

## ESPAÇOS DE EXPOSIÇÃO DE LISSTIZKY: a Grande Transição

### [LISSTIZKY'S EXHIBITION SPACES: the Great Transition]

Inessa Kouteinikova

**Resumo:** A contribuição de El Lisstizky para o modernismo foi decisiva em quatro diferentes áreas, as quais devo reconhecer antes de traçar sua vida e contribuição como um designer de exposições. Primeiramente, como pintor, sua criação do conceito de PROUN significando abertura de espaço e um acesso através do qual alcança a arquitetura e o design tridimensional. Em segundo lugar, como um teórico visual da arquitetura construtivista, e inventor de uma das mais dinâmicas invenções da área, o Skyhood. Em terceiro lugar, como o principal tipógrafo e ilustrador do Construtivismo, criador de um novo tipo de livro, no qual o conceito do design assumiu a apresentação da comunicação, com acesso simultâneo a todas as páginas, de modo que o livro se tornasse um tipo de objeto-PROUN. Em quarto lugar, e o menos discutido, como realizador de um novo tipo de arte na forma de um espaço de exposição *total*, pioneira nos seus quartos-PROUN e aplicadas nas suas exposições de propaganda Soviética e industrial na Alemanha, entre 1927-1930.

**Palavras-chave:** Espaço de exposição, design de exposição, abstração, supremacia.

**Abstract:** El Lisstizky's contribution to modernism was decisive in four different areas, which I should note before going on to trace his life and contribution as an exhibition designer. Firstly, as a painter, by his creation of the PROUN concept as a means of opening up space and an access through which to reach architecture and 3-dimensional design. Secondary, as a visual theoretician of constructivism architecture, and inventor of one of its most dynamic inventions, the Skyhook. Thirdly, as Constructivist's foremost typographer and illustrator, creator of new kind of book, in which the design concept took over the whole presentation of communication, with simultaneous access to all the pages, so that the book itself became a kind of PROUN-object. Fourthly, and the least spoken - as the realiser of a new kind of art in the form of the *total* exhibition space, pioneered in his PROUN-rooms and applied in his exhibitions of Soviet propaganda and industry in Germany between 1927-1930.

**Keywords:** exhibition space, exhibition design, abstraction, suprematism.

Precisely the last two roles of architect and exhibition designer which combine the most important mission Lisstizky took upon himself as a translator and mediator of space, a role of absolute necessity for the future's fertility. So that we might call Lissitzky a configuring Mercurius for his work telescoped the virtues of Hermes, spirit

of crossroads and messages. He is a guide to the spatial labyrinth of the Orpheus and Eurydice.

In his early article called “Discovery of Lisstizky”, Pierre Rouve, referred to Lisstizky as St. Paul of Geometry. And so he remains with us, an Apostle, who preached Gospel of Supremacist Purity and a dreamer, who believed that art must “transform Emptiness into Space”. This was natural and inevitable: Lisstizky’s dream was not to refurbish art, but to remold life.

The modernist designer known to the world as El Lisstizky was born in the small town of Pochinok near Smolensk of Central Russia in 1890, into a Jewish family. When he died fifty one years later from tuberculosis, he was one of the last surviving member of the UNOVIS movement in Vitebsk and a visionary follower of Malevich. Swept up in the most momentous events of the twentieth century, including World War One and the Russian Revolution, his short life was punctuated by dislocation, innovation, commissarship and curatorship.

By the time he was fifteen Lisstizky had produced a revolutionary almanac illustrated with his drawings in the style of Mikhail Vrubel. There were two handwritten copies and it was his first book design. Mikhail Vrubel and Russian folk art were Lissitsky’s first inspirations, but he began to have doubts about being a painter and when the Petrograd Academy refused him entrance because of his Jewishness, Lisstizky decided to concentrate on architecture and left for Germany to study.

