektura* in 1975[36] and is preceded by an introduction summing up opinions on mass housing expressed by architectural circles and the general public from the early seventies.[37] The introduction starts with the assertion that using industrial building methods is the only feasible solution for the housing problems and that "[t]he understanding of this truth is at the basis of housing policy in Poland, because we have to construct 7.3 million new dwellings by 1990."[38] Although late-modern estates

> transformed the spatial environment of man, giving him sun and air (…) the results were often not equal to the intentions. (…) Uniform houses, arranged in a uniform pattern, produced a depressing monotony. The results of losing the correct scale were becoming increasingly noticeable. (…) The uniformity and monotony of housing areas is becoming intensely felt. The identical lay-outs, consisting of identical houses with identical detail, are becoming increasingly anonymous, lacking individual identity (…). The need for a different approach to the design of house areas is becoming more and more evident. (…) The housing areas have become dormitories (...). There is a growing need to create an integrated spatial environment of intermixed residential, shopping, cultural, educational, and other social functions. To develop urban areas, which (…) would represent

---

[35] "Consultative meeting of the First Secretary of the Central Committee of PUWP with representatives of the Association of Polish Architects before the VII Plenary Session," *Architektura* 5–6 (1977), page not numbered.

[36] See *Architektura* issue #326–327 (1975) from pp. 22–72.

[37] In *Architektura*, the first articles expressing dissatisfaction with the condition of industrialized mass housing buildings appeared in 1971.

[38] Ibid., 10.

> fragments of the town as a whole. The notion of "a street" is being again recognized, a street (…) full of life, facilitating social contacts with an attractive programme of differentiated functions. There are various attempts to create new residential areas adequately meeting the present-day demands. One of them is the project for Ursynów-North, a Warsaw district, presented on the following pages.[39]

The competition for Ursynów was won in 1970 by a team led by an experienced urbanist, Ludwik Borawski, who suddenly died very soon after. Szczepanik-Dzikowski and Szkop decided to invite Marek Budzyński, who was finishing his internship in the Danish studio, Sven Hogsbro, at that time to replace Borawski. Budzyński agreed to become the new general planner of Ursynów and held this function beginning in 1971. Budzyński decided to get involved in the project under the condition of creating a new plan from scratch rather than developing the one designed by Borawski. Although Ursynów was realized in the obligatory prefabricated concrete panel system, it was planned as a social and urban experiment breaking with the model of loosely distributed, disconnected housing units arranged according to a clear, geometricized plan. Instead of a rigid outline based on straight lines, which would have been typical for late-socialist modernist settlements, the plan of North Ursynów by Budzyński's team is based on organic, irregular lines of housing units of different heights and lengths. The ground level is diversified by artificial hills, slopes, and elevations created with the soil removed during the construction process. The units are placed along both sides of Komisja Edukacji Narodowej – the main communication artery connecting Ursynów with the rest of Warsaw. The curves and bends created by the units allow for interior

[39] Ibid., 6–20.

urban spaces that are much more cozy and intimate than the vast open spaces known from late modern housing settlements. The lines of housing units are interrupted by narrow openings for small pedestrian streets and alleys connecting the units with the rest of the settlement. North Ursynów was built using two systems of prefabricates: *Szczecin*, based on a 4.8m/2/4m concrete slab, and *WK-70* offering slabs in a range of sides between 2.4m and 6m. The first – the *Szczecin* system – allowed for slight diversification of the slabs' texture by adding surface elements such as white granite chips, which were used in some Ursynów's buildings. With the use of a more flexible systems of prefabricates, which allowed at least some formal diversity, the designers hoped to achieve a settlement significantly different from most of architecture in late socialist Poland.

The main intention of the designer's team was to return to the ideals of traditional urban space, especially the street, and recreate them within a socialist city. As we can read in "The Rehabilitation of the Street," an article describing the objectives behind Ursynów's design, "the leading principle for us was to achieve functional and spatial continuity (…), [w]e tried to create a new urban tissue for Warsaw. It is realized, inter alia, in our attempt to restore the concept of 'the street," as a result of which "the buildings are not dominating over the space, but are integral parts of it."[40] The apartment blocks of various heights and lengths are situated along narrow streets. The ground level was planned for stores,

---

[40] Andrzej Szkop, "Rehabilitacja Ulicy," *Architektura* 326–327 (1975), 41.

restaurants, and services ensuring functional diversity and "[i]ntricate minglings of different uses," following Jacobs's guidelines on the components of well-planned, living cities. The pedestrian traffic is privileged within the entire complex:

> The speed of a walking pedestrian is a natural speed for registering [urban] phenomena and sensing the space. (…) The pedestrians' attention is concentrated above all in the spaces for stores and services. Therefore, when designing the elevations, we are thinking not in terms of singular buildings but of street frontages, especially their ground floors. The variability of the space and its individual character play the most important role in the identification of residents with "spatial spheres," such as neighborhood, block, street, courtyard, house (…). Such identification is crucial for the residents' well-being. (…) The ground floor decides the character of the street. (…) [T]he most important elements are on the level of the pedestrians' sight. (…) The ground floor is the closest to the human scale (…) it provides a natural terrain for human interactions.[41]

The project descriptions for North Ursynów are saturated with the rhetoric known from works of such thinkers as Alexander and Jacobs, even though its planners didn't refer to their theories explicitly in descriptions. As Budzyński admitted in an interview thirty years after designing Ursynów, Jacobs was an especially vital point of reference. "When I was thirty years old," he says, "Jane Jacobs was a crucial figure. Everyone involved in Ursynów knew who she was, we were reading and using her theories."[42] "She," writes Budzyski, "had a strong influence [on Polish architects in the seventies]. Christopher Alexander as well (…). His attempt was to create the city from patterns meaningful for groups and individual users of space. He noticed them, named them and showed that

---

[41] Ibid.

[42] Budzyński, "Interview with Marek Budzyński," 20.

this is how you design the city. (…) I need to admit that he had a strong influence on me."[43]

In the project statement, Budzyński outlined the major goals of Ursynów and presented them as part of wider political goals and promises declared by the Party and its leader Edward Gierek:

> The design of Ursynów North was and is synchronized with the decisions for accelerated socio-economic development of the country [as well as the declaration of] opening ways for initiatives [and] the general devaluation of the old standards, norms, requirements, and bureaucratized institutional actions. [It is tied to] the moment of searching for new forms of action, defining goals and ways of achieving them, awakening inspirations and setting ambitious challenges. This moment of struggle, high hopes, and will, [this moment of] meaningful, not just formal, undertakings.[44]

As the general idea behind Ursynów, Budzyński indicated "continuation, reference to forms which already exist. The design for Ursynów is not an attempt to find something 'new'. It is an attempt to materialize and realize well known 'truths'."[45] The major principle of the design was "[t]o allow the inhabitants to take part in the shape, form, and use of their spatial environment [as well as to] give them a bigger spectrum of choice" and to "adjust the initial spatial organization to its unpredicted, organic transformations."[46]

The presentation of the Ursynów project stands out from the majority of the presentations of Polish mass housing designs, not only because of the language focused on

---

[43] Ibid., 13–14.
[44] Marek Budzyński, "Ursynów Polnocny – uwarunkowania, zasady," *Architektura* 326–327 (1975), 25.
[45] Ibid.
[46] Ibid., 25–26. The architects sought also other than architectural means to establish symbolic connections between Ursynów and the city. For example, in the early days of Ursynów's design, the architects tried to create a lapidarium of Warsaw's townhouses in Ursynów. *Architektura* 407 (1982), 62.

the role of individual users, flexibility, and the return to traditional urban patters but also because of the distinctively attractive visual material. Instead of the usual way in which projects were presented in *Architektura* – with cold technical drawings, plans and axonometric drawings, sometimes accompanied by a rather formal photo of the authors – North Ursynów's presentation was a powerful visual statement. Two major visualizations of the project, drawn by Budzyński, Szczepanik-Dzikowski, and Szkop in black, blue, and bright pink show Ursynów's spaces as lively, dense places with housing of different heights covered with wild-looking creepers, common spaces such as playgrounds or neighborhood clubs, as well as services like shops, restaurants, bars, and cafes with neon signs of major Polish brands of that time (such as "Hortex" or "Pollena") and even "Coca-Cola." The presence of the Coca-Cola slogan in particular is a meaningful detail, given the brand's role in Gierek's plan of opening the country to the West. In the fifties and sixties Coca-Cola, as an obvious symbol of Western capitalism, had been described by propaganda press as "liquid pest."[47] The Party warned Polish citizens of the dangers of the imperialist way of life with the popular slogan, "the enemy lures you with Coca-Cola," and the beverage was absent from Polish stores.[48] In December 1971, very soon after Gierek's team took over, the government bought a license to produce Coca-Cola locally.

---

[47] Literally: "liquid potato beetle." Communist propaganda claimed that the potato beetle had been introduced in Poland, East Germany, and Czechoslovakia to cause famine and economic crisis. During the Cold War, the Warsaw Pact countries launched a common campaign called "The War Against the Potato Beetle."

[48] For more see: "Bąbelki i socjalizm z ludzką twarzą: Pepsi-cola w PRL," *Polska Times,* August 18 2010 and "Stonka w płynie," *Newsweek*, July 29 2007.

Coca-Cola thus became one of the symbols of Gierek's new era of openness and prosperity. Instead of overwhelming, monotonous concrete wilderness, which dominated the landscape of late socialist Poland, Ursynów's visualizations promised a vibrant city, with an integrated local community of inhabitants living surrounded by greenery and spending free time in neighborhood clubs and even enjoying the once-forbidden imperialist soda.

The texts of Budzyński and other designers of Ursynów are illustrated not only with drawings, maps, plans, and models, but also with numerous pictures showing young architects at work at the design studio, sketching studiously and explaining ideas to others, walking through Ursynów's muddy ground and laughing while carrying a toddler-size bathtub filled with picnic food, or barbequing sausages and drinking beer on the site of the future Gierek's flagship mass housing undertaking. All of this sent a clear message: Ursynów was an unprecedented project and a break from the inhuman and intimidating late-socialist settlements.

The pictures of joyous and enthusiastic young architects suggested a real change in approach to architecture, just as the progressive plan for Ursynów promised an opening of the new citizen-friendly era of the regime. Stimulating the urban character of Ursynów was essential to this task; as Szkop recalls, "we assumed that it [Ursynów] should be a city, not a huge settlement. This is the difference. We used references to historical projects we knew from the lectures on history of architecture. (…) We solved many problems thanks

to the solutions from the past. And you can see traces [of this thinking] in Ursynów: urban patterns, streets, the ways we developed the area." The team's design narrows the streets and diversifies the monotonous, concrete housing units with elements such as roofing, arcades, or stairs with railings. One of the traditional, pre-modern urban patterns key for Ursynów's design team was the model of a housing unit with services and stores located in the first floor and thus accesible from the street. This idea was heavily limited not only by the reality of the post-socialist economy in which, as Szkop commented ironically forty years after Ursynów's design, "there was nothing to trade,"[49] but also by the necessity of the use of prefabricated concrete modules. Concrete slabs not only made traditional retail solutions such as storefronts impossible, but also limited the possible surface of stores and services. The designers struggled to overcome these limitations by erecting rows of retail pavilions attached to housing buildings.

