

Ni bilo vse tako sivo, kot je na fotografijah¹

Intervju z Vladimirjem Kulićem /

It wasn't all as gray as in the photos¹

Interview with Vladimir Kulić

Boštjan Bugarič

Vladimir Kulić je arhitekturni zgodovinar, kustos in kritik, specializiran za moderno in sodobno arhitekturo. Je izredni profesor na Florida Atlantic University, kjer predava arhitekturno zgodovino. Njegova prva knjiga *Modernizem vmes: arhitekturne mediacije socialistične Jugoslavije* (z Marojem Mrduljašem, fotografije Wolfgang Thaler, 2012) analizira povojno jugoslovansko arhitekturo. Prejel je številne štipendije in nagrade, vključno s tistimi Inštituta za višji študij na Princetonu, Ameriške akademije v Berlinu, Fundacije Graham Foundation, umetnostne galerije National Gallery of Art Washington, odbora American Council of Learned Societies in fundacije Fondazione Bruno Zevi v Rimu.

Vladimir Kulić is an architectural historian, curator, and critic specializing in modern and contemporary architecture. He is Associate Professor at Florida Atlantic University, where he teaches courses in architectural history, theory, and design. Kulić has written extensively about architecture in the former Yugoslavia. His first book, Modernism In-Between: The Mediatory Architectures of Socialist Yugoslavia (with Maroje Mrduljaš, photos by Wolfgang Thaler, 2012), surveyed the remarkable body of architecture produced in that country after World War 2. He has received numerous fellowships, grants, and awards, including those from the Institute for Advanced Study in Princeton, the American Academy in Berlin, the Graham Foundation, the National Gallery of Art in Washington, DC, the American Council of Learned Societies, and Fondazione Bruno Zevi in Rome.

Opomba: Dr. Boštjan Bugarič je intervju z dr. Vladimirjem Kulićem prvič objavil v Tageszeitungu (25. 11. 2018) in Architectuulu (29. 11. 2018).

Note: Dr Boštjan Bugarič first published the interview with Dr Vladimir Kulić in Tageszeitung (25th November 2018) and Architectuul (29th November 2018).

Pregledna razstava *Proti betonski utopiji: Arhitektura v Jugoslaviji 1948–1980* je v Muzeju moderne umetnosti (MoMA) v New Yorku ameriški javnosti prvič predstavila jugoslovansko modernistično arhitekturno dediščino. Tema obravnava raznolikost arhitekturnega jezika v Jugoslaviji, ki je bila posledica raznovrstnosti in enotne ureditve države.

Vladimir Kulić, eden izmed kustosov razstave, nam je v pogovoru povedal, da je »imela jugoslovanska arhitektura širšo družbeno odgovornost pri oblikovanju in preobrazbi celotne družbe, ne samo peščice najbogatejših«.

Razstavo ste razdelili na štiri tematske enote (modernizacija, globalna omrežja, vsakdanje življenje in identitete). Lahko pojasnite, zakaj takšna struktura?

S strukturo smo poskušali ujeti nekatere ključne dejavnike, ki so vplivali na razvoj jugoslovanske arhitekture. Najprej velja poudariti projekt obnove in posredno tudi projekt modernizacije porušenih objektov takoj po drugi svetovni vojni. Preoblikovanje mest, uporaba novih gradbenih tehnologij in preobrazba družbe so bili odločilni dejavniki, v okviru katerih se je odvijala celotna gradnja jugoslovanske arhitekture. Drugi dejavnik, ki je vplival na razvoj arhitekture, je bil specifični in dokaj nenavadni geopolitični položaj države; ta je bila široko povezana s tujino. Odličen primer je Skopje, ki je po potresu leta 1963 postalo arhitekturno stičišče za arhitekta z vsega sveta. Po vojni pa so domači arhitekti začeli graditi tudi zunaj Jugoslavije.

1 Izjava Nade Horvatinčič, mame selektorice spomenikov Sanje Horvatinčič, ob odprtju razstave v Muzeju moderne umetnosti (MoMA) v New Yorku.