One may assume that Constructivist architectural movement seemed to spring from nowhere on account of the absence in Russia of any progressive architects corresponding to the generation of August Perret or Peter Behrens. And so it is not surprising that Lissitzky should have chosen Germany, where there was a great architectural debate going on. In 1909 he enrolled at the Technische Hochschule at Darmstadt. During these years, the department was a major cultural center and where the Art Nouveau Magazine *Deutsche Kunst Decoration* was published. An artist’s colony, in some ways prefiguring Bauhaus, had been established there by the Grand Duke Ernst-Ludwig of Hesse, and architects such as Peter Behrens and his wife Lilly

Kramer. Viennese Joseph Olbrich had built houses and exhibition halls there. Another influence that the young Lissitzky would have picked up in Darmstadt would have been that of Aubrey Beardsley (1872-1898), whose graphics were suffused with Japanese, decadent and erotic imagery, drawn from the British Aesthetic movement and Art Nouveau and expressed the mystical union of man and nature (like Beardsley, Lissitzky died early from tuberculosis) In the summer of 1911 Lissitzky went on a visit to Paris to Osip Zadkin, and on his way back he paid a visit to Henry van de Velde (1863-1957), the Belgian architect in Brussels. Van de Velde was extremely influential in Germany at that time, but he was also one of the few contemporary western architects to have built in Russia. He designed the staircase and interior for the Art Collector Sergei Shchukin in Moscow especially to house Matisse's *La Dance*.

The following summer, 1912, Lissitzky toured Italy, but rather like Paul Klee, what impressed him was the Romanesque, the very architectonic Italy of Pisa and Ravenna (ill.), the primitive painters such as Cimabue, Giotto, Ucello, who were closest to the Russian icon masters such as Andrei Rublev and Feofan Grek, and who for the first time reconsidered the spatial principles of compositions.

In 1914 he had returned to Russia to complete his training, but by this time, building work has practically stopped and in fact he got his first job in 1916, with the Pushkin Museum laying out the exhibition of the Egyptian department. This experience set a precedent for Lissitzky, and in fact he was never able to see any of his architectural projects built at all.

The other artistic outlet that Lissitzky exploited at this time was that of book illustration. Between 1917 and 1919 he produced a series of Yiddish picture books. One of the first was made in a limited edition in the form of an old Torah Scroll, and painted in watercolor Art Nouveau style. Later the same year he produced a story called "The Kid" in colored lithographs, this time in a manner probably resembling Wassily Kandinsky, who was the most famous Russian artist in Germany before the war and who was now back in Moscow. Lissitzky's style changed again in 1919 when Marc Chagall invited him to come and teach at the Art School that he had established

at the Jewish town of Vitebsk in the Western Belorus'. The illustrations he produced at this time continue the characteristic mystic Jewish Expressionism, but now with a completely Cubist approach to Space, take up from Chagall. However, the lettering is still set in a separate, orthodox fashion disconnected with the picture.

It was at that time that one of these incidents occurred, which illustrate that struck of ruthlessness, which seem to have characterized the radical wind of the Russian avant-garde. It was the sort of stroke, which eventually eliminated all the alternative modernisms in Russia save that of Constructivism. In 1919 Lissitzky invited Kazemir Malevich to teach at the Vitebsk Art School, and in fact it must have seemed that they had much in common (ill.). But Malevich was a notorious *mystagogue*, whose doctrine in art implicitly declared all other kinds to the obsolete. So when Chagall returned from a visit away from the School one day, he found himself deposed and Malevich in his place as the leader of an entirely new kind of school (WULLSCHLAGER, 2008), which was now called UNOVIS ("Affirmers of the New Art") and political revolution that had just happened. It was to be a purely Supremacist establishment, dedicated to leaving all partially modern forms of art far behind. What part Lissitzky had in this *coup*, we don't know for sure. He certainly was a complete supporter of the Bolshevik revolution, and the previous year he had designed a flag, which had been carried in procession on May Day across Moscow's Red Square. Nevertheless, for a man with his obvious sensitivity towards a traditional Jewish culture and imagery, the arrival of the charismatic Malevich must have had the shock of terrific crises of commitment. It was the pain of being absolutely modern, and necessity, as Rimbaud also put it, "is making oneself a visionary, a seer". Some of the strain and drama of this moment comes out of this biographical note Lissitzky wrote in 1928:

