



Study Centre for National Reconciliation

Študijski center za narodno spravo

INTERNATIONAL WORKSHOP

MEDNARODNA ZNANSTVENA DELAVNICA

**SPATIAL POLITICS IN AUTHORITARIAN AND
TOTALITARIAN REGIMES: OPEN QUESTIONS AND NEW
RESEARCH APPROACHES**

**PROSTORSKE POLITIKE V AVTORITARNIH IN
TOTALITARNIH REŽIMIH: ODPRTA VPRAŠANJA IN NOVI
RAZISKOVALNI PRISTOPI**

PROGRAMME AND ABSTRACTS

PROGRAM IN POVZETKI

Ljubljana, 12. 4. 2022

International workshop SPATIAL POLITICS IN AUTHORITARIAN AND TOTALITARIAN REGIMES: OPEN QUESTIONS AND NEW RESEARCH APPROACHES

Mednarodna znanstvena delavnica PROSTORSKE POLITIKE V AVTORITARNIH IN TOTALITARNIH REŽIMIHI: ODPRTA VPRAŠANJA IN NOVI RAZISKOVALNI PRISTOPI

Programme and Abstracts / Program in povzetki

Urednik / Editor: Matic Batič

Tehnični urednik / Technical Editor: Mirjam Dujo Jurjevčič

Založnik / Publisher: Študijski center za narodno spravo

Za založnika / For the publisher: Tomaž Ivešič

Elektronska izdaja dostopna na / Electronic edition available at:

<https://www.scnr.si/mednarodna-delavnica.html>

Ljubljana, 2022

The workshop is organized as part of the project Z6-3222 *Fluid Landscape: Architecture, Identity and Border Space in the Northern Adriatic from 1943 to 1954*, co-financed by the Slovenian Research Agency.

Delavnica je organizirana v okviru projekta Z6-3222 *Fluidna krajina: arhitektura, identiteta in obmejni prostor v severnem Jadranu od 1943 do 1954*, ki ga sofinancira Javna agencija za raziskovalno dejavnost Republike Slovenije.

Katalogni zapis o publikaciji (CIP) pripravili v Narodni in univerzitetni knjižnici v Ljubljani

[COBISS.SI-ID 105325571](https://nuk.ub.uni-lj.si/COBISS.SI-ID/105325571)

ISBN 978-961-7120-04-2 (PDF)

FOREWORD

International Workshop

SPATIAL POLITICS IN AUTHORITARIAN AND TOTALITARIAN REGIMES: OPEN QUESTIONS AND NEW RESEARCH APPROACHES

One of the defining features of the “short 20th century” has been the rise of the authoritarian and totalitarian regimes. Although the differences between many of those authoritarian and totalitarian states have been profound, there were also a number of similarities and common characteristics. One of those was the extensive employment of spatial politics (e. g. building monuments, fostering certain architectural styles, developing new urban spaces etc.) as means of projecting power, expressing values or (re)shaping a new man. One need only think about many building projects undertaken (or projected) by Nazi Germany or the Soviet Union, characterized by their excessive monumentality coupled with classicist architectural aesthetics. However, the spatial politics of totalitarianism was far from exclusively reactionary or monolithic, as it was also deeply connected with new avant-garde forms of architecture and urbanism.

Its complexity, as well as the fact that architectural and urbanist projects continue to shape urban environments and cultural landscape in general until today, has contributed to the fact that this research topic has already drawn much attention from international humanities and social sciences, especially since the 1980s. This rise in interest has been influenced by a simultaneous turn towards cultural history in its variegated forms. As spatial politics occupies a complex point at the intersection of political power, ideology, collective memory and identity formation, it offers a unique research opportunity not only for cultural history, but especially for interdisciplinary research. Scholars have thus extensively studied a number of research topics connected with the field of spatial politics, but most of the existing research remains confined within single national or ideological paradigm. Therefore, there exist a number of detailed studies dealing with, say, the history of architecture and its functionality in Nazi Germany, but not a lot of work studying this topic in a comparative and/or transnational perspective. Furthermore, there are also a number of (newer) research approaches which can be successfully applied to the study of spatial politics in authoritarian and totalitarian regimes, such as the methodology of border studies.

