

MULTIFUNCTIONAL CULTURAL CENTERS IN “ARHITECTURA R.P.R.”/ “ARHITECTURA” REVIEWS

Ioana Cătălina VĂRZARU¹

ABSTRACT:

THE STUDY IT IS BASED ON RESEARCHING THE FONDS OF THE FORMER MAGAZINE “ARCHITECTURA R.P.R.” (AFTERWARDS KNOWN AS “ARHITECTURA”)², THE ISSUES BETWEEN 1952 AND 1992. THE PUBLICATION IS THE ONLY ARCHITECTURE PERIODICAL DEDICATED TO THE PUBLIC AND REACHEABLE IN THE COMMUNIST ROMANIA, REPRESENTING THE MAIN SOURCE FOR PROJECTS AND STUDIES CARRIED OUT IN THE COMMUNIST AGE. IN THIS RESEARCH AND INVENTORY, THE MAIN ISSUE WAS DEFINING THE TERMS THAT DESCRIBE THE CULTURAL PROGRAM IN ATTENTION OF THE FUNCTION OF CULTURAL CENTERS. IN THIS WAY, I WILL CRONOLOGICAL LIST THIS NAMES IN ORDER TO REACH A BETTER INSIGHT.

KEY WORDS: YOUTH HOUSES, COMMUNIST REGIME, CULTURE, ARCHITECTURE

INTRODUCTION

In Romania, the idea of leisure has been found in people's lives since the beginning of times. Handicraft evening sitting, followed by various workers' circles, and then the coteries formed amongst intellectual communities - are just few examples that have preceded and actually led to the emergence of these houses of culture.

As a response to the necessity of culture among the majority of the population, a new programme appears – the Club, which will be the place of holding for numerous ways of spending free time. For this reason, its location should be close to the central area of the settlement, in the most favorable position, surrounded by gardens and parks - as part of joint activities that were also held outdoors (theater performances, bees, festivals and other events). From an ideological standpoint, they had to express a new content, socialist and to combine popular artistic traditions harmoniously with advanced technical achievements.

In urban areas, it is a noted concern amongst architects to create a relatively open interior spaces, so as the rooms can work together.

Also, these establishments become very important and having many functions such as becoming a civic center, having administrative functions, commercial or hotelier functions. All in all there were not the cultural establishments that they ought to be, even becoming simple ideological instruments. Due to the high demand of these centers the solution that was

¹ PhD.cand., Ion Mincu University of Architecture and Urbanism Bucharest, Romania, catalina86v@gmail.com.

² The first issue appears in 1906. The publication didn't appear constantly, the periodicity being mutable depending on the financial availabilities of the Architects Union R.S.Romania.

found was to build generalized projects which in time led to monotony and the depersonalization of the centers.

The program of Youth Houses first appeared on the initiative of Professor architect Emil Barbu Popescu, initially as a subject in school for designing “Neighborhood equipment and leisure centers” and then as a guide/ regulation for different “Youth facilities”³ (with the inspiration “Foyer de la Jeunesse”). This was the design theme for “Youth Houses” sent to U.T.C. (Communist Youth Union) led by Nicu Ceaușescu who coordinated, among other things, these constructions. The first building of this type is Youth’s Athenaeum in Reșița.

The freedom that young architects had in the design of the house was a brave start to practice the profession because there is a direct link between designers and users, without passing through advisory committees or other state institutions imposing financial restrictions. One thing that proves the importance of this liberty is the recognition among co-architects of the qualities these architectural projects had. In *Arhitectura* magazines, almost all Youth Houses are mentioned. Moreover, a part of them were awarded by the Union of Architects of SRR, the most representative being the one in Slatina, which received the Special Prize of the City Kardjali, Diploma of Honor and Silver Medal at Interarch '87, Sofia – Bulgaria, as well as the Union of Architects Award in 1986.

