

Stavba kot spomenik / *The Building as a Monument*

Maroje Mrduljaš

Medtem ko gradnja spomenikov socialistične Jugoslavije doživlja pozornost svetovne javnosti, so posebne arhitekturne tipologije, ki hibridizirajo komemoracijo in specifične oblike družbenega življenja, prezrte. V tem prispevku s študijama primerov kulturnih domov v Kolašinu in Nikšiću v Črni gori raziskujemo prenos komemorativne vsebine s spomenikov na arhitekturne tipologije. Ta prenos je vplival tako na arhitekturo kot na programe, ki so oblikovali nove pristope h komemoraciji. Jugoslovanski samoupravni socializem je bil okvir za uskladitev spomeniških in performativnih vidikov novih tipologij, pa vendar emancipacijski potenciali koncepta niso bili nikoli v celoti uresničeni. Članek bo obravnaval sodobno usodo teh specifičnih tipologij, ki so očistene svoje prvotne funkcije in ideološke vsebine.

Samoupravni socializem je bil uveden leta 1950 po izločitvi Jugoslavije iz sovjetskega bloka dve leti prej. Sistem je domače izkušnje samoorganiziranja med protifašističnim odporom združeval z idejami iz zgodnjih del Karla Marxa ter idejami utopičnega socializma in anarhizma iz devetnajstega stoletja. Teoretično naj bi bil državni aparat nadomeščen z neposredno demokracijo, tako v gospodarskem kot v političnem življenju. Opolnomočenje delavcev in državljanov bi moralo potekati sočasno s sistemsko decentralizacijo vseh družbenih sfer. Sistem samoupravljanja je spodbudil razvoj v regiji, uvedel hitro urbanizacijo in bistveno izboljšal življenjski standard. Vendar je ustvaril tudi krize in številna nasprotja: med neposredno demokracijo in dejansko prevlado komunistične partije, med planskim gospodarstvom in trgom, med instrumentalno racionalnostjo in socialnim idealizmom.

Arhitektura je pogosto igrala vlogo posrednika med temi nasprotji. Takšna vloga je bila mogoča zaradi niza pogojev, predvsem koncepta kulturne avtonomije, ki jo je ideologija samoupravnega socializma zagovarjala kot posebno jugoslovansko vrednoto. Kulturna avtonomija se v arhitekturi ni nanašala le na estetska vprašanja, ampak tudi na temeljna vprašanja vsebine, saj je bilo prav arhitekturi zaupano artikularanje novih družbenih oblik in odnosov, vključno s komemoracijo.

Eden od ideoloških stebrov jugoslovanskega socialističnega sistema je bil protifašistični boj, ki je bil predmet obsežne spomeniške in monumentalizacijske aktivnosti. Bil je tudi eden redkih instrumentov konstruiranja vsejugoslovanske identitete. Preizkušenih je bilo mnogo pristopov do spomenikov, vendar spominjanje ni bilo omejeno le na artefakte, temveč je močno vplivalo na družbeno življenje z različnimi praznovanji, izobraževanjem in popularno kulturo. Sčasoma se je spreminjalo tudi razumevanje spomenikov. Po začetni prevladi figuralnih spomenikov v štiridesetih in petdesetih letih prejšnjega stoletja je prevladujoča estetika postala abstrakcija, zlasti za najprestižnejše spomeniške naloge. Eksperimenti so segali od krajinskoarhitekturnih ureditev do obsežnih abstraktnih skulptur, v katere je mogoče vstopiti. Spomeniška mesta so bila razširjena s programi, ki so vključevali muzeje, izobraževalne prostore in gostinske objekte. V okviru izjemno razširjenega polja monumentalizacije protifašističnega boja je bil spominski pomen prenesen tudi na hitro rastočo tipologijo kulturnih centrov.

Teorija samoupravnega socializma je zahtevala aktivno vključevanje in sodelovanje državljanov v političnem in gospodarskem življenju. Udeležba je zahtevala emancipacijo državljanov, da bi lahko razumeli svoj položaj, vlogo in interese v širšem družbenem kontekstu. Slovenski politik Edvard Kardelj, vodilni ustvarjalec sistema samoupravljanja, je to emancipacijo označil za »globoko kulturno in etično revolucijo /.../, transformacijo celotne zavesti delovnega človeka«. Pomemben instrument emancipacije so bili kulturni centri, kjer so se prepletale profesionalna, amaterska in popularna kultura, zabava, izobraževanje in politične dejavnosti. Kot takšni naj bi kulturni centri ustvarjali nove oblike javnih prostorov, kjer bi se

While the production of monuments under socialism in Yugoslavia has been receiving international exposure during recent years, specific architectural typologies that hybridised commemoration and specific forms of social life are being overlooked. Using the case studies of the cultural centres in Kolašin and Nikšić in Montenegro, this paper examines the transfer of commemorative meaning from monuments to architectural typologies. This transfer affected both architectural forms and programmes, which potentially opened up new approaches to commemoration. Yugoslav self-management socialism provided the framework for the reconciliation of commemorative and performative aspects of new typologies, yet the emancipatory potentials of the concept were not fully realised. The paper will tackle the contemporary destinies of these specific typologies, which are stripped of their original functions and ideological support.

Self-management socialism was instituted in 1950, in the wake of Yugoslavia's expulsion from the Soviet bloc two years earlier. The system combined the indigenous experiences of self-organisation during the anti-fascist resistance with the ideas from Karl Marx's early works, as well as nineteenth century utopian socialism and anarchism. Seen as an "alienating political force", the state apparatus was to be replaced, in theory, with direct democracy in both the economic and political life. The empowerment of workers and citizens was meant to be accomplished by the systemic decentralisation of all social spheres. The system instigated unprecedented development in the region, introduced rapid urbanisation, and fundamentally improved the living standard. However, it also produced crises and numerous contradictions, e.g. between direct democracy and the de facto dominance of the Communist party, between a planned economy and the market, between instrumental rationality and social idealism.