Spatial Politics in Authoritarian and Totalitarian Regimes

The workshop is intended to stimulate new insights in this research topic by bringing together scholars working on those research questions from different disciplinary and methodological perspectives. Workshop themes include (but are not limited to) the following broadly conceptualized interrelated research questions:

- What is the role of (symbolically charged) spatial features in forging collective identities and values? How and why did authoritarian and totalitarian regimes conceptualize, claim and (re)shape (public) space?
- What role did spatial politics have within various authoritarian and totalitarian systems? In what ways did they legitimize the ruling elite and its ideological programme?
- What were the main differences between different authoritarian and totalitarian regimes in the field of spatial politics? How did the role of spatial politics in non-democratic regimes differ from that in democratic societies existing at the same time?
- How did “common people” react to ideological impositions “from above”?
- What role does cultural heritage associated with authoritarian and totalitarian regimes play in contemporary societies? What are the differences between different national and ideological contexts?

Organiser:

Study Centre for National Reconciliation

Organising Committee:

Matic Batič, PhD (Lead)

Tomaž Ivešić, PhD

Damjan Hančič, PhD

PREDGOVOR

Mednarodna znanstvena delavnica

PROSTORSKE POLITIKE V AVTORITARNIH IN TOTALITARNIH REŽIMIH: ODPRTA VPRAŠANJA IN NOVI RAZISKOVALNI PRISTOPI

Ena od najpomembnejših značilnosti »kratkega 20. stoletja« je bil vzpon avtoritarnih in totalitarnih režimov. Čeprav so bile razlike med posameznimi avtoritarnimi in totalitarnimi državami velike, so jih povezovala tudi številne podobnosti in skupne značilnosti. Ena od teh je bila intenzivna uporaba prostorske politike (npr. v obliki gradnje spomenikov, spodbujanja določenih arhitekturnih stilov, gradnje novih urbanih prostorov itd.) kot sredstva za projiciranje moči, izražanje vrednot ali (pre)oblikovanja novega človeka. Dovolj je pomisliti le na številne gradbene projekte, ki sta jih izvedli (ali projektirali) nacistična Nemčija ali Sovjetska zveza, za katere je značilna izjemna monumentalnost v kombinaciji s klasicistično arhitekturno estetiko. Vendar pa prostorske politike totalitarnih režimov še zdaleč niso bile izključno reakcionarne ali monolitne, saj so bile povezane tudi z novimi avantgardnimi oblikami arhitekture in urbanizma.

Kompleksnost, pa tudi dejstvo, da arhitekturni in urbanistični projekti iz tega obdobja še danes marsikje oblikujejo urbana okolja in kulturno krajino nasploh, je pripomoglo k temu, da je ta raziskovalna tema že vzbudilo veliko pozornost mednarodnih humanističnih in družboslovnih ved, še posebej od osemdesetih let 20. stoletja dalje. Do porasta zanimanja za to področje je prišlo pod vplivom sočasnega zasuka h kulturnozgodovinskim raziskavam. Ker prostorska politika zaseda kompleksno točko na presečišču politične moči, ideologije, kolektivnega spomina in oblikovanja identitete, ponuja edinstveno raziskovalno priložnost ne le za kulturno zgodovino, temveč tudi za interdisciplinarno raziskovanje. Znanstveniki so tako že obširno preučevali številne raziskovalne teme, povezane s področjem prostorskih politik, vendar večina obstoječih raziskav ostaja omejena na določen nacionalni okvir ali ideološko paradigmo. Tako obstajajo številne podrobne študije, ki se ukvarjajo npr. z zgodovino arhitekture in njeno funkcionalnostjo v nacistični Nemčiji, a le malo del, ki bi preučevala to tematiko v primerjalni in/ali transnacionalni perspektivi. Poleg tega lahko za preučevanje prostorske politike v avtoritarnih in totalitarnih režimih uspešno uporabimo številne (novejše) raziskovalne pristope, kot je npr. metodologija obmejnih študij.

