Program

Day 1  Open to the Public
Wednesday, October 23, 2019

9:15 – 9:30 • Welcome
Igor Kąkolewski and Małgorzata Popiolek-Roßkamp
Center for Historical Research Berlin of the Polish Academy of Science

9:30 – 11:00 • Panel 1: Urban Geographies of Damage
Chair: Jerzy Elżanowski
Carleton University
Christian Lotz and Paul Grünler
Herder-Institut Marburg
Is There a Critical Geography of 1940s Aerial Photography in Central and Eastern Europe?
Robin Woolven
Independent scholar, Wiltshire, UK
The Middlesex Bomb Damage Maps
Iva Rait Stojanović
Zagreb University
Post-Second World War Reconstruction of Šibenik: Realities and Narratives

11:00 – 11:30 • Coffee Break

11:30 – 13:00 • Panel 2: (Trans)local Perspectives on Post-Conflict Planning
Chair: Carmen M. Enss
Bamberg University
Laurence Ward
London Metropolitan Archives
Archiving the London County Council Bomb Damage Maps
Simone Bogner
TU Berlin
Authority or Think Tank? The Role of the Architects’ Department in the London City Council Between War Damage Mapping, Reconstruction Planning, and Nation Building, 1939–1951
Łukasz Stanek
Manchester University
‘Baghdad Was Like Warsaw’: Comparison in the Cold War

13:00 – 14:00 • Lunch

14:00 – 15:30 • Panel 3: Agency at Times of Crisis
Chair: Małgorzata Popiolek-Roßkamp
Center for Historical Research Berlin of the Polish Academy of Science
Michael Grass
Warwick University
Agents – Networks – Resonance: The ‘Transnational Momentum’ of Defining Heritage in Postwar Europe
Anna Vyazemtseva
University of Insubria / Institute of History and Theory of Architecture and Urban Planning, Moscow
Urban Planning and the ‘Foreign’ Experience in the Soviet Union Towards the End of World War Two
Ella Chmielewska
Edinburgh University / Edinburgh College of Art
Waraw Afterimages: On Memory and Poetry in Ruins

15:30 – 16:00 • Coffee Break

16:00 – 17:30 • Keynote Lecture
David Fedman
University of California, Irvine
Blackened Cities, Blackened Maps: Toward a Social Geography of Japanese Cities Aflame

17:30 – 18:00 • Coffee Break

18:00 – 19:00 • Roundtable
Chairs: Jerzy Elżanowski Carleton University and Carmen M. Enss Bamberg University
Ella Chmielewska Edinburgh University / Edinburgh College of Art
Gabi Dolff-Bonekämper TU Berlin
Igor Kąkolewski Center for Historical Research Berlin of the Polish Academy of Science
Zoya Masoud TU Berlin
Łukasz Stanek Manchester University
Gerhard Vinken Bamberg University

19:30 • Dinner

Day 2  By invitation only
Thursday, October 24, 2019

09:30 – 11:00 Graduate Student Presentations
Chair: Małgorzata Popiolek-Roßkamp
Center for Historical Research Berlin of the Polish Academy of Science
Zoya Masoud
TU Berlin
Damage Assessments in the Old City of Aleppo: Initiatives, Cooperations, and Methods
Barbara Szczepanska
University of Wrocław
The Case of a City ‘In-Between’: Architecture and Urban Planning in Postwar Opole
Georg Sedlmeyer
Bamberg University
War Damage Recording in Nürnberg: Actors, Methods and Maps
Adam Przywara
Manchester University
Rubble Europe: Transnational History of Rubble Materialities During the Early Reconstruction of Warsaw

11:00 – 11:30 • Coffee Break

11:30 – 13:30 • Scientific Networks Workshop

13:30 – 14:30 • Lunch

14:30 – 16:30 • Joint Publication Workshop

16:30 – 17:00 • Coffee Break

17:00 – 17:30 • Closing Remarks
Simone Bogner

Authority or Think Tank? The Role of the Architects’ Department in the London City Council Between War Damage Mapping, Reconstruction Planning, and Nation Building, 1939–1951

In 1951 the “Festival of Britain” opened in London and nationwide. There were, in London alone, three main exhibitions: the South Bank exhibition ground, with the Royal Festival Hall by Leslie Martin, as well as many temporary attractions, like the “Dome of Discovery” by Ralph Tubbs, the “Skylon” by Moya, Powell and Samuelson, or the Riverside Restaurant by Jane Drew and Ove Arup, the Battersea Pleasure Gardens, and a building exhibition in Poplar – the Lansbury Estate by Frederick Gibberd.

