

# Design versus Discourse

*Architectural Education in Croatia, 1945-1991, within Socialist Yugoslavia*

*Dafne Berc and Maroje Mrduljas.*

## Abstract

*This article reviews the various periods which can be distinguished in the official teaching of architecture in Croatia, emphasizing on the relationship between socialist ideology and architecture in the 1950s and the 1960s.*

*After the Second World War, Yugoslavia rejected soviet socialist realism and artistic practice achieved considerable autonomy. But the socialist project demanded two tasks from architecture: representation of the new society and urbanization. Thus, the priority for higher education was mass production of professionals. Architecture, seen as a synthesis of art and engineering, progressed with the general economic development and was often identified with the construction industry. Limited theoretical research and absence of critical thinking produced stagnation. Instead of giving way to a critical theory as a basis for the students' intellectual development, the fading of the socialist Project strengthened concepts which followed the professors' personal poetics. The Architecture Faculty of Zagreb continued to legitimize its modernist curriculum. The artistic and conceptual trends developed at the faculty since the late 1970s replaced the long awaited critical discourse, which began to appear only in the 1980s with the arrival of the first professionals trained in the U.S.A.*

*In 2009, official architectural education in Croatia turned ninety; it started in 1919 with the foundation of the Engineering College in Zagreb. Actually a half of this activity went on in the period from 1945 to 1991, during which Croatia had the status of one of six republics of the Socialist Federal Republic of Yugoslavia; this had an essential effect on the character and objectives of architecture and hence the education of Croatian architects. This impact is manifested in the reflection of the specific synergetic relations between socialist ideology and architecture during the fifties and sixties, when the intensive modernisation of society unfolded, where extensive urbanization played an especially important role. After the mid 1960s, modernisation processes lost their impetus, and architecture reacted to new circumstances, gradually changing the focus of interest to a post-modern evaluation of the historical city and conceptual research. Notwithstanding the nominal orientation of the Yugoslav socialist project towards social emancipation, the political system never opened up to radical criticism, which was replaced by the concept of reform. The limited scope of theoretical research and critical thinking affected the stagnation of the curriculum of architectural education, as well as of architectural discourse in general, and architecture primarily stayed a productive modernisation device within the ideological framework of the reigning system.*

## **Modernisation and the formation of socialist Yugoslavia.**

*The Yugoslav project was a theoretically original socio-political experiment located, in geopolitical terms, between Eastern and Western bloc. This project operated somewhere between frequently opposed and even contradictory concepts: between a planned economy and the free market; the one-party system and worker self-management; constraints on the freedom of political speech yet autonomy in culture; federalism and unitarism. The project erected the development of the socialist system that would provide for gradual evolution towards a communist society as its programmatic objective. For such a task, accelerated modernisation and the transition of the predominantly rural country into an industrial and urban land was essential. This social and demographic transition was ideologically motivated by the need to create an urban proletariat as social entity ready to accept socialist modernity and to reject "traditional" or "reactionary" values. But modernisation also had a very pragmatic and essential role in the advancement of infrastructural, economic and technical capacities for overall social development.*

*The overarching modernisation project of "constructing a utopia" was devised as a collective enterprise in which architecture was to take part, one of the key actors, which is illustrated by a popular propaganda slogan of the fifties: electrification, industrialisation,*

urbanisation! Architects and planners were a part of the professional and governing elite, which was to a great extent involved in the modernisation of the land and enjoyed a relatively high degree of autonomy. This was aided by the impression that modernism and socialist progress were coterminous and evolutionary processes. Such assumptions had their historical roots in the progressively oriented architectural intelligentsia formed before WWII.

**The transition of modern architecture: from criticism of capitalism to socialism.**

During the formative period of the modern movement up to WWII Croatia knew a vigorous exchange of architectural ideas with the leading international centres and key figures, which had a considerable influence on the formation of an ideologically and conceptually consistent modern movement with an emphasis on social awareness, many of the leading architects being leftist inclined.

