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SUMMARY
SUMMARY

They stand as physical witnesses of a time that has passed, that once denoted the starting point for a new society. Yet, they are still gearing toward something that even today doesn’t exist, proclaiming a distant future, a utopian society, which already has become an unrealized past.

Robert Burghardt

The existing phenomenon of memorial architecture in the territory of Ex-Yugoslavia may be presented as the most important and at same time the least known experience of Yugoslav and European architecture of the twentieth century.

The creation of the memorials starts in 1945, with the unification of Serbian, Croatian, Bosnia And Herzegovina, Slovenia, Montenegro and Macedonia as federative republics in the new “promised land” of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia under the leadership of Josip Broz Tito. Guided by the slogan of brotherhood and unity, the new state was been created through all institutions and social practices. Memorial architecture played an important role in establishing the newly created Yugoslav identity, as an instrument of unification, which presented the unique national struggle against Nazism and
fascism. The architecture in this case not only affects the creation of emergent identity but also as a correction and guidance of the national memory towards important events of the past. All professional and human resources were involved in the creation of memory. On the territory of Yugoslavia in the period of fifty years, were created about 22,000 monumental features, in places that witnessed the painful past such as concentration camps, deportation, battles, massacres, mass killings and graves or on the other hand places of important for the revolutionary struggle and independence.

It is noteworthy that, despite the undisputed architectural and artistic value of these achievements, until today, there has been very little research and comprehensive studies of memorial architecture of Yugoslavia. Despite the occasional interest of the critics and the journalists, national professional mapping and interpretation of modern architecture and especially memorial production in socialistic Yugoslavia was almost completely overlooked. After the traumatic and violent collapse of the ex-Yugoslav Federation, accompanied by modest cultural and academic research, after destruction of its supranational identity and the re-construction of national identities, national critic have left the previous artistic and architectural research without any review, evaluation or even exact findings about its history. The transitional period towards
liberal capitalism has created an a priori hostile environment towards a socialist period and its legacy, once again trying to ignore history.

When it comes to the European or World architectural historical and critical scenery Yugoslav architecture remained peripheral and ignored. Filippo Bricolo explained this phenomenon in the sequent way. “This delay, due in part to the tendency of historiography and militant critic of modernism to highlight exclusively the great stands of modern movement, with the peripheral position of the Yugoslav Titoistic culture compared to the rest of Europe, determined a lack of research of events in these regions of the Balkans. It is the phenomenon that does not only concern the war memorials, but also involves all the Yugoslav architecture of the nineties. With the exception of grand rediscovery of Plečnik, occurring in the eighties, the rest result, until now, excluded from the historiographical and critical treatment of art and architecture of the twentieth century.”

Only in recent years, we can notice re-interest for this topic, from national and international professional public, from the

---

adequate time and space distance for liberal historical research and architectural critic. Therefore, this thesis is an attempt to reconstruct not only the history of construction of memorial architecture, but also its meaning and its place in the international map of modernism.

The core of the thesis “Memorials without memory” constitutes a survey on the concept of memory and identity in memorial architecture. The purpose of this research is to build a path through which we could identify and propose a new role of memorial architecture, within the changed social and political context. A special analysis is given to the parallel analysis of memorial production and political history in the former Yugoslavia, from its beginning until the dissolution. Also, particular reference is devoted to the work of the architect Bogdan Bogdanović, whose “new formula of memorials” played a major role in Yugoslavia’s new, modern and progressive image during the bipolar division of the world.

With the premise of cultural identity theory; according to which every identity is socially controlled and culturally conditioned category, and that identity is not created and developed outside of culture, but is constructed in relation with current political, economic and cultural mechanisms, research of Yugoslav identity and Yugoslavism as ideology is central for this thesis.
With the hypothesis of the role of the monument to celebrate the memory of a specific event or person from the past, in order to create the political permissive concepts of identity in the present, there is the evident need to research monuments as instruments which were exposed to dictates of the dominant ideological and symbolic directions. The ideological dictate directs not only symbolic architectural language, but also shapes the memories, assessing the significance of historical events and processing them into one compact narrative. The subject of the research is seen within the concept of symbolic conditionality of ideology over the memorial architecture.

In that way one of the main theoretical assumptions of this study is that rhetorical and visual communication plays a central role in the formulation and transmission of the public memory of the Second World War. In this way, monuments are studied, not only as the interpretation of the contemporary history, but also as tools for the ideological re-creation of the past. The research studies the process of ideological conquest of public (and even private) space, by creating new ideological symbols, aimed at strengthening of collective unity and creating an image of a unique society during the period after the Second World War. In all parts of the former Yugoslavia
about 20,000 monuments and memorials have been constructed.

At the beginning, the monuments emphasized military victims and celebrated civilian casualties in adequate architectural forms usually as the soldiers in uniforms and civilian martyrs for freedom, in the stylistic line with socialist realism. From 1960’s – ’80’s, known as “golden age of Yugoslav architecture”; there have been a turnover in raising monuments related to the Second World War. The new approach, towards an abstract design, is no longer transmitting openly the ideological message, but is aesthetically sophisticated work of art, that transcend the rigid dogmatism of the early Communist governance. Surrealism of Bogdan Bogdanovic has announced a new era for monumental architecture that represents a unique and authentic art production of large scale. His memorials transcend the boundaries between architecture, landscape and sculpture, blurring the lines between traditional and modern methods of construction. More importantly transcendent the previous triumphant rhetoric and pathetic commemorative symbolism towards open forms of forgiveness and celebration of live.

The violent dissolution of EX-Yugoslavia, significantly affected the determination of the structural and functional aspects of
the socio-economic systems, the nature of social relations, the creation and change of identity. Yugoslav cruel ending and changed political and social system, has led to the transitional phase with its own phenomenon. Transitional period is researched through the change of meanings, systems, ideologies. In the research of the field of transition, where change is a dominant cultural and social phenomenon, we introduce the concept of trans-aesthetic, changing perception of history over time, changing collective memory, dependence of ideological meaning on historical perception and collective memory. In that sense the monument has become a site of cultural conflict instead of a symbol of national pride and triumph of the state. Today it almost evokes its antithesis as anti-monument. Memory evokes it antithesis in oblivion.

The hypothesis of the thesis is that forced amnesia is not going to change the history, but will most probably compromise and crumble the identity. The question is can we re-use the memorials as the ideologically symbolic objects of the recent past in present? If semantic associations depend on an historical memory and collective imagination, how can an architectural intervention not only enhance the wounded territory’s physical and economical posture through development, but also help re-discover and clarify a sense of new national identity?
ON THE METHODOLOGY

Methodology of the research is very eclectic; different methodological activities were used in different part of the thesis. The overall framework is set up through linking architecture with the political history of the period, in order to understand better the existing present phenomenon.

First chapter is a broad theoretical study of the monument and memorial and its multilayer significance, approached from the aesthetical and architectural point of view, and also from the topical social analysis of memory studies linked, up to contemporary memorial theories. The monument and memorial, as sites of remembrance, as “designed memory”, are analysed through physical and symbolic models through which the memory is projected into space. Historical development of memorial architecture and its formal characteristics is analysed through modern, post-modern societies up to contemporary monuments of today. The concept of the monument has gone through the radical change in the 21st century, experienced a serious semantic shift and has become a site of cultural conflict instead of national unity. Today monuments are counter-monuments: participatory monuments, based on a rejection of conventional mimetic and
heroic evocation of events, less institutional, and more self-reflexive.

The second chapter rely more on the theoretical background of social culture, researching the powerful relationship of monuments with the national state, introducing concepts of social identity and ideology and architectural dependence on political decisions. Architecture, especially memorial architecture, is therefore researched as “text of culture”, ideological tool for creation of the politically “correct” present and future.

The third chapter is a special survey is on the particular context of Socialist Federative Republic of Yugoslavia from its beginning to its dissolution. The role of architecture in the process of creation of new state, new ideology and society is the broader thematic frame. Through historiographical survey on the monumental and memorial production from the beginning of Socialist Yugoslavia, after the World War II, up to the important historical events in the sixties which represent the turning point in the memorial architecture of SFR Yugoslavia this chapter presents different phases of the memorial architecture with parallel analysis with the political history defined through precise stylistic and ideological
characteristics, from socialist realism towards socialist aestheticism or socialist modernism.

The core of the research is a phenomenon of memorial architecture built in the 60’s, 70’s and 80’s, with a special survey on surrealist production of Bogdan Bogdanovic, the most prominent and fruitful memorial architect of former Yugoslavia. Through the comprehensive bibliographic analysis of Bogdanovic and the analyses of the case studies of Memorial park Slobodište, Kruševac, Memorial park Popa, Vrnjačka Banja; Memorial cemetery in Mostar, Memorial park Jasenovac, Croatia and Memorial park Dudik in Vukovar common conclusion on the “new memorial formula” have been reached.

Further with the forth chapter is analysed the process of the changing of the overall social context with its consequences in changing social and architectural identity. The complex consequences of the transition that involves the social and physical emerging structures, is reflected in the process of mutation of meaning, ideology and the collective memory of a society. The current abandonment and forgetfulness of these memorial sites are consequential due to the painful events that occurred in SFR Yugoslavia. The universal symbolic meaning and modernist language were inappropriate for the new born
nationalism, but today represent the existing and living transnational network of charred past, and could be understood as a promise of a common future.
MEMORIAL OR MONUMENT
MEMORIALS WITHOUT MEMORY

MEMORIAL OR MONUMENT

Only a very small part of architecture belongs to art: the tomb and the monument.

Adolf Loos

Despite of abundance literature on the memorials and monuments, there is still missing one single general theory. The analyse of the term monument or memorial today represents a topical and interdisciplinary study in the fields of Cultural studies, History, Social studies and also Architecture, Aesthetics and Art History.

In the simplest way, a monument can be defined as an object of great dimensions, made of durable materials, dedicated to commemorate a person or events important for the collective memory and social identity of the society. Both terms; monument and memorial, derive from the same semantic origins from Latin monumentum which means “a monument, memorial structure, statue, votive offering, tomb, memorial record” or literally “something that reminds” from monere “to
remind, to warn”. Monument trough history had gain different and wider signification, not only: a statue, building, or other structure erected to commemorate a notable person or event, but also a building, place, or site that is of historical importance or interest and also an enduring and memorable example of something. Memorial, on the other, hand have commemoration in its semantic core.

Andras Renyi differentiated two often interchangeable terms in the sequent way. According to him, publicly erected site markers and visual signs have two different functions in a modern society: they celebrate past events, persons or symbols that are of great importance for the “positive identity” of a given community, or they may warn the community not to forget negative events, persons or symbols, that people would rather not remember. Architectural and sculptural signs referring to “positive identity” he defined as “monuments”, while those claiming more reflectiveness and critical thinking on behalf of the beholder, are “memorials”.

Andreas Renyi is a professor at Central European University and one of the European theorists in Nationalism studies. Teaches a course Monuments and Memorials: aspects of constructing national identity and public memory through the visual arts in 20th Century Central and Eastern-Europe.
Lars Berggren, on the other hand, defined three different but overlapping functions of all monuments: as a status object, as an instrument of propaganda, and as a work of art. The awareness of these functions, according to him, is crucial for understanding the single object and the process of raising monuments as a phenomenon.⁵

Taking in consideration the history and the theory of monuments that is, previous theoretical work in this field, we cannot sidestep Alois Reigl, and *Modern Cult of Monuments*. Riegl distinguishes three different commemorative values in monuments: age value; historical value and intentional value. In the work of Austrian historian “intention” occupies a central position. Specifically he classifies monuments precisely to intentional and unintentional monuments. Or the monuments explicitly and only designed and realized in order to be used in monumental purposes, and others who gain monumental characteristics over time because of the undeniable historical and artistic values.⁶


Andrea Pinotti, a professor of philosophy who’s particular interest is in theory of aesthetics, empathy and memory, notes, that, a monument, perhaps the first time, relate two seemingly contrary concepts, *the concept of death and the concept of power*. Pinotti continues "*given its phenotype and its structural relationship with the power and death, the monument cannot by its nature be approached from a perspective exclusively aesthetical or historically artistic: often, only for its size and its grandiloquence, invades and clutters the public space.*"\(^7\) Here we can trace the origins of the often used term *Public monuments*. According to this, there is to conclude that monument is an ethical, theological and political object. Monuments are to be analysed disabling its dual nature: on one hand semantic associations, symbolic meanings and ideological and political background and on the other esthetical and architectonical values of the deliberated form of art.

Researching in the sphere of power, the monument represents an intention of power to represent and to perpetuate itself through the image, through the sculpture or architecture. Referring to the relationship between monuments and power, that is the ruling political and social systems, the most

---

interesting part of this research field is the relation of monuments and totalitarian power, totalitarian regimes.

Researching the experience of death in the monument, particularly in cenotaph (empty tomb) we are on the track of the very interesting concept of presence of the absence. "As presence that marks the absence of the dead, the monument is believed to be the field of research privileged either for the historical genesis of image production as a response to the trauma of death, for the repeated arising and production of images as supplements to the missing: it not only belongs to the mnemonic traces, externalized memories, but it represents the incarnation for antonomasia."8

Memorials can be analysed as the extreme forms of what Foucault defined as Heterotopia, or places that are experienced as different, distinct from the rest of the spatial and temporal reality.9 Understood in this way, they influence the perception of time. Eternity, timelessness has always been an aspiration of the regimes and thus communication of ideas

---

in these places become more significant. A tendency for eternity in architecture is represented through the choice of materials, its duration, indestructibility and inability to change; hence it is to be understood the frequent use of stone and reinforced concrete. The second model for the research of the eternity is through its form, which is supposed to be constantly new and topical, meaning increasing alienation from formalism, constant simplification and geometrization, to abstractness as its final expression.
COLLECTIVE MEMORY IS A METHODOLOGICAL ARTEFACT

Memory is built. Memory is not something which is just there. It is also constructed... When we remember we are not in the past. We are always remembering now. The nature of the memory also changes with the present and with the future.
Daniel Libeskind

Recent works on memory within Cultural and Social studies have established Memory studies as an independent field of research and within presented different definitions and different classifications of memory. In this area the theoretical work of Maurice Halbwachs is of great importance. Maurice Halbwachs was the first, in 1920s, to introduce the theory of “collective memory” as a social phenomenon, which represents today the basis of contemporary research in memory studies. His written work was discovered about fifty years after his violent death in the concentration camp Buchenwald in 1945 and elaborated and continued in different ways. Halbwachs introduced the term “collective memory” in academic debate and gives it much greater significance than the seemingly
simple metaphor. As he stated, individual memory hardly ever exist independent, but represent always a part of a wider collective framework. The collective groups do not have memory, the memory in them does not exist a priori and by itself, but the same collective group determines the memory of its members. Halbwachs further elaborated his theory saying that the process of establishing collective memory is actually a process of reconstructing the past or certain events from the past. Collective memory, therefore, is nothing more than activities carried out in the present regarding certain events of the past. In this way, every collective memory is the processes of social modelling of the past into the socially and politically acceptable forms of the present and future, therefore collective memory is “socially determined” phenomenon. According to him, the individual and the society can only remember inside a certain “social framework”. In the same way, those events outside these frameworks, or events that are not important for the members of a society, or for the ruling elite, are to be forgotten. All collective memories in this way are restricted and directed by the governing elite.10

More recently, the late German historian Martin Broszat develops further Halbwachs theories saying that; monuments

in their references to history, may not remember events so much as bury them altogether beneath layers of national myths and explanations. According to him, monuments reduce or, in his words, "coarsen" historical understanding as much as they generate it.\(^\text{11}\)

The process of preservation and spatialization of collective memory takes place through the material performances: books, monuments, museums, street names and institutions, as well as through the celebration and commemoration of certain events of the past through the celebrations, days of remembrance, through which certain societies creates a relationship with their own past. Pierre Nora defined all these places, events and the material performance as "places of memory", "lieux de memoire"\(^\text{12}\).

Jan and Aleida Assmann elaborated the ideas of collective memory in order to form today's dominant theory of memory in Germany. They divided collective memory into two further distinctions: communicative memory and cultural memory. Similar to the notion of "embodied memory", communicative


memory is formed by the recollections of individuals that are passed down in informal, oral conversations from generation to generation. Their lifespan is generally three generations before they disappear. Cultural memory or “externalised memory”, as Assmann named it, is externalised through physical media; through images, monuments, days of remembrance, writings and other physical structures. Externalised or cultural memory in this way creates a shared or common memory for a whole society, which becomes the history lessons for present and future generations and thereby forms a shared identity for a certain group. Jansen divided, further, cultural memory into two categories; “functional memory” and “storage memory”, giving functional memory the active part of the cultural memory, the historically and ideologically creative part of memory.

Jay Winter, American researcher, uses different methods of analysis of these “places of memory”. According to him, the central place in the research of culture and politics of memory are commemorative practices that take place in these places of memory. He further stated that the process of remembrance

---

cannot be linked only to a monument or some other place of memories, but to the very specific commemorative practices that are much more inclusive than the static nature of memorial itself. Centre of his research is shifted from the monument to those practices that have led to its construction and all the practices that represent its using. Heike Karge goes further, defining the various phases in the life of a monument, the phase of growth and creation, the life phases, the phase of transformations and at the end the phase of physical and mental decline.\(^\text{15}\)

Paul Ricoeur in his recent book “Memory, History and Forgetting” argues on the topical questions of present history; “Why some events are remembered and others forgotten?” He examines the complex and reciprocal relationship between remembering and forgetting, between memory and oblivion, and the dependence of the perception of historical experience and the production of historical narrative. Ricoeur (writing about topical question of the Holocaust in Germany) introduces the concept of an “appeased memory” which is linked to forgiveness, a balance between remembering and forgetting. Ricoeur explained that “the appeased memory does not seek to

\(^{15}\) Heike, Karge, *Biografie di monumenti, Bozze della Ex Jugoslavìa, Diario Europeo*, January 2008, p.18-27, p.27
forget the evil suffered or committed. It seeks rather to speak of it without anger.” 16

MEMORIALS WITHOUT MEMORY

MEMORIAL TROUGH HISTORY

Today, culture lives under the sign of Mnemosyne, goddess of memory and mother of muses.
Daniel Abramson

Most common type of memorials in European memorial architecture is a monument in form of pillar or obelisk, which development takes roots from the classical period. Metaphorically pillars and obelisks impersonate human action, strength and power; metaphysically it represents a type of media which allows a connection between humans and the divine. It could also be interpreted abstractly as axis mundi – a point in which heavens and earth are joined.17 After a long brake which lasted throughout the middle age, obelisk as the most suitable form of celebrating people and events came back in Renaissance period, with a strong role of church and

Christian religion which takes monopoly over politics of celebrating people and events – politics of memory.¹⁸

Memorial obelisks were widespread throughout European continent. Many were built as a celebration of religion, and the first memorial pillar which celebrated secular event was built in 1677. near the London bridge. It was built, by Cristopher Rehn and Robert Hooke, in memory of a great fire which decimated London in 1666.

Most significant period for memorial architecture in Europe comes in 18th century – the age of enlightenment and romanticism. Dualism of the 18th century, expressed through the parallelism of rationalism and romanticism, was manifested in architecture through revival of both, Greek and Roman role models and Medieval, Far and Middle East influences in style. Neoclassical architecture presents a projection of modern understanding of antique aesthetics, while the Gothic, Medieval architecture had a romantic character because of its association to irrational and mysterious. Historicism was a perfect architectural tool for the

¹⁸ Strating from Pope Sixtus V obelisks were placed around the Papal Rome as an expression of world power. In the same period, the Pope used the ancient Roman columns and placed on them the images of saints. Luois, M.: Arhitektura, elementi arhitektonskog stila, Beograd, 2009, p.172.
expression of "romantic age of reason and sensuality"\textsuperscript{19}, which was reflected through memorial architecture of this and future times.

The memorial architecture bloomed throughout the continent, with a transition from pre-modern to modern perception of history, with growth of the civil awareness and nationalisms in Europe. The churches monopoly over history was taken over by the governments, thus in this period we witness a growth in number of commemorations and monuments with a goal to lower churches influence on history, culture and nationality. In this period new physical performances of remembering emerge and obtain special significance after the French Revolution through the following architectural forms: Pantheon-temples of the nation, military cemeteries, monuments and mausoleums dedicated to famous people of science, art and politics.

French bourgeois revolution has a particular significance in the history of memorial architecture. Monumentomania\textsuperscript{20}, as

\textsuperscript{19} Traktenberg, Marvin, Osamnaesti vek, u Istorija moderne arhitekture: Antologija tekstova. Koreni modernizma knj. 1, edited by M. R. Perović, Beograd, 1997, p. 21
defined by Berggen, is an intense building of monuments celebrating democracy and republic in France after the revolution. This phenomenon is highly important for development of French democratic identity. Female figure of Marianne, a personification of French Republic occupies town squares, public spaces, public institutions, as in other forms of social self-conformation (postal stamps, bank notes, etc.).

Marianne, inspired by Greece goddess Nike, will remain to have a strong influence to development of monumental architecture. Researching the role of Marianne, female figure as nation allegory, Maurice Agulhon states that “she has formed the desired type of social communication and substantially has created an individual and social identity, becoming mandatory decor of all prefectures, the municipal buildings ... ... the trademark of one European republic of that time.”

Another form of memorial has been established after the French revolution; monuments of smaller dimensions, so-called “Altars to the Homeland”. They have a form of sarcophagus and are dedicated to “martyrs for freedom”.

After French revolution army cemeteries gain special significance. They become a reflection of democratization of

---

memory, and of a new culture of memorizing their victims and heroes fallen in a fight for their nation and republic. A sacrifice for a Homeland – “Pro patria mori”\textsuperscript{23} was represented as the most divine goal. After the French revolution, a need for inventing a deeper meaning in war, become a national obsession.

Reinhart Koselleck has presented the historical evolution of monumentality. His periodization overlaps the periods of iconography from the function of the monument as a mean of legitimation and cohesion of states and societies. He explains that dynastic memorials legitimise the right of individual to inherit political offices, while republican memorials legitimise the meritocratic ideal based on deserves of individual endeavour, most often endeavour on the battlefield. The republican period has brought “democratisation of memorials” for the death, represented by individuals names inscribed in the name of a sovereign people. The subsequent nationalist period commemorated soldiers, first as heroes or defeated for the nation, and after the First World War as object of national mourning.\textsuperscript{24}

\textsuperscript{23} \textit{Dulce e decorum est pro patria mori}. Is a line from Roman lyrical poetry Odes by Horaces [Orazio, Odi, III, 2, 13. The line can be roughly translated into English as: “It is sweet and right to die for your homeland.”

\textsuperscript{24} Koselleck, Reinhart, \textit{The Practice of Conceptual History, Timing history, Spacing Concepts} [Cultural Memory in the Present], Stanford University Press, 2002, p.67
Two political tendencies of the 19th century, nationalism and imperialism, gave a character to architecture of this period. Memorial architecture in this period had a twofold purpose. Monuments, with their symbolic and educative purpose, were meant to serve as “mass production of tradition”, while at the same time building new monumental buildings and creating new ceremonies were supposed to represent nations supremacy and competitiveness on the international stage.