The festival’s affirmative aim was to swear the British to a peaceful, more productive, and modern future, and a specifically British identity in which everybody would be able to participate. Not only were the light and colorful pavilions and structures devised to distract the British from the aftermaths of WW2 – a daily life that was still dominated by food rationing and ruins. They were also supposed to introduce a British version of modernism, by mixing new materials and construction techniques with the peculiarity of a “British Way of Life.” The exhibitions itself were endeavors to educate the audience about the “British contribution to civilization since 1851, in the arts, in science, and technology”. Gerald Barry, director-general of the Festival, dubbed the Festival, thus a “Tonic to the Nation.”

Nonetheless, memories around the Festival, the evaluation of its influence on architecture in Great Britain as well as on politics, remain ambivalent. In the catalog for the exhibition about the Festival at London’s Victoria & Albert Museum in 1971, curated by Mary Banham, infamous architecture critic Reyner Banham denounced the festival’s architecture as “effeminate” – and not at all British. Adrian Forty, analyzing the political situation, finds that Great Britain under Labour Government was in 1951 indeed suffering “a relapse” on many levels, and concluded to call the festival rather a “Narcotic to the Nation.”

Responsible for the concept and execution of the festival was, from 1947 on, the Architects’ Department in the London City Council (LCC). The same department, since 1939, had been producing the London War Damage Maps (as Laurence Ward will be shedding light on in his presentation). These maps, in turn, served as the basis for the County of London plan of 1943, drawn up under the leadership of the department’s director JH Foreshaw and city planner Patrick Abercrombie. Within this context, the Southbank site, before and after the war, will be examined more closely, taking as a starting point a statement by Mary Banham, who claimed: “Do not forget that the South Bank itself was built on the rubble of East London.”

For the Festival, the department had enabled mainly modern architects and designers to participate, by employing or contracting them. The youngest were given a chance to work on their very first projects. To no surprise, many of them, like Jane Drew, Frederick Gibberd, or Leslie Martin, were members of the Modern Architectural Research Group (MARS), the British chapter of the Congrès Internationaux d’Architecture Moderne (CIAM). The Festival marked a starting point in the development of the Department’s reputation as a think tank and experimental testing field. With its “studio atmosphere,” it attracted young modern architects for decades – James Stirling, Ron Herron or Alison and Peter Smithson, to name just a few. It is, therefore, necessary to elucidate, as Ruth Lang put it, “the careful interweaving of immaterial factors, of constructing political structures, transposing professional relationships, and through forging links with education and industry,” which was crucial to the success of the Department.

David Fedman

Blockened Cities, Blackened Maps: Toward a Social Geography of Japanese Cities Aflame

Taking the firebombing of Tokyo as its focus, this talk examines the process whereby the logic of area incendiary bombing crept onto the map. To do so, I track the production and use of maps along every step of the “kill chain”: the sequence of intelligence gathering, logistical planning, and tactical implementation that culminated in each attack. When read in conjunction with planning documents, I argue, these maps reveal particular patterns of urban vulnerability and erasure—what I call the social geography of firebomb destruction.

Michael Grass

Agents - Networks - Resonance: The ‘Transnational Momentum’ of Defining Heritage in Postwar Europe

Within the modern re-shaping of post-war Europe attempts and debates that long for the preservation of the historic fabric seem to contradict the architectural modernism. A closer look at the strategies and protagonists of post-war planning and architecture after the Second World War reveals that most cities decidedly turned to merge historic buildings and modernist structures in favor of narrating a complex interdependency of cultural progress, modern reorganisation of life, and remembering the sacrifice and the loss caused by the war. Theories to visualise the dialogic relationship of defining a canon of structures worth preserving
and celebrating the rebirth of destroyed cities as an effort to overcome obstacles of the past were shared across borders and ideologies. Despite systemic rivalries, architects and urban planners embarked on discussions about heritage values, the feasibilities of reconstructions, and methodological aspects of studying and evaluating the history of urban development.