Another important element diversifying North Ursynów was the greenery, developed with landscape architect Irena Bajerska. The ground of North Ursynów was initially flat, and the designers decided to diversify its surface by raising selected areas and create hills of different dimensions. The main goal in the landscaping of Ursynów was to preserve existing trees as well as to plant new ones to create spaces with wild-looking greenery rather than neatly organized modernist parks. In Ursynów, trees and plants were not reduced to "the lungs of the city," or a merely functional element serving the

---

[49] Szkop, quoted in Lidia Pańków, *Bloki w słońcu. Mała historia Ursynowa Północnego* (Wołowiec: Czarne 2016), 109.

hygienistic purpose of providing oxygen and supporting healthy living functions, as they had been presented in modernist documents such as *The Athens Charter*[50]; rather, trees and plants were treated as sculptural elements shaping the architecture of the complex. Creepers like ivy and grapevine, for which the coarse structure of the concrete slabs was a perfect ground, allowed the elevations to function as vertical gardens.

One of the settlement's most prominent spaces is a large city square with a sculptural church, both of which were designed in 1980 by Piotr Wicha, Zbigniew Badowski, and Marek Budzyński. The church was intended to bring a sense of historical continuity into an estate erected from scratch, and the square was planned to recreate the role traditionally played by local town markets and to become "the most prominent town square, which will concentrate the life of the entire population of Ursynów."[51] As Budzyński says,

> We decided that the church in Ursynów should be a symbol of the continuity of culture, Polish identity, that it should be at the same time be a symbol of the connection with the past and a progressive social ideology. We found it important (…) especially in Ursynów, within a newly emerged city fabric. (…) [Ursynów] was made from abstract forms produced in the factories of houses. In Ursynów there was no time for coming of age and "accretion," for changes and growth. (…) Additional problems arose with the simplifications made during the construction process and with the adjustments required by the primitive methods available for construction.[52]

---

[50] Le Corbusier, *The Athens Charter* (New York: Grossman Publishers, 1973).
[51] "Kosciol na Ursynowie polnocnym w Warszawie" (editors' discussion with Marek Budzyński and Piotr Wicha). *Architektura* 407 (1982), 64.
[52] Ibid., 66.

Ursynów's church and square were therefore attempts to save some of the leading design principles of Budzyński's team, which were lost in the realization process. Squat proportions, foundations made of stone, and low, simple portal columns recall examples from Romanesque architecture, while flowing curves of buttresses and façades recall both provincial baroque and gothic forms. Architects juxtaposed historical motifs with modern architectural language – the plain surface of the façade combined with an entrance shaped in the form of cross, and the roof and exterior walls of the aisles covered with copper sheet or bijou precast concrete detail of the portal. The architects put special emphasis on building materials and saw the realization of the church as an opportunity for the revival of traditional craftsmanship. Their intention was to work with natural materials such as brick, stone, or wood rarely used in the industrialized reality of Polish late socialist architecture:

> We wanted to return them to society thanks to this church. Both materials and craftsmen who still know how to use them. Carpenters, masons, stonemasons and their apprentices. These professions are basically destroyed and it would be wonderful if here they could find employment as well as some sort of protection from Ursynów's inhabitants.[53]

The eclectic mélange of architectural styles used in Ursynów's church was supposed to help create a true continuity with tradition and to establish a stronger bond between Ursynów's space and its users. However, instead, as the organic, historicizing forms, red brick, and the attention to architectural detail contrasts sharply with neighboring housing units made with prefabricated slabs, this mixing draws attention to the failures of North

[53] Ibid., 69.

Ursynów's realization. Despite the intentions of its designers, the crude precast concrete dominates the landscape of Ursynów to such a degree that references to traditional and historical urban forms are hard to grasp. The designers' efforts to diversify the complex by, for example, choosing curves and bends rather than straight lines to organize its plan, introducing different heights of the housing units or using various textures of concrete slabs, did result in a living environment of significantly higher quality than the vast majority of housing estates in late socialist Poland. Nevertheless, because of the material and building technology used, Ursynów still overwhelms with the monotonous greyness of precast concrete and repetitiveness of boxy forms of housing units. Despite the designers' intentions, Ursynów resembles a set of building blocks, much like many late modernist settlements.

One of the crucial components of Ursynów was the idea of the participation of the inhabitants in the process of design. User participation – promoted by Western postmodernists as a part of the broader move towards a more egalitarian, democratic architecture – was a controversial idea in the reality of late-socialist Poland. The centrally managed process of design and production of architecture as well as the rather rigid prefabricate system did not present auspicious conditions for user participation. Nevertheless, the Ursynów designers insisted on inviting future users to the process of design. As the team wrote in 1971:

> The architect's role is to serve the society. The architect's work is a stimulator of desires, needs and possibilities. Today's social consciousness (...) allows the

> architect to create in collaboration with the users. We want the future inhabitants of Ursynów to take part in the creation of the city from the very beginning. There should be a bond between designers and inhabitants. (...) We think that it is necessary for the well-being of the people who will live there. They need to know that everything was done there for them.[54]

After the first residents moved in to Ursynów, they were encouraged to participate in the life of the neighborhood by organizing events in community centers or taking care of shared gardens. Those activities were animated by a team of sociologists led by two urban sociologists – Krzysztof Herbst and Waldemar Sieminski – helping the first tenants to meet each other and to make use of spaces designed for their interaction. The ideas of local engagement and the encouragement of social life were therefore integral parts of Ursynów's plan. Initially, Herbst postulated the creation of an Office for Apartment Selection (Biuro Wyboru Mieszkań), an intermediary institution working for the improvement of communication between designers and inhabitants. The users would communicate their particular needs to the officers, who would gather and organize them into a formalized proposal.[55] As Herbst says,

> We needed to reconstruct the space of the community. Communist concepts of housing were targeted to destroy the community as settlement and settlement as community. Our designing was essentially conspiring. For me [the Ursynów planners' work] was like a revelation. And I was contributing sociological thinking to it: ways to prevent crises and conflicts. For example, common laundry rooms. I knew from Sweden that those kinds of spaces greatly enable human interactions, they make people meet with each other.[56]

---

[54] Ludwik Borawski, Jerzy Szczepanik-Dzikowski, and Andrzej Szkop, "Życie i Nowoczesność," *Życie Warszawy*, July 6, 1971.

[55] Krzysztof Herbst, "Propozycje socjotechniczne," *Architektura* 326–327 (1975), 27.

[56] "Najbardziej ludzka sypialnia – Ursynow trzydziesci lat pozniej" (discussion between Krzysztof Herbst, Jan Dziubecki, Marta Bieniasz, Dominik Dobrzanski, Jerzy Szczepanik-Dzikowski, Marek Budzyński, and Stanisław Chrzanowski), *Architektura Murator* 6 (2005): 64–75, 67. Quoted in Pańków, 82.

Although the Office for Apartment Selection never existed as a formalized entity, the team managed to consult minor elements of the design directly with the users. As Herbst recalls, "Budzyński accepted practically every idea, including the wildest ones. (...) Fence the lawn with car tires cut in half – sure, go ahead, insert glass panels on your balcony – yes. As long as there is life, as long as the inhabitants arrange this space for themselves and for their likeness."[57]

When completed, Ursynów was considered as only a partial success. The reality of late socialism was fundamentally different than in socialist Denmark where Budzyński's design philosophy had been shaped:

> In Denmark, I had a chance to carefully observe how a truly open society works, a society, which is based upon the ideas of social democracy. There, the housing defined streets and piazzas, together with the network of services fulfiling inhabitants' needs – laundries, neighborhood clubs, cafes, small daycares. (...) It was really hard to realize this concept given the primitive prefabricated system, which didn't allow us to design along the functional and emotional needs of the future users.[58]

As Piotr Wicha recalls, "there is not a single place in Ursynów completed in accordance with the original project."[59] Less than twenty percent of the services planned in the initial design were realized. Out of the twelve planned piazzas, only one was fully realized. As Budzyński said in an interview held in 1984, "Ursynów was designed with an assumption

---

[57] Ibid.
[58] Marek Budzyński, "Architekt jako urbanista," 74. Romuald Loegler speaks similarly about his experience as practicing architect in Finland: "Through my work in Finland, I had an occasion to experience a truly humanist architecture, architecture truly focused on people, something that was absent in Poland." Loegler, interview by the author.
[59] Marek Budzyński, and Ewa Przestaszewska-Porebska, Piotr Wicha, and Anna Koziolkiewicz, "Pasaz Ursynowski – dyskusja," *Architektura* 417 (1984), 41.

that there is a centralized, grand, supple and well-functioning institution, which builds the city fabric. (...) As it turned out, real investment possibilities of the State are close to zero when it comes to services for the people."[60] Economic constraints were paired with the limitations posed by prefabricated technology – as mentioned previously, the module of concrete slab limited possible retail solutions – and despite designers' efforts to diversify the façades, spatial complexity was rather impossible to achieve. The monotony of the omnipresent grey prefabricated concrete slab was hard to overcome. The ideal of a walkable street also needed to be confronted with reality as the planned two-floor parking spaces were never built and Ursynów's streets were soon taken over by parked cars. Not all spaces designed for social interaction worked out. Budzyński recalls that when the people realized that one of the construction sites in their vincity prepared the ground for a street market, they strongly protested against it.[61] Also the collective laundry buildings were never truly operating since it turned out that, as Herbst put it, "Poles hate to show up with their dirty laundry in public spaces."[62]

The practice of Budzyński shows that the use of postmodern notions such as the return of the street and pre-modern urban forms in late socialist Poland did not necessarily mean a revolutionary gesture against the system (as in the case of the Dom i

---

[60] Ibid., 31.
[61] Ibid., 32.
[62] "Najbardziej ludzka sypialnia," quoted in Panków, 88.

Miasto [DiM] group), but could also function as attempts to reform it from within. Similar efforts can be found among other architects such as Romuald Loegler. As he says,

> [t]he intentions behind my projects, such as Centrum E or Pradnik Czerwony are parallel to Budzyński's intentions in Ursynów. This idea [of architecture as a medium for social change and an attempt to change social relations witin the possibilities of late socialism] is analogical, no doubt. Of course, there are differences – like in Ursynów the greenery was one of the major elements to provoke social interactions. In our projects, we tried to create spatial remedies for social atomization and anonymity of living in mass produced, homogeneous housing estates by focusing on common spaces. Our goal was to create a bond between the people, and also identification of the inhabitants with the place they live in.[63]

Thus in Centrum E and Ursynów alike, the postmodern revivals of traditional spatial solutions and historical traditional urban forms were means of contributing to social and political change. Loegler and Budzyński used the Party's efforts to present itself as more people-oriented through promoting more "humane" settlements to realize their own agendas. Bielecki and the DiM group, in turn, outright rejected any collaboration with the regime and decided to disseminate their vision for architecture only through the discursive means of manifestos and discussions.

Both of these ways of using architecture as a platform for political activism had their limitations. Bielecki's visions were circulated only within architectural circles and remained purely theoretical until the tra nsition to the market economy in 1989. Loegler and Budzyński managed to materialize their ideas, but their realizations diverged significantly from their original plans. Most of the spatial solutions that had socially

---

[63] Loegler, interview by the author.

progressive agendas weren't realized. At the same time, both Centrum E and Ursynów proved to be successful in the goals of community building and identification of the inhabitants with their living space. Centrum E remains a sought-after location in Kraków's real estate market. A great numer of Ursynów's original tenants still live there, and the neigborhood is one of the most popular in Warsaw. Numerous book publications, blogs, and websites on Ursynów's architectural and social history – mostly created by its inhabitants – are also a vital sign of its importance for the community.

It would be an overstatement to say that Bielecki's, Loegler's, or Budzyński's architectural discourses and realizations contributed to systemic change in any direct way. Nevertheless, as a part of a broader cultural and intellectual movement that led to the eventual overturning of the regime, their theories and designs played a distinctly political role.