"In 1918 there flashed before my eyes the short circuit which split the work in two. This single blow pushed the time we call the present like a wedge between yesterday and tomorrow. My efforts are now directed towards driving the wedge deeper. One must belong on this side or on that - there is no midway." (LISSTZKY-KUPPERS, 1980).

In the event, the impact of Malevich on Lisstizky seems to have been wholly positive, and the results are best shown in Lisstizky’s final illustrated book from this period – “*Pro Dva Kvadrata*” (“The story of Two Squares”, ill.) for children, drawn up in 1920 and published in Germany in 1922<sup>1</sup>. He wrote of it in his essay “Typographical facts”:

In this tale of two squares, I have set out to formulate an elementary idea, using elementary means so that children may find it a stimulus to active play and grown-ups enjoy but as something to look. The action unrolls like a film. The words move within the fields of forces of the figures as they act: there are squares. Universal and specifically plastic forces are bodied further typographically.<sup>2</sup>

The twelfth pages tell the tale of a confused world brought to order and clarity by the impact of two Beneficent squares, Red and Black form outer space. The sequence reads:

Of two Squares, 1920 (outer cover)

Of two squares, El Lisstizky (inner cover)

Dedication: To all, all children.

El Lissitzky. Supremacist Tale of 2 squares in 6 games (title page)

Don’t read, get paper, ruler, and blocks, set them out, paint them, and build.

Here are two squares

They fly onto the earth from far away

And see a Black storm,

Crash - and everything flies apart

And on the black was established Red clearly.

This is the end – let’s go on.

UNOVIS constructed. Vitebsk 1920.

<sup>1</sup> *Russian Modernism*, The Collection of the Getty Research Institute for the History of Art and the Humanities, introduction by Jean-Louis Cohen, Bibliographies and Dossiers, 1997.

<sup>2</sup> See Sophie Lissitzky-Kuppers, *El Lissitzky, life, letters, texts*, Thames and Hudson, 1980.

Lisitzky seems to have used Black to denote everything with inertia and all matter in it, the concrete material on which new reality was to be rebuilt. But Red represented the guiding spirit, the subject matter. It is typical of this period in both Lisitzky's and Malevich's art that they should have invented a symbolic system which both represented the triumph of the revolution and embodied the doctrine of Suprematism. The transformative dimension of Malevich and Lisitzky's work is lost to us today, but it is precisely what so impressed their contemporaries. Few years later, most of Lisitzky's exhibition designs were also executed in two primary colors – black and red.

The “Story of 2 squares” revolutionized Lisitzky's approach to the book design for he went beyond simply illustrating the text and took his aim to the creation of the new book out of the materials of the book itself. The new book designer would not merely decorate the book, but construct it, allowing its purpose and content to determine its structure.

Malevich took over the Vitebsk school in 1919, and it was during that year that Lisitzky painted his first PROUNs. It was also during 1919 that Malevich painted his series of white-on-white pictures and exhibited them at the 10<sup>th</sup> State exhibition in Moscow, and then at the end of the year declared the end of suprematist painting. From Lisitzky's writings, it is clear that he became a complete adherent of Malevich's Suprematist system, in which the work of art ceased being a contemplation of reality, but a new reality itself. The following year of 1920, he wrote an essay entitled “Suprematism in World Revolution”, his major attempt at theory, and shows some signs of awkwardness, but his conviction comes in the same ringing tones as Malevich's. Lisitzky paradoxically accepted both the materialist aesthetics of communism and the absolute spiritualism of Suprematism. At least when he wrote this essay in the 1920, he nevertheless placed the final emphasis on the artistic, not the political revolution as the means to ultimate reality, because he ended the essay with this – “and of communism which set human labour on the throne and suprematism which raised aloft the square pennant of creativity now march forward together. Then