Similar to France, other European countries, through monuments, army cemeteries and commemorations, honoured the dead, fallen for the nation. Army monuments and army cemeteries were the first to be constructed in memory of common soldiers. In this way, through sacralisation and immortalization of regular soldier’s life, battle became a sacred duty, which deviates from everyday life, and makes a soldier into the hero of the nation. This form of commemoration, “Unknown Soldier’s” cult, and a myth about grandiose war

---

Germany has failed to present Wilhelm the First as unifier although there were raised 327 monuments until 1902. But in the course of one year after Bismarck’s death in 1898, 470 municipalities decided to raise Bismarck memorials or towers. In France, the cult of republicanism was successfully spread through two types of monuments: the idea of the republic itself (in the form of Mariana,) and bearded figure of citizens - distinguished personalities. Building of republican monuments was encouraged, and the price is paid at the local level. Buildings and monuments were the most visible form of newly established German history and the new regime. More in: Izmišljanje tradicije (edited by Hobsbawm E. and T.Ranger), Beograd: 2002, pages 284, 396-403.
experience, had its biggest expansion after the First World War. The appearance of the monument to the Unknown Soldier democratize the cult of the dead and celebrates the National Remembrance, which is, at the same time, being depersonalized, while, on the other hand monuments are becoming an identity creation of survivors. As Benedict Anderson points out, “There are no more striking emblems of modern nationalist culture of cenotaphs and tombs of the Unknown Soldier. There was no anything like ceremonial respect that the public indicates for these monuments because they are intentionally empty, or that no one knows who lies beneath. However, although in these graves there is no anyone’s remains, nor are they inhabited by immortal souls, but they are still full of ghosts of the national fantasy.”

---


MODERNITY WELCOMES MONUMENTS BUT REJECTS MONUMENTALITY

If it is a monument it is not modern, and if it is modern, it cannot be a monument.
Lewis Mumford

Modern movement at the beginnings of the 20th century changed the meaning of the monument. Lewis Mumford in 1938 famously claimed “If it is a monument it is not modern, and if it is modern, it cannot be a monument.” Mumford here was criticizing the inability of monuments to survive the fall of symbolic meaning in current times when the universal value system had changed so dramatically. The content of the monument is dependent on historical and aesthetical background of the society in that particular time. In that way the meaning of the monument is never everlasting. But anyway, the more multi-cultural and heterogeneous society was becoming, the more it was longing for unification of these parts through some common grounds. A modernist monument should be able to register this multiplicity and number of

---

competing social memories and present then trough modern language.

In 1934 Sigfried Giedion, Fernand Leger and Josep Lluis Sert write a kind of Modernist Manifest on Monumentality. In “The Nine Points on Monumentality” monuments, beside the features they already possess, are presented with critique over their inability to adapt to modern times and become powerful accents in urban context. Ironic and ambivalent towards heroism or nationalism, challenged with multiple meaning and disbelief, monuments have been found on the verge of their own existence. All along the need to create the illusion of common ideals or public memories was always alive. Modernity recalls monuments, but rejects monumentality. A monument according to modernist Manifest on Monumentality should be a product of integration and collaboration between the planner, architect, painter, sculptor, and landscapist. Modernists, for the first time, introduce the interdisciplinary approach in the field of design of public monuments. Also in the Ninth point of Monumentality, authors give some guidelines and proposals in project design, as well as guidance of using materials, green or water surfaces. A monument, in this way, becomes a modern architectural and urban element of the city adapted to the changed and modern lifestyle of the society.

“Modern materials and new techniques are at hand: light metal
structures; curved, laminated wooden arches; panels of
different textures, colours, and sizes; light elements like
ceilings which can be suspended from big trusses covering
practically unlimited spans. Mobile elements can constantly
vary the aspect of the buildings. These mobile elements,
changing positions and casting different shadows when acted
upon by wind or machinery, can be the source of new
architectural effects...During night hours, colour and forms can
be projected on vast surfaces. Such displays could be projected
upon buildings for purposes of publicity or propaganda... Such
big animated surfaces with the use of colour and movement in
a new spirit would offer unexplored fields to mural painters and
sculptors. Elements of nature, such as trees, plants, and water,
would complete the picture."\(^{29}\)

Other important contribution is the idea that the monument is
not exclusively functional or political unit, "Monumental
architecture will be something more than strictly functional. It
will have regained its lyrical value."\(^{30}\) When it comes to design
process of monumental structures, authors introduce the idea

\(^{29}\) Giedion, Sigfried, Léger, Fernand, Sert, Josep Lluis, *Nine points on
Monumentality*, 1934, p.3 available on:

\(^{30}\) Giedion, Sigfried, Léger, Fernand, Sert, Josep Lluis, *Nine points on
Monumentality*, 1934, p.4 available on:
of emotional, phenomenological experience of space that should evoke spiritual or psychological reaction.
Bojana Pejic reminds on the difference of the discourse about political memorials we can establish today and the traditional monuments discredited as “art on commend” or “art on commission”. According to her examinations, the monuments as visual representations should be understood as the “site in which power becomes constituted, where the rhetoric of the power is mostly visible”. American art historian David Summers explains that “substitutive images” (the representation of rulers) and the space in which they are used are “ipso facto realisation of power, not expression of power but actual form taken of power in one or another place or time.” Monuments in that sense, like other forms of visual representation in public sphere play a constitutive, not only reflexive role.

The role of monuments can best be followed on the example of French Republic. Collapse of the Monarchy and disappearance of the bodies and institutions of the monarch created voids in

---

31 Pejić, Bojana, Yugoslav monuments: Art and the Rhetoric of power, in MONuMENTI the changing face of remembrance, Centar za kulturnu dekontaminaciju, Belgrade, 2012, p.10
the socio-political system that was compensated by very symptomatic overproduction of symbols, rituals and ceremonies of the secular state. By creating Marianne, personifications of the Republic, that is materialized vision of the nation in the form of female figures, replaced the portraits of kings and monuments. Female Figure Marianne is not accidentally selected; Marianna takes the role of “supreme goddess” of polytheistic societies, which is the Virgin Mary of the Christian system. Particularly interesting are parallel analyses of the physical performances of Marianne and the Virgin Mary.

The spatial manifestations of religious and civic (laic) religious presentation remained the same, transposes and used in a different way in the new secular societies. The first and most recognizable motif of memorization of war is a symbol of the Pieta. Pieta, the performance of the Virgin Mary, who in her arms is holding the dead Christ, gave the seal of the entire propaganda of war and memorization of the war. Pieta is a symbol found on the numerous visual presentations of the fallen in the war. In the Word War I poster for the Red Cross, there is a nurse holding in her arms a soldier and with her strength and size offers him the last consolation. She is also a call for help and reassurance to embrace personifications of the nation for which the victim was laid. Official name of the poster, very symptomatically, is “The Greatest Mother in the World”. In a similar way at the largest Italian military cemetery in Redipuglia, the statue inside the memorial centre is represented thought the same motives: Italian soldier, exhales in hands of personification of Italy, holding on his chest Italian flag, as consolation for his laid sacrifice. This play was used in earlier decades but only after the First World War became communicative for wider parts of society.

We can also draw a parallel between the visually most widespread play of Moses who carries God’s commandments from Mount Sinai and sculpture by Joseph Chinard of the
Republic, which, in a sitting position, shows two identical boards of Moses, on which this time, instead of God’s commandments, are the Rights of Citizens and the Laws of the national state.

Familiar archetypes and mythological images and symbols, corrected into the newly created ideological and political promotion, create easier identification and faster acceptance of the changing processes. In this way symbols, archetypes and myths, already deployed in the collective consciousness, decisively influenced the formation of collective identity. We can conclude that, the process of communication of the system with the individual was always conducted in the same way, through the existing or new myths and rituals, and with purpose of greater identification of individuals with the new principles, and thus even politically and socially opposing regimes communicated on same semantic grounds.
VIOLENCE OF PUBLIC ART: ARE MONUMENTS INHERENTLY VIOLENT, OR ARE THEY A PROVOCATION OF VIOLENCE?

All efforts to aestheticize politics culminate in one point.
That point is war.
Walter Benjamin

"Much of the world’s public art – memorials, monuments, triumphal arches, obelisks, columns and statues – has a rather direct reference to violence in the form of war and conquest. From Ozymandias to Cesar to Napoleon ad Hitler, public art served as a kind of monumentalizing of violence, and never more powerfully than when it presents conqueror as a man of peace, imposing Napoleonic code or a pax Romana on the world."33 American historian WJT Mitchell in his article "Violence of Public Art” argues on the topical issue asking following questions: “Is public art inherently violent, or is it a provocation of violence? Is violence built into the monument in

its own very conception? Or is violence simply an accident that befalls some monuments, a matter of the fortunes of history?"\(^{34}\) Furthermore violence in this sense, sculptured within the monument has brought, through history, to some very aggressive responses towards them. Mitchell in this article differences two types of violence directed against monuments and public art. The first on is “official” violence of political, judicial system, as for example, was the case of the removal of the “communist Pantheon” in Budapest which was a parliamentary decision. The second one is “unofficial”, violence performed by angry masses.

As Bojana Pejic, in Yugoslav Monuments: Art and the Rhetoric of Power reminds: “Since at least French revolution, the treatment of public monuments point to the fact that image-making is as old as image-breaking”.\(^{35}\) Both image-making and image-breaking are characteristic for Yugoslav memorial scene; from the creation of first Yugoslav state after the World War I up to the dissolution of Yugoslavia and creation of new independent national states. All states form the First Yugoslavia (Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) in 1918 up to today’s national states are raised from the revolutions and

\(^{34}\) Ibid, p.378
\(^{35}\) Pejic, Bojana, Yugoslav Monuments: Art and the Rhetoric of Power, in Monumenti: the changing face of remembrance, Centar za kulturnu dekontaminaciju, Belgrade 2012, p.12
wars, so the aggressive image-breaking and new born identity creation through monumental and memorial architecture as adequate visual rhetoric are to be understood. Spatialization of a new ideology always flows parallel with the destruction of symbols of the past one.
PARADOX OF MONUMENTALITY: ANTITHESIS IN SPATIO-TEMPORAL RELATIONS

There is nothing in this world as invisible as a monument.

Robert Musil

In 1927, Robert Musil, in his famous essay on monuments, was the first to announce the paradox of monumentality, saying: "The remarkable think about monument is that one does not notice them. There is nothing in this world as invisible as a monument". Peter Carrier explains Musil’s radical scepticism towards the visibility of public monuments through following three arguments. First, he claims that anything that endures loses its power to influence the senses of the observer, such that the familiarity of a statue seen on one’s daily travels renders the statue banal. Second, at the time when Musil was writing, public monuments increasingly had to compete with media advertisements in order to capture the attention of the

public. Third, everyday settings for the monuments, such as street corners and public squares, which are decorated with dynamic scenes of galloping horses and sword-wielding soldiers frozen in the battle, render the heroic men of history ridiculous and thus precipitate them into the ocean of oblivion.\(^{37}\) Pierre Nora also argued about this subject saying, “The less memory is experienced from the inside, the more it exists through its exterior scaffolding and outward signs.”\(^{38}\) His statement can be analysed in the inverted way, presuming that the more memories are formalized thought physical structures the less is lived and experienced through personal emotional levels.

According to many theorists, historians and critics of art, an, a priori, monumental stability, grandiosity, triumphalism and pretentiousness to eternity is what makes monuments archaic, pre-modern. Respectively, contemporary historians criticize the inability of monuments to follow up socio-political changes. They remain frozen in time in which they arise and undeniably testify about that period. In the changed context they lose their intentional meaning. As, one of the most important theorist of monumental production, James Young said; neither monument

\(^{37}\) Carrier, Peter, *Holocaust monument and National Memory Cultures in Germany and France since 1989*, New York, Berghahn Books, 2005, p.15

nor its meaning are eternal. “Both a monument and its significance are constructed in particular times and places, contingent on the political, historical, and aesthetic realities of the moment.”

Young develops further his thesis about static nature and rigidity of monuments comparing it with totalitarian regimes and their exclusiveness and self-reference. “How else would totalitarian regimes commemorate themselves except through totalitarian art like the monument? Conversely, how better to celebrate the fall of totalitarian regimes than by celebrating the fall of their monuments? A monument against fascism, therefore, would have to be a monument against itself: against the traditionally didactic function of monuments, against their tendency to displace the past they would have us contemplate and finally, against the authoritarian propensity in monumental spaces that reduces viewers to passive spectators.” In his research, Young has based exclusively on the monumental heritage of Germany, comparing the monumental production of the fascist regime in the interwar period and burning issue of the commemoration of the Jewish victims in the united Germany. He claims that monuments

---


perform the function of remembrance for us, making us passive recipients of the visual content.

Time factor is very interesting in relation to monument’s attempts to freeze a moment from the past for the future. Monument has suffered dramatic changes of symbolic meanings through historical development and dynamic political and social succession of events. In this case is important to research the field of transition, where change represents the dominant cultural and social phenomenon. The process of the changing of the social context has its consequences in changing social and architectural identity. The complex consequences of the transition that involves the social and physical emerging structures, is reflected in the process of mutation of meaning, changes of ideology and the transformation of collective memory of a society. Transition understood as the theoretical concept or realistic phenomenon introduces space- temporal relations based on antithesis; as Memory - Oblivion, Monument – Anti-monument.
The scar, the wound, the place marking death exceeds our sense of order. One impulse is to repair, to repudiate, and to erase in an attempt to aid forgetting.
Karen Wilson Baptist

Memory, once willing to be physically presented, externalized from our personal and collective consciousness and guarded under other physical forms (written, graphic, sculptural, architectural), paradoxically leads to promoting oblivion. Andrea Pinotti explains that “it is precisely at the moment when I entrust the memory to an external media I can afford myself the luxury of forgetting it.” Memory as a social phenomenon is susceptible to change. Collective memory of a society is a sensitive and changeable category depending on the actual political, social and ideological goals. Social memory can rarely over-live the changed social context, and rather ends promoting oblivion or amnesia.

On the other side, we should conclude that oblivion does not exist only in the absence of monuments or commemorative

---

practices. Oblivion and silence are related to every monument. The eloquence of the monuments is tidily connected with its counterpart; the silence or muteness. Rienhart Kosselleck mentions that every collective memory implies its antipode through silence. “It belongs to the inherent logic of monuments the fact that each performance is hiding something. The key question is: What is hiding?”\textsuperscript{42} Koselleck states, exploring the memorial heritage of the First World War, that in whole Europe of the 20th century, monuments dedicated to the First World War are silent about the enemy, hiding its victims.

\textsuperscript{42} Kosselleck, Rienhart, quoted in Heike Karge, \textit{Biografie di monumenti, Bosse della Ex Jugoslavia}, Diario Europeo, p.23
The sunken fountain is not the memorial at all. It is only history turned into a pedestal, an invitation to passers-by who stand upon it to search for the memorial in their own heads. For only there is the memorial to be found.

Horst Hoheisel

The concept of the monument has gone through the radical change in the 21st century, experienced a serious semantic shift and has become a site of cultural conflict instead of national unity. Conceptualize in traditional way, monument, today, provokes diametrically opposite results of those for which it is intended “ends to promote oblivion rather than memory, amnesia rather than mneme, instead of eloquence, aphasia”.

The paradox of monumentality provoked through art history various oxymoron constructions, for example anti-monument, counter-monument. Guided by these conclusions and in order to ensure the durability of memories and presence of memory and history in the present, modern monuments are becoming

---

more and more anti, or counter-monuments. The antithesis of the traditional monument is defined through contrasts of its defining attributes. Traditional monument could be defined through several always clearly noticeable characteristics: maximum visibility, imposing dimensions, expressed verticality, durability of materials, bombastic rhetoric, and extreme figurativeness of events or persons who are commemorated. What would the anti-monument look like whose final outcome of preservation of memory and sincere eloquence freed from ideological and iconographic phrases? Whether they really need to be contrary to all the features of traditional monuments? Is the solution to the monument of modest dimensions of lightweight materials, abstract, ephemeral, invisible, subterranean?

New critical approach to the monument is brought by a new generation of artists after the fall of Berlin Wall in the reunited European context. One of the triggers for a re-thinking the concept and status of the memorial were the events of the recent past, as, for example, the competitions for the Memorials to the Murdered Jews of Europe. For the very long period Europe has proved real autism and incapacity for an adequate response to the tragedy of its past. The need for the monuments is not gone, but monument as a symbol of national
pride and triumph of the state is no more welcome in the new born societies.

German artist Horst Hoheisel had a rather intriguing proposal for the Memorial to the Murdered Jews in Berlin. Provoking and showing the absurd of the idea of building a memorial, he proposed, no longer anti-memorial, but an anti-solution for its creation. Rather than building a new facility commemorating the victims, he suggested detonating the Brandenburg Gate, and pouring its remains at the former place of existence. “How better to remember a destroyed people than by a destroyed monument?” Instead of raising a new structure to commemorate the disappearance, the disappearance of another construction would be more appropriate; instead of fulfilling the gaps created by murders in our histories and collective memories, the artist proposes the creation of gaps which would always remind us and recall us not to forget. This is an extreme response to the inability and autism of the monuments to provoke memories, their passive attitude towards the viewer, and their result in detaching ourselves from our memories. Instead of concretizing the memory and shifting it from a personal and collective into the physical and

---

political memory, the artist, on contrary, suggests an empty space where personal memories on the murdered Jews could and would meet.

Rachel Whiteread, Judenplatz Holocaust Memorial Vienna

New counter-monuments are participatory monuments, based on a rejection of conventional mimetic and heroic evocation of events. New memorial production in a less institutional, and more self-reflexive way bring people to remember traumatic events and losses, that otherwise would be rather forgotten, for instance, the Holocaust. Most contemporary monuments and counter-monuments; such as Jochen Gerz’s Vanishing column in Hamburg-Harburg, Rachel Whiteread’s Nameless Library in Vienna or Gyula Pauer’s Shoes at the Danube bank in Budapest look very different from traditional monuments.

Vanishing column in Hamburg is an interesting example of contemporary monument, anti-monument, by the artist Jochen Gerz. It is a simple polygonal black column that in a certain
time period was supposed to vanish, to disappear in the ground, to bury itself. It was an interactive monument that only by the participations of public could evolve into the memorial. People were supposed to write their own memories on the black surface and to participate in the collective remembering and mourning the victims. The column only after being covered with personal writings and memories could be buried; could vanish. James Young points out that “in fact, perhaps no single emblem better represents the conflicted, self-abnegating motives for memory in Germany today than the vanishing monument.”45 This proposal raises another important question related with the memory, the issue of duration. The closed, rounded and finished positive form, by the author’s opinion, completes the memory itself and puts an end to the question of remembering. On the contrary, it is supposed to be always open and topical issue of German society. Another interesting example could be the Sunken fountain in Kassel. The original fountain was a donation to the city of Kassel from a wealthy Jewish entrepreneur. During the Second World War the fountain was completely destructed until the resent competition for its revival and reconstruction. The winning proposal was from the German artist Horst Hoheisel. Hoheisel

has propped the exact copy of the original but inverted, sunken into the ground. It is a monument-shaped hole into which water runs from a surrounding pool; from a distance only the sound of water indicates its presence. “I have designed the new fountain as a mirror image of the old one, sunk beneath the old place in order to rescue the history of this place as a wound and as an open question, to penetrate the consciousness of the Kassel citizens so that such things never happen again.”

As seen from above, the purpose of the so-called Anti-Monuments is not to present another tombstone. They are meant not to console, but to provoke passers-by; to demand interaction, to enforce self-reflection and to make viewers experience the common space they construct around themselves.

---

Sunken fountain in Kassel, Horst Hoheisel

Jochen Gerz, Vanishing column, Hamburg
MONUMENT AND THE NATIONAL STATE
Monument and the National State

Monuments are, therefore, only possible in periods in which a unifying consciousness and unifying culture exist. Jose Lluis Sert, Fernand Leger, and Sigfried Giedion
Nine points on Monumentality

"Memories always represent processes of reconstruction". Therefore they are inseparable from the social context in which they take place. We always remember depending on the context we live in present. As Nelson and Shiff explained society’s demand to have monuments is inevitable: “monuments are symbols, built and left for the future generations to learn about the ideals of the past”. There are always two sides to a monument: the aesthetic context of a particular time and a socio-political history.

Political teachings, utopian projects, ideological trends, former totalitarian regimes have left us, today, at the beginning of the

---

47 Peitler-Selakov, Mirjana: Memorial art in Serbia from the Balkan Wars until Today, in Monuments: the changing face of remembrance, Centar za kulturnu dekontaminaciju, Belgrade 2012, p.16
21st century, some more material remains. They are numerous state symbols; monuments - the personification of social ideals through stylized fathers of nations, or new *Altars to the Homeland* (*Altari della Patria*), which were established through a series of ceremonies and rituals. These new symbols represented a guarantee of legitimacy in the international state system. "They were the main mediators in two-way communication between the state and the individual; they were carrying the whole range of emotional associations, which were offering to the individual the clearest and most direct identification with the collective."49 Regardless of the uniqueness and diversity of certain national ideologies and political systems, monuments in the period from mid-19th to the late 20th century were established as the most suitable medium of propaganda of nationalisms. They spatiality represented a great "mise en scene" of a spectacular cultural production and promotional campaigns. In this way monuments are becoming the favourite and indispensable among ideological allies and opponents. The whole century of dynamic political and social changes left a changed urban and natural landscape, modified with the new "*Altars to the nations*".

---

49 Manojlović Pintar, Olga: Ideološko i političko u spomeničkoj arhitekturi prvog i drugog svetskog rata na tlu Srbije, PhD dissertation, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, 2004, translated by author, p. 2
The main motive for the production of state symbols, that through collective divination emphasized martyrism of the individual, lays in the need for establishing a political regime and a ruling personality (monarch or the president of the republic). As Olga Manojlović Pintar explains, "in the context of a long historical duration, we are able to recognise, through the analysis of the monuments to the world wars, the opposing political projects as the poles of the same concept - complete ideologization of the society."\(^{50}\)

---

\(^{50}\) Manojlović Pintar, Olga, Ideolosko i političko u spomeničkoj arhitekturi prvog i drugog svetskog rata na tlu Srbije PhD dissertation, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, 2004, translated by author, p. 25
We must remind ourselves that the memories and identity are not fixed categories, but representations or construction of reality, subjective rather than objective phenomena, we continually correct our memory to fit in our current identities.

John Gillies

Analysis of the term ideology is meaningful for this research, especially considering the fact that the research subject is analysed through the concept of ideological conditionality of memorial architecture. From the number of definitions of ideology Althousser gave the most comprehensive one. He defined ideology as “the system of the ideas and representations which dominate the mind of a man or a social group”. In other words ideology is a rounded picture of a society as a whole and a position of a man with it. Ideology in its specific meaning is a system of values of the society and the man within, and also a system of goals and standards that one needs to realise through its activities. Althousser explained...
Marxistic Theory of society as a whole, as the structure of every society constituted by “levels” or “instances” articulated by a specific determination: the *infrastructure*, or economic base (the unity of the productive forces and the relations of production) and the *superstructure*, which itself contains two “levels” or “instances”: the politic-legal (law and the State) and ideology (the different ideologies, religious, ethical, legal, political, etc.). Ideology as superstructure is grounded on the infrastructure, as he explained, and cannot exist without the infrastructural basis. He approaches structure and function of ideology through two theses:

- Ideology represents the imaginary relationship of individuals to their real conditions of existence;
- Ideology has a material existence.

Paying the ideology the fundamental character, Althusser concludes that: “there is no practice except by and in an
ideology; there is no ideology except by the subject and for subjects.”

Understood as a form of architectural philosophy and applied conceptual schemes, the ideology represents a principled basis for all professional and social activities. According to that, all cultural practises should be analysed through their ideological coordinate system, and for the research of the creation of Yugoslav ideology, the role of architecture within is fundamental.