Conclusion

Architectural styles or tendencies can rarely be unequivocally ascribed to a single ideology or political orientation, and postmodern architecture is no exception. Although best known in Western European and North American realizations inseparable from the economic and political conditions of late capitalism, the uses of postmodern forms and theories worldwide were various. Given that Western Europe and North America still dominate scholarship on architectural history and shape its canon, it is not surprising that postmodernism is seen as socially and politically conservative, disinterested in any conscious social agenda. Postmodern architects are understood as preoccupied with form, not ideology. However, in countries such as Chile in Poland, postmodern buildings were consciously ascribed social and political roles. Colorful facades with a wide range of historical references or urban forms based on the revival of traditional typologies were used as tools for changing social and political reality, both by regimes in power and by forces oppositional to them. As chapters one and three ("Postmodernism and the State: Chile" and "Postmodernism and the State: Poland") explore, in the 1970s and 1980s postmodern architecture was used for propagandistic purposes both by Pinochet's regime in Chile and the socialist government of Polish People's Republic. At the same time, as discussed in chapters two and four ("Postmodernism Against the State: Chile" and Postmodernism Against the State: Poland"), architects in these two countries practiced a version of politically and socially engaged postmodernism that

could counter agendas of ruling regimes. Across these chapters, I have argued that Chilean and Polish architecture between 1970 and 1990 complicate the generally accepted view of postmodern architecture as a politically disengaged and exclusively neoliberal phenomenon.

In most of the case studies analyzed in this dissertation, the contrasting agendas of governmental and oppositional forces mingled and overlapped with each other. In many Polish cases, such Marek Budzyński's North Ursynów in Warsaw (realized from 1975) or Romuald Loegler's Na Skarpie in Kraków (1985), postmodern forms were used both by the government to build a positive image of the State and by the architects to pursue a counter-government agenda. This complexity is especially stark in Chile with the example of the CEDLA group and one of its members, Cristián Boza. CEDLA used postmodern ideas to realize a vision of a city as an agent of social change in a way that functioned oppositionally to Pinochet's neoliberal regime. However, Boza, one of the co-founders of CEDLA and one of the main organizers within the group, and who made declarations regarding CEDLA's mission that "postmodernism … was about regaining our identity,"[64] was also an owner of one of the most successful architectural studios during Pinochet's regime. His workshop realized many commissions for commercial projects, which defied the values promoted by CEDLA, including various caracoles in Santiago, such as Caracol Lo Castillo (1980) or Centro Comercial Eve (1981). These

[64] Boza, interview by Joaquín Serrano, 165.

projects use fashionable postmodern forms or elements such as local, artisanal materials (for example red terracotta cladding in Centro Comercial Eve) in a strictly formalistic way. They not only take from postmodernism the most superficial, formal inspirations, but also contribute to the vision of urban space and society endorsed by the dictatorship. Moreover, in 1987 Boza took part in the competition for the Chilean Congress organized by Pinochet's administration. Boza's practice was critically discussed within CEDLA and faced objections from many of its members. Nevertheless, Boza remained one of CEDLA's crucial figures until it ceased to exist. This discrepancy between theory and practice of some of the group's members (Boza's case is the most controversial) is one reason why some of the architects – Fernando Pérez Oyarzun, for example – remain skeptical towards CEDLA's agenda.[65] Complexities like these reveal that the division between architectures endorsed by the State and architectures against the State proposed in this dissertation is bound to be ambiguous. Projects such as Na Skarpie or North Ursynów could be analyzed both in sections describing propagandistic and oppositional uses of postmodern architecture. Nevertheless, both in Chile and Poland, postmodern architecture was used as a tool to pursue social and political agendas in ways intended to challenge the status quo.

[65] Oyarzun, interview by the author (published in Appendix).

Despite critics' sense that "now is absolutely not the time to be indulging in postmodern revivalism,"[66] architectural practice and academic discourse of the last few years suggests that postmodern forms and theories are part of the architectural tradition that will inform the work of the next generation of architects. Chilean and Polish architecture offers a different perspective for understanding this renewed interest; it presents a lesson radically different from that of "learning from Las Vegas." Chilean and Polish architecture reveals that postmodern architecture was not necessarily focused solely "on aesthetics to the detriment of social content;"[67] it was not "the new corporate style," or a movement characterized by "passivity vis-a-vis economic and political power."[68] Instead of formalist aestheticism and empty playfulness subjugated to commercial goals, architecture from these locations proves that postmodernism has a potential to function as a political and social project. Perhaps lessons learned from the East and from the South might even provide a new perspective on the architectures of the conventional architectural core.

[66] Griffiths, "Now Is Not the Time."
[67] Cocotas, "Design for the One Percent."
[68] McLeod, 29, 38.

Appendix: Interviews

INTERVIEW WITH HUMBERTO ELIASH, SANTIAGO DE CHILE, 8/23/2016

(Chilean architect, funding member of the CEDLA group)

LK What were the goals behind creating CEDLA?

HE This story begins in London, 1975, when I met Cristián Boza, Fernando Castillo Velazco, and Fernando Montes. They were very important for the creation of CEDLA two years later in Santiago. In London, we had a chance to visit the studios of Leon Krier and Rob Krier, as well as that of James Stirling. We knew with Cristián Boza that we wanted to go back to Chile. Fernando could not, because he was in political exile, and he didn't know when he could come back. In London we made our first projects, taking advantage of the atmosphere of freedom which we couldn't find at the same time in Chile, because of the military regime and political infiltration of the universities there. When we decided to go back to Santiago, we realized that there is no possibility for us to get into the university so we created CEDLA.

LK But eventually both Boza and you got to teach at the university here. When was that?

HE It was in 1982 when I started teaching at La Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile – I graduated from Universidad de Chile and I wanted to teach there, but since it was a private Catholic university, it was not as politically controlled as the national university, Universidad de Chile. But eventually I got to teach at Universidad de Chile as well, starting in 1992.

LK CEDLA published a magazine, *ARS*. How was it financed? I know that you got funding from construction companies, but how was it possible in the time of economic crisis when the construction industry slowed down?

HE I don't remember that it was a problem, ever. Nobody was worried about where the money came from. We not only sustained the magazine to express our ideas, but we also rented a house for our offices and gallery space, and we paid the rent every month for it.

LK Exactly, how did you manage to afford it, was anyone specific in charge of fundraising within CEDLA?

HE Three people within the group had especially broad connections and many contacts – Cristián Boza, Jose Muzart, Pedro Murtinho – so they were mainly in charge of

fundraising, but other members were doing it too. We all had some projects, like many architects, so we were just asking the contractors and owners of the companies with which were involved in our projects to contribute. Let's say we were making a house with solar panels, so we called them and said look, would you like to be advertised in our magazine? We needed money just to cover printing costs so it wasn't that much. [Eliash opens *ARS*.] For example this company [points at advertisement], Cordillera, they paid the cost of the tiles that we used at the gallery. And everything was made like that with one exception – during the making of the third issue, we wanted to try another way to finance it. We sent a copy of the magazine with the letter asking for contributions, and we hoped that the people would pay us after they received the magazine. And – of course – nobody or almost nobody paid.

LK But still, you managed to publish the magazine.

HE Yes, we never had problems with the funds.

LK I was wondering how you managed to criticize the government and its policies in the articles published in *ARS*. You even managed to have a very pro-government newspaper, *El Mercurio*, as one of your collaborators.[1]

HE In Chile if you have contacts to get to the right people, you get what you want. It worked like that during the dictatorship too. If you wanted to publish something in *El Mercurio* you just needed to find people you know and who work there and that's it.

LK So they, *El Mercurio*, didn't back off from endorsing you even after your critical articles?

HE No, I can't remember any problems really. They really didn't care what we are doing.

LK How were your relations with the Colegio de Arquitectos? In the magazine *CA*[2] there is an official welcome note, but I noticed that in the discussion sections of the magazine I rarely see CEDLA members as invited participants. Is that a coincidence, or were there some tensions?

HE There were definitely tensions, but there is a difference between the Colegio de Arquitectos and the *CA* magazine published by it. The Colegio's head was changing every 4 years, so sometimes they agreed with us and sometimes not. But the magazine

---

[1] In the first issue of *ARS*, on the front page, El Mercurio is mentioned as one of the collaborators along with several construction companies.
[2] "Saludamos a ARS," page not numbered.

was always against our vision because its director, Jaime Marquez, was affiliated with Universidad Católica in Valparaiso and was very much critical of anything beyond the Valparaiso School.[3]

LK CEDLA also organized meetings, for example the seminar in Caburga.[4] How was it possible to organize them, since meetings were forbidden by the government?

HE The Caburga meeting was made the same way we financed *ARS*. Two of us – Cristián Boza and Hernan Duval – had their houses there, so we just went there. Then each one of us paid the train ticket and we went there by train. We organized a seminar there and transcripts of our presentations and discussions are published in *ARS*. We also invited friends from Argentina, Colombia, and Peru. Argentinean contacts were especially important for us, because of the similar political situation of the dictatorship and a group of similarly minded architects with a group called La Escuelita. We tried to establish solid connections with La Escuelita, mainly with Tony Díaz and Justo Solsona, and other Latin American architects, like Humberto Fernandez or Juvenal Baracco.

LK Since Caburga was an organized meeting, and you advertised it in ARS, I am still wondering, how was it possible to do it under dictatorship?[5]

HE Well, in the eighties the regime was more relaxed. Also, as for international contacts, in CEDLA we were inviting architects like Graves or Rossi, and it was possible since La Escuelita was inviting them too. So, when they were already in Buenos Aires it was feasible for us to get them to Santiago, paying way less for tickets and hosting them in our houses.

LK I also remember you saying that some people hesitated to come to Chile because of the regime.

HE Yes, at the beginning nobody wanted to come, but in the second half of the eighties it started changing. They wanted to support us as the opposition. Many of our guests made public declarations against the government or politicized universities, like Oriol Bohigas who came to Santiago on the occasion of the fourth Bienal de Arquitectura co-

---

[3] The Valparaíso School, or The Open City Group, is a group of the teachers and alumni at the Design and Architecture School in the Catholic University of Valparaíso. In 1971 they established an experimental housing colony – Ciudad Abierta (*Open City*) – which is a testing ground for their ideas of experimental architecture inspired by poetry and investigations of the material properties of the location.

[4] A village 800 km away from Santiago. The meeting took place between April 6 and 8, 1984.

[5] Free public meetings were prohibited by Pinochet's military government.

organized by CEDLA members.[6] It was the time when nobody wanted to come, but he said that he accepted the risk to come to the country ruled by the dictatorship because he suffered a similar isolation under Franco, so he understands us and wants to show his support. So yes, it was important for the architects that they were invited by an oppositional group. Same story with Aldo Rossi.

LK But in *CA* these critical voices against the government voiced during Bienals weren't published, right?[7] Was there some internal censorship in *CA*?

HE Yes. There wasn't explicit censorship of architectural publications or debates. But, for example, I remember that during a lot of the discussions during the Bienal de Arquitectura[8] , the public, especially the students, was voicing critical opinions against the government. Discussions which were part of the Bienal were then published in the *CA*, but excluding these voices. So there was a form of internal censorship within Colegio, and people were careful about what they were publishing.

LK What were your major theoretical inspirations?

HE For me, Rossi, Krier, Sterling, Jacobs, and Venturi were crucial for shaping an idea of what we want for the city and the society.

LK What about Christopher Alexander?

HE For me his philosophy of the city is central, yes.

LK CEDLA emerged in a very particular time and in *ARS* you often criticize the neoliberal policies of the government. Did you treat architecture as a social and political project?

HE Yes. CEDLA was a political project. We treated architecture as a social agent. Chilean society at that time was very divided and the neoliberal politics produced two things we were strongly opposing. The first was segregation, which pushed low income people outside the city limits and welcomed only the middle and upper middle class in the city center. The second was that Pinochet's neoliberalism produced isolation, the society was becoming increasingly disintegrated and people were losing a sense of community. In

---

[6] The Fourth Bienal de Arquitectura in Santiago (1983) was organized under the title *Patrimonio y Presente: La recuperación Crítica del pasado* (*Heritage and the Present: Critical Recuperation of the Past*), and was curated by Pedro Murtinho.

