

NEŠTO VIŠE OD KRONOLOGIJE – PRILOG NEPISANOJ POVIJESTI ČASOPISA

MARIJA
BOROVIČKIĆ

MORE THAN A
CHRONOLOGY –
A CONTRIBUTION TO
THE MAGAZINE'S
NON-WRITTEN
HISTORY



Povodom 50. obljetnice časopisa *Život umjetnosti* uredništvo je napravilo retrospektivno i arhivsko istraživanje te osvrta na rad i utjecaj časopisa od njegova osnutka 1966. godine do danas. Imajući na umu važnost djelovanja i kontinuiranog rada časopisa te brojnost priloga od više od 550 autora o raznovrsnim temama u polju povijesti umjetnosti, likovne kulture, arhitekture, urbanizma, dizajna, fotografije, muzeologije i kulturalnih studija, dogovorili smo razgovore i zabilježili sjećanja nekih od dugogodišnjih suradnika, članova uredništva i bivših glavnih urednika časopisa. Naznačili smo i „napipali” na taj način obrise dinamizma časopisa, heterogenost i slojevitost uredničkih politika, važnost i uvjetovanost promjena kroz vrijeme, izmjene u djelovanju i strukturi uredništva, kao i važnost transformacije samog medija te društvenog i političkog konteksta koji je konstantno definirao ograničenja i mogućnosti časopisa. Utoliko je časopis, osim najvažnijih suradnika i ključnih ličnosti i autoriteta struke, kulture, umjetnosti i povijesti umjetnosti, definirao i širi okvir vremena.

Kristaliziraju se stoga neke neizostavne ličnosti i uloge poput Božidara Gagre, vizionara, glavnog urednika i pokretača časopisa, ali i političara i utjecajne osobe na širem kulturnom planu; Igora Zidića, jednog od prvih autora, člana uredništva i ključne osobe u Matici hrvatskoj, instituciji koja isprva „udomljuje” časopis; Žarka Domljana, glavnog urednika tijekom 1970-ih godina, osobe koja „prenosi” časopis u delikatno političko vrijeme iz Matice hrvatske u Institut za povijest umjetnosti; Željke Čorak, svestrane povjesničarke umjetnosti i glavne urednice 1970-ih i 1980-ih godina koja, među ostalim, kroz časopis propituje obrasce struke i revalorizira pojedine ličnosti i povijesna razdoblja; Tonka Maroevića, jednog od najplodonosnijih i najučestalijih autora u časopisu, dugogodišnjeg člana uredničkog tima i glavnog urednika krajem 1980-ih godina; Zvonka Makovića, autora brojnih priloga, člana uredništva

On the occasion of the magazine's 50th anniversary, the *Život umjetnosti* editorial board prepared a retrospective and archival research with a review of the magazine's work and influence since its foundation in 1966 till present day. Keeping in mind the importance of the magazine's continuous work and the numerous contributions from more than 550 authors covering various topics in the field of art history, visual culture, architecture, urbanism, design, photography, museology and cultural studies, we arranged interviews and recorded memories of some of the magazine's long-time collaborators, members of the editorial boards and former editors-in-chief. In such a way, we have indicated and “detected” the outlines of the magazine's dynamics, the heterogeneity and layeredness of its editorial policies, the importance and conditions of changes that occurred over time, the changes in the editorial board structure and work, as well as the importance of the transformation of the medium itself and of the social and political context which was constantly defining the magazine's limitations and possibilities. In so far, this magazine has, alongside the most prominent collaborators and key figures and authorities in culture, art and art history, also defined a wider frame of time.

Indispensable figures and roles thus crystalized, such as Božidar Gagro, a visionary, the magazine's founder and editor-in-chief, but also a politician whose influence could be felt on a broader cultural plan; Igor Zidić, one of the magazine's first authors, member of the editorial board and the key figure in *Matica hrvatska*, the magazine's first publisher; Žarko Domljan, the magazine's editor-in-chief in the 1970s, a person who during the delicate political period “transferred” the magazine from *Matica hrvatska* to the Institute for Art history; Željka Čorak, a versatile art historian and the magazine's editor-in-chief in the 1970s and 1980s who, among other things, used the magazine to question the profession's

i glavnog urednika krajem 1980-ih i početkom 1990-ih godina te urednika specifičnoga tematskog broja posvećenog *Novoj slici*; Darje Radović Mahečić, glavne urednice časopisa tijekom 1990-ih godina, turbulentnog perioda kada se poništavaju neki od temelja struke i kada časopis traži svoje mjesto kao medij, ali i medijator; te mnogih drugih.