Memorials are inextricably linked with the politics of memory and collective identity; in this regard it is necessary to further explore the concept of identity in relation to the monuments and state policy. Policy of memories and identities has always been the domain of governing elite, even from the development of the first institutional states. But the transition to the modern national states has brought a change in terms of the phenomenon of identity, nation and state. In medieval and early...
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54 The identity explains and interprets the structure of relationship between man, community and society. It represents a sort of social mechanism that serves to highlight the conceptualization of both individuals and the entire society and different social products. If we talk about the identity of the philosophical and logical standpoint, the term ‘identity’ means ‘equality’ and ‘sameness’. This means that the identity as particular term is marked as ‘like’, i.e. equal to himself, at the same time distinguishing it from all that he is not, setting it apart as separate and different from the ‘others’. In the humanities identity represents the totality of indicators such as name, title, physical and visual manifestation. Stanford Encyclopedia of Philosophy, Identity: http://plato.stanford.edu/entries/identity-politics/
modern world, “nations” were groups of people who were
distinguished by their cultural characteristics and that existed
independently of the political institutions of kingdoms and
principalities. The turbulences in terms of national affiliation of
political boundaries of new states have changed the meaning of
identities and unleashed the political construction of identities
and state. In this context, “modern bureaucratic nation-state
identity has played a major role in the creation of national and
fateful belonging.” Identity, as artificial creation of the ruling
elite, was first theorized by Max Weber. During the nationalist
zeitgeist of the 19th century, he referred to the “artificial origins
of the belief in the common ethnicity”, and to the formation of
modern nation states driven by the political power, bureaucracy
and economic interests, as “purpose-rational association”.

“Interests, rights and markets replaced ancestry, customs and
tradition as the basis of political and economic order.” Weber
explains how the development of industrial capitalism and
anonymous state bureaucracy and secularised mass societies
led to widely spread individual uprooting and the

55 Schrader, Lutz, Monuments and the politics of identity, in MOnuMENTi the changing face of remembrance, Centar za kulturnu dekontaminaciju, Belgrade 2012, p. 8
56 Weber, Max, Economy and Society. An outline of interpretive sociology, quoted in Schradel, L., Monuments and the politics of identity, in MOnuMENTi the changing face of
remembrance, Centar za kulturnu dekontaminaciju, Belgrade 2012, p. 10
57 Schrader, Lutz, Monuments and the politics of identity, in MOnuMENTi the changing face of remembrance, Centar za kulturnu dekontaminaciju, Belgrade 2012, p. 8
disenchantment of the world. The imminent lack of social meaning and integration of the new-born societies was challenging the ruling elites. The cultural “cement” the state required was found in the elements of “ethnic affinity”, “language group” and in the “homogeneity of the ritual regulation of life, as determined by shared religious beliefs”.58

Miroslav Hroch, a political theorist, recognised for his work about the formation and evolution of the national movements in the Central and Eastern Europe, develops further theories of the of the artificial origins of national and different national identities. He defines nation in the sequent way, “Now, the nation is not, of course, an eternal category, but was the product of a long and complicated process of historical development in Europe. For our purposes, let us define it at the outset as a large social group integrated not by one but by a combination of several kinds of objective relationships (economic, political, linguistic, cultural, religious, geographical, historical), and their subjective reflection in collective consciousness.”59 Hroch further defines the development of the national community through three phases: from the birth of the
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58 Weber, Max, Economy and Society. An outline of interpretive sociology, quoted in Schradel, L., Monuments and the politics of identity, in MONuMENTi the changing face of remembrance, Centar za kulturnu dekontaminaciju, Belgrade 2012, p. 10

national idea in intellectual circles, through stages of its emancipation introducing vernaculars and spreading the press and literacy, until the final massification of national sentiment in all layers of the society. He identified three elements, as irreplaceable, in the process of nation making:

- “memory” of some common past, treated as a “destiny” of the group - or at least of its core constituents;
- density of linguistic or cultural ties enabling a higher degree of social communication within the group than beyond it;
- conception of the equality of all members of the group organized as a civil society.

If we focus on the ideology of socialism and the formerly established countries of the Eastern Bloc, it is interesting to recognise the complete negation of the previous political regimes and political system of nation-states which surrounded them. Radically changed political practices and structures of society, required a strong promotion of the socialist system of values and their simple presentation to the population through the negation of propaganda symbols of the former regime and the creation of new ones.60

60 In the Soviet Union, in different ways, was compensated the absence of public executions of rulers, by destroying monuments of Romanov family in the whole country. An
Breakups with the symbols of previous regimes and overproduction of new can be seen as a reflection of strong need for the construction of “its own acceptable” past and as a guarantee of a correct present. Its spatial representations remained the main characteristics of all revolutions (both national and social) and a precondition of successful enthronement of collectivist ideologies in political practices.

“Promoting invented traditions and a whole series of ritual, audio and visual symbols, state ideology were legitimised in front of the individual as an essential element of its identification.” 61

The common denominator of all ideologies was the need of glorification of war as creative acts of and most powerful way of promoting the state. In this context, the territory of the former Yugoslavia stands out as an interesting study case. The state composed of several nations, which emerged and dissolved

---

61 Manojlović Pintar, Olga, Ideološko i političko u spomeničkoj arhitekturi prvog i drugog svetskog rata na tlu Srbije, PhD dissertation, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, 2004, translated by author, p. 58
throughout history, different political and social regimes, wars and revolutions have left the physical traces through its memorial and monument products. The collective consciousness of society, in the turbulent decades of the twentieth century, experienced the consequences of political change and revolution. In search of an identity, and interaction with all Balkan nationalisms and of ethnicity - Yugoslav primarily [whether unitary, federal, supranational character], collective consciousness of the former Yugoslav Peoples has passed all stages of identification, from ethnic to national, to supranational.
Eric Hobsbawm in his work "Mass production of traditions" explained the artificial origins of some traditions in order to establish, as explained before, a strong identity and create belongings and affiliations to new-born society and nation. Hobsbawm differentiate mass production of traditions in two directions, official and unofficial, or how he defines the political and social direction. Production of customs, traditions was present in all periods of historical development of society, but perhaps the most developed at the beginning of the last century. The creation of new nation-states, changed border lines, complex and conflictual geopolitical situation shows an undeniable need for production of “official” common traditions of the new nation. The significance of the phenomenon of creating, inventing traditions, we can monitor repeatedly on several occasions during historical development of the last two centuries; in the period thirty - forty years before the First World War, the period between the two world wars, and finally after the World War II. There is to conclude that there was no need for the “tradition production” where the social structure

---

remained unchanged, “where it seems that people’s fate is not subordinated to other forces besides the divine one, which remained unattainable to the human kind, and where effective old forms of hierarchical jurisdiction, as well as stratified and relatively autonomous subordination, with its many forms, has remained and left unchanged”\(^6^3\). The problem was significantly bigger in the new-born countries, where there weren’t already rooted relations of political obedience and loyalty, in the emerging countries with the altered social and political structures, where the state legitimacy and legitimacy of the previous social order was not generally recognized. Establishment of legitimacy, according to Hobsbom, usually proceeded in this tree way scheme:

- Political mobilization of the masses through religion (or civil religion)
- Class consciousness (or awareness of the classless society)
- Nationalism (or supranationalism) or xenophobia.

War conflicts, unity and monolithic nature of each nation, were strength through the platitude of “external enemy” and the “victim laid on the Altar to the Homeland”, trough Nationalism

---

\(^6^3\) Hobsbawm, Eric, ibid, p. 387
(Supranationalism) and xenophobia. Social elite, through two basic paradigms, was strengthening the unity and commitment of the individual to the collective: the negative perception of the other, and clearly distancing themselves from him, and secondly through the sacralisation of war victims. Archetypal representations of good and evil, thus transferred to us and them, while each victim fallen for freedom and unification received prerogatives of martyrs and possible saints. Invention of tradition and creation of virtual social, political and cultural continuity, political elite managed to mitigate the artificiality of modern societies establishing the laic religion of nationalism, patriotism and internationalism.

Hobsbawn distinguishes three main innovations in “tradition inventing”, related to the period of rise of elective democracy and mass politics which happened from 1870 to 1914:

- progress of religious secular equivalent by introducing elementary education;
- production of new public ceremonies;
- mass production of public monuments.

Applying this theory to the case of SFR Yugoslavia we can observe and understand different models of political mobilisation. The mobilization of the masses through the
religion has always been a politically valid way to focus social attention towards politically acceptable models. In the non-religious, atheist societies, as Yugoslav society was, creating civil or secular religion was inevitable. Religion, with the church as an institution of dissemination of religious ideas, has always been considered one of the fundamental pillars of the society. In the countries of changed social conditions one so important part of the social and political foundation could not just be deleted, but instead it could be replaced by the other. In this case we are talking about “Secular” or “Civic” religions. New system of moral codex had been spread into the masses through other institutions of educational character, usually by obligatory elementary education.

In addition to the development of secular equivalent of the church through the new educational institution aimed at all social classes, special importance is given to the invention of public ceremonies. In SFRY there were established a number of new public ceremonies; such as Relay of Youth, where as in other public ceremonies, the tendency was to transform the legacy of the revolution in the combined expression of spectacle and state power and the enjoyment of the citizens. As already mentioned one of the most important forms of production of traditions according to Hobsbawm was mass production of public monuments. In all of the former Yugoslavia
about 20,000 public monuments and memorials have been constructed.\textsuperscript{64} Quantity of memorial production speaks unquestionably about the political need for the specialisation of its revolutionary traditions.

\textsuperscript{64} Lajbensperger, Nenad: Memorijali drugog svetskog rata u službi dnevno političkih potreba socijalističke Jugoslavije, in Prostori pамења 2, Филозофски факултет и Музей Примених Уметности у Београду, 2011, p. 286.
Emil Durkheim, one of the fathers of modern sociology, was the first one who recognizes the process of revolution of religious consciousness in secular forms, which is the use of civic ritual in commemoration of national events. Understanding religion, not only as a social creation, but also as divinisation of society, that is the celebration of power of society to which the individual belongs to, he saw rituals as a preparation of a man for a social life by establishing self-discipline and creating a kind of asceticism. He recognized the religious dimension in the ceremonies organized by the national state (as a form of reaffirmation of social solidarity and transferring long-term value to future generations).

“The spiritual energy flows into the social channels, which then assume a religious character and become a fertile ground for unusual form of social idolatry.” 

With these words, Nikolas Berdyaev, explains the processes of canonization and the

---

sanctification of secular principles with the aim of establishing a political gesture and propaganda of new ethics codes. Durkheim and Berdyaev recognized and defined the ways in which modern states and their institutions were promoting secular contents placing them within religious dimensions, even in moments of pronounced antagonism, and even in moments of animosity towards the church as an institution.

Parallel development with the state, made monumental symbolism one of the crucial places in the establishment of laic religion of nationalism - propagating transcendent symbols of martyrism and thus enabling the wide deployment of national ideals. This phenomenon becomes particularly apparent in the second half of the 19th and especially after 1914, when the monuments have become the clearest model of keeping the memory of the millions of dead, and required practice of all communities, regardless of the forms of its government. As ones crucifixes and statues of the patron saints, they have become places of gathering of the community in mourning for the lost members and simultaneous manifesting the pride for their sacrifices. Emphasizing that fallen gave lives for higher goals, such as liberation of the Homeland and the salvation of

---

66 Manojlović Pintar, Olga, Ideolosko i političko u spomeničkoj arhitekturi prvog i drugog svetskog rata na tlu Srbije. PhD dissertation, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, 2004, p. 67
the nation, the government “nationalized the lives of its citizens.”

Yugoslav memorial, especially the more important memorial complexes can be analysed as the Altars of the secular religion of Socialism. They have a spatial structure, which is very often closely related to the sacred spaces, temples. But its meaning-making comes, not only from its spatial form and organization, but also from it public and daily use. “Society over the signifying practice sets the network of agents that will suppress the reality of signifying practices in the name of symbolized and acceptable and tolerable reality. Art is a fine instrument of production other than itself, displaying or reflecting other than itself.” Šuvaković, with these words, gives a theoretical background in the field of social semiotics, in order to better understand and analyse daily political use of monuments as an important signifying practice of Socialist leading politics.

The construction of a new public building was often completed with the inauguration of a monument. The ritual has changed

---

69 Social semiotics is a branch of semiotics which investigates human signifying practices in specific social and cultural circumstances, and which tries to explain meaning-making as a social practice.
little to this day. It generally began with the initiative to construct a monument, followed by the debates on its political message and aesthetic form. The public excitement created by the media and opinion leaders formed part of realisation. Once attention had been drawn, the monument already began to have a political and educational impact – even before the first stone had been laid. In this process national hierarchies of meaning were questioned and confirmed, overturned and constructed. That is why all elements are hotly debated: artists and locations, designs and realisation, invitations to and speeches at the inauguration. The reason for increased public interest had much to do with the new function of monuments during the formation of modern nation states. A decidedly representational and educational purpose in the name of the national idea came to the fore. Subsequently personalities – almost exclusively men – were put on the pedestal, which had rendered outstanding services to the nation by defending it on the battlefield, contributing to the rebirth and development of the national language, or shaping the national literature, art and science. Metaphorical representations of key events in the national history were also popular. The nation was to be united around the historic experiences, achievements and symbols, so to speak. In the process not only the public’s mind-set but also
the entire public space was remapped historically and politically. Propaganda speeches on the memorial places were perfect places for dissemination of the political ideas. Stefano Taiss defines it as “a pedagogical aspect of use of monuments”. Monuments in Yugoslavia underline this aspect. Within the monument there is always designed and an outdoor amphitheatre, where can be organized opening propaganda speeches, historical lectures, national celebrations, linking descendants and ancestors in a holy order in this holy place. Visiting memorials of the Socialist Yugoslavia was obligatory, but often presented, as sacred duty of the citizen to honour his descendants fallen for our liberty and independence. Pilgrimage visit to the memorial places were organized as obligatory school visits with educational character. Memorial sites, for that reason, are equipped with all complementary facilities; in form of accommodation, sport and leisure facilities and obligatory educational infrastructure, as open amphitheatres, conference rooms etc.

Yugoslav memorials were spectacles by their own nature, but also spatially produced sceneries for spectacle, ceremonies,

---

70 Schrader, Lutz. Monuments and the politics of identity, in MOnuMENti the changing face of remembrance, Centar za kulturnu dekontaminaciju, Belgrade 2012, p. 8
71 Stefano Taiss, Presente! I memoriali del fascismo italiano, in Memorie di pietra, I monumenti delle dittature (edited by Piretto, Gian Piero), Raffaello Cortina Editore, 2014, p.69
opening, and speeches. It was a political activity of the Party and state leadership represented through the monuments daily use and especially in the act of ceremonial openings of the monuments. During the ceremonial opening, with numerous public presents, it was obligatory to open the memorial complex with a speech, from someone from top of government and the party and often it seemed to be Josip Broz Tito. In these speeches, in addition to highlighting the events and personalities that memorial commemorate, they spoke about the current situation in the country, foreign and internal policy. This has had propagandist purposes to present the results of the state and party politics and to inform about future steps of the government. Due to the large period of time at the openings was talked about plenty topics.

4th July 1971 – the Day of Battle in Tjentište, Socialist Republic of Bosnia and Herzegovina
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1945. ____ 1946. ____ 1947. ____ 1948. ____

TIMELINE

May 1, Liberation of Trieste
May 9, Victory in Europe Day
May 15, Military operation in Yugoslavia completed.

December 19, Constitutive assembly adopted a declaration proclaiming Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia.

January 31, the first Constitution of the FPRY was proclaimed.

December 5, Nationalisation Law adopted.

The first five year plan was adopted, although because of the break with the USSR it took 6 years to conclude.

October 11, exhibition Architecture of the people of the USSR in Belgrade.

July 21 – 28, Congress adopted the Programme and Statues of the CPY.
A resolution approved the view of the CC of the CPY about the unjust accusations of the Cominform and the CC of the Soviet Union.
Tito’s NO to Stalin.

Antun Augustinčić, Monument to the Red Army in Batina

Russian architect Aroncik, Monument in Murska Sobota

Momčilo Belobrk, Monument in Ritopek
The National Assembly voted in
the Law on the
Conveyance of Factories to
Worker Management, in line
with Marx’s motto Factories to
Workers, Land to Peasants.

Worker self-management
given statutory force.

Counseling of Architects in
Dubrovnik.

Exhibition of Petar Lubarda in
Belgrade marked a definitive
break with ‘objective visual art’.

New tendencies in visual arts:
catching up with post-war
avant-garde trends.

Zagreb’s EXAT 51 opposed
geometrical abstraction to the
socialist-realism concept.

End of socialist realism:
a paper of Miroslav Krleža at
the 3rd Conference of the Fed-
eration of Writers of Yugoslavia
in Ljubljana, a theoretical
show-down with the dogmatic
understanding of literature,
fine art and music.

Agreement reached between
the governments of Italy, UK,
USA and Yugoslavia about the
Free Territory of Trieste.

Novi Sad agreement:
official use of the
Serbo-Croat standard lan-
guage.

Sreten Stojanović,
Monument Liberty
at Iriski venac

Bogdan Bogdanović
Monument to the Jewish
Victims of Fascism, Belgrade

Edvard Ravnikar,
Memorial complex Kampor,
Island Rab
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1956. During a visit to India, Tito's meeting with Prime Minister Nehru.

1958. Meeting of Tito, Nehru and Nasser on the Brijuni islands, and a declaration was framed condemning the division of the world into blocs, and proposing peace-loving active coexistence among the nations.

1960. For the first time since 1938, general elections are held, for the new Federal Assembly and the parliaments of the republics. A decision of the new Federal People's Assembly, Petar Stambolić presiding, Tito was re-elected President of the Republic.

Population of Ljubljana was 152,000, of Zagreb 585,000, of Belgrade 680,000, Sarajevo 183,000 and of Skopje 185,000.

Currency reform launched.

Process of liberalisation of the foreign currency regime foreseen, in phases. For the first time it was possible to keep foreign currency in a private account, with initial deposit of ten dollars.

Tito travelled to the USSR, where he signed the Moscow Declaration acknowledging the possibility of different ways to socialism.

---

Bogdan Bogdanović, Memorial in Sremska Mitrovica
Economic reforms.
First post-war census: population of 18,512,805

First conference of the Non-alignment movement held in Belgrade, with 25 countries taking part. Yugoslav delegation consists of Josip Broz Tito, Edvard Kardelj, Koča Popović, Vladimir Bakarić and Veljko Vlahović.

Ivo Andrić wins the Nobel Prize for Literature.

New constitution proclaimed, the name of the country changed, the new name being the Social Federal Republic of Yugoslavia.

Disastrous earthquake destroys Skopje. 1,070 dead, 2,900 injured and four fifths of the houses in the town are destroyed.

Special UN Fund and Yugoslav government promoted an international competition for the centre of Skopje; winning architects are Kenzo Tange, Tokyo, and Zagreb architects Radovan Miščević and Fedor Wenzler.

4th Plenum of League of Communists of Yugoslavia held in Brijuni Islands.

Bogdan Bogdanović, Memorial Jasenovac

Bogdan Bogdanović, Prilep memorial

Ivan Sabolić, Memorial complex Bubanj, Nis

Bogdan Bogdanović, Slobodište, Kruševac

Bogdan Bogdanović, Memorial graveyard in Mostar

Boris Magaš, Edo Smidihen Museum of the Revolution in Sarajevo

Janez Lenassi, Monument in Ilirska Bistrica

Kenzo Tange, Master plan for the center of Skoplje
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Student demonstrations in Belgrade, clashes with police. Protests in other centres of Yugoslavia. Red Universities: students occupy faculty buildings and try to introduce university autonomy.

Administration settles accounts with extreme left, the leaders of the student revolt and representatives of the modernisation of the Yugoslav left.

MAPOC-mass movement in Croatia; polititions of the Croatian Spring forced to resign - Slavko Dapčević Kučar and Miko Tripalo.

“Cadre” change in media and university. Cultural organisation Matica hrvatska and Prosvjeta abolished.

Nixon-Tito meeting.

New constitutions od SFY adopted. Constitutional amendments create the autonomous provinces of Vojvodina and Kosovo.

Jovan and Iskra Grabulovski, Makedonium memorial

Dušan Đžamonja, Monument to Slavonia fighters, Kamenska

Marko Mušić, Memorial centar Kolašin, 1975

Vojin Bakić, Monument to Slavonia fighters, Kamenska

Boško Kićanski, Memorial in Makljen, 1978

Dušan Đžamonja, Memorial Osaury in Bartella, Italy, 1970

Svetlana Kana Radčević, Memorial in Barutana

Miodrag Živković, Tjetište, Sutjeska

Ivan Antić, Ivanka Raspopović Šumarice Memorial complex, Kragujevac

Vojin Stojić, Monument at Kosmaj

Bogdan Bogdanović, Memoril Jasikovac, Berane

Dušan Đžamonja, Kozara monument
May 4, Jospi Broz Tito died in Ljubljana hospital.

Signing of a petition against the 133rd article of the criminal code in SFRY, which had become synonym for the political persecution of people who thought differently.

Winter Olympic games held in Sarajevo, first time in the Socialist country.

14th Congress and disintegration of the League of Communists of Yugoslavia.

First multi-party elections in Slovenia, Croatia and Serbia.

Dissolution of Yugoslavia.

Miodrag Živković, Memorial Kadinjača, 1979

Bogdan Bogdanović, Monument Popina

Bogdan Bogdanović, Memorial Dudik

Vojin Bakić, Monument in Petrova gora, 1981
MEMORIALS WITHOUT MEMORY
MEMORIAL ARCHITECTURE IN SOCIALIST FEDERAL REPUBLIC OF YUGOSLAVIA

YUGOSLAV IDEOLOGY AND CREATION OF YUGOSLAV IDENTITY

The ideological system of socialist Yugoslavia was in constant flux. At its core was communism, whose manifestations evolved from totalitarian Stalinism to highly decentralized system of social-self-management. The next ideological layer related to “resolving the national question” through federalization of the constituent nationalities, held together by the increasingly loose concept of brotherhood and unity. Foreign policy oscillated from close alliance with the USSR to leadership in the Non-Aligned Movement. Finally, like all revolutionary societies, socialist Yugoslavia established its own traditions, on one hand through the massive commemoration of the revolution and the war for national independence, on the other hand through the personality cult of the country’s leader, Josip Broz Tito.

Vladimir Kulić

The Yugoslav path started after the World War I, with the intention to unite the South Slavic people into one single state for the first time in their history. First Yugoslavia, Kingdom of
Serbs, Croats and Slovenes\textsuperscript{72}, emerged from the ruins of the two major empires; Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian Empires, and they both have left a significant mark on the entire region, thus emphasizing the differences between Balkan people that have existed throughout centuries. Yugoslav path, from the WWI until the dissolution, wasn’t a straight line development, but it was rather a complex and discontinues progress. Evolving and growing Yugoslavia spitted twice on its way. First time at the beginning of World War II, during the Nazi German occupation in 1941, and second break occurred in 1991, shortly after Tito’s death and during a time when numerous countries of the eastern bloc were experiencing their own collapses. Each break swept through the Yugoslav territory in form of a class, religious and ethnic war causing a revolutionary reinvention and transformation of its physical and ideological state.\textsuperscript{73}

The collective consciousness of the former Yugoslav nations had passed all the ideal political systems and revolutions: from liberal bourgeois capitalism and liberal capitalist fascism, national and revolutionary communism, Stalinism, real

\textsuperscript{72} Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was formed in 1918. The state changed its name into Kingdom of Yugoslavia, by King Aleksandar I Karadjordjević in 1929. Yugoslavia was state’s colloquial name from its origins.