[7] After each edition of the Bienal, *CA* published transcripts from discussions that took place within this event.

[8] An architectural event (exhibitions, lectures, and discussions) organized from 1977 onwards in Santiago de Chile by the Colegio de Arquitectos.

this sense, CEDLA and Santiago Poniente were social and political statements, statements against that. It was also against the philosophy of the city embodied in San Borja, which also had alienating social effects.

LK Would you say then that CEDLA's practice was an attempt to defend the city from two extremities – the late modernist approach to urban space (as in San Borja) on the one hand and the neoliberal approach to the city on the other?

HE Yes. They were equally destructive for the cities. I think that we trying to find a third way beyond these extremities.

LK You were opposed to late modern urban planning and the neoliberal approach to the city as well. Did CEDLA consider itself as an oppositional political project then, or was this thinking was absent?

HE It was oppositional, but not in terms of political parties, none of us were members of any parties, everyone was independent, but we tried to make politics through architecture.

LK How different was your approach from that of Ciudad Abierta? They were also searching for roots of Chilean architecture and identity and a social component of community building is present there as well, but in a different way. I was wondering if that was important to your discussions at all.

HE We were really critical of this position. I had and have friends living and working there, but during the discussions we were on the opposite sites. We, CEDLA, believed that in order to be efficient, the city should be made in relation to the present reality, whether we like it or not, and they just isolated themselves. We criticized also the name – Ciudad Abierta – because it's not a city and it's not open. It's suburban (located on the beach) and not open, because it's gated, private.

LK Are these debates between CEDLA and members of the Ciudad Abierta community documented somewhere?

HE No, they were private conversations, but very heated, very engaged. We as CEDLA wanted to do something very different than Ciudad Abierta, we didn't just separate ourselves but we tried to do something with the risk of contradictions. Just look at Boza's work, its full of contradictions.

LK Since you mentioned the work of Boza, did you discuss his works internally, within CEDLA? And did you – in CEDLA – identify any dangers in postmodernism?

HE Yes, mostly we were critical of the understanding of postmodernism as simply the return of the historical forms. We were also very critical of caracoles by Boza, they are terrible for the city.

LK Santiago Poniente is a manifest of CEDLA's ideas and approach to the city. What other projects would you mention as especially important?

HE The crossing of Amerigo Vespucio y Apoquindo streets and our social housing projects. We were very critical of this social housing on the peripheries, promoted by the State. Isolated little houses with no common, public space, limited infrastructure and very far from urban connections, schools etc. For my practice this reflection we were doing in CEDLA was very important and I implemented ideas we developed in CEDLA in my future, post-dictatorship housing projects.

INTERVIEW WITH PEDRO MURTINHO, SANTIAGO DE CHILE, 8/30/2016

(Chilean architect, funding member of the CEDLA group)

LK: How did CEDLA emerge?

PM: CEDLA was born as a reaction to the lack of possibility of architectural reflection under dictatorship. It was a reaction to intellectual silence. We were inviting architects like Peter Eisenman or Michael Graves, organizing exhibitions, and doing projects. CEDLA was formed in 1977; and the first Bienal, where we presented Santiago Poniente, happened in the same year.[9]

LK: What was the relation between CEDLA and Colegio de Arquitectos de Chile?

PM: There was a tension. I was a director of the Bienal in 1983 and there was a tension obviously between *CA* and us, and against me, because of Víctor Gubbins.[10]

LK: How did you manage to get funding for CEDLA?

PM: We are architects, so we had projects. And we had contractors. We fundraised among them and about 50% of the funding came from them and the other was from us. Like ceramics, bricks companies.

---

[9] The first Bienal de Arquitectura in Santiago (1977) was organized under the title *Patrimonio Nacional (National Heritage)* and was curated by Cristián Fernández Cox

[10] Gubbins was the president of the Colegio de Arquitectos de Chile between 1982 and 1986.

LK: How did you manage to get patronage from *El Mercurio* while being critical of the government politics?

PM: That wasn't a problem. And when we wanted to write in *El Mercurio*, we could be published there. We had this option.

LK: But how, since you were critical towards the government?

PM: Indirectly, architecture wasn't important for the government. Nobody cared.

LK: Did your position towards postmodernism change over the course of your time in CEDLA?

PM: It's hard to think about it in retrospective, but for us postmodernism meant the ideas like the importance of drawing, the human scale of the city and architecture, the importance of the street, typologies like the corner, the gallery, the courtyards, continuous facade. We were concerned with how the city works, not just the form itself.

LK: You don't use the word postmodernism often in *ARS*, why?

PM: We didn't care about declaring ourselves as postmodernists. But we were postmodernists. We were not like the Valparaiso school which always needed to stress that they are modern. For us, postmodernism was a cultural change. We thought that we were postmodern. We weren't interested in the form only but in the exploration of our roots, and of how the city functions. Postmodernism was a tool for us to look for other ways to form the city. CEDLA was a critical movement concerned with architecture, but also with the state of the country. It brought strength and energy to criticize the current situation – the situation reduced to consumerism, mercantilism and capitalism. I am not a communist. But the Chicago school that took over the country together with start of the dictatorship was terrible. We weren't political in the sense that we weren't linked to any political party, but CEDLA was a social project. It was a statement against the neoliberal treatment of the city as commodity, and it this sense it was oppositional. [interrupted by a phone call]

PM: What were we talking about?

LK: You were saying that CEDLA was a statement against neoliberal treatment of the city as commodity…

PM: Yes, exactly, and also against what projects like San Borja stood for. We were looking for something in-between. You know, we all went in different directions after CEDLA. Look at Boza for example, he went completely to the right.

LK: In *ARS* you introduced postmodernism as a functional, urban problem, not as a formal tendency or style, is it correct?

PM: Definitely. Postmodernism was important for us as a social problem, because the city is a social project. All architectural proposals must go together with social goals. I need to go, we can discuss something very quickly and meet again.

LK: Ok, let's start talking about Santa Elvira project then.

PM: In this project we really fought hard with the investor. We fought because he didn't understood our principles of urbanism and social dwelling, and he was interested only in the commercial aspect. When we said that we wanted 30% of the project to be taken by public space he simply said no way and insisted that it needs to be reduced to 5%. Let's continue the other day, I'm already late.

INTERVIEW WITH PILAR GARCIA, SANTIAGO DE CHILE, 09/01/2016

(Chilean architect, former student of Cristián Boza)

LK In the eighties, you were one of the initiators of postmodernism-oriented student journal, *Contrapropuesta* (*Counterproposal)*. Why the title *Contrapropuesta*?

PG It was a hard time for us in the school of architecture. Because of the context of military government, our school was closed for one year when the military government intervened. Then it was divided into three schools: architecture, urbanism, and public works.

LK Could you say more about this division of the School in three parts?

PG The change was introduced by Hernán Riesco, the director of the school. Then they changed him for Gustavo Munizaga – Riesco left in late seventies or early eighties and the rector of the university appointed Munizaga on his place. Munizaga was an urbanist, educated in the USA and a Universidad de Chile graduate. He invited Boza, Moreno, and Hernán Duval to teach elective studios and I took them. This is how we, the students, learned all of these ideas of postmodernism. An important thing was that it wasn't a style, Cristián didn't speak of it as a style but he spoke of it as a problem of the city. So *Contrapropuesta* was inspired by these ideas.

LK So it was a postmodern counterproposal to modernism?

PG Yes, for us modernism destroyed the typology of our cities. It was a contrapropuesta to that way of doing the city and architecture. Also, in modernist-oriented training there

was no critical thinking beyond composition, we were just trained to operate by composition, there was no critical thinking behind that. So we needed something to discuss, think about, speak about.

LK So, *Contrapropuesta* was a proposal against what was promoted by CORMU from the one hand and…

PG Yes, it was funny, because my father was a director of CORMU. But when the military regime started he left CORMU, he met the CEDLA group and attended all of their meetings and events. I didn't know about that before I started my studies at the School of Architecture, I never heard about postmodernism from my father, I learned about it from Boza's seminars. Boza was making us read all these books, Rossi and others, and we didn't even have them in our library. In these seminars we discussed postmodernism as an urban problem, a problem of how to design a city. We were finishing our studies, and we were taking part in CEDLA meetings, the one with Rossi for example. So these guys taught us about people like Venturi or Graves and Europeans like Sterling, who was very important for Boza.

LK Did you start *Contrapropuesta* in your 5th year?

PG I don't remember, yes I think so… [showing pictures]. This is the group, this is Hernán Duval, Juan Pablo, Jorge Domingues, Juan Ugarte, and this is me and Jorge, Patricia Valenzuela. We were like a thinktank, or maybe it's an exaggeration, we were having meetings like once a week and discussing texts and projects, plus we also ran the magazine—the school of architecture lend us the photocopy machine so we could actually produce it.

LK What elements of postmodernism did you consider relevant for Chilean architecture?

PG Rossi, Krier, Colin Rowe...

LK Was Venturi an inspiration?

PG Yes very much, we had distance to his architecture, but his theory absolutely, yes. For us *Learning from Las Vegas* was like a big explosion, a revelation. But, we were aware of the dangers in postmodernism, that it can be treated like fashion, it's easy to treat it as a mere dress to change. Even though we did a lot of terrible things in our designs when we were young, and sometimes we are ashamed of it, we tried to be careful to not to treat it as just another fashionable dress.

LK You also mentioned that postmodernism was introduced as a problem of the city.

PG Yes, it wasn't about singular buildings, but about the city as a whole. Even though there is a discrepancy between Boza's practice and theory because his work is a lot about buildings. He was also seen as a superficial guy, even though to all of those things he was the engine. Cristián is a very social guy so he gained some jobs due to this social skill. The main persona. He is a bit like Cristián Unduraga in his social skills, Undurraga is always well related to the government of the moment, I don't know how he does it but it's true. He was very related to the mayor of Santiago, that's why he made the Plaza Constitucion. So he had a lot of jobs in those days. Cristián did too. Undurraga also had a commission for a manual for urban furniture from the mayor of Santiago.

INTERVIEW WITH PEDRO MURTINHO, SANTIAGO DE CHILE, 09/01/2016

(Chilean architect, funding member of the CEDLA group)

LK: What readings were especially important for CEDLA?

PM: *Architecture of the City* by Rossi. Leon Krier, but more his drawings than writing.

[interrupted by a phone call]

PM: Venturi, his *Complexity and Contradiction* especially. And Christopher Alexander.

LK: What was your (CEDLA's) attitude towards state agencies of urban planning, like CORMU?

PM: CORMU is a symbol of modernism, and its paradigm of the isolated tower. Like San Borja. San Borja and Santiago Poniente were symbols of CORMU's approach to the city based on the worst paradigms of modernism and Le Corbusier's urbanism based on the isolated tower as a solution to urban problems. There was no thought behind it and we were against it. It's not even that it was modernist, there was just no deeper thought behind it. We stood with CORMU's message of building for the people, working for the people, instead of subjecting architecture to market rules. But their approach to planning wasn't well thought through.

LK: What about CORMU as an institution, not its design philosophy, but the role for the country? I am asking because Humberto Eliash mentioned in the interview with me that it was important for CEDLA.

PM: Ah yes, I understand now and I agree, it was very important for CEDLA and for me, even though I am not as socialist as Eliash, especially in the times of CEDLA he was very socialist. I think CEDLA was socialist but not communist, and Eliash was communist. So he has maybe more respect for CORMU than I do, as a state institution, but I am all for CORMU's idea of social architecture.

LK: You mentioned that Eliash was a communist, what about your political position?