Architecture often played the role of an intermediary between these contradictions. Such agency was possible because of a set of preconditions, most notably the concept of cultural autonomy, which the ideology of self-management socialism defended as a specifically Yugoslav value. Cultural autonomy in architecture, however, referred not only to aesthetic questions but also to the essential issues of programming, which entrusted architecture with the agency of articulating new societal forms and relations, including commemoration.

One of the ideological pillars of Yugoslav socialist system was the anti-fascist struggle, which was the subject of a vast practice of commemoration and monumentalisation. It was also one of the few instruments of constructing a pan-Yugoslav identity. A plethora of approaches to monuments were tested, yet the commemoration was not exclusively tied to objects in that it significantly informed social life through various celebrations, education, and popular culture. How monuments were understood also changed through time. After the initial proliferation of figurative monuments in the 1940s and 1950s, abstraction became the dominant aesthetic, reserved for the most prestigious commemorative tasks. Experiments spanned from the site-specific land-form interventions to the inhabitable large-scale abstract sculptures. Memorial sites have been expanded with auxiliary programmes which included museums, educational spaces, and catering facilities. Within the context of the extremely expanded field of monumentalisation of the anti-fascist struggle, commemorative meaning was also transferred to the fast-growing typology of the cultural centre.

The theory of self-management socialism demanded active involvement and participation of citizens in political and economic life. This participation required the emancipation of citizens who could comprehend their position, role, and interests

družabne skupine srečevale zunaj delovnega in družinskega okolja. Po ideji decentralizacije je morala nova kulturna krajina doseči vse državljane in zajeti celotno ozemlje nerazvite Jugoslavije. Medtem ko je bilo kulturno življenje v velikih urbanih središčih večinoma organizirano prek mreže že obstoječih institucij, se je razvoj novih kulturnih središč zgodil predvsem v manjših mestih manj razvitih regij. Prav v takih robnih pogojih so kulturni centri sprožili nove oblike družbenega življenja. Postali so najbolj izpostavljene javne zgradbe, ki so prevzele položaj cerkva in mošej, kar je poudarilo njihov simbolni in spomeniški potencial.

Kulturni centri so bili instrumenti emancipacije, pa tudi prostori ideoloških predstav, tako da so nekateri od njih izrecno imeli status spomenika. Toda simbolične vloge spomenika ni bilo preprosto povezati s prvotnimi nameni samoupravnega kulturnega centra, ki naj bi bil dinamična in odprta institucija. Spomeniška vloga arhitekture je morala tekmovali z običajnimi spomeniki. V večini primerov je funkcija prevladala nad formalno monumentalizacijo. Spomeniški pomen je zastopalo ime institucije, ideološko funkcijo so izpolnjevali dogodki, ki so se odvijali v njej. Kljub temu so preizkušali različne možnosti uskladitve monumentalne oblike in različnih programskih shem. Najvidnejši protagonist takšnega pristopa je bil slovenski arhitekt Marko Mušič.

Mušič je študiral v Ljubljani pri Edvardu Ravnikarju in v začetku šestdesetih let prejšnjega stoletja sodeloval v biroju Louisa Kahna. Po vrnitvi v Jugoslavijo je bil izjemno uspešen na domačih arhitekturnih natečajih in je postal eden najbolj izpostavljenih arhitektov svoje generacije. Izkušnja sodelovanja s Kahnom je najbrž bistveno pripomogla k Mušičevi naklonjenosti do sodobne monumentalnosti, kar se je izkazalo za posebej uspešno v nizu natečajev za kulturne centre. V nekaj več kot desetletju je zmagal na šestih natečajih, v Zagrebu (1966), Kolašinu (1970), Bitoli (1970), Prištini (1970), Bosanskem Šamcu (1976) in Nikšiću (1978). Medtem ko se ti projekti med seboj razlikujejo po svojih konceptih in nekateri od njih niso bili realizirani, sta bili kulturni središči na Kolašinu in v Nikšiću v Črni gori vrhunec sinteze spomeniškega pomena in državotvornih funkcij. Ni naključje, da je do te sinteze prišlo ravno v odročnih krajih Črne gore. To je bila ena najmanj razvitih republik federativne Jugoslavije. Bila je eden od epicentrov protifašističnega boja, toda na črnogorskem ozemlju ni bilo pomembnejših bitk ali koncentracijskih taborišč, najpomembnejših prostorov monumentalizacije. Zaradi tega je šla gradnja obsežnih spomenikov v petdesetih in šestdesetih letih prejšnjega stoletja večinoma mimo Črne gore. V tistem obdobju je imela prednost industrializacija te pretežno podeželske republike; ta je porabila večino naložb, zato je mreža kulturnih ustanov ostala šibka ali nerazvita. V sedemdesetih letih pa so se zgodili nekateri poskusi odprave te pomanjkljivosti.

Mestece Kolašin leži na odročnem gorskem območju in je bilo eden od epicentrov protifašističnega boja v Črni gori in Jugoslaviji. Spominski dom (1970, 1971–1975) je bil zasnovan po formuli »javna stavba je spomenik«. Njegov simbolični namen je bila spomeniška obeležitev prvega zbora Nacionalnega protifašističnega sveta Črne gore, ki je bil v Kolašinu leta 1943. Skupščina je bila ključnega političnega pomena in Kolašin je veljal za glavno mesto Črne gore v času druge svetovne vojne. Novo kulturno središče bi moralo spomniti na zgodovinske dogodke, hkrati pa zagotavljati različne javne storitve, tako da je bil dejanski program stavbe mešanica spominskega muzeja, kulturno-kongresnega centra in komunalne službe. Mušičev projekt, izbran na javnem arhitekturnem natečaju, je izpolnil vse tri zahteve.