The archive of projects worked by C.U.A.S.C.-C.U.B. (Council of Architects' Union of Communist Students - University of Bucharest Center) where they made most of these projects, disappeared in 1986. So, at the moment, there is no clear evidence of this type of program.

As that period coincided with the fall of communism, many projects were never to be executed, while others were not completed. For example, the Youth House in Brașov which was begun before the 90s was decided to be demolished because of various disagreements regarding its location and volumetry.

Another example is in the case of the one in Giurgiu, construction designed in the middle of the '80s but remained unfinished because of the fall of the communist regime and was abandoned in the state of structure.

GENUS PROXIMUM

In the beginning of 20th century, the need for rural inhabitants to socialize is striking. Therefore, in some areas, public appear buildings such as National Houses⁴. With minimal functions, answering the needs of citizens, the building were responding to some characteristics of their social life. An good example is the one put by Cosma Jurnov in his book *Arhitectura centrelor multifuncționale* (The Architecture of multifunctional building): in Băbșa, Timiș county, there was big hall in which you could design a stage with a capacity of 100-120 seats and a smaller room used as a library or a rehearsal room.

A new program is the Club⁵ one, developed for the first time in Soviet Union as an effect of the cultural needs of „working” masses. In this way, the first project was displayed in the *1st-2nd issues of 1952*, the Cămpina Club, designed in 1951, „dedicated for working masses from Campina” and which contains o multifunctional room (conferences, shows, cinematography) with a 500 seats capacity and a room for various „political-social” activities (lecture assembly, chess, table tennis, library, etc.). The article displays in details information about the Club’s function, emplacement, finishing and the exterior architectural design, inspiration for the facade’s treatments, also the constructive system. The big quantity of works in this field requires the decision of typifying the projects for clubs by their type

³ These were divided by category, with or without accomodation, with or without club.

⁴ Case Națională (rom.)

⁵ Clubul (rom.)

(syndical, districtal) and by the hall's capacity. This thing has been decided by C.C.S. (Central Council of Unions) and by C.S.A.C.⁶ (State Committee for Architecture and Constructions) which, in 1953 draws up the „Normative for Club's planning”; normative which establishes rules for issues such as interior dimensions and the functional sketches. In the fourth issue from 1954, the study for a typified project of a Syndical club which answers to an adaptability requirement, and thanks to a symmetrical view of the volume, this would be able to successfully maintain a high posture. Functionally speaking, the club is divided into two sectors: entertainment and activities.

References for Cultural hostel⁷ appear in *8th issue of 1954*, in an article about the urban planning for working masses, in which are described various urbanism analysis for possible approaches of habitation ensembles established in the proximity of industrial centers, in progress or fresh-new designs „for medium-quality accommodation for working masses”. Therefore, besides the habitation area, there is a space dedicated to the public services (shops, a club, daycare, kindergarten, school, sports, medical centers), as interest points in the community. The farmost important service is the club or the Cultural hostel which represents the center of cultural life of the entire area, being given the most favorable position. The club activity doesn't take part only inside the building. There is an outside space as well with outdoor cinematic projections, festivities and sports activities. That's why, the club has to be surrounded by gardens, parks, sport fields, which allows this kind of activities; a settlement that doesn't take notice of these necessities is wrong and inadequate. The typifying problem began to be highly-discussed between architects, so, the big quantity of articles⁸ that approaches this subject is distinguished, not as far the function is concerned. The *4th-5th issue of 1956* and the *3th issue of 1968* are actually referring directly to this problem. In the *5th issue of 1956*, the *Plenara a VI-a a Uniunii Arhitecților* (The 6th Meeting of Union of Architects) is discussing the insufficient “assortment” of clubs and hostels.