After the education of master builders in the School of Applied Arts in Croatia, the tertiary education of architects started in 1919 at the construction-engineering department of the Engineering College. From 1926 to 1942, a relatively short lasting but influential architectural department at the Academy of Fine Arts run by the architect Drago Ibler worked in parallel with this department. While the Engineering College was close to cognate polytechnics in Central Europe, the academy worked according to the principles of workshops and the participation of the students in concrete tasks. The parallelism of these different approaches to architectural

education created a healthy competitive atmosphere and a productive exchange of opinions, although international modernism was without any question the leading paradigm in both institutions. It is a significant fact that from the ranks of the few (only eighteen) graduates of the architectural section in the Academy of Fine Arts five of the key figures in the Zagreb school of architecture were recruited. The projects and buildings of Drago Galić, Lavoslav Horvat, Mladen Kauzlarić, Stjepan Planić and Neven Šegvić crucially defined Croatian architecture. In addition, Galić, Kauzlarić and Šegvić were to become influential full professors at the future Architecture Faculty.

Beyond the borders of institutional education, the leading contribution to the development of architectural thinking in the interwar period was made by the Zemlja [Earth] group led by Drago Ibler, which brought together leftist oriented and socially engaged artists and organised a number of didactic exhibitions until the ideologically motivated police ban on its activities in 1935. Also working alongside the Zemlja group was the Zagreb Working Group, the national CIAM group for the then Kingdom of Yugoslavia. It was founded in 1932, at the initiative of Zagreb architect Ernest Weissmann, distinguished collaborator of Le Corbusier. It was characterised by having many members and its dedication to publicly engaged action and to social and planning issues. At the fourth CIAM congress, on the basis of exhaustive analyses of the existing social and economic conditions and relationships in Zagreb, the Zagreb Working Group

clearly defined its demand for the construction of high-quality dwellings for the masses whose welfare was at threat, for standardisation and the industrialisation of building production.

The situation changed however in 1942 when the Architectural Department at the Academy of Fine Arts was abolished according to the decision that tertiary level construction education should be concentrated in the engineering faculties. In spite of Ibler's post-war attempts to have the training of architects continued at the Academy of Fine Arts, in fact education was continued only at the Engineering Faculty.<sup>(1)</sup> The monopoly of a single architecture school in undergraduate education started: in 1956 the Architecture, Construction and Surveying Faculty was founded, while from 1962 the Architectural Faculty became independent in the framework of Zagreb University. The conception of the master's workshop went on as architectural design postgraduate education in the context of JAZU – the Yugoslav Academy of Sciences and Arts – in Zagreb, which was from 1957 first run by Ibler himself, after 1964 being taken over by his student Drago Galić. Workshops were conceived as being equivalent to the master workshops of the fine arts, which were then run by the most important Croatian fine artists. The highest level of architect education, then, was under the control of JAZU – the most powerful and authoritative cultural and scientific institution in Croatia, leading to the further education of architects becoming an elitist matter, and instead of being a discursive postgraduate approach, the focus on

architectural design was retained. At the faculty itself, a postgraduate course was gradually introduced, that of *Urbanism and Spatial Planning*, in 1969; the *Preservation and Revitalisation of the Architectural Heritage*, in 1975; and *Architecture in Tourism and Leisure*, 1981.

**The cultural context of high modernism**  
Yugoslavia developed positive achievements such as the theoretically innovative and emancipatory concepts of worker self-management, a high level of social security and quality of life, a successful foreign policy and continued endeavours for society to be modernised via reform. However, a telling criticism of the real political functioning of the system was given by Croatian philosopher Borislav Mikulić: "The social system in Yugoslavia developed politically, in spite of all the tendencies of its programme, only to the level of enlightened socialist absolutism. ... the so-called Yugoslav third way, which had such a big reputation in the foreign policy field... remained in its essence a centralist model of the rule of society via a party that settled every wave of crisis by retreat into conservatism and preservation of its monopoly of power... In this ambivalence between its paper declarations and its real way of rule most effectively it derogated not only from its principled option of self-government but even from the level of legislation achieved."<sup>(2)</sup>

In cultural terms, after heated discussions about the appropriate form of artistic expression for a new socialist society that lasted from 1945 to 1952, socialist realism of the Soviet type was rejected and artistic practices

obtained their aesthetic and conceptual autonomy. This decision was in large part the consequence of the Tito-Stalin clashes and the split of the then Federal Peoples' Republic of Yugoslavia from Eastern bloc, in 1948. In this debate a paper by a leading Croatian intellectual and writer, Miroslav Krleža, in 1952 at the Third Conference of Yugoslav Writers in Ljubljana was crucial in urging freedom for art, or its independence from politics. Krleža served as Tito's specially close advisor for cultural issues, and this event marked, at a symbolic level, the official reckoning with cultural totalitarianism.

