

MIKLÓS SZÉKELY

Ephemerality and political geography

In the present collection of essays the definition of Central and Eastern Europe includes all the countries that underwent a shared process of political, social and economic modernization in the period after the first universal exhibitions in the mid-nineteenth century. Exhibitions in the nineteenth century were often related to modernity and their architecture reflected diverse nation building strategies (Greenhalgh 1990). In Central and Eastern Europe national movements flourished in imperial contexts: in the territories of the Habsburg Empire (later Austria-Hungary), Prussia (later Germany) and Russia. Central and Eastern Europe is a fluid geopolitical concept of the twentieth century referring to a politically unstable territory, whose borders shifted almost continuously during the timespan under investigation. Temporary constructions were erected for national and international exhibitions as a means for conveying ideas to an immediate audience, while pavilions were regarded as hubs of architectural and artistic trends, political visions, and cultural and social issues. The complex political, cultural, social, economic and urban context of ephemerality is related, in this volume, to the nation-building strategies of the region. Our focus is on the interrelationships between constantly changing political ideologies and spectacular ephemeral architecture and displays. The wide range of approaches in this book includes the exterior and interior design of an exhibition pavilion, along with its location within the exhibition park and among neighboring edifices, and its function as a projection of regional, national or corporate representation.

The main objective of this volume is to investigate the relationship between nation-building strategies, political propaganda and temporary architecture in Central and Eastern Europe. This region, notwithstanding the absence of any commonly accepted definition of its borders, has been subject to incessant political and ideological change from the time of the Napoleonic wars up until the accession of most of its countries to the European Union. A succession of historic events – the liberal revolutions of the mid-nineteenth century, the formation of a unified Germany, the creation of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, the retreat of the Ottoman Empire from the Balkans, the two World Wars, and the gradual spread and subsequent rapid collapse of the communist regimes – has fostered, among other things, a perpetual search for stability, and yet has constantly led people and politics in ever newer directions. This resulted in radical shifts of orientation approximately every thirty or forty years, therefore within a single generation or so. Ephemeral architecture in the region has thus reflected a plethora of diverse approaches within a very short timescale, such as different historical revivalist tendencies,

vernacularism, neo-Byzantinism, and the enigma(s) of modernity, while technological innovations in construction, such as aluminum or the development of architectural photography, have become incorporated into political discourse.

The phenomenon of what it means to be Central European has recently formed the focus of scholarly investigation. A volume by Ákos Moravánszky, *Competing Visions: Aesthetic Invention and Social Imagination in Central European Architecture, 1867-1918*, was the first publication on the architectural identity of the region whose author identified Austria-Hungary as a political entity in the indeterminate region today called Central Europe. Moravánszky sees a plurality of modernistic expressions which testifies to a universalist vision of the nations within an empire – an experience that all the nations of Central and Eastern Europe have shared in the course of the last two centuries, regardless of their separate origins, languages, beliefs and traditions.

The idea of competition, before entering the world of architectural interpretations, was the key notion of Mary Douglas and Aaron B. Wildavsky's volume, *Risk and Culture* (1982), which greatly influenced the anthropological approach to the phenomenon of Central and Eastern Europe. Among academic fields, in addition to contemporary art theory and practice, anthropology and ethnography play a fundamental role in defining Central and Eastern Europe as a particular place, whose multiplicity and heterogeneity not only influence the region's "gazes", but also the way they are hierarchized and necessarily envisaged in their given cultural-political situation (Demski, Baraniecka, Sz. Kristóf 2013: 12–13).

The notions of competition, empire, the change of social norms, the role of media, and national narratives are especially symptomatic in the case of universal exhibitions, which, while addressed to an international audience, were organized in most cases in national capitals, and tended to amass increasing numbers of exhibitors. Regional exhibitions exercised great influence on industrial and cultural urban centers. (Filipová 2015: 1–20). A classification of international shows of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries reveals the fundamental aspects of such events. Universality and internationality often coincide, with the first referring to the universal character of the exhibited goods, objects and inventions, and the second referring mainly to the international range of exhibitors. In the course of the nineteenth century, an exhibition is more likely to have been international, displaying universal or specialized exhibits to an international audience, rather than universal, demanding a huge financial contribution from national revenues, placed under the auspices of the highest national rulers and organized mainly in capital cities (Royle 1998). The evolution of the universal exhibition can be traced back to the industrial exhibitions that appeared at the end of the eighteenth century, displaying a diversity of goods produced across the nation, such as the

Exposition publique des produits de l'industrie in 1798 (Kusamitsu 1980, Carpenter 1971: 465–470).