The *6th issue of 1960* presents the winning projects of the typified projects for Cultural hostel with 300 seats, Cultural hostel with 400 seats and District's cultural center⁹ with 400 seats; the last one being given the urban placement. There is however an exception; District center and Cultural hostel with 400 will have a show hall which will not host any other activities besides meetings. The old-fashioned show hall hosted events such as reunions and dances, but in time the furniture was being deteriorated and the evacuation conditions were not being suitable for such activities. Thus, it was considered that the meeting hall should be paired with the lounge, and that the event room should only host events. Thence, the criteria for architectural plastic and the spatial relation between interior functioning and the exterior background were appreciated. However, there was a special attention for the solving of disjointed access for the hall and club.

⁶ C.S.A.C. also deal with coordination, guidance and the practical pursuit of the typified projects for planning the social-cultural buildings; potency given by I.S.P.O.R. (Institute for Planning the cities, public buildings and habitation buildings), but also initiating some public contests for typified projects by cultural nature.

⁷ Cămin cultural (rom.)

⁸ I will only list the ones that beared upon the cultural program: *2nd issue of 1955* - Typified projects for social-cultural buildings from the agricultural environment; *4th issue of 1955* - About the typified planning issue; *10th issue of 1955* - Studies for typified projects of Cultural hostels for village, *3th issue of 1956* - Development of the typified projects - The main task in the architectural field; *4th-5th issue of 1956* - Typified projects for social-cultural buildings; *7th issue of 1957* - Typified planning; *6th issue of 1960* - Contest for typified projects for Cultural hostels and District's cultural center; *4th issue of 1962* -Typifying some social-cultural constructions: Cultural houses, Clubs, Cultural hostels; *5th issue of 1965* - Typified planning. Housing and social-cultural buildings;etc.

⁹ Casă raională de cultură (rom.)

Nicolae Vlădescu's¹⁰ Cultural House¹¹ from Mangalia is presented as a final piece of work in *4th-5th issue of 1961*. The design was conditioned by the trapezium silhouette, the declivity of the terrain, the monumental purpose and the marking of the access in relation to the plaza. The main functions are the ones for shows and club. The show hall has 470 seats. The appendages for the cinema (projection cabin, lights, sound, screen deposit) and the theatre (changing booths, showers, costumes, stage property rooms) were taken into consideration. Between 1960-1961, I.S.C.A.S (Institute of Studies and Design in Constructions, Architecture and Systematization) drew up typified projects for Cultural hostel with 400 and 600 seats. In the 4th issue of 1962, improvements of older projects were brought to light through possible constructive, functional and economical solutions. This typified step manages the answer of an „urgent need”, so that after being put into practice, conclusions of efficiency and design could be determined. Thus, conclusions lead to a „new phase” and design institutions accomplish a series of sights: Cultural house from Făgăraș (*6th issue of 1962*), Cultural house from Tulcea (*first issue of 1965*), Cultural house ensemble from Bacău (*4th issue of 1966*), Cultural house for unions from Baia Mare, Cultural House from Sibiu, Cultural house from Alexandria (*first issue of 1970*), Cultural house Vaslui (*3rd and 4th issue of 1971*), Cultural house for unions from Oradea, Cultural house from Suceava, Cultural house from Cîmpulung Moldovenesc, Syndical club in Arad (*3rd issue of 1973*), Cultural house for unions Alexandria, Cultural house for unions Sibiu, Cultural house for unions Ploiești, Cultural house for unions Buzău (*2nd issue of 1974*), Cultural house for unions from Tîrgoviște (*5th issue of 1977*), Cultural house from Alba-Iulia (*4th and 5th issue of 1981*), Cultural house for unions from Constanța county (*3rd issue of 1987*), Cultural house for unions Miercurea Ciuc (*4th issue of 1988*), Cultural house for unions from Colibași Argeș (*2nd issue of 1989*).

In the *5th issue of 1965*, head architect of I.P.C.T. (Institute of Design of Typified Constructions) was presenting his intention of removing negative aspects of typified projects and supporting unique projects from architects¹².