The presentation investigates the links and the interweaving of protagonists, themes, and architectures to promote a disciplinary shift from revisiting individual case studies to a perspective that discusses collaborative approaches to reconstruction and conservation. Resonance is discussed as the impact, reappearing, and looping of distinct topics within various debates during the first decades after the end of WW2. It hopes to open the scope to discuss how the architecturally narrated dialogue of loss and rebirth, of past and progress, altered the way the value of historic structures was evaluated and how the strategies that defined built heritage are becoming the subject-matter of heritage preservation studies today.

The three sections of the presentation exemplary address various ‘exchange scenarios’ and attest for a ‘transnational momentum’ avant la lettre, prior to the theory of transnationalism as an academic meter to review cultural achievements. As such scenarios conferences, exhibitions and professional networks are scrutinised: from ‘Warsaw rebuilds’ and the Office for Reconstruction of the Capital’s (Biuro Odbudowy Stolicy, BOS) commitment to British rebuilding strategies in 1946, via the Study group for urban history (Arbeitsgruppe Siedlungsgeschichte und Urbanistik) and its inaugural congress in Erfurt 1956, to the International Union of Architects (Union Internationale des Architectes, UIA) and their 1958 Moscow congress entitled ‘Construction and Reconstruction’. Platforms of exchanging architectural ideas were also provided actively through university partnerships, academic collaboration, and especially town twinning. The latter explicitly challenged the growing tensions between the East and the West through sharing architectural concepts, resources, and personnel. As resonance is perceived as the impact certain topics created within planning discourses, how they resurfaced in different contexts and looped back to their place of origin – by then of course altered and transformed by local interpretation – the third part deals with the topic of narrating history through conceptually and deliberately composed townscapes.

It focuses on methods of organising and administering public and governmental commissioned heritage landscapes, such as the realocating of properties, municipalisation and communitisation, the reploting of land, as well as reorganising the urban ichnography. This also includes discussing traces and ‘physical evidence’ of trans-national and cross-ideological collaboration as part of the heritage landscape today.

Christian Lotz + Paul Grünler
Is There a Critical Geography of 1940s Aerial Photography in Central and Eastern Europe?

Throughout the 20th century, the development of cities and their surrounding areas in East Central Europe has been documented in various visual and textual sources. The paper focuses on aerial photographs, topographical charts and city maps of cities during the 1930s and 1940s. Taking up approaches of John Brian Harley (maps as texts) as well as Denis Wood (maps as arguments), the paper explores the potentials of these sources for a critical geography and critical cartography. In doing so, the paper seeks to analyse what possible questions can be addressed to what kind of combination of visual and textual sources. It focusses on three major fields: How did actors address various public spheres with maps, aerial photographs and other documents related to urban planning during the 1940s? How can we analyse aspects of map-authorship and map-use in urban planning processes in an analogue and in a digital era? What kind of methodological challenges are related to temporal issues of map sources, such as planning agendas, urban memory issues etc.? Zoya Masoud

Damage Assessments in the Old City of Aleppo: Initiatives, Cooperations, and Methods