in the further stages of development it is communism, which will have to remain behind because suprematism – which embraces the totality of life’s phenomena – will attract everyone away from the domination of work and from the domination of the intoxicant senses. It will liberate all those engaged in creative activity and make the world into a true model of perfection. This is the world into a true model of perfection. This is the model we await from Kasimir Malevich. After the Old Testament there came the New – after the new the communist - and after the communist there follows finally the testament of Suprematism” (LISSTIZKY-KUPPERS, 1980, p. 331-334).

This was Lisstizky’s most general statement of his artistic philosophy; his later, more technical writings deal with specific issues such as the PROUN (ill.), typography, exhibition rooms and architecture.

It seems clear then that the original inspiration for the PROUN concept was the spatial implication of Malevich’s painting at its absolute in the white surface. Lisstizky wrote, “In the history of the evolution of painting the white surface of the suprematist canvas is the ultimate expression of space”. But this *tabula rasa* seems to have been precisely the point of entry to a new dimension that Lisstizky envisaged for architecture; he expressed it in series of numbers diminishing to zero and building up again, he called it the foundation stone for the new spatial construction of reality, and when he published an essay on PROUNS in *De Stijl Magazine* in June 1922 (p. 113-119) he subtitled the essay “Not world visions, but world reality”. Here he emphasizes that PROUN is not to do with technology but is based on the human economics of order and perception. He writes, “PROUN is the creation of form [control of space] by means of the economic construction of material, to which a new value is assigned” (idem, ibidem). He switches to describe the spectators approach and involvement with the PROUN by recalling “the first stage” of Suprematist painting. “We inspected the 1<sup>st</sup> stages of the two-dimensional space of our structure and found it to be as firm and resistant as the earth itself. We are building here in the same way as in three-dimensional spaces and therefore the 1<sup>st</sup> need here” (idem, ibidem). Six years later in his “Biography” Lissitzky adds:

“The painter’s canvas was too limited for me. The connoisseur’s range of colour harmonies was too restricted; and I created the Proun as interchange station between painting and architecture. I have treated canvas and wooden board as a building site, which placed the fewest restrictions on my constructional ideas. I have used black and white (with flashes of red) as material substance and subject matter. In this manner it is possible to create reality which is clear to all.” (LISSTIZKY-KUPPERS, 1980)

Lissitzky’s twin propensity as book illustrator and designer was ideally matched and so, within a comparatively short period, he produced some of his finest exhibition rooms, which established his reputation as an original designer and curator. It started with an invitation of Alexander Dorner (1893-1957), the innovative director of the Hanover Landesmuseum<sup>3</sup>, who had hoped that Theo van Doesburg would create an original exhibition installation when he commissioned him to design what is now generally accepted as the first permanent gallery for abstract art. Dorner, apparently, was not satisfied with van Doesburg’s scheme of fenestrated wall and transparent mural on which the abstract work would be hung, so he invited El Lissitzky to install a version of the *Raum fur konstruktive Kunst (Room for Constructivist Art)*, which he had installed at the 1926 *Internationale Kunstausstellung (International Art Exhibition)* in Dresden (iil.).

Lissitzky’s abstract art gallery remains the most famous component of Dorner’s grand plan for restructuring the Landesmuseum. When Dorner became director in 1922, the museum was a paradigm of the traditional nineteenth- and early-twentieth-century museum. Housed in what Dorner’s biographer describes as a German Versailles, the galleries were organized according to the conventions of traditional museum practices. Dorner’s plan for the Hanover galleries abandoned many standard museum practices that had dominated Western museology. He did away with symmetrical, salon-style methods and introduced spare, and what were considered “modern,” installations. Traditionally, collections were arranged according to the fashion of contemporaneous connoisseurship and, since the founding of art history as