The universal exhibition, as a new phenomenon of the secularized and industrialized society of the nineteenth century, was an interpretation of its current state of development, and was thus in need of a new, unique form of architecture (Wesemael 2001: 136–142). This had to befit the temporary character of the universal exhibitions: it was tailored to meet the required holding capacity and mirrored its continuous development. However, this continuously renewing architecture did not manifest itself solely in the new, revolutionary materials of the nineteenth century: apart from halls of iron, glass and faience, the use of wood-and-plaster “light-structured pavilions” became widespread within a short time of its first appearance. In response to new economic challenges, organizers and participants representing the national sections of universal exhibitions faced a new, unfamiliar task: how to gain economic, commercial and cultural advantages for their country by associating it with an original and distinctive image. The economic force of country-branding was often mixed in with historical traditions, especially through peasants’ room interiors, which were considered prime national symbols by many exhibiting countries (Stoklund 1999: 5–18).

In their article, Viazova and Korndorf question the conventional belief that, to paraphrase the authors, the history of glass architecture began with purely utilitarian palace greenhouses and orangeries, which grew, due exclusively to nineteenth-century technological advances, into the gigantic pavilions of world fairs and glass-vaulted arcades (Auerbach 1999). Apart from the gallery-like constructions of universal exhibitions, small-scale pavilions, as representatives of some or other political agenda, were also created using ephemeral architecture. Pavilion architecture underwent a fundamental evolution in the late nineteenth century. Traditional types of ephemeral architectural – triumphal arches, ornamental fountains, *castrum doloris* – were gradually taken over by innovations intended to serve equally the representational needs of an increasingly secularizing bourgeois society, the preservation of national memory, and mass entertainment. The most important innovation came with the exhibition pavilions themselves, which first appeared in greater numbers at the 1867 Paris Exposition; pavilions built with the express purpose of national representation appeared during subsequent decades. These buildings, initially modestly sized and constructed mostly for commercial purposes, evolved into two new types after the 1890s: open-air museums, mirroring authentic peasant architecture and catering for the newfound interest in ethnography, complemented with novel entertainment districts in the form of pavilion-complexes; and buildings that provided exhibition space for artisans or cottage industries, but without gastronomical functions. As Bernasconi argues in this volume, the tent-room represents a sedentism of mobile and ephemeral architecture. Half a century before the first universal exhibition, the late eighteenth and

early nineteenth centuries saw the spread of the “tent-room” in Europe. This was a form of internal decoration that borrowed from the shape of a tent and its different functions, both political and cultural. To paraphrase the author sedentism was an important step in the life of ephemeral architecture, providing deep insight into its function as a symbolic legitimation of the monarchy at the beginning of the nineteenth century, and illustrating its role in the cultural consumption process. In this context the tent-room was the transformation of a technical device (an item of ephemeral architecture) into a decorative cipher. The mobile, easily transformable character of a tent, previously used by the military, as a place where members of the upper class could retire and relax, was transformed into a symbolic venue for national political agendas after the proliferation of pavilions in exhibition parks following the 1867 Paris Exposition (Wesemael 2001: 233–242). Indeed, both the early appearance and the diffusion of such light architectural structures can be related to the Bourbon dynasty. The spread of this interior motif can be traced in the history of political symbology and in the cultural consumption of travel at the turn of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries.

The 1867 Paris Exposition also saw the appearance of a new medium with distinctive architectonic styles. Small-scale pavilions showcasing gastronomy or private entrepreneurs appeared here for the first time in significant numbers. Before long, pavilions were appropriated by nations as the medium *par excellence* for self-representation at the universal exhibitions at the turn of the century. The ephemeral palaces built on the Rue des Nations for the 1900 Paris Exposition are evidence of this. (Wesemael 2001: 136–142)

What had originally been referred to as “industrial exhibitions” tended to be called “general exhibitions” from the last quarter of the nineteenth century (*Országos Általános Kiállítás - General National Exposition* in 1885 in Budapest, or the *Expoziția Generală Română* in 1906 in Bucharest), focusing on different kinds of exhibits produced nationwide especially for the occasion (Albert 2015: 113–115). Universality remained the leitmotif for major fairs, where the latest and greatest was put on display – items from everyday material culture, important technical inventions and outstanding industrial achievements, bringing international exhibitors together. As civilization “progressed”, the need arose for specialized exhibitions focusing on a particular type of trade, product or invention, maintaining an international character with the attendance of non-national exhibitors. The first *International Art Exhibition* in Venice in 1895, for example, which became today’s Venice Biennale, was in fact an international exhibition specializing in the fine arts, while *Die Internationale Hygiene-Ausstellung* in Dresden in 1911 attracted international exhibitors of a new kind, who specialized in modern casual life.