Stavba je dolga točno 100 m in tvori središče glavnega mestnega trga. Zasnovana je kot impozantna skulptura, geomorfna aglomeracija trianguliranih volumnov,

in the broader social context. Slovenian politician Edvard Kardelj, the leading creator of the self-management system, described this emancipation as a "profound cultural and ethical revolution... a transformation of the complete consciousness of the working man." An important instrument of emancipation were cultural centres, where professional culture, cultural amateurism, popular culture, entertainment, education, and political activities were all intertwined. As such, cultural centres were meant to create new forms of public spaces where different social groups would meet outside of the work-family pattern. Following the idea of decentralisation, a new cultural landscape had to reach all citizens and cover the whole territory of the underdeveloped Yugoslavia. While the cultural life in large urban centres was mainly organised through the network of already existing institutions, the development of new cultural centres occurred mainly in smaller towns of the less developed regions. It was precisely under such peripheral conditions that cultural centres initiated new forms of social life. Cultural centres became the most exposed public buildings, taking over the position of churches and mosques, which emphasised their symbolic and monumental potential.

Cultural centres were the instruments of emancipation but also the sites of ideological performances so some of them received the explicit status of a monument. But the symbolic role of a monument was not easily integrated with the original intention of a self-managed cultural centre, i.e. a dynamic and open institution. Also, the commemorative role of the buildings had to compete with the proliferation of more conventional monuments. In most cases, formal monumentalisation was discarded in favour of a functional approach. The memorial meaning was entrusted to the name of the institution and the ideological role was fulfilled through the events that took place in the centres. Still, the possibility of the reconciliation of monumental form and the heterogeneous programmatic schemes of cultural centres was investigated. The most prominent advocate of such an approach was Slovenian architect Marko Mušič.

Mušič studied in Ljubljana under Edvard Ravnikar and worked with Louis Kahn in the early 1960s. After returning to Yugoslavia, Mušič was extremely successful in Yugoslav architectural competitions and became one of the most exposed architects of his generation. The experience of working with Kahn is believed to have significantly contributed to Mušič's affection for the modern monumentality which proved to be especially useful in the series of competitions for cultural centres. In the course of scarcely more than a decade, he won 6 competitions in Zagreb (1966), Kolašin (1970), Bitola (1970), Priština (1970), Bosanski Šamac (1976), and Nikšić (1978). While these projects vary in their concepts and some of them were not realised, the cultural centres in Kolašin and Nikšić in Montenegro were the pinnacle of the synthesis of commemorative meaning and civic functions. It was not a coincidence that the breeding ground for this synthesis were two remote towns in Montenegro. Montenegro was one of the least developed republics of federal Yugoslavia. Though one of the epicentres of the anti-fascist struggle, the territory of Montenegro featured no key battle sites or concentration camps, the prime sites of monumentalisation. Consequently, the construction of large-scale monuments mostly bypassed Montenegro during the 1950s and 1960s. During the same period, the industrialisation of the predominantly rural Montenegro was a priority which used up the majority of investment, and the network of cultural facilities and institutions remained weak or underdeveloped. In the 1970s, attempts got underway to resolve these deficiencies.

The small town of Kolašin is situated in a remote mountain area and was one of the epicentres of the anti-fascist struggle in Montenegro and Yugoslavia. The

izvedenih iz gladkega betona. Stavba je v korenitem nasprotju z okolico, tako po obliki kot tudi po materialih, njen simbolni pomen pa je jasno označen. Mušič je trdil, da dinamična strešna podoba ponavlja lokalno arhitekturo, dramatična geomorfna oblika kompleksa pa se nanaša na kanjon reke Tare. Vhodi v dve glavni funkcionalni coni, kulturni dom in občinske urade, so skriti in podrejeni formalnemu konceptu.

Notranjost kulturnega središča je organizirana okrog velikega »vestibula občanov« z zastekljeno streho. Predprostor, ki je zasnovan kot zbirališče, povezuje veliko večnamensko dvorano in kopico zenitalno osvetljenih kubičnih prostorov – po Mušičevih besedah »celic dogodkov« – v katerih so knjižnica, muzej, kavarna, galerija in sejni prostori. Po Mušiču je bila osnovna naloga njegove zasnove »omogočiti številne prostorske ureditve in s tem številne alternativne rabe, od katerih nekatere v tem trenutku morda še niso predvidene«. Čeprav je ta vsebina usklajena z idejo o samoupravnem kulturnem centru, je bila vsaka celica zenitalno osvetljena zaprta soba brez povezave z drugimi in z zunanostjo. Potencial za fleksibilno rabo je bil omejen na odprtje glavne dvorane proti vestibulu, kar je omogočalo prostorsko ureditev, ki je bila najprimernejša za politične shode in spominske dogodke.

Mušič je predpostavil radikalen prelom med zunanostjo in notranostjo. Zunanost je brutalistična, notranost pa je zasnovana kot barvite postmoderne »hiše v hiši«. Vsaka prireditvena celica je oblikovana kot avtonomna tema. Glavna dvorana je obdana z valovitim modrim ovojem, ki določa zapleten prostor, in sicer neodvisno od konstrukcije stavbe. Dihotomija med igrivo artikulacijo notranjosti in avtoritarno privlačnostjo drzne zunanosti odraža dvojni simbolni in programski namen zgradbe. Končni rezultat formalne ekspresivnosti je bila introvertirana stavba, ločena od glavnega mestnega trga in okoliškega parka, kar je poudarjalo njeno reprezentativno vlogo, a je zmanjšalo njegove performativne potenciale.

