

Panel Discussion II

with Atli Magnus Seelow, David Maulén de los Reyes, Susanne Neubauer, Chin-Wei Chang, and the Audience chaired by Joaquín Medina Warmburg

encounters with bauhaus
and modern design

learning processes

swedish functionalism

functionalism as a concept

swedish functionalism vs.
german modernism/bauhaus style

power relations and geopolitics

dependency and periphery
as a concept

construction of a «third world»

interplay of projection and
appropriation

Joaquín Medina Warmburg

In our «Bauhaus and Bauhaus Pedagogy in Sweden, Latin America and China» section, we are again dealing with transfer experiences in the broadest sense of the term, with encounters, unfamiliar and perhaps also destabilizing situations, which people engage with in different ways, trying to either actually maintain an attitude or develop new attitudes—like Bruno Taut, for example, who very quickly articulated preconceived opinions and passed judgments, which he subsequently gradually revised. In the process, adjustments may also be made that are essential in order to remain true to modern attitudes in the long term. In contrast to the contributions to the discussion in Section I, we have also expanded the scope of the subject matter, in particular to encompass product design.

The identification of the welfare state and Functionalism in Sweden is particularly interesting. As we have heard from Atli Magnus Seelow, misunderstandings often arise between transmitters and receivers in transfer processes due to the latter's specific expectations. In this context, the identification of Swedish Functionalism with German Modernism is an interesting topic for discussion, especially in view of our thematic focus—transfer, translation, and transformation processes in the political realm.

Susanne Neubauer's paper explicitly addressed the question of the politicized field in which these processes take place, and in this context, I would like to follow up in more detail on the ideological and cultural construction of the concept of «dependence» or «periphery». There is a backstory to this in the very high numbers of Latin American students at the HfG Ulm [Ulm School of Design], who helped shape the discourse there, including leftist discourse, with Tomás Maldonado playing a leading role. And at the same time, I am always suspicious about such assertions for the question arises who helped whom. Who helped whom when the HfG Ulm was closed down? Was it really about the centre supporting the periphery, with protagonists who went to the periphery and built something there, or did the construction of the «Third World», «dependency» and the «periphery» first give these young graduates, former HfG lecturers, a meaningful function, making them a source of hope and providing them with meaningful activities? I suspect this means it was an encounter where the exchanges were mutually beneficial.

David Maulén de los Reyes recently pointed out an interesting connection with Gui Bonsiepe. He views him as part of a Bauhaus tradition or lineage of Bauhaus reception in Chile,

bauhaus reception
different bauhaus versions

hfg ulm's criticism
of the bauhaus

reception of different versions
of modernism

functionalism as a concept
dependency and periphery
as a concept

intellectual colonialism

identification of functionalism
with the welfare state

functionalism as a concept

which at the same time includes the HfG Ulm's criticism of the Bauhaus. However, that was not the only Bauhaus tradition in Chile. Instead, several academics at faculties and schools of architecture adopted positions that went in the opposite direction, for example Emilio Duhart, who had studied at Harvard and subsequently, in his articles in the context of the curriculum reform, published Walter Gropius' early study *Idee und Aufbau des staatlichen Bauhauses Weimar* [The Theory and Organization of the Bauhaus] (1923) and invited Josef Albers to Chile. If one looks at both stances, they are not part of a common lineage, but rather, especially in the ideological and political realm, contrary positions that were in conflict with each other and also related to power struggles in the educational field. I would like to discuss this and connect it with Bonsiepe's arrival on the scene in the late 1960s.

Finally, Chin Wei-Chang's paper put many things into perspective. From the Chinese standpoint, the Bauhaus seems to be one of many options, which relativizes the idea of an overwhelming Bauhaus in global reception. Particularly in view of the Edward Said quotation that Chin-Wei Chang paraphrased, it seems obvious to replace the term «Bauhaus» by «Functionalism» or «periphery», which would give us a good topic for grappling, in Said's sense, with the intellectual colonialism associated with the projections contained in these terms.

Let us start with the first topic and the question I already mentioned concerning the identification of Functionalism and the welfare state in Sweden. And since there is a direct lineage of tradition or a direct transfer here—much more direct than, for example, in China, where the transfer takes a detour via Cambridge, London and Paris—the question arises as to why the term «Functionalism», of all things, which is obviously also politically charged in this context, has come to epitomize transfer or translation processes involving the Bauhaus in Sweden. One could perhaps also have chosen the term «rationalization», which Adolf Behne defined in his publication *Der moderne Zweckbau* [The Modern Functional Building] (1923), differentiating it from «Functionalism», as fulfilling a practical purpose à la longue, which means an approach to satisfying a practical purpose that takes into account the changing demands of several generations and refrains from the greatest possible adaptation to a purpose that is as specialized as possible.

[H] What does it mean to understand the Bauhaus as a transnational and transcultural network of relationships?