From an organizational point of view, Cultural houses belong to C.S.C.A. (State Committee of Culture and Arts) and syndicalist clubs belong to C.C.S (Central Council of Unions). In the *3rd issue of 1963*¹³, their purpose is defined as „usage of leisure of working people and their families, in a controlled manner, given the option of lifting their cultural, political and professional level. The same issue presents the decision taken by the two involved institutions, of dividing the endowments the following way: the cities with a strong industrial character would have Syndical clubs belonging to C.C.S., other localities would have District's cultural centers belonging to C.S.C.A. and in district capitals or other places with similarities, it is taken into consideration the realization of central cultural units.

¹⁰ In 1976 he's PhD Thesis is being published in withing Ion Mincu Institute of Architecture - *Cultural Youth Houses* and which has nothing to do with the subject of the current work – Youth houses.

¹¹ Casa de cultură (rom.)

¹² A proposed decision would be planning by functional sections with multiple possibilities of assembly and potential partis. Another measure is the liberation of the endorsement of phase P.E.- which means decreasing the time required for endorsement, a bigger independence and granted liability for typified planning, but also for adapted planning.

¹³ Also there are presented a number of principles regarding functions that should be proposed, necessities for a global thinking of the future sistematizations but also insuracing a coherent cultural network. Colaboration with C.S.C.A. constitutes "one of the important premises that will contribute to a solution as judiciously as possible.

Even though the existence of other rehabilitations and redesigns with cultural functions was certain, a single situation from the *5th issue of 1988* is presented – The redesign of Cultural house „Nicolae Bălcescu” of 4th sector in Bucharest¹⁴.

Every two years, the magazine was publishing articles about the ratio between social cultural constructions, trying to express the building power of the state: „An activity with a special constructive breadth, a testimony of our regime for creating the material conditions on the development of higher education; the accomplishment of having student dormitories with canteens, with a considerable level of comfort for future scientific and technical settings” (*4th issue of 1964*); this thing cancels the real needs of architects: „We find it hard to be able to cope with the thought of introducing inadequate materials only because they were accessible on the site; ordinary windows were installed instead of the original heat-absorbing ones, travertine pedestals and metal or wood confections were badly executed, the bathrooms from the accommodation spaces were not following the design, etc.” (*6th issue of 1982*)

DIFFERNETIA SPECIFICA

On the score of the idea contest for Cultural house in Oradea, displayed in *2nd issue of 1967*, architect Aurelia Teodorescu makes a few observations that underlie and announce the show up of the new architectural program. She also casts reflections on the near resemblances between the projects, concerning the activities "established without emplacement concern, not being centered on activities that characterize us as a country, with distinctive development in some regions of our country [...] for instance: ceramics studios, wood manufactory, braids, fabrics or glass manufacture, etc.". Simultaneously, it is noticed the deficiency of the sector that is supposed to ensure the leisure and the communication possibilities, which "suffers a didactic rigidity and doesn't enables a free, spontaneous and open practice". Other required functions are the ones serving sports activities and food services. In *6th issue of 1981*, it is figured the contest for Cultural house of youth¹⁵, organized by Central Committee of U.T.C., which seeks "creativity stimulation with a view to obtain a complete study about the Youth house¹⁶ functions' interrelationship and their optimization in order to achieve some constructions that respond to the multiple requirements dictated by the youth-specific activity dynamics". It has been registered a huge number of participants- over 270; which denotes a will for affirmation and expression about a new cultural program. Still, 46 projects were delivered. On this contest's account, there were many debated topics that were referring to the emplacement, functional freedom versus dictated restrictions, the typifying issue, the functional connections that were established indoor, monumentality versus plain volumes animated by events. This initiative suggests that most of the Cultural houses from cities do not properly answer to the actual needs of the youth. Unlike these, Cultural houses tend to be a place for "social contact" of the youth. The new functional requirements appear in addition to the Cultural house's theme: the educational workshop's diversification and proposed leisure time activities; besides the show hall, a polyvalent hall appears, designed for dinners that require public alimentation zones and that can contact the club zone, the accommodation unity - sector generated by the need for "youth tourism", halls for sport activities including gyms or aerobic, etc. Functionally speaking, a few zones are distinguished: the show sector (organized in multifunctional halls, so that it hosts theatre