<sup>3</sup> Viewer-Interactive Installations at the Landesmuseum in Hanover.



a discipline in the late eighteenth century, they were also installed in a more "scientific" manner: that is, chronologically and by schools. Influenced by theories of Alois Riegl--particularly the notion of *Kunstwollen*, according to which culture is envisioned as an organic unfolding of aesthetic spirit--Dorner redesigned the museum's schema and made the collections chronological. Riegl's discussion of *Kunstwollen*, however, begins with classical antiquity and ends with the Baroque. In order to deal with so-called primitive and modern art, Dorner modified Riegl's ideas to conceive the process as infinite: he dissolved Riegl's closed historical framework and expanded the collections to include prehistoric and contemporary art. Dorner also emphasized the historical context of the work in his installations, eventually displaying catalogues in the galleries that outlined the history of Western civilization and ended with the statement: "Understand this art not as a competitor with that of our own age; it is born of quite other conditions, but it goes further in its conception than the previous period. Now, get up and look at the exhibitions."<sup>4</sup>

Dorner's strategy for restructuring the Landesmuseum was to create what he called "atmosphere rooms" that were intended to evoke the spirit of each period and to immerse the visitor, as much as possible, in each specific culture. The Renaissance galleries were white or gray to emphasize the cubic character of the rooms and the period's interest in geometric space and perspective (ill.). One of final stages of this linear history of different epochs was provided by Lissitzky's *Abstraktes Kabinett* (*Abstract Cabinet*), which was constructed in 1927 and 1928. Lissitzky's stated purpose in creating the *Abstract Cabinet* was to do away with the viewer's traditional exhibition experience: "If on previous occasions ... [the visitor] was lulled by the painting into a certain passivity, now our design should make the man active. This should be the purpose of my room." Lissitzky's strategy for achieving this was to design gray walls lined with metal slats (in Dresden they had been wood) that were white on one side and black on the other (ill.) This type of wall surface shimmered and changed color within a spectrum of white to gray to black as the visitor moved through the room.

<sup>4</sup> See Max Arian, *Zoeken & Scheuren, de jonge Sandberg*, 2010.

Lissitzky designed sliding frames containing four works, which could be viewed two at a time. In one corner against two walls was a rectangular sculpture pedestal that was painted black and red. Adjoining this rectangular structure, and next to the wall beneath a window, were table showcases containing four-sided drums that could be rotated by the viewer. Lissitzky had wanted to install a periodically changing electric light system to achieve the white-gray-black effect, but unfortunately no electric conduits were available in the new exhibition complex.

Perhaps more important to the history of the Museum of Modern Art, that MOMA's first curator of architecture, Alfred Barr and Philip Johnson, visited Lissitzky's installation. Barr reflected in the 1950s that "the *Gallery of Abstract Art* in Hannover was probably the most famous single room of twentieth-century art in the world."<sup>5</sup> Johnson, who wrote that "the *Abstract Cabinet* at the Hanover Museum was one of the most vivid memories and most exciting parts of the Weimar Republic", actually appropriated aspects of Lissitzky's techniques in his own installations. But no one's assessment of the project's significance surpassed the artist's. Lissitzky, like Kiesler, saw his exhibition designs as central to his work. In his autobiographical chronology, which was written a few months before he died in 1941, Lissitzky noted, "1926: My most important work as an artist begins: *the creation of exhibitions*. In this year I was asked by the committee of the *International Art Exhibition* in Dresden to create the room of non-objective art."

#### **PRESSE-AUSTELLUNG, COLOGNE, 1928<sup>6</sup>.**

Another exhibition that celebrated the possibilities of photography, but dealt specifically with publishing and the press, was the Soviet section at *Der Internationalen Presse-Ausstellung (International Press Exhibition)*, held in Cologne in 1928 (ill.). This exhibition's historical importance lies primarily in its groundbreaking design. More

<sup>5</sup> See Susan Noyes Platt, *Modernism, Formalism, and Politics: The Cubism and Abstract Art*, Exhibition of 1936 at the Museum of Modern Art, *Art Journal*, vol 47, no 4, Revising Cubism, Winter, 1988.