\textsuperscript{73} Djurić, Dubravka, Šuvaković, Miško, Impossible histories: Historical Avant-Gardes, Neo-avant-gardes, and Post-Avant-Gard in Yugoslavia 1918-1991, MIT Press, 2006, p.3
socialism, self – governing socialism, post socialist patriotism and transitional post socialism. \(^7\) Searching for national identity, national awareness has passed through all stages of collective affiliation; from ethnic to national and supranational. In the period of such turbulent events and changes, there is the evident need for promoting the state and strengthening its identity through the symbols. Their identification with the citizens was of crucial importance for the survival and future life of the social and political system.

Identity is typically constructed through carefully chosen cultural content. Yugoslav identity chose such content which needed to fulfil certain tasks. Most importantly, this content was to round off Yugoslav nation as a singular, real and authentic which stand opposite other contemporary nations – Italian, German, Hungarian etc. Simultaneously, main purpose of the Yugoslav identity was to oppose particular, ethnic identities which remained strong in South Slavs nationalities, and to discourage them depending of the political context.

FPR Yugoslavia\(^7\) developed on the political ideals, established already during the WWII, during the partisan struggle and has


\(^7\) Yugoslavia was renamed the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia in 1946, when a communist government was established. In 1963, with the new constitution, the
been developing, as a promise, with minor variations until the end of Tito’s life. Simplified, they could be represented through the two elements:

- Idea of social justice and equality, that from the economic standpoint was developing through the redistribution of resources, wealth and production and after various forms definitely established in form of Socialist Self-management;

- Politically motivated creation of a supranational identity of Yugoslavism, synthesized through the slogans of Brotherhood and Unity (Bratstvo i Jedisntvo).

At the end of the war, the newly formed socialist country faced numerous questions that needed to be resolved; how to rebuild the country, how to define a political and national identity and finally, how to resolve the question of a delicate geographical position between the East and the West. Yugoslav leaders adopted the socialist ideology already during the war and were

---

country was renamed again to the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia (SFRY). The state is most commonly referred to by this last full name (Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia), which it held for the longest period of al
determined to follow the path of the Soviets and adopt their model in establishing “its economic planning organisation, judicial systems, state bureaucracy, health care and educational systems, and cultural and educational spheres”.

Immediately after the war Yugoslavia did belong to the Eastern bloc, growing from a rural to an industrial country, building its urban proletariat system. During this alliance, the Yugoslav regime tried to impose socialist realism as an official style in arts and architecture. However, this attempt had little success since already in 1948 Yugoslavia’s conflict with the Cominform will result in its walking away from the Soviet partnership, and its political, social and cultural models. Three years of alliance was too short period to create an important changed urban character. More impact can be traced in the other forms of art; literature, painting, sculpture and some example of memorial architecture are valid as well.

Great number of the architects of the older generation, especially those who were oriented toward academicism and national style, ended their carriers in the post-war period. The younger generation of architects, more easily fitted into the

---

76 Perović, Miloš: Iskustva prošlosti Gradjevinska knjiga, Belgrade, 2008, p. 28
77 Cominform - Communist Informational Bureau was founded in 1947, represents the official forum of the international communist movement since the dissolution of the Comintern and confirmed the new realities after World War II, including the creation of an Eastern Bloc.
new political and social system, and they already affirmed themselves in the fourth decade. Mostly they were the architects of modern orientation, many of them before the war belonged to the GAMP [Group of Architects of Modern Movement], so that the construction in the post-war period has become, in many ways, related to the achievement of pre-war modern architecture.\(^7\) Nameplates of the project architect, which one could find in the new built residential and public buildings the pre-war period are replaced in the same way, by the names of the large construction companies, representing symbolically one of the main features of the construction of a new era - the abolition of the private sector and the vanishing of the identity of the artist.\(^7\) Depersonalization of architects in the fifth decade was accompanied by extremely limiting artistic freedom and creativity and determining and directing design approach and prescribing certain typology of buildings. Both types of reduction of identity will experience its transformation at the beginning of the sixth decade.

Architecture was given a significant role to participate in the constitution of Yugoslav new, modern, progressive identity. However, its contribution was not most influential; other social

\(^7\) Bogunović, Slobodan, Arhitektonska enciklopedija Beograda XIX i XX veka, Beograd 2005, p.1322
\(^7\) Prosen, Milan, O Socrrealizmu u arhitekturi i njegovoj pojavu u Srbiji, Nasledje IX, Belgrade, 2008, p. 96.
and scientific activities also were involved in this process. Antropo-geography and ethnopsycho (Jovan Cvijić), ethnography (Niko Zupanić), linguistics (Aleksandar Belić), social psychology (Vladimir Dvorinković), political history (Stanoje Stanojević, Viktor Novak, Vladimir Ćorović,..), as well as daily social activities such as magazines “Jugoslovenska reč” (Yugoslav word), “Jugoslovenska žena” (Yugoslav women) created, explained, supported and maintained Yugoslav identity.

Neven Šegvić’s introduction in the journal Arhitektura, gives an insight of the architectural profession within overall political situation. “Our theoretic standpoint regarding the matter of architectural shaping must be based on the analysis of a contemporary socialist social system, on the analysis of the forms of its organization, analysis of the development of its material assets, of its conceptual and cognitive progress. The entirety of all those factors creates the basis for the development of a contemporary architectural formation that must be the expression of its time.”

Yugoslav identity through architecture can be traced in different moments of urban and architectural production in the country.

---

80 Šegvić, Neven, foreword, journal Arhitektura, n.12, 1950, p.3
First of all there were through the construction of the six capitals of the republics, through their political and public institution; national assemblies, party headquarters, universities, libraries as the pillars of the represented national identities. The second way was through the Yugoslav presentation in the international events; such as pavilions on the International exhibitions, but also through the architectural infrastructure of the international events hosted in Yugoslavia (Winter Olympic Games in Sarajevo, Mediterranean games in Split, or the International Non-Aligned Movement conferences). Finally, one of the most important segments in the symbolic legitimization of the system was the construction of the memorials and monuments to the anti-fascist war and the revolution.
Competition proposals for new Master plan for New Belgrade, 1947
Above: Urban Planning Institute of Belgrade,
Below: Edvard Ravnikar
The idea to mark the territory where People’s Liberation Army of Yugoslavia led one of its most difficult and critical battles in World War II, is a unique example of ethical wisdom, evocative traditionalism and social usefulness. And not so much because of the debt to the dead, as much for the living, for the young generation who can take the ethical ideals of Sutjeske from the past into the present moment and into the vision of the future. Because Battle on Sutjeska is not a drama on human dying and nothingness of death, but an act for which we all live, the call on obligation, that conscience that drives on reflection, that echo that warns.

Ljubo Mihić

The Second World War in Yugoslavia was a complicated and complex conflict on national and international levels. It had the characteristics of Liberation War from foreign occupiers (Germans, Italians, Hungarians, and Bulgarians), also it was a war with the civil society, nationalist pro-Nazi forces against populations of other nationalities. It also had the characteristics of a national, civil war between ideologically opposing military national formations; on the one hand the Croatian nationalist groups of the extreme right Ustashe and on the other Serbian monarchists of conservative right Chetniks, on third side Partisan resistance movement, which become massive along the war, and which came out of the war as the
winner. There were also present other national military and pro-military forces in different parts of Yugoslavia. This confusing and conflicting situation, of extreme intensity, at the conclusion of the War, has being presented through a generally accepted myth and the official thesis that the war was fought between the Yugoslav peoples and their foreign collaborators against foreign occupiers (German, Italian and other fascistic forces) and domestic traitors.  

In order to create new ideology of Yugoslavism, social and political elite directed the collective memory through the newly created memorial structures towards more institutionalized “our history”, “history of the winner.” The winners, not only write the history, but are also inclined to selective memory. At the beginning of the new epoch, with the end of the war, the Partisan forces were trying to present the history of WWII in Yugoslavia as a Partisan struggle, helped and supported by all citizens of Yugoslav countries. The idea of the enemy was completely transferred to the foreign enemy of fascistic forces, and the “domestic traitors” who were instigated, almost obliged to collaborate with the enemies, according to the post-war thesis. “In this way, the civil war and the war against

---

citizens, that were the main element of the conflict, disappeared from the public memory.\textsuperscript{82}

National Liberation War “therefore, represents the foundation myth of Socialist Yugoslavia, as it was the case of wars of independence or the Great War for many European countries”.\textsuperscript{83} Yugoslav people, united by the communist Partisans, and divided by occupiers, are to be considered innocent.\textsuperscript{84} It was, indeed, a consolatory vision, easily accepted for everyone. With these statements the state was trying to clean the public conscience and present itself as a united and compact in front of the challenges of the reconstruction.

Cultivation of remembrance of the National Liberation War and other revolutionary traditions, as brotherhood and unity, was one of the most meaningful tasks of Yugoslav authorities. By cultivating revolutionary traditions, it meant primarily: commemoration of the revolution and national liberation struggle through on the first place memorial architecture. Not only the governmental institutions were in-charge, but they naturally controlled and monitored the processes. The process of writing and constructing memory was knitted through all

\textsuperscript{82} Gobetti, Eric, Partizanski spomenik, Appunti sulla funzione simbolica dei monumenti partigiani nella Jugoslavia di Tito, in Memorie di Pietra, Raffaello Cortina Editore, 2014, p.166
\textsuperscript{83} Gobetti, Eric, \textit{Ibid}, p.166
\textsuperscript{84} Gobetti, Eric, \textit{Ibid}, p.166
levels of the society in many different ways: by erecting memorials, memorial parks, by organizing marches on the roads of the Brigades, by maintaining events, giving the names of fallen soldiers to the schools, factories, and streets.

War memorials to the liberation war (which in Yugoslavia coincides with the Communist and Socialist revolution) gained, in this way, an enormous importance as material manifestation of one of the most fundamental narratives of the new state: the simultaneous national and class liberation of Yugoslav people.
Map of important memorial sites in Ex-Yugoslavia
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It is important to explain the “monument” phenomenon in communist society. Socialist ideology with its strive to utopia makes the natural and logical attempt to strengthen validate communism through architectural propaganda. A large number of projects are called monuments, making it easier for the party to claim that they are “eternal”. Communist monuments are more often inhabitable structures with strange functional concept, rather than sculptures and statues. An accurate analogy is to look at them as temples of communist ideology.

Dimitar Baldzhiev

Monuments were raised through the entire lifetime of SFRY, but not in the same way and with the same goals or stylistic and aesthetic characteristics. More than 20 000 monuments were raised during the life time of Socialism in Ex-Yugoslavia. The quantity speaks undeniably about social and political necessity for the physical demonstration of its ideas. Considering the fact that Yugoslav discontinuities in the political sense are reflected also in its architectural legacy I elaborated the classification of memorial production in SFRY. In the following chapter, I have divided the process of raising a memorial in Yugoslavia into three phases considering political

---

and aesthetic steam. The three phases are defined by the years that represent milestones in the history of Yugoslavia. The first phase starts with the creation of post-war Yugoslavia in 1945 until the conflict with the Cominform in 1948, the second phase lasts up to 1961, which is considered a turning point in Yugoslav history, as a year of important political and economic reforms, third phase lasts until the end of Tito’s life in 1980 and the end of Yugoslavia soon after.
Sovietisation of Culture - Theorizing Social Realism (1945-1948)

We have to look upon the architects of the USSR... (in order to) be able to produce works mature enough to initiate the beginning of the new architectural epoch, epoch of socialist realism in architecture.

Durad Bošković, Arhitektura, 1947

The first phase in the memorial production of SFRY starts with the end of Second World War, and a creation of a new state. Communist government, during this period, was marked by the conflicts between the dominant cultural models of the East, and repressed, but never completely rejected cultural values of the West. Yugoslavia during WWII went through a socialist revolution, controlled and operated by the Communist Party. Pre-constitutional situation of Yugoslavia was characterized by a strong state government of the Communists, who were preparing the transition to a Soviet-style socialism, which happened in the spring of 1945. Immediately after the war, as a
faithful ally of the first country of Socialism, Yugoslav regime followed and copied the political and cultural platforms from Soviet Union. That period can be characterized as the Sovietisation of culture, which influences in the theory and practice of socialist realism will become visible in all spheres of cultural life. Cultural policy of that period was set to satisfy the most basic cultural needs of the population. Its task was to popularize and familiarize the construction of new government and economic reconstruction of the country. Through the work in the field of culture, government was supposed to present the objectives of the Communist Party to the society and to liberate it from the Western cultural and ideological influences.

Soviet influence and the ideas of Socialist realism were disseminated in several ways; primarily through: translating scientific and professional literature, literary works, dramatic literature, textbooks; and through the press, magazines, theatre, film, music, literature, art, architecture, education of Yugoslav people in the USSR, and the guest performances of Soviet scientists, writers, actors and visual artists in Yugoslav main cultural centres as Belgrade or Zagreb.

The ideas of the new socialist system, modelled after the Soviet Union, was transferred into the field of urban design and architecture, through several state institutions; most
importantly through the activity of the Society for Cultural Cooperation of Yugoslavia with the USSR (with independent section for urbanism and separate sections for architecture) and the Federal Association for Cultural Relations with Foreign Countries. The activity of the two organizations was based on the organization of exhibitions, publications, lectures, etc. Of particular importance, primarily for the dissemination of ideas of Socialist realism, as official style in architecture, was the exhibition Architecture of the people of the USSR, opened in the hall of the Academy of Sciences in Belgrade, in October 11, 1947, in honour of the anniversary of the October Revolution.

President of the Committee for Education and Science in Yugoslav Government, Marijan Stilinović, opened the exhibition saying that, “In a socialist society architects have stopped being hired labourers and servants of capitalists and landlords, they were liberated of caprices and demands of various upstarts and they finally put their talents and creative abilities to the service of the people”. During his speech, among others, he pointed out the supremacy of Socialist realism in front of the others historical styles. “The Soviet architects have shown that, in this way, they had dealt with distasteful combination of different styles inherited form the bourgeois period, also with formalistic and constructivist architecture which expresses the decadence of bourgeois culture, and they took the path to create realistic
architecture, which mainly wants to comply the artistic principle with functional principle.”

Socialist realism in SFRY should be seen as an attempt to create a symbol of the new social order, emerged after the reunion of Yugoslavia and the Soviet Union in 1945. The term originated from the socialist realism in literature, extended to the visual arts, setting for the ideal of a celebration of the common man, the working man, proletariat, and later the leader and the party. The key concepts of Socialist realism defined as "partiinost’" (party-mindedness), "ideinost" (ideological-content), "klassovost" (class content), "pravdivost" (truthfulness) were compatible with Yugoslav cultural and social policies. Immediate changes were made in literature, painting and sculpture, but imposing a symbolic break at the level of built environment was a much more daunting task. The transformation of human environments takes a slow pace, even in much more resourceful countries than Yugoslavia was immediately after World War II. The pressing need to assert power symbolically, especially at the end of the war and in the immediate post-war period, when the reign of the Communist Party was not yet firmly established, had to be accommodated.

---

87 Anonim, U Beogradu je otvorena izlozba fotografija "Arhitektura naroda SSSR", Daily news Borba, 12.10.1947, translated by author, p.4
in supplementary ways. One way was making of highly visible new symbols whose construction was not physically demanding, memorial construction of wide range, “from ephemeral decoration to permanent memorial structures bordering on architecture.”  

This period was marked by mass construction of memorials of simple tombstone character, smaller dimensions, symbolically marked by the five-pointed star, with or without the hammer and sickle, and often even with the orthodox cross. In some cases there were constructed commemorative graveyard for both; soldiers of Red Army and Jugoslav Army, which had a special ideological importance and commemorative function. Red stone was used very often for the memorials, which is symbolically tied to the notion of the Red Army, and the colour red as the dominant characteristic of the Communist Party. As a sign of appreciation for the assistance during the war and the liberation, and also as a sign of friendship between the two communist parties or the two countries, first Memorials built in the territory of former Yugoslavia were dedicated to the Soviet Red Army. The most important monuments were raised in Murska Sobota (1945), Ritopek (1946) and Batina (1947).

---

89 Kulč, Vladimir, Land of the in-between: modern architecture and the state in Socialist Yugoslavia, 1945-65, PhD dissertation, The University of Texas at Austin, 2009, p.75  
90 It is important to mention the ideological and political wish through which victim of the Red Army was presented quite often greater than that of partisan victim for the
The Batina monument\textsuperscript{91} to the soldiers of Red army became the first important architectural statement of Communist power in Yugoslavia and one of the most explicit visual proclamations of Yugoslavia’s short-lived allegiance to the Stalinist Soviet Union. Moreover, it suggested the direction in which Yugoslav architecture could develop if allegiance survived longer than a mere three years.

\textsuperscript{91} The Battle of Batina took place 11-23 November 1944 and was one of the final operations in the liberation of Yugoslavia. The Red Army and the People’s Liberation Army of Yugoslavia fought German units fortified at the hilly right bank of the Danube. Crossing the river from the Vojvodina while exposed to German fire, they suffered considerable losses of at least 2,000 soldiers. Particularly bitter fights occurred at the cliff above the Danube, where the monument was placed after the war.
Antun Augustincic, an already affirmed sculptor during the “Old Yugoslavia”, but at the same time close friend of Tito, the Vice President of Yugoslavia’s provisional parliament at the time, decided to take over the project for Batina monument. Together with his pre-war collaborator Drago Galic, created a monument on a traditional tree level composition; marble podium with figural composition of soldiers, an obelisk in the middle and a sculpture on the top. Oval marble podium rises from the slope of the hill, with a broad semi-circular staircase facing the river Danube.

Antun Augustinčić and Drago Galić, plan for the Batina monument

The two bronze soldiers stand on the rectangular block in the middle of the staircase. The obelisk, formally the most complex

---

92 At first, the project was assigned to a Russian architect signed by the name Feldman. Feldman designed the monument in June 1945, and only six months later Augustincic rejected the existing project and proclaimed himself in charge of the memorial site. Kulic, Vladimir: Land of the in-between. Modern architecture and the state in Socialist Yugoslavia, 1945-1965, PhD dissertation, University of Texas at Austin, 2009, p.81
element of architectural design, rises from the podium abruptly and is equally abruptly truncated at the top. The multifaceted obelisk form conceals an ideological reference: the upper half of the obelisk is shaped in a five-pointed star plan; in the lower half, additional five arms support the figures of that symbolize Red Army soldiers. These sculptures were executed in marble to blend with the pillar and not distract from the _Victory_ on the top. The sculpture of Victory steps in the triumphant way forward. Her hair and clothes wave in the wind evocating Nike’s wings. She holds a torch with a five-pointed star, raised in her left hand, a communist symbol of star embedded in the flame provides a proper ideological connotation. In her right hand, she carries a sword pointing downward but which seems ready to be used in the very next moment, perhaps a hint at the never-ending task of revolutionary activity. Military connotations are strengthened through two bronze combatants advancing in a powerful diagonal motion. Romantic, idealized image suited the much more general message, “*that of the victory of socialism, referring not just to a past event, but even more to a promising future.*”

---

93 The shape of the pier brings to mind another canonic piece of 1930s Socialist Realism: the Red Army Theater in Moscow, whose plan and many details, including columns, were also shaped like five-pointed stars.

The evident propaganda support can be best shown from the words of Belgrade writer and art critic Otto Bihalji Merin, who compared Batina Victory to the Statue of Liberty of New York. "Like the tower of illumination, monument is powerfully rising over the water and the land. Heroic breath of that work and power of consciousness of the mind that created it, brought many young people from all around the world. They come from the countries of capitalism ... passing lands and seas, at the gate of the former "New World" left behind another monument, which once had the name of Liberty." He continued defining it as a "symbol of eternal brotherhood (between the Soviet and Yugoslav people) and a symbol of the Yugoslavs' love and gratitude to the Red Army." He proclaimed the monument one of the "great works of art of today," obviously elevating it to the status of a role model for art and architecture of socialist realism.

Ideas of socialist realism in art corresponded to the values of the political revolution and the struggle for liberation from fascist occupation. Other monuments built in this period usually contained figurative compositions, in fighting positions, highlighted verticality and an obligatory five-pointed star as a symbol of communism. Emphasizing martyrism within the idea

---

95 Bihalji Merin, Oto: Dve statue slobode, (Two statues of liberty), Književnost, January 1948, Vol1, translated by author, p.24
of the revolution, especially in these early years, seemed the decisive element for the creation of the collective identity and the precondition for the future of the community.

Theorizing socialist realism in architecture is very topical today. Theoretical thought about architecture of socialist realism was far more developed than its practice. Socialist realism did not leave deep traces in the Yugoslav architecture, except for a few extreme rationalized residential buildings, and several public buildings in forced monumentalism, and some examples of memorial production, as for a broader impact there was no time, which leads today to conflicting opinions on existence of socialist realism in architecture of post war Yugoslavia. As Aleksandar Kadijević pointed out that “in terms of morphology continued the pre-war tendencies, in its essence - structuralism, purpose and ideological characteristics, was completely adapted to the demands of a new time, the taste and the perceptions of one-party totalitarian establishment.”

---

96 About conflicting opinions on the existence of socialist realism in Yugoslav architecture more in: Kadijević, Aleksandar, O socrealizmu u beogradskoj arhitekturi i njegovim oprečnim tumacenima, Nasledje, n. IX, Belgrade, 2008
97 Kadijević, Aleksandar, O socrealizmu u beogradskoj arhitekturi i njegovim oprečnim tumacenima, Nasledje, n. IX, Belgrade, 2008, translated by author, p.83
MEMORIALS WITHOUT MEMORY

AT THE CROSSROADS –
NEW BEGINNINGS (1948 – 1962)

Nowhere in the world has been raised more monuments to the fallen soldiers during the last war. The grateful nation does not celebrate the epoch of peaceful construction only by great social reforms, built factories, power stations, railways but with youthful enthusiasm and limitless creative power, and also by the monuments that testament that, the immortal names of fallen soldiers and their great work, should never disappear.
Z.T. Daily news Politika, 06.08.1952

1948 is a milestone, not only in the memorial architecture, but in the entire history of Yugoslavia. This year represents the break-up of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia and the Cominform, and the cessation of all political relations with the Soviet Union.98 The separation from the USSR, also the internal

---

98 On 28 June 1948, the Cominform issued a resolution that accused the country’s Communist leaders of diverging from the “correct path” of Marxism-Leninism and invited the CPY membership to put an end to their regime. Communist Party of Yugoslavia decided not to obey the Soviet Union and to continue on the way of independence. Within months of the resolution, the relations with socialist countries deteriorated so much that between 1949 and Stalin’s death in 1953, there were no official or private contacts between Yugoslavia and the
and foreign affairs, were demanding the immediate new social and political order and the immediate presentation of that order through all social practices. The role of the politics and complementary social practices was to present the state as a modern, open and progressive. Promoting the re-birth of the country and its independence, in architectural language meant shift in the ideological but also stylistic and esthetical sense.

The maturation of the consciousness “of the total conflict with the Cominform, and the transition from the defensive to the ideological and political offensive cultural policy against Stalinism”\textsuperscript{99}, was reflected in the pursuit of new conceptual basis of culture, creativity and education. Yugoslav Communist party demanded “bravely and without hesitation” distancing from the old clichés and formulas, from the old organizational forms of generally accepted practices of the Soviet Union, and the affirmation of long-time neglected domestic experiences.