Delavnica je namenjena spodbujanju novih vpogledov na tem raziskovalnem področju, pri čemer združuje znanstvenike, ki se ukvarjajo s tozadevnimi raziskovalnimi vprašanji iz

različnih disciplinarnih in metodoloških zornih kotov. Teme delavnice vključujejo (vendar niso omejene na) naslednja široko zastavljena in med seboj povezana raziskovalna vprašanja:

- Kakšna je vloga (simbolično nabitih) prostorskih fenomenov pri oblikovanju kolektivnih identitet in vrednot? Kako in zakaj so avtoritarni in totalitarni režimi konceptualizirali, si prisvajali in (pre)oblikovali (javni) prostor?
- Kakšno vlogo je imela prostorska politika v različnih avtoritarnih in totalitarnih sistemih? Na kakšen način je legitimirala vladajočo elito in njen ideološki program?
- Katere so bile glavne razlike med različnimi avtoritarnimi in totalitarnimi režimi na področju prostorske politike? Kako se je vloga prostorske politike v nedemokratskih režimih razlikovala od vloge v sodobnih demokratičnih družbah?
- Kako so se »navadni ljudje« odzivali na ideološka vsiljevanja »od zgoraj«?
- Kakšno vlogo ima kulturna dediščina, povezana z avtoritarnimi in totalitarnimi režimi, v sodobnih družbah? Katere so razlike med različnimi nacionalnimi in ideološkimi konteksti?

Organizator:

Študijski center za narodno spravo

Organizacijski odbor:

dr. Matic Batič

dr. Tomaž Ivešić

dr. Damjan Hančič

PROGRAMME / PROGRAM

PROGRAMME

9.00 – 9.15

Welcome Remarks

Tomaž Ivešić (Director of SCNR)

9.15 – 10.00

Keynote speech:

Borut Klabjan (ZRS Koper): **Space Oddity: Spatial Politics, Social Engagements and the Limits of the State**

10.00 – 11.30

Pavlina Bobič (SCNR): **Nurturing the Mind, Mending the Body: The Body as a Political Space**

Martin Pekár (*Pavol Jozef Šafárik University Košice*): **Analysis of Power Interventions into Public Space as a Tool for Research of Non-Democratic Regimes (Sociological-Historical Approach)**

Matic Batič (SCNR): **(Re)drawing Borders, Imagining (new) Landscapes: Spatial Politics in the Northern Adriatic from 1943 to 1954**

Discussion

11.30 – 12.00

Coffee break

12.00 – 13.30

Sophie Elaine Wolf (*University of Innsbruck*): **Making the Alps »Italian« - Landscape and Tourism as Fascist Instruments of a New Identity for South Tyrol/Alto Adige**

Klaus Tragbar (*University of Innsbruck*): **The Stations and the Landscape. Two (different) Buildings by Angiolo Mazzoni**

Damjan Hančič (SCNR): **Interwar Nazi Buildings in Kamnik: Their Emergence, their “Transfer” in the Post-War Socialist Period and their Current Functionality**

Discussion

13.30-15.00

Lunch

15.00-17.00

Petar Grubišić (*University of Ghent*): **Agrarian Reform and Colonisation as Foundations for Legitimate Rule of Yugoslav Socialist Government: Gateway towards Collectivisation in Slavonia and Vojvodina**

Györgi Orsós (*University of Pécs*): **Discursive Approaches on the Emergence of the Socialist Urban Landscape in Hungary**

Jelka Piškurić (SCNR): **Vision of Socialist Modernization: The Concept of the Neighbourhood Unit in Ljubljana**