NATION-BUILDING STRATEGIES IN THE EUROPE OF THE EMPIRES 1890–1920

In the region of Central Europe, universal and international exhibitions shared many features with their western precedents. At the same time, however, they adopted independent agendas, related to the specific political circumstances in which they were organized. The case of Hungary, as the Eastern half of the Dual Monarchy, and therefore covering a large part of what authors define today as Central Europe, provides an especially pertinent example of such an autonomous transformation of the exhibition medium, which was used to proclaim sovereignty, modernity and national identity. In contrast to the *csárda*-like Hungarian pavilions (resembling a tavern), which emphasized the idyllic *puszta*-image of the country at international exhibitions in the 1860s and 1870s, Hungarian self-definition radically changed after the Millennium festivities of 1896 (Albert 2015: 116–122). The new image considered vernacular arts and architecture as a source of the new culture of modernized Hungary (Keserü 2005: 17–24, Moravánszky 1998, Rampley 2000). For many artists, architects and passionate amateurs, peasant traditions preserved national roots and fragmented memories from the pre-conquest period. As a collection of remnants of the mythical past, peasant culture was interpreted as the basis of reinvented national myths and legends, and, more importantly from a political point of view, drove attempts to revive a national vernacular in art and architecture. (Hobsbawn 1983: 263–307, Anderson 1983) The Hungarian Millennium was an event of great national enthusiasm. Intellectuals, politicians, priests, noblemen and sometimes simple citizens promoted their ideas on how to commemorate this event. Even though organizational issues played a crucial role, the date of the conquest could not be determined, not even approximately. (Sinkó 1993: 132–136; Vadas 1996: 23–30). The use of art and architecture for national representation became a major element of official cultural politics after the Millennium exhibition in 1896, and during the subsequent two decades, in every part of the Dual Monarchy.

Hungarian exhibitors first took part in universal exhibitions as early as 1851 in London, although the history of Hungarian pavilions, like that of all the other participating nations, did not begin until 1867 in Paris. Before the Exposition Universelle of 1900 in Paris, the Hungarian architectural presence focused on small scale pavilions for food and wine, which generally showcased the wood industry and were ethnographic in character – in 1867, 1873 and 1889, imitations of *csárda* buildings has offered visitors different experiences: a Hungarian restaurant in Paris in 1867, a wine restaurant in Vienna in 1873, and a proper *csárda* function in Paris in 1889 (Houze 2012: 131–141). As part of a new and nationalistic paradigm of national representation, national pavilions reflected the image of cultural sovereignty for both Hungary and Croatia. Still, there was no hint of an idea of political independence, and national life was envisioned within the Habsburg

Monarchy. The political concept of being Hungarian or Croatian and sovereign did not exclude accepting the results of the political compromise of 1867. Cultural self-image differed from political will and reality. The importance of Hungary's presence in exhibition halls and pavilion grounds abroad, physically separated from Austria, was visually emphasized after the Millennium Exhibition.

In the course of the nineteenth century, small trade fairs and industrial exhibitions around Europe increasingly opened up to international exhibitors and audiences. In general, universal exhibitions were addressed to international audiences. After the Austro-Hungarian Compromise, a number of attempts were made in Hungary to organize an international exhibition. The Millennium Exhibition was a proud affirmation both of Hungary's present and its past. The contemporary aspect of the Millennium Exhibition was contained in the representation of the latest economic and cultural achievements of Hungary in the Main Contemporary Group, which included industrial, ethnographic and art sections. The retrospective part of the Main Historical Group, housed in a romantic pavilion composed of replicas of twenty-two different historic buildings, focused on historical development and culture going back to the coronation of King St. Stephen of Hungary in 1000 AD (Albert 2015: 118–119).

As Damjanović argues in his paper, political relations and especially national political independence greatly influenced the setting, the statistical references and the display of exhibition constructions. Croatian pavilions were erected at exhibitions those organized on the territory of the Austro-Hungarian Empire, the most important being the Millennium Exhibition in Budapest in 1896, where Croatia was represented with four large pavilions (Damjanović 2010: 237–241). Participation in the exhibition reflected the political situation of the time, for Croatia was part of Hungary, and was thus obliged to be involved in the exhibition to demonstrate the political connection between the two countries.

Following the research of Cornaglia, if themes such as industry or agriculture were really “national” and therefore demanded pavilions with visible wooden or wooden-like structures, the less “serious” theme of eating and drinking could be represented by livelier and more lavish types of architecture, whose roots were intended to be seen in internationally acknowledged architectural approaches. This could result either in Baroque eclecticism – as in the case of the French Restaurant designed by the architects Kármán & Ullmann for the Hungarian Millennium celebration held in Budapest in 1896 – or in the flourishing Art Nouveau style – for example, the Hungarian Bakery Pavilion of József Fischer at the Exposition Universelle of 1900. In the case of the French Restaurant, there is a clear neo-Baroque reference, a world away from the Wagnerschule, standing out among an architectural landscape filled mostly with pavilions bearing visible wooden or wooden-like structures, referring to the national theme of woods,

forests and the wood industry. Other pavilions with neo-Baroque forms, designed by the Braun brothers and by J. E. Hubert, housed Croatian wines and Hungarian sparkling wine companies.