¹⁴ Even though the study does not focus on the Bucharest situation, I wanted to make this notice because I think it is appropriate to mention that I have never met, in the magazine, the situation that brings up a reinstatement in the circuit of an existing building by cultural nature.

¹⁵ This article being the only one in the Arhitectura magazine (excluding the other project presentations) that refers to the Youth houses, sometimes comparing them with other Cultural Houses.

¹⁶ Casa tineretului (rom.)

shows, dance shows, music concerts, film screenings, etc.); the cultural-educational sector (covers various applied technology scenes, for hobbies, exhibition spaces, library, etc.); the recreative sector (for games, sport activities and entertaining reunions); also the accommodation unity - that doesn't exist in every project. The freedom that architects enjoyed, functionally, but also aesthetically, proved the need for new architectural expressions in the cultural-buildings field. There were no awards, besides five mentions: 73215 (C. Jurov and E. Jurov), symmetry, proportions, rythm (D. Patriciu), the old building (D. Ștefan), field (P. Curta and A.M. Nicolae), white, pink and pure bud (V. and S. Florea).

Issue number	Name	Architects	Information revealed in the magazine
no. 3/74	CASA TEHNICII – TÎRGU-JIU	arhitecții Emil Barbu Popescu (autor), Daniel Cincu, Nicolae Lascu, E. Ionescu, Petre Ciuta, Ștefan Șteblea, Ion Șerbănescu	- Presentation of the project - Plans, sections, facades - Model
no. 3/74	ATENEU – REȘIȚA	arhitecții Daniel Cincu, Emil Barbu Popescu, stud. arh. Ștefan Olaru, Mariana Paxino	- Presentation of the project - Plans, sections, facades - Model
no. 4/80	CASA TINERETULUI – TIMIȘOARA	-	The Union of Architects Awards 1978 - Mention
no. 5/82	CASA TINERETULUI DIN DROBETA TURNU SEVERIN	arh. Mihai Botescu	The Architects Union Awards 1981- social-cultural constructions field
no. 2/79	BAZĂ TURISTICĂ PENTRU TINERET. CASA ȘTIINȚEI ȘI TEHNICII CLUJ-NAPOCA	Radu Spânu (principal)	- Presentation of the project - Plans, sections, facades - Model
no. 4/86	CASA DE CULTURĂ A ȘTIINȚEI ȘI TEHNICII PENTRU TINERET – CLUJ-NAPOCA	-	The Union of Architects Awards 1985 - Mention
no. 2-3/81	CASA TEHNICII ȘI ȘTIINȚEI IAȘI	Nicolae Porumbescu, Constantin Lepădatu	- Presentation of the project - Plans, sections, facades - Photographies from the site
no. 1/82	CASA TINERETULUI GALAȚI	Emil Barbu Popescu (principal), Petre Ciută, Viorel Simion	- Presentation of the project - Plans, sections, facades - Model
no. 4/86	CASA TINERETULUI – GALAȚI	-	The Union of Architects Awards 1985 - Mention
no. 6/87	CASA DE CULTURĂ A TINERETULUI – GALAȚI	Emil Barbu Popescu, Viorel Simion Colaborator: arh. Mircea Chira	- Photographies completed building
no. 2/88	CASA TINERETULUI GALAȚI	Emil Barbu Popescu, Viorel Simion, Zoltan Takacs, Dorin Ștefan, Mircea Chira.	Nicolae Ceaușescu age. Fast-traking period, modernisations and developement unprecedented of cities all around the country.
no. 3-4/91	CASĂ DE CULTURĂ A TINERETULUI LA GALAȚI	arh. Emil Barbu Popescu, Viorel Simion, Petre Ciută, Mircea Chira.	nominalization
no. 1/	CASA TINERETULUI	Emil Barbu Popescu (principal), Dorin	- Presentation of the project