The old city of Aleppo, the UNESCO world heritage site, has been in a state of war since 2012. After the Arab spring erupted in Aleppo and peaceful demonstrations turned into an armed conflict, the city was divided into regime-held areas in West Aleppo and rebel-controlled areas in East Aleppo. The front lines of East-West boarders were located the old city. Not only did the fighting parties shrir the responsibility to preserve and care for the old city’s historic fabric, the old stones themselves became a focal point where the discourse of space and power was promulgated through acts of destruction. These acts included burning the historic Suqs and damaging buildings through barrel or tunnel bombs, sometimes even resulted in the blowing up of historic monuments that were transmitted internationally through videos and social media. Meanwhile, heritage activists on the ground rushed to document the collapsed buildings with their mobile camera, allowing the whole world, including Aleppines in Aleppo and in Exile to witness and follow the destruction as it has never happened throughout the history in any other wars. Heritage experts and practitioners are continuously highlighting the importance of the old city as one of the oldest continuously inhabited cities in the world. Until the 12th of December 2016, when the regime forces were victorious and declared Aleppo under their control, it was nearly impossible to carry out comprehensive assessment on the ground. Therefore, over the 5 years of war, many war damage recording initiatives around the globe followed new methods to document the damages within the historic fabric. Mainly they relied on satellite images and videos uploaded online by activists and fighting parties, who marked their victory over monuments. Damage mapping initiatives followed different mapping methods, languages, level of details and norms, using different forms of publications like youtube video channels, websites, questionnaires, online databanks, annual reports, maps, 3D models etc. Except of one modest try to unify their efforts, these initiatives kept their autonomies as separate projects. Apart from the UNESCO project, implemented in cooperation with the Directorate-General of Antiquities and Museums (DGAM), all initiatives had no physical access to the site, which caused a great margin of uncertainty and potential of mistakes. Even after the 12th of December 2016, the political climate of victorious parties prevented damage assessment projects to participate directly in any preservation or reconstruction activities in Aleppo. This means that data exchange did not take place neither in political nor scientific level. However, ad hoc reconstruction did not cope with these fragmented efforts of mapping the damages, as they started the process of reconstruction immediately after the war. This forced few initiatives in Exile to cooperate indirectly with active rebuilding’s Syrian actors by exchanging documents online or through meetings in Beirut as a neutral location.

Zoya Masoud
Damage Assessments in the Old City of Aleppo: Initiatives, Cooperations, and Methods

The old city of Aleppo, the UNESCO world heritage site, has been in a state of war since 2012. After the Arab spring erupted in Aleppo and peaceful demonstrations turned into an armed conflict, the city was divided into regime-held areas in West Aleppo and rebel-controlled areas in East Aleppo. The front lines of East-West boarders were located the old city. Not only did the fighting parties shrir the responsibility to preserve and care for the old city’s historic
This paper examines the measurement of assessing the damages within the old city of Aleppo from architectural and urban planning perspectives, considering the delicate political climate. Comparing maps and methods shows the effectiveness of these initiatives in the current on-going reconstruction.

Adam Przywara
Rubble Europe: Transnational History of Rubble Materialities During the Early Reconstruction of Warsaw

My PhD research introduces the matter of rubble into architectural history through an account of the immediate post-war period and early reconstruction era in Warsaw. In my work I aim to trace transformations of rubble into materialities of architecture in order to uncover the entanglements between wartime destruction and communist reconstruction. Mobilising the notion of rubble rather than that of ruins in the context of modernity allows me to establish an original materialist position in architectural history. The resulting account indicates a relational understanding between sociocultural implications of destruction and the changing political-economy of the early reconstruction era.

Rubble, subjected to both labour-intensive and technologically advanced processes, in the postwar years acquired the materialities of waste, salvage and aggregate. The process of wasting produced landscapes of post-war cities which undermined the division between the natural and man-made environment. As such, rubble mounds can become an important departure point for reimagining the relations between historical nature and material memory. In contrast with wasting, salvaging of building material indicates a historically universal struggle for subsistence in the state of scarcity. However, salvaging which occurred in the so-called “Recovered Territories” of post-war Poland shows a complexity of relations between the necessities of construction sites, destruction and the state-wide process of inventing identities and myths. Finally, history of engineers’ and architects’ experimentation with rubble aggregates can provide a crucial insight into the process of communist modernization and industrialisation. Moreover, in the trans-national perspective, aggregate uncovers the emergent post-war division of labour within the architectural field. A division which, based on expertise and standardisation, spread beyond the singular nation states and continent in the decades following the 1940s. Seen through its materialities, the matter of rubble overcomes an ontological division between the destruction and production of architecture in modernity. Instead, it shows a multiplicity of uses, meanings, and values emerging from the cyclical view of architectural production and destruction. Set in the institutional and private archives in Poland, Germany and France, my research uncovers the changing relations between inhabitants, workers, architects, engineers and millions of cubic meters of rubble and ruins — the built environment of the post-war era. This allows my work to make several contributions to the fields of architecture and history. In the first place, it allows for an architectural history which grasps together processes of destruction and construction in modernity. This, in turn, offers a way in which built environment can be understood beyond the epistemological division between natural and historical. Moreover, looking at labour extended towards transformations of rubble into materialities of the future built environment produces an account of political-economy of architecture in a local, national and trans-national context. This will allow me to grasp the reciprocal transformation between the society, professionals, state administrative and their built environment in the post-war period, informing our understanding of the place of architecture within it.

