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ABSTRACT
This study is a preliminary inquiry into the work of Burle Marx in Uruguay between the decades of 1950 and 1980. In this period, he had some piecemeal collaborations with two pioneers of modern design in Uruguay: Luis García Pardo and Walter Pintos Risso. They attempted to pragmatically materialize the idea of Gesamtkunstwerk, i.e., total artwork, produced for a local bourgeoisie. This was expressed through architecture, gardens, built-in works of art (such as sculptures and murals), designer furniture, and advertising graphic design for their own products.

As our research methodology, primary sources were searched, such as document resource centers (which remain private), contemporary press, and advertising brochures. The studied works were visited and interviews were conducted with people associated with the work of Burle Marx and the aforementioned Uruguayan architects.

Keywords: Gesamtkunstwerk. Burle Marx. Advertising. Modern imaginaries. Uruguay.

RESUMO
Este artigo investiga preliminarmente a obra de Burle Marx no Uruguai nas décadas de 1950 a 1980. Nesse período, ele colaborou de forma fragmentária com dois pioneiros do design moderno no Uruguai: Luis García Pardo e Walter Pintos Risso. Eles tentaram materializar pragmaticamente a ideia de Gesamtkunstwerk, de uma obra de arte total, produzida para uma burguesia local. Isso se expressou na arquitetura de edifícios, jardins, obras de arte incorporadas – como esculturas e murais –, móveis de autor e gráficos publicitários para seus próprios produtos.

Como metodologia, foram revisadas fontes primárias, alguns acervos documentais ainda não acessíveis ao público, imprensa de época e folhetos publicitários; foram visitadas as obras em estudo e realizadas entrevistas com pessoas ligadas à obra de Burle Marx e dos citados arquitetos uruguaios.

INTRODUCTION

BURLE MARX AND THE INTERNATIONAL POSITION OF MODERNIST BRAZILIAN ARCHITECTURE

The modernist Brazilian movement reformulated modern architecture. Unlike the early European modernist interventions, where architects stressed the use of perfect, harmonious, clear, objective forms, Brazilian exploration approached fictions from the tropics, the instinctive, vital, and elemental (RIGOTTI, 1999). While the elites in Europe carried out modern productions at a small scale, in Brazil, the State was in charge of generating a national visual project (CAVALCANTI, 2006).

In 1939, the Brazilian Pavilion —by Lucio Costa, Oscar Niemeyer and Paul Lester Wiener—was inaugurated in New York for the Universal Exhibition. In 1943, the Brazil Builds: architecture new and old 1652-1942 show was organized at MOMA, the first exhibition on Latin America in this globally relevant museum (LIERNUR, 1999). Thus, modernist Brazilian architecture conveyed a modern progressive imaginary. During the second São Paulo Biennial in 1952, Brazil received representatives from the international modernist movement, such as Walter Gropius, Max Bill, Josep Sert, Alvar Aalto, among others. However, the Brazilian production would come under criticism, such as in the article “Report on Brazil” published in Architectural Review in 1954 (RIGOTTI, 1999, p. 79).

This is the setting where artist and landscape designer Roberto Burle Marx stands out, a central figure in the formation of modern visuality in Brazil. The first stage of his work is marked by its expressionist pictorial style based on organic, abstract, and flat geometries, in which green is not used in a naturalistic fashion as a material to unify the whole, encouraging instead the merging and interbreeding of traditions. Burle Marx’s work starts with Lúcio Costa and is later associated to local protagonists such as Reidy, Niemeyer, and Portinari. The building that would become the Ministry of Education in Rio de Janeiro in 1938 synthetizes in an exemplary manner his ideas for a public square, whose undulating, colorful forms are conceived to be appreciated from above. A second stage in Burle Marx’s work has been associated to projects such as the one he designed in 1950 with Rino Levi for Olivio Gomes’ house. This is when a botanical strictness starts to show, together with a manipulation of Nature and its essential elements: water and organic and mineral materials. (ÁBALOS, 2007).

His great landscaping projects from the 1950s, mainly in Rio de Janeiro, evince his manufacturing of public spaces, articulating architecture, landscape, and ecological systems in a large scale.

Technological changes in the color printing process of brochures in the 1950s (associated to significant changes in the social role of images, marked by the introduction of visual icons in everyday life) must have contributed to promote his work, so unique due to its use of a diverse chromatic palette anchored in his pictorial resources and to the socialization of a widespread modernist sensitivity.