U ovome prilogu donosimo isječke nekoliko intervjua koji nas najjasnije upoznaju s drugom stranom časopisa, onom do sada nepisanom, neslužbenom, personaliziranom, subjektivnom, ispovjednom ili pak politički i društveno uvjetovanom. Nastojali smo potaknuti i naznačiti reflektivnost, individualizam, kontekstualizaciju ili čak autokritičnost kao istraživačku metodologiju i perspektivu koja nam rastvara vrijednu slojevitost časopisa. U slučaju *Života umjetnosti*, časopisa koji znakovito nosi vitalnost u samom svom nazivu, prepoznavamo da mimo respektabilne kronologije časopis generira i vrijednosti otvorenosti i transformabilnosti – za preživljavanje ključnih oblika kolegijalnosti i prepoznavanja modusa „prebacivanja štafete s jednog na drugog”.

Uredništvo srdačno zahvaljuje Žarku Domljanu, Igoru Zidiću, Tonku Maroeviću, Zvonku Makoviću, Darji Radović Mahečić, Ješi Denegriju, Snješki Knežević, Karmen Gagro, Ladi Kavurić i Mišku Šuvakoviću.

forms and reevaluate certain figures and historical periods; Tonko Maroević, one of the magazine's most prolific authors, a long-time member of the editorial board and the editor-in-chief in late 1980s; Zvonko Maković, author of numerous articles for the magazine, a long-time member of its editorial board, the editor-in-chief during the late 1980s and early 1990s and the editor of the specific thematic issue dedicated to *New Image*; Darja Radović Mahečić, the magazine's editor-in-chief in the 1990s, a turbulent period during which some of the profession's foundations were nullified and the magazine itself was searching for its place as a medium and a mediator; and many others.

This contribution presents fragments from several interviews which reveal the magazine's other side, the side that until now remained unwritten, unofficial, personalised, subjective, confessional or politically and socially conditioned. We tried to encourage and point out the reflectiveness, individualism, contextualisation or even auto-criticism as a form of research methodology and a perspective that can introduce us to the magazine's valuable layeredness. In the case of *Život umjetnosti* which symbolically carries vitality in its own name, we can recognise that this magazine, past the respectable chronology, also generates values of openness and transformability – forms of collegiality and recognition of the “relay race” approach, which are crucial to survival.

The editorial board would like to thank: Žarko Domljan, Igor Zidić, Tonko Maroević, Zvonko Maković, Darja Radović Mahečić, Ješa Denegri, Snješka Knežević, Karmen Gagro, Lada Kavurić and Miško Šuvaković.

IGOR ZIDIĆ

„Peristol je bio časopis za umjetnost prošlosti, a mi stvaramo časopis za moderno i suvremeno, za sadašnjost.”

Isječci iz razgovora vođenog 3. svibnja 2017.

Prisutni ste kao član uredništva u časopisu od samih početaka, od 1966. godine kada se časopis pokreće u sklopu Matice hrvatske. Možete li rekonstruirati vrijeme, kontekst i definiranje programatskog koncepta časopisa?

IGOR ZIDIĆ ... Bio sam u časopisu i prije prvoga broja; trebalo ga je pripremiti, izboriti „bлагослов” određenih političkih institucija, SIZ-ova itd., ali i izboriti suglasnost Matičinih upravnih tijela. U tome nam je od pomoći bio i naš profesor Grgo Gamulin, koji nas je poticao i podržavao. Tvrdio je da Hrvatska treba časopis za modernu umjetnost i da ga treba prepustiti „mlađim snagama”. U tome je i ustajao; stariji su kolege, ne baveći se intenzivno modernom i suvremenom umjetnošću, imali časopis *Peristol*. U Beogradu je izlazila *Umetnost*, u Ljubljani *Sinteza* i mislili smo da Zagreb,

kao jako središte moderniteta i suvremenosti, mora pokazati i da je kritički živ. Ja sam u Matici hrvatskoj bio izabran za tajnika početkom lipnja 1966. pa sam zahvaljujući tome bio u svim upravnim strukturama društva i mogao sam pridonijeti tome da se časopis udomi. Bilo je važno imati pouzdanog izdavača, imati prostor u kojemu urednici mogu obaviti dio poslova, primiti suradnike i slično. Od svih nas politički je najbolje stajao Gagro i on je za vlast bio neka vrsta garancije da se časopis neće baviti političkom kontrabandom.

Kasniji politički kontekst i slom Hrvatskog proljeća rezultirao je prijelazom časopisa iz Matice hrvatske u Institut 1973. godine. Pitanje je bilo tko će i kako dalje voditi časopis, neki su suradnici bili proskribirani, rad časopisa otežan...