1 Statement by Nada Horvatinčič at the opening of the exhibition at the MoMA Museum of Modern Art in New York; Nada is the mother of selector for monuments Sanja Horvatinčič.

Exhibition Toward a Concrete Utopia: Architecture in Yugoslavia, 1948-1980 introduces the story of how particularity and unity produced a great diversity of architectural language and expressions. The topic is presented for the very first time in the Museum of Modern Art (MoMA) in New York.

In conversation with one of the curators, Vladimir Kulić, we discover that "Yugoslavia is a kind of a reminder that architecture had wider social responsibility in transforming society and working for people other than those wealthiest."

Mr. Kulić, you divided the exhibition in four parts, modernization, global networks, everyday life, and identities; Can you explain why such a structure?

With this structure, we tried to capture some of the defining conditions under which architecture in Yugoslavia had developed. The first condition was the project of reconstruction and modernization after WW2. The transformation of cities, technologies, and the society was the defining framework within which entire construction of Yugoslav architecture occurred. The second condition was the very specific and rather unusual geopolitical situation of the country, which was extensively connected with the rest of the world. Skopje is a great example where a city became an architectural meeting ground for the entire world. In addition, architects from the region had previously never built anywhere outside of the region; that changed after the war as well.



1



2



3

Sl. 1: Spomenik bitke na Sutjeski, Miodrag Živković (1965–1971), Tjentište, Bosna in Hercegovina. Foto: © Roberto Conte, 2017.
 Sl. 2: Razstavni plakat za retrospektivno razstavo arhitekta Janka Konstantinova (1984). Vir: osebni arhiv Jovana Ivanovskega.
 Sl. 3: Kolaž za ovitek knjige *Arhitektura Bosne in pot do sodobnosti* Dušana Grabrijana in Juraja Neidhardta (1957).
 Vir: zasebni arhiv Juraja Neidhardta.

Fig. 1: Monument to the Battle of the Sutjeska by Miodrag Živković (1965–71), Tjentište, Bosnia and Herzegovina.
 Photo: © Roberto Conte, 2017

Fig. 2: Exhibition poster for the retrospective of architect Janko Konstantinov (1984), Collage diazotype and tracing paper.
 Source: Personal archive of Jovan Ivanovski

Fig. 3: Cover of *Architecture of Bosnia and the Way to Modernity* by Dušan Grabrijan and Juraj Neidhardt (1957).
 Source: Private archive of Juraj Neidhardt

Pomemben dejavnik arhitekturnega razvoja je bila tudi zelo specifična tekstura vsakdanjega življenja. Množična stanovanja so bila v Jugoslaviji zaradi nenehnega eksperimentiranja z različnimi stanovanjskimi tipologijami na neki način edinstvena. Pojav sodobnega oblikovanja in s tem povezave s potrošniško kulturo je imel bistveno vlogo pri nastanku osnov jugoslovanskega oblikovanja. Pomemben razvojni dejavnik je bil tudi jugoslovanski multikulturalizem, ki je v različnih delih države omogočil razvoj raznolikih arhitekturnih kultur. Kljub raznolikosti so medsebojno vplivale druga na drugo in delovale pod enakimi pogoji. Vsekakor pa je dinamika med posebnim in enotnim omogočila veliko raznolikost v izrazu arhitekturnega jezika. Zaradi interakcije med različnimi kulturami je Jugoslavija zanimiva študija primera za preučevanje današnjega stanja.

Zakaj naj bi ameriško občinstvo zanimala razstava o gradnji v Jugoslaviji?