Atli Magnus Seelow

Yes, it is not easy to explain why in Sweden Functionalism very quickly became a generic term for everything modern. In Sweden, everything is indeed «Functionalist», just as here in Germany «Bauhaus style» has become established as the epitome of modernity. And even if there is no direct explanation for this, I would at least like to try to cite a number of indirect clues as to why this process functions like this: Let me begin by noting that Uno Åhrén uses the terms «utilitarian art» and «functional» for Le Corbusier's architecture, with the latter term emerging in 1927. In 1930, i.e. at the Stockholm exhibition, this term was already in use and having a broad impact. That allows us to conclude that at that time the term «functional» was in the throes of becoming a designation referencing «*Neues Leben*» [New Living or a New Lifestyle]. I suspect that after the Great Depression, people were looking for a term that could express economic efficiency even more vigorously than the term «rationalism». That is suggested by Le Corbusier's comment in *Gli elementi dell' architettura funzionale* [Elements of Functionalist Architecture] (1932) the major overview publication edited by Alberto Sartoris, a CIAM founding member and a key player in the world of rationalist architecture, that he convinced Sartoris to change the title from «architettura rationale» to «architettura funzionale». This volume brings together a large number of buildings and projects from the Nordic countries for the first time, including around nine examples from Sweden. And there is also what I would describe as a new departure in architecture and design on the one hand coinciding with a sense of a new political departure on the other, which explains the strong impact of Functionalism in Sweden. Particularly after the 1930 Stockholm exhibition, Functionalism was seen as overcoming the world economic crisis, as overcoming the conservative government and as the beginning of almost forty years of Social Democratic rule in Sweden, a period associated with the construction of the Social Democratic welfare state.

swedish functionalism vs.
german modernism/bauhaus style

functionalism as a concept
utilitarian architecture

new living—a new lifestyle

new political, social, and
architectural awakening

identification of functionalism
with the welfare state

social democratic welfare state

Joaquín Medina Warmburg

[H] In this play of interactions between transmitters and receivers, in the interplay and transformation of expectations and a sense of mission about the message transmitted, the question arises of whether it is sufficient or fitting to imagine the Bauhaus transfer between Germany and Sweden as being a one-way street. Or, to put it in tangible terms, is there also a transfer that goes in the

processes of transfer,
translation, and transformation

interplay of projection and
appropriation

opposite direction, in other words, some contribution from Sweden or Scandinavia that would have had an influence on the Bauhaus, directly or indirectly?

Atli Magnus Seelow

Well, there was probably no comparable direct influence in the opposite direction, apart from the Swedish architect Sune Lindström, who also spent a year studying at the Bauhaus in Dessau. And there were not too many direct contacts at all. In this context, it is of course important to mention the friendship between Sven Markelius, a Swedish architect and a very early CIAM founding member, and Walter Gropius. Markelius had met the Bauhaus founder in 1927 during a trip to Germany, during which he also visited the Bauhaus school in Dessau. He was very impressed by Gropius' ideas during this trip. Contacts then intensified after the Bauhaus was closed during the Nazi era with the emigration of Fred Forbat and Werner Taesler to Sweden. In 1938 Fred Forbat, a Hungarian-German architect and urban planner who had worked in Walter Gropius' studio from 1920 to 1922, albeit with some interruptions, and had also taught at the Bauhaus in Weimar, accepted an invitation to Sweden from the architect Uno Åhrén. During his time there he inter alia worked for architect Sune Lindström, preparing the general plan for the city of Lund from 1938 to 1945. German architect Werner Taesler, who had studied at the Bauhaus in Dessau in 1929, went into exile in Sweden in 1935. But here again, the direction of transfer was from Germany to Sweden. Essentially, there was no reverse transfer moving in the opposite direction, in any case not in the way we would like to imagine.

emigration and exile

processes of transfer,
translation, and transformation

There are nonetheless a number of interesting aspects of German-Scandinavian exchanges after 1933. 1940 saw the publication on the German book market of a publication in German by Danish architect and town planner Steen Eiler Rasmussen, entitled *Nordische Baukunst*—a very strange book containing examples of both progressive and conservative architecture from the Nordic countries. Conversely, it was also possible to view—probably in a model exhibition in Oslo in 1936 or 1938—a small selection of German architecture, although without any examples of progressive architecture.

exchange processes

The very unsatisfactory state of available research is another reason why we know so little about German-Scandinavian or German-Swedish exchanges during this period. We hardly know when and who from which Nordic countries took part in the

CIAM congresses. Our knowledge is mainly based on the memoirs of Sven Markelius' widow, who was asked about these points fifty years later.

Joaquín Medina Warmburg

At this point we should take a closer look at Sven Markelius' boarding house approaches in contrast to comparable projects by Walter Gropius. In the early 1930s Gropius published his ideas on rationalizing housing construction in Swedish magazines. In CIAM he had derived these ideas historically from the transformation of sociological structures, in particular the dissolution of the traditional family, the emergence of the nuclear family with a working wife, as well as the increased numbers of single and divorced people, new forms of sociability, the club house, and how supply arrangements are organized within the house. The state therefore had to take on new roles, for example relating to care for the elderly and children. Modern architecture was also meant to respond to this phenomenon of modernization by offering new forms of shared living in a modernized society. In other words: Gropius understood social modernization with its new needs as a prerequisite for modern architecture.

In the depiction of Swedish Functionalism, the relationship between societal or socio-economic conditions and modern architecture appears downright inverted: First there is modern architecture, as something complete that is imported or transferred, and only after that the idea of a welfare state that is in the first instance produced by modern architecture. This would be, so to speak, the inverse and highly «non-Functionalist» route to Functionalism. To what extent must or could such concepts relating to building typology and social issues be adapted to the local conditions and Swedish ideas of «Functionalism» by émigré Bauhaus staff and students?