IGOR ZIDIĆ ... Mnogi su bili proskribirani, srećom ne mnogi i u *Životu umjetnosti*. Ja nisam godinama mogao objavljivati tekstove u dnevnome tisku, intervenirati na televiziji, oglašiti se na radiju. To se, međutim, nije odnosilo na naš niskotiražni časopis. Tih sam godina objavljivao u Sloveniji, Srbiji, Bosni i Hercegovini, baveći se i dalje isključivo hrvatskom likovnom tematikom, ali sam te tekstove mogao plasirati uglavnom samo izvan Hrvatske. Poslije događaja

135

IGOR ZIDIĆ

“Peristol was a magazine for art of the past, and we create a magazine for the modern and contemporary, for the present.”

Excerpts from the interview conducted on May 3, 2017

You have been the editorial board member since the *Život umjetnosti* very beginning in the 1966, when the magazine was founded within *Matica hrvatska*. Can you reconstruct the time, the context and the process of defining the magazine's concept?

IGOR ZIDIĆ ... I was involved in the magazine even before the first issue appeared; we had to prepare the magazine, obtain the “blessing” from certain political institutions such as Self-managing interest community etc. as well as to win the approval from *Matica's* governing bodies. Our professor Grgo Gamulin, who encouraged and supported us in our mission, also helped us in the process, claiming that Croatia needed a magazine for contemporary art and that such a magazine should be run by “younger forces”. He was very consistent; older colleagues, who were not much involved in

modern and contemporary art, had the magazine *Peristol*. Belgrade was publishing *Umetnost*, Ljubljana *Sinteza* and we thought that Zagreb, as a strong centre of modernity and contemporaneity, must show that it is critically alive. In early June 1966, I was appointed as the *Matica hrvatska's* secretary, which introduced me to every administrative structure in the society and allowed me to contribute to publishing the magazine. It was important to have a reliable publisher and a space for editors to work, meet their collaborators and etc. Among us all, Gagro held the best political position and in the eyes of the governing structure he represented a kind of guarantee that the magazine would not deal with political contraband.

The political context that followed and the break of Croatian spring resulted in the magazine's transfer from *Matica hrvatska* to the Institute of Art History in 1973. The question arose as to who and how will continue to run the magazine, some of the collaborators were proscribed and the magazine's work was hindered...

IGOR ZIDIĆ ... Many were proscribed, fortunately not many of those who collaborated with the *Život umjetnosti*. For years I was not allowed to publish articles in daily press or to participate in television or radio programs. However, this did not apply to our low-circulation

iz prosinca 1971. ubrzo je bila raspuštena Matica pa bi bilo neproduktivno – dapače, samoubojstveno, časopis zadržavati u Matici. Ja sam se, potkraj šezdesetih počeo studioznije baviti nekim temama iz hrvatskoga 20. stoljeća i dnevnu sam kritičku praksu postupno zanemario. Od kraja pedesetih počeo sam objavljivati kritičke osvrtne u *Studentskome listu*, a postao sam i stalni likovni kritičar *Telegrama*, u kojemu pišem od 1961. do 1969. Kroz sve to vrijeme pisao sam i drugdje, a od 1971. u *Hrvatskom tjedniku*. Poslije toga, kako sam već rekao, od 1972. načelno više nije bilo moguće surađivati s visokotiražnim glasilima ili medijima velikog dometa. Ipak bi se, tu i tamo, našao netko tko je iz solidarnosti znao riskirati i objaviti tekst nepoćudnog suradnika. Sjećam se kako me jednoga dana Bepo (Josip, op. a.) Depolo pozvao na večeru. Kaže: „Dođi, nešto slavimo.” Pitam ga: „Što slavimo?“, a on odgovara: „Neću ti reći, dođi.” I ja dodem, on otvara bocu vina i govori: „Slavimo što su 50. put na radiju brisali tvoje ime i prezime citirano u mojim kritikama!” Znali smo se, dakako, i našaliti sa svim tim problemima; poremetili su nas ti događaji i te zabrane u mnogočemu, ali bili smo mladi pa nije nedostajalo vitalnosti i spretnosti u izbjegavanju nelagoda.

Časopis je od početaka prigrlio širi dijapazon umjetničkih tema, a jedna od većih i zastupljenijih, možda najviše tijekom 1960-ih i 1970-ih godina, bila je tema urbanizma, stanovanja, prostora, arhitekture, a nerijetko su ti tekstovi bili i vrlo kritični prema aktualnim zbivanjima i prostornim promjenama. Ali i neovisno o časopisu, u širem prostoru i vidokrugu politike i struke važnost teme urbanizma bila je u to vrijeme prisutnija i bolje prepoznata nego danas.