In the cultural history narrative of Croatia in the fifties and sixties, an important event was the formation of the neo-avant-garde group Exat 51 in Zagreb; it took off from the Bauhaus idea of the synthesis of all plastic arts and championed abstraction and freedom of visual expressive idiom. Modernist thinking in the visual arts culminated in the movement called New Tendencies (the first international exhibition was held in 1961; the fourth and last in 1974), also based in Zagreb, which became one of the chief international centres for neo-constructivism and research into the synthesis of science and art. These trends are crucial for an understanding of the Croatian cultural and political context in which the progressive tendencies in art took over the role of the social avant-garde as well, although their scope was limited and was reduced purely to the cultural issue. In social sciences, in the mid-sixties the philosophical group Praxis was created; this was a line of what was called non-

dogmatic Marxism and is considered an original contribution to Marxist thinking, relying on a reading of early Marx and the "criticism of everything in existence". Praxis was at work from 1964 to 1974; it issued a journal and organised the famed Korčula summer school, achieving considerable international renown<sup>(3)</sup>.

These progressive tendencies had a positive effect on artistic and intellectual life; however, this remained fragmented and marginal as compared with the political world and social reality. Thus the parallel existence of progressive tendencies in various cultural practices was left without any interaction – the philosophers of Praxis thus in their journal registered only in one article the achievements of local modernist art through an account of the architect and artist Vjenceslav Richter, while the New Tendencies, in spite of the similarity of their views, were not very closely connected with Praxis.

### **Representation and urbanisation**

The socialist project focused its demands on the architecture of the fifties and sixties on two basic tasks: the representation of the new society, and urbanisation. The architectural modernism inherited from the pre-war period was supplemented by collaboration with fine artists and became the official expression of the socialist project as it sought for an authentic "socialist Gesamtkunstwerk". The representative buildings of political institutions in Croatia and Yugoslavia as well as all other public structures were produced as on the whole well articulated buildings in the spirit of international high modernism.

*Andre Mohorović, professor of architectural theory at the Faculty of Architecture, anticipated this process in a programmatic text of 1948, in which he took an ideological risk and implicitly took issue with historicism and so implicitly with socialist realism: "Contemporary monumentality derives from the strength of the working masses, and not from the distance of class differences, and accordingly the forms of contemporary architecture have to be new, deriving from the new reality of social relations and expressed with new structures and new material."<sup>4</sup> The success and acceptance of modernist architecture in Croatia was favourably affected by the fact that neither in the West nor in the East was it understood as a means of representing political power, which underscored its suitability for the identification of socialist Yugoslavia as culturally autonomous from both the "totalitarian East" and the "decadent West". Clients like the Yugoslav People's Army unexpectedly commissioned some radical architectural experiments, and right to the middle of the sixties advanced architectural designs were used for the purpose of propagandising socialist progress. Through a synergy of the representation of ideology, of a high level of architectural design knowledge and a fertile cultural milieu, a unique architectural culture of high modernism was created. This body of modern architecture is relevant in the international context, but is still without its proper evaluation and is excluded from the dominant historiography of modernist architecture.*

*A second form of collaboration of the*

*socialist political system and modern architecture was the mass production of cities. Thus along with the ideological aspects of modernisation, considerable advances were made in raising the overall standard of living via the development of new housing estates with their basic infrastructures, educational institutions, medical services and other public facilities. Architects and planners enjoyed the support of the ruling elites, and town planning was carried out on top-down principles, while the mechanisms of civil participation were limited. In few settings were modernist concepts applied with such faith, consistency and to such a great extent. Collectively owned property and the expropriation of real estate took the burden of market principles from the shoulders of architects and planners. But economic parameters and constraints in the available resources did nevertheless affect urban planning concepts, as in what was called "crane planning", where the disposition of buildings was determined by the ability to use construction cranes with maximum effectiveness. Most interventions, because of convenience, were carried out in peripheral areas where there had been no earlier building, and so socialist town planning was primarily the colonisation of tabula rasa situations. The potentials of architecture as means of social improvement were in Yugoslavia equated with the issue of how to achieve the set aims of the socialist project as fast and well as possible and this synergy had a dual effect: positive in the sense of vigorous tempo and on the whole well designed and constructed mass produced architecture and negative in the sense*