Atli Magnus Seelow

I think it's important to differentiate. Because in the Nordic countries, rationalization efforts were made at a very early stage, independently of modern architecture. Immediately after the First World War, various forms of cooperatives were founded, also with their own architecture and engineering offices, some of which were very progressive or even more progressive than the corresponding efforts in mainland Europe. To name just a few examples: Osvald Almqvist, one of the most progressive Swedish architects,

rationalizing housing construction

modern architecture
and design as a response
to social modernization

swedish functionalism

identification of functionalism
with the welfare state

rationalization

cooperative housing construction

- [F] What are the social, political, and economic preconditions for Bauhaus reception? And how do they vary from one period or country to another?
- [H] What does it mean to understand the Bauhaus as a transnational and transcultural network of relationships?

standardization

who carried out studies on the standardization of kitchens between 1922 and 1927—which is in part earlier than the Frankfurt Kitchen—or the cooperative and architectural office of the cooperative association, which built standardized shop interiors—cooperative stores, some of which still exist in Sweden today. This standardization of shop interiors took place very early in the 1920s and in some cases was so progressive that it was later reflected in Ernst Neufert's *Bauentwurfslehre* [Architects' Data] (1936). Through rationalization and standardization, Sweden sought to counteract the devastating housing situation in Stockholm, which was considered the poorest or worst anywhere in Europe at the turn of the century. As the process of industrialization did not begin until much later in the Nordic countries, essentially in the 1870s and 1880s, it correspondingly unfolded faster than on the continent. The aforementioned early attempts at rationalization and standardization are in essence independent of the processes whereby the Bauhaus or Neues Bauen [New Building] were transferred and translated northward, which only began in the second half of the 1920s. In short, we cannot adequately understand these reception processes unless we look at the preconditions of Swedish Functionalism, i.e. at what already existed in Sweden before Bauhaus reception. For this reception did not take place on a tabula rasa and was not detached from these preconditions.

[F] [H]

Joaquín Medina Warmburg

Let us now move on to Bonsiepe and take a closer look at the concept or the ideology of the periphery. I mentioned earlier that I suspect that it is by no means so clear in which direction assistance moves. Incidentally, I find terms such as «periphery» or «Third World», as well as this ideology of dependence, not at all helpful for the present day. For the 1960s, they were above all useful for designers: for designers who were looking for a meaningful activity in the setting of mass-consumption societies in the German or Western world on this side of the Iron Curtain; for designers, especially German product designers, whose criticism of capitalism and doubts about their role in the capitalist system (as «useful idiots» who, through superficial styling, provide the necessary formal obsolescence in the service of consumption) turned the so-called «Third World» into a hopeful, meaningful construct. In that part of the world, product designers were supposed to provide import substitution within the framework of industrialization programmes and thus contribute to eliminating the dependence

dependency and periphery
as a concept

construction of a «third world»

critique of capitalism

- [H] What does it mean to understand the Bauhaus as a transnational and transcultural network of relationships?
- [I] What can we learn from the history of the Bauhaus and Modernism when facing current issues? And how can this enable us to gain new insights into the past?

of the «periphery» on economic, political and cultural centres, especially the USA and Europe. In this constellation, this construct of the «Third World» or «periphery» could indeed offer a sense of meaning for these young left-wing graduates from the HfG Ulm. In other words, the example of Bonsiepe in Chile also renders visible strained interactions in the field of politics: between the context of the late 1960s in the Federal Republic of Germany and the circumstances in Salvador Allende's Chile. But wasn't this also a kind of intellectual colonialism in Edward Said's sense?

power relations and geopolitics
intellectual colonialism

Susanne Neubauer

Yes, of course, that is a question that needs to be asked. What I find extremely compelling about this research topic is that in the academic examination of our historical subject-matter and the relationship between West Germany and Chile that you describe, which was established at a very specific historical moment in the field of design, we must always reflect critically on our own standpoint and ask ourselves how we deal with it as researchers. It would certainly be an imperialist approach if I were to try to presume, taking the German context as my point of departure, that I could enter into the circumstances of a country I do not know, dissect concepts there and sketch out some kind of grand historical arc. That is why in the research I am doing with Marcelo Mari at the Instituto de Artes Visuais of the Universidade de Brasilia, which moves in the direction of transculturality or globalization, we really want to try to establish this double arc, in other words, to incorporate different perspectives and establish an exchange between them. Coming back to Gui Bonsiepe, it would certainly be interesting to ask him whether he perceived the meaning of the construct «periphery» cited by Joaquín Medina Warmburg in these terms at the time. However, I find his publication on his experiences in Chile¹ incredibly fascinating and progressive, because in the passages in which he writes about the use of resources, I perceive an attitude and approach to the environment, or rather an environmental awareness, that I find very interesting in view of the challenges we face in the 21st century, although the desire to strengthen local production may also be utopian to some degree. Nonetheless, I see this as an early approach to addressing the centre-periphery problem. I think that it should definitely be seen as a positive step if a German designer goes abroad, discusses this topic locally and makes it tangible as a theme in the first place.

self-image of the historian
and researcher

[H]

dependency and periphery
as a concept

[I]

environmental awareness

centre and periphery
as a concept

[G] Which ways of taking a stand can we discover in processes of Bauhaus transfer, translation, and transformation?

Joaquín Medina Warmburg

Why is this something positive?