Counseling of Architects and Urban planners of Yugoslavia in Dubrovnik\textsuperscript{100} at the end of 1950, two years before Congress of

---

\textsuperscript{99} Obrenović, Violeta, \textit{Srpska memorijalna arhitektura}, 1918-1955, PhD dissertation, Faculty of Philosophy, Department for History, University of Belgrade, 2013, p.346

\textsuperscript{100} Counseling of Architects and Urban planners of Yugoslavia in Dubrovnik hosted 247 elected delegates from associations of architects from all republics.
writers in Ljubljana, meant, in the theoretical sense, the abandonment of the socialist realism in architecture. Counselling had the general attitude, that the architecture of our region must have the stamp of the epoch and the environment in which it arises and an adequate and specific linguistic expression. Counselling in Dubrovnik did not have an actual subversive character; but the subversive ideas were presented in papers of some participants (Vladislav Ribnikar, Milorad Macura).

The Counselling in Dubrovnik in 1950, represent an ideological and theoretical break with social realism as official style, even though the changes in practical terms of memorial production were still insignificant. The period from 1950 was marked by expansive monuments and memorials rising. The largest number of memorials built immediately after 1950 have a rather humble, folk character and retain the formal solution

---

101 Congress of Writers in Ljubljana in 1952, in Yugoslav historiography, is usually considered the theoretical break with socialist realism in art. Miroslav Krlježa, in his famous paper, expressed the radical criticism of dogmatism in art and pleaded for the liberty in the artistic production.


103 Vladislav Ribnikar, during his discourse, for the first time, officially criticized the architecture of Social realism, based on existential minimum, which supposed to produce spiritual leveling and standardization of peoples' lifestyle. He advocated the free development of individualism and liberty in design, not limited by spatial minimum that threatens the quality of life. Ribnikar, Vladislav, Problemi stambenih zgrada, in Referati za I savetovanje arhitekata i urbanista Jugoslavije, Belgrade, 1950,
from the first post-war years. Even the break with socialist realism, was publicly announced in Dubrovnik, the memorial architecture practice showed the evident distance from the theory.

The official break with Soviet alliance in memorial architecture, in the beginning, meant the negation of the first phase and the glorification of the role and fame of the domestic, partisan forces compared to Red Army forces glorified in the previous period. By stressing the importance of their own heroes and the socialist and communist past in their territories, Yugoslav government responded to the attacks of the Soviet Union and sent a message that the communism and the liberation did not come with the Soviet army, but had their own unique development on this particular territory. The same 1948, was characterised, as it usually happens in the political upheavals, by the removal of the existing monuments to the Red Army. The removed monuments were mainly those that were raised in town squares, urban areas and cemeteries.

The split between the Yugoslav and Soviet leadership, at the level of symbols did not manifested immediate cut with the proclaimed values of Soviet society. Socialist realism, which affirmed the ideas of socialist revolution and the triumphal rule of the proletariat, continued to exist in an almost unchanged
symbolism of monumental architecture, but with entirely opposite content and signification. In this sense, as a counterpoint to the representation of Red Army soldiers, there was placed the symbol of the Yugoslav Partisans, which were strongly promoting the idea of autochthonism of partisan struggle and its rootedness in the nation.

Transition of the celebration of one’s heroes to the others, we be found on the examples of sequent two monuments. During the conflict with the Informbiro\(^\text{104}\), Batina monument falls into the background, while Sreten Stojanović, raises its counterpart in 1952, the monument at Iriški Venac. The similarity of these two monuments is undeniable, both of them follow the basic principles of socialist realism, primarily in the monumentality and then in the realistic portrayal of the freedom fighters. Both are composed on high marble podiums with an obelisk in the centre, and a female figure on the top, in Batina monument there is Victory (Pobeda), and in Iriški Venac, female figure, allegory of Freedom (Sloboda). They both, in the base part, contain figures of soldiers, according to their purpose, in case of Batina monument, Soviet Red Army soldiers, and in the Iriški Venac monument the soldiers of Yugoslav People’s Liberation Army. The monument was highlighting the most important

\(^{104}\) Informbiro is the Yugoslav name for the Cominform (Comunist Informational Bureau).
elements of the Communist propaganda, important for the creation of the new history and identity: cooperation of the soldiers with the peasants, the participation of workers and peasants in the revolutionary movement and also people’s sufferings. Decisiveness expressed on the face of each figure, a united approach of figures in foothill, was identified as new elements in mythologizing the war. “Emphasizing the avant-garde role of the Party in the leadership of the people’s movement during the war, was emphasized the party’s firmness and unity during the conflict with Stalin and his allies.”

Elaboration of the new approach and new interpretation of the role of the monuments was topical subject of everyday discussions. The vast monumental production during the fifties has been developing spontaneously and somewhat was gradually losing its importance. Negative comments coming from the professional and unprofessional audience about the quality and quantity of the memorial artistic product have inspired new thoughts and recommendations in order to modernize the approach to the memorial architecture. So, in Titograd (today Podgorica) daily newspaper Pobjeda, in 1955,

---

105 Daily newspaper Politika, Belgrade, 10.11. 1952
106 In an article form 1953 in Zagreb newspaper Vjesnik, commenting on monuments' quality was reduced to the statement “Uniformity of sculptures and kitsch are often met.” Zagreb daily newspaper, Vjesnik, 9 December 1953.
was commented the exhibition of the competition for Monument to the battle for the liberation of Pljevlja in 1941. "The issue of raising monuments is highly topical today and it should be approached in conceptually and aesthetically more contemporary, more modern manner. Monuments should not be the glorification of an event, but a synthesis of feelings, ideas, beliefs that can nurture the people."

Monolithic organization of war veterans - Federation of Associations of World War II veterans (SUBNOR), in the mid-fifties, took over the responsibility of remembrance of the WWII because of it uncontrolled spread all over the country. From this period SUBNOR stood behind all the future actions and was an ideological scrutiny oversaw of their implementation. This association started with more systematic memory policies and enabled the financing of the more complex memorial project. Its major task was to deal and publicly discuss, via competitions, new concept of memorial sites, best capable of affirming and formalising abstract notions, such as Revolution, the People’s Liberation Struggle, Brotherhood and Unity. At the Third Congress of the Veterans held in Ljubljana in 1955, was pointed out that until than 810 regulated cemeteries and 14,690 individual graves were constructed, over 30,000 remains were

---

107 Titograd daily newspaper Pobjeda, 29.11. 1955.
transferred in special cemeteries, 316 memorials were built, and 81 Museum of the National Liberation War were opened.\textsuperscript{108} Only in the period from 1951 to 1954, 5100 monuments, memorial plaque and memorial fountains have been constructed.\textsuperscript{109}

Significant changes of state symbols ensued only in the years of consolidation of political power, proving the institutional reform that have taken place after the period of reconstruction of war-devastated and demolished country. The state received its promotion also trough massive programmes of urban construction of entire new cities as New Belgrade and New Zagreb. Architecture, and important building operations such as complex urban centres, buildings of state representations, memorial architecture were used to legitimize the new social order and Yugoslav independent future. These endeavours had, both pragmatic and symbolic values, \textit{“embodying and representing the modernising ambitions of the socialist society as on par with the leading international centres.”}\textsuperscript{110} In the stylistic manner the deviation from the Soviet-Yugoslav relationship meant the deviation from the socialist realism in art and architecture as an imported and copied stylist direction.

\textsuperscript{108} Anonim, \textit{Kongres Saveza boraca}, Daily newspaper Borba 20.04.1955, p.1
\textsuperscript{110} Kulić, Vladimir, \textit{Spaces of representation}, in Unfinished Modernisation (edited by Vladimir Kulić and Maroje Mrduljaš), UHA/CCA, Zagreb, 2011, p.35
The change in the stylistic manner meant going back to the modernistic orientation of the pre-war period, as most of the operating architects were modernist education. In this way modernism became a signifier of the progressive nature of Yugoslav socialism, although it came to the architectural scene as a rather logically established affiliation, not as a product of the official cultural policy.

Edvard Ravnikar, Memorial complex Kampor, Rab, 1953

Ideological influence did not disappear, but the forms for expressing these ideas were more liberal. The basic form of expression in monumental architecture and sculpture has been
transferred to geometric forms. The first significant monument raised in the new style is Monument to Jewish victims in Jewish cemetery in Belgrade, work of the architect Bogdan Bogdanović, completed in 1952. Only a year after Edvard Ravnikar projected a memorial complex Kampor on the island Rab. There is recognised an obvious shift of typology, new memorials are landscape complexes with a particularly developed spatial-urban structure in a form of complex sacred landscape. In both memorials we can trace the obvious rejection of triumphal and celebrative rhetoric and appropriation of new open symbolism. Bogdanovic and Ravnikar not only announced a new era in the monumental production of Yugoslavia, but also meritorious for the major engagement of the architects in the memorial production. Before, this was practically exclusive filed of sculptural design.
Today, there can be no more “national style” or only for “socialist art”, but only unideologized, deliberated art.
Lazar Trifunović, NIN, 1961

The beginning of the Yugoslavia’s new way or the so called Third path is considered the year 1961 for several reasons. That is the year of the first Conference of the Non-Aligned Movement in Belgrade with the participation of 25 states. The organisation of the Non-Aligned announced Yugoslavia’s political aspiration between East and West during the bipolar division of the world. After the years of the important economic reforms which eventually established Socialist Self-management as official economic order, as counterpoint of the state socialist economy of the countries of the East, and the free market of the West, Yugoslavia was going through major
economic progress. The 60’s and 70’s were usually referred to as “golden age of Yugoslav architecture”, due to the accelerating economic development and new cultural and artistic liberties.

The economic growth Yugoslavia has experienced in the sixties and seventies; a significant period of time which has passed since the war ended; as well as the maturation of new generations that have not felt the war and did not have the emotional political or ideological connections with the war or the revolution led to a transition of monumental style towards memorial landscapes and different use of memorial spaces.

Architectural journal *Arhitektura Urbanizam* published in 1961 an entire number dedicated to the memorial and monumental architecture in Yugoslavia, in honour of the 20 years anniversary of the revolution. After 15 years of monumental creativity, slightly disorganized and uncontrolled, the question of raising the monument becomes topical and requires serious theoretical, typological, stylistic analysis.

In this special issued number we can trace a very paradigmatic shift of meaning. The monuments were not any more

---

monuments to the victims of the war or to the fighters for freedom and liberation from the fascist occupiers, but they were *Monuments to the Revolution*, the Socialist revolution that was still in progress. Dragi Milenkić explicitly explains in his introduction about contemporary monuments that; "it is well-known and clear enough that, parallel with the process and during the National Liberation War, the Revolution of Yugoslav people was arising, with all the essential properties of the Socialist revolution. During the war, it was an armed struggle; when the war ended, it continued its courses as socialist, revolutionary and social revival. The war and the revolution intertwined initially and brought an armed victory, freedom and independence of Yugoslavia with its legacies, which served as a base for further development and transformation of Yugoslavia into a socialist country."\(^{112}\)

Historians, theorists and architects who presented their critical analyses agreed that the memorial heritage created up to this period is of modest artistic value. All the recommendations were given towards the more controlled and interdisciplinary way in order to commemorate the revolution as the greatest legacy of contemporary Yugoslavia. There was present, very often, sarcastic and judgmental tone regarding the current way

---

\(^{112}\) Milenkić, Dragi, *Mesporazum oko savremenih spomenika kulture, Arhitektura Urbanizam* n.10, 1961, translated by author, p.3
of commemoration of the victims, battles, and revolution. Radoslav Putar ironically stated, “Fortunately - really fortunately, there is no an overview of the financial means spent for raising monuments about whose artistic values, out of the respect towards their purpose, we are usually not discussing.”\textsuperscript{113}

Žunković defined Yugoslav monuments as typological synthesis of the figurative sculpture and architectural compositions (architectural elements that served to emphasize the sculpture, to create an adequate scenography and reinforce the monumentality). His criticism relates to the dissonance and the forced synthesis of different elements. “They are trying to achieve some kind of synthesis of the plastic arts, but this is not achieved in an internal, organic way, but artificially. Once, all the elements of such complex monument belonged to the same style, they will be connected to a single unit. We, however, abstract, modern architectural forms, combine with naturalistic figures. It is obvious that such forms cannot suit each other well and they remain dissonant parts of the dysfunctional environment.”\textsuperscript{114} Architectural sculpture (abstract and geometrical) is according to him the typology to follow for

\textsuperscript{113} Putar, Radoslav, \textit{Smisao i mogucnost spomenika}, Arhitektura Urbanizam, n.10, 1961, translated by author, p.18

\textsuperscript{114} Žunković, Zoran, \textit{Nasi spomenici danas}, Arhitektura Urbanizam, n.10, 1961, p.22

Tourist guide of Monuments to the Revolution, 1986

Postcard with the Monuments to the Revolution
the future production. The memorial field should be architectural not sculptural as many of the existing examples showed.

Architectural monument through its abstract form should communicate the very essence of the memorial, its universal idea of revolution, freedom, eternity, victory. According to Žunković, “all the elements of the monument have to be subordinated to its idea; they have to be the tools through which the monument communicates its story.” Here we can trace the use of the abstract forms in memorial art and architecture. The abstract form can better and with more success present the pure visual presentation of an abstract term. The abstract monument, according the Žunković, is much more eloquent; because it provokes the opposite process, the visual idea triggers the emotion towards the abstract term as victory, liberty, martyrs or violence.
In the stylistic manner the deviation from the Soviet-Yugoslav relationship meant the deviation from the socialist realism in art and architecture as an imported and copied stylist direction. The change in the stylistic manner meant going back to the modernistic orientation of the pre-war period, as most of the operating architects were modernist education. In this way modernism became a signifier of the progressive nature of Yugoslav socialism, although it came to the architectural scene as a rather logically established affiliation, not as a product of the official cultural policy. This distinctive period in the stylistic development of the visual arts and architectural design, in theory of art and architecture is named “socialist
aestheticism” or “social modernism”. Socialist aestheticism, served an additional significant function in terms of resources by which the ruling structure could build a picture of Yugoslavia as a modern and prosperous society, as, the clearest and most visible way to represent the progress of the country is through architecture and construction in general. As already mentioned return to modernism and its further development characterises the architecture of the second half of the 20th century. Memorial architecture as an open field of exploration would be characterised, a part of modernist tendencies, with futurism, surrealism, regionalism and more importantly will blend the boundaries between sculpture, architecture, landscape architecture. As Burghardt defined them: "These monuments are not only modernist but also have a very particular monumental and symbolic typology comprising fists, stars, hands, wings, flowers, and rocks; they are bold (sometimes structurally daring), otherworldly, and fantastic." 

---

115 Sveta Lukić, in 1963, used the critical term “socialist aestheticism”, for the first time, to define a phenomenon in contemporary Serbian literature. He had in mind the term “socialist realism”, as probably the most important ideological and morphologically counterpart of “aestheticism” in art of the sixties. Later the term has been welcomed and used by visual art critics. The term functional uses Lazar Trifunović in the context of the promotion of Belgrade Informel painting.

These new typology of memorials can be defined as memorial parks, memorial landscape, as they were erected on the historic sites of the Partisan battles, which means they are located outside of villages and town, in the nature, in the open landscape. They represent functionally and typologically rich and complex structure of merged functions of remembrance, leisure, education, sport and receptions. Memorial is often accompanied by a museum or amphitheatre, which had served as an open-air classroom, emphasising its educational and propagandistic function. There were almost obligatory receptive facilities as cafes, restaurants, hotels, youth centres, as well as sport and picnic facilities. Memorial parks were hybrid complexes, merging leisure with education, architecture with landscape, memorial with landscape. Most importantly they merged two opposite functions of mourning and celebration.

Landscape is their vital character. Landscape, nature, in this way, enters in a dialogue with the memorial object, raising question of the relationship of the man with his environment.\footnote{First models of so called landscape memorials can be found in Germany, where the cult of nature as a way of memorialization of the dead, was developed in the form of “Heldenhaine” - Heroic grove, which represents a space of the countryside especially conceived for the cult of the war victims, but without visibly marked graves. Instead of them the trees take their role as a symbol of individual and collective power. Nature in that way serves as a living monument, symbol of rebirth. Mosse, George L.:\textit{Fallen soldiers, Reshaping the memory of the World Wars}, Oxford University Press, 1991. p. 91}
This very plastic and spatial aspect is a constant characteristic of most modernist monuments. New memorials developed interaction and deeper penetration with the observers. By establishing powerful communication with the individuals, strong emotions were transmitted on the mass, reached its culmination at the place of the gathering, leaving the effect like pilgrimages. Monumentality of the memorial space was not reflected only in the size of the central monument but more often in the size of the space where the memorial complex is. The impression of height in these works has been replaced by the impression of vastness.

Kozara memorial complex, memorial sculptor and museum

Some of the existing memorial sites were re-projected in the sixties and seventies, as it happened with Kadinjača and
Tjentište. Immediately after the war, in the places of great battles significant for the course of the war, were commemorated with monumental features modest in size, which usually contained the names of fallen soldiers for the homeland. Now comes to re-project of the memorials at the same places, like contemporary palimpsest, a sort of rewriting of history, and the new routing of the collective memory of its younger generation towards the heroic past of her ancestors and towards the bright future of its descendants.

The intensity of raising monuments was highest over the first half of the seventh decade of the twentieth century. Among the monuments raised the especially noted were those in the manner of socialist aestheticism with strong authorial stamps, above all works of Bogdan Bogdanovic, Vojin Bakic, Miodrag Zivkovic and Dusan Dzamonja. Many of them are worth mentioning.
MEMORIAL COMPLEX SUTJESKA

The battle of Sutjeska was one of the great battles and a turning point in the whole Yugoslav partisan movement during World War II. It was a deciding episode in the Yugoslav resistance. The memorial site on Sutjeska was constructed in 1971, after a design of sculptor Miodrag Živković, Sutjeska, Valley of heroes, as it was renamed after the war in order to honour Partisan victims and soldiers was one of the first memorial complexes that flourished through the countryside. The complex is consisted of memorial sculpture, an open air amphitheatre and a memorial centre (museum of the battle). The core of the complex, memorial sculpture, consists of two monumental rocks, which although similar are not copies of one another, and which mark the site of the breakthrough while simultaneously forming an artificial gorge. The form of the
sculpture changes as the visitor is passing between the rocks. Arriving, entering the complex, the visitor perceives two sides as massive and monolithic, but passing through the visitor realizes that the monument opens up to become a more sophisticated form and reproduces the experience of marching through the mountains. Continuing the path, monument from the other side turns into the wings, a clear symbolic association of freedom and liberty. The path leads further to the small museum (architect Ranko Radović). The transitional shift of perspective is followed by the transition in meaning experienced by the interactive contact with the memorial.
MEMORIAL PARK KOZARA

Dušan Džamonja, Kozara monument

The monument at mountain Kozara, located in northern Bosnia, is positioned at the highest point of the forested mountain range. Kosara was an area of massive anti-fascist movement and has paid a high price for its resistance. Monument was built in 1972, following the project of sculptor Dušan Džamonja. Typologically, a monument is bounding architecture and sculpture, due to its size and formal characteristics. It is a cylinder form made of twenty trapezoid concrete pillars with conical gaps in between them, 33 meters high. Visitors are able to enter the monument through these gaps whose conical form is designed precisely so that a human
body can just about squeeze through them to get inside the monument but which makes getting out again a wholly unpleasant physical act. Inside the cylindrical form of the monument, visitors stand in a dark, chimney-like space, the light filters in through the vertical gaps by which one entered. Visitors spontaneously look up, for the opening at the top, for the sun light as the announced and promised light of freedom. The form of interiority produces an unpleasant feeling of entrapment, which clearly refers to the horrifying experiences during World War II.

Dušan Džamonja, Kozara monument interior and exterior

The circular form of the monument can be related to another aspect: the integrative idea of Kolo, traditional dance which has been practised together by all different population of the area around Kozara. The two contrary significance; can be interpreted in the following way, "The external siege, the encirclement, can be broken only through the internal circle of
solidarity and struggle." Memorial complex is consisted of architectural sculpture, smaller size museum of similar composition and structure, and a silent and suggestive ambient behind the monument in between the walls where is possible to read and commemorate a long list of fallen soldiers and civilians (more than 9000), organised by the towns of origins. The idea of naming the town origins and not the nationality was an important issue, emphasising the participation in the anti-fascist of entire region and commemorating the victims in as individuals. Kozara was one of the favourite Yugoslav memorials. "It was a common saying that in Yugoslavia lived those who were going to Rome, those who were going to Mekka, and those who were going to Kozara. Kozara was visited every year by a million of visitors, in ten years it is ten millions, it is a very isolated place, and you have to want it."  

---
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MEMORIAL COMPLEX PETROVA GORA

The monument on Petrova Gora is one of the latest and most interesting memorial parks realized in Yugoslavia. Constructed in 1981 by the prominent sculptor Vojin Bakić, situated in the highest elevation of the Petrova Gora Mountain range, the monument was intentioned as homage to the killing of partisans by Ustasha forces.

Vojin Bakić, Petrova Gora working model and built memorial 1981

Petrova gora represents a mature example of the memorial-park typology with a museum, restaurant and educational facilities fully integrated into the monumental structure. The central monument consists of a massive 37 meter high steel
and concrete structure of irregularly unfolding organic shapes rises into the air. The four storey construction is composed of oval structures embellished with rounded shapes that “grow” asymmetrically out of one another. Inside the monument, the organic multi-storey open spaces wind their way up to the top by way of the organic spiral ramp, reminiscent of the forms of the Guggenheim Museum in New York. “A structure of about five stories with curvy walls, it looks like a small office building designed by Frank Gehry.”120 This complex and ambitious structure was supposed to represent the main cultural infrastructure in this particularly poor part of country.

Regardless of whether were raised at the sites of major execution or great battles, memorial parks were supposed to become a place of gathering of citizens, with a clearly defined program of celebration accorded the sequence of participation of representatives of all socio-political organization. In this way was constructed the continuity of Yugoslavism through the struggle for social justice and the equality. These landscapes do not leave indifferent any visitor and the messages that they carried are not so easily readable. "It would be incorrect to say that the Memorial Parks are just scenery for theatrical interpretation of history." Although they are designed to talk about the past, commemorating the memory of a common tragic past, they also reflect the contemporary socialist society; they are abstract forms that refer to the modern future. In a country with many different cultures, ethnicities, identities and truths, these monuments, regardless of their location, belonged to every Yugoslavian. These monuments parted with a history in which there was always tension and a place where borders were constantly shifting, and their abstract and modern design is focussing on the common future and common universal ideas of equality and unity, and social justice.
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121 Manojlović Pintar, Olga, Ideološko i političko u spomeničkoj arhitekturi prvog i drugog svetskog rata na teritoriji Srbije, PhD dissertation, Faculty of Philosophy, University of Belgrade, Belgrade, 2004, p.145
BOGDAN BOGDANOVIĆ—NEW FORMULA OF MEMORIALS
Bogdan Bogdanović – New Formula of Memorials

Today his supranational, multiethnic, transreligious and life-affirming memorials are among the most impressive artistically conceived commemorative sites inscribed into the European cultural landscape.

Friedrich Achleitner

Bogdan Bogdanović (20 August 1922 – 18 June 2010) grew up in a family of leftish intellectuals in the pre-war Belgrade. His father, Milan Bogdanović, was a literally critic and editor, in 1934 he established the magazine Danas, together with Miroslav Krleža, and later he became Managing director of the National Theatre in Belgrade. Bogdanović, as a very young, was in contact with a number of famous writers and artists of that time, at early age became part of the bourgeois and intellectual elite.