82	DIN SLATINA	Ștefan, Colaborators: Călin Irimescu, Andrei Molnar, Dana Ștefan, studenții-arhitecți Caius Filimon, Adina Alexiu, Mircea Corcodel, Mihai Crăciun, Ștefan Mantulescu, Laurențiu Samoilă	- Plans, sections, facades - Model
no. 3/ 85	CASA TINERETULUI DIN SLATINA	Dorin Ștefan, Emil Barbu Popescu (principal)	Project in-progress 1979 - 1981
no. 5/ 87	CASA ȘTIINȚEI ȘI TEHNICII PENTRU TINERET SLATINA	Emil Barbu Popescu, Dorin Ștefan	Special Award of Kardajali City, Honorary degree and silver medal, at Interarch 87, Sofia – Bulgaria, The Union of Architects Awards 1986 - award
no. 1/ 88	CASA TINERETULUI DIN SLATINA	-	The Union of Architects Awards 1986- award
no. 2/ 82	CASA ȘTIINȚEI ȘI TEHNICII PENTRU TINERET – RÎMNICU VÎLCEA	Ștefan Lungu, Petre Ciută	The Union of Architects Awards 1986 - award in the social-cultural constructions field
no. 6/ 82	CASA ȘTIINȚEI ȘI TEHNICII PENTRU TINERET DIN RÎMNICU VÎLCEA	Ștefan Lungu Consultant: Emil Barbu Popescu Colaborator: Mariana Fetti	- Presentation of the project - Plans, sections, facades - Photographies completed building
no. 3/ 88	CASA ȘTIINȚEI ȘI TEHNICII PENTRU TINERET – RÎMNICU VÎLCEA	-	Nicolae Ceaușescu age – big architectural and urbanistic achievements
no. 4/ 88	CASA ȘTIINȚEI ȘI TEHNICII PENTRU TINERET – RÎMNICU VÎLCEA	Barbu Emil Popescu, Ștefan Lungu, etc.	-Photography perspective
no. 5/ 84	CASA ȘTIINȚEI ȘI TEHNICII PENTRU TINERET BOTOȘANI	Stelian Morohoi (principal)	- Presentation of the project - Plans, sections, facades - Photographies completed building
no. 6/ 84	CASA TINERETULUI CRAIOVA	Dan Budică (principal), Ștefan Sertis, Bogdana Polizu, Nicoleta Pîrvănescu	- Presentation of the project - Plans, sections, facades - Drawn perspectives
no. 2/ 87	CASA ȘTIINȚEI ȘI TEHNICII PENTRU TINERET DIN CRAIOVA	Dan Budică (principal), Ștefan Sertis, Bogdana Polizu, Nicoleta Pîrvănescu	- Presentation of the project - Plans, sections, facades - Photographies completed building
no. 6/ 84	CASA TINERETULUI DIN ORȘOVA	Ion Giurcă (principal), Nicolae Ispas, Gabriel Bălan, Gabriela Crețu, Marian Diaconu	- Presentation of the project - Plans, sections, facades - Model
no. 1- 6/ 90	CLUB STUDENȚESC LA BRAȘOV	Emil Barbu Popescu, Dorin Ștefan Team: Dorin Ștefan, Dan Marin, Mircea Corcodel, Mihai Eftimie, Colaborators: Mihai Opreanu (exteriors), stud. arh. Horia Reit, Codrin Tritescu, Adrian Gîndilă, Dana Dobrescu, tehn. Eugen Fugaciu, Ioan Stefiuc	- Presentation of the project's status - Model
no. 5- 6/ 91	CASA STUDENȚILOR DIN BRAȘOV - EPILOG	Designed: D.S. Birou de Arhitectură – București (Dorin Ștefan, Teo Stancu, Vlad Vrejoiu, Alexandru Cișmigiu, Dragoș Badea, Dan Baci, Călin Ștefănescu, Mariana Andreescu)	- Presentation of the project's status - Plans, sections, facades - Model