*that it ignored many objective problems like unconsolidated city areas and the frequent reduction of plans to uncompleted urban conglomerations.*

*On the one hand, these circumstances enabled the implementation of very large planning schemes with their infrastructure, parks, squares and the basic social and welfare services. On the other hand, the over-idealistically devised plans were not completely feasible, leaving old infrastructure and planning problems unresolved and new neighbourhoods devoid of planned public contents. The gap between ambitious town planning concepts, the level of political control over self-management and the realistic economic capacities was considerable and was the consequence of the lack of interaction among the various players in the construction of the city and poor, bureaucratically-run planning at all levels. Modernisation was thus carried out to the level that an instable and insufficiently developed economic system could support. For these reasons, the modernisation designs were implemented only up to the level of basic functionality and not to the completion and finalisation of the models as planned. Modernisation was thus reduced to an optimised utopia and a technocratic vision of urban development, while the real result in the scale of actual architectural articulation was rationalised. The specific success of the planned socialist reconstruction of the city was the even-handed division of prosperity and the housing stock, which resulted in the social diversity of the new housing estates; this has lasted until this day.*

### ***The educational profile of the Zagreb school of architecture***

*In the period immediately after WWII, in the spirit of the general social climate, the priority for tertiary level education in socialist Yugoslavia was egalitarianism and mass production of architects; the exponential growth in the number of the students of the Engineering Faculty had as early as 1956 achieved the number of four thousand, 596 of whom were enrolled in the architecture department in the academic year of 1955/56. But the number of graduate students fluctuated, and from only 28 graduates in 1958, it leaped very rapidly to a record 158 as early as 1963. The number of graduates did change, but it has remained within this order of magnitude to this day. The teaching staff included many but not all leading architects, with prominent professors being largely involved also in prestigious construction assignments and enjoying both social and professional reputations. The intellectual profiles of these professors-cum-architects were not unified, and thus the faculty employed idiosyncratic authors with dual careers (in architecture and the visual arts) like Josip Seissel and Božidar Rašica, pragmatically ordered designers like Zvonimir Vrkljan, Mladen Kauzlarić and Drago Galić, and avant-garde architects like Vladimir Turina. But right from the beginnings the budget was inadequate to provide for a sufficient number of teachers with complete commitment to their teaching work. For this reason Faculty started hiring part-time labour, on the whole practically inclined people, self-taught, as far as the educational process was concerned.*

*The logical consequence of accelerated modernisation was the concern of architecture and so architectural education being directed towards a pragmatic and efficacious resolution of concrete problems. From this point of view the constant feedback between the architectural and building practice and the education of architects became important. Feedback went on mainly from practice to education. The typological themes had been the permanent mainstay of the curriculum from the pre-WWII period. In principle, it was the cultural and ethical aspects of architecture that were accorded the greatest importance, but they were looked at as autonomous and purely architectural phenomena unconnected with the social sciences and with empirical research. In 1959 during a debate about starting up a postgraduate course, Vladimir Turina, one of the most talented architects of the post-war generation and educated at the Engineering College, warned: "The very strongly technical character of the current undergraduate course gives the basic architectural problem area – the creative formation of a spatial synthesis – a fairly encyclopaedic character... I do not share the belief that architectural studio work in the framework of a postgraduate course should have narrower specialisations [i.e. typological] ... my opinion is that this might lead to unnecessary stereotypes and short-sightedness that would unnecessarily restrict the synthetic personality of the creative architect."<sup>(5)</sup> The growing corpus of increasingly high quality Croatian modern architecture accumulated since the 1920s constituted high standards and entirely concrete*

*examples, and the students empirically "learn from the city itself". The developed publishing activity of the Croatian Architects' Association – the journals Čovjek i prostor (Man and the Space) and Arhitektura (Architecture) – in the editing of which teachers from the Architecture Faculty took part, contributed to the formation of a feeling of belonging to an architecturally and artistically progressive scene, to the dissemination of knowledge about architecture and to the education of students, for whom these journals provided important intellectual stimulus.*