Renato Podbersič (SCNR): **“The House of the Living”: The History of Jewish Cemetery in Rožna Dolina in the short 20th Century**

Discussion

19.00

Dinner

PROGRAM

9.00 – 9.15

Pozdravni nagovor

Tomaž Ivešić (Director of SCNR)

9.15 – 10.00

Programski nagovor:

Borut Klabjan (*ZRS Koper*): **Space Oddity: Spatial Politics, Social Engagements and the Limits of the State**

10.00 – 11.30

Pavlina Bobič (SCNR): **Nurturing the Mind, Mending the Body: the Body as a Political Space**

Martin Pekár (*Pavol Jozef Šafárik University Košice*): **Analysis of Power Interventions into Public Space as a Tool for Research of Non-Democratic Regimes (Sociological-Historical Approach)**

Matic Batič (SCNR): **(Re)drawing Borders, Imagining (new) Landscapes: Spatial Politics in the Northern Adriatic from 1943 to 1954**

Razprava

11.30 – 12.00

Odmor za kavo

12.00 – 13.30

Sophie Elaine Wolf (*Univerza Innsbruck*): **Making the Alps »Italian« - Landscape and Tourism as Fascist Instruments of a New Identity for South Tyrol/Alto Adige**

Klaus Tragbar (*Univerza Innsbruck*): **The Stations and the Landscape. Two (different) Buildings by Angiolo Mazzoni**

Damjan Hančič (SCNR): Interwar Nazi Buildings in Kamnik: Their Emergence, their “Transfer” in the Post-War Socialist Period and their Current Functionality

Razprava

13.30-15.00

Kosilo

15.00-17.00

Petar Grubišić (*Univerza Ghent*): Agrarian Reform and Colonisation as Foundations for Legitimate Rule of Yugoslav Socialist Government: Gateway towards Collectivisation in Slavonia and Vojvodina

Györgi Orsós (*Univerza Pécs*): Discursive Approaches on the Emergence of the Socialist Urban Landscape in Hungary

Jelka Piškurić (SCNR): Vision of Socialist Modernization: The Concept of the Neighbourhood Unit in Ljubljana

Renato Podbersič (SCNR): “The House of the Living”: The History of Jewish Cemetery in Rožna Dolina in the short 20th Century

Razprava

19.00

Večerja

ABSTRACTS / POVZETKI

NURTURING THE MIND, MENDING THE BODY: THE BODY AS A POLITICAL SPACE

Pavlina BOBIČ

Study Centre for National Reconciliation

The concept and ideals of modern masculinity are a social construct rooted in the 18th century. Genuine manhood was considered inseparable from the self-cultivation of the individual (spirit) and was essentially related to the concept of honour. Manliness – or femininity - in this respect symbolized virtues ascribed to individuals as well as the spiritual vitality of the entire society. It claimed the alignment of strength and health with body and mind, while keeping the individual's (erroneous) passions in check. Courage and daring were thought to be the virtues that a man had to possess, but he was also supposed to be compassionate, loyal and noble. The connectedness between them was also seen from the fact that notion of heroism entails self-abnegation, which can also be seen as death of one's own desires in order to live for the attainment of an exalted goal. In what ways was the body conceived of as a convenient backdrop against which the Catholic and liberal thinkers construed their understanding of war, past and future, and used it as an emblem for the mental reconstruction of the people in the era that followed the Great war? The dissonance between the conservative – Catholic – and the liberal – Sokol – perspectives were telling of the uncompromising clash that forebode radical rupture within traditional political parties during the Second World War.