Susanne Neubauer

[G] In this Chilean context, Bonsiepe was able to take part in a (short-lived) Socialist experiment that he obviously very much identified with politically. And this enabled him to carry out a critique of capitalism on the spot. I think it's legitimate for a young person to take up this field of practice, where it's not just a matter of theory or writing theoretical manifestos, but really part of—and this I think was what made it enticing—a utopian project that could be put into practice and tested, in the hope, as he also wrote, of avoiding a simple repetition of the Russian Revolution's mistakes.

critique of capitalism

Joaquín Medina Warmburg

In this context, it is perhaps also interesting that there is a link here to Hannes Meyer's experiences in Mexico. David Maulén de los Reyes also talked about logical positivism as an element in Tibor Weiner's approaches in Chile, and there are Latin American traditions of positivism: The Argentinean Tomás Maldonado—Gui Bonsiepe was his master student—is one clear example, and another is the German philosopher Max Bense and his enthusiasm for Brasília, especially in the 1960s—so there are also other types of interactions that do not simply lead so clearly into this ideological Socialist nationalization policy. In fact, in Chile there is this concept of the environment, which also comes from Maldonado; it does not have much to do with the issue of the natural world but is more closely related to environments, to these cybernetic visions and systemic approaches that are also related to a critique of the Bauhaus: criticism first of all of the traditional lineage embodied by Max Bill, which was continued thanks to the presence of lecturers from the USA such as Josef Albers, and ultimately culminated in the publication of Maldonado's correspondence with Walter Gropius in the spirit of «unmasking the fairy tale of the rationalist Bauhaus». At the same time, another Bauhaus was held in high esteem: that of Hannes Meyer and his scientific methods. Did Bonsiepe also reflect on this? To what extent was Bonsiepe involved during the Ulm period in Claude Schnaidt's 1965 Hannes Meyer monograph (*Hannes Meyer: Projekte, Bauten und Schriften*), with a foreword by Tomás Maldonado? We do however know that it was precisely this other tradition of the «left-wing» Bauhaus that failed in its attempt to gain a foothold in Latin America. That was

environment as a concept

environments—cybernetic visions
and systemic approaches

hfg ulm's criticism of the bauhaus

different bauhaus versions

power relations and geopolitics

self-image of the architect and designer

hfg ulm's criticism of the Bauhaus «good design» as a concept

universal design principles

bauhaus reception

different Bauhaus versions

also the case in Chile, where the progressive curricula inspired by this stance—Tibor Weiner at the Universidad de Chile—found a pendant in the Bauhaus-Harvard tradition—Emilio Duhart at the Universidad Católica de Chile.

Shouldn't the «Bonsiepe case» also be understood as transposing to local conditions a polarization between hegemonic centres that occurred almost globally during the Cold War, even if at the same time he forms part of a Latin American tradition? In other words, not understood at all as a merely «peripheral» special case, but rather as something that is right in the midst of events and addresses central problems, namely the environmental problem? Did Bonsiepe also see himself in Chile as following in the tradition established by Tibor Weiner and not merely in this European tradition of a critique of the Bauhaus tradition à la Gropius and a revival of the tradition of scientific methods associated with Hannes Meyer?

Susanne Neubauer

I cannot judge that, but I know he criticized Max Bill's concept of «good design» and indirectly, as I understand it, the Bauhaus concepts of universality. I think this is a question that should be addressed to Gui Bonsiepe himself.

Joaquín Medina Warmburg

But that's also connected to Maldonado's «Palace Revolution».

Susanne Neubauer

Yes, definitely.

Joaquín Medina Warmburg

Perhaps then in response to David; it is a question I did already ask. There is this tradition of Hannes Meyer in Chile, but then parallel to that there is the indirect tradition of Walter Gropius, filtered through Harvard, especially through Emilio Duhart, as you showed. You described it as a lineage, in other words, as not very differentiated, but I identify a great deal of tension there. There is a reform plan by Tibor Weiner, and Emilio Duhart makes a counterproposal and then publishes the Weimar Bauhaus' pedagogical concepts from 1923.

David Maulén de los Reyes

What I wanted to point out in my contribution was the Hannes Meyer tradition in Chile. So, let me now try to give an idea or

abstract of the whole process of Bauhaus reception in Chile. In the 40s, in the National University, that is, in the University of Chile, we had the influence of Hannes Meyer and Tibor Weiner. And in the 50s we have the influence of Josef Albers and Walter Gropius in the Catholic University, a private university. But that's of course a bit oversimplified because it is much more complex.

You know, Hannes Meyer was not the only reference in the University of Chile in the Forties, another was the teamwork idea of Walter Gropius—or more exactly, in the same faculty, one teacher referred to or worked with the teamwork idea of Walter Gropius and the other with that of Hannes Meyer. And the Chilean architect Emilio Duhart is also a very important person in Chile. In 1935, Duhart began to study architecture at the Catholic University of Chile (UCCh), which he graduated from in 1941. In 1942 he moved to the United States, where he studied architecture together with Ieoh Ming Pei at Harvard University. During this stay at Harvard, Duhart became acquainted with the modern architecture movement that would become a cornerstone in his career. After having returned to Chile, he worked as an architect and in 1951 he returned to the UCCh to work as a teacher where he would later become director of the Urbanism, Housing and Planning department. Nevertheless, in the Fifties he also gave much support to students from the University of Chile, too.

In 1957, we have this long *Seminarium* for many months where all the tendencies in Chile were discussed in order to develop a big master plan for the next thirty years. And Emilio Duhart was only one voice among many. And in the Sixties, we have the influence of Max Bill, co-founder of the HfG Ulm and its first rector (1953–56), on the ideas of corporate design in Valparaíso. And history is repeating itself with Max Bill on the one hand and Gui Bonsiepe on the other.