The commemoration of Hungary's Millennium was not, however, limited to domestic displays in Budapest, but extended to exhibitions abroad. Hungary officially joined the 1900 *exposition universelle* in Paris as a participant and invested more financial, economic and intellectual effort into its national presentation than ever before. The Hungarian pavilion on the Rue des Nations was the first to be decorated using vernacular motifs on an ephemeral construction, opening the way for the use of such motifs and premodern tendencies in Hungarian pavilions during later decades. The paper investigates the changed and unchanged aspects of the two national representations and the change of message from the domestic to the international audience. The universal exhibition of 1900 offered a radically different concept of nation-building strategies, with rising interest in the making of modern Slavic art and architecture and the emergence of neo-Byzantine architecture, both of which took on increasing significance in the interwar period.

Hungarian representations did not change fundamentally from 1896 to 1900, unlike their target from a domestic to an international audience: the Millennium Exhibition was a proclamation of Hungary's historicity as well as modernity (Unowsky, 2004). Four years later, beside the economic and cultural sovereignty exhibited in the galleries of the Hungarian historical pavilion in the Rue des Nations, Hungary's and Croatia's officially appropriated historical narrative was emphasized through a mixture of historic and vernacular architectural elements. At the turn of the century, Hungarian folk traditions were officially propagated in features of modern national art and architecture. This was an important factor in pavilion architecture and decorative art objects. This was not only political, but also had an important economic aspect: tastefully formed products reflecting the modern national style greatly enhanced a country's reputation and also improved market success. It was for this reason that organizers of some participating countries, Hungary included, wished to influence the modernization of their country's architecture and art through an interpretation of folk traditions. Hungarian pavilions erected between 1900 and 1911 proposed different solutions for national architecture: the installations of the 1900 Paris Exposition reflected the concept of Ödön Lechner (1845-1914), whose brand of "national" architecture followed the famous *Bekleidungstheorie* – the use of folk patterns and motifs on facades – propounded by the German architect and theoretician Gottfried Semper (1803–1879). The Hungarian exhibition installations in 1900 were designed by Zoltán Bálint and Lajos Jámbor, architects who followed in Lechner's footsteps: their aim was to highlight Hungary's economic and cultural sovereignty, while the pavilion on the *Rue des Nations* focused on its own historical narrative.

Minea underlines in his paper that Universal Exhibitions offered the newly independent Balkan states – Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria and Romania – an excellent opportunity to represent their diverse approaches in nation building process (Popescu 2006: 286–290). Western influence was still obviously present in the creation of a national architecture, the pavilions of the new independent Balkan countries were mostly built by French architects. The early-twentieth-century Balkans witnessed both the emancipation of several nation states and the dissolution of the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman Empires. This was the end of a long historical process, which relied heavily not only on political and diplomatic means, but also on cultural imagination. The elites of these rapidly developing political entities (Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria and Romania) sought to create a national imagery that would be instrumental in legitimizing nation- and state-building, expansionism and various other political issues.

As Ignjatović argues in his paper a decade later the question of historicity remained a fundamental part of this process – to paraphrase the author, the nation’s distinctive identity that reflected both its historical grandeur and its future prospects. At the 1900 Paris Exposition the national pavilions of Balkan countries – Greece, Serbia, Bulgaria and Romania – expressed their competition and as such they were all employing styles related to Byzantine architecture (see also Popescu 2004). The variety of Byzantine architectural appropriations and their modern “nationalized” versions reflect the various national discourses in the Balkans. The diverse approaches of forming a common modern identity in the ethnically and religiously mixed Balkan region were all based on being modern successors to an ancient imperial power.

Ágnes Sebestyén demonstrates another kind of modern imperialist tendency in the Balkans calling attention to cross-cultural references and the complex layers of identity in the Multi-ethnic and multi-religious Balkan region. In the case of Bosnia and Herzegovina modern identity building process was articulated around *Slavonic* and *Muslim*, “Western” and “Oriental”. The author argues that the location and interdependence of the pavilions of Austria-Hungary at the Paris Universal Exhibition in 1900 reflected the political and economic efforts of the Dual Monarchy. This was intended to justifying the annexation of the province and this process was culminated in the design of the pavilion of Bosnia and Herzegovina at the 1900 Paris Exposition. To paraphrase the author, the commissioner-general, the Swiss Henri Moser conceived the pavilion as an image of the peaceful encounter of two cultures and two civilizations: Slavonic and Muslim, “Western” and “Oriental” as it is reflected in the “Bosnian-imagination” architecture and decoration of the pavilion decorated by the Czech painter, Alphonse Mucha. The whole iconographical program sustained clear imperialistic political aims of Austria-Hungary, it demonstrated that all the cultural efforts of the Austrian administration had aimed at connecting Bosnia and Herzegovina to the “Western” world, while preserving

its oriental characteristics (Çelik 1992: 88–93). The pavilion of Bosnia and Herzegovina, similarly to the common use of oriental and western influences, remained in the core of the Ottoman Pavilions in turn-of-the-century pavilions at European universal expositions.