Bogdanović started his studies at the Faculty of Architecture before the war in Yugoslavia started, but during four years of war period the Faculty was closed so he joined the partisan movement, and immediately after became active in the
Partisan struggle for a short period. After the war ended, he returned to his previously started architectural studies and graduated with honours with one of the Yugoslav most important modernist architects, Nikola Dobrović. His graduation thesis was a landscape design project of Croatian island of Lapad. During this formative period influences in the personalities of Yugoslavia’s leading modernist as Drago Ibler and Nikola Dobrović can be traced in his design. Bogdanović was also inspired by Mediterranean culture and methods of project which Dobrović and Ibler masterly represented. Second influence could be seen in autochthon and original style of Jože Plečnik. Plečnik’s free interpretation of classicism, imaginative disregard of rules and taste for apparently illogical combination of elements remained constantly present in the future Bogdanović’s work. Very important formative influence came also form his erudite reading of the history of art and architecture, anthropology, mythology, ethnology, religion, which provided a rich background in his built and literary work. After the graduation in 1950 he became a teaching assistant at the Faculty of Architecture, at the Department of Urbanism (where he remained his entire career, later as a professor and finally as a Dean of the Faculty in 1970).

After the end of WWII in Belgrade and Yugoslavia the socio-political situation changed completely, which affected
importantly architectural production. His intellectual dandy spirit could not be expressed anymore through experiments and exciting surrealist performance as in the pre-war period. The period after the war, as already stated, is a period characterized by uniformity of expression, from architectural to political and civic one. In 1952, Bogdanović, almost accidentally, won the competition for the Memorial to the Jewish victims in Belgrade, but the monument was built without leaving real echoes in professional and general audience. Seven years will pass until his future success. To this period of his creative, professional and personal life, Bogdanović refers as a “Period of seven skinny cows”, meaning, not only, to the seven years of modesty of creative architectonic production but also to the general quality of cultural and social life.

From 1959 to 1981 Bogdanović’s professional work will changed for the better; he will build nineteen monuments, so that this can be considered the most productive period of his career, obtaining the attribute of the State’s official memorial architect. Bogdanović has never denied that the confidence he had with the ruling Communist Party was necessary in order to realize his works: “The architecture I was creating was sacred … Architects were always building churches, mosques and
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122 Bogdanović, Bogdan, Ukleti Neimar, Feral Tribune, Split, 2001, p.95-101
monuments for the ruling regime ... They were building for the Pope, sultans, kings ... When you look at this architectural richness, you are not thinking for whom it is built, it is important that it’s built.”

During 1959, Bogdanović has received an engagement for the construction of three monuments; in Sremska Mitrovica, in Mostar and in Jasenovac. A year later he was asked to project a memorial Slobodište in Kruševac and one in Kosovska Mitrovica, and in 1961 he received the order for the monument in Prilep. Already the first monuments built in Sremska Mitrovica and Prilep caused unexpectedly large journalistic echo in the West. Well-known professional magazines have published a very commendable contributions of these works, as, for example, *L’Architecture d’aujourd’hui* of 1963 published texts on monuments in Prilep, Sremska Mitrovica and Jasenovac. Italian *L’Espresso* in the same year published a text written by Bruno Zevi about the memorial in Sremska Mitrovica. Bogdanović, in a later interview, remembers its international and domestic audience from the architectural and political public. “For many colleagues my archetypical, anthropological memorial constructions were totally incomprehensible, even inacceptable because of their unusual
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123 Bogdanović, Bogdan, quoted in Vukovic, Ivan, *Mesta sjecanja – Memorijali Bogdana Bogdanovic,*
symbolism. But for Tito, for the Yugoslav leading communists they were a welcome proof of the artistic independence of the country from the Soviet cultural hegemony. If I can remember correctly it was an Italian magazine that wrote about my memorial in Prilep, in Macedonia: “Tito’s lecture for Chruchtchow.” That was probably also a reason why I could do a lot of the things that I wanted to do at the time.”

Archaic symbolism, the absence of pathos and political iconography gave Bogdanović’s memorials universal value and quality, recognized in the West. This popularity has suited Tito’s government, which after the conflict with the Cominform sought to appear in the West as a liberal variant of socialism, in contrast to the Soviet Union and Warsaw Pact countries.

Bogdanović was not only as an architect, urban planner and professor, but also as a writer, theorist, essayist, a skilled draftsman, and sculptor, he proved to be a creative personality of versatile talent. During his active life he was the President of the Union of Architects of Yugoslavia (1964-68), Vice-Dean (1964-66), the Dean (1970-71) Faculty of Architecture, as well as the mayor of Belgrade (1982-86). He has received numerous awards and public recognition; two October prizes for
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124 Bogdan Bogdanovic, Interview with Reinhard Seiss, A time traveller through dream worlds, translated and published in SAJ (Serbian Architectural Journal), n.3, 2011, p.86
memorial complex in Sremska Mitrovica in 1960 and for the memorial complex in Jasenovac six years later, the annual award of Union of Architects of Yugoslavia for the memorial park "Slobodište" in Krusevac in 1964, as well as the „Borba“ republic award in 1965 for the Memorial Cemetery in Mostar. He also received Seventh July Award for the Lifetime Achievement in 1976, the Grand Prix for architecture Union of architects of Serbia, the prestigious Piranesi Award in 1989, the Herder Prize in 1997 for the "construction of anti-fascist monument and symbolism of separation of good and evil," Austrian Cross of Honor for Science and Art (Ehrenzeichen für Wissenschaft und Kunst) in 2002 and the Gold Medal of the city of Vienna a following year. Finally in 2007 he was awarded with a prestigious Carlo Scarpa award for the landscape design. He was a corresponding member of Serbian Academy of Arts and Science, elected in 1970, but in 1981 decided to leave the Academy because of the political disputes.

Since 1993, being dissident with Milosevic politics, Bogdanovic moved to Vienna where he lived till his death. In this period he was honoured as member of the Russian Academy of architecture and construction science (1994), member of the Bavarian Academy of Fine Arts (1998), and member of the Academy of Architecture of Serbia (2008). In these years Bodanović has published numerous books, professional
articles, essays, newspaper articles among them: “Mali urbanizam” [Small Urbanism: he conceived this title as an opposite to “big urbanism”, expression that he used to define bad examples of urban design practice in Yugoslavia during that time. With this book he sustained for a more human-scaled approach to urbanism], “Zaludna mistija” (is an oneiric fantasy about the esoteric meaning of architecture whose main characters are Bramante, Palladio and Piranesi), “Zelena kutija: knjiga snova” (The green box: book of dreams, a sort of diary collecting his dreams), “Urbanisticke mitologemes” [Urbanistic Mithologemas] and “Krug na četiri ćoska” [“The Four Cornered Circle”: deal with symbolic meanings of architecture and history of the city], “Mrtvouzice” [“Dead Ends” is a book containing the message of a 60 pages long letter previously sent to Milosevic expressing his opposition to nationalistic politics], “Ukleti neimar” [“Doomed Architect” is a collection of autobiographical essays]. In this exile he published several books in German, some of them never translated in Serbian: “Die Stadt und der Tod” (“The city and the death”), “Vom Glück in den Städten” (“The city and his future”). The last works are influenced by the devastation of the war and the future recovery of the city.
Most representatives of Belgrade intellectual elite of the interwar period were francophone. Since, they were educated at French schools, they gathered around certain new ideals and political goals originating from Paris, centre of European avant-garde at the time. They were mainly left-wing, supporting surrealist movement, whose main representative and founder in Belgrade was a writer, essayist and artist Marko Ristić. Belgrade Surrealist movement was closely linked with the Paris Surrealist movement, Ristić and other representatives of the Belgrade scene were in constant contact with Breton, were often visiting Paris and were participating in the exhibitions of Surrealist movement in the capital of France. Ristić, who remained faithful to surrealist principles until the end his life, perhaps more than any other representative of this movement, explains Surrealism as art that “is created from the deepest needs of life and as an expression of aspirations of human spirit for self-discovery. Because of this, artistic creation must be immediate, not controlled, not by the demands of common sense, nor the conventions of aesthetics, or the practical needs
of society, because all of that is restricting the freedom of creation, without which there is no real art.”

Bogdanović in the pre-war period, after finishing High School, shows extraordinary intellectual and creative abilities through a series of published essays and travelogues. In this time he meets Marko Ristić and remained honestly intrigued by surrealist ideas and manifestos. More than wanting to become a member of an avant-garde group, he wanted to become a surrealist because the ideas of the subconscious, the mythical and magical easily nestled in his mind, and he was elaborating it in his own unique way. Intoxicated with new ideas of Surrealism and inspired by leaders of this movement, such as Breton and Ristić, Bogdanović writes a kind of Manifest of Surrealism in Architecture named “Vers une architecture surrealiste”. With a clear reference of his opposition toward modern movement and Le Corbusier, Bogdanović fights for a free architecture, liberated from modernist schemes and regulations. Inspired by recent similar Paris situation, house for Tristan Tzara, young Bogdan designed the house for Marko Ristić that was his first attempt of surrealist design. House was, as he said, designed through play, humour, and it was full
of extravagant situation, unfortunately today there are no physical traces of the project.

Both in Europe and in Serbia, especially in Belgrade in the interwar period, Surrealism was not only an artistic practice or movement but it was a complex existential, behavioural or political world where various artists (poets, painters, and directors) and theorists meet, work and discuss their ideas. Surrealism by its organization was an outgrowth of the civil bourgeois and decadence, but has also been oriented to revolutionary ideas of Marxism from Bolshevism to Trotskyism.\textsuperscript{126} Also in young Bogdanović lived these two aspects of the same reality: by the political point of view he defined himself as convinced Trotskyist\textsuperscript{127} which means to be still socially aligned with the politics of the dominating regime. On the other hand, from an artistic point of view he became a militant of Surrealism (writing the Surrealist Manifesto in architecture attempting to establish certain models and ways of surrealist design, and not only) being fascinated by the possibility to find an alternative reality -the surreality- where is possible to express without limits and escaping the restricted

\begin{flushleft}
\footnotesize
\begin{itemize}
\item Djukic, Ana, \textit{Avangardni pokreti dadaizam i nadrealizam}, available on: http://eseji.blogspot.it/2010/09/avangardni-pokreti-dadaizam-i_12.html
\end{itemize}
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cultural dogmas imposed by the Yugoslavia of that period. Therefore his understandings of Surrealism could be explained by Breton’s words: “\textit{Completely against the tide, in a violent reaction against the impoverishment and sterility of thought processes that resulted from centuries of rationalism, we turned toward the marvellous and advocates it unconditionally}”\textsuperscript{128}.

Through Surrealism as an artistic creation, through various mechanics, an artist tries to reach out to the unconscious and to create, deliberated of constraints of reason, of logical, ethical or aesthetically limits. It’s a new, illogical way of expression, based on the belief in a higher reality – surreality - as result of an uncontrolled play of thoughts. Surrealism was the driving force of his first poetic experiments. Finding himself in the time in which modernism was preserved and in the most diverse didactic levels promoted into academic canons, we could state that in the long run Bogdanovic will not betray this “prophecy” : “\textit{the one who was not outrun by the fashionable trends, has the prospects to be pronounced truly modern one day}”\textsuperscript{129}.

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{128} Andre Breton as quoted in Radio interview with Andre Perrinaud, \textit{Conversations, Autobiography of Surrealism}, 1993, \\
\textsuperscript{129} Ristic, Ivan, Sketch it’s me.. 
\end{flushright}
Surrealist influences are very important, essential for understanding his future work. One of the most important surrealist legacies that would later define his architecture is an “open form”. In surrealism there was a striking tendency towards the destruction of the hierarchical order of art. Cancelled boundaries of genres, types have resulted with bounds and links between different arts; architecture, sculpture, poetry and visual arts, creating in this way a visual symphony or literary collages. The idea of the work of art as an open form became very topical; art becomes open to various creations and interpretations, different psychological experiences, since it is born from the deepest subconscious.

The second important surrealist influence is the idea of the “collective subconscious”. Georges Bataille, founder of the journal Documents, was the first to introduce the issue of the unconscious in the ethnological cultures, and later in his writings he attempted to detect the unconscious in mass culture, photography, film, tribal ritual items. Bogdanovic, taking advantage of the stratified and complex Balkan unconscious (which means to dig into the fantastic repository of a country where lay memories, ancient tales and folks), will create an enriched surrealist world from which will born his models of memorial design. The sketches of Bogdan Bogdanović testify that are not only associated with the designs
of the monument entities: these drawings evoke an undoubted poetic multi-layered and trans-disciplinary world in which architecture solutions are mixed among images originating from the collective subconscious and anthropological memory. This means that architect is completely aware to use the surrealist method of *écriture automatique* (automatic writing) to define his personal design methodology but also as an ideal “personal submarine” to dive into the deepness of Balkan unconscious culture, an entire world where the observer can meet surreal creatures and settlements and not only fantastic architectural realizations. Drawing is the basic medium of expression of Bogdanovic’s production and in one interview, when asked about the significance of a sketch for his work, he melancholically answered, “Sketch it’s me”. Bogdanović has donated his rich legacy to Vienna Architekturzentrum, which is the part that he has managed to save before the destructive attacks of the representatives of the repressive political regime. Currently the centre is hosting about 25 000 drawings, sketches, and working models.
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I am, however, the same as I was: a bad communist, but with convictions – a leftie with convictions.
Bogdan Bogdanović

During his prolific career he was a Professor at the Faculty of Architecture and as an unconventional pedagogue, teacher and lecturer, he was constantly challenging the dogma of conventional educational system. He used to be the Vice-Dean and the Dean of the Faculty of Architecture of Belgrade, honorary member of the Serbian Academy of Sciences and Arts, President of the Union of Architects of Serbia from 1964 to 1968. He established in 1976, the school for the “Philosophy of architecture” in Mali Popović (small village in Serbia), and planned to devote himself after leaving the professor chair at University of Belgrade. The school did not have a fixed schedule of lectures, and was developing new approaches towards architectural practice based on heuristic, exploration game.

He was an influential and active member of the academic and political life of Belgrade and the Federation, at the same time he could be defined as dissident. During the sixties and
seventies it would be more accurate to characterize him as a revolutionary, more than dissident. As a professor of Urban Planning, Urbanology, as he renamed his own course, he was constantly introducing innovations and challenging the dogmatism of the socialist urbanism. He has reformed the Belgrade Faculty of Architecture into a multidisciplinary school emulating some North American schools. By propagating the methods which compromise state ideology and uniform urbanism which were the base for all new-born Yugoslav cities, Bogdanović was a respected revolutionary during his entire academic and professional career. He becomes a dissident at the end of his professional career. In 1980 Bogdanović resigned as member of the Academy of Sciences and Arts, and thus with that gesture, he clearly defined his attitude towards the general nationalistic view of political and cultural elite of Serbia in that time.\footnote{Although his personal decision was to leave the Academy, according to the Statute, which makes it impossible to delete the membership, that decision was not respected, and formally he remain the member until the end of his life.}
Six years later, in 1986, taking advantage of his reputation on the international scene, he formed International Academy of Architecture. Paradoxically, his position as Political Opposition always had an echo and at the end of his career he accepted ultimately political function of Mayor of Belgrade. With many ideas about the city, which he was elaborating for more than fifty years, he hoped his political engagement to have an urban and urbanistic echoes. Unfortunately his political career will end in the most turbulent way.
The culmination of Bogdanovic resistance’s is publicly proclaimed by a letter to Slobodan Milosevic\textsuperscript{133} in 1987, in which he openly expressed his disagreement with the nationalist politics of the governing elite and perhaps prophetically predicted unsustainability of such aggressive attitudes and tragic dissolution of the federation. However provocation was excessive for the regime at the time and from 1987 to his definitive leaving from Belgrade and exile in Vienna in 1993, Bogdanović suffered serious threats and pressures from the political authorities and the media. The message was transmitted through occasional demolishing and finally closing of his alternative school of Philosophy of Architecture in Mali Popović, devastation of his personal properties and personal threats to his life. Media persecution of state television appeared as Fontana Giusti states \textit{“a semi-public witch hunt against him.”}\textsuperscript{134}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{133} Slobodan Milošević was elected in 1986 the President of the Central Committee of the Communist party, which gave him supreme authority and control of the State.
\end{flushleft}
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\textsuperscript{134} Fontana Giusti, Gordana, Kololija, \textit{Bogdanović dissident in life}, in \textit{Architecture and the Paradox of Dissidence}, p. 33-44
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2 Map of Bogdan bogdanović’s memorials
Case study: Monument to Jewish victims of fascism in Sephardic cemetery in Belgrade, 1951-1952.

Completely unplanned, with an invitation for a smaller closed competition for monument to Jewish victims of fascism in Belgrade, Bogdanović begins architectural career, which he will, almost exclusively, dedicate to the memorial architecture. As young, ambitious and promising architect (assistant at University of Belgrade) of that time, he was invited with other five young architects (among others A. Josić, and M.
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135 Aljoša Josić, later Alexis Josic, is a Belgrade born architect, who will later become one of the founder of world famous architecture and urban office Candilis, Josic, Woods.
Vasiljević) to participate in preliminary design competition for the memorial to Jewish victims. Later in his autobiographical essays he gladly remembered this particular and incidental episode and gave an imaginary explanation of non-existing project which led him to the architectural solutions. “A friend asked me “do you have an idea?” The answer is known in advance, which architect, especially at the beginning of his career, would admit to have no idea ... And because there was no other way I bravely speak, invent, fabulise. “Do you remember that alley of catalpas at the Sephardic cemetry, that confluence of perspective in an imaginary point ... From that point down there is growing the new “anti-perspective”. And to clarify what this nonsense might mean, I further explain: “There in the depths, in the “depth of the depths” two pillars draw a sort of “the gate at the end of the road”. Immediately after telling the story he started designing the narrated project; the anti-perspective, the gate. This was the beginning of his particular methodology where the design and the written word often intervened. He would often say: “I wrote so that I would know how to build, and I built so that I would know what to write”136. Guided by the idea that the great architecture can always be explained, told about, the complexity of the written and drawn or built forms and their constant interlinking in his
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work can be announced in the sequent way: “Monument to the Sephardic cemetery revealed to me that, in my job, metaphor and allegory were, at least, as important as in poetry.”

Monumental complex consists of three parts: the access ritual paths, two monumental slabs and a shrine. Manević read this tripartite monumental composition as the play of “dramatic monumentality”; through exposition, complication and culmination. Two symmetrical boards retreated towards the top, in the form of “anti-perspective”, as an opening gate to eternity. Passing through the gate, the path leads to the shrine, where there is a sculptural performance of candlestick Menorah, one of the most recognizable symbols of Judaism. The study of Kabbalah, in the preliminary design process for the memorial, will mark for a long period his career. The wide world of symbols would become an eternal inspiration for future work.

The jury, consisted of eminent architectural critics and designers Aleksej Brkić and Momčilo Belobrk, decided in Bogdanović’s favour, awarding him with first prize. The jury praised the “absence of the trivial and monumental ritual pathos, welcoming archaism of the project that opposed to the
functionalist technicism of that period”. Brkić later wrote that this monument, with dignity and hope in the eternal renewal of nature, encourage thinking about the universally valid topics of human existence.

The monument was originally planned in concrete, however, the Jewish community has insisted on the stone as a building material, in order to respect the traditional and religious demands, so Bogdanović had to re-project the monument. Then the experience of construction in stone will be the second discovery that will mark his career. As a material for access ritual path and two low walls that define the path, the author used the remains of a stone facade from the demolished buildings in the Jewish quarters during the war. This has underlined the symbolism of continuing life, never ending energy that flows and continues in different forms of life.

The symbolism of the monument can be interpreted in several ways: as the split of the wall towards the eternity, or the two plates of Moses, or even the wings of an angel, etc. Bogdanović

---


had never explicitly explained nor interpreted his memorials. Openness of symbols and architectural forms to different interpretations (polisemiosis), is an important characteristic of Bogdanović’s works. He believed that the answers and the meanings of the symbols we should search in ourselves, in our anthropological and cultural past, because each unilateral and unambiguous definition of symbols meant, according to Bogdanović its degradation and death.

The place where Slobodište memorial park was erected has been a place of stermination, where German occupiers and “domestic traitors” have killed hundreds of civilians, mainly locals. Sacral character of this place can be traced, first of all, from its name. The idea of the architect was to erect in this particular place “The Sanctuary of Freedom” (literally translated as Svetilište Slobode) and renamed through a seductive play of words Slobodiste by famous Serbian writer Dobrica Ćosić who was engaged in the project to overview all the literary aspects of the park.

The park is conceived as a big sacred area “8” shaped (250 meters long) engraved in the territory in which are dislocated in free order some sculptures that seems to recall flying figures.

\[140\] Vuković, Vladimir, *Arhitektura sjecanja - Memorijali Bogdana Bogdanovića*
The passage from the profane to the sacred ambient and entrance to the memorial space is defined with “The gate to the Sun.” Initiation begins passing through “the gate to the Sun” and continues along the 250 meters long axis. The limes, the border between the profane and sacred space is clearly defined with landscape articulation. It represents an invisible architectural line which demarcates the changed landscape, the limes between crater intervention and natural landscape. The Gate to the sun is situated on limes line, and represents its
interruption, in a form of semicircular stone intervention. Formal similarity inspired Vladimir Vuković to compare the stone gate to the reverse omega sign. "Omega is the last letter of the Greek alphabet, which in our culture has a universal meaning of the end. Bogdanović, reverting the symbol, turning it upside down, used the principle of anagram, and can be interpreted as the end, which, in terms of the eternal renewal of nature, marks a new beginning. The method of anagram author has used very often, finding inspiration in the Gnostics’s "topsy-turvy world".  

Entering the sacred landscape, immersing into the landscape, memorial reveals its hidden drama. The access path, from the Gate to the Sun, continues to the “Valley of the living”, an open-air amphitheatre, where even today local recitals and shows are performed. From the “Valley of the living” dynamic sinusoidal path continues into another crater area, called “Valley of the memories”. In this 16m deep crater are located six pairs of “stone wings”, while another six pairs of wings are disposed on the slope of the crater. The wings on the slope are of slightly smaller dimensions, so that the perception of perspective is heightened. They represent the most important symbolic and semantic element of the memorial. They could be
understood as a kind of spread sanctuary. The so-called “horned birds”, from the deep soil of the crater, are taking off to the sky. A clear semantic association of freedom, flight and hope is the core of its meaning. The inspiration for the formal design of the wings, Bogdanović elaborated in his book “Horned birds” (Rogate Ptice), created more than ten years later. It’s a drawing diary of numerous inspirations and symbolic reminiscences of the memorial elements. In this particular way, the author continues the design process. This procedure is not intended to change or “improve” already presented project, but to explain the emergence of the idea and its numerous symbolic meanings and possible future developments. For Bogdanović design process did not end with the completion of memorial complex, but continues, in the form of (infinite) elaborations of creative thought. This process of “redesigning” of memorials, Bogdanović applied on other memorials (for example, the collection of drawing in the “Book of the capital” is the elaboration of the elements in the Čačak memorial project).
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142 The book Horned birds (Rogate ptice) is a product of work with students in the school for the philosophy of architecture in Mali Popovic.
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Bogdan Bogdanović, Memorial site in Sremska Mitrovia

Bogdan Bogdanović, Slobodište memorial site
The modernity of the composition is an astonishing synthesis of a complex interlacement of symbolic interpretations. Monumentality is dealt with a very sophisticated and conceptual approach where still the result is a shocking short-circuits between archaic and contemporary. When Slobodište was erected its completely disruptive and new formula for the existing memorial scene in Yugoslavia gain attention, especially because of its main topic consisting in a very deep manipulation of the landscape. The architectural design is embodied in the nature itself which is clearly visible in two artificially modelled craters representing a large symbol of Infinity. The courageous choice of the architect put this memorial very close to land art since the large scale of the symbol (slopes reach 16 meters of height) seems to create a metaphysical dialogue with elements of the environment (sky, land, wind) and at the same time, being mimetic, is silently immanent in the landscape stimulating a deep reflection about eternity into the visitor.
Whatever the observer can evoke with its imagination is completely allowed and “projected” by the awareness of Bogdanovic in dealing with magic matter of symbolism and surrealism. Are the sculptures representing flying figures or gates tracing an ideal passage? A petrified sequence of a butterfly flight or a group of fantastic gnomes facing a travel in another dimension? Through a multiplicity of interpretations this place mainly aims to communicate through different vision the experience to live simultaneously the eternity and the instant. Which is the sense itself of the memory intended in a classical perspective, as nostalgia or the pain coming from an ancient wound.