IGOR ZIDIĆ ... Tome je nekoliko razloga. Jedan profesor s našeg fakulteta, kojega smo cijenili kao znalca, profesor Milan Prelog, bio je stvarni autoritet u struci i otvarao nam oči za te teme. Održavao je u to vrijeme na javnim tribinama sjajna predavanja. Premda još nisam imao nekog posebnog interesa za arhitektonske i urbanističke teme, ipak nisam mogao ne otići na njegova javna predavanja. Možda je baš tada on, onkraj katedre, pobudio moju znatiželju i za područja arhitekture i urbanizma. Jedna je od aktualnih i važnih Prelogovih tema tada bila Jadranska magistrala, koja je napravila prilično štete u našim primorskim sredinama; u gradovima i u naseljima, ali i u krajoliku. Sjekla je, bez skrupula, povijesno graditeljsko naslijeđe, hortikulturnu baštinu, organsičnost starih rješenja u kojima se osjećala povezanost čovjeka i prirode, grada i okolice. I

magazine. During those years I published papers in Slovenia, Serbia and Bosnia and Herzegovina, continuing to focus exclusively on Croatian art, nevertheless those articles I was able to mostly publish only outside of Croatia. *Matica hrvatska* was disbanded in the aftermath of the event in December 1971, and it would have been unproductive, practically a suicide, to keep the magazine in *Matica*. In the late 1960s, I started to work more studiously on certain themes concerning the Croatian 20th century and I completely neglected the daily critical practice. In the late 1950s I started to publish critical reviews in *Studentski list* and I became the resident art critic in *Telegram*, for which I wrote in the period from 1961 until 1969. During all this time, I was also writing for other magazines, in the year 1971 I started to write for *Hrvatski tjednik*. As I mentioned, from the year 1972 onwards it was no longer possible to collaborate with high-circulation publications or high-range media. Every once in a while, however, someone would risk their chances and publish an article written by an undesirable collaborator, as a sign of solidarity. One day, I remember, Bepo [Josip] Depolo invited me to dinner, saying: “Come over, we are celebrating.” I asked him what they were celebrating and he replied: “I won’t tell ya, come over.” And so, I came to his house and found him opening a bottle of wine, “We are celebrating the fiftieth time they deleted your name and surname, quoted in my reviews!” We knew, of course, how to joke

with these problems; all those events and numerous bans disturbed us, but we were young and did not lack vitality and skill in avoiding discomfort.

From its very beginning, the magazine embraced a wider range of artistic themes. One of the larger and more prevalent themes, perhaps mostly during the 1960s and the 1970s, concerned urbanism, housing, space and architecture. These papers were often very critical towards current events and spatial changes. But, even regardless of the magazine, in those years the importance of the theme of urbanism was more present and better recognised within a wider field of politics and profession than it is today.

IGOR ZIDIĆ ... Several reasons can explain this. Professor Milan Prelog, whom we greatly appreciated, was a real authority in our profession and opened our eyes to these themes. He used to hold excellent lectures at that time. Although at that point I still had not developed a particular interest in architecture and urbanism, I could not miss out on his public lectures. Perhaps it was precisely he who, beyond his department, ignited my curiosity for fields of architecture and urbanism. Current and important topics that Prelog was dealing with at that time included Adriatic highway, which created a significant damage to our seaside, its towns, villages and landscape.

Gamulin je o tome pisao s više empatije i zanosa, dok nas je Prelog osvajaio hladnom i ubojitom argumentacijom. Ponudio nam je, u analizi svega toga, i gospodarske parametre pa smo iz njegovih predavanja saznawali kako je sirovi, novi urbanizam i njegov fragment „cestovni funkcionalizam” u svoj svojoj brutalnosti bio, zapravo, slika naše sredine, naših novih „profesionalaca”, trenutačnih procjena „naših potreba”. A one su se uvijek definirale linijom manjega otpora, mantram „jeftinije ponude” i korupcionaškim finansijskim modelima. Svi su veći gradovi u to vrijeme razvijali svoje nove četvrti pa smo imali već ostarjeli Novi Zagreb, počeo se – s više sreće i pameti – izgrađivati Split 3 i tako dalje. U sličnom ili razmjernom opsegu događalo se isto u Zadru, Rijeci, Osijeku i drugdje, tako da je to bila tema od prvorazrednog interesa. Na tim su se mjestima i u te su se projekte ulagala golemo sredstva i ja sam, na nekom od Prelogovih predavanja, uspoređujući muzejske cijene slika i skulptura s cijenama gradogradnje shvatio društvo tvornu, prvorazrednu važnost urbanizma. Zatim se tome htjelo dati i neki ideološki pozitivan predznak, u smislu: mi to nećemo raditi bezdušno kao neki drugi, mi ćemo to raditi s najvišim humanim obzirima i brigom za društvo u cijelosti. I onda je došla ta magistrala, koja je i stvarno i idejno povezala sve naše gradove i naselja na moru i uz obalu, ali i povezala na kraju, učinivši ga

posve razvidnim, problem odnosa baštine i suvremenosti, prošlosti i sadašnjosti. U toj je tematici Prelogov angažman bio od najveće važnosti. Ali ovdje treba reći i da su dvojica od prve četvorice urednika *Života umjetnosti* – Žarko Domljan i Eugen Franković – bili ljudi koji su se aktivno i kvalificirano bavili arhitekturom i urbanizmom.