*The theoretical backbone of the Architecture Faculty was formed on the whole through a conventional study of the history of architecture, a foundation course in plastic design along the lines of Bauhaus and lectures from architecture theory. The understanding of architecture as synthesis of art and engineering was stimulated, while research and scholarly work were poorly represented. In this kind of setting, the individual and non-scientific charisma of individual teachers came to the fore; particularly significant was that of Neven Šegvić who established himself as an informal focus of the intellectual life of the Architecture Faculty during the whole of his career, from 1945 to 1987. As early as 1950 Šegvić himself had drawn attention to the absence of any consistent theoretical discourse: "Because of the... absence of any theory to oversee practice, our architectural development moved along the line of general economic development, often identified with the construction industry, that is, the physical development of the space, which does not however exhaust*

*the architectural problem of creating specifically human spaces related to the physical and psychological complexes of humanity. This absence of architectural theory and criticism has necessarily been reflected in many approaches and built works. Terse and one might say unformed building masses have been created, without the specifically architectural factors related to man and his emotional structure.”<sup>(6)</sup>*

**Technocratisation and the transition from socialist modernisation to the market.**

*In the mid-sixties it gradually became clear that the system of socialist self-management was economically unsustainable, improperly led by the managerial elites, and that it was all beginning to depend on economic aid from outside. At this moment ideology began to split apart from social tendencies, and consequently from construction, just as the role of modernisation was no longer connected to the utopian horizon of the socialist project. Although potentially this point of the disappearance of a direct relation between ideology and architecture might indicate the emancipation of the self-contained technical dogmatism and the beginning of a polemic with modernism, this did not in fact happen. The creative and pragmatic successes of high modernism had an ambivalent effect on the development of architectural culture, for high standards were erected, while a fetish was made out of modernism, and its evolution did not develop enough in the direction of critical experiments.*

*In addition, the foundation of architecture in functionalist typologies*

*and simple technical solutions was still a direct response to the demands that the construction industry made on the architect. Since the whole of the education was conceived and dimensioned to “meet the needs of industry” (at service to the echoes of a social paradigm), the curriculum of the Faculty of Architecture among other things followed the personnel requirements of future employers, who were becoming ever more powerful. For back at the beginnings of socialist modernisation big construction firms had been set up, achieving high standards in some aspects like the prefabrication. The economic reform of 1964 brought in elements of the free market of goods and services, and the constitutional changes of 1974 were a reaction to demands for greater liberalisation and the weakening of centralism in the organisation of the state. In addition, Yugoslavia played a significant role in the Non-aligned movement, which opened up many foreign markets, to which one has to add the countries of Eastern bloc, and the construction industry became one of the leading export branches. As a result of competition in the international market, the construction industry increasingly functioned according to the organisation type of the capitalist corporations, where architectural knowledge was not autonomous, merely one of the elements of the final product. Because of the character of the tasks that it undertook, big complexes in developing countries, architectural culture was not of primary importance to the building industry, rather the design tasks were essentially pragmatic.*

*During the seventies and eighties creative independent offices that were run by some of the most important and talented artists such as Ivan Vitić, Kazimir Ostrogović and Vjenceslav Richter gradually died out. They were replaced by nameless collectives integrated into large building industry companies where there was no modernist synergy between science and art, as urged by the protagonists of neo-avant-garde tendencies in Croatia in the fifties and sixties; rather, by contrast, a loss of the progressive aspirations of the discipline itself.*

**The problem of critical discipline.**  
*The insufficiently defined dialectic relation between social sciences and socialist modernisation in terms of theory and practice resulted in functionalism and technology gradually becoming instrumentalised for a mechanical understanding of urbanism divided from city reality. Research advances were focused on individual experimental projects or built structures, but were not understood as agent of social change. Urbanism and consequently architecture had no possibility to be constituted as a critical discipline, because of the integration with the socialist system and pragmatic requirements. According to socialist doctrine, the system evolved and was self-adjusting in line with technical, economic and other parameters; in Yugoslav socialism though there was no political and ideological alternative. Although the issue has not been re-examined, post-modernism, because of the championing of pluralism and deconstruction of systems of power was not comparable with the socialist system*

and the reception of post-modernism in Croatia was closed to the most strictly intellectual circles.