Jasenovac is located on the left bank of the river Sava, one of the largest and most important rivers in the former Yugoslavia. It springs in Slovenia, flows through Croatia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, Serbia and flows into the Danube at the point where meets Belgrade. On the border of the republics of Bosnia Herzegovina and Croatia, during the World War II Croatian pro-Nazi forces called “Ustasha” organized on this site, in Jasenovac, a concentration camp from the existing brick plant. Jasenovac was the largest and the most notorious concentration camp in the Balkans where thousands of Serbian, Muslim and Roma nationality as well as Croatian communists lost their lives, in the most horrifying ways.\(^{143}\)

These scars on the history of the new Yugoslav state, with the aim to preserve the new fraternal atmosphere of the beginnings, have been intentionally erased immediately after the war and remained forgotten. After the completion of the war, the concentration camp was completely destroyed, erasing

\(^{143}\) More on this at: http://www.jusp-jasenovac.hr/Default.aspx?sid=5929
memories and any physical remains of its existence. It was only 20 years after that the government decided to open the Jasenovac question and to raise a memorial to the victims of the camp. In September 1960, the Central Committee of the Federation of War Veterans’ Organisations of Yugoslavia invited architects Zdenko Kolacije and Bogdan Bogdanović to present proposals for the creation of a memorial complex at the site of the former Jasenovac concentration camp. In the sixties Bogdanović was already an affirmed memorial architect, and becomes in charge of the project.
Terrors of this place and its history left an emotional impact on young architect during his first visit to Jasenovac. The river Sava in this section slowly meanders through gently sloping landscapes of Slavonia following a tortuous course that forms many curves. This particular natural configuration of the river is the cause for its very often overflowing during the year. At the same time the area is rich of many other canals and little ponds so that is very easy to feel disoriented by the presence of the water. A sort of legend says that even if the prisoners of the concentration camp succeeded into escape they would get lost because of the difficulty to orientate by the rivers. Surely this story and this unique wetland landscape left a deep impression on Bogdanović, provoking a series of ideas and drawings, clearly suggesting the archetypal of a natural labyrinth based on dualism ground-water. The architect himself defined it as a “labyrinth in the labyrinth” meaning that sense of deep psychological penetration in the experience of confusion and disorientation.

---

As inheritance of his Surrealist creative roots, drawing was the basic meaning of expression to arrive to a project design. And it’s free-hand, quick drawing, seemed led by subconscious, as a kind of automatic writing introduced by Breton and the French Surrealists. In the sketches, dualism between water and land is clearly represented as an obsession: the water and land penetrates each other like two fighting snakes or they burn together in the vision of a flaming fire. These images testify the creative process of the architect to be inspired by suffering and torture feelings. Somehow this phase must be seen as preliminary and absolutely necessary within the evolution that leads to the final birth of the flower, a clear symbol of new life, forgiveness after the storm. Bogdanović says: "I recall the first sketch for a monument in Jasenovac. I
recall the confusing plural plotted labyrinths that I, one after the other, lie on the pile. During the nights, meshes snakelike filled with water and earth embankments, flickered before my eyes, which are reminiscent of the Lucifer’s dark angel tails.”

In this huge production of sketches it’s very hard to create a chronological order but we can surely claim that Bogdanovic tried simultaneously different path in which is possible to individuate elements of connection. In all the drawings flames or snakes is probably intended to be the land manipulation but is possible to see the presence of a focal point where all the flowing signs are converging. This point marks the presence of a memorial sculpture that seems to be the tridimensional “continuation” of the signs ruling the landscape arrangement. This allows us to state that in the mind of Bogdanović the famous flower before to be a flower could have been an eruption of flames. Surely the architect during the creative process is going to detail separately the parterre and sculpture. In 1962 Bogdanović shows a semi-definitive model to Tito and its delegation of politicians and is clearly that something has happened in the meanwhile. The parterre arrangement is still representing a system of dunes whose general design recall a flaming fire, but what is completely changed and solved is the

---

sculpture; the metamorphosis happened. The flame is now turned in a wonderful 30 meter high “Stone Flower” or “Melancholy lotus of concrete”: a strong symbol of forgiveness and eternal renewal stands as a sign that no one ascribes guilt, nor calls for revenge, but anticipates the hope in life and the future. In line with typical symbolism of Bogdanovic, in which forms and figures simultaneously recall different things, the flower can still be seen in a large range of semantic interpretations. However all the visions refer to the symbolic triad of birth, growth and death where the death is always intended to be a natural passage to renew life. As Bogdanovic himself confirms: “The monument over there is standing on the place of horror and every attempt to reproduce the cruelty in the form of a memorial would have been ridiculous, miserable and void. It was necessary to get into the metaphysic and my approach was the following: it has to be a monument for life and it has to show that the crime has not won in the end. It was important to commemorate the countless victims in a reverent way, but it was also significant to express that life goes on.”

---

146 Bogdanović, Bogdan, Interview with Reinhard Seiss, A time traveller through dream worlds, translated and published in SAJ (Serbian Architectural Journal), n.3, 2011, p.88
The path that leads to the Memorial is a remaining of the old railroad tracks leading to the Brickyard and to the camp, later.

The path, at the large lake (former brickyard pond) separates from the main route and leads, paved with the original wooden planks to the Flower of reinforced concrete that rises above the crypt.
When it comes to Bogdan Bogdanović then the openness of form is read in its open semantics. We met a wide and rich world of symbols, myths and archetypes which Bogdanović governs and revives through his memorials. Maybe right for the reason because they originate in the deep Balkan mythical historiography, they are so charged with associations and emotions. Their open reading is what is considered the most significant contribution of Bogdanović. As he states, "I have always been suspicious of pundits who, without hesitation, and with lexicographical precision, explicitly interpret the symbols."\(^{147}\) As he spoke symbols "are a sign the other man’s reality in which penetrates only by feelings, intuition, miracles of personal imagination. Standardization, narrowing, closing their meanings violently separates a sign from its hidden

\(^{147}\) Bodanović, Bogdan, *Ukleti Neimar*, Feral Tribune, Split, 2001, p.165
spiritual content and often converts it into an empty insignia of physical aggregation, and in the case of its totalitarian versions into the magical sign of drastic self-subjecting." On contrary to this, he was very amused with others interpretations and experiences of his memorial. They obligated him to further reviews and reflections. “They (some people) argued that (this flower) reminds them of the flame over ravines Biblical great waters, the cosmic fire, the blazing flower. Others have read six petals as flowerily Kabbalistic diagram. Third (people) was flowerlike concrete crown indirectly reminding of the Old Testament poem about Esther, in which archaic calligraphers print letters so that at the very moment of reading they flourish. There were experts that have seen in the flower a “hieroglyphics of good” over dramatic connection between land and water, the famous lotus from the Koran, the sign by which the evil spirits came to earth, and from where they are forbidden to go out. Some who had the opportunity to see concrete beams petals in the dusk, fog or under the natural disaster, they claimed that they were screened as a winged being, as Archangel, even as the goddess Nike, the hypostasis of victory.” Even the last interpretation of the monument as a victory emerged clearly from the same semantic sequence, life,

future, forgiveness, but it was not favourite to the architect because it was also able to recall to its antipodes, in the form of death or revenge. Bogdanovic was personally oriented always to a positive interpretation of death as renewal of life.

At this point is very important to state that this sense of renewal through the death is inspiring every scale of the project and is traceable in every part or detail of this memorial. Bogdanovic in his final version of the par-terre arrangement creates grass covered and cone shaped tumuli erected in the same location of the warehouses of the former concentration camp. This reveals his intention to reinvent (in a modern perspective) an archaic funerary typology as element of land art composition. The reference to death is forgiven by the extreme harmony of a modern peaceful park, ready to embrace the life of numerous visitors. What is remarkably coherent with this vision of renewal is for sure the use of the railway sleepers as recycled material. The choice to give a third life to an original element involved at first in the working reality of the brickyard and then in the deadly reality of concentration camp, strengthen the Bogdanović belief that existence is subjected to a cyclic rule of birth, growth, death and rebirth.
Case study: Memorial park Popa, Vrnjacka Banja, Serbia

Popina memorial

Popina is the last significant project of Bogdan Bogdanović, and the decision to be the last appears of his own will, reading a large number of hidden symbols. The monument was erected on the site Nebrak, above the river Popina, where in 1941 was played the first major battle between the partisans and the German forces. In 1977 the neighbouring municipalities of
Trstenik and Vrnjacka Banja gave the order for the construction of its monumental complex, which originally meant to include a motel, sport court, artificial cascades on the river and of course the monumental complex. This was a frequent practice in Yugoslavia of that period, to mark the places of great battles National Liberation War, not only with memorial content, but also with tourist, sports, and hotel facilities. Educational character of memorial complexes was particularly emphasized by the amphitheatres and motels with classrooms. Memorial complexes were serving mostly for the younger generation and represented the obligatory route of school excursion. But for financial reasons the local authorities dropped the accompanying tourist and sports facilities, while for the monument they approved rather important financial resources.

The access ritual path, one of the constant elements of Bogdanović’s memorial space, here is represented by a sixty meter long axis. At its beginning, or end, in this memorial is not clearly stated, or it is deliberately left in doubt, instead of gate, the solemn entry in this space is represented by the stone block in which is carved the dedication to the fallen soldiers. Ritual path is a complex physical and perceptual experience. At a certain distance from the stone there are three massive stone rings on a pedestal with Cyclopean stairs.
Inner Diameter of the circles is three meters. Compositional structure of the complex is a linear composition of three different elements, whose rhythm can describe A-BBB-C-B. The third element of composition dominant prismatic building eighteen meter high with a circular passage six meters in diameter. Here the ritual path is the basic concept of the
memorial, and presents itself as an imaginary tunnel. The symbolism of the clear of passage is evocative in its wide semantics of the eternal ontological question of human existence in the sense of transience and also renewal. One of the curiosities of this memorial, which is revealed through a deeper investigation, is that proportion of the large prism, is corresponding to the proportions of the gaps between stone slabs of Belgrade monument, and that is its negative, its supplementation. This is another application of the principle of anagrams as a method in the design of the memorial. Author of this process and drawing documented. He associated memorials by certain characteristics in pairs, in this case the connection were brought, not by chance, the first and last project, which is “ontological circle” is closed. Monument Popina characterized by an entire absence of ornamentation. Vuković believes that this is the result of the author’s belated concession to modern architecture and criticism about the appropriateness of his architectural works of the earlier period. On the other hand the monumental complex its rich composition and application of materials represents a big ornament of nature in which it is located. Particularly interesting is the text engraved in the base of the last stone “If you need repeat me” the text as in a mirror engraved on both

---

150 Vladimir Vukovic, Arhitektura sjecanja, hjxckz
sides of the stone elements. So again we meet this key concept of duality and suggest the possibility of reading the composition from both side’s axes. Not only the possibility but the countless passing through a tunnel, as many times as “necessary.” The idea of the passing in this semantic and symbolic sequence does not end the idea of the end, on the contrary, the idea of an infinite number of passes, re birth. If it is compared to the previous memorials (only to think of the city abbreviations as realized in Mostar or in Knjaževac), it can be seen that this warrior mausoleum, completed in 1981, provides proportionally scarce repertoire of possible “tales”. It could rather be said that the gigantic prism and pertaining omegas open a new chapter in the history of alphabet, unless the Popina memorial is opened and interpreted within the context of other buildings of the same period. “*The sign in the free nature*,” Bogdanovic wrote few years later, “is always a little similar to the voice of the pleading, intoxicated urban man. That voice, if articulated enough, does mean something, says something. Semeion, in the contact with the natural environment, becomes an energy substance of higher order. It even becomes, in a manner of speaking, a maieutical model, the means of intellect and cognition”.

---

MEMORIALS OF FORGIVENESS – MEMORIALS TO LIFE

Signore Bogdanović, you’re probably a communist, but here, in this Biennale, obviously only you believe in God.

Unknown, from the book of impressions, Biennale di Venezia, 1980

Understood among opponents as eclectic, artist who decorated, with no desire to investigate and open dubious themes, on the other hand, Bogdanović was marked by admirers, as one of the rare artists who, highlighting the historical archetypes was looking for universal meanings of symbols that he established, as well as historical phenomenon that have celebrated. Contemporary Yugoslav critique has never fully accepted or understood the creation of Bogdan Bogdanović. His works have remained somehow unclear and vague to rest of the professional public. Rare contemporaries left, in a clear and precise way, comprehensive historical critical reflection on the unique creativity in memorial architecture after the war. However his production echoed in international critical circles, where liberated cultural thought easier and better understood a different monumental rhetoric and composite and eloquent
symbolism. Miodrag Protić, a renowned art critic, later director of the Museum of Contemporary Art, elected Bogdanović, at the very beginning of his career among the most significant artists (sculptors). Putting emphasis on the individuality and uniqueness of artistic expression, analyse them through the conflict of classic and modern in his work. Protić considered him the ideal artist of postmodern age, which in surrealism seeks for an introduction to the future and not return to the past. Analysing only two, until then (1964), designed memorials (Memorial to the Jewish victims in Belgrade and memorial in Sremska Mitrovica) Protić said that contrary to the spontaneous game of the Surrealists who dig at the hall of consciousness, Bogdanović method was "strictly controlled spontaneity, by inverting and cutting architectural elements, he builds the sceneries in which aesthetics outweighs the functionalist ethics." Ethics and aesthetics will remain his lifelong interest and research for its universal balance is always present.

Bogdanović’s memorials represent the exact opposite to the aesthetics of war, starvation, and rift; represent a positive memory, forgiveness for the future. Memorials tell a new story, with new rhetoric, a story of forgiveness. In this story there is no place to exaggerated monumentalism, screams

---

152 Miodrag Protic, Savremenici II, 1964, p. 263
and pain, explicitly and drama of death. Bogdanović writes in “I already knew, even then, that I would not look for nor find inspiration in bringing Evil to live”\textsuperscript{153}. In his work there are no indications of death, suffering or violence. Not even one recalls the battle, revenge; they all have a cathartic essence. “I had carried within a sense that in what was then Yugoslavia, after so many wars, the most important thing was the catharsis, so we all calm down, make peace.”\textsuperscript{154} Merging multiple, heterogeneous local traditions in one unique Yugoslav cultural identity was the way in which his monuments were used in public political life, transforming society and its individuals and trying to encourage the coexistence of numerous identities of Yugoslav citizens. Bogdanovic’s “new formula of memorials” has no connection with a long tradition of figurative monuments or with those mighty abstract geometrical twodents and tridents which during the fifties symbolized “brotherhood and unity” the Yugoslav nations. Bogdanovic works are all multi-layered; pleasing to the eye, there is always a side story that colours the play of abstract shapes with charm of sentimental memories.\textsuperscript{155}

\textsuperscript{153} Bogdanovic, Bogdan, \textit{Ukleti Neimar}, Feral tribune, Split, 2001, p.160
\textsuperscript{154} Bogdanovic, Bogdan, \textit{Ukleti Neimar}, Feral tribune, Split, 2001, p.160
\textsuperscript{155} Zoran Manevic, Bogdanovic Bogdan, Leksikon Neimara, ... str 32
These memorials terminate former connection with the symbolism of emerging ideology; symbols of suffering, partisan and civilian starvation, heroic victory and the National Liberation, represented through obligatory red star or realistic formal representation of the soldiers or civilians. Bogdanović stated himself: “My monuments never had any of this action, agitating, victorious and triumphal, which was greatly present, the memorial art, even when it was not realistic”. They are turning to a deeper and hidden symbolism; archaic forms of Balkan subconscious.

To understand Bogdanović’s attitude towards the symbolic presentations, reference should be made to Carl Gustav Jung, who have been researching the meanings of symbols through dreams, and Ernst Cassirer who developed different philosophy of the symbolist performances. Bogdanović studied them both and they visibly influenced his understanding of symbols. Jung places the symbols as universal archetypes in the collective human unconscious. Archetype comes from the Greek archetypes, composed of Arche, “principle”, e typos, type, idea, a model. Its meaning is closest to the “primary idea”, the basic idea, the original type. Archetype, contrary to its semantic origin, indicates something very complex, difficult for interpretation and individualization. It means something unconditioned, not tied to time or place, not dependent on the
historical and geographical factors. Archetype is entirely made of the spiritual character. Carl Gustav Jung explains it in the sequent way: “Is not a question of ”representations” as of the inherited possibility of representations and still no archetype is reducible to simple formulas. The archetype is like a vase that you can never completely empty or fill. In itself, there is only power, and when it takes shape in a given matter, is no longer the same as before. It persists through millennia and yet demands always new interpretations. Archetypes are unshakable elements of the unconscious, but continually change shape.”

Bogdanović himself creates new symbols in his heuristic exploration game: as a means of communication in which he connects otherwise incompatible concepts, or taking them out of their usual environment and placed them in a completely new context, and so they evolve, graphically and semantically, creating hybrid symbols that speak something new. When Bogdanović this on monuments read as a conscious choice of symbols that were created in the ancient history outside of the current ideology and therefore free from all the negative connotations that an actual political situation could bring, while retaining the universal symbolism of anti-war semantics, of peace, love, hope and reconciliation. Bogdanović was always going back to the archaic symbolic shapes. “What I was able to
go to archaic shapes. I was convinced that the more the semantic of form were able to penetrate the meta-historic levels of human imagination, the more comprehensible the symbol became. Archaism of inspiration imposed an archaism of architectonic methodologies.” Derogating from the dualism winner - defeated, his memorial spaces are based on the archetypal dualism of good and evil. "My constructions represented the struggle of these two principles, something that everyone could interpret differently: it was not for me to define good or evil. An, my monuments were not real monuments. Rather, they were stories, interesting objects, fantastic ones and much visited, especially by young people."\(^{156}\)

Bogdanović had never explicitly explained any symbol presented in his monuments. Openness of symbols and architectural forms for interpretation, polisemiosis of forms is an important characteristic of Bogdanović’s works. Using intentional and always returning to a historical complexity troubled Balkan countries, where in a small area in a relatively short time period the most diverse cultures, civilizations deeply engraved their seals, undermining the roots of the collective memory, reading symbols was always alive, new and rich.

\(^{156}\) Bogdanović, Bogdan, Quated from interview with Alexandre Mirlesse to Notre Europe, 19 of February 2008, available on: http://www.institutdelors.eu/media/re7-bbogdanovic-en.pdf?pdf=ok
“That is the beautiful part of making open forms, using open symbols. The symbols are in principle something very open, something which is very lively, never fixed. When somebody asks what a symbol is meaning, what it is trying to say, that is always the wrong question to ask. It is always about what you are seeing in it. Therefore I believe that my monuments are still interesting – also for people who don’t even know for which historical reasons those monuments were built.”157 Powerful symbolism of Bogdanović’s memorials is not abstract and cosmological, but very concrete, easily recognizable and mundane, says Manević. “The timeframes of this story can be a millennium, the content may be amazing, but solid relationship with the local landscape and local culture is what makes the story believable, binding the soul of an observer.”158 It is precisely this binding with the cultural, historical, traditional and natural framework that gives memorials authentic identity and coherence that transcends all timeframes.

He advocated for the new ideas about the city and was also producing new cities. First at Faculty of Architecture later in his school for the Philosophy of Architecture he was encouraging students to design their own cities, digging deeper into the

157 Bogdan Bogdanović, Inteview with Reinhard Seiss, A time traveller trough dream worlds, translated and published in SAJ (Serbian Architectural Journal), n.3, 2011, p.89
158 Zoran Manević, Bogdanović Bogdan, in Leksikon Neimara, ... str 34
subconscious, imagination, myths and archetypes that we carry inside our personal or collective memory. His surrealist background had served always as a unique of interest which was enriched with many others. A unique pedagogical approach and a critical analysis of the existing urbanist utopia and reality have been contrary “to the official uniformity of urbanism, which was countrywide curriculum”159. Academic career begins and ends at urbanistic courses, while professional, at first glance, is completely separated and deals almost exclusively with the memorial architecture. Only seemingly are two separate fields of research. He took advantage of the opportunity and given trust as a state memorial architect, merged these two fields of research.

Memorials were conceived as cities of the dead, as “necropolis”, as sacred cities, as chthonic cities. His research on the myths and archetypes, the imaginary cities here could be physically investigated, through the architectural presentations of personal and collective subconscious, he created new sacred or transcendental landscapes. The physical structure of the memorial sites is to be analysed as sacred landscape, necropolis (City of dead) or sacred city, analysing its urban structure, its formative elements. The analysis could be

159 Fontana Giusti, Gordana, Kololija, Bogdanovic dissident in life, in Architecture and the Paradox of Dissidence, p. 33-44
developed through the following elements: the definition of “threshold”, “gate”, (filter between the secular space and the sacred space); the definition of “limes”, “boundaries”; the definition of “traces”; the definition of “ritual access path” (perceptual or practicable); the definition of “shrine”, meditation or sacred place. Memorials always start with a threshold, a gate, the entrance to the sacred landscape, and continue with a predefined path that calls for the contemplation in the style of Peripatetics in the ancient gardens of Cicero and Pliny.  

Timeless monuments where archaic and archetype meet. Bogdanović combined disparate historical references with an almost frivolous ease, realizing that in memorials, the associative and subconscious meaning tend to survive far longer than any precise, historically specific interpretation. Most of his memorials are, consequently, extremely open-ended and multivalent collages of forms and motifs, vaguely reminiscent of actual historical references, but never explicit.

Manipulation of the ground, of the natural landscape, which is one of the main characteristic of memorials Bogdanović, Ivan Ristić defined as a form of land art created in 1950, before

---

Robert Smithson even coined a word land art. Monuments are knowingly placed in a natural context, referring to the ancient system of marking territory. In order to conclude I will use Bogdanović’s own words: “I dream of Europe without monuments. By that I mean without monuments of death and disaster. Perhaps philosophical construction: monuments to love, to joy, to jokes and laughter.”

---

MEMORIALS WITHOUT MEMORY

CANCELED IDEOLOGY AND WOUNDED IDENTITY

Today, years after the violent dissolution of Yugoslavia, and after the partisan victory turned to defeat, this new historical constellation renders the monumental sculptures ambiguous objects: beautiful, sad, powerful, strange, weak, bold, and almost invisible. Many were destroyed in the early 1990s by nationalist forces; others were vandalized, or at best abandoned and then almost forgotten.