In 1972 Bonsiepe wrote an article in which he explained the interface concept, the design of interaction, in which we can find a very important insight: If you copy an answer from another context, it doesn't work. What I want to say is that we can understand the interpretation of Bauhaus ideas as a movement from the Twenties until the Seventies inside the national development project, especially as part of the Public Education in Art scheme in the Twenties, in architecture and design in the Forties and Fifties, in design at the end of Sixties. And it is very interesting that the discussion in the two principal architecture schools in Chile, the University of Chile and the Catholic University of Chile, in the

different bauhaus versions
heterogeneity of the bauhaus

Fifties, at the end of the Second World War, is very similar to that in Dessau in the late Twenties. But you can understand all the interpretation of Bauhaus is inside this project of the nation, from the Twenties until the Seventies.

power relations
and geopolitics

Joaquín Medina Warmburg

But in political discourse there is not simply a project of the nation, but also a dispute between various proposals concerning the university's orientation and also between different affiliations, although it also makes a difference whether we are talking about private or public universities. It is a politicized field or a politicized space, to pick up on the term from the section title.

education reform
bauhaus school
active school

However, I would like to turn now to another interesting point. David, you stated that there were state-subsidized educational models similar to the Bauhaus as early as the 1920s in Latin America. What exactly constituted the purported similarities? How can they be explained? And what kind of position did newcomers like Tibor Weiner adopt in relation to these traditions? To what extent were the modernization ideas of the progressive education movements in Chile compatible with those of the Bauhaus, even if the latter cannot be understood as uniform either?

David Maulén de los Reyes

The similarities between the state-subsidized educational models in Chile and those of the Bauhaus relate on the one hand to the Active School ideas, theories and methodologies, which aimed to encourage students to form their own autonomous criteria rather than producing mechanical copies from a teacher as in the 19th century. And they relate on the other hand to the inseparable connection of departure of both: the political and the educational system. Like the Bauhaus, which was born as a state educational project of the Weimar Republic, the notion of an educational reform of the entire public educational system, with ideas from the Active School, supported by a movement of Chilean teachers and the Chilean labour federation between 1920 and 1924 was the nucleus of a new Chilean constitution and Constituent Assembly of 1925. Even if it did not succeed, the ideas of the educational reform did not disappear.

General Carlos Ibañez, who seized power in 1927, believed he could dominate the social movement using the Italian corporatist model and handed over power in the field of education to the teachers' unions of the Active School during 1928. In the Chilean Ministry of Education's documentation of this year you can see

active school

a lot of information about Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, Friedrich Wilhelm August Fröbel, Maria Montessori, etc.

education reform

propaedeutics—*vorkurs*

After being appointed as Director General of Art Education and Director of the Escuela de Bellas Artes and the Museo de Bellas Artes in 1928, Carlos Isamitt succeeded in changing the entire artistic education of the country, and in the main art school he created an impressive preliminary course, a «*Vorkurs*», which also included subjects such as anthropology, grammar, civic education, in addition to the classic exercises with the psychology of elemental colours and geometric shapes, geometry, anatomy, art history and comparative design, etc., as well as creating courses for workers. Carlos Isamitt had studied the new curricula of art schools applied to industry in Europe and was very enthusiastic about the educational theories of the Active School. At the *Exposition Internationale des Arts Décoratifs et Industriels Modernes* in Paris in 1925, he was impressed by the VKhUTEMAS methodology.

This is not just a matter of intellectual colonialism and Isamitt was not only «colonized» by European pedagogical ideas, for he was also a specialist in the investigation of indigenous geometry. It is fair to say that the Active School proposes construction of knowledge by valuing its own cultural variables in a systematic, non-illustrative way.

This process was violently interrupted in 1929. When Ibañez fell in 1931, the social movement continued, but in a fragmented way; only the attempts by architecture students to change the curriculum in 1931 to 1933, and later in 1938, remained.

new pedagogies

Besides similarities between educational models in Chile and the Bauhaus concerning the methodology of the pedagogical model, direct forms of exchange existed even before Tibor Weiner. The Chilean Roberto Davila studied in Dessau and returned as a teacher in the midst of the 1932–33 reform. At that time, Guillermo Ulriksen, a professor at the University of Chile, was already talking about Hannes Meyer's Bernau ADGB Trade Union School. After the failure of that reform, Enrique Gebhard and Waldo Parrañez began to publish the journal *ARQuitectura*, and the *Bauhausbücher* series circulated among them.

A new attempt to change the school of architecture was launched after the Popular Front government won the election in 1938. The students did not manage to change the school, but in 1939 the Popular Front created CORFO, the national production development corporation, which was also the government industrial agency responsible for Cybersyn, INTEC, and ECom in 1970–1973.

new architectural curriculum

active school

co-op design

bauhaus pedagogies

Abraham Schapira, who prepared the curriculum of the University of Chile with Tibor Weiner between 1945 and 1946, stated that it was based on theories of the Active School, as is confirmed by many instances of Co-op design being applied at the University of Chile. Tibor Weiner also mentioned Pestalozzi and Ulriksen continued to speak enthusiastically about Meyer's Co-op design as «the pedagogical methodology of the Bauhaus» in 1946. And the Active School is also mentioned in the declaration from the commission on architectural education at the 1947 Pan American Congress in Lima, drawn up by José Garcíatello.