The educational establishment on the whole did not register current post-modern experience, and the debate between the modernist and the post-modernist situation was primarily to do with generations and designs, and not conceptual and interdisciplinary. Within the actual architectural discourse, the object of research in architectural design and in criticism remained primarily the architectural artefact, and much less its welfare and social performative, and architecture could thus not be constituted as a genuinely progressive practice. The architecture itself was a result of the socialist project, for it had given it a privileged cultural and professional status, but it had taken from it the possibility of authentic critical action. All of this had a crucial effect on the absence of the development of contemporary critical thinking within education itself, and the academic community did not deal with radical concepts analogous to the experience of 1968 in West.

Only in the eighties, through the work of young teachers such as Marijan Hržić and Nikola Polak, both of whom had had the experience of post-graduate education in United States, did post-modern theories make their way into Croatian architectural discourse and the faculty. Thus an editorial in *Arhitektura*, in which Marijan Hržić appeared as the new editor in chief, went: "Of course pluralism of approaches and thinking is implied. The epoch that defines us is above all the epoch of the system mind. Hence the work of difference, and pluralism, one of its consequences,

is a fact that in the context of the epoch cannot be avoided."<sup>(7)</sup> This at last opened a moderate argument with modernism and addressed diversity, complexity and stratification of the city as the authentic features of the urbanity at a time when the social system was already showing signs of decadence.

#### **Non-scientific alternative**

Instead of replying to the fading of illusions of late socialism with a review of architectural thought, education was anchored in the past. Thus the typological forms were not reviewed, nor were innovative planning morphologies proposed; research work was not introduced as educational topic. In such a milieu, one of the responses to the growing scepticism about modernism was a "flight to metaphysics". Traditions of non-scientific charisma became increasingly expressed, and instead of a precise elaboration of relations between designing and critical theory, aphoristic, hermetic and artistic concepts were offered as the basis for the intellectual development of the students. This production of meta-theory developed within the design studios themselves, as a consequence of the individual views of the personal poetics of the teachers, which gradually led to the crystallisation of the idea that "form follows concept". This interesting premise carries with it a problematic factor: the quality of the education of students mostly depends on the teaching personality of the mentor who leads through the architectural design studio.

This is what one of the most influential teachers of the Architecture Faculty of the end of the eighties, Ivan Crnković, has to say, with reference to his own

individual positions: "I pronounced some of my own lectures alchemical, and they might have been called phantasmagorical. This is the skill of exciting strange and fantastic pictures and figures with the help of optical illusions... In our faculty there is plenty of insistence on synthesis... It is impossible however to integrate my teaching with teaching about the composition of mortar and if this cannot be integrated, then nothing else can."<sup>(8)</sup> Crnković's words, like Turina's, clearly reveal two latent tensions immanent to architectural education in Zagreb: that between the collective and individual, and between engineering principles and poetic or metaphysical introspections that strengthened with the waning of the socialist project.

This kind of spontaneously arising educational method gradually leads to design studios that promote conceptual thinking, while in the rest of the teaching there is still stress on stereotyping and obsolescent polytechnical doctrine. The method results in a small number of students who independently manage to turn this practice of aphoristic thinking into their own productive position, while most of the other students become integrated into the labour force of the technocracy to which every discursive practice is unintelligible and difficult to apply to architectural practice. The specific positive effect of such a situation is that conceptual thinking is rationalised through insistence on a high degree of tectonic control over projects, and technicism obtained a counterweight in poetic thinking in spite of the absence of elaborated theoretical thinking.

*Phantasms concerning the deserted utopia and personal sacrifices. Architecture and town planning served, in the framework of Yugoslavia, as a means for utopian and then technocratic (unfinished) modernisation. Yet, technocratic doctrines and bureaucratic policies became the primary structural weakness of Yugoslav socialist utopia. The Zagreb school of architecture managed to bring up creative minds that could produce individual cultural valuable architectural achievements, as it qualified a labour force for the implementation of urbanisation in the modern spirit. The persistent insistence on the polytechnical and modernist tradition of the Faculty of Architecture in Zagreb and the Croatian architectural scene as a whole is a usual sign of the self-enclosed nature of peripheral milieus, as well as the consequence of an inability to abandon a teleological understanding of modernisation as route to the utopia sketched out during the beginnings of the socialist project. But the Faculty of Architecture in Zagreb went on legitimising its modernist curriculum even after that time when the social utopian horizon was vanishing. The artistic and conceptual tendencies that were developed at the Faculty from the end of the seventies served as a replacement for critical discourse. These tendencies did not come into open polemics neither with the tradition of the school nor with the urban and social reality, but rather worked as a kind of parallel curriculum. A hybrid of the two approaches can, in the kindest interpretation, be accepted as a method for maintaining building culture, but not as emancipation of society. Because of the minimum scientific and research*