S druge strane, neke druge aktualne i intrigantne teme, poput moderne umjetnosti ili najnovijih umjetničkih zbivanja i suvremene umjetnosti, samim time i njezine afirmacije – u časopisu su bile zastupljene, valorizirane ili prepoznavane od samih početaka.

IGOR ZIDIC ... Mi smo to naše programsko stajalište ustrajno branili i zastupali. *Peristil* je bio časopis za umjetnost prošlosti, a mi stvaramo časopis za modernu i suvremenu; za sadašnjost. Sâm sam u to doba pisao o nadrealizmu i apstrakciji u Hrvatskoj, o Kniferu, Kožariću, Periću, Vaništi, Ivančiću. Pretežni nas je interes vodio prema neobrađenim ili slabo istraženim temama hrvatske moderne umjetnosti. Neki od kapitalnih likova naše tadašnjosti poput Šimunovića, Motike, Glihe, Juneka, Kaštelančića, Ružića i mlađih – do Petlevskoga i Šuteja – nisu još bili kritički udomljeni i gotovo da su zahtijevali naše intervencije. O nekima se pisalo mnogo i često, ali i površno (Stančić) pa nije bila samo riječ o neobrađenim temama nego i o nedostatnoj metodologiji.

The highway scrupulously cut the historical architectural and horticultural heritage, as well as the organic aspect of old solutions in which we could feel the connection between man and nature, the city and its surroundings. Gamulin also wrote about this particular topic, although with more empathy and enthusiasm, whereas Prelog was winning with his cold and deadly arguments. His analysis also offered economical parameters, from his lectures we learned that this raw, new urbanism and its fragment – the “road functionalism”, in all its brutality, was actually a reflection of our environment, of our new “professionals” and current estimates of “our needs”. And our needs were always defined by the path of least resistance, the mantra of “the cheaper offer” and the corrupted financial models. All larger cities were developing their new neighbourhoods at the time, and so there was the already aged Novi Zagreb, they started to – with more luck and brains – build Split 3 and so on. In a similar range the same process was taking place in Zadar, Rijeka, Osijek and other cities which made it a high interest topic. Enormous financial means were invested in these places and projects; by comparing the museum prices of paintings and sculptures with the prices of building a city during one of Prelog’s lectures, I realised the society-forming, first-class importance of urbanism. They intended to attribute it with an ideological positive aspect so as to say: “we will not do it soullessly as others do, we will do it with highest human

considerations and care for the society as a whole”. And then this highway appeared, which in reality and ideally connected all our cities along the coast. However, ultimately the road also connected, and made entirely obvious, the problem of the relation between heritage and contemporaneity, the past and the future. Prelog’s work and engagement was the most important one in this topic. Nevertheless, we need to stress that two of the first four editors of *Život umjetnosti* – Žarko Domljan and Eugen Franković – were actively and qualifiedly engaged in the field of architecture and urbanism.

On the other hand, other current and interesting themes, such as modern art or the most recent artistic events and contemporary art and thus its affirmation – were represented, valorised or recognised in the magazine from its very beginning.

IGOR ZIDIC ... It was part of our program concept which we persistently defended and advocated. *Peristil* was a magazine for the art of the past, whereas we were creating a magazine dedicated to modern and contemporary art; for the present. At that time, I wrote articles on surrealism and abstraction in Croatia, on Knifer, Kožarić, Perić, Vaništa, Ivančić. The general interest leads us to uncovered or unexplored topics of Croatian modern art. Some of our capital

Primjećuje se da sa *Životom umjetnosti* dolazi i do strukturalnih promjena u kritičkome diskursu. Ta se njegova orijentacija, na svoj način, sačuvala do danas, tako da je časopis ostao i moderan – i više nego u naše vrijeme – suvremen.

Ali mijenja se i medij, uloga časopisa nekada, kada je trebalo popratiti događaj, ponuditi neku vrstu kronike i informacije, nije jednaka današnjoj. Ne postoje iste potrebe, a to se na *Životu umjetnosti* dosta lijepo prati od 1960-ih godina do danas.