Mislím, da za to obstajata dva razloga. Prvi je ta, da razstava postavlja novo podlago, ki ameriškemu občinstvu in tudi širši zahodni publiki prikazuje, da se je sodobna moderna arhitektura razvijala tudi zunaj običajno sprejetega kanonskega območja. Ob raziskovanju zgodovine moderne arhitekture so v literaturi večinoma zajeta geografska območja zahodne Evrope in Združenih držav Amerike. Ta razstava je študija primera, ki dokazuje obstoj zanimive in inovativne arhitekture tudi zunaj teh območij ter prikazuje, da je navdihujoča arhitektura obstajala tudi v nekdanjem socialističnem svetu. Jugoslavija je primer, ki govori, kako zapletena zgodba se je razvijala v socialističnih deželah.

Kateri pa je drugi?

Drugi razlog, da je razstava zanimiva za ameriško občinstvo, je trenutno politično stanje. Po štirih desetletjih neoliberalizma se začenja znova ceniti vloga arhitekture pri gradnji javnih urbanih prostorov, ki niso več zasebni. Zlasti v ZDA je bila arhitektura v veliki meri reducirana zgolj na oblikovanje za premožne. S tem je arhitekturno razmišljanje, včasih širše razširjeno in

Another defining condition was a very specific texture of everyday life. Mass housing in Yugoslavia was in some ways quite unique due to a great deal of experimentation with housing typologies. The emergence of modern design and the related consumer culture added to this specific texture of everyday life, and architects were fundamentally instrumental in it because it was through them that modern design came into existence in Yugoslavia. Finally, Yugoslavia's multiculturalism was yet another defining feature. Multiple architectural cultures were developed in different parts of the country, yet they interacted with each other and worked under the same conditions. This kind of dynamic between particularity and unity is something that produced a great deal of diversity in terms of architectural language and expressions. The interaction between different cultures is a big issue of our current moment, so Yugoslavia is an interesting case study in that respect.

Why should a US citizen care about an exhibition about building in Yugoslavia?

I think there are two reasons. One is that this exhibition breaks a new ground for American audience as well for the audience anywhere in the West in the sense that it shows that modern architecture also flourished outside of the canonical region where we normally assume it was accepted. When you read histories of modern architecture, the geographical areas that are covered are mostly Western Europe and the United States. This exhibition is a case study demonstrating that innovative, interesting architecture was built outside of this canonical area. In particular, it shows that inspired architecture existed also in what used to be the former socialist world. Yugoslavia is a great example revealing that the story is much more complicated.

And the other reason?

The second reason why I think it is interesting to the American audience is the current political moment. After four decades of neoliberalism, we are finally beginning to see a renewed appreciation for architecture's role in



4

Sl. 4: Trg revolucije (danes Trg republike), Edvard Ravnikar (1960–1974), Ljubljana, Slovenija. Foto: © Valentin Jeck, MoMA, 2016.

Sl. 5: Jugoslovanski paviljon za Expo 58, Vjenceslav Richter (1958), Bruselj, Belgija. Vir: Arhiv Jugoslavije.

Sl. 6: Poslovna stolpnica S2, Milan Mihelič (1972–1978), Ljubljana, Slovenija. Foto: © Valentin Jeck, MoMA, 2016.



5

Sl. 7: Milica Šterić na srečanju v Energoprojektu. Vir: Žene u arhitekturi, <http://www.zua.rs/sr/research/alfa-i-omega-arhitekture-energoprojekta/>.

Sl. 8: Stanovanjska hiša Laginjina, Ivan Vitić (1957–1962), Zagreb, Hrvaška. Perspektivna risba – tempera, svinčnik in črnilo na papirju (1960). Vir: Arhiv Ivana Vitića, Hrvaška akademija znanosti in umetnosti.

razumljeno med prebivalstvom, zdaj koncentrirano znotraj enega odstotka najpremožnejših. Jugoslavija je v tem smislu nekakšen opomin, da je imela arhitektura širšo družbeno odgovornost pri preoblikovanju družbe in naj bi delala tudi za ljudi zunaj tega odstotka najpremožnejših.

Zakaj ste izbrali časovni okvir med letoma 1948 in 1980?