Mušiču ne moremo odrekat prostorske domišljije in mojstrskega ravnanja s tridimenzionalnimi strukturami. Spomeniški pomen je bil uspešno preveden v funkcionalno arhitekturno tipologijo, monumentalnost pa je izhajala izključno iz arhitekturnega koncepta. Kljub temu projektu ni uspelo rešiti temeljnega konflikta med monumentalnostjo in prepotrebno odprtostjo javne institucije. Odtujeni skulpturalni objekt ni vzpostavil neposrednega in čitljivega odnosa med javno ustanovo ter urbanim in družbenim tkivom mesta.

Spominski dom je sicer spodbudil lokalno kulturno življenje, vendar ga kolašinci nikoli niso povsem sprejeli. Tehnične težave (puščanje) niso bile nikoli rešene in zastekljeno streho predprostora so kasneje prekrili. Po razpadu socialistične Jugoslavije je bila odgovornost za vzdrževanje stavbe s črnogorske države prenesena na občino, katere proračun pa je bil omejen na goli minimum. Velika dvorana propada, kulturni center je prazen ali pa ga uporabljajo lokalne podružnice političnih strank; občinski trakt pa še vedno deluje. Občina Kolašin razpravlja o rušenju Spominskega doma in njegova usoda je negotova.

Nesoglasja, ki so zaznamovala Spominski dom v Kolašinu, so se še stopnjevala pri Mušičevem delu v bližnjem Nikšiću, drugem največjem črnogorskem mestu. V začetku sedemdesetih let 20. stoletja je bil Nikšić cvetoče industrijsko mesto s 50.000 prebivalci (v primerjavi z 9.000 leta 1948). Leta 1974 se je na dan 30-letnice osvoboditve Nikšića začela pobuda za zgraditev Doma revolucije. Kompleks naj bi obeležil tudi prvi zbor Nacionalnega protifašističnega sveta Črne gore, isti dogodek, ki je botroval nastanku Spominskega doma v Kolašinu. Občina Nikšić se je odločila, da bo »kulturni center postavila kot najprimernejši spomenik vojakom, padlim za svobodo in socialistično revolucijo, iz Nikšića in okolice«. V odbor za razvoj kompleksa je bilo vključenih 90 ljudi, z Veljkom Zlokovićem, junaškim partizanskim vodjem in članom jugoslovanske zvezne vlade, na čelu. Imenovani so bili trije pododbori – za koncept, propagando in zbiranje sredstev. Člani odbora so bili partizanski veterani, ki pa niso bili večji načrtovanja in razvoja kulturnih

Memorial Home (1970, 1971-75) was designed according to the formula "public building equals monument". Its symbolic purpose was to commemorate the first assembly of the National Anti-Fascist Council of Montenegro, which was held in Kolašin in 1943. The assembly was of critical political importance and Kolašin was considered to be the WW2 capital of Montenegro. The new cultural centre was intended to commemorate the historic events but also provide various public services, resulting in the building's actual programme combining a memorial museum, a culture-congress centre, and municipal services. Mušič's project, chosen in an open architectural competition, fulfilled both demands.

The building is exactly 100 m long. Designed as an imposing sculpture, the geomorphic agglomeration of triangulated volumes executed in smooth concrete occupies the centre of the main town square. The building forms a radical contrast with the surroundings in terms of both form and materials, and its symbolic importance is clearly indicated. Mušič argued that the dynamic roofscape replicates the local vernacular architecture while the dramatic geomorphic form of the complex references the canyon of the River Tara. The entrances to the two main functional zones, the cultural centre and the municipality offices, are concealed and subordinated to the formal concept.

The interior of the cultural centre is organised around a large "vestibule of the citizens" with a glazed roof. Intended as a gathering place, the vestibule connects a large multipurpose hall with a cluster of top-lit cubical spaces - "event cells" as Mušič called them - that housed a library, a museum, a café, a gallery, and meeting spaces. According to Mušič, the basic task of his design was "to allow numerous space arrangements and thus many alternative actions, some of them perhaps not foreseen at this moment". While this intention is in tune with the idea of a self-managed cultural centre, each cell was an enclosed top-lit room with no connection to the exterior or each other. The potential for spatial transformations was limited to the opening of the main hall toward the vestibule, a spatial condition which was most suitable for political rallies and memorial celebrations.

Mušič made a radical break between the exterior and the interior. The exterior is brutalist, while the interiors are designed as a colourful post-modern idea of "houses within a house". Each event cell is designed as an autonomous theme. The main hall is enclosed by an undulating blue inner envelope that defines the perplexing space independent of the building's structure. The dichotomy between the playful articulation of the interior and the authoritarian allure of the bold exterior reflects a double symbolic and programmatic purpose of the building. The final result of the formal expressiveness was an introverted building detached from the town's main square and surrounding park, which emphasised its representative role but diminished its performative potentials.

Mušič's spatial imagination and masterful handling of three-dimensional structures are undeniable. The commemorative meaning was successfully translated into functional architectural typology and the monumentality derived solely from the architectural concept. However, the project did not manage to resolve the fundamental conflict between the monumentality and the much needed openness of a civic institution. The alienated sculptural object didn't offer a more direct and legible relationship between the public institution and the urban and social fabric of the town.

The Memorial Home encouraged local cultural life, but it was not entirely accepted by citizens of Kolašin. The technical problems with leaking were never resolved and the vestibule's glazed roof was covered. After the collapse of socialist Yugoslavia, the responsibility for the maintenance of the building was transferred from the State of Montenegro to the municipality and the building's budget was reduced to the bare minimum. The large hall is decaying, the cultural centre is either vacant or used by political parties' local branches; the municipality wing is still in use. The Municipality of Kolašin has considered demolishing the Memorial Home and its destiny is still uncertain.