<sup>6</sup> The Mass Media as the Method and the Message: The Cologne's Pressa Exhibition of 1928.

than any other exhibition of the 1920s, the Soviet pavilion at "Pressa" dramatically introduced exhibition design as a new discipline within the field of visual arts and as an artistic endeavor in its own right. The Soviet pavilion provided what must have been an astonishing new type of public spectacle. Its theme, the history and revolutionary power of the press within the Soviet Union, took the form of a dynamic walk-through stage set that also introduced its audience to new photographic techniques, such as giant photographs and photomontages, and new materials, such as cellophane and Plexiglas. Lissitzky designed the pavilion in collaboration with approximately thirty-eight members of a collective that included artists and graphic, stage, and agitprop designers, among whom were Aleksandr Naumov, Elena Semenova, and Sergei Senkin, who accompanied Lissitzky to Cologne for the installation of the pavillion.

The pavilion was divided into twenty sections, including *The Constitution of the Soviets*, *Trade Unions*, *Lenin as Journalist*, *Censure and Freedom of the Press*, *Worker and Farmer Correspondents*, and *The Reading Room*. These sections contained 227 exhibits produced by the thirty-eight members of the collective as well as a photomural, titled *The Task of the Press Is the Education of the Masses*, created by Lissitzky and Senkin; it was eleven feet high and seventy-two feet long and was divided into sections by red triangular banners (ill). The Soviet pavilion was paradigmatic on a number of levels, the most important being that the installation design itself was a realization of its subject: the power of the new mass media, the new materials, and the new technologies that were moving the Soviet Union into a revolutionary new era.

Lissitzky designed many of the exhibits within the first room; in addition to the photomural he created with Senkin, he created the two central exhibit stands, *The Constitution of the Soviets* and *The Newspaper Transmissions* (ill). The *Transmissions* exhibit took the form of newspaper presses. Examples of Soviet newspapers and posters were mounted on floor-to-ceiling conveyor belts that wrapped around rotating cylinders. The visitor had to walk past the six mechanical transmissions to reach the centerpiece, *The Constitution of the Soviets*, composed of a star-shaped scaffolding studded with six spinning globes, running text, and electric spotlights. According to the

catalogue designed by Lisstzky himself, the ellipse that capped the star represented the Soviet landmass and the six globes signified the six republics, connected by the sentence wrapped around the structure: "Workers of the World, Unite!" Three spotlights on the bottom of the structure magnified its red color and created a dynamic play of shadows on the ellipse's ceiling.

When looking at Lisstzky's exhibition designs and reading his ideas, one wonders why exhibition design's variety of means and powers of communication have been collectively forgotten, for the most part, by the art historical and museum establishment not just in Russia, but in Europe and America. Innovative exhibition design flourished in Europe and the United States from the 1920s through the 1960s, with most experimentations taking place through the 1950s. Herbert Bayer, like Frederick Kiesler, Lilly Reich, El Lissitzky, and Giuseppe Terragani, was one of many artists, designers, and architects who considered exhibition design to be an important aspect--in some cases the most important aspect--of their work. Bayer, who created a relatively modest installation of books for German section of *Pressa*, later described Lissitzky's installation:

A revolutionary turning point came when El Lissitzky applied new-constructivist ideas to a concrete project of communication at the "Pressa" Exhibition in Cologne in 1928. The innovation is in the use of a dynamic space design instead of unyielding symmetry, in the unconventional use of various materials (introduction of new materials such as cellophane for curved transparency), and in the application of a new scale, as in the use of giant photographs. (TUPITSYN, 1999)