Contrary to the political situation of South-Eastern Europe at the end of the nineteenth century, North-Eastern European nations faced different challenges and – like Latvia and Poland, incorporated into Russia and Germany – adopted different strategies of exhibition architecture and display. The Galician General Provincial Exhibition, held in 1894 in Lviv (Lemberg) – the capital city of Galicia, one of the crown lands of Austria-Hungary – was a major show. As the author Drohobycka-Grzesiak demonstrates, the show reflected competing nation building strategies between ethnic groups without central political administration, analyzed in details by Markian Prokopovych (2008: 242–274). Galicia was a multi-national and multicultural region, the western part being ethnically Polish, while the eastern part was mostly Ukrainian. Although the Galician General Provincial Exhibition was originally intended to reflect the aspirations of the province as a whole, it instead shone a light on the unequal position of Poles and Ukrainians in Galicia at that time. The organizing Polish patriotic circles considered the exhibition as a platform for propaganda activities, which addressed the Polish audience of the region: the event was organized on the 100th anniversary of the most important Polish independence movement – the Kościuszko Uprising. The ephemeral pavilions reflected the debates on Polish modern national architecture, like in the case of Mucha's decoration for the Bosnian-Herzegovinian pavilion in Paris in 1900 their iconographic programs were based on national – in this case – Polish history and culture while the Ukrainian participation was restricted to ethnographic character.

A similar tendency can be traced in another culturally, religiously and linguistically heterogenic Eastern and Northern territory of Austria-Hungary. In 1896, the 10th All-Russian Congress of Archaeology took place in Riga – this exhibition forms the focus of the investigations of Silvija Grosa. As the author points out, following the rationale of Çelik and Kinney exhibitions often fostered ethnographic and archeological researches in the host country (Çelik, Kinney 1990, see also Albert 2015: 121). The Riga Latvian Society organized an exhibition based on more than 6000 ethnographic items collected from different regions of Latvia by expeditions specially organized for this event, they were displayed in a wooden pavilion was built for the exhibition. In June 1901 the 700th Jubilee Exhibition of Industry and Crafts was opened in Riga. As Grosa argues, the significance of the exhibition lay not so much in the discovery of Art Nouveau as in the growth of self-confidence in both Riga and the wider region, which also promoted an appreciation of historical traditions.

MEDIATIZED MODERNISM AND PROPAGANDA 1920–1970

The definition of Central Europe changed after the First World War as a result of political realignment. The region of Central Europe (including, in discourses of the post-WWII situation, Poland, the Czech Republic, Slovakia, Hungary, Slovenia, Croatia and, to a certain extent, Serbia) is, as mentioned earlier, a fluid geopolitical concept and a politically unstable territory with constantly shifting borders, but two additional factors must be borne in mind. Firstly, it consists of a group of countries where western civilization and western values have long been incorporated in exhibition organization and displays; and secondly, the modern canons that appeared in architecture and display in the post-WWII socio-political context served as objectified references in intellectual discourse. Additionally the implementation of modernity since the 1960s has relied upon markedly different strategies in Central European exhibition architecture.

The creation of new nation states in Central Europe after the First World War fundamentally changed the political circumstances. New national policies promoted new national identities based on the enigma of modernism in society, state administration, economics and culture. The modernism-based national cultural policies led to a boom in national museums and art galleries, especially in new capital cities of regional and/or national importance. The Čiurlionis National Art Museum (later Vytautas the Great Museum of Culture) in Lithuania's postwar capital, Kaunas, for example, and the first modern art museum in the region, the Muzeum Sztuki in Łódź in Poland, soon become promoters of modernist cultural tendencies, although very different in their target audience and objectives. As in post-revolutionary Paris at the beginning of the long nineteenth century, newly created art museums in the post-WWI period played a crucial role as the foremost representational tools of the new national narratives. The foundation of national museums and art galleries in capitals from Kaunas to Ljubljana, the reorganization of regional museums (Landesmuseen), or the transformation of regional collections into national ones was all carried out to serve the representational needs of new national politics. The foundation of museums based on patriotic, civic, or middle-class initiatives is an important characteristic in the region: nations living under Russian, Prussian or Austrian rule, deprived of national self-determination until the end of the First World War, with dominant Russian- or German-speaking intelligentsia in the national lands in the nineteenth century, followed Western nation-building strategies and faced strikingly similar problems (Gellner 1983; Smith 1999). The internationalization of art and modern art museums from the beginning of the 1920s coincided with the formation of the nation states in Central Europe, and thus with a desire to create national cultural and artistic canons. As a result of the shifting status of objects – during the process of musealization – from a non-specified to a specific meaning, museum objects “leave the functional everyday environment of use and are placed in a special environment where

they serve an entirely different purpose.” This was nothing new, as ever since the reorganization of the Louvre in the 1780s, collections and individual artworks had been subject to political appropriation in modern museums. This went against the crucial international character of modernism. Modernist architecture surpassed the nineteenth century classification of classical forms and national tendencies in architecture; it reflected formal artistic problems and philosophical issues, and was based on shared experience. Similarly to the theoretical shift in musealization, the display and settings of ephemeral interwar pavilions also changed significantly.