IGOR ZIDIĆ ... To je tajna časopisa koji je, hvala Bogu, živ i djelatan. Kada smo počinjali nitko nije mislio da će se ta inicijativa toliko održati; ipak je bila riječ o stručnom časopisu, koji se koristio jezikom struke dok je razmatrao neke od tema od ipak užeg, strukovnog interesa. Tako sam i sam mislio da nema velikih izgleda da se *Život umjetnosti* prometne u dugovječan periodički časopis. Sadržajna promjena koja se dogodila i koja je opravdana s obzirom na promjenu društvenog miljea, duhovnih oscilacija i novih modela mišljenja i novom senzibilnošću koja se u njemu danas očitava – ono je što mu daje vitalnost.

ŽARKO DOMLJAN

„Putujuća redakcija”

Isječci iz razgovora vođenog

23. kolovoza 2016.

Kao bivši urednik, od 1971. do 1976. godine, ali i dugogodišnji suradnik časopisa, prisjećate li se početaka rada časopisa, njegova osnivanja 1966. godine, prvog urednika i svojevrsnog vizionara časopisa Božidara Gagre te općenito važnosti časopisa u to vrijeme?

ŽARKO DOMLJAN ... Pojava *Života umjetnosti* bila je jedan veliki događaj, velika novina i veliki dobitak za struku. Prvi su se put pojavili neki teoretski članci, i tematskih je brojeva bilo, pa su se neke teme počele sistematski obrađivati i valorizirati. To je bila jedna vrlo talentirana generacija: Zidić, Gagro, Ivančević, poslije Rus... Ja nisam bio u prvoj redakciji časopisa. Tu je bio Božo Gagro. Ali sam to pratio, i zbilja je postojala potreba za jednim časopisom za likovnu umjetnost jer nije bilo ničega. Institut za povijest umjetnosti bio je zapravo virtualan. Bio je profesor Gamulin koji je imao nekoliko suradnika, dogovorno, tu i tamo bi se našli, to se kao zvao Institut, ali formalno nije postojao. Inicijativa Zidića i Gagre za osnivanje časopisa pokrenuta je unutar Matice hrvatske koja je jako dobro stajala, imala je puno novca i tu

figures of that time such as Šimunović, Motika, Gliha, Junek, Kaštelančić, Ružić and those younger – Petlevski and Šutej – critics did not recognise them yet and it was almost as if they needed our interventions. Many papers were often written on some of them, but in a superficial manner (Stančić), so there was also a lack of methodology alongside uncovered themes. *Život umjetnosti* also introduced structural changes in critical discourse. Such an orientation has continued to this day, which allowed the magazine to stay modern – and more than in our time – contemporary.

The medium has also changed. The former role of magazines, when it came to cover an event or to give information, is no longer the same as it is today. The needs have changed, which we can see if we look at the *Život umjetnosti* issues from the 1960s onwards.

IGOR ZIDIĆ ... This is the secret of this magazine which is, thankfully, still alive and running. When we were starting the magazine, nobody thought this initiative would last this long; in the end, this was a professional magazine, with articles written in professional language about specific themes that are not necessarily interesting to general public. I thought myself that the *Život umjetnosti* did not have much chance to become a long-standing periodical magazine. Its vitality lays in the

change of content that occurred – this change is justified considering the change within the social milieu, spiritual oscillations, new models of thought and the new sensibility that reflects within it today.

nije bio nikakav problem naručivanja, plaćanja, tiskanja, distribucije. Sve je Matica imala kroz nakladni zavod, cijelu tu mašineriju. Božo Gagro kao glavni urednik bio je jedan od najsposobnijih povjesničara umjetnosti i šteta što nije išao dalje u struci. Njega je uz struku privlačila i politika i onda je otišao u to. Uvijek je održavao nekakav kontakt sa strukom, ali politika mu je bila nekako draža, slađa, bliža. Bio je ministar kulture. Mi smo poslije postali veliki prijatelji makar se politički nismo slagali.

Kada ste se, s kojim temama i tekstovima Vi priključili radu časopisa?