Letnici sta bili izbrani tako na podlagi arhitekturnih kot tudi zgodovinskih kriterijev. Tako smo temo zožili zaradi lažje obvladljivosti gradiva za razstavo, saj sta bili izbira in količina gradiva eden naših največjih izzivov. Letnici se seveda nanašata na dve zgodovinski prelomnici; prva označuje razpad povezave Jugoslavije s Sovjetsko zvezo leta 1948, druga pa Titovo smrt. Obe letnici sta tudi arhitekturni prelomnici. Po letu 1948 ni bilo več prisotno vsiljevanje socialističnega arhitekturnega realizma, po letu 1980 pa se je pojavilo arhitekturno obdobje postmodernizma.

Razstava trdi, da je bila Jugoslavija eksperiment?

Jugoslavija je bila brez dvoma velik eksperiment. Proces je potekal skozi nenehno evolucijo, zato je v tem kontekstu naslov »H konkretni utopiji« za razstavo zelo primeren. Ne le v smislu, da govorimo o betonski (angl. *concrete*) arhitekturi,² ampak tudi v kontekstu koncepta *konkretne utopije* Ernsta Blocha, ki poudarja idejo družbe v večnem nastajanju, torej utopijo kot proces nenehne preobrazbe. Jugoslavija je bila v tem smislu res utopija, ker je bila v nenehnem iskanju napredka. Na razstavi lahko zaznamo, da je večina arhitekture, proizvedene v Jugoslaviji, precej eksperimentalna. Vprašanje je samo, ali je poskus uspel.

In?

V najrazvitejših kapitalističnih državah sta se modernizacija in urbanizacija zgodili z ogromnimi žrtvami delavskega razreda. Za Jugoslavijo bi lahko rekli, da je bila cena modernizacije bolj pravično razporejena. Neuspeh Jugoslavije je bil predvsem v reprodukciji lastnega sistema, ki ga kapitalizem kljub stalnim ciklom kriz uspešno reproducira.

Poleg modernizma in brutalizma so v Jugoslaviji prevladovali strukturalizem, metabolizem in postmodernizem. Kako razstava prikazuje ta zahtevni arhitekturni besednjak?

Eden od načinov, s katerimi smo poskušali prikazati to raznolikost, je bila razdelitev na štiri monografske sobe, posvečene štirim najvidnejšim arhitektom tega obdobja. To so bili Vjenceslav Richter, Edvard Ravnikar, Juraj Neidhardt in Bogdan Bogdanović. Njihovi različni značaji ponazarjajo izjemno

the construction of the civic and public realm, for the communal rather than private. In the US in particular, architecture has been largely reduced to a kind of window dressing for the super wealthy. The amount of architectural thinking that used to be distributed among the population much more widely at one point is now concentrated in the hands of the one percent. In this regard, Yugoslavia is a kind of a reminder that architecture had wider social responsibility in transforming society and working for people other than those wealthiest, other than the one percent.

Why did you choose the time frame between 1948 and 1980?

The dates were chosen on the basis of both architectural and historical criteria. We had to narrow down the scope, and one of the greatest challenges was selecting and reducing the amount of material to make the exhibition manageable. The two dates refer to two historical turning points. One is Yugoslavia's break with Soviet Union in 1948, the other is Tito's death in 1980. However, these are also architectural turning points. After 1948, the attempted imposition of socialist realism died off very quickly, and after 1980, we start to enter the architectural postmodernist period.

The exhibition claims: Yugoslavia was an experiment?

There is no doubt that Yugoslavia was an experiment. It went through a constant evolution. In that sense, the title "Toward a Concrete Utopia" is appropriate. Not just in the most obvious sense, that we are talking about concrete architecture, but also in reference to Ernest Bloch's concept of concrete utopia, which emphasizes the idea of a society in perpetual becoming, utopia as a process in constant transformation. In that sense, Yugoslavia was indeed a utopia because it was in constant search of improvement. The exhibition argues that much of the architecture produced in Yugoslavia was quite experimental. The question is whether the experiment failed.

And did it?