Georg-Felix Sedlmeyer
War Damage Recording in Nürnberg: Actors, Methods and Maps

“Anyone who wants to get to know and understand Nuremberg’s current state of urban development should have seen the city three times: before World War II, immediately after the end of the battles in 1945, and finally in our present day.”
(Schwemmer, Wilhelm, 1953: Ein Gang durch die Nürnberger Altstadt, S.84)

Before the war, Nuremberg was one of the most important historical cities in Central Europe. At the same time, it was the second largest city in southern Germany, a center of electrical and armaments industries. Also, from the 1930s onwards, it was the “City of the Reichsparteitag”. From August 1942, the city thus came into the focus of Allied air raids, which caused severe destruction, especially of the old town, until the end of the combats in April 1945.

Anyone who wants to understand Nuremberg should have seen it three times. The brief moment described by W. Schwemmer (Director of the Municipal Art Collection) in 1953 right after the fighting and just before the reconstruction points out a decisive moment. Here, the future architectural heritage of the city was defined by the clearing or securing of buildings or building remains. The consideration of this moment is still incomplete — especially with regard to its relevance to urban planning. Damage surveys tell of this time and the possibilities for urban redevelopment.

Actors who recorded the damage in Nuremberg can essentially be subdivided into state, municipal or private groups of persons. They pursued different interests in the damage surveys and accordingly, assessed damage and situations differently. For example, private actors aimed at financial compensation and rapid repair of damaged property. On the other hand, urban actors were interested in maintaining public security and supply, clearing rubble or later implementing improvements of all kinds in the urban structure. In addition, government agencies were interested in standardized statistical data on destruction in order to provide material, labor or financial resources for reconstruction.

The methods of damage assessment and their assessment of destruction varied according to interest. The Nuremberg damage records found so far – mostly maps – show, beginning in 1942 and ending in 1952, a wide variety of representations of damage, droppings, reconstruction areas, debris or survivals. A proven damage was not necessarily to be equated with a material loss but could also be measured by the construction work to be carried out.

The Nuremberg City Archives contain dozens of different maps that evaluate the conditions after destruction. Since the maps were archived without context, it has so far been possible to make only a few statements about the maps and the damage they contain. A first contextualization has now taken place and the previous narrative of war destruction and reconstruction needs to be extended to include conscious decisions and assessments initiated by perspective orientated damage assessment. All the recordings also tell of different ways of dealing with destruction.
Łukasz Stanek
‘Baghdad Was Like Warsaw’: Comparison in the Cold War

Urban knowledge production in hegemonic Western centres in the wake of the Cold War has been characterised by a double bind: the calls for a diversification of this knowledge beyond normative Western concepts have been paralleled by a systematic erasure of such diversity as it actually existed in the second half of 20th century. This paper uncovers this diversity by focusing on the comparative practices in urban research and design that took place in the course of the collaboration between architects, planners, scholars, and administrators from socialist Eastern Europe and postcolonial Global South during the Cold War. While decolonization allowed for an opening of these cities towards architectural and planning expertise beyond the former colonial centres, the Cold War resulted in a multiplication of the sources of such expertise. Contrary to the entrenched vision of the globe divided into two parts, socialist and capitalist, these cities became places where competing technologies, blueprints, concepts, methodologies, and epistemic frameworks were compared, tested, appropriated, and advanced.