Joaquín Medina Warmburg

integral co-op architecture

You claim that «Integral Co-op Architecture» successfully found its way to other countries thanks to the Sixth Pan American Congress of Architecture, held in Lima, Peru in 1947. That likewise sounds astonishing, as the organizers and most of the participants followed a completely different line. Fernando Belaúnde Terry, the spokesman for the hosts, had studied in the USA and would, as President of Peru, also advocate a USA-friendly policy. Together with the early Bauhaus member Paul Linder, he arranged Albers' and Gropius' trips to Lima. Their social and pedagogical ideas were not in line with Co-op. Assuming, that such a Co-op influence did indeed exist, how could it have come about under circumstances that were not exactly conducive in either political or academic terms?

David Maulén de los Reyes

From my point of view, the National University of Engineering, UNI Lima, and above all its School of Architecture, represents an intermediate point. It is not as radical as the University of Chile, but it is not as conservative as the Catholic University of Chile. It is also a public university and as such more similar to the University of Chile.

When I started researching, I was a little astonished when the old architects told me that UNI Lima and other schools wanted to follow the model since the presentation of the new curriculum at the University of Chile in 1947. But over time I have found enough information that confirms the influence of this change.

new architectural curriculum

José Garcíatello, the Chilean professor of bio-architecture, presented the new curriculum from the University of Chile, in a document prepared by Abraham Schapira, Jorge Bruno Gonzáles and Tibor Weiner. This text was also presented at the Sixth Congress in the Chilean magazine *Arquitectura y Construcción*. Garcíatello also participated in the committee on architectural

education at the congress, and in its declaration you find ideas and concepts of Hannes Meyer at the Institute of Urbanism in Mexico in 1940 and from the reform of the University of Chile, such as, for example, «the pedagogical system that corresponds to the professional training of the contemporary architect is that of the Active School» (5); that «a scientific attitude of concern and curiosity» has to be stimulated (5); that problem-solving in architecture requires «analysis» and «synthesis» (3) and that the problems of architectural composition are to be solved in «the triple urban, plastic and technical aspect».

new architectural curriculum

During and after this congress, Garcíatello received invitations from various countries to explain the new curriculum of the University of Chile; in his 1953 farewell speech and report, the Rector of the University of Chile mentioned that the 1946 curriculum was taken as a reference by several schools in other countries after this Congress. From 1947 on, there was a systematic exchange between the University of Chile and the University of Lima for several years. The influence of the University of Chile model culminated in the election of its Dean of the Architecture (Hector Mardones Restat) as President of the International Union of Architects (UIA) in 1957.

neoliberalism as a paradigm shift

After 1973 and 1981, the University of Chile was destroyed, and the 1980 constitution, drafted by economists and lawyers from the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile, envisaged that public education would be replaced by education conceived as a market commodity. Processes of oblivion and repression are connected with these changes. When I was studying, people at the Pontifical Catholic University of Chile told me that, through contacts with Albers in 1953, «they had brought the Bauhaus to Chile».

processes of oblivion
and repression

processes of transfer,
translation, and transformation

power relations and
geopolitics

reception of different versions
of modernism

Joaquín Medina Warmburg

I am also very interested in the politicized field in which Bauhaus transfer and translation processes take place, especially in the case of China, as it was hardly mentioned in Chin-Wei Chang's paper. The Bauhaus' centrality was relativized by a large number of schools where Chinese students were trained as architects, but the impression arose that they coexisted on a relatively equal footing; politicization of these options was not discernible. Therefore, I would like to ask whether it was really like this in the sense of the designers who did not only want to produce fetishized goods. Was Art Deco, to cite just one example, a politically connotated option, and if so, in which period?

- [F] What are the social, political, and economic preconditions for Bauhaus reception? And how do they vary from one period or country to another?

Chin-Wei Chang

Yes, I think, Art Deco was an option with a political connotation. But as far as my paper is concerned, my research focus is specifically between 1919 and 1949, so that was before the Communist government under its leader Mao Zedong entered the political arena and that is why I focused on aspects like school policy or the difference between a national university and a missionary university, i.e. on institutional matters and problems. Nevertheless, it is worth noting that school policy is also a political issue and it decides quite a lot how you can organize, for instance, your faculty. If you go to the missionary school, you must have been found very worthy of doing so by your family, otherwise you cannot afford the tuition. At the same time other universities are poor, say, before 1949—national turnover went down under Chiang Kai-shek's Guomindang (GMD) government, the funding was at its limits, and the students had to go to war. So, this is definitely a political issue. Then, the year 1949 constitutes a deep break, because after that China was fully guided by the dictate of learning everything from the Soviet Union.

[F]

Another political issue is Bauhaus reception in China and the politics of remembrance especially with respect to the Bauhaus centenary. Take Tongji University in Shanghai for example: Not only did its College of Architecture and Urban Planning (CAUP) building, as mentioned in my presentation, have affinities to the Bauhaus building in Dessau in terms of its architectural design, but in 2019 it also served as the venue for a significant exhibition and conference—addressing the themes of Bauhaus theatre and the preliminary course (*Vorkurs*) respectively. In addition, parallel to these centenary events, the CAUP-based journal *Time + Architecture* (*Shidai Jianzhu*) published a special issue: «The Bauhaus and Modern Architecture». Nevertheless, the founding of Tongji's Department of Architecture ironically testified to the demise of its ground-breaking counterpart at St. John's, which was modelled on the Bauhaus. After Mao Zedong came to power and inaugurated a new China, the People's Republic of China (PRC), he adjusted the strategy for university re-organization on a national scale. In the case of a missionary university like St. John's, namely an «alien» university supported by American funding, attempts were made to forcibly integrate it with national universities: A victim such as St. John's was first dismembered and subsequently the fragments were annexed to other bodies—in the case of the Architectural Department, to Tongji. Whereas St. John's had previously been

bauhaus reception and geopolitics

bauhaus centenary politics of memory

- [F] What are the social, political, and economic preconditions for Bauhaus reception? And how do they vary from one period or country to another?

able to recruit some foreign teachers, from the USA, from the UK, or even from Hungary and so forth, this was henceforth prohibited. As a result, some Chinese graduates returned and taught at their alma mater, in a fashion closely akin—albeit accidentally—to the Bauhaus. In the light of the foundation of the PRC government, St. John’s University lost all the autonomy it had enjoyed thanks to its war-time exterritorial status.