Burle Marx’s whole career projects him outside the borders of Brazil, reaching countries such as the United States, Argentina, Venezuela, and even a small neighboring country: Uruguay.

SMALL URUGUAY

Uruguay is a unique country in Latin America, located between two giants, Brazil and Argentina. It is a nation with a limited surface populated by around 3,000,000 inhabitants in the 1970s. It modernized itself early on and had a mythical middle class with remarkable education and income indexes for the region. Its iconic architectural works, created between the 1920s and 1950s, evince a hegemonically European culture with a certain stylistic syncretism and an average high quality (CAPANDEGUY, 2009).
In the 1950s, its School of Architecture underwent a great cultural and ideological revolution thanks to its curriculum renovation in 1952, which was very much linked programmatically to Bauhaus and a hybrid system of Architecture Workshops after Beaux Artes. These would assume radical modern narratives associated with pre-War European rationalism and to some of the quests by the old masters, such as Le Corbusier, Gropius, and even Frank Lloyd Wright. Toward the late 1950s into the 1960s, this institution became more culturally conservative, drifting apart from the innovations of Le Corbusier, modernist Brazilian architecture, and Team X.

BURLE MARX IN URUGUAY: AN OPEN RESEARCH FIELD

Some studies have pointed out the links between the architecture of Rio Grande do Sul and that of Uruguay in the mid-20th century (COMAS; CANEZ; BOHRER, 2004). Yet, the link between Burle Marx and Uruguay represents an epistemic niche that is yet to be systematically approached.

Some evidence suggests that an exhibition was organized on his work, that he delivered some lectures, and that he collaborated with some architectural projects with Luis García Pardo in the 1950s and 1960s and with Walter Pintos Risso in the 1980s. Nevertheless, his biggest bond was with Uruguayan architect and landscape designer Leandro Silva Delgado, an almost unknown creator who worked in Burle Marx’s studio and later settled in Europe but remains ignored locally (FERNANDEZ GÓMEZ, 2019).

This study will look into and attempt to reconstruct and interpret Burle Marx’s designs in the context of some proposals by García Pardo and Pintos Risso. What was the initial bond between Burle Marx and García Pardo? They may have met through Brazilian architect Rino Levi, who was a juror, together with García Pardo, in the 1955 tender for Preliminary Designs for the Banco Hipotecario building in Montevideo (MEDERO, 2012). Levi had worked with Burle Marx in Brazil in projects such as Olivo Gomes’ house and the Prudencia building. However, we should consider that García Pardo was a delegate for Uruguay’s Architecture Society at the Architects Congress in São Paulo in 1954. One year before, in 1953, García Pardo—who had studied film-making in Argentina—had shot a documentary titled Arquitectura Moderna Brasileña (Modern Brazilian Architecture) in Brazil (LOPEZ DE HARO, 2016).

---

1 According to Rafael Lorente Mourelle and Diego Capandeguy, interviewed for this paper in 2021.
2 PARDO, Luis García. García Pardo’s Curriculum Vitae. [192-]. García Pardo Archive – Facultad de Arquitectura, Diseño y Urbanismo.
3 Film unavailable during the drafting of this study.
Burle Marx and García Pardo worked together on the Gilpe and Positano buildings in Montevideo. Both were middle-aged creators, with parallel careers and visions of modern art. Such a bond would become stronger during García Pardo’s move to Brazil in 1973. Conrado García Ferrés (García Pardo’s son) remembers that the Uruguayan architect was a regular visitor at the Burle Marx site in Rio de Janeiro in this period (SEGAWA; SUZUKI; 2021).

**THE GILPE: AN ABSTRACT DESIGN AS A WHOLE**

The Gilpe building is a residential project in the Pocitos neighborhood of Montevideo, curiously located on Brasil Avenue. It was one of the first residential high-rise buildings in the city. The project was developed between 1952 and 1953 and completed by 1956. According to García Pardo’s personal archive, the intervention by the Brazilian landscape designer took place at the end of this process. It was commissioned by a local businessman and it was meant as the roof of the market property for people with refined taste.