Among these comparative practices, this paper will focus on “thinking Baghdad through Warsaw.” In the wake of the coup led by colonel Qa-sim (1958), a large number of Polish architects, planners, engineers, and technicians travelled to Baghdad where they collaborated with Iraqi and, sometimes, other foreign agents. Among the most impactful results of this collaboration were the master plans of Baghdad, delivered by the Polish design institute Miastoprojekt-Kraków in 1967 and in 1973. This paper focuses on the comparative practices that were the basis on this planning. Polish planners in Baghdad compared all the time and for many reasons. They compared to gain knowledge about the urbanization of Baghdad, their fragmentary access to data, as well as language and time constraints, key sources for their comparative practice were cartographic documents. Such documents are also essential for historians who attempt to reconstruct the development of Baghdad as a node of competing networks of expertise and resources during the Cold War. In the second part of this paper, I will argue that the Geographic Information System (GIS) environment is a useful tool for such study. When critically used, this environment facilitates bridges across fragmentary data and translations between incommensurable documents. In this way, it allows to model the impact on Baghdad’s urbanization of the master plans’ design decisions (land use, transportation network) and the broader regulatory framework it instigated. Rather than a technical issue, I intend to show that the translation of an analogue document into a digital shapfile is an interpretative process. While often concerned with numbers – inhabitants’ densities, catchment areas, radii of social facilities, traffic indicators – the comparison of cartographic documents points far beyond technical concerns. In particular, such comparison allows to understand the changing everyday life of inhabitants, the shifting concepts of Arab socialism, and debates about the history of Baghdad, to which Miastoprojekt’s plans responded and which they facilitated.

Iva Raić Stojanović
Post-Second World War Reconstruction of Šibenik: Realities and Narratives

The Second World War brought considerable artillery and bombing damage to Croatian towns and cities. In the early postwar period, the country – now part of socialist Yugoslavia – underwent an extensive reconstruction process. In terms of urban policy and planning, the main imperative was to foster large-scale housing and industrial development. At the same time, there was a growing concern for damaged historic settings, some of which would be faithfully restored while the others treated more freely. Importantly, the postwar professional practices of urban planning and heritage conservation stemmed from new legislative and institutional frameworks, and were expected to embody and reflect the changed socio-political reality: either by reinforcing the country’s future-oriented image or by reshaping its past. In the eyes of the authorities and professionals alike, both aims rendered the presence of wartime ruins in the urban context unacceptable.

In this paper, I will discuss the narratives behind the postwar reconstruction of historic towns in Croatia through a study of Šibenik. Using multiple sources produced by the authorities, planners and conservators, I will examine how the town’s bomb-sites were recorded, represented and treated, and to what degree the process was influenced by dominant planning and conservation paradigms. Three selected cases representative of different urban scales will illustrate the range of concerns. Dragan Boltar’s regulation plan of Šibenik (1947) advocated a zoning system with lower building density, which was to include the transformation of the partially damaged historic town into a residential area with gardens, and the setting up of a new administrative and cultural center outside of its confines. Ivan Vitić’s modernist school and cultural center complex (1949–60), built in place of a damaged 19th-century block by the medieval town wall, was meant to piece together the surviving urban fabric and bring visual coherence to the area. Finally, the near-total reconstruction of the Renaissance Civic Loggia (1947–60), carried out by the conservator Cvito Fisković and architect Harold Bilinić, exemplifies the intention to retrieve the original appearance of a valuable monument, while providing a new interpretation of its history.

Barbara Szczepańska
The Case of a City “In-Between”: Architecture and Urban Planning in Postwar Opole

The end of World War Two and subsequent rapid change of european borders caused a sudden disruption in history of many cities. That was also the case of Opole – a city that had been a part of Germany for a few centuries suddenly became a part of southwestern Poland and so called Recovered Lands. New administration and municipal authorities had to not only rebuild a damaged city and become acquainted with it, but also create a myth of indigenously polish Opole and use the city as one of the tools of communist propaganda.