**ANALYSIS OF POWER INTERVENTIONS INTO PUBLIC SPACE AS A TOOL FOR
RESEARCH OF NON-DEMOCRATIC REGIMES (SOCIOLOGICAL-HISTORICAL
APPROACH)**

Martin PEKÁR

Pavol Jozef Šafárik University Košice

According to the prominent sociologist Henri Lefebvre, space is an instrument of power. Every state regime strives to use space for social control through various interventions. While in democratic regimes the use of public space is the result of by majority accepted interventions, in non-democratic regimes these are power interventions usually based on such ideological starting points, which are not generally accepted by society. On the contrary, interventions into public space are becoming one of the tools for implementing state ideology into the consciousness of society. In their research on public space, German sociologists Walter Siebel and Jan Wehrheim defined its four basic dimensions — legal, functional, social and material-symbolic. Interdisciplinary sociological-historical research of interventions into each of these dimensions seems to be a suitable analytical tool in understanding the relationship between public space and the state regime, the conclusions of which allow a detailed understanding of the nature of individual non-democratic (authoritarian or totalitarian) regimes typical for the 20th century Europe, as well as transnational ideological connections. In the workshop I would like to present this interdisciplinary approach on the example of the authoritarian para fascist regime of the Slovak state (1939–1945), on the example of specific interventions into the urban space and the use of new knowledge in the interpretation of this regime.

(RE)DRAWING BORDERS, IMAGINING (NEW) LANDSCAPES: SPATIAL POLITICS IN THE NORTHERN ADRIATIC FROM 1943 TO 1954

Matic BATIČ

Study Centre for National Reconciliation

The paper addresses the ideological dimension of spatial interventions in the cultural landscape in the northern Adriatic, a typical European borderland which was marked by ethnic diversity and frequent changes in political boundaries during the 20th century. More specifically, the research topic covers ideologically charged spatial interventions from 1943 to 1954, when the territory was first administered by Nazi Germany as part of the Operational Zone of the Adriatic Littoral. After 1945, the area was first occupied by the Yugoslav and Anglo-American authorities, and then divided between Italy and communist Yugoslavia under the provisions of the Paris Treaty of 1947 and the London Memorandum of 1954.

Methodologically, the paper integrates research on the cultural dimension of space and border studies. Based on the findings that spatial features can be understood not only in physical terms but also as a cultural category, the paper explores the process and functionality of the cultural landscape in a selected border area, marked by the absence of a clear source of cultural and political sovereignty. It is for this reason that competing states, as well as non-state actors, have been forced to invest so much more effort in ensuring their own legitimacy, often through the (re)creation of public space, which was meant to express their own view of the region's character.

In terms of content, the paper will present the selected processes of the transformation of the cultural landscape in the turbulent period from 1943 to 1954. These include the removal of Italian monuments and other forms of spatial marking, the destruction of other forms of (undesirable) buildings (castles, churches), the erection of monuments and inscriptions related to the partisan movement and the new Yugoslav government, and finally the construction of Nova Gorica as an example of a new urban space. Furthermore, I will address issues related to the actors who shaped this process, both in terms of the personal factor of the decision-makers involved, as well as the consideration of the role of the various state and non-state actors.

MAKING THE ALPS »ITALIAN« - LANDSCAPE AND TOURISM AS FASCIST INSTRUMENTS OF A NEW IDENTITY FOR SOUTH TYROL/ALTO ADIGE

Sophie-Elaine WOLF
University of Innsbruck

With the Treaty of Saint Germain in 1919, the region of South Tyrol/Alto Adige became a border region: formerly part of the Tyrol, the region now became part of the Italian Kingdom. With the establishment of Mussolini's fascist regime in 1922, efforts to »Italianize« the new border region intensified increasingly. The »Italianization« included a wide variety of aspects: administrative reorganization, name changes, school reform, and an urban redevelopment that was pushed forward in the 1930s. Among other things, the goal was to transform the provincial capital of Bolzano into a modern, Fascist city while enhancing its character as a tourist jewel of the Alps. The fascists had two levels in particular in mind. First, they sought the forced integration of the local, traditionally German-speaking population; second, they wanted to present the region to the national public as both Italian and attractive to tourists. The Italians were to literally conquer the new territory as tourists.