ŽARKO DOMLJAN ... Ja sam se redakciji priključio s 5. brojem, koji je bio tematski posvećen projektu Južni Jadran. Jedan vrlo ambiciozni projekt financiran od Ujedinjenih naroda. Prvi put se pokušao valorizirati jadranski prostor i obala, što će se s njom događati sljedećih godina, početak turizma i slično. I oni su snimali obalu helikopterima, izračunavali koliko ljudi može stati, koliko ležajeva, hotela... To se radilo jedno pet-šest godina, s velikim ambicijama, velikim angažmanom prostornih planera; Marinovićem, Uzelcem, suradnika iz Urbanističkog instituta Hrvatske, arhitekata, sociologa, turističkih djelatnika... I nakon tog mog velikog članka, oni su

valjda nešto u njemu našli. Milan Prelog bio je kontakt-osoba sa strukom, ali i Grgo Gamulin, koji je u svakom broju objavljivao. Ono što je bilo vrlo komotno i ugodno, to je ta Matica Hrvatska kao izdavač. Ona je imala neograničena sredstva, čim je autor predao tekst odmah je sve bilo plaćeno, svi su bili zadovoljni. Malo se onda otezalo s realizacijom, tiskanjem, prijelomom, slaganjem, to je sve tada išlo ručno, nije bilo niti *offseta* pa je išlo pisano, pa onda prepisivano, pa jedna korektura, pa druga korektura... Dok je časopis izašao prošla je sigurno godina dana. Kako je Matica imala razgranatu prodajnu mrežu, naklada je bila 1000, barem mislim. S te organizacijske i financijske strane nije bilo nikakvog problema i u takvim okolnostima dakako da je jako ugodno raditi.

Matica hrvatska izdavač je do zabrane njezina rada 1972. godine, nakon čega časopis preuzima Institut za povijest umjetnosti. Koliko se i kako uvjeti i kontekst vođenja časopisa u to vrijeme mijenjaju?

ŽARKO DOMLJAN ... Dolazi 1971., dolazi slom Hrvatskog proljeća, Matica hrvatska je zabranjena, sve je zatvoreno. Kad je počelo Hrvatsko proljeće, kad je Zidić postao glavni urednik *Hrvatskoga tjednika*, onda sam mu ja prepustio svoju sobicu od uredništva *Života umjetnosti*. To je bila jedna mala soba u Matici hrvatskoj, s ormarom

ŽARKO DOMLJAN

“Travelling editorial board”

Excerpts from interview conducted on August 23, 2016

As a former editor-in-chief, in the period from 1971 until 1976, as well as its long-standing collaborator, can you share with us your memories of the magazine's very beginning, its founding in 1966, of its first editor and visionary Božidar Gagro as well as of the magazine's importance at that time?

ŽARKO DOMLJAN ... *Život umjetnosti* was big news and a great value for the profession at that time. Theoretical articles appeared for the first time, there were thematic issues and later some topics started to be systematically covered and valorized. It was a very talented generation: Zidić, Gagro, Ivančević and later Rus... I did not take part in the first editorial board. Božo Gagro was there. But I followed the magazine and there was really a need to have a magazine for visual art because there was nothing. The Institute for Art history was practically a virtual institute. Professor Gamulin and his associates would meet every now and then and it was referred to as institute, but it never formally existed. Zidić and Gagro's initiative to establish a magazine started within *Matica hrvatska* which had

sufficient funds and there was no problem in regard to orders, payments, printing and distribution. *Matica* was providing the entire machinery through its publishing institute. Božo Gagro, as the editor-in-chief, was one of the most capable art historian and it is a pity that he did not advance further in that direction. He was also interested in politics and chose to continue his career down that path. He always kept a contact with his profession, however he preferred politics, it was closer and somewhat sweeter to him and he was the minister of culture at one point. Later on we became great friends, even though we did not share same political opinions.

When did you join the magazine? What were your first topics and articles?

ŽARKO DOMLJAN ... I joined the editorial board in the 5th issue. The issue's topic was Southern Adriatic – a very ambitious project financed by the United Nations, trying for the first time to valorise the Adriatic Sea and its coast, to accentuate what would happen to it in the years to follow, the beginning of tourism and so on. The project included photographing the coast from helicopters, estimating how many people, accommodation and hotels it can receive... It lasted for 5-6 years, with big ambitions; spatial planners such as Marinović, Uzelac, collaborators from the Croatian Urban Institute,