It can be argued that collective perception surrounding post-war cities in western Poland was mainly shaped by two big narratives or myths. First one being the myth portraying the
reconstruction of damaged cities as a heroic, yet quick and efficient process. The second narrative depicted cities of so called Recovered Lands (now western territories of Poland) as the ones particularly nurtured by local and national authorities as tools of propaganda.

Opole is a curious case of a city growing and progressing partly in accordance with, and partly away from those big narratives. It was a formerly german city destroyed by war’s aftermath, yet the trajectory of its reconstruction and further growth in the second half of 20th century differed substantially from bigger cities with similar history: Wroclaw or Gdask. Opole was too small to be deemed important, constantly underfunded, overshadowed by bigger investments and reconstructions, affected by distinctive social problems. Problems surrounding the process of mapping the city, its scope and the extent of war damage can serve as an example of difficulties encountered by new polish authorities while operating in unknown cities and the discrepancies between official national propaganda and often harsh conditions of post-war reality.

Municipal authorities of post-war Opole developed an ambiguous approach to city’s pre-war history and german heritage. It was often negated or destroyed (like pre-war monuments), but sometimes it became a source of inspiration (best exemplified by the use of german plans and projects in post-war urban planning), which created a link of continuity between Opole’s pre-war and post-war reality.

Simultaneously with difficult and slow material reconstruction of urban space, there were new myths created about the city, its architecture and history. Their ultimate goal was to create a brand new Opole, indigenously polish, brought back to its Motherland after centuries of „occupation”. Post-war identity of the city was built on brand myths created about the city, its architecture and urban-planning not only on Soviet Union. The second is the rise of interest in the contemporary architecture abroad, showed in the publications and researches of the Academy of Architecture of USSR, interrupted by the campaign of 1948. Among the examples is the dissertation by Roman Higer on contemporary architecture and urban planning in the United States, approved in 1947, with the deprivation of title in 1949. The third case is the recovery of the Avant-guard architecture, with the involvement of Moissej Ginzburg, the ex-leader of constructivist movement OSA that was abolished in 1932. The soviet architect was invited to work on the proposals for the elaboration of the system for the reconstruction of towns destroyed during the war. Moreover, this “liberalization” was temporary. The return to the “foreign” experience would take place only after 1955, when the first books published on architecture and urban planning treated the post-war reconstruction in Poland, a country under a remarkable soviet influence.

Anna Vyazemsteva

Urban Planning and the ‘Foreign’ Experience in the Soviet Union Towards the End of World War Two

Since the nationalization of every branch of production and distribution in Russia after the Revolution of 25 October 1917, the arrival of foreign press was under the state control. However, the journals and translations published in USSR in 1920s and 1930s showed the continuous interest in international architecture and urban planning practice. The travelling abroad was very limited for economic reasons, state control of migration and mutual distrust with foreign countries. The foreign professional press, books, translated literature were the main source of knowledge on international experience and the primary material for the for the articles and books on the topic by local authors. Since the free circulation of press was very limited, it is possible to consider that all publications on foreign urban planning reflect a greater state program for the reconstruction of the country.

Analyzing the content of the local journals and professional editions we can see the gradual decrease of the space dedicated to the foreign architecture. This dynamic reflects the state policy towards the increase of the state control on the society and increasing political terror. In the same time the collections of state professional libraries showed a quite continuous arrival of professional editions from abroad.

The “censorship” for the news on contemporary foreign architecture reached the peak at the beginning of the WWII. During the wartime, according to several testimonies, the repressions and heavy political control decreases, that was reflected in art, architecture, as well as on the exchange with “abroad”. The years around 1945 showed an engaging development of the sphere of culture in general and in architecture and urban planning as well, marked by the new visions and international exchange. Then so-called campaign against “formalism” and “cosmopolitanism” started in 1948 brought back the pre-war repressions till the death of Stalin in 1953.