In the most developed capitalist countries, the modernization and urbanization occurred through extreme sacrifices from the working class. We could speculate that the price of modernization in Yugoslavia was more justly distributed. Yugoslavia's failure was ultimately in the reproduction of its own system, which something that capitalism achieves successfully, despite the constant cycles of crises.

Alongside modernism and brutalism, structuralism, metabolism, and postmodernism were also dominant in Yugoslavia. How does the exhibition convey this very elaborate architectural vocabulary?

One of the ways in which we tried to convey this diversity is through four monographic rooms dedicated to individual architects who were among the most prominent professional figures. They are Vjenceslav Richter, Edvard

2 Dobesedni prevod izraza concrete utopia je »konkretna« oziroma »betonska« utopija (concrete = beton).



6



7



8

Fig. 4: Trg Revolucije Square (present-day Trg Republike Square) by Edvard Ravnikar (1960–74), Ljubljana, Slovenia. Photo: © Valentin Jeck, commissioned by The Museum of Modern Art, 2016

Fig. 5: Yugoslav Pavilion at Expo 58 by Vjenceslav Richter (1958); Brussels, Belgium. Source: Archive of Yugoslavia

Fig. 6: S2 Office Tower by Milan Mihelič (1972–78), Ljubljana, Slovenia. Photo: © Valentin Jeck, commissioned by The Museum of Modern Art, 2016

Fig. 7: Milica Šterić at the meeting in Energoprojekt. Source: Photo ZUA
Fig. 8: Apartment Building on Laganjina Street by Ivan Vitić (1957–62), Zagreb, Croatia, perspective drawing (1960). Source: Ivan Vitić Archive, Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts

raznolikost arhitekturnih pristopov, metod, izrazov in jezikov, ki so se razvijali v Jugoslaviji. Richter je bil v središču neoavangardističnega gibanja v petdesetih in šestdesetih letih prejšnjega stoletja. Bogdanović je bil produkt nadrealističnega gibanja iz dvajsetih in tridesetih let. Neidhardt je bil morda najzanimivejša figura kritičnega regionalizma, Ravnikar pa je bil odličen sintetizator arhitekturnih idej, od Plečnika in Le Corbusiera do Aalta. Kljub razlikam so vsi štirje arhitekti prispevali h gradnji najpomembnejših primerov politične arhitekture v državi, od stavb parlamentov in razstavnih paviljonov do spomenikov druge svetovne vojne. V drugih državah je bila tovrstna raznolikost arhitekturnih jezikov zelo redka.

Vsi štirje so moški ...

Eden izmed mojih najljubših eksponatov je fotografija Milice Šterić, ki sedi v pisarni sedeža Energoprojekta v Beogradu s strankami iz Afrike. Okrog nje stojijo beli moški, ki jo pozorno poslušajo. Ta fotografija govori o subverziji tradicionalne hierarhije rase in spola, prikazuje namreč resnično utopično razsežnost Jugoslavije, ki je poskušala osvoboditi in opolnomočiti vse vrste ogroženih marginalnih skupin, vključno z ženskami.

Tako kot je uspelo Milici Šterić?

Milica Šterić je bila pomembna arhitektka, še pomembnejša pa je bila kot vodja arhitekturnega biroja, ki se je lahko uspešno pogajala o velikih projektih in pogodbah v Afriki in na Bližnjem vzhodu. Druga ženska v arhitekturi je bila Svetlana Kana Radević, ki je v šestdesetih letih prejšnjega stoletja prejela državno nagrado Borbe za arhitekturo. Kasneje je študirala pri Louisu Kahnu, sodelovala s Kišem Kurokavo, preživljala čas v Švici in na Japonskem. Realizirala je veliko projektov napredne arhitekture. Vsekakor ne mislim, da je bila Jugoslavija nekakšen feministični raj, saj so bile ženske v arhitekturnem poklicu še vedno v manjšini in so s težavo prebile »stekleni strop«, a so si prizadevale za integracijo v poklic.