The interwar period gave rise to national modernist architecture, which, in combination with the emerging role and rapidly developing technology of media and photography, fundamentally changed perceptions of architecture. As Ágnes Anna Sebestyén refers to the statement of Kester Rattenbury, media representations of buildings have to be distinguished from the originals that they are based upon (Rattenbury 2002, xxii). The author highlights the representations of modernist ephemeral exhibition architecture and interiors and analyzes their own narratives and their own meanings. As a precursor to Mitchell’s statement on the transformation of visual culture in the light of digital culture (Mitchell 2005), newly emerging architectural photography during the interwar period became the most powerful medium influencing architectural discourse both in the national style politics and in the more cosmopolitan international forum. Ágnes Anna Sebestyén explores that the status of architectural renderings and photographs as source materials in scholarly discussions is evident, but it is necessary to accentuate, to paraphrase the author, that not only the architectural structures must be analyzed, but also the way they were constructed by means of architectural representation. Sebestyén analyzes how ephemeral pavilions became “media constructions”, and then developed into “permanent structures” by means of different media.

Ephemeral constructions influenced the rapidly changing character of modern cities after the First World War. Projects for small-scale catering and transport pavilions were designed to be integrated into the Vienna and Budapest cityscapes of the 1920s. The unrealized architectural plans by Bertalan Árkay are treated as high-quality examples of ephemeral architecture in the metropolitan public space in the essay of Tamás Csáki. This essay opens the investigation on the way how modernist architects in Central and Eastern Europe intended to use “new” materials, such as reinforced concrete and glass.

The strong link between modernism and national identity cannot be considered as a Central European peculiarity. The par excellence multiethnic state in the West, Switzerland, has experienced a similar identity transformation. Swiss reaction to the First World War saw the development of a potentially destructive divide in Switzerland between the francophone and germanophone communities and the development of two opposing interpretations of Swiss exceptionalism. To para-

phrase the author Caoimhe Gallagher, Swiss historical myths have been instrumental in the creation of a coherent Swiss national narrative, chief among which has been a particular image of homogenous Swiss national unity. Le Corbusier's rejection of Swiss identity during this period was typical of many francophone Swiss intellectuals, who rejected what was viewed as a germanophone narrative. In the author's rationale the 1939 exhibition in Zurich, in particular, embodied the Swiss nationalist policy of *Geistige Landesverteidigung* (Spiritual Defense). Gallagher argues that public support for Le Corbusier, expressed among the francophone community during the period, suggests an intriguing counter-narrative existed, which contradicted the image of national unity put forward by the germanophone organizers of the exhibition of 1939 in Zürich. The identity-building process of the newly emerging nation states of Central Europe in the interwar period and the multi-ethnic, Western European Switzerland incorporated the primordial international discourse of modernism in similar ways.

New mass media technologies appeared in parallel with the formation of new nation states after the First World War. The politics representing Czech and Czechoslovak identity at fairs and expos between 1891 and 1958 demonstrates this shift in the representational paradigm, as Marta Filipová argues. Exhibition pavilions built to represent the Czech or Czechoslovak nation reflected the changing links between pavilion architecture and the constantly changing contemporary ideologies – the non-representational period of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, the republican period and then the communist period were all linked to the idea of architectural modernism as a characteristic of “Czechness” across the decades and political systems. Filipová demonstrates the various intentional, yet ephemeral, ideological systems in the design of ephemeral exhibition buildings of the Czech and Czechoslovak identity-building process at the exhibitions of 1928 and 1958. The paradigmatic shifts presented in her paper were symptomatic for the countries of Central Eastern Europe in the 1920 to 1960s. The Jubilee Exhibition of 1891 which, as a showcase for Czech nationalism, was organized in the frame of the multiethnic Austro-Hungarian Empire. Although the show fundamentally differed from the politically independent attitude of the Hungarian Millennium Celebrations, the Czech Village of the exhibition, similarly to the Polish or Hungarian exhibitions of the 1890s became a particularly important attraction, aimed at invoking a sense of historicity of the Czech nation, embedded in folk culture and tradition. As the author demonstrates the role of folk art has significantly lost its significance in the region. The importance of original forms of their national – Czech, Polish or Hungarian – cultures, was replaced by a more international and modernist orientation on the political and art scenes.

Like Hungary in the period before the First World War, Czechoslovakia's cultural policy and its ephemeral constructions were typical examples for most of the new nation states. The republican period of Czechoslovak identity-building was

expressed for the first time in the full complexity of different approaches in the architectural concepts of the Czechoslovak temporary exhibition installations at La Triennale di Milano, the International Exhibition of Decorative Arts, beginning in 1923. The aim of Petra Novakova's paper is to shed light on the complexity of different approaches towards the architectural concepts of Czechoslovak temporary exhibition installations at La Triennale from 1923 until 1968. As the author argues, all eight of the national presentations of this period were considered both as an efficient way of artistic confrontation and as an important representation of the state through political propaganda both for international visitors on the spot than for the domestic audience via the means of "media constructions".