The contradictions which characterised the Memorial Home in Kolašin culminated in Mušič's work in the nearby Nikšić, Montenegro's second largest city. In the early 1970s, Nikšić was a prosperous industrial city with population of 50,000, compared to 9,000 in 1948. In 1974, on the 30th anniversary of Nikšić's liberation from the

ustanov. Obsežen program kompleksa je vključeval izobraževalni center, kulturni center, mladinski klub, informacijski center, gostinske objekte, poletni amfiteater, studije za glasbo, dramo, vizualno umetnost in oblikovanje, galerijo, knjižnico, interno sprehajališče in spominsko dvorano. V središču stavbe je bil velikanski avditorij za kongrese in kulturne predstave. Organiziran je bil arhitekturni natečaj in znova je zmagal Mušič.

Na prvi pogled so se nameni projekta zdeli napredni. Z gradnjo Doma revolucije bi se moralo končati obdobje obsežne modernizacije tega perifernega mesta in Nikšić naj bi se vpisal na zemljevid spoštovanih sodobnih jugoslovanskih mest. Kulturna palača naj bi pri meščanih vzbudila optimizem, celo občutek zaupanja. Kakšen pa je bil v obdobju, ko se je gradil Dom revolucije, družbeni kontekst v Jugoslaviji? V sedemdesetih letih sta bili dokončani povojna obnova in industrializacija. Nujen je bil korak naprej, od trde modernizacije v prožnejšo modernost. Ta pritisk se je v gospodarskem življenju že dogajal. Gospodarsko-tržni odnosi so napredovali, socialistične korporacije in banke so pridobivale moč. Številni pomembni arhitekturni projekti v Jugoslaviji iz sedemdesetih let prejšnjega stoletja so bili v bistvu mednarodni: turistični kompleksi na obali, sedeži velikih podjetij, ki so delovala globalno, kot sta bila Energoprojekt v Beogradu in INA v Zagrebu, ter izvoz gradbene industrije v neuvrščene države. Zdi se, da je Dom revolucije s svojo velikostjo tekmoval s temi novimi akterji v jugoslovanski ekonomski in urbani krajini. Ustvarjalci zgradbe so morda mislili, da je to zadnja priložnost, ki jo imajo za predstavitev takega tipa, kar je vplivalo na pretirano povečanje velikosti stavbe. Natečajna naloga je zahtevala 9.237 m², Mušičev idejni projekt je predvidel 10.900 m². Pod pritiskom organizacijskih odborov pa je velikost stavbe med gradnjo narasla na spektakularnih 21.738 m². Samo 250 kvadratnih metrov je bilo izrecno namenjenih spominu, zasnovanih kot kontemplacijski prostor. Projekt je presegal realne potrebe ne le lokalne skupnosti ali Črne gore, ampak verjetno celotne Jugoslavije. V Nikšiću ni bilo niti kulturne ustanove niti kulturne produkcije, ki bi lahko napajala obseg načrtovanega objekta. Poleg tega so v sedemdesetih letih prejšnjega stoletja v Jugoslaviji raziskovali nove umetniške oblike performansa, konceptualno umetnost in eksperimentalno gledališče, zaradi česar so templji kulture postali zastareli. Le kakšni programi in dogodki naj bi se odvijali v tem ogromnem kompleksu? Katere institucije in družbene skupine naj bi ga uporabljale in naseljevale? Namesto kulturne evolucije je kompleks uvedel monumentalizacijo staromodnih utopičnih pogledov. Prvotna ideja o mešanju spomina in emancipatorne kulturne institucije je bila prezrcaljena. Sporočanja spomeniškega pomena ni prevzela arhitekturna oblika, temveč obseg programa.

Tak preobrat je bil posledica nezmožnosti uskladitve pogleda na zgodovino s pogledom na prihodnost. Herojska revolucionarna preteklost se je preoblikovala v mit, ki je postal preveliko breme za razvoj novih oblik javnega življenja. Tudi ime stavbe je bilo kontradiktorno: ali revolucija lahko ima dom? Če bi bil ta aktiven in trajen, kot bi moral biti v samoupravnem socializmu, ali ne bi moral biti brezdomec, neudomačen, nenehno v gibanju in delovanju? Brez spomenikov, zakoreninjenih v vsakdanjem življenju, fizično brez oblike ...

Kulturni center samoupravnega socializma je materializiran v zgradbi, ki je bila funkcionalno popolnoma določena, kjer prebivalci niso imeli možnosti participirati niti pri arhitekturi niti pri programu. Pomisliti velja, da je zasnova Doma revolucije nastala po radikalnih zasnovah družbenih središč Cedrica Pricea in hkrati po načrtu Centra Pompidou v Parizu; projektov, katerih cilj je bilo temeljito preoblikovanje koncepta kulturne ustanove skozi idejo odprtega sistema. Dom revolucije je v nasprotju s temi novimi vizijami kulturnega življenja združeval stare funkcionalne tipologije. Mušič se je moral spopasti s prenapihnjem merilom in je ustvaril kolaž, ki je po širitvi programa postal velikanski »Merzbau«.¹

Nazis, an initiative was undertaken for the erection of the Home of the Revolution. The complex was also to commemorate the first assembly of the National Anti-Fascist Council of Montenegro, the same event already commemorated by the Memorial Home in Kolašin. The Municipality of Nikšić decided to build the "cultural centre as the most appropriate memorial to the soldiers from Nikšić and its surroundings killed in the struggle for freedom and socialist revolution". The committee for the development of the complex included 90 people headed by Veljko Zloković, heroic partisan leader and member of Yugoslav federal government. Three sub-committees were appointed and tasked with the concept, propaganda, and fundraising respectively. The committee members holding the most influence were partisan veterans unfamiliar with matters of programming and development of cultural institutions. The complex's expansive programme included an educational centre, a cultural centre, a youth club, an information centre, catering facilities, a summer amphitheatre, studios for music, drama, visual arts and design, a gallery, a library, an internal promenade, and a memorial space. The focus of the building was a gigantic auditorium for congresses and cultural performances. The architectural competition was organised, and it was again won by Mušič.