Kakšen razvoj je v primerjavi z drugimi vzhodnoevropskimi državami doživela jugoslovanska stanovanjska gradnja?

Razvoj množične stanovanjske gradnje je bil v Jugoslaviji precej raznolik. Po drugi svetovni vojni je zaradi potrebe po novih stanovanjih, saj je ogromno ljudi ostalo brez domov, prišlo do naročil glede standardizacije, tipizacije in industrializacije stanovanj, in to ne le v vzhodni, ampak tudi v zahodni Evropi. V nekaterih vzhodnoevropskih državah, kot sta bili na primer NDR in Češkoslovaška, sta bili standardizacija in tipizacija izjemno uspešni. Sovjetska zveza je izdelala največji projekt modernizacije arhitekture na svetu s 30 milijoni stanovanj; tudi ta je temeljila na standardiziranih modelih.

Ravnikar, Juraj Neidhardt and Bogdan Bogdanović. Their wildly divergent personal oeuvres illustrate the extreme diversity of architectural approaches, methods, expressions and languages cultivated in Yugoslavia. Richter was at the core of the neoavant-garde movement of the 1950s and 1960s. Bogdanović was the product of the surrealist movement dating back to the 1920s and 1930s. Neidhardt was perhaps the most interesting figure of critical regionalism, whereas Ravnikar was a great synthesizer of architectural ideas, from Plečnik to Le Corbusier and Aalto. Despite their differences, all four of these architects contributed to the construction of the most politically significant structures in the country, from parliament buildings and exhibition pavilions to World War 2 monuments. That kind of diversity of representational languages was rare elsewhere.

All four are men...

One of my favorite exhibits in the show is the photo of Milica Šterić sitting in an office in Energoprojekt headquarters in Belgrade with clients from Africa. Surrounded by white men standing up and listening to her. This image tells about this subversion of traditional race and gender hierarchies, demonstrating the truly utopian dimension of Yugoslavia, which attempted to liberate and empower all kinds of groups that were disfranchised throughout history, including women.

Just like Milica Šterić?

Milica Šterić was significant as an architect but even more so as an architectural manager who was able to successfully negotiate contracts throughout Africa and the Middle East. Another well-connected woman was Svetlana Radević, who was awarded the national prize for architecture in the 1960s. After that, she studied with Louis Kahn, worked with Kisho Kurokawa, spent time in Switzerland and Japan, and was able to produce a great deal of interesting advanced architecture. I don't want to say that Yugoslavia was some kind of feminist paradise because women were still in the minority in the architectural field and had a hard time breaking the glass ceiling, but deliberate efforts at their inclusion were nevertheless made.

How did housing develop in Yugoslavia compared to other Eastern European countries?

A short answer would be that mass housing in Yugoslavia was also rather diverse. After WW2 - not just in Eastern Europe but in Western Europe as well - standardization, typification, and industrialization of housing were the order of the day because huge numbers of people were left homeless. In some East European countries like the GDR and Czechoslovakia, standardization and typification were extremely successful. The Soviet Union produced what could be described as the largest architectural modernization project in the world with 30 million apartments, again based on standardized designs.



9



10



11

- Sl. 9:** Hrib svobode, Janez Lenassi in Živa Baraga (1965), Ilirska Bistrica, Slovenija. Foto: © Roberto Conte, 2017.
Sl. 10: Spominski park Dudik, Bogdan Bogdanović (1978–1980), Vukovar, Hrvaška. Foto: © Roberto Conte, 2017.
Sl. 11: Spomenik vstajnikom Korduna in Banije, Berislav Šerbetić in Vojin Bakić (1979–1981), Petrova gora, Hrvaška. Foto: © Roberto Conte, 2017.