i malim stalažama. I onda sam rekao: „Igore, to je puno važnija stvar za nas sve nego *Život umjetnosti*. Ja se povlačim. Ja ću samo najnužnije dolaziti, a ti, evo, izvoli...” Jer *Hrvatski tjednik* izlazio je tjedno, to je bila živa redakcija, ljudi su dolazili, odlazili... Kad je Matica zabranjena, tražili su da izvadim materijale. Formalno sam prenio časopis, izdavač je postao Institut za povijest umjetnosti, u dogovoru s profesorom Milanom Prelogom. Što se zatim događa: časopis više nema sredstava, nema više Matice hrvatske, nema njezinog računovodstva, sve se prebacuje na Institut i tu se bitno mijenja situacija. Institut je slabo stajao. To su ona sredstva koja dobijete i gotovo. Autori su se malo onda i pokolebali. Vi znate da je Gamulin bio proskribiran, morao je napustiti Fakultet, Institut, sve je preuzeo profesor Prelog. Tada je Prelog postao glavna osoba. I tu je nastao jedan za našu struku fatalan sukob, podjela između Gamulina i Preloga. Prvenstveno politički sukob, koji se onda prenio na cijelu našu generaciju jer su sve nas nekako razvrstavali – ili si „gamulinovac” ili si „prelogovac”. Ja sam se našao u velikom pritisku da ne objavljujem Gamulina. Ali sam u svakom broju objavljivao barem po dva njegova teksta. Onda je uskraćeno financiranje želeći me kao glavnog urednika prisiliti da ne objavljujem Gamulina. Ja sam ga uporno objavljivao, a svaki je put pisalo: „odbija se, razgovarati s redakcijom”. I onda me pozvao Ivo Vrhovec na

razgovor kao glavnog urednika. To je bio razgovor između mačke i miša. Pitao sam: „Molim Vas, ako postoji nekakav popis autora koje ja ne smijem objavljivati, dajte mi da imam crno na bijelo.” „A, ne, ne! Takav popis ne postoji. Ali Vi morate kao glavni urednik imati takav senzibilitet.” Ja sam rekao: „Takav je senzibilitet potreban za jedan politički časopis, a ja vodim stručni časopis i imam senzibilitet za stručni časopis, a ovaj drugi nemam...” On je vidio da ja njega probam na tanki led da se izjasni, a nije se smio izjasniti jer bih ga tražio pismeno. Tako da ti brojevi dok god sam ja vodio, to je bilo zapravo jedno kritično razdoblje. Redakcija je vrlo malo sudjelovala, ja sam to vukao praktički u taški pa sam se šalio da je „putujuća redakcija”. Nisam imao ni stola ni prostorije. Onda je tu meni pukao film, bilo mi je svega dosta. S Prelogom sam bio dobar, s njim sam održavao dobre kontakte. On je tražio koga će uzeti za novog urednika. Izbor je pao na Željku Čorak. Znae kako je Prelog govorio za Željku Čorak? Da je ona „atomska centrala”. Tolika energija... Imala je energiju i imala je klikere. Ona je koncipirala broj o Bolleu. Održan je simpozij o Bolleu i onda je bio uređen i tematski broj časopisa o Bolleu. I to je prvi put da je Bolle kao arhitekt rehabilitiran.

architects, sociologists and touristic workers were greatly engaged in the projects. I guess my vast article also contributed, they must have found something in it. Milan Prelog was the contact person with the profession, as well as Grgo Gamulin whose papers were published in every issue. Having *Matica hrvatska* for our publisher was very comfortable. *Matica* disposed with unlimited financial resources; as soon as the author submitted his article, everything was paid and everyone was content. The realisation part, which included printing and layout was a bit slow: everything was done manually back then, there was no *offset* so we had to write everything and copy it, then go through proofreading... It took a year to publish one issue. The print run was around 1000 copies per issue, thanks to *Matica's* branched distribution network. There was no problem with organisation and financing, and it was very comfortable to work in such conditions.

Matica hrvatska published the *Život umjetnosti* until it was banned to work in 1972, after which the Institute for Art history took over the magazine. How and in what extent the conditions and the context of running the magazine changed during those years?

ZARKO DOMLJAN ... With the fall of Croatian spring in 1971, *Matica hrvatska* was banned and everything shut down. When Zidić became the editor-in-chief in *Hrvatski tjednik* in the wake of Croatian spring, I

gave him my *Život umjetnosti* little office to use it. It was a small office room in *Matica hrvatska*, with cabinet and small shelves. I told him: “Igor, this is much more important to us all than *Život umjetnosti*. I will come in only when it will be most necessary, you go ahead and use the office...” *Hrvatski tjednik* was a weekly magazine, with a very active editorial board, people coming and going... Once *Matica* was banned, they asked me to take out my material. In agreement with professor Milan Prelog, I formally transferred the magazine over to the Institute for Art history, its new publisher. What happened next; the magazine had no funds, *Matica hrvatska* and its accounting were no longer active, everything was transferred to the Institute and here the situation changed greatly. The Institute was in not such a good position, you get the funds and you have to make do with it. And then the authors became a bit discouraged as well. As you know, Gamulin was proscribed and forced to leave the faculty and the Institute. Prelog took it over and became the person in charge which led to a parting between Gamulin and Prelog, a fatal confrontation for our profession. It was primarily a political confrontation which affected our entire generation because we were all classified in a way – either you belonged to “Gamulin” or to “Prelog” team. I was under pressure not to publish