PM: I used to identify myself strongly with Democracia Cristiána.

LK: Humberto Eliash also said that for many of the foreign architects coming to Chile on CEDLA's invitation, their presence in Chile was like a statement of support of the opposition. Do you think it's an accurate statement?

PM: Yes. For example, Salmona didn't want to come to Chile at all because of Pinochet. When I went to Argentina, I went to his lecture and I persuaded him to come.

INTERVIEW WITH CRISTIÁN BOZA, SANTIAGO DE CHILE, 09/05/2016

(Chilean architect, funding member of the CEDLA group)

LK For two years, after 1968 when you got your title you worked in CORMU, how did this experience influence your future career?

CB I will tell you one story. One day in 1972, my director at CORMU asked me and my friend to go and buy wooden blocks. We had no idea why we were doing this, but we got the blocks and returned to the office. When we came back we finally learned what they were needed for – they were used as models for buildings, he just took these blocks and arranged them evenly on the ground. I thought he must be joking! How can you build the city from wooden blocks like that? At this moment I really started to think about what 'the city' is and what 'city planning' is. Then I went to Edenborough, and then come back to Chile for a moment, and then I worked with Sterling in London. And then I came back to Chile, I wanted to teach here but due to the coup we weren't invited anymore to teach at the university. So we created CEDLA with Humberto Eliash, Pedro Murtinho, and a lot of other people. Since we couldn't teach at the university we thought, why don't we organize an institute to discuss all the things that are important to us freely? Our ideas were rooted in postmodernism—Sterling, Leon Krier, Charles Jencks (whom I didn't like at all but he wrote many books on postmodernism and they were important), Aldo Rossi... But it actually all started before, in London, when I met

Humberto Eliash and we started to discuss about the city. When we went back all doors were closed to us so we decided to make our own institute.

LK Let's talk about CORMU for a minute, as from my previous conversations it looks like it was important for CEDLA. Did you share the social-oriented philosophy of CORMU?

CB Absolutely. CEDLA shared with CORMU a pro-social idea of the city. This is visible in our project for Santiago Poniente. In this project, we focused on one part of the city and proposed our vision to recuperate this neighborhood. The key element was the central boulevard, La Rambla, and we wanted to keep the old, existing buildings, which were important for the community, such as the church, or places like the market square. Older architects couldn't understand this, and they were throwing shoes at us. Literally, when we presented Santiago Poniente for the first time, they were throwing shoes at us. It was like a fight between the old and young generations. We were defending the old tissue and we were for the integration of the people in the city, we were against the segregation of the city, that poor people are pushed to the peripheries. We wanted to mix people with different incomes. It was very important for us to deal with the existing urban form, not abstract problems. We first wanted to analyze why places like Santiago Poniente weren't working. So we studied how they were done, like for example in *Learning from Las Vegas*. But the social component was crucial for us. The design for Santiago Poniente was based on 3 simple types: the street, the square, the boulevard – places where people can meet, discuss, integrate, and mingle.

LK Do you think that for CEDLA postmodernism had a social component embedded?

CB Yes, but it's very difficult to put it in words. Our position was: no to segregation, yes to the interchange of people. We tried to achieve this by creating public spaces based on traditional typologies, like street or square, and ensuring mixed-use spaces that encouraged people to interact. The design of Santiago Poniente was based on three typologies: the street, the square, and the boulevard as places where people can meet, discuss, integrate and mingle. These elements were crucial. Our goal was to defend the old tissue and to foster integration of the people in the city, we were against the segregation and against the fact that poor people were pushed to the peripheries of Santiago. We wanted to mix people with different incomes. And students were very enthusiastic about it all, so we thought we did our job.

LK Can we go back for a moment to the origins of CEDLA? So, the idea of CEDLA was born between you and Humberto Eliash and then other people like Pedro Murtinho

joined you in Chile. But what about Fernando Castillo Velazco? He couldn't join you as he was exiled, but did he take part in forming of CEDLA?

CB Absolutely, he was crucial. He didn't join us in Chile as he was on exile in Cambridge, in England. For us Fernando was sort of a statue, we respected him very much. So, he couldn't do CEDLA with us, but we went to conferences together, we discussed together. He agreed with us but couldn't act with us.

LK How did you manage to find funding for CEDLA?

CB We had very good connections with construction industries, they couldn't say no as we were their clients. Thanks to that we could bring the best architects to Chile – Aldo Rossi who stayed in my house, Alvaro Siza also in my house, Charles Moore, Tony Díaz and more…

LK Yes, since you mentioned Díaz, was La Escuelita important for you?

CB Yes, CEDLA was based on La Escuelita and we maintained close relations with this institute.

LK What was your, CEDLA's, position towards the approach of Ciudad Abierta?

CB Have you been there? Listen, the point is that the Valparaiso School of Arquitecture was a poetical act, and the actual, real, existing city wasn't important to them. The forms, and spatial craziness, the creative use of wood are amazing, 30 years before Benedetta Tagliabue was doing it. But this is not a city. Very nice pieces of architecture, but not the city.

INTERVIEW WITH FERNANDO FERNANDO PÉREZ OYARZÚN, SANTIAGO DE CHILE, 09/06/2016

(Chilean architect, architecture critic and theorist, architecture professor affiliated with la Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile)

FP Why are you interested in postmodernism in Chile?

LK I am writing about how postmodernism was used both by Pinochet for propaganda purposes, and as part of oppositional agendas, like in CEDLA's example.

FP I am not sure about this, I think it is too simplistic. I feel you are right in a certain way, but its too simplistic to put it in this way. Postmodernism here had a social agenda, yes, but also a strong commercial agenda. Boza once compared postmodernism to taking

soft drugs, because they both resulted in the liberation of forms. Also, Boza was building caracoles! First he was in CORMU in Allende times, then building caracoles in Pinochet times.

LK Yes, I am aware of this.

FP Plus a lot of it was just so formalistic, just look at the buildings from this time in Santiago by Boza and look how many of them use these very Sterling-esque red tiles. Everywhere.

LK Sure, on the one hand postmodernism had in Chile this strong commercial component, but on the other hand, in what CEDLA was doing and publishing in *ARS* you can see how postmodernism was used to criticize neoliberal policies of the government.

FP In Chile, people with socialist beliefs opposed postmodernism! For instance the *AUCA* magazine. CEDLA maybe tried to link a kind of social agenda to these new ideas, but very soon it was clear that the neoliberal agenda was stronger.

LK Are you suggesting that this social agenda of CEDLA was entirely artificial, instrumental?

FP Yes.

LK What would you say about Santiago Poniente? Do you think it is unsuccessful?

FP It is completely unsuccessful and completely ignorant about the specific conditions of the place, they were imposing something that was trendy at the moment. For instance, they were using the word "rambla," and you can never find rambla in Chile, never. In Havana yes, but we don't have ramblas here!

LK When I, for instance, talked to Humberto Eliash…

FP He is and was a man of the left. But, for example look at Boza! After the dictatorship ended he was also connected with people in power, he got attached to Piñera[11], he was just looking for work, for commissions. I think that Cristián Boza was very important to Chilean cultural life and he is a very talented man, but his main goal was to get work. Under one regime or another. He was doing social housing during Allende, CORMU, and all that, and then doing commercial buildings under Pinochet, and then, most

[11] Miguel Juan Sebastián Piñera, businessman and politician, president of Chile in 2010–14 and re-elected in March 2018.

recently, got really closely attached to the right-wing government. It would do you credit if you were able to express this kind of complexity in your work.

LK Right, but the bigger question is also what dissent or opposition can mean in architecture. Unless you choose a path like Ciudad Abierta, you always need to accept some external rules to work.

FP Yes, Ciudad Abierta is an exception. So I would say that if I try to express the most important cultural content of this postmodernism, I would say that it was turning towards a certain historiography or interest which was so far away from modernist architects. They started to read historical texts again, Vitruvius, Palladio, eighteenth-century theoreticians. Thin renewed interest in history was very healthy for architects, and they learned about it through *ARS*. Secondly, this generation was more sensitive to the urban fabric and urban analysis. Also to questions about how to understand urban morphology. And I think that those tendencies had consequences for future generations, for people working in the nineties – the famous generation of Chilean architects, like Aravena or Radic. But CEDLA… what realizations did they do in fact? Just very few social housing projects. I think that CEDLA was against the regime, that's true, but should you rescue those works?

LK I am interested in this particular complexity that you pointed out.

FP Those times were full of complexities. For example Castillo Velazco, who got involved in CEDLA and who was embarrassed of the wonderful work he was doing in Allende's times. I told him many times that he shouldn't be! It is unbelievable how such an amazing guy was sort of ashamed of the wonderful work he was doing before. And then again remember what Cristián Boza was doing, horrible caracoles, Eve, Lo Castillo…Absolutely commercial buildings, not socialist at all!

LK Absolutely, but in CEDLA there were very heated discussions at that point, and they – for example Humberto Eliash or Pedro Murtinho – were criticizing these projects very strongly.

FP It is very complex, and also there are people now who are ashamed of what they were doing, like Cristián Undurraga is. I find what CEDLA was doing unsuccessful and uninteresting. Would I recommend students to learn from this? It is interesting as a historical case, as a symptom of those times, but nothing else.

INTERVIEW WITH HUMBERTO ELIASH, SANTIAGO DE CHILE, 09/07/2016

LK I was thinking about instances like Nicolas Garcia, people who first worked with CORMU and then he sympathized with CEDLA. Do you know about any similar stories?

HE Yes, there were other people like Walter Bruce, for example, and there was an affinity in spirit between CEDLA and CORMU. CORMU promoted something we wanted as well – urban renewal – but they realized it in a fundamentally different, modernist, way. But we were supportive of the idea that the State takes responsibility for planning, and doesn't give the city entirely to private hands as we saw under Pinochet.

LK I recently talked to Fernando Fernando Pérez Oyarzún about Santiago Poniente and CEDLA, and we talked a bit about your use of typologies which for you were a way to regain the identity of the city threatened by neoliberal reforms. For him, they were artificial and imposed since you used typologies like La Rambla, not organic for Chilean space.

HE Well, Cristián Boza suggested the term La Rambla and maybe it wasn't the most appropriate but it's not about the name; but the concept of the open promenade of mixed uses is present in many Chilean cities. In our projects, like in Santiago Poniente, everything happens on the street, activities are mixed, society mixes, the architectural heritage is protected and intermingles with new buildings. We simply saw the city as integrated on many levels, both in a formal and social sense. Maybe due to our lack of maturity we presented many things with inadequate language, but for us that was not the most important thing, terminology is only secondary, what was important were the mixed use, the relationship we proposed with the park and the old city.

LK You said that one of the most important goals in Santiago Poniente was to act against segregation. How did you plan to achieve that? This mixing people of different incomes?

HE In our vision of the city, we wanted to mix uses, functions, and, most importantly, different economic strata of society. But we didn't have the actual tools to make it happen. It was more of wishful thinking, within the market-driven reality of that time and in the reality in which the military government was cutting limbs of the state and giving more and power to the private sector. Only years after the fall of the dictatorship did I manage to put these ambitions of social integration into practice, for example in my social housing projects.

LK So the goal was to keep those people in the center instead of displacing them, but you didn't propose any specific solutions how to do it?

HE Yes, we didn't have instruments to do it. But after the military government was over I managed to put it in practice, like in one of my housing project I realized in la Reina.

LK I also wanted to ask about La Escuelita as your inspiration in CEDLA. La Escuelita had a very strong political and social component; for example, Avenida de Mayo is a very political project, was that important for you?

HE Yes of course! We knew the drawings of Avenida de Mayo, yes, it was very important for us! In both countries we were living under dictatorships. And we were opponents to the military dictatorship. We had friends who were taken into prison or killed. Many of us. Friends of architects. Jorge Moscato was an activist, he had a strong political role. But also we thought in the same way about the role of architecture, the character of the city.