Four design strategies may be highlighted

1) The abstraction of the building located between low discreet neighboring constructions. Its open floor plan consists of two buildings with glazed panels on one side, white common walls, and levels joined by a circulation space. The square is the organizing pattern in the plan and façade. The building “breaks with the street line” making an abstract statement. From the main glazed frontage protrudes a battery of large balconies hanging on tensors, which cast shadows and act as poetic licenses. García Pardo organized each apartment in what he called “a perfect functional triangle” private, social, and service areas (MEDERO, 2012, p. 10) (Figure 2).

2) The achievement of a Gesamtkunstwerk. Modern, auteur design of all its elements range from the advertising brochures to the plans, frontage, main door, furnishings (such as its BKF chair), entrance hall with its abstract mural by Uruguayan artist Vicente Martín, back children’s playground by Burle Marx,
and the technological support infrastructures of the building. Such design elements express a modern visuality, by then innovative and very contemporary.

3) Space fluidity on the ground floor, which expands into the back garden, emphasized by the greater height, free-standing pillars, and transparency of the hall.

4) Technological innovation, a sign of symbolic and pragmatic internationalization with wide athermal picture windows (which take up the whole window opening), Otis elevators, telephone lines, individual electric “power” central heating units for each apartment, and an American-style kitchen.

García Pardo (who was also a lithographer⁴, film director, and promotor and remains ignored by historiography) bet on a Gesamtkunstwerk and on conveying the modern imaginary in all spheres, as may be seen in the advertising brochure for the sale of the units.

The brochure is a 16-page A4⁵ offset-printed publication (Figure 3). It was printed prior to the completion of the building since its façade is presented based on photographs of a model. Its graphic design stresses its abstract nature. The brochure contains clear communication, with blocks of text in small-case typography float as graphic shapes in a blank space. The publication is mostly done using black ink while the use of yellow in the background sets off the information. The publication lacks information as to where it was printed or who was in charge of the design. It is thought to have been García Pardo’s own idea. Each page highlights a significant aspect of the building regarding its conceptual changes: volumetry (glass box), residential condominium (new forms of inhabitation and standard floor plans with flexible areas), sophisticated installations (underfloor heating), and an open ground floor (with a recreational garden linking visual arts to landscaping).

---

**BURLE MARX IN THE GILPE: A SPARSELY VEGETATED DRY GARDEN**

Burle Marx’s collaboration in designing the garden of the Gilpe building took place during the planning stage of the project, which emerges from at least two previous sketches for that garden. These antecedents evince Burle Marx’s superlative, adaptive, artistic, and design capacity. The ground floor of the building makes the visual idea of a *Gesamtkunstwerk* apparent, articulating the garden, plastic arts, and modern architectural resources. Visual permeability is made possible from the sidewalk to the back garden. Furthermore, the garden is set back, creating a clear access to the public space, crowned on one side by an extensive abstract mural consisting of simple lines and a constructivist style by Uruguayan plastic artist Vicente Martín (REY ASHFIELD; KUTSCHER; BARRIOLA, 2015). Such a mural had already been sketched in the said advertising brochure.

Unlike the project for the building in the brochure, which underwent no modifications, García Pardo’s archive holds three different designs for the garden. His sketches already show the imaginary of the modern garden in its preliminary stages. One of them represents the architecture as an orthogonal, geometric grid, an allusion to modern “glass boxes.” Below that appears the garden based on curved, rolling, rhythmic lines, which could be associated with the features of Burle Marx’s prior work. To the right –west– of the sketched garden lies an area based on irregular forms meant for children’s activities. At the center of the garden, a space is reserved for planting trees to offer some shade, and in the back lies a rectangular area without any obstacles which, as presented in the next project, was meant as a bocce (bowls) court.

---

⁴Luis García Pardo conducted studies and work in litography in secondary school at the Taller Litográfico de la Fábrica Nacional de Fósforos. PARDO, Luis García. García Pardo’s Curriculum Vitae. [192-]. García Pardo Archive – Facultad de Arquitectura, Diseño y Urbanismo.

García Pardo’s archive holds a 1953 plan of the garden, which shows its elements more clearly: the various zones are maintained as per the previous project but we find fewer of them. Apart from the proposed areas (greenery, kiosk, bocce court, and playground), it incorporates paths which join the various activity spaces and enables people to traverse the whole space. It features local icons, such as vegetable species — white laurels, lemon trees, vines, and prickly pears— and a bocce court (Figure 4).