Using selected urban planning and architectural interventions in Bolzano from the 1920s and 1930s, this contribution illustrates how the historic city was juxtaposed with a modern new town and how an Italian narrative was created for Bolzano in which the landscape and the relationship to it occupied a prominent position. This was done, for example, by enhancing the surrounding mountains as a tourist attraction. But also, more subtle strategies were applied to make the mountain panorama, which traditionally had been perceived as »Tyrolean«, as truly »Italian«. Therefore, various visual connections between the city and the landscape - especially the view of the famous »Rosengarten« which had been renamed »Catinaccio« - became important reference points in urban planning interventions in Bolzano.

The case study of this northernmost provincial capital of Italy can thus enlighten us about the diverse methods used by the fascists to »Italianize« natural and built space.

**THE STATIONS AND THE LANDSCAPE. TWO (DIFFERENT) BUILDINGS BY
ANGIOLO MAZZONI**

Klaus TRAGBAR

University of Innsbruck

With the end of the First World War, the former Austro-Hungarian crown land of Tyrol was divided up: South Tyrol and Welschtirol, today's Trentino, fell to the Kingdom of Italy, which was thus able to assert part of its territorial claims, e.g., a northern border at the Brenner, and now develop its state sovereignty in the newly acquired territories.

In order to effectively stage the seizure of the new territory, among other things, in 1928 the former *K.u.K.* railway station of Bolzano was rebuilt by the chief architect of the *Ferrovie dello Stato*, Angiolo Mazzoni. The individual building sections and their heights corresponds with South Tyrolean landscape elements: The Rosengarten, a characteristic mountain formation in the Dolomites east of Bolzano, is effectively framed as a landscape by the tower and the connecting wing of the new station and so visually becomes part of the newly acquired territory.

In contrast to Bolzano, the Austrian railway station in Trento was demolished and rebuilt from 1932 to 1936 consistently in rationalist forms according to Angiolo Mazzoni's design. After the controversially discussed *Stazione Santa Maria Novella* in Florence, the station in Trento was the second new station building that was explicitly considered a sign of *modernità* and *italianità*. A representative pillared portico lends the station a certain monumentality; the widely projecting flying roofs emphasise its dynamism and lead the eye to the monument to Cesare Battisti, a so-called Fascist martyr, built 1935 on the Doss Trento hill opposite the station.

The paper outlines the design of the two railway stations in Bolzano and Trento and analyses both their architectural language and their reference to the landscape against the background of the different appropriation strategies of the Kingdom of Italy in the newly acquired territories of South Tyrol and Trentino.

**INTERWAR “NAZI” BUILDINGS IN KAMNIK: THEIR EMERGENCE, THEIR
“TRANSFER” IN THE POST-WAR SOCIALIST PERIOD AND THEIR CURRENT
FUNCTION**

Damjan HANČIČ

Study Centre for National Reconciliation

During World War II, the Gorenjska region was occupied by the German Army and the territory was de facto annexed to the Third Reich. This opened the potential for forced Germanisation of the area. The Germanisation also included attempts to make the occupied landscape look as “German” as possible, which is why the German occupier tried to give the area of Kamnik, among others, as German an appearance as possible, constructing new buildings in typical Nazi and Alpine architectural styles. It bears emphasising that the buildings in question, although bearing the “stamp of Germanisation”, were not erected merely for their symbolic role, but had a very utilitarian character. As to their function, these buildings would have been needed also in different temporal-historical circumstances. The author uses documents and pictures to present the most important buildings and public infrastructure built in Kamnik in the era of the German occupation during World War II, their “pre-history”, their architectural features, their intended use, as well as their post-War use and their current state. In the socialist period after World War II, these buildings retained their function or partly received a new one, while their external appearance remained unchanged to the present day.