INTERVIEW WITH FERNANDO FERNANDO PÉREZ OYARZÚN, SANTIAGO DE CHILE, 09/12/2016

FP I was thinking…I think that in your dissertation you should put Chilean postmodernism against the background of what was happening at the moment, of course the political situation but also as I told you, other architects who were sharing or opposing this kind of posture, and I think this will be also useful. Plus having a general overview what was happening in other countries, for example, in Argentina La Escuelita was very important.

LK: Yes, I wanted to ask you about exactly those two things: 1. How other architects reacted to CEDLA, and 2. The relation with La Escuelita which CEDLA members mention often as their point of reference. But there are also differences between them which I'd like to discuss.

FP: There are, I'm not sure here, I cannot express it very precisely but I think that Escuelita was a kind of NGO, and under very difficult political conditions – and those are the similarities between them and CEDLA undoubtedly. What is true – and I'm mentioning this because I was arguing with you about that – is that both of them probably share a genuine cultural interest in countering the economy and agenda of the dictatorships in Argentina and Chile. And also, in both cases they contributed to animating the cultural world of architects and brought some hope.

LK: Okay, so they both existed outside universities, under regimes, but another important thing is that La Escuelita had this strong political component, like what they were doing with Avenida de Mayo, that was a very politically charged project. And then

would you say that CEDLA was similar to it? They were also taking case studies from their city, like Escuelita did, and they were interested in postmodernism as well. Or would you disagree because you think that there is no true political or social component to it?

FP: (silence)

LK: For Eliash when I asked him, this political component of CEDLA was very important.

FP: For him it was that way. That's true that both groups were outside of the system, they shared that. But if the origin of that was a statement against the regime – I am not sure about that. There were people who strongly opposed the regime within CEDLA, but also people who were not that worried about that.

LK: This was also my impression, that CEDLA wasn't a monolith…
FP: And also remember about architects who were opposing both CEDLA and the government – they were associated with AUCA. AUCA defended the connection between socialism and modern architecture.

LK: CEDLA is not a monolith and I am aware of that. Boza – totally commercially oriented, then Eliash totally left-leaning and…

FP: Yes, because life is very complex. Because Boza was active in CEDLA but also taking part in the competition for Congreso de Chile. But it is very complex, for instance, the director of the competition for the Congress was Horacio Burgilesi, and he was an important character in the sixties and seventies. He was sympathizing with Democracia Cristiána, so he was against the regime but he though probably that it is better to get involved in order to squeeze the best out of this competition.

LK: What were the reactions of other architects to the emergence of CEDLA?

FP: The architects were divided, some in favor of this new position, some not. It is parallel to what was happening on the international scene – like Aldo van Eck who was defending the idea that there was a kind of social project behind the modern architecture and that it shouldn't be abandoned.

LK: I was wondering about the critical voices against CEDLA; it was obviously an AUCA circle, but what about people like yourself – people who weren't necessarily against postmodernism itself, but didn't think that CEDLA's approach was genuine?

FP: Probably I was an isolated case.

LK: How did it happen that La Católica under Gustavo Munizaga decided to hire CEDLA members?

FP: Hmm, I was in Spain back then, in 1980 and '81. Gustavo Munizaga is a very complex character, he was always concentrated on urban studies, he was a very charismatic teacher. There was an open, or almost open competition…

LK: Open?

FP: Well, yes, there was a call. That's how Munizaga was elected. Monsterrat Palmer, Herman Bannen, people from Valparaiso – they were all engaged in the competition, so it was very diverse. So it was kind of open. Humberto Eliash was Munizaga's teaching assistant at Universidad de Chile, and Boza was teaching there too. Munizaga was very much connected to the young people, he was educated in the West and he had the charisma. So people like Eliash or Manuel Moreno came because of this connection. And Gustavo was of course interested in what was happening in CEDLA, but at the same time polemical with them. So his position was from outside of CEDLA, and he was also invested in social issues a lot, and practical issues and planning, and he didn't find it in CEDLA. But he was attracted to the intellectual value that CEDLA brought. His idea was to renovate the school with the help of young and active people and getting faces to make the school more attractive. It wasn't directly about inviting CEDLA.

LK: Was then Universidad de Chile more free than La Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile during the time of Pinochet?

FP: Difficult question. I would say, that La Católica in my opinion in general terms was much more lucky than Universidad de Chile under the dictatorship. It was less politically controlled. La Católica had a deputy rector, Hernan Larrain. He was right-wing of course, but intelligent and had some intellectual sensitivity, or at least he could distinguish high quality works from low quality ones. I think that made Católica – despite that it was no doubt under control – a more academically favorable environment. Within this system, there were of course parts totally in control of the government, like the School of Law, or Economy, but the Architecture School was a different entity, with more freedom. I think that Hernan Riesgo was a man able to be a mediator between different forces. So even some left-wing people were hired during his times. He was really interested in academic quality. I wouldn't say that it was free, not at all, but there was more freedom.

INTERVIEW WITH MARTA LESNIAKOWSKA, WARSZAWA, 06/05/2017

(Polish architecture historian and critic)

LK In an email to me you mentioned these "pleasant seminars during which we were saving the world, architecture and the homeland from the commies,"[12] organized by Czesław Bielecki. Could you elaborate on that?

ML Czesław is the best person to talk about it.

LK Who took part in these seminars?

ML Tons of people, but I don't remember the names.

LK I assume Jacek Zielonka, Marek Biskot (since they worked with Bielecki), who else?

ML Yes, them, for sure also Bielecki's ex wife and Wojtek Szymborski… These meetings weren't regular and they were informal, we would simply get a message about an upcoming seminar and that's it. They were organized roughly every other month, maybe once every three months. The participants were, mostly, architects, for example Tomek Turczynowicz. But also scenographers, artists…Bielecki's book – "Gra w Miasto" which he published much later – is based on these seminars so you can get a sense of what they were about from it. The seminars took place in the eighties, and very early nineties. We were meeting at Wiejska street, in Bielecki's workshop.

LK What readings did you discuss during these meetings?

ML I really don't remember well, but architecture theory, some philosophy, also a lot of Christopher Alexander because Zielonka was translating his book into Polish at that time. Jencks for sure…I really don't remember, but I remember Jencks well because I remember intense discussions after this reading.

LK What were the discussions about?

ML Again I don't remember the details but in general, for us, in Poland, the interest in postmodernism was different than in the West. It was a chance to revive the traditions of Polish architecture instead of the universalist, international language of modernism. Postmodernism wasn't for us a matter of form, a matter of façade, we were interested in how the city works, we wanted to return to traditional urban forms such as streets, quarters or squares. We were interested in old traditional typologies. For us, the form was an expression of ideological and political attitudes. We understood postmodernism as a chance for the renewal of architectural vocabulary. We believed that the return to

---

[12] Marta Leśniakowska, email message, July 8 2016.

detail, to human and urban scales, traditional urban forms, to traditional thinking about urban fabric – very different from the oppressive character of late socialist architecture – would shape new kinds of social relations.

LK Was postmodernism oppositional for you?

ML Absolutely. The seminars had a strong political dimension. The closer it was to the downfall of communism, the more chances we saw in creating new social forms/facts with architecture and urbanism. It was strongly political. So it was strongly political, and of course Bielecki was the leader. Also, his "Continuity in Architecture," which is a Polish manifesto of postmodernism, is strongly political too.

LK What else did you read?

ML Venturi for sure…You know, the access to English-language publications was very limited.

LK I also wanted to ask about censorship in late socialist Poland. How active was censorship in comparison to the fifties or eighties? I am concerned with architectural discourse of course.

ML Everything needed to be approved by the censors. In the eighties, I had a five-year long ban to publish. In 1981 I wrote an essay for an exhibition catalogue, I don't even remember what it was about, but I refused to correct it and as a result I got the ban.

INTERVIEW WITH CZESŁAW BIELECKI, WARSZAWA, 06/09/2017

(Polish architect and politician, founder of DiM group)

LK I'd like to talk about three things: about the *Dom i Miasto* (DiM) group, the seminars at Wilcza street, and the International Congress organized by the International Union of Architects in 1981 in Warsaw[13] during which the *DiM Charter* was presented. Let's start with DiM; when was it established?

CB We, as DiM, felt that the Congress would be a perfect occasion to voice our views on architecture. Our group was established during one of SARP's meetings in Gdańsk, in the Fall of 1980. This is when we started to formulate our views. We wanted to return to traditional forms of streets, to traditional urban fabrics, and as you can see from the

[13] The Fourteenth International Congress of Architecture organized by the International Union of Architects under the title, "Architecture, Man, Environment," which took place between June 15 1981 and June 21 1981 in Warsaw.

condition of Polish architecture today, this postulate was never realized. But in short, we were an opposition, which is clear from the coda to our DiM Charter.

LK Who were the members?

CB It was around twenty-something people, I can send you a list. The group existed roughly until the martial law was introduced, on December 13th of 1981, after which I got focused on underground activity completely. I tried to reactivate it in 1983, and the idea was to establish a network of connected workshops under this common name, DiM. But, there wasn't much enthusiasm for this idea. I remember that Hanka Karpinska said that it doesn't make sense because my workshop would always be the most important one. Well, what can I do…

LK Did you interpret your activity in DiM politically?

CB Everything was political in these times. We were a group of different people, I definitely was a political animal.

LK How did you present the DiM Charter?

CB We published it printed on leaflets, in Polish, French, English, German, and Spanish, and we distributed them among the visitors. I only have the French and Polish versions now, but I will ask around to get you an English version. We were endorsed by Solidarność.

LK What was the character of this endorsement?

CB We had close contacts with Solidarność, we explained our concept to them and they approved it, that's it.

LK Was Solidarność interested in urban space and architecture?

CB Yes, people like Krystyna Zachwatowicz were.

LK How were the reactions to the DiM Charter?

CB Foreign visitors were very intrigued and reacted very positively. Charles Jencks, Joseph Rykwert, Paolo Portoghesi. Polish architects – mixed feelings, some of them were jealous of our connection with Solidarność, of that we managed to be endorsed by them.

LK When did you start the seminars and how long did they last?

CB We started the seminars after I got out of jail in September 1986 and they weaned naturally in late eighties, when I had other urgent things to do I stopped organizing them and nobody took over.

INTERVIEW WITH ROMUALD LOEGLER, KRAKÓW, 07/01/2017

(Polish architect)

LK You didn't do a lot of housing in socialist times, why?

RL It was hard for me to work within the large concrete panel construction system. I had experiences from different countries, where I studied and worked, and I knew that you could use large panel construction methods in great ways. In Poland it was impossible. The list of prefabricates available in Poland was so limited, that you could build only very primitive, limited architecture. So it was a conscious decision. But in Prądnik Czerwony[14] we tried to squeeze as much as we could from this system.

LK Was this realization a result of a competition?

RL Yes, in this realization we tried to humanize late socialist architecture.

LK Was it stated in the competition rules that it needs to be realized in prefabricated concrete panel technology?

RM Yes.