Burle Marx’ introduced a notable change (Figure 5). It alters the space and conception of the elements comprising the garden, eliminating a design with more innocent characteristics to lend it a personal, modern, international character based on his experience and signature style. He introduces a cultural blending and hybridization between natural and artificial at a small scale, just as he does in his bigger projects (ÁBALOS, 2020, p. 63).

Burle Marx’s proposal for the Gilpe garden is depicted in a wonderful watercolor perspective signed by him and kept at García Pardo’s archive. It portrays a rear common wall with a ceramic mural, garden furniture for children, and the design for the garden, with its areas, flooring, and vegetation (Figure 6).

Burle Marx reorganized the previously proposed components. As a first forceful resource, he placed the live components in the perimeter of the property,

---

6 This perspective features the appearance of the logo “Perspective of the Garden of the Gilpe building – Montevideo. Project: Roberto Burle Marx”. This logo also appears in other works for Brazil by Burle Marx.

unlike what he had done in prior proposals. This creates a central space that assigns zones by using different floorings. It also produces a sole route based on the use of curves, which is characteristic of his projects in those years. This set of paths generates a short walk\(^8\) but, in turn, contains a central sand ring (which ended up being built with grass) that defines two play sectors\(^9\) consisting of forms that may be associated to geometrical shapes in accordance with the design of other garden components. This visual work with shapes is also intensified by the differential use of materials, including local components such as bricks. As with many Burle Marx’s works, the whole of the garden may be appreciated when looking down from the rear balconies. The predominant use of dry components has made it possible for the garden to be preserved substantially to the present.

On the rear common wall (visible from the street), Burle Marx proposes a mural made of vitrified ceramic tiles as a finish. In those days, he had designed and incorporated several murals into his gardens, many of which may be linked to Candido Portinari and to international visual arts movements of the day. For instance, the 1951 house for Moreira Salles, which, with its clear Portuguese influences, could be linked to the human representations of Pablo Picasso’s \textit{Les Demoiselles d’Avignon} (\textit{The Young Ladies of Avignon}), as well as his 1953 tile mural in the Ceppas building, with geometric figures after the Glasgow School.

The ceramic tile mural for the Gilpe building follows this line. It also consists of abstract drawings of geometric figures in primary colors. This could be associated with De Stijl, especially with Piet Mondrian, with lines and blots in primary colors in harmonic compositions. Thus, in one of Burle Marx’s lectures, titled Concepts in Landscape Composition, of 1954, he claimed:

> I can explain my approach to art in great measure in terms of what happened to my generation when the artists were hit by the impact of cubism and abstraction. The juxtaposition of the plastic traits of these esthetic movements and natural elements created the attraction towards a new experience. (BURLE MARX, 1954, p. 88)\(^{10}\)

These surfaces with abstract drawings in murals became Burle Marx’s signature (DOHERTY, 2018).

In this biographical, cultural mood, Burle Marx also seems to design the playground\(^{11}\), made up of several planes in primary colors.

No information is available regarding the definition of the type of vegetation used in the garden. Burle Marx, in a letter addressed to García Pardo in 1956, stated:

> I am finishing the list of plants for the garden project in your building and I will send it as soon as possible. My trip to Puerto Rico and Venezuela forced me to be absent from my studio for over a month, so that I have fallen behind with work. That’s why I am so sorry for not having honored my promise, which I hope will not be an impediment to your work. (BURLE MARX, 1956, p. 1)\(^{12}\)

\(^{8}\) Interviewed for this study in 2022, García Ferrés (Luis García Pardo’s son and a resident in Brazil) remembers that, during his childhood at the Gilpe building, children used such paths as a bicycle track.

\(^{9}\) García Ferrés points out that these areas were used as a basketball court and skating rink.

\(^{10}\) In Roberto Burle Marx Lectures, Landscape as art and urbanism, 2018.

\(^{11}\) The proposal for the playground is a curious one as it strays from Roberto Burle Marx’s work. It is worth wondering whether this piece was designed solely by him.

\(^{12}\) Burle Marx, Roberto [Letter] addressee García Pardo, at his studio on San José street, Montevideo. September 1956. 1 page. García Pardo Archive, Documentary center 2258/27, IH, FADU, UDELAR.