Apart from being "media constructions" the physical structure of pavilions was used as a means of propaganda for promoting the communist ideology, developing the building industry, proclaiming technological modernity and advancing the communist economy. As Péter Haba argues in his paper, in Hungary the spectacular display of technological developments was of utmost significance in the post-revolutionary, early Kádár era, since after the events of 1956, the new government strove not only to de-Stalinize the political sphere and to restructure the economy but also to win over the population by propagating modernization. Efforts were redoubled to develop the Hungarian aluminum industry, deemed important in households and also in the renewal of the building industry. Demonstrating industrial capacities through the use of new materials and the development of exhibition industry was a common characteristic of socialist economies in the region. As Mirna Meštrović and Aleksander Laslo demonstrate in their paper, Zagreb, the Croatian capital, became the flagship venue for international exhibitions in former Yugoslavia. The authors point out the commercial value of modernist pavilions: in the 1950s-1960s many new pavilions were built, while others changed owners or users. The original Hungarian pavilion of 1956, constructed with a light and dismountable metal structure, was moved not far away to make room for a new pavilion for West Germany, and later again, to a more distant point, while Hungary shared a new pavilion with Spain. To paraphrase the authors' main statement, the Zagreb Trade Fair became an unrivaled arena for the most direct head-to-head competition between the radically opposed Western and Eastern worlds. This coincides with Haba's arguments on national propaganda via the use of new materials and exhibition organization. The Hungarian aluminum industry and the export of this new "national" material was seen as a means of raising the profile of the Hungarian economy in the West. By doing so the designers of the pavilions reflected on a novel international tendency in the 1950s and 1960s, on the utilization of "three-dimensional metal structures" in architecture both in Budapest and Zagreb, capitals struggling for leading position in socialist exhibition industry. Simultaneously to the repositioning of the pavilions in Zagreb, Yugoslavia's international reputation built up continuously. Lara Slivnik analyzes the Yugoslav pavilions built for world exhibitions: among the ones in Barcelona

(1929), Paris (1937), Brussels (1958), and Montreal (1967) the latter is in the focus of her investigations. The author underlines that the Yugoslav pavilion at Expo 67 was an interaction between competition entries and national representation in a troubled multi-ethnic country, the afterlife of the pavilion was a sign of international rapprochement: it was reconstructed in the West, as the Seamen's Museum in Grand Bank, Newfoundland, Canada.

Modernity, incorporated into the identity-building strategies of post-WWI nation states, is reflected also in the contemporary discourse on memory. Roula Matar-Perret's analyze of the works by the Croatian artist David Maljkovic investigate the artist's singular territories which are the history of modernist concepts. Two of Maljkovic videos – *These Days* (2005) and *Lost Memories From These Days* (2006) – unfold the Italian pavilion conceived by Giuseppe Sambito for the Zagreb Fair in 1961. In Maljkovic's films, Sambito's building does not appear as a simple set, but impregnates the attitudes and the action, giving a primordial sense to the whole work. Maljkovic's attempt at reanimating the memory of this economic and cultural icon is interesting for pointing out a manifestation of a singular afterlife of the pavilion within the tendency of patrimonialization and rehabilitation of ephemeral architecture in the 1980s.

The afterlife of pavilions, in the shape of post-WWII modernism, can be traced not only in their reuse as museums or exhibition spaces. The Hungarian pavilion in Venice's Giardini, one of the first buildings erected for the Venice Biennale, inaugurated in 1909. In her long survey, the author Cristiana Volpi demonstrates the political and architectural tendencies influencing the continuous transformation of Géza Maróti's pavilion-like permanent exhibition structure. The Hungarian Pavilion shows clear references to medieval and vernacular *Magyar* architecture and to the national artistic tradition of rich and colorful ornamentation (Sisa 2015: 23–28). As in the international expositions held in Milan three years before (1906), and in Turin two years later (1911), Hungary attempted to affirm its specific cultural identity through the architecture and the decorative arts, noticeably in opposition to the Austrian national one. Although conceived as a permanent exhibition structure, its primary architectural context was the Hungarian pavilions of Milan and Turin. The ideological and political choices that modified its structure during one century reflect a similar modernist approach to the problem of exhibition phenomena as in the preceding Yugoslav and Croatian cases. These modifications significantly contributed to the consideration of the building as ephemeral in spite of its originally permanent structure.