LK I'm asking because in the Nowa Huta competition, which you also won, it wasn't said that it needed to be realized in concrete panel construction, just that "all building materials and the construction technology needs to be generally available for realization in Cracow."[15]

RM Yes, it is really interesting! I will tell you why. The competition was organized in a moment when the people knew already that the system is fragile. The Party tried to resolve social tensions showing its caring side and declared its attention to the people by the attempt of "humanizing" architecture. They wanted architecture which would be a landmark in Poland. Zbigniew Zuziak[16] informed the organizer, the Cooperative Housing Association, that the entries should be postmodern proposals. But it wasn't official. It was stated unofficially and was not a part of official guidelines because

[14] Prądnik Czerwony housing estate, Kraków, 1987.
[15] Loegler, "Konkurs SARP na rozwiazanie zespolu mieszkalnego," 53.
[16] The Main Architect of Kraków, 1984–91.

everybody knew that postmodern architecture is expensive – for example, due to its attention to detail and building materials. They organized this competition to show that the Party is going in a new direction. Prefabricated concrete was a symbol of the old, of everything bad in Polish architecture so they didn't want to mention it in the competition guidelines. Nowa Huta competition was organized to appease unrest among the workers. They, the Party, wanted to show that they care for people in Nowa Huta, that's why the rules of the competition are different from most other competitions in late socialist times. They were defined by the Main Architect, a man willy-nilly associated with the Party, defined in a way which fitted into the propaganda of humanizing architecture, about which I talked before. For example, there was a recommendation to include pitched roofs, or that the buildings should have some architectural detail, like a "historizing" railing in the balconies.

LK Would you see your projects as similar to what Budzynski was doing, as attempts to implement more progressive solutions within the possibilities of the time? From what you are writing and saying about your projects, it sounds like architecture was for you a medium for social change and an attempt to change social relations within the possibilities of late socialism.

RL The intentions behind my projects, such as Centrum E or Prądnik Czerwonyare parallel to Budzyński's intentions in Ursynów. This idea is analogical, no doubt. Of course, there are differences – like in Ursynów the greenery was one of the major elements to provoke social interactions. In our projects, we tried to create spatial remedies for social atomization and anonymity of living in mass produced, homogeneous housing estates by focusing on common spaces. Our goal was to create a bond between the people, and also identification of the inhabitants with the place they live in.

LK In what technology was Nowa Huta built?

RL In "wielki blok," which gave us more flexibility and allowed for some individualization.

LK But it was more expensive than "wielka płyta," right?

RL No! We managed to fit in the budget. Of course we struggled with material shortages, for example with aluminum.

LK And these elevations painted with poster color!

RL Yes. I recently told this story at a conference in Berlin and the audience simply did not want to believe it possible, they thought I was joking. Well I wasn't joking, it was definitely possible in socialist Poland.

LK Could you describe the function of the loggia?

RLThe intention was to create a new version of public spaces for interactions and gatherings known from historical cities – a nucleus of the urban. In our project, it was designed as an urban theatre, a free and open platform for spontaneous activities, mainly for the local community, as well as a space for pre-planned shows or concerts. But the main point was that it's a place where people can meet and talk without forcing them and without imposing anything, a place which simply invites to be there. It was very different from socialist spaces. It was a symbolic way to give this space to the people and to encourage them to interact and cooperate without imposed regulations or rules, to free them from how people were taught to act in socialism, always on command, in a pre-programmed way.

LK Why wasn't the loggia realized?

RL Nobody wanted to invest in an empty space without a clear function assigned to it.

LK What was the role of the International Congress in 1981 for Polish architectural discourse?

RL It was very important, this is when Bielecki first presented DiM's ideas. The congress was full of postmodern postulates, but not formalistic, mainly they were concerned with this humanisation of architecture which I mentioned before, and which was so much needed in Poland.

LK What was the reception of the DiM Charter?

RL Bielecki interpreted postmodernism politically and for him it was a critique of the regime clearly. But also, in my opinion, this manifesto was superficial, it didn't help to solve any real problems. I know that many architects received it as superficial, and then when you see his realizations, and compare this theory with his later realizations, it is clear that he treats postmodernism superficially.

Works Cited

Alexander, Christopher. *A Pattern Language: Towns, Buildings, Construction*. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1977.

Allard, Pablo. "Traslademos el Congreso." *La Tercera* (April 9, 2012): 38.

Aman, Anders. *Architecture and Ideology in Eastern Europe During the Stalin Era: An Aspect of Cold War History*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1992.

de Arce, Rodrigo Perez. "The Garden of Intersecting Paths: The Remodelación San Borja and the Schools of Architecture." *ARQ* 92 (2016): 50–67.

"Architektów kłopoty z wolnością. Rozmowa z Cz. Bieleckim" (conversation between Tomasz Jastrun and Czesław Bielecki). *Architektura-Murator* 1 (1994): 26–28.

Arriola, Ricardo Contreras. "Editorial." *ARS* 7 (1986): 7.

"Bąbelki i socjalizm z ludzką twarzą: Pepsi-cola w PRL." *Polska Times*. August 18, 2010.

Bielecki, Czesław. "Continuity in Architecture." *Architektura* 3–4 (1978): 25–75.
—. Email message. July 9, 2016.
—. *Gra w Miasto*. Warsaw: DOM Dostepny, 1996.
—. Interview by the author. June 9, 2017 (published in Appendix).

Borawski, Ludwik, and Jerzy Szczepanik-Dzikowski and Andrzej Szkop, "Życie i Nowoczesnośc." *Życie Warszawy*. July 6, 1971.

Boza, Cristian. Interview by Joaquín Serrano in *Editar para transformar: publicaciones de arquitectura y diseño en Chile durante los años 60s y 70s, en el marco de la exposición Clip/Stamp/Fold*, edited by Pablo Brugnoli and Fernando Portal (Santiago: Capital Books, 2015): 158–167.

Bristol, Katharine. "The Pruitt-Igoe Myth," *Journal of Architectural Education* 44.3 (May 1991): 163–171. http://www.pruitt-igoe.com/temp/1991-bristol-pruitt-igoemyth.pdf.

Bruszewski, Andrzej. "Editor's Afterword." *Architektura* 3–4 (1978): 76–77.
—. "Editor's Note." *Architektura* 379–380 (1979): 23.

Budzyński, Marek. "Architekt jako urbanista." Interview by Katarzyna Bilik and Karolina Matysiak. *Rzut* 6 (2015): 73–81.
—. "Interview with Marek Budzyński" in *Polish Postmodernism: Architecture and Urbanism, vol. 2*, edited by Alicja Gzowska and Lidia Klein (Warszawa: 40000 Malarzy, 2013): 5–60.
—. "Ursynów Polnocny – uwarunkowania, zasady." *Architektura* 326–327 (1975): 22–72.

Budzyński, Marek, and Ewa Przestaszewska-Porebska, Piotr Wicha, and Anna Koziolkiewicz. "Pasaz Ursynowski – dyskusja." *Architektura* 417 (1984): 31–42.

de Castro, Sergio. El Ladrillo: *bases de la política económica del gobierno militar chileno*. Santiago de Chile: Centro de Estudios Públicos, 1992.

Christian, Shirley. "Chile's Handcuffed Press can Still Jab at Pinochet." *The New York Times*. September 4, 1986. http://www.nytimes.com/1986/09/04/world/chile-s-handcuffed-press-can-still-jab-at-pinochet.html.

Cocotas, Alex. "Design for the One Percent." *Jacobin Magazine*. June 6, 2016. https://www.jacobinmag.com/2016/06/zaha-hadid-architecture-gentrification-design-housing-gehry-urbanism/.

Constitución de Chile de 1980 (Article 24). Barcelona: Linkgua, 2018.

"Consultative meeting of the First Secretary of the Central Committee of PUWP with representatives of the Association of Polish Architects before the VII Plenary Session." *Architektura* 5–6 (1977): page not numbered.

Le Corbusier. *The Athens Charter*. New York: Grossman Publishers, 1973.
—. *Towards an Architecture*. Los Angeles: Getty Research Institute, 2007.

Cox, Cristián Fenandez. "Universalidad y peculiaridad en la dimension simbólica: un marco teórico." *ARS* 5 (1984): 13–16.

Dattwyler, Rodrigo Hidalgo. *La vivienda social en Chile y la construcción del espacio urbano en el Santiago del siglo XX*. Santiago de Chile: PUC, 2005.

Díaz, Francisco. "Los arquitectos y la falta de memoria." *Bifurcaciones: Revista de estudios*

culturales urbanos (online journal). June 5, 2013. English version (unpublished): "Architects and the lack of memory: the project as alibi to forget. The José Domingo Gómez Rojas Park in Santiago and the Congress Building in Valparaíso, Chile." Final paper for Contested Grounds: The Spatial Politics of Memory course (prof. Mabel Wilson) at Columbia Graduate School of Architecture, Planning & Preservation, December 2012, 11.

—. "Arquitectura y postmodernidad en Chile: complejidad y contradiccion en la dictatura" in *Arquitectura en el Chile del Siglo XX*, edited by Fernando Pérez Oyarzun. (Santiago: ARQ Ediciones, forthcoming): pages unnumbered in unpublished draft.

Díaz, Francisco, et al. *Docoposmo: Documentacion y Conversaciones Sobre el Posmoderno* (guide in the form of leaflet). Santiago, 2008.

Dom i Miasto group. *DiM Charter*, pamphlet. Warsaw, 1981.

—. *Drogi Rozwiazywania Kwestii Mieszkaniowej*. Pamphlet. Warsaw (1981–1984).

Duval, Hernan. "Periferia metropolitan: algo mas que arquitectura." *ARS* 7 (1986): 9–10.

"Editorial." *ARS* 5 (1984): 7–8.

Edward Gierek na Ursynowie (TV documentary). Aired on January 08 1977, TVP.

Eliash, Humberto. Interview by the author. Santiago de Chile, Chile. August 23, 2016 (published in Appendix).

—. "La periferia dibujada." *ARS* 7 (1986): 11–21.

Furman, Adam Nathaniel. "The Democratic Monument: Adam Nathaniel Furman's Manifesto for a New Type of Civic Center." *Archdaily*. July 3, 2017. https://www.archdaily.com/874860/the-democratic-monument-adam-nathaniel-furmans-manifesto-for-a-new-type-of-civic-center.

Garcia, Pilar. Interview by the author. Santiago de Chile, Chile, September 1 2016 (published in Appendix).

Griffiths, Sean. "Now is not the time to be indulging in postmodern revivalism." *Dezeen*. October 30, 2017. https://www.dezeen.com/2017/10/30/sean-griffiths-fat-postmodern-revivalism-dangerous-times-opinion.

Habermas, Jürgen. "Modern and Postmodern Architecture" in *Critical Theory and Public*

Life, edited by John Forester (Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1988): 317–331.

Harwood, Elain, and Geraint Franklin. *Post-Modern Buildings in Britain*. London: Batsford, 2017.

Hatherley, Owen. "Postmodernism will not be forgiven lightly for what it did to architectural culture from the 1970s onwards." *Dezeen Magazine*. August 20, 2015. http://www.dezeen.com/2015/08/20/postmodernism-not-forgiven-impact-architectural-culture-legacy-owen-hatherley-opinion/.

Hawthorne, Christopher. "Pritzer winner Alejandro Aravena on Pinochet, postmodernism, and building a house for $7,500" (interview with Alejandro Aravena). *Los Angeles Times*. January 13, 2016. http://www.latimes.com/entertainment/arts/culture/la-ca-cm-pritzker-winner-alejandro-aravena-hawthorne-interview-20160113-story.html.

Healy, Derry. "Los arquitectos deben perder el tiempo." *ARS* 7 (1986): 26–30.

Herbst, Krzysztof. "Propozycje socjotechniczne." *Architektura* 326–327 (1975): 27–28.

Hernández, Pablo Fuentes. "La revista AUCA, 1965-1986: divulgación de la arquitectura y contribución disciplinar en el epílogo de la modernidad." *Arquitectura Revista* 7.2 (2011): 126–141. http://revistas.unisinos.br/index.php/arquitetura/article/view/arq.2011.72.04/638.

Irving, Allan. "The Modern/Postmodern Divide and Urban Planning." *University of Toronto Quarterly* 62.4 (Summer 1993): 474–487.

Jacobs, Jane. *The Death and Life of Great American Cities*. New York: Vintage Books, 1992.