**AGRARIAN REFORM AND COLONISATION AS FOUNDATIONS FOR
LEGITIMATE RULE OF YUGOSLAV SOCIALIST GOVERNMENT: GATEWAY
TOWARDS COLLECTIVISATION IN SLAVONIA AND VOJVODINA**

Petar GRUBIŠIĆ

University of Ghent

Agrarian Reform and Colonisation that occurred from 1945 to 1948 can be viewed as a culmination of processes of land redistribution which started in the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenians. But, unlike the previous Authoritarian and Fascist governments, it wasn't biased towards one ethnic group, but towards reconciliation and solution of economic disparity. Although the colonization was initially viewed as a long-term project, it wrapped up by the beginning of 1948. Its effects are still visible in the wider consciousness of the people whose predecessors were, in some way, tied to it.

This paper analyses this event from the perspective of colonists from Dalmatia who were settled in Slavonia and Vojvodina. It tackles the reasons for the relocation of certain groups, the methods that were used in the redistribution of land, and how it permanently changed society in the region. It shows a socialist government's steady approach which transitioned from a necessity to repopulate emptied areas, towards implementation of a collectivist structure as a prerequisite for colonization. It also addresses the settler's reaction to the changing government policies. In addition to that, it explains the common colonist village and dwells into the government's plans of building new settlements for the settlers and reasons why that kind of territorial reshaping was scrapped in the end.

The research is based on the archives of the Department for Agrarian Reform and Colonisation at Croatian State Archives. It additionally makes use of the archives of the Regional People's Committee of Dalmatia, held at the State Archives in Split. Lastly, it is backed by archival sources of numerous local authorities from the State Archives in Šibenik. It is also complemented by works of authors such as Stipetić, Gačeša, and Maticka.

**DISCOURSIIVE APPROACHES ON THE EMERGENCE OF THE SOCIALIST
URBAN LANDSCAPE IN HUNGARY**

Györgi ORSÓS

University of Pécs

The most well-known and iconic city of the Hungarian socialist urbanism is Dunaújváros. During the socialist period it became one of the most important industrial cities of the country, and the symbol of the new industrial society. As a totally newly constructed city, its urban landscape could serve as symbol of the latest aesthetic and the new, utopian ideas about history. In this presentation, two debates are to be discussed, which fundamentally influenced the construction of the city, so to provide a better understanding of the intellectual context of the authoritarian spatial politics.

First, I would like to present the debate about the localization of the new city, because it reveals the two ruling paradigms of spatial planning. Fears of potential war against Yugoslavia overrode concerns of the economical conceptions of the geographical space, so the city was built further away from the southern border and the originally planned location. Secondly, I will discuss one particular theoretical debate in 1951 among leading ideologists (for example György Lukács) and architects about the ideological role of architecture, and by the means of discourse analysis I will point out the different debate positions, interests and concepts of society. The two main positions were the Modernist and the Socialist Realist, which coincided with the two opposite poles of the independent socialist architects and the authorities. The outcomes of the debate basically determined the architecture of the Stalinist period and shaped the urban landscape of Dunaújváros. Later on, with the totalitarian regime softening up, through the Modernist vision could prevail, which crystallized through the debate. In the final part of my presentation, I embed this in a broader Hungarian architectural history to understand the roots of the national traditions, the contemporary international tendencies and the commands from above in the intellectual history of the socialist urban landscape.

VISION OF SOCIALIST MODERNIZATION: CONCEPT OF THE RESIDENTIAL NEIGHBOURHOOD VS INDIVIDUAL HOUSING EFFORTS

Jelka PIŠKURIĆ

Study Centre for National Reconciliation

Workers' housing conditions was one of the most important concerns of the socialist social policy in Slovenia. In the first post war period housing construction was driven by the housing shortage and new social and economic circumstances. From the very beginning, the state was set on ensuring its housing supply, but soon realised that it lacked resources and that new housing construction could not keep up with the demand, so in the early 1950s the authorities started encouraging work organizations to actively engage in tackling the housing problems of their employees. Since 1950s, state-appointed urban planners started to create spatial and housing plans, first for Ljubljana and other Slovene cities, then gradually also for surrounding rural areas. In designing residential areas, architects often looked to Scandinavian models for inspiration. In Ljubljana, Savsko naselje was the first residential area to follow certain residential neighbourhood planning principles (the development plan from 1958 integrated the neighbourhood into a coherent whole). But it was not until the 1960s that the neighbourhood concept became a norm. Šiška neighbourhood ŠS 6 is considered to be the first comprehensively designed neighbourhood, its plan dating to 1966. The 1970s were the period of the most intensive housing construction, which slowed down in the 1980s, when economic conditions deteriorated.