At a glance, the intentions of the project seem progressive. The construction of the Home of the Revolution was intended to conclude a period of extensive modernisation of the peripheral city of Nikšić and place it on the map of upstanding modern cities in Yugoslavia. A cultural palace ought to have created optimism, even a feeling of confidence for the inhabitants of Nikšić. But what was Yugoslavia's social context in the period when the Home of the Revolution was being built? In the 1970s, the post-war reconstruction and industrialisation were completed. What was needed was a step forward, from hard modernisation toward a more flexible modernity. This push was already taking place in economic life. Economic market relations were advancing and socialist corporations and banks were acquiring more power. Many significant architectural projects in Yugoslavia in the 1970s were essentially international: tourist complexes on the seacoast, headquarters of big companies which operated globally, such as Energoprojekt in Belgrade and INA in Zagreb, and the export of construction industry to Non-Aligned countries. The massiveness of the Home of the Revolution seemed to compete with these new factors in the Yugoslav economic and urban landscape. The creators of the building may have believed that this might be their last chance to show off their importance, which caused a surreal bloat in the building's size. The competition brief asked for 9,237 sqm, Mušič idea project was 10,900 sqm. Under pressure from the organising committees, the size of the building grew to a spectacular 21,738 sqm as it was being built. Only 250 sqm were explicitly devoted to the memorial, designed as a contemplation space. The project exceeded the real needs of not only the local community or Montenegro but probably of the whole Yugoslavia. There was neither a cultural institution in Nikšić nor such a scope of cultural production that could take full advantage of the scale of the planned facility. Moreover, the new artistic forms of performance, conceptual art, and experimental theatre that were researched in Yugoslavia in the 1970s made temples of culture obsolete. What programmes and events were supposed to take place in this huge complex? What institutions and social groups were to use and inhabit it? Instead of a cultural evolution, the complex introduced monumentalisation of old-fashioned utopian visions. The original idea of combining commemoration with an emancipating cultural institution was reversed. The communication of the commemorative meaning was not assigned to the building form but to the scale of the programme.

Such a reversal was the consequence of the inability to harmonise the view of the history with the view of the future. The heroic revolutionary past got shaped into a myth which became a burden, indeed one too large for the development of new forms of civic life. The name of the building was contradictory as well: can a revolution have a home? If it is active and permanent, as it was supposed to be in self-management socialism, should it not be without a fixed abode, undomesticated, constantly moving and operating? With no monuments, rooted in daily life, physically shapeless, etc.

The cultural centre for self-management socialism is materialised in a building that has been functionally completely determined, where there was no possibility of participation either on the level of architecture or the programme. It is useful to remember that the design of the Home of the Revolution took place after Cedric

¹ Merzbau je bilo dadaistično umetniško delo – prostorska instalacija Kurta Schwittersa (1887–1948) iz let 1923–1937, uničena v bombardiranju ob koncu 2. svetovne vojne.

Že sama velikost objekta in notranjih prostorov je zagotovila monumentalen učinek. Da bi razrešil amorfnost dimenzij, je Mušič razvil kompozicijsko strategijo prekrivanja. Pretirane geste je uporabil tako, da bi se medsebojno prekrivale. Spektakularni delavski klub na vrhu kompleksa je omogočil privilegiran pogled in postal nova simbolična krona mesta. Postavljen je bil na ogromen stolp nad odrom, da bi razgibal sicer umirjen obris kompleksa. Zaradi svoje nenavadne oblike je stavba dobila enega izmed svojih mnogih vzdevkov: Sfinga. Zunanost je bila zasnovana kot podaljšek urbane krajine, da bi ublažila vizualno masivnost. Vendar zunanje terase in avditoriji niso bili jasno povezani niti z mestnim tkivom niti z notranjostjo stavbe. Zdi se, da je bila stavba načrtovana za prireditve z ikonografijo različnih ideoloških ritualov, ne pa kot kraj neformalnih prostorskih praks. Tudi velika vhodna plaza je bila vprašljiva, saj je kompleks povzročil prekinitev urbane strukture, ki je preprečila kontinuiteto javnega mestnega prostora. Številne arhitekturne značilnosti Doma revolucije so tako dvoumne.

Dom revolucije se je pojavil kot nekakšna avantura, ki je izčrpala materialne in organizacijske vire. Gradnjo so financirali iz različnih skladov, vključno z zveznimi. Celotna mestna skupnost je sodelovala s finančnimi prispevki, h katerim se je zavezala na javnem referendumu. Leta 1989 je bila gradnja po več kot desetih letih ustavljena. Razpad socialistične Jugoslavije leta 1991 je bil za graditelje Doma revolucije morda srečna okoliščina, saj so bili odvezani vsakršne odgovornosti. Nikšić se je znašel v radikalno drugačnem kontekstu, najprej kot del zveze Srbije in Črne gore, od leta 2006 pa kot del neodvisne države s 600.000 državljani – v primerjavi z Jugoslavijo z 21 milijoni prebivalcev. Težka industrija Nikšića se je soočila z resnim upadom. Od Doma revolucije sta ostali veličastna ruševina, spomenik ukinjeni ideologiji, in zapuščena urbana pokrajina, ki jo domačini prezirajo.