The paper develops the argument around three examples. The first emblematic is the book “Urban planning”, edited by V.Shkavarikov, A.Bunin and N. Poliakov, that was published in 1945 by the Academy of Architecture of USSR, one of the first books that treated the XX c. urban-planning not only on Soviet Union. The second is the rise of interest in the contemporary architecture abroad, showed in the publications and researches of the Academy of Architecture of USSR, interrupted by the campaign of 1948. Among the examples is the dissertation by Roman Higer on contemporary architecture and urban planning in the United States, approved in 1947, with the deprivation of title in 1949. The third case is the recovery of the Avant-guard architecture, with the involvement of Moissej Ginzburg, the ex-leader of constructivist movement OSA that was abolished in 1932. The soviet architect was invited to work on the proposals for the elaboration of the system for the reconstruction of towns destroyed during the war. Moreover, this “liberalization” was temporary. The return to the “foreign” experience would take place only after 1955, when the first books published on architecture and urban planning treated the post-war reconstruction in Poland, a country under a remarkable soviet influence.

Laurence Ward

Archiving the London County Council Bomb Damage Maps

This presentation will consider the London County Council Bomb Damage Maps in the context of their creation, ongoing management and use at London Metropolitan Archives. The bomb damage maps are comprised of 110 Ordnance Survey 1:2500 sheets, created in 1916 and updated to 1940. These base sheets were used to record damage to buildings in London caused by air raids and V weapons during the Second World War. They are a popular and important source for the study of the air raids on London and the program to rebuild the capital which followed the war. In 2013 the maps were inscribed to the UNESCO UK Memory of the World Register, a list of documentary heritage which holds special cultural significance for the UK.

Following the implementation of the Home Office Civil Defence strategy, which was in place by June 1939, the London County Council (the
The Middlesex Bomb Damage Maps

Robin Woolven

The Middlesex Bomb Damage Maps

Generally the recording of war damage 1939-1945 is devoted to inner urban areas but the 240 sheets of the Middlesex Bomb Damage Maps held in the London Metropolitan Archives (LMA) record the bomb and missile damage suffered by that sector of Outer London which housed a quarter of Greater London’s population in a sector roughly from five miles (8 Km) to fifteen miles (24 Km) from Charing Cross, stretching from Sunbury on Thames in the South West, up around to the River Lea and the Essex border in the North East. For wartime purposes Greater Middlesex comprised the 26 local authorities of the County of Middlesex plus those six neighbouring authorities in Hertfordshire within the Metropolitan Police Area.

Although Middlesex can be considered Suburban North West London, the 31 local authorities of the enlarged wartime County ranged from densely populated boroughs like Tottenham, Hornsey and Willesden bordering the London County Council area, together with many ancient townships such as Harrow, Enfield, Uxbridge and Chiswick to the less populated outer fringe areas like Barnet Rural District and Cheshunt including the more distant areas where the expanding metropolis was, in 1939, still building its suburban housing estates between the essential road, rail, water and electricity and gas infrastructure of a growing Greater London.

At a scale of 1:2,500 the Ordnance Survey Map sheets, each covering one mile north/south and ½ miles (1.6 x 2.4 Km) east/west show every building, when the maps were printed around 1935-38, as one inch represents 208 feet (63m). Using these sheets the Middlesex War Damage Survey, under the County Engineer and Surveyor, regularly assessed the damage suffered and recorded the three most severe degrees of damage by colouring damaged properties on the sheets either Red (Total damage, building to be demolished), Orange (Some repairs possible but could become red) or Yellow (Borderline areas, uncertain whether repairs possible, might have to be demolished). Unfortunately, less severe damage was not recorded but other relevant local records are held at the LMA. The damage shown is cumulative, from the first bombs on Middlesex in August 1940, through the 1940-41 blitzes, the nuisance raids of 1942-43 and the V weapon offensives from June 1944 to the end of March 1945.

The map details illustrate the extent and range of damage shown on the maps across Middlesex and suggest that they had some role in post-war reconstruction planning. They will also demonstrate the caution necessary when reading the maps and relating their information to the current topography of Middlesex. The original sheets, which are available for inspection by readers at the LMA in Clerkenwell, remain an invaluable source for architectural, social, local and family historians as well as to surveyors and architects.