Although residential neighbourhoods provided housing for many, they were only one of the means of tackling the housing problem. It soon became apparent that housing policy generated inequalities in access to state-built housing. Building an individual house with their own labour proved to be the only option of housing solution for many as it allowed them to allocate their financial resources over a longer period. The practice intensified in the second half of the 1960s, also enabled by favourable lending policy. At the same time, we can observe an increase of illegal and unauthorized construction. These were a result of various reasons, from lengthy procedures for obtaining the building permit and low price of non-development land to the freedom that this self-build gave people in deciding how and what they wanted to build. In this way, the paper also tries to highlight the discrepancy between the concept of the socialist residential neighbourhood and people's plans to achieve their particular interests within the socialist ideal of appropriate housing for all.

**»THE HOUSE OF THE LIVING« : THE HISTORY OF JEWISH CEMETERY IN
ROŽNA DOLINA IN THE SHORT 20TH CENTURY**

Renato PODBERSIČ

Study Centre for National Reconciliation

Town of Gorizia was sometimes also known as Jerusalem upon Soča river (ital. *Gerusalemme sull'Isonzo*). Jews were probably present in the town at the time of its establishment, and their first written mention dates to 1288. The local Jewish community stood out more due its impact on the everyday life in the town than due to their numerical presence. Today, the Jewish community no longer exists in Gorizia. In 1969, the numerically weak local Jewish community united with that of Trieste.

The memory of what was once an important part of Gorizian community is kept alive by the Jewish cemetery in Rožna Dolina near Nova Gorica, the final resting place of over nine hundred Jews, with the oldest tombstone dating to the 14th century. The Jewish cemetery in Rožna Dolina not only stands as a unique monument to the Jewish cultural heritage in Slovenia, but it is the biggest Jewish cemetery in the state and one among the best preserved in Central Europe. Apart from the synagogue in Gorizia (Italy) from the mid-eighteenth century, it is the only remnant of immovable cultural heritage that once belonged to the rounded-out Jewish community in Gorizia, which is now divided between two EU countries – Slovenia and Italy. Burying the dead has a special place in the Judaism (Talmud). Burial is one of the most important rituals in Judaism and also customarily associated with ritual impurity, caused by the contact with the deceased's body. A special Jewish funeral service, which is usually composed of volunteers, cleanses the deceased's body before the funeral and makes all the necessary preparations for the burial. The sanctity of the burial grounds is, among others, also attested by events that took place during the Battles of the Isonzo. After the fall of Gorizia and the Isonzo Front shifted eastwards, the town had found itself in the front line by the autumn of 1916. Military maps of the time show that the Austro-Hungarian units held their assault positions in the eastern part of the Jewish cemetery and the Italian units in the western part, both sides making every effort to respect the sanctity of the Jewish burial grounds, but nevertheless destroying the Jewish funeral parlour during the exchange of fire. After the First World War, Jews in Gorizia restored the facility and reopened it in 1929. The funeral parlour then remained in use until 1947, when the newly demarcated border between Yugoslavia and Italy cut the cemetery off from the seat of the Jewish community in Gorizia. The Holocaust, however, had an especially disastrous effect on the Jewish population in Gorizia, with the majority of those who persisted in the town during the war, being driven to Nazi camps. Thenceforth, the few Jewish inhabitants of Gorizia bury their deceased in the Jewish cemetery at Gradisca d'Isonzo (Italia).