The reason why my research focuses particularly on the period from 1919 to 1949 is that, after that decisive caesura, China did not reopen again until 1977, which marked the end of the Cultural Revolution. That is why I point out that many translations of famous Bauhaus books into Chinese—e.g. texts by Itten or Kandinsky, to cite just a few examples—appeared simultaneously, right after the adoption of the Chinese policy of Reform and Opening under Deng Xiaoping’s regime. In other words, the historical moment at which reception, translation and transformation of Bauhaus ideas becomes possible is in fact, once again, a very political issue.

- [F]

Joaquín Medina Warmburg

In Taiwan, too, works by Ieoh Ming Pei (cf. Tunghai University Campus in Taichung, 1950s) led to architecture in the Bauhaus-Harvard lineage of tradition that refers to local historical architecture. How can such phenomena be classified in comparison to the mainland in the shared context of the Cold War? Or, to put the question in more general terms, were there also, as in Japan (Bruno Taut), moves towards a self-critique of modernism and a turn towards «regionalist modernism»?

Chin-Wei Chang

This prompts me to my rewarding attendance in 2017 at the Bauhaus centenary symposium *Rethinking Pei in Hong Kong*, where I gave a talk titled «High Modernists at Harvard GSD: I. M. Pei, Walter Gropius, and TAC’s Huatung/Tunghai University». I. M. Pei’s role at Tunghai University in Taichung, to be frank, was as a take-over impresario in place of Gropius at Huatung University in Shanghai. Due to the post-WWII sovereign shift mentioned above, the missionary project had emigrated to what was by then so-called Free China: Taiwan, where the nationalist government fled as an alternative during the Cold War. «Regionalist modernism», as you enquire, did take place but was indebted—surprisingly not to Pei—but significantly to his local colleagues, Chen Chi-kwan

dialogue between modernity
and tradition

self-critique of modernism
regionalist modernism

relationship to history
relationship to traditions
and cultures

universal design principles

modernist architecture and
national identity construction

self-critique of modernism

relationship to history

and Chang Chao-kang, who took the helm of building logistics on site. In contrast, Pei could merely visit them from time to time, given his very time-consuming professional activities in New York by the early 1950s. Alongside this, we need to notice that, unlike Pei, both Chen and Chang carried out their undergraduate training in China: at Southeast University in Nanjing and St. John's in Shanghai, respectively. And it is worth noting that Pei briefly attended the latter institution, too, aged 17 to be exact, although he did not complete his studies there before leaving his motherland for the US, heading first to Penn, then to MIT and later to Harvard. Due to Gropius' lack of interest in history studies both at the Bauhaus and Harvard GSD, his students (including Pei) learnt a universal modern aesthetic—flat roof, ribbon windows, roof gardens, and open spaces, features that predominate unequivocally in Tunghai as well—but it was the Chen-Chang tandem that expanded the palette of that campus in terms of Chinese-ness through detailed design which, I reckon, may be what sparked your question.

It is usually, if not always, tempting to lend plausibility to Harvard-Bauhaus affairs in accounts of Chinese modernities in architecture even to this day. The critical relationship between national identity and the development of Modernist architecture, however, has received piecemeal heed from historians. As we can see at Tunghai University, could such a «foreign» style ever be domesticated? Could Modernism ever become Chinese? Being sanguine about Bauhaus per se should make no pretence to constituting a self-critique of modernism, as Bruno Zevi, Pei's peer at Harvard, reminds us in the first volume of the 1959 *Encyclopedia of World Art*. Criticizing his own masterclass tutor's restrained «use» of history in an essay entitled «Architecture», Zevi asserted that no one had a «more reactionary and biased concept of history» than Gropius. Pei seemed to barely attain region-specific sensibility within the walls of GSD, apart from exercises in surface, volume, space, and colour; it should be noted that his 1946 graduate project on Shanghai Art Museum was highly akin to Corbusian principles, bearing feeble evidence of «[the] organic movement,» as Zevi recounted, «which became active in Europe about 1930 and was critically elaborated about 1940, [and] offered a clear invitation to treat modern architecture historically.» There are, of course, historians who have already traced the processes of what they see as an authentically Chinese Modernism and situated them within the established discussions. They have not, however, formulated a chorus of discourse concerned with the Chinese-ness of

modernist architecture and
national identity construction

Modernism nor figured out the way in which Modernists sought to testify to Modernism as Chinese. For me, it is this kind of problematic issue, hitherto little tackled, that your intriguing question raises.

Joaquín Medina Warmburg

I would like to start the question-and-answer session with the audience now.