Burle Marx and García Pardo worked together again for the Positano building, also located in Pocitos, which the latter built together with architect Sommer Smith. The design stage was a long process spanning 10 years, from 1950 to 1959. The building was finally completed in 1963 (LÓPEZ DE HARO, 2016, p. 191). Three stages are identifiable in this period, during which various studies and modifications are conducted based on regulation changes, different structural proposals, and design explorations.

García Pardo states in so many words that the author of the garden in the Positano building is Burle Marx. In his curriculum vitae, under the category “Works of art integrated to architecture,” he states: 1961. “POSITANO” apartment building on the corner of Ing. Ponce and Charrúa […] Front garden design by painter and landscape designer Roberto Burle Marx.

García Pardo’s mentioned design strategies are reinforced in the Positano. They are:

1) The abstraction of the whole with a pure, transparent ten-store prism on pillars on an irregular plot with both its main frontages dressed in athermal glazing and containing an air chamber. Its purity and misalignment with the street line contrasts with the neighboring eclectic-historicist constructions. A structural and material building tectonics could be posited which reinforces such abstraction (Figure 7).

2) The achievement of a Gesamtkunstwerk, in which complementations and visuals and modern iconographies of different arts are intensified through the participation of local and international artists who participated in the project in various aspects of its landscape and visual arts, as will be addressed below.

3) The spatial fluidity of the ground floor, permeating the garden through that space of the building.

4) Technological innovation, with a structural proposal performed by state-of-the-art engineers, such as the Dieste y Montañez Studio at first, and Leonel Viera, who adjusted the project. Its innovative structure concentrates weight loads on large reinforced concrete pillars that delimit the service areas at the core of the structure to free its perimeter.

Regarding the garden, conceived as a micro-landscape, García Pardo, with his previous experience at the Gilpe, summoned agronomist Pablo Ross in 1958 to be in charge of a preliminary plan for the outer spaces.
on the ground floor\(^\text{15}\). This expert, one of the first Uruguayan landscape designers, was a member of the Instituto de Diseño de la Facultad de Arquitectura (Design Institute of the School of Architecture). The García Pardo Archive has preliminary plans for the garden as made by Ross.

Some years later, Burle Marx joined the project and contributed with his design for the garden at the Positano. His participation originated, according to Ross, from an exhibition of the landscape designer’s work, organized by Brazilian authorities at the School of Architecture. García Pardo, who wrote the introduction to the brochure of that exhibition (MEDERO, 2012), acted as the host of the Brazilian artist and a group of personalities, such as Jorge Páez Vilaró. Ross remembers that:

Burle Marx brought these big drawers, more like small containers, full of live plants. Tillandsia aeranthos and color plants. Indeed, he was a colorist when it came to plants as well. (TUJA, 2018, p. 125)\(^\text{16}\)

This exhibition had been presented in Buenos Aires before.

**BURLE MARX AT THE POSITANO: A GARDEN AS A SUBTLE TAPESTRY**

As remembered by Ross\(^\text{17}\), Burle Marx makes a quick sketch on a napkin during Burle Marx’s aforementioned visit to Montevideo. Ross himself would be in charge of executing it later. No other documents or writings by Burle Marx or García Pardo have been identified\(^\text{18}\). However, García Pardo’s archive contains two articles from the Uruguayan newspaper *El País* dated 1963, one of which is signed by María Luisa Torrens, a renowned art critic with this newspaper.

The first article, published in March 1963 is short and forceful in presenting the Positano as “an example of beauty, akin to the concerns of the day and adjusted to the most strict and modern artistic concepts.” The second article, from May 20 of the same year, is more extensive and is titled “Five Artists Team Up in a Work of International Worth,” in which a group of local and Brazilian creators is mentioned. The former included architects Luis García Pardo and Sommer Smith and sculptor Germán Cabrera and the latter, Italian painter Lino Dinetto and landscape designer Burle Marx (Figure 8).

---


\(^{16}\)Ibid.

\(^{17}\)Ibid.

\(^{18}\)Access to Burle Marx’s Archive in Brazil was impossible during the drafting of this study.
The article claims that flowers play a key role in Burle Marx’s work by their color and contribution to forming planes as they move and interact with the architectural and sculptural space (TORRENT, 1963a).