Tudi rušenje se je izkazalo za predrago. Mušič je ostal fanatično predan projektu in je predlagal preprojektiranje, vendar je projekt zaradi vključitve veleblagovnice še narasel. Obenem je Dom revolucije postal priljubljena tema številnih študentskih del in diplom v regiji in tujini. Nazadnje, spodbujeno z odmevnostjo črnogorskega paviliona na beneškem arhitekturnem bienalu leta 2014, na katerem so bile predstavljene štiri modernistične ruševine, vključno s Spominskim domom na Kolašinu in Domom revolucije v Nikšiću, je črnogorsko ministrstvo za turizem in trajnostni razvoj leta 2015 razpisalo mednarodni natečaj za projekt obnove Doma revolucije. Razpis je bil odprt, brez vnaprej določenega programa, in je zahteval strateški pristop k pomladitvi strukture. Avtor prispevka je bil član mednarodne žirije.

Zgodovina projekta je dokazala, da Doma revolucije ni mogoče dokončati, treba je sprejeti njegovo nedokončano stanje. Materialni ostanki polpretekle zgodovine so postali razpoložljiv prostorski vir. Ali lahko v razmerah atomizacije postsocialističnih družb in zmanjševanja pomena javnega tak projekt spodbudi kolektivno akcijo? Največji izziv obnove Doma revolucije je bila mobilizacija vseh vpletenih deležnikov, od politične elite na državnih in občinski ravni do lokalne skupnosti. Ali lahko arhitektura ne samo spodbuja, ampak tudi usklajuje proces družbene kohezije?

Na natečaju je zmagala ekipa arhitektov HHF iz Basla in arhitektov Sadar + Vuga iz Ljubljane; predlagali so realen koncept, ki temelji na delitvi obstoječega prostora: na 10 % notranjih celic s konkretnimi funkcijami, 20 % obnovljenih javnih površin in prometnih poti ter 70 % zavarovanih nedostopnih prostorov, katerih uporaba bo določena v prihodnosti. Vsi posegi so predvideni v pritličju stavbe. Projekt se tako spretno izogne pasti pretirane ambicije in ne ponuja nemogočih

Price's radical designs of civic centres and at the same time as the design of Centre Pompidou in Paris, the project that aimed to fundamentally reform the concept of the cultural institution through the idea of an open system. Unlike these new visions of cultural life, the Home of the Revolution was aggregation of old functional typologies. Mušič had to deal with an overblown scale and created a collage that, following the expansion of the programme, became a giant Merzbau.¹

The sheer scale of the building and interior spaces guaranteed a monumental effect. In order to resolve the amorphous massing, Mušič developed a compositional strategy of concealment. Exaggerated pretensions were there to mask one another. A spectacular workers' club on the top of the complex provided a privileged view and became the new symbolic crown of the city. It was placed onto the enormous tower above the stage in order to complete the otherwise dull skyline of the complex. Thanks to its odd shape, the building got one of many nicknames: the Sphinx. The exteriors were designed as inhabitable extensions of the urban landscape in order to alleviate visual massiveness. Yet the external terraces and auditoriums were not clearly connected with the urban tissue or with the interior of the building. It seems that they were planned to host the iconography of various ideological rituals rather than being designed as places of informal spatial practices. Even the large entrance plaza was contradictory because the complex had created a break in the urban structure that prevented the continuity of public urban space. Many architectural features of the Home of the Revolution are thus ambiguous.

The Home of the Revolution appeared as a kind of an adventure that exhausted the material and organisational resources. The construction was financed from different funds, including Federal ones. The entire Nikšić community participated through financial contributions made compulsory following a public referendum. In 1989, after more than 10 years, the construction was halted. The break-up of the socialist Yugoslavia in 1991 may have been a fortunate circumstance for the builders of the Home of the Revolution because no one was responsible for the waste of resources. Nikšić then found itself in a radically different context, first as a part of the union of Serbia and Montenegro, and from 2006 in an independent country with 600,000 citizens compared to Yugoslavia's 21 million. The heavy industry of Nikšić faced a serious decline. What remained of the Home of the Revolution was a magnificent ruin, a monument to an aborted ideology and an abandoned urban landscape despised by the locals.

Even its demolition proved to be too expensive. Mušič remained frantically devoted to the project and proposed a redesign, but the building only grew larger owing to the inclusion of a department store. At the same time, the Home of the Revolution became a popular topic of numerous student works and diplomas in the region and abroad. Finally in 2015, encouraged by the success of the Montenegrin pavilion at the 2014 Venice Architecture Biennale, which featured 4 modernist ruins including the Memorial Home in Kolašin and the Home of the Revolution in Nikšić, the Ministry of Tourism and Sustainable Development of Montenegro launched an international competition for the Home of the Revolution reconstruction project. The brief was open, without any predefined programme, and asked for a strategic approach to the rejuvenation of the structure. The author of this paper was a member of the international jury.

The history of the project proved that it was not possible to finish the Home of the Revolution, it was necessary to embrace its uncompleted state. The material remnants of recent history became pending spatial resources. Under the conditions of the atomisation of post-socialist societies and the narrowing of the public domain, can such a project serve as a trigger for collective action? The biggest challenge of the reconstruction of the Home of the Revolution was the mobilisation of all the stakeholders, from the political elite on the State and municipal level to the local community. Can architecture not only encourage but also co-ordinate the process of societal cohesion?