Doreen Mende

modernity as a concept
second-order cybernetics

Thank you very much, especially for the papers, which shed light on this trope of the periphery, more from the point of view of knowledge production and networking than from that of ideology research. I particularly appreciated that the concept of modernity was also updated once again by looking at cybernetic technologies. I think this is a very important step, and I have two questions on that point.

demand to decolonize design

The first question is for Susanne Neubauer: Which texts did Gui Bonsiepe write about decolonization, or in which texts does he grapple with this topic? I am asking as during Bonsiepe's time teaching and researching at the HfG Ulm (1960–68)—before his time in Latin America—far-reaching decisions were taken that shaped the course of the decolonization and independence of former colonial states. On December 14th, 1960, the General Assembly of the United Nations issued the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples and established committees accordingly. The Bandung States, a loose alliance of Asian and African states that aimed to end colonialism, combat racial discrimination, and foster cultural and economic cooperation, held their first conference in 1955, at which they officially described themselves for the first time as the «Third World», in distinction to the «First World» (Western Bloc) and the «Second World» (Eastern Bloc), and, as a synonym, also called themselves the «Non-Aligned Movement». In the mid-1960s, Tricontinentalism also became established itself as a broad network of liberation movements in Asia, Africa, and Latin America.

critique of colonialism

construction of a «third world»

Susanne Neubauer

I still do not have an overview of all Gui Bonsiepe's work and cannot tell you how it is linked to the diverse political counter-movements in Latin America. It would be interesting to know more about Bonsiepe's connections with the large number of movements fighting against globalization, imperialism and for

human rights in the Latin American context. The text I quoted is «Design im Übergang zum Sozialismus: ein technisch-politischer Erfahrungsbericht aus dem Chile der Unidad Popular (1971–73)» [Design in Transition to Socialism. A Techno-Political Field Report from Unidad Popular's Chile (1971–73)] from 1974, which contains two pages on decolonization.

Doreen Mende

The second question is for David Maulén de los Reyes: Were there links between graphics, design, and cinema in the Latin American context? I am thinking of Gui Bonsiepe and Cybersyn, a Socialist cybernetics project that Bonsiepe designed on behalf of Salvador Allende with the aim of paving the way for an alternative route to Socialism; Mário Pedrosa, the Brazilian Marxist art critic and political activist; the *Organization of Solidarity with the People of Asia, Africa, Latin America* (OSPAAAL), founded in 1966 in Havana, Cuba, which communicated this project of liberation and revolution with fantastic graphic designers using graphic and technological means; and the Third Cinema movement in Argentina, with Fernando Solana, an Argentinean film director and politician, who in 1968 created the paradigm of revolutionary activist cinema with his film *The Hour of the Furnaces* (Spanish: *La hora de los hornos*). I have not been able to find any information on this yet.

In short, I'm very interested to hear whether there is a specific alliance between the *Cybersyn* project in Chile and the *Organization of Solidarity with People in Africa, Asia and Latin America* (OSPAAAL) and its graphic designers, and the Third Cinema movement in Argentina—all revolutionary movements attached to ideas of Marxism, Leninism, Socialism, Internationalism, Tricontinentalism.

David Maulén de los Reyes

Well, obviously, the context is the same and it is interconnected, but I think it is interconnected in a more complex way, because this process I tried to show is not only a Chilean process; it is all around the continent, from the Twenties until the Seventies, we have projects where the state is trying to do the project of Modernity. And there can be connections between the processes in all the countries at the same time, that is why I showed this meeting in Peru after the Second World War where the movement is not a national movement or a movement from only one school. For example, the Sixth Pan American Congress of Architecture in Lima

in 1947 discussed Tucumán in Argentina as a model for a regional movement and that can be connected all the time. And when *Cybersyn* was made, obviously, the Socialist government was an improvement, but for example, the little spoon you showed is so special, you see the white spoon made by Bonsiepe. But this spoon is possible within a project that runs for twenty years. Augusto Pinochet, who followed Salvador Allende after the military coup, had to be convinced to continue with the project because he wanted to stop it. This white plastic spoon was to teach people how to use powdered milk, but it was a project that ran for twenty years with different governments. For example, you need to understand this in order to understand the value of this sign. Bonsiepe used to say if you want to work with me, first you have to study economics, in the Economics faculty we are not only going to make beautiful objects. And that's how he came to talk about interfaces, because he had to try to develop how to know the value of use in the aesthetic field. For example, he began to talk about this concept of interaction design, but he was thinking how to translate economic politics into architectural fields. For design interaction, everything is connected. And especially, the *Cybersyn* project was two things: On the one hand, a network about online information—it doesn't exist nowadays, as you can get information online in real time—and on the other hand, a tool to enforce management of national industries' production throughout the country, but in an industrialized way. And this Chilean project was part of the (Cordillera de los) Andes project—*Pacto Andino*—, where Chile was going to do radio systems, industrial products etc., but it was not only Chile's project, but rather a project involving many countries at the same time. For example, if Uruguay produced maté, la yerba mate, the Chileans would build machines for industrialization of la yerba mate. It was an interregional project for development.

Notes

- 1 Gui Bonsiepe, «Design im Übergang zum Sozialismus: ein technisch-politischer Erfahrungsbericht aus dem Chile der Unidad Popular (1971–73)», in: Bernhard Bürdek et al (eds.), *Designtheorie*, Vol. 1, Hamburg 1974; see also Gui Bonsiepe, *Entwurfskultur und Gesellschaft: Gestaltung zwischen Zentrum und Peripherie*, Basel/Boston, Mass./Berlin 2009. [English translation: Gui Bonsiepe, *Design in Transition to Socialism. A Techno-Political Field Report from Unidad Popular's Chile (1971–73)*], reprinted in: *Civic City Cahier 2, Design and Democracy*, London 2010, p. 5–29].