This proposal was based on the repeated use of six different species to create rhythms. The project consisted of

[…] some drawings with curved lines, in turn, the lines continued into straight-line prolongations with some orthogonal and other round sectors… it was freehand. He did it in front of me. (TUJA, 2018, p. 125).

In Torrent’s opinion, Burle Marx incorporated a decisive local factor by opting for an orthogonal design for the garden:

Roberto Burle Marx himself, distinguished Brazilian architect and garden designer, often baroque in his compositions dominated by curves, tries to hold back that tendency charged with dynamism and movement by combining curves and rectangular elements in such a way as to adapt the garden to the national idiosyncrasy, more temperate than that of tropical Brazil. (TORRENT, 1963b)

The press article and its three photographs are another manifestation of the modern iconography they wished to convey, in which modern visuals evidently go beyond mere architecture. These images show a stark volume in its urban context. The sculpture by Germán Cabrera, a pioneer of oxidation metallurgy in contrast with the technological innovation of the glass pris and a floor plan of Burle Marx’s garden. This, together with a photograph in García Pardo’s Archive, is one of the few extant records of the original work of the Brazilian landscape designer (although it underwent alterations).

The article stresses that Julio Testoni, a renowned photographer, is the author of the photograph that illustrates Cabrera’s work. Famous for his photographs taken at the Maracaná Stadium in 1950, Testoni was part of Collective Grupo 8, formed with the goal of fostering contemporary art through collective interventions with Oscar García Reino and Carlos Páez Vilaró, among others (DI MAGGIO, 2017, p. 128). García Ferrés remembers the artistic discrepancies between Grupo 8, García Pardo’s collective, and other artists such as Jorge Paéz Vilaró (GARCÍA FERRÉS, 2022).

In brief, in the Positano building Burle Marx showed his capacity to adapt to a very specific context with a garden conceived as a subtle tapestry that interacts positively with all the other components of the work.

OPEN INQUIRIES: LINCOLN CENTER, BURLE MARX AS BRAND AND THE GARDEN AS PARK

Burle Marx’s work in Uruguay was not limited to the designs made with García Pardo. Starting in the 1970s, the internationally widely acclaimed artist collaborated in some relevant real estate projects, such as those by architect Walter Pintos Risso at the Punta del Este seaside resort (GAETA, 2001).

The Lincoln Center residential project was presented and promoted by Pintos Risso by means of an article (also published in the El País newspaper) in November 1979. It boasted a surface of 32,000 built square meters and included a garden design by landscape designer Burle Marx. This project coincided again with a much-promoted visit to Punta del Este by the artist as a lecturer.

The bulletin to promote Pintos Risso’s work was published by El País on a Sunday, on which it enjoyed its largest circulation. It was aimed at a wider public, rather than being a product for a small, cultured elite.

22This project and photographs of Burle Marx with Pintos Risso also appeared in Revista Arquitectura, v. 980, n. 248, p. 20-28.
It is a publication in color and has the same format as the newspaper, exhibiting the name of Burle Marx on its cover as the author of the landscape design. His name acts as a brand, appropriating the connotations of high quality that comes with the prestige gained through his career. Perhaps this garden, whose dimensions resemble those of a park, constitutes the stigma of distancing himself from the avant-garde, experimental ambition of the total design of his collaborations with García Pardo, which cuts through architecture, landscape design, and visual communication. All of which would require further inquiry.

A PRELIMINARY BALANCE

The work and influence of Burle Marx in his wider collaborative work within a sensitivity and culture of modern design is an open topic in Uruguay’s historiography. Particularly in García Pardo’s designs, visual communication and architecture are a part of his conviction in Gesamtkunstwerk. No references to this notion have been found yet in the few writings and interviews with García Pardo, but it is a question open to exploration.

It is in this context that it is necessary to frame Burle Marx’s interventions, such as the sketches of his gardens for the Gilpe and Positano buildings in Montevideo. Gaining future access to Burle Marx’s archives in Brazil could shed some light on the matter. Another open subject is the recognition that, also in Uruguay, Burle Marx’s work and his landscape design project in general have been regarded as secondary to his as architectural design, as has been the case in Brazil (POLIZZO, 2019). Could all these collaborations and intrusions of landscape design, artworks, and modern...
furnishings into architecture operate as modern visuals as a whole, expressed in the signed advertising brochures or in the photography of the day?
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