Jameson, Fredric. *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2003.

Jara Jara, Cristián. *Ciudad, sociedad y accion Gremial: los arquitectos de Chile en el siglo XX*. Santiago de Chile: LOM Ediciones, 2015.

Jencks, Charles. The New Paradigm in Architecture: The Language of Post-Modernism. New Haven: Yale University Press, 2002.

—. The Story of Post-Modernism: Five Decades of the Ironic, Iconic and Critical in Architecture. Chichester, West Sussex: Wiley, 2011.

—. *What is Post-Modernism?* London: Academy Editions, 1986.

Klein, Lidia (ed.). *Postmodernizm polski – architektura i urbanistyka*. Warsaw: Wydawnictwo 40000 Malarzy, 2013.

Klein, Naomi. "How Power Profits From Disaster." *The Guardian*. July 6 2017. https://www.theguardian.com/us-news/2017/jul/06/naomi-klein-how-power-profits-from-disaster.
—. *The Shock Doctrine: The Rise of Disaster Capitalism*. London: Penguin, 2008.

Klotz, Heinrich. *The History of Postmodern Architecture*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1990.

"Kosciol na Ursynowie polnocnym w Warszawie" (editors' discussion with Marek Budzyński and Piotr Wicha). *Architektura* 407 (1982): 61–69.

Lasota, Marek, and Malgorzata Ptasinska and Zbigniew Solak. "Malopolska i Swietokrzyskie" in *Stan wojenny w Polsce 1981–1983*, edited by Antoni Dudek (Warsaw: Instytut Pamięci Narodowej, 2003): 217–285.

Leśniakowska, Marta. Email message, July 8, 2016.
—. Interview by the author. Warsaw, Poland. June 5, 2017 (published in Appendix).

Liernur, Jorge Francisco (ed.). *Portales del Laberinto. Arquitectura y ciudad en chile, 1977-2009.* Santiago: Universidad Nacional Andrés Bello, 2009.

Loegler, Romuald. Interview by the author. Warsaw, Poland. July 1, 2017 (published in Appendix).
—. "Interview with Romuald Loegler" in *Polish Postmodernism: Architecture and Urbanism, vol. 2*, edited by Alicja Gzowska and Lidia Klein (Warszawa: 40000 Malarzy, 2013): 154–201.
—. "Konkurs SARP na rozwiazanie zespolu mieszkalnego i koncepcji programowo-przestrzennej 'Skarpy' w Nowej Hucie. Dyskusja pokonkursowa." *Architektura* 429 (1986): 53–66.

McGurik, Justin. "Has postmodernist design eaten itself." *The Guardian*. September 12, 2011. https://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/2011/sep/12/postmodernist-design-v-and-a-retrospective.

McLeod, Mary. "Architecture and Politics in the Reagan Era: From Postmodernism to

Deconstructivism." *Assemblage* 8 (1989): 22–59.

Ministerio de Vivienda y Urbanismo, División de Desarrollo Urbano. *Política Nacional de Desarrollo Urbano*. Publicación No. 114 (March 1979). http://politicaurbana.minvu.cl/wp-content/uploads/2012/10/Politica_19791.pdf.

Miranda, Carolina. "Rough, yet poetic: Chilean Architecture has its moment." *Los Angeles Times*. May 17, 2015. http://www.latimes.com/entertainment/arts/miranda/la-et-cam-chilean-architecture-goes-international-20150515-column.html.

Mouffe, Chantal. *On the Political*. New York: Routledge, 2005.

Murtinho, Pedro. Interview by the author. Santiago de Chile, Chile. August 30 2016 (published in Appendix).

—. Interview by the author. Santiago de Chile, Chile. September 01 2016 (published in Appendix).

Myelnikov, Yevgeny. "Romantic Modernists." *Architektura* 379–380 (1979): 75–88.

Nadolny, Adam. "Postmodern architecture in the historical quarters of Poznan as a shaping element of the city's cultural environment." *Architectus* 2.32: 49–53. Accessed January 25, 2018. http://www.architectus.arch.pwr.wroc.pl/32/32_08.pdf.

"Nadzwyczajny Walny Zjazd SARP w stulecie organizacji polskich architektow 13-15 maja 77, Kraków." *Architektura* 5–6 (1977): 7–8.

"Najbardziej ludzka sypialnia" (discussion between Krzysztof Herbst, Jan Dziubecki, Marta Bieniasz, Dominik Dobrzanski, Jerzy Szczepanik-Dzikowski, Marek Budzyński, and Stanisław Chrzanowski). *Architektura Murator* 6 (2005): 64–75. Quoted in Pańków, 82.

Ockman, Joan. "Review: *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture* by Robert Venturi." *Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians* 74.4 (December 2016): 490–492. http://jsah.ucpress.edu/content/75/4/490.

Ogólnopolska Narada architektów. Materiały do dyskusji. Zeszyt 3. Warszawa: ZG SARP, 1956.

Oyarzun, Fernando Pérez. Interview by the author. Santiago de Chile, Chile. September 6 2016 (published in Appendix).

Palmer, Monserrat. "Urbanismo, ideologias y dependencia." *CA* 22 (1978): page not numbered.

Pańków, Lidia. *Bloki w słońcu. Mała historia Ursynowa Północnego*. Wołowiec: Czarne 2016.

Paperny, Vladimir. "An Interview with Denise Scott Brown and Robert Venturi." *Architectural Digest* (Russia) (July 2006): 36–41. http://www.paperny.com/venturi.html.

Portoghesi, Paolo. *Postmodern: The Architecture of the Post-Industrial Society*. New York: Rizzoli, 1982.

Preston, David A. Latin American Development: Geographical Perspectives. New York: Routledge, 1996.

"Proposicion para Santiago Metropolitano, Area Poniente: Anteproyecto Santiago Poniente." *AUCA* 34 (1978): 74–75.

Rabascall, Julia Talarn. "Chile's presidential palace basement was Pinochet's torture chamber." *Agencia EFE*. October 16 2016. https://www.efe.com/efe/english/world/chile-s-presidential-palace-basement-was-pinochet-torture-chamber/50000262-3069436.

Rebolledo, Mauricio Becerra. "Las olvidadas erradicaciones de la dictadura" (interview with Cristián Palacios and César Leyton). *El Ciudadano*. December 17 2012. https://www.elciudadano.cl/entrevistas/las-olvidadas-erradicaciones-de-la-dictadura/12/17/.

"Remodelación Santiago Poniente." *ARS* 1 (1978): 15–28.

Reyes, María Isabel Pavez. *Diseño urbano inclusivo para Santiago Centro: Concurso internacional 1972 Santiago de Chile*. Santiago: Universidad de Chile, Facultad de Arquitectura y Urbanismo, 2015.

"Rezolucja Krajowej Partyjnej Narady Architektow w dniu 20-21 czerwca 1949 r. w Warszawie." *Architektura* 6–8 (1949): 162.

Rigotti, Ana Maria. "El otro cruce de los Andes: Megaformas proyectadas en Argentina para Santiago" in *Sudamérica moderna: objetos, edificios, territorio*s, edited by Hugo Mondragón and Catalina Mejía (Santiago: Ediciones Arq, 2015): 206–226.

Rose, Margareth A. The Post-Modern and the Post-Industrial*: A Critical Analysis*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1991.

Rossi, Aldo. *The Architecture of the City*. Cambridge, Mass: MIT Press, 2007.

"Saludamos a ARS." *CA* 22 (1978): page not numbered.

Shapira, Abraham. "Renovación Urbana: en busca de Consenso." *AUCA* 50/51 (1986): 15–18.

de Simone, Liliana. "*Caracoles* comerciales y otras especies en vías de extinción: La evolución del proto-mall en Santiago de Chile y su vigencia actual." *Bifurcaciones: Revista de estudios culturales urbanos* (online journal). September 24 2012. http://www.bifurcaciones.cl/2012/11/caracoles-comerciales/.

Stanek, Łukasz. "Mobilities of Architecture in the Global Cold War: From Socialist Poland to Kuwait and Back." *International Journal of Islamic Architecture* 4.2 (October 2015): 365–398.
—. *Postmodernizm jest prawie w porzadku / Postmodernism Is Almost All Right: Polish Architecture After Socialist Globalization.* Warsaw: Fundacja Narodowej Kultury Bęc Zmiana, 2012.

Stepan, Alfred. "The Last Days of Pinochet?" *The New York Review*. June 2 1988. http://www.nybooks.com/articles/1988/06/02/the-last-days-of-pinochet/.

Stern, Steve J. Battling for Hearts and Minds: Memory Struggles in Pinochet's Chile, 1973–1988. Durham: Duke University Press, 2006.
—. Reckoning with Pinochet: The Memory Question in Democratic Chile, 1989–2006. Durham: Duke University Press, 2010.

"Stonka w płynie." *Newsweek*. July 29 2007.

Szkop, Andrzej. "Rehabilitacja Ulicy." *Architektura* 326–327 (1975): 41.

Undurraga, Cristián, and Ana Luisa Devés. "Plaza de la Constitución." *CA* 41 (1985): 193–194.

“Vanguardia y Post Modernismo en Chile.” *ARS* 4 (1981): 24–31.

Venturi, Robert. *Complexity and Contradiction in Architecture*. New York: Museum of Modern Art, 2011.

Venturi, Robert, and Robert Izenour, and Denise Scott Brown. *Learning from Las Vegas*. Cambridge, Mass.: MIT Press, 1972.

W., Alberto Gurovich. “La Pintana: la ciudad interminable.” *Revista INVI* 9 (1990): 5–19.

Winn, Peter (ed.). *Victims of the Chilean Miracle: Workers and Neoliberalism in the Pinochet Era, 1973–2002*. Durham: Duke University Press, 2004.

Woś, Rafał. “Gra w miasto.” *Dziennik Gazeta Prawna*. October 10 2013.

Yurchak, Alexei. *Everything Was Forever, Until It Was No More: The Last Soviet Generation*. Princeton: Princeton University Press, 2006.

Zholtovski, Ivan V., and Yevgeny Mielnikow. “The Classics of the Soviet Architecture.” *Architektura* 375–388 (1979): 82–85.

Zwoliński, Zygmunt. “Biuro Projektów Budownictwa Ogólnego ‘Budopol’ w Warszawie.” *Architektura* 383–384 (1979): 4–18.

Biography

Lidia Klein earned her first Ph.D. in 2013 from the Department of Art History at the University of Warsaw in Poland, defending her dissertation, "Living Architectures: Biological Analogies in Architecture at the End of the Twentieth Century" (director: Waldemar Baraniewski). During that graduate degree, she was awarded a Fulbright Junior Advanced Research Grant at the Department of Art, Art History and Visual Studies (AAHVS) at Duke University during the 2010–2011 academic year. While finishing her Ph.D., she worked as an Assistant Professor at the Academy of Fine Arts in Warsaw during 2012–2013. Klein began her second Ph.D. at Duke in the AAHVS Department in the fall of 2013. During the Spring semester of 2016 she was a Visiting Assistant in Research at the Yale School of Architecture. As of 2018, Klein is the author, editor, or co-editor of five published books and numerous articles on contemporary architecture. Her book projects include the single-author study, *Living Architectures: Biological Analogies in Architecture of the End of the 20th Century* (Warsaw: Fundacja Kultury Miejsca, 2014) [in Polish], and edited books, *Transformation: Polish Art, Design and Architecture After 1989* (Warsaw: Fundacja Kultury Miejsca, 2017) [in Polish], *Polish Postmodernism: Architecture and Urbanism* (Warsaw: 40000 Malarzy, 2013) [in Polish], and *Making the walls quake as if they were dilating with the secret knowledge of great powers* (Warsaw: Zacheta, 2012), co-edited with Michal Libera.