After a long and sparsely documented history from ancient times to the eighteenth century, ephemeral buildings appeared with new characteristics in nineteenth-century architecture. Over the course of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries, *ephemeral buildings* frequently offered the latest architectural solutions

for contemporary ideas, ideologies and trends. They were usually intended by architects to function as an autonomous experimental genre, providing new possibilities in terms of concept, planning, setting and display. They were also a powerful means for nation-building, they offered mass entertainment as a new phenomenon, and they provided a “magic frame” for the latest achievements of civilization in the nineteenth century. Later they were often appropriated and utilized by dictatorial regimes for their own needs, as demonstrations of power or as flagships of modernism.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Albert S. D. 2015, The Nation for Itself: The 1896 Hungarian Millennium Exhibition and the 1906 Romanian National General Exhibition. [in:] Filipová M. (ed.), *Cultures of International Exhibitions 1840–1940. Great Exhibitions in the Margins*, London, pp. 113–136.
- Anderson B. 1983, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*, London, New York.
- Auerbach J. 1999, *The Great Exhibition of 1851: A Nation on Display*, New Haven.
- Bennett T. 1989, The Exhibitionary Complex, *New Formations*, vol. 4, pp. 73–102.
- Carpenter K. 1971, European Industrial Exhibitions before 1851 and Their Publications, *Technology and Culture*, vol. 13/3, pp. 465–486.
- Çelik Z. 1992, *Displaying the Orient, Architecture of Islam at Nineteenth-Century World's Fairs*, Berkeley – Los Angeles – Oxford.
- Çelik Z. Kinney L. 1990, Ethnography and Exhibitionism at the Expositions Universelles, *Assemblage*, vol 13, pp. 35–58.
- Damjanović D. 2010, Herman Bollé and Croatian Pavilions at the Exhibitions in Trieste (1882) and Budapest (1885 and 1896), *Centropa*, vol. 10/3, pp. 231–243.
- Demski D., Sz. Kristóf I., Baraniecka-Olszewska K. (eds.) 2013, Introduction [in:] *Competing Eyes – Visual Encounters with Alterity in Central and Eastern Europe*, Budapest.
- Douglas M., Wildavsky A. 1982, *Risk and Culture. An Essay on the Selection of Technological and Environmental Dangers*, Berkeley.
- Filipová M. (ed.) 2015, *Cultures of International Exhibitions 1840–1940. Great Exhibitions in the Margins*, London.
- Gellner E. *Nations and Nationalism*, 1983.
- Greenhalgh P. 1991, *Ephemeral Vistas: History of the Expositions Universelles, Great Exhibitions and World's Fairs, 1851–1939*. Manchester.
- Harvey P. 1996, *Hybrids of Modernity: Anthropology, the Nation State and the Universal Exhibition*, London.
- Hobsbawm E., Ranger T. (eds.) 1983, *The Invention of Tradition*, Cambridge.
- Houze R. 2012, Home as a Living Museum: Ethnographic Display and the 1896 Millennium Exhibition in Budapest, *Centropa*, vol. 12/2, pp. 131–151.
- Keserü K. 2005, The Transformation of Architectural Thinking in Central Europe at the turn of the Twentieth Century [in:] *The Beginnings of Modernism in Central European Architecture*, Budapest.
- Kusamitsu T. 1980, Great Exhibitions before 1851. *History Workshop Journal* vol. 9/1, pp. 70–89.
- Mitchell W. J. T. 2005, *What do Pictures Want?: The Lives and Loves of Images*, Chicago.
- Moravánszky Á. 1998, *Competing Visions: Aesthetic Invention and Social Imagination in Central European Architecture, 1867–1918*. Cambridge MA.

- Popescu C. 2004, *Le style national roumain: construire une nation à travert l'architecture, 1881-1945*, Rennes.
- Popescu C. 2006, Une architecture pour la nation: context, idéologie et typologie du style national roumain, [in:] *Idée nationale et architecture en Europe 1860-1919*. Rennes, pp. 285-294.
- Prokopovych M. 2008, *Habsburg Lemberg: Architecture, Public Space, and Politics in the Galician Capital, 1772-1914*, Central European Studies, Lafayette.
- Rampley M. 2011, Peasants in Vienna. Ethnographic Display and the 1873 World's Fair, *Austrian History Yearbook*, vol. 42, pp. 110-132.
- Rattenbury K. (ed.), 2002, *This Is Not Architecture: Media Constructions*, London, New York.
- Royle E. 1998, *Issues of Regional Identities: In Honour of John Marshall*. Manchester.
- Sinkó K. 1993, A millenniumi kiállítás mint Gesamtkunstwerk (The Millennium Exhibition as Gesamtkunstwerk) [in:] Zádor A. (ed.), *A historizmus művészete Magyarországon (The Art of Historicism in Hungary)*, Budapest, pp. 132-147.
- Sisa J. 2015, *Lechner, A Creative Genius*, Budapest.
- Smith, A. D. 1999, *Myths and Memory of the Nation*, Oxford.
- Unowsky D. 2004, Staging Habsburg Patriotism: Dynastic Loyalty and the 1898 Imperial Jubilee [in:] Judson P. Rozenblit M. (eds.), *Constructing Nationalities in East Central Europe*, Oxford - New York, pp. 141-156.
- Vadas F. 1996, Programtervezetek a Millennium megünneplésére (1893), (Plans to Commemorate the Hungarian Millennium (1893)). *Ars Hungarica*, vol. 24/1, pp. 3-55.
- Wesemael P. van, 2001, *Architecture of Instruction and Delight. A Socio-historical analysis of World Exhibitions as a didactic phenomenon (1798-1851-1970)*, Rotterdam.