Burghardt, Kirn

The national history has been re-written again; school curricula were changed or are still being changed. One of the most exemplary illustrations of historical revisionism is undoubtedly the dramatic change in the landscape of monuments. We contrasted two different politics of memory: firstly, the Yugoslav memorialisation of antifascist struggle and secondly, the post-Yugoslav memorialisation of segregated ethnic communities.
The memory politics of the Yugoslav communist party was aimed at a conciliatory universalism based on a positive and inclusive idea of a socialist Yugoslavism. The memorial sites represent the universalism of the social politics of Yugoslavia, which rejected the logic of nationalism, and consequently, the logic of ethnic-cleansing imposed by fascist forces. The abstraction seen in the monuments has provoked the opposition of mainly nationalist ideologues who have criticized them for not showing what actually happened on the site. The rise of nationalism and the re-appropriations of the national war past will soon escalate in the devastating civil war of the 1990’s.

We would argue that it was precisely because of both their anti-fascist communist legacy and abstract form; symbolizing the space of a different Yugoslavia, that many modernist partisan monuments have been destroyed, or left to decay. Nowadays, the partisan memory is increasingly assigned to oblivion. Wherever the narrative embodied by the monuments stood

---

162 In the 1980s, many of the painful events of the Yugoslav war past were reopened; such as the extermination and concentration camp Jasenovac where Croatian pro-Nazi forces murdered Serbian, Jewish and Roma civilians. The number of victims were either drastically pumped-up or toned down by the different sides. Parallel to this, the post-World War II killings (some vengeful and some politically motivated) by communists and partisans were for the first time broadly addressed, opening many of the partially healing wounds from the civil war that took place during World War II. Robert Burghardt, Gal Kirn. «Yugoslav Partisan Memorials: The aesthetic form of the revolution as a form of unfinished modernism.» In *Unfinished Modernisation: between Utopia and Pragmatism*, di Maroje Mrdulja, Vladimir Kulic, 84-95. Zagreb: UHA/CCA, 2011
directly in opposition to nationalist interests, memorial sites were removed, almost exclusively in Croatia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, where a large number of anti-fascist sites were destroyed or damaged. Situation was different, much less dramatic, in other states like Slovenia, Serbia, Montenegro or FYR of Macedonia. The narrative of self-liberation and the partisan struggle was more suited to integration into the new nationalistic narratives, for that reason we can find there some well preserved and recently renovated memorial sites. Within Macedonia, the historical revisionism is drastically visible; in ethnic Albanian areas the monuments are in neglect; we can follow this phenomenon on the example on memorial in Struga, on the other hand, in the ethnic Macedonian region, the monuments are well kept and still visited, such as for example memorial in Prilep.

Boško Kićanski, Makljen memorial in 1970’s and today
Bogdan Žižić made the documentary *Damnatio Memoriae*\(^\text{163}\) in 2001, on the fate of antifascist monuments, on the Croatian territory during and immediately after the civil war in 1992. The documentary is a witness of the dynamics and the nationalistic policy of retaliations for the antifascist past. Apart from some minor comments, it did not really succeed in enhancing public discussion on this important issue. Žižić delineates two prevalent methods in dealing with monuments in the early 1990s. The first method was conversion of old monuments: they were simply given new content. The monument would remain the same, except that the red stars would be replaced by Catholic crosses, and the antifascist slogans of the Peoples’ liberation Struggle with the Croatian checkerboard coat-of-arms and inscriptions dedicated to the Croatian nation. The other method of getting even with the past was direct grassroots acts of destruction. Unknown perpetrators would simply blow up monuments or deface them and write Ustasha slogans on them. The politics of destruction was a realization of an extreme nationalist project undertaken from above and

\(^{163}\) The phrase Damnatio memoriae describes a political practice in Ancient Rome. Traitors were excluded from the Roman urbs and all historical traces of their existence were erased. In this way, the honor of Rome was preserved. The Senate, or later an Emperor, could apply this strategy to condemn their predecessors and seize their property and remake or destroy the monuments of the condemned.
The spontaneity of grassroots activities was sometimes hidden, other times openly supported by the official politics.164

On the other hand we can witness a very topical issue of raising new national and ethnic monuments of poor artistic value or an interesting phenomenon of new bizarre memorial figures of ‘favourite heroes’ in the centre of villages and cities, which are becoming the cultural symbols of this region. New monument hysteria has appeared in Serbia since 2007 with monuments for

---

Rocky Balboa, Bob Marley and Johnny Depp. They point to a crisis of the collective state identity which also derives from a lack of positive heroes stemming from the violent conflicts that followed the break-up of Yugoslavia. Apart from the “imported” character of Srdjan Aleksić, there are no personalities or heroes of that war which an ordinary person could or want to identify with. At the same time, the characters of Hollywood film heroes and musicians have a therapeutic effect. They carry within them the power of childhood dreams of a fighter for a good cause and a better world.

At first glance Yugoslav memorials, in its mature phase in the 1960-1980’s, are not recognizable as typical antifascist monuments. The precise meaning of the sculptures is not
clear. There are no representations of suffering victims or antifascist victors; there is no idealized figure of partisans. This sculptural form is anti-figurative and abstract. It completely negates the humanist moment of suffering or victory, but at the same time strategically touches the question of re-presentation and imagination of the partisan struggle. “The openness which originates in the abstract language of the monuments is a visual manifestation of the emancipation from the Stalinist dominance of socialist realism in the eastern bloc, in which the future is represented only in a happy-overreaching form of the present. The monuments invoke a utopian moment, stick to aniconism, and translate the promise of the future into a universal gesture.”

It is true to say that the formal aspect of universalism embodied by these memorials has been more stable than the political universal claims of the revolution which was defeated. But with most of the museums attached to memorial sites now closed, and very few school trips or other excursions to them organized these days, the monuments have been completely decontextualized.

---

165 Burghard Robert, Partisan Memorials in former Yugoslavia, available on: http://fzz.cc/issue02PART.html visited on: 07.05.2015
Towards the Recovery – Instead of Conclusion

It is certain that these monuments will not say the same think to the future generations, as they are saying to us now, but it is important that they don’t become silent.
Bogdan Bogdanović

European or World architectural historical and critical scenery have left Yugoslav and almost all architecture of Eastern Block peripheral and ignored. “*The hegemonic western definition and selection of architecture of the second half of the century was to emerge during the process. Western overviews and research works on architecture have at least marginalised, if not entirely obliterated, the achievements of the East... and that gap needs to be filled in further research.*” 166 Therefore this thesis is a fumble attempt to fulfil the existing gap, with a rather important and unique typological production of the recent past.

The specificity of the Yugoslav socialism happened due to geographical and political position of Yugoslavia between East

and West, and due to the desire to prove itself as in the ideological, and symbolic way as a unique and autonomous state, to separate itself from the influence of both and create its own path. Searching for Yugoslav own path was not easy nor a straight line process, and experiments in political and social life brought a series of reforms, which eventually resulted in numerous benefits: “the essential industrialisation and urbanisation of the country, social security and a considerable increase in the quality of life of the citizens, as well as a level of cultural freedom sufficient to allow for the development of entirely authentic and internationally relevant cultural practices.”

Mrduljaš and Kulić claim that, from today’s perspective, architectural and urbanistic practice have not reached the levels of innovation that have happened in social and political sense; the utopian and progressive ideals of self-managing socialism, social justice and equality. Spatial concepts, inspired by the social and political utopian aspirations, have not brought greater differences and innovation in architecture in relation to the tendencies of modernism in the rest of the world. However the role of architecture in the creation of a modern and socially responsible society is more than evident and essential.

---

I would have to add to their conclusion that however memorial architecture of socialist period was more innovative, progressive, and utopian than maybe any other typological category of that period. The Yugoslav politics of memory after the Second World War entailed complex intertwining of political, ideological and artistic practices. The erection of monuments dealing with the Yugoslav event was not simply imposed from above, but accepted and negotiated by broad masses of the population. Memorials of Ex-Yugoslavia represent a unique architectural production of that kind and even today, with its eloquent presence and stylistic eclectics provoke interest among many. They represent the vast filed of experiments and research in the moment of evident political and social and financial support.

In the specific case of Yugoslavia, the socialist revolution was materialized in the project of modernization, education, anti-fascism and the creation of the common multi-ethnic space. The major task of these monuments for the revolution was to consider how these universal claims could be addressed and formalized into an aesthetic language. The Yugoslav memorial production started as commemoration of tragic events of the Second World War, with the intention to keep from oblivion and pay the respects to the fallen soldiers and innocent victims. As the socialist revolution, in the post war narrative, was identified
with the struggle during the war [National Liberation Struggle], following that change, the monuments were becoming monuments to the revolution. Burghartd and Kirn noticed here an important contradiction in the very idea of the Monument to the revolution. “Revolutions are generally associated with the overthrow of government and destruction of a certain [oppressive] heritage: with the destruction of institutions, but certainly not with memories and its institutionalization in the form of a monument.” Following their argument revolution erases the past in order to start another path to the future, there for the fascination of the future is relevant for these memorials.

Abstract form of Yugoslav memorials is clearly representing the universal ideas of social policies. In the abstract formal language of these memorials, there is certain openness, which consents space for self-reflection and room for personal associations. It facilitates multiple interpretative approaches and awakens fantasies. “The abstract vocabulary allows for an appropriation of meaning that bypasses the official narrative, making the monuments accessible to even those who disagree

---

with the official political line.” Hybrid memorial compositions are artistic representation of positive memory, which means positive ideology; they celebrate life instead of mourning dead.

The Second World War in Yugoslavia, which is renamed National Liberation War, was a civil war at many national and opposing ideological levels. Important role of these memorials was to give consolation for all parts of the conflict, they represent physical manifestation of forgiveness, reconciliation as Yugoslav path of brotherhood and unity could be achieved only through forgiveness for the past and bright and brave steps to the future. These memorials represent the ultimate examples of appeased memory - memory with forgiveness. Paul Ricoeur coined this particular term in order to show the only possible path of politics of memory, talking about the topical issue of Holocaust memorials end European politics of memory in the context of united Europe. Yugoslav memory politics and memorial artistic creation achieved the same level of conciseness fifty years ago.
Today, there still remains a certain fascination about the universal character of these monuments; these monuments were products of the very specific historical circumstances and simultaneously, had a formal strength to outlive the era of their construction. With the recent fashionable academic attention to the archaeology of modernism a renewed interest in these monuments is growing. Today these monuments attract much attention of the general public, they became very topical issue of artistic discourse, are frequent guests of sites and blogs about art and architecture, make part of various design projects, and often trigger enthusiastic discussions. I will
mention some of them, on the first place the exhibition *Scene for a New Heritage*, in MoMa, New York. The project that lends the exhibition its title is the video project of Croatian artist David Maljković. The video starts with cars comically wrapped in shiny metal foil to make them appear futuristic, driving along rural roads and arriving at a derelict monument of Petrova Gora. Monument seams infested, without the majority of metal plates on the facade, park and plaza are invaded by weeds and shrubbery. There’s a feeling of mournful nostalgia in sharp contrast to the spirit of forward-looking faith in one of history’s most comprehensive collective endeavors; Socialism, that the monument once embodied. Maljkovic places Monument of Petrova Gora into the future, using the translatability of abstract high modernist language towards the future in order to imagine an alternate future, one informed by events of the past but never realized. While Maljković places the visit to Petrova Gora in the future, with a clear message of progressive, modern, and futuristic ideas of monuments, most of the other art projects in monuments search and emphasizes *only exotics and otherness*. 
Projects of artistic photography, such as photographs of Roman Bezjak, within the project *Socialist modernism* or photographic publication *Spomenik* of Jan Kempenaers have a similar approach. They chose gray days and the darkest corners to document what was left of modernism in the former eastern bloc and in the former Yugoslavia, as part of the *Vanishing act*, or another non-existing world. Phantasmagorical collages of Vesna Jovanović and Tanja Deman at the project *Deserted Utopia*, represent Yugoslav monuments superimposed in environments of socialist mass tourism, today seem exciting and interesting visual art projects. Nevena
Katalina on the other hand uses these memorials in order to create pop art posters. These projects begin and end only with the fetish of strangeness of the form, its artistic and aesthetical values, ignoring the context and intentional origin and existence of these monuments.

Vesna Jovanović, Tanja Deman Deserted Utopia

Willem Jan Neutelings signs a preface for Kempenaers photography collection. Starts the text with the following words, “You’ll see Spomeniks on strategic outcroppings, lofty passes and sweeping plateaus: gigantic sculptures, firmly anchored to the rocks. They are objects of stunning beauty. Their abstract geometric shapes recall macro views of viruses, flower-petal goblets, crystals. They are built of indestructible materials like
reinforced concrete, steel and granite. Some are solid, others hollow. The largest Spomeniks even afford access to the public, teetering on the boundary where sculpture becomes architecture.”  Here we can notice a very paradigmatic use of the word Spomenik (in Serbian monument) instead of the English equivalent of the term. With this, Neutelings is definitely emphasising the only possible reading of these structures as strange, defined by exotic otherness, without the need to understand the genesis and their social importance and its contextual rootedness. According to him “The photographs raise the question of whether a former monument can ever function as a pure sculpture, an autonomous work of art, detached from its original meaning.”

What remains completely erased from Neutelings analysis is essential to understand the specific position of the memorials and monuments to the Revolution of Yugoslavia, as well as its position today. It is the emancipatory dimension of these monuments and of the socialist revolution that has taken parallel flow with the liberation war; it was the anti-capitalist revolution for more equal and classless society. The revolution

---

has radically changed the lives of most people in Yugoslavia, and especially women. In this context, the role of monuments in Yugoslavia was not identical to that in Western or Eastern Europe, which were places of remembrance for those who died for freedom. Monuments in Yugoslavia had the task to bring the memory to the future, but also more importantly, the flames of the revolution. Reading monuments as pure aesthetic forms, and autonomous works of art, greatly diminish the significance of these structures. Their social emancipatory role, as a pledge for a common future, is equally important as their modernist language oriented towards future.

I find very interesting text of Dubravka Sekulić, who talks about current topic of the future of the monument at Petrova Gora, which is not completely destroyed, however, is devastated and abandoned. As Sekulić states; funds for the construction and opening, which lasted from 1972 to 1981, in large part were provided from local communities, which were the main initiators of the project. The memorial complex, which in its composition had significant cultural and educational contents, was supposed to be the backbone of the cultural infrastructure in this area. These two aspects of the project, a massive participation of the local communities in the financing of the construction, as well as the planned function of cultural centre for the community, are very often ignored. “To the artistic, and
all those other readings, is much more suitable story where the brutal and inappropriate grandiose form, has landed on that territory because of the self-will of the governing elite, possibly by Tito himself.”

The war and the restitution of capitalism delete the ideology from the monuments, especially emancipatory idea of permanent revolution and the classless society, as well as anti-fascism as the foundation of society. Sekulić continues saying that, “For those who analyse these places as pure aesthetic form, Petrova Gora and other monuments become depoliticized non-places which value is in the highly aestheticized abstract forms. Modernism, cleaned from the ideology, and turned into an exotic style. Especially here, in the mountain backwoods, where is not expected.” Reducing Petrova Gora and other monuments to the pure exotic form and fetishism, and reading and analysing them in the bourgeois key of high art, deletes the emancipatory potential of sociability, which these monuments had, and never completely fulfilled. Today they form an invisible network of symbolic locations that still have the power to generate Yugoslav space, and represent a physical memory of the common past and a promise for the common future. Having

---

no intention of looking back to historical events with nostalgia, but rather determined to critically interpret the values and ambitions that modernization had in socialist conditions, one could not help but notice social justice and solidarity, cultural progress and support in expanding and sharing knowledge, as well as the significance of the public opinion. Although social reality in Yugoslavia was by no means ideal, still it was characterized by constant efforts to go towards that goal, by actively including architecture and urban planning in such process.
APPENDIX AND BIBLIOGRAPHY
Antun Augustinčić (1900 –1979)

Antun Augustinčić was a prominent Croatian sculptor active in Yugoslavia. Along with Ivan Meštrović and Frano Kršinić he is considered one of the three most important Croatian sculptors of the 20th century.

His most notable sculptures include the Peace monument, in front of the United Nations building in New York City and the Miner statue in front of the International Labour Organization headquarters in Geneva.

Augustinčić In 1918 he enrolled at the Arts and Crafts College and after Royal Academy of Arts and Crafts in 1922, both in Zagreb, where he studied under the guidance of Ivan Meštrović. He received a scholarship from the French government and continued his studies at the École des Beaux-Arts in Paris under the guidance of Jean Antoine Injalbert.

In 1929 he was one of the founding members of the Earth Group (Croatian: Grupa Zemlja) arts collective which brought together prominent left-oriented sculptors, painters and architects, such as Drago Ibler, Krsto Hegedušić, Ivan Tabaković, Ivan Generalić, and many others. Augustinčić took part in several exhibitions organised by the group between 1929 and 1933, when he left the group, two years before it was banned by the authorities in 1935. In the late 1930s he also created a couple of monuments to King Alexander in Sombor and Skopje, which were later destroyed.
in World War II. During the war Augustinčić remained active. In 1946 Augustinčić became a professor at the Academy of Fine Arts in Zagreb, and after the war he was made a member of the People’s Assembly. In 1949 he was made a full member of the Yugoslav Academy, and from the 1950s onwards he started making portraits, art nudes and figurative sculptures. In the years after the war he made a number of notable sculptures, such as the monuments to Josip Broz Tito in Tito’s birthplace of Kumrovec (1948), politician Moša Pijade (1953), violinist Zlatko Baloković (1962), 16th century Croatian writer Marin Držić (1963). In 1970 Augustinčić donated his works to his native town of Klanjec, where a gallery exhibiting his works opened in 1976.

Vojin Bakic (1915-1992)

Vojin Bakic was a prominent Croatian sculptor of Serbian descent. He was an important artistic figure, particularly in the 1950’s and 1960’s Croatian contemporary art scene. He collaborated with the group EXAT-51 and the “Nove tendencije” (New tendencies) movement. He completed many public monuments: among them Monument in Bjelovar (1946), the Monument to the Revolution in Kamensko (1958-1968), the Monument to the Train Victims in Zagreb (1978), as well as monuments in Kragujevac, Dotrscina (Valley of Graves) and Petrova Gora (1981). After 1945 he gravitated towards impressionistic treatment of the surface. This period is primarily parked by the portraits of Ivan Goran Kovacic (1946) and Silvije Strahimir Kranjcevic (1948).
During the 1950’s Bakic reduces the volume of his sculptures by the use of sharp fractures, and edges, and later by merging the details of the sculptural mass. During that time, he made an entire series of bull sculptures in various dimensions (Bull, 1950,1956). With the series entitled Nudes, Torsos and Heads he completed his focus on organic, associative shapes, and from 1958 he turned towards the challenge of open forms, inner spaces and light. Further professional development made him the first artist in a local context to follow the principles of geometric abstraction and to start the study of optic effects. By altering concave and convex surfaces, he made “light shapes” which were close to constructivist poetics. In Elaborated Surfaces (1960-1964) he articulated strict and consistent units made of lined-up elements, whereas in Light-bearing Shapes (1963.1964) he created effective structures by means of modulating identical mirror units, for which he also used new materials, such as stainless steel.

**Dušan Džamonja (1928 –2009)**

Dušan Džamonja began his studies at the Academy of Fine Arts in Zagreb in 1945 under the professors Vanja Radauš, Frano Kršinić and Antun Augustinčić, all notable authors. In 1951, he graduated in the master class of Professor Antun Augustinčić. In 1951, he worked in the Krsinic workshop until 1953 when he started his own workshop in Zagreb. In 1970, he began the construction of his house and workshop in Vrsar, Istria according to his own design. Džamonja draws primarily in chalk and uses the technique of washed ink; however, Džamonja leaned towards sculpture, early on. He has used
many materials, from bronze and iron to wood, glass, concrete and polyester in his sculptures. "He developed new ways of using traditional materials; he reconciled the intractability of metal to the fluidity and animation of nature; and, without resorting to narrative, he imbued his architectural monuments with the sensation of human presence..." [Jasia Reinhar]

His works are in numerous public and private collections, museums and galleries in the country and abroad. However, his most notable works are: Dušan Džamonja’s Park of Sculptures, near Vrsar, is a famous and cultural tourist attraction. Monument to the Revolution (1967), World War II memorial in Podgarić, Croatia. The Memorial Monument in Mrakovica, The Memorial Ossuary to the Fallen Yugoslav Soldiers of the First and Second World Wars in southern Italy, Barletta. Designed a number of monuments to the Partisans and victims of concentration camps, most notably the Memorial Ossuary at Barletta, near Ban (1970) and the Monument to the Battle of Kozara (1972).

**Sreten Stojanović (1898 –1960)**

He was born on 15 February 1898 in Prijedor in Bosnia-Herzegovina, in the house of Orthodox priests who "preached the faith for strength of people and who imagined Russia to be something that is ours or more beautiful, bigger, more Orthodox, closer to God and more powerful than anything that was German or Turkish", as he wrote in his autobiography. He belonged to the Young Bosnia Movement where he was, as a juvenile pupil of the Tuzla’s high school, sentenced to 10 years in prison. He was also shortly engaged adventurously in
national interests at the end of the First World War. In Vienna he studied sculpture and at the beginning of the 1920s he enjoyed a turbulent bohemian life in Paris, where he also devoted himself to study. With Dragiša Vasić and Vladislav Ribnikar he was traveling through the Soviet Union in 1927. After the Second World War he was a dynamic social and cultural activist.

They were big defenders of the modern art in between the wars Yugoslavia and their house became one of the most known meeting places of artists, writers, young left-wing politicians and intellectuals. Being in the midst of social happenings, he returned to Bosnia immediately after the end of the war where he was engaged in creation of first Yugoslavia, with all his achieved political and penal reputation, belligerence and revolutionary mood.

During the Second World War he lived in Belgrade with his family and when the war was over he found out that his brother, Dr. Mladen Stojanović, died. His brother was a legendary national hero and one of the key persons of Josip Broz Tito’s partisan movement in western Bosnia. After his brother’s death, Stojanović engaged himself in many functions. He was the chairman of the National Front in Belgrade, commoner, the secretary of the Association of Painters of Yugoslavia, the chairman of the Association of Painters of Serbia, the principal of the Art Academy, the editor of the magazine "Art", a member of Serbian Academy of Art and Sciences in 1950, etc.

In memorial buildings in Belgrade, Vojvodina, Montenegro and Republic of Srpska in Bosnia-Herzegovina there are some of his most important monumental compositions.
Miodrag Živković (1928-)

Miodrag Živković is a Serbian sculptor and a professor at the Faculty of Applied Arts in Belgrade. In 1944, immediately after the liberation of Yugoslavia, he moves to Belgrade where he completes high school studies and starts Faculty of Applied Arts in Belgrade. He was a President of the Association of Applied Artists of Serbia in two electoral terms. He was engaged in the production of design in the Serbian economy and the realization of humanization of the art in living and working spaces. From 1968 he works as a Professor at the Academy of Applied Arts in Belgrade, where he was also engaged as a Dean from 1974.1977.

He is the sculptor of many of the notable monuments from the socialist period as Monument to the Brave in Ostra, Serbia, Sutjeska monument in Tjentiste, Bosnia, Kadinjaca monuments in Serbia along many others. He remained the most popular memorial sculptor even today. He was in charged for many monuments to the Serbian victims during the Civil war.
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