¹ Merzbau was a Dadaist work of art – a spatial installation by Kurt Schwitters (b. 1887, d. 1948) made between 1923 and 1937, and destroyed in bombing at the end of WW2

scenarijev uporabe. V takšni viziji kompleks še vedno ostaja monumentalna ruševina, ki se aktivira s pristopom, bolj podobnim fleksibilnemu urbanističnemu načrtovanju kot arhitekturi. Obstoječa struktura je bila obravnavana kot urbana pokrajina, ki se postopoma kolonizira v skladu z dejanskimi potrebami. Arhitekti so vztrajali, da mora prvotni Mušičev projekt formalno ostati nedotaknjen, pri čemer je treba upoštevati njegov status spomenika in prepoznati njegove dimenzije kot edinstveno kakovost. Prvotna nasprotja so odpravili tako, da so celotno strukturo odprli; tako je postala porozna in bolje povezana z okoliškim mestnim tkivom. Namesto samostojnega in izoliranega spomeniškega objekta bi moral Dom revolucije končno postati organski del mesta, pokrit in naseljen javni prostor.

Za uspeh projekta je bil bistven sistem dodeljevanja prostorov novim uporabnikom, ali z drugimi besedami, odprta politika upravljanja prostorov. Le usklajevanje različnih zahtev in spodbujanje programske raznolikosti bi projektu zagotovilo vitalnost. Država je prispevala začetna sredstva, za izvedbo del pa je bila zadolžena občina Nikšić. Narejen je bil izvedbeni projekt in izdano gradbeno dovoljenje. Lokalna skupnost je pozdravila možnost, da se problem zloglasne »modre grobnice« v središču mesta dokončno razreši.

Še en zgodovinski preobrat pa je pobudo spodbudil. Dela so se začela marca 2018, junija pa je postalo očitno, da se ne uresničuje projekt arhitektov HHF in Sadar + Vuga, ampak nekaj drugega. Velike prostore stavbe so zaprli, druge pa odrezali, v nasprotju z idejami o pretočnosti prostorov in celovitosti prvotne strukture. Dela so zato ustavili in stanje projekta trenutno ni jasno.

Spominski dom v Kolašinu je bil poskus uskladitve oblikovne monumentalnosti in državljanskega programa. Prevlada oblike nad programsko zasnovo je ovirala razvoj stavbe v novih družbenih in kulturnih pogojih. Iracionalnost prvotnega projekta Doma revolucije v Nikšiću je izhajala iz poskusa konstrukcije monumentalnosti s pretiranim kulturnim programom. Tako monumentalne ambicije kot program kulturnega središča so zastareli že v času gradnje, kar kaže na nezmožnost ortodoksne socialistične ideologije, da bi sprejela naslednjo stopnjo v razvoju družbe. Megalomanski idealizem, vpet v Dom revolucije, je ustvaril spektakularno razvalino, ki je komaj primerljiva s čimerkoli, kar se gradi po svetu. Trenutna parcelacija Doma revolucije je posledica izvajanja zasebnih interesov z javnimi deli. Je žalosten kazalnik parohializma, pomanjkanja idealizma in propadanja javnega dobrega. Če je bil pozni socializem, izražen s stavbami-spomeniki, ujet med preteklostjo in prihodnostjo, so sodobne postsocialistične družbe ujete v neprekinjeno sedanjost, ki zanika preteklost in prihodnost. Ko se zgodovina ustavi, ni prostora za spomenike.

Prevedel Miha Dešman

The competition was won by the team of HHF Architects from Basel and Sadar+Vuga from Ljubljana, who proposed an ultimately realistic concept based on the division of the existing space into 10% of interior containers with concrete functions, 20% of renovated public areas and circulation routes, and 70% of secured and inaccessible spaces whose use would be defined in the future. All the interventions are focused only on the ground floor of the building. The project thus cleverly avoids the trap of an overblown ambition and does not create impossible scenarios of use. In such a vision, the complex still remains a monumental ruin activated by an approach which is more similar to flexible urban planning than to architecture. The existing structure was treated as an urban landscape which is gradually colonised in accordance to the actual needs. Architects insisted that the original Mušić project should formally remain intact, respecting its status of the monument and recognising the scale of the spaces as a unique quality. They resolved the original contradictions by opening up the whole structure, which became porous and better connected with the surrounding urban tissue. Rather than a free-standing and detached monumental object, the Home of the Revolution should finally become an organic part of the city, a covered and inhabitable public space.

Essential for the success of the project was the management of the allocation of the spaces to new users, or, in other words, open-source politics of space. Only the harmonisation of various demands and the encouragement of programmatic diversity would guarantee the emergence of urban vitality. The State ensured the initial funds, and the Municipality of Nikšić was responsible for conducting the works on the site. The execution project was designed and the building permit issued. The local community applauded the possibility of a breakthrough on the notorious "blue tomb" in the centre of the city.

Yet one more historical turn undermined the initiative. The works started in March 2018, but in June, it became obvious that what was being realised was not the HHF and Sadar+Vuga project but something else. Large spaces of the building had been enclosed and others were being chopped off, contrary to the ideas of the porous space and the integrity of the original structure. At the moment, the works are on hold and the status of the project is unclear.

Memorial Home in Kolašin was an attempt to reconcile formal monumentality and a civic programme. The predominance of form over programmatic performance obstructed the evolution of the building in new social and cultural conditions. The irrationality of the original project of the Home of the Revolution in Nikšić stemmed from an attempt to construct monumentality out of an overblown cultural programme. Both the monumental ambitions and the cultural centre's programme were outdated already in the time of their construction, indicating the inability of orthodox socialist ideology to embrace the next stage in the development of society. The megalomaniac idealism embedded in the Home of the Revolution created a spectacular ruin hardly comparable to anything else being built worldwide. In its present divided-up state, the Home of the Revolution is a result of conducting private interests through public works. It is a pitiful testament to parochialism, a lack of idealism, and expiration of public good. If late socialism, as evidenced by buildings-monuments, was suspended between the past and the future, the contemporary post-socialist societies are trapped in the continuous present, denying both the past and the future. When history stops, there's no space for monuments.