While criticizing Lissitzky's plan as somewhat "chaotic" and championing a more organic, flowing, and rational approach to exhibition technique, Bayer nonetheless saw his encounter with Lissitzky's *Pressa* exhibition as a turning point in his artistic career. It was his introduction to the vast possibilities of exhibition technique: "from there I started to think about exhibition design." Like Lissitzky's earlier designs - *Room for Constructivist Art* and *Abstract Cabinet*, the *Pressa* installation implicitly acknowledged the role of the viewer in the creation of meaning by providing a stage-like experience

for the spectator<sup>7</sup>. This was precisely the description Jan Tschichold gave when writing about the success of the Soviet pavilion in 1931: "The room thus became a sort of stage on which the visitor himself seemed to be one of the players. The novelty and vitality of this exhibition did not fail; this was proven by the fact that this section attracted by far the largest number of visitors, and had at times to be closed owing to over-crowding" (JONG, 2008). Lissitzky was awarded a medal from his government in honor of *Pressa's* success.

After *Pressa*, Lissitzky designed the Soviet pavilion for the 1930 *Internationalen Hygiene-Ausstellung (International Hygiene Exhibition)* in Dresden and the Soviet section of the 1930 *Internationalen Pelzfach Ausstellung (International Fur Trade Exhibition)* in Leipzig (ill.), where the techniques developed at *Pressa* were employed. Lissitzky described himself during these years as a "pioneer of the artistic construction of our exhibitions abroad with their new political responsibility." From the late 1920s until his death in 1941, exhibition design in the service of the Soviet political agenda became a primary focus for Lissitzky. Although these exhibitions dealt with the mass media, technology, commerce, trade, and evaluations of the modernization of everyday life, they were constructed mainly as political propaganda. At the beginning of this period, Stalin consolidated his power, instituting the first five-year plan in 1928. In 1932 a resolution dissolving the diverse artistic factions that had been tolerated since the revolution was adopted, and Soviet cultural policy was redirected toward a stringent Social Realism.

Lissitzky's resolute commitment to the Soviet state as it transformed from revolutionary communism to Stalinist totalitarianism raises questions regarding his collaboration with the Soviet government. Unlike Mies van der Rohe, who took an apolitical stance, Lissitzky was an avowedly political individual. Judging from his letters and writings, it seems that Lissitzky's faith in Marxism was unwavering. He saw his exhibition designs as his "political responsibility," and throughout his autobiographical

---

<sup>7</sup> This aspect will be effectively used by Kiesler, Bayer and Moholy-Nage in their designs in the later years.

chronology Lissitzky refers to his service to the state. Whether he was fully aware of the Stalinist atrocities and what was his attitude toward the Soviet totalitarian state are matters not adequately documented and requires more research and exploration.

## REFERÊNCIAS

De Stijl 5, no 8, 1922, 113-19.

JONG, Cees W. **Jan Tschihold, Master Typographer: His Life, Work and Legacy**, Thames and Hudson, 2008.

LISSTIZKY-KUPPERS, SOPHIE. **Lisitzky, El. Suprematism in World Revolution**, in: El Lissitzky: Life, Letters, Texts, 331-34

\_\_\_\_\_. El Lissitzky, life, Letters, Texts, 1980.

JOHNSON, Phillip. **1908-2002, The Getty Research Institute**, Los Angeles, California

TUPITSYN, Margarita. **El Lisitzky: Beyond the Abstract Cabinet**, New Heaven and London, Yale University Press, 1999

WULLSCHLAGER, Jackie. **Chagall: A Biography**, Knopf, 2008.

**SOBRE A AUTORA:** Dr Inessa Kouteinikova is an Amsterdam-based researcher and independent scholar whose focus is Central Asia's arts and culture under the Russian colonial rule and Russian Orientalism. Born in Moscow and trained as an art and architecture historian in New York (Columbia) and Cornell Universities, she spent three years lecturing in Australia and working at the Australian National Gallery. Since 2000 she divides her time between Amsterdam, Moscow and Uzbekistan.