In the chart there are listed, sorted by the appearance's date, the Youth houses from Romania that have been presented in the *Arhitectura* magazine, issues between 1952 and

1992; with indications referring to the number of the publication, the name appearing in the title, the architects and information about the written presentation and/or drawn found in the article.

Even though the topic of the study isn't the city of Bucharest, the Touring Complex for Youth - Lacul Tei¹⁷ should be reminded, planned within C.U.A.S.C.-C.U.B., displayed in *1st issue of 1981*, and which had been listed for The Union of Architects Awards 1980, social-cultural constructions field. Not all the projects for Youth houses had been presented in *Arhitectura* magazine, among the unmentioned ones are Youth houses from: Brăila, Cîmpina, Ploiești, Balș, Zalău, Baia Mare, Oradea, Giurgiu. Some of them remained at the drawn stage. Others suffer a *decrepit condition or functional obsolescence of many public buildings repels any sympathy, while others linger as relics of a past epoch, awaiting (self-) demolition*.¹⁸

CONCLUSION. NOTICES ON THE SCORE OF THE ANALYSIS

- It should be appreciated the strictness wherewith there were presented the projects for the studied cultural objectives between 1960 and 1970, fact that begins to attenuate by the end of the date. On the other hand, there are a few articles that should be mentioned: in *6th issue of 1982* – the story of Youth's Science and Technology House¹⁹ from Rîmnicu Vîlcea and in *1st-6th issue of 1990* and *5th-6th issue of 1991*- the debate about the Youth house Brașov, project that was declined by C.N.M.A.S.I. (National Commission of Monuments, Ensembles and Historical Sites).

- Also, I am pointing out the critical attitude - critical view that is missing from the nowadays romanian speciality magazines, of the articles that refer to typifying the buildings, furthermore, the interest that architects show for clueing and clarifying this situation.

- Because some of the projects are displayed in more issues, often in different stages of planning, it is hard to establish which are the real authors of the constructions. This common law is caused, probably, by the many people from planning institutions involved in the project.

- Referring to the name of "Youth Houses"²⁰, according to the list previously displayed, this varies - Youth's Athenaeum, Cultural house of youth, Technical Sciences House, Touring Complex for Youth, etc.

- Another remark about the cultural centers presented in the pages of the magazine is that rarely there are correlated the groups with other types of functions. For example, the social-cultural and commercial center of Țiglina 1 Galați neighborhood, from *6th issue of 1963*, has commercial unities, public alimentation, population services, management of the district, cinematography with 800 seats, clubs and exhibitions, and a district library.

¹⁷ Complexul turistic pentru tineret (rom.)

¹⁸ Zahariade, Ana Maria - *Architecture in the communist project, Romania 1944-1989*

¹⁹ Casa științei și tehnicii pentru tineret (rom.)

²⁰ În no.3/1959 is succinctness presented the project for "casa tineretului la pitesti"- appellation that does not refer to the "casele de tineret" upkept by U.T.C.;the building being more of a "camin cultural"

REFERENCES

1. *Arhitectura* magazines, numbers between 1952-1992
2. **Tabacu, Gabriela**; *Revista Arhitectura. Studiu monografic și indici (1906-1944)*, Bucuresti: Humanitas, 2006;

This work was financially supported through the project "Routes of academic excellence in doctoral and post-doctoral research - READ" co-financed through the European Social Fund, by Sectoral Operational Programme Human Resources Development 2007-2013, contract no POSDRU/159/1.5/S/137926.