*output, the contribution of the Faculty can be read off through the practice that remained within the framework of the modernisation processes determined by social circumstances, and was dependent on them: when the modernisation processes were at their peak, architecture advanced. Otherwise, it did not offer alternative or emancipatory models. Thus, Croatian architectural discourse did not manage to envision the concept of the city which would courageously utilize utopian potentials of socialist project. The main achievement of the Architecture Faculty was to sustain the integrity of the discipline on historically inherited modern principles, most of all on the basis of the cult of talent. In the words of Zdenko Strižić, author of one of the key, few textbooks of the Architecture Faculty written in 1952: "Architecture comes into being only... with deep identification with the task and self-sacrifice to every individual task"<sup>(9)</sup> Thus arose a paradoxical situation in which modernity was cultivated through an education that had not been modernised for decades and had been resigned to the painstaking initiatives of self-sacrificing individuals. The body of successful and conceptually consistent Croatian architecture in the 20th century should in the first place be ascribed to the continuity of international modern ideas that were successfully engrafted onto the specific local context, in which the Architecture Faculty primarily played the role of an efficacious but critically passive mediator between the historical avant-garde and practice. *

#### NOTES

(1) Ibler's departure for Geneva in 1942 and his failure to take part in the Partisan movement worked against these post-war endeavours, in spite of his incontrovertible leftist orientation.

(2) "Poietički pojam prakse i njegov kulturni kontekst, Filozofija praxis u političkim, teorijskim i umjetničkim previranjima 60-ih", zbornik "The poietic concept of praxis and its cultural context, the Philosophy of praxis in the political, theoretical and artistic ferments of the sixties," collective edition: Prostor u jeziku/Knjževnost i kultura šezdesetih, ed. Krešimir Mičanović, Zagreb, 2009.

(3) Critical theoretical and social thinking in Yugoslavia has a continuity, but in a very particular nomadic form, for it is manifested through the working of individual philosophical or literary journals or intellectual groups until they were banned, disbanded or atomised in some way by the political system. But the focuses of criticism and that internal intellectual dissidence were phased out individually, while others remained active, and new initiatives appeared. Repression was never total, rather aimed at any current overstepping of the measure of criticism that the system was ready to tolerate.

(4) "Teoretska analiza arhitektonskog oblikovanja", ("Theoretical analyses of Architectural Design") 1948, reprinted in Ulrich Conrads "Programi i manifesti arhitekture 20. Stoljeća" (Programs and Manifestoes on 20th-Century Architecture), Croatian enlarged edition, 1997, Zagreb.

(5) "Kakav postdiplomski studij arhitekata?", ("What Kind of Postgraduate Studies for Architects?") Čovjek i prostor, no. 92., Zagreb, 1959.

(6) „Arhitektura – Neven Šegvić“, Arhitektura no. 211, Zagreb, 2002.

(7) Arhitektura, no. 184-185, Zagreb, 1983.

(8) "Ivan Crnković – Interview", Oris magazine no.2, Zagreb, 1999.

(9) "O stanovanju – Arhitektonsko projektiranje", ("About dwelling – Architectural Design", 1956, reprinted 1996, Zagreb.

#### ILLUSTRATIONS:

Page 40: Zagreb City Hall (Kazimir Ostrogović, 1955-58) (Image source: Museum of the City of Zagreb)

Pages 46-47: Residential neighborhood Siget, developed from 1963 till 1969, one of the first out of 25 newly planned neighborhoods of New Zagreb (Image source: Museum of the City of Zagreb)

Page 51, top: Yugoslav Pavillion at World EXPO in Bruxelles in 1958 designed by architect and artist Vjenceslav Richter, one of the co-founders of the neo-avant-garde group Exat 51 and participant of the New Tendencies movement (Image source: State Archive of Serbia and Montenegro)

Page 51, bottom: Residential neighborhood Travno, developed from 1970 till 1977, one of the newest and biggest neighborhoods of New Zagreb, today numbering 15 000 inhabitants (Image source: Museum of the City of Zagreb)