Fig. 9: Freedom Hill Monument by Janez Lenassi and Živa Baraga (1965-65), Ilirska Bistrica, Slovenia. Photo: © Roberto Conte, 2017
Fig. 10: Dudik Memorial Park by Bogdan Bogdanović (1978-80), Vukovar, Croatia. Photo: © Roberto Conte, 2017
Fig. 11: Monument to the Uprising of the People of Kordun and Banija by Berislav Šerbetić and Vojin Bakić (1979-81), Petrova Gora, Croatia. Photo: © Roberto Conte, 2017

Kaj pa Jugoslavija?

V Jugoslaviji se to ni zgodilo, deloma zaradi zgodnje decentralizacije. Na neki način se je uresničil neuspeh povojnega ideala množične industrijske gradnje, katerega stranski učinek je bilo izogibanje urbani monotoniji, kakršno poznajo v nekaterih drugih delih Evrope.

Kakšna je razlika med jugoslovansko stanovanjsko in turistično arhitekturo, ki je imela prav tako velik razvojni uspeh?

Vsekakor velja turistična arhitektura za eno od uspešnih zgodb v Jugoslaviji. V obdobju zgodnjih šestdesetih let prejšnjega stoletja, ko se je na Jadranu začel razvijati množični turizem, je glede razvoja slednjega v Sredozemlju že obstajalo nekaj izkušenj, in s tem se je razvilo zavedanje o nevarnostih neusklajenega in kaotičnega razvoja. To zavedanje je bilo vgrajeno v DNK jugoslovanske turistične arhitekture. Prizadevali so si za namestitev več sto tisoč turistov, ki so prihajali na Jadran – turistov, ki bi na destinacije prihajali z zavedanjem glede ohranjanja kakovosti naravnega okolja in zgodovinskih mest. Arhitekti so ohranjanju okolja podredili številne strategije in novo arhitekturo previdno vključili v naravno krajino. Zaradi tega nosi arhitektura, podedovana iz šestdesetih in sedemdesetih let prejšnjega stoletja, velik kulturni kapital.

Kakšno vlogo imajo spomeniki, ki so del te arhitekturne razstave?

Spomeniki razstavo zaokrožajo. Govorijo o pomembni arhitekturni tipologiji, ki je nastala v povojni Jugoslaviji. Nekateri najpomembnejši spomeniki so hudo poškodovani in njihovo stanje tako služi kot opomin na uničenje Jugoslavije. Ob izhodu iz galerije se je z muralom Davida Maljkovića postavilo pomembno vprašanje: kaj nam zapuščeni protifašistični spomeniki pomenijo danes? To je v trenutnem političnem ozračju zelo pomembno vprašanje, zato se razstava konča z vprašanjem in opozorilom obenem.

And in Yugoslavia?

In Yugoslavia, that never happened, in part due to the early decentralization. In some ways, this was a failure of the post-war ideal of mass industrial construction, but as a side effect, it did stave off the kind of urban monotony known in some other parts of Europe.

Is it possible to distinguish housing from tourism architecture, which at the same time had great success?

Tourism architecture was one of the success stories in Yugoslavia. By the time mass tourism started exploding in the Adriatic in the early 1960s, there was already some experience with the development of mass tourism elsewhere in the Mediterranean, which raised awareness of the danger of uncoordinated, chaotic development. This awareness was built into the DNA of tourism architecture. There were great efforts to accommodate hundreds of thousands of tourists that were coming to the Adriatic and the same time preserve the quality of the natural environment and historical cities. Architects developed numerous strategies for preserving the environment, carefully incorporating new architecture into the natural landscape. The body of architecture inherited from the 1960s and 1970s is still instructive, carrying with itself a great deal of cultural capital that survives to this day.

What role do monuments play as part of this architectural exhibition?

The monuments conclude the exhibition. They speak of an important architectural typology produced in post-war Yugoslavia, but in a way, they commemorate Yugoslavia itself. Some of the most important ones are badly damaged, and their current state serves as a reminder of the destruction of Yugoslavia. At the exit from the gallery, a mural by David Maljković poses an important question: What do these derelict antifascist monuments mean for us today? It is a very important question in this current political climate. The exhibition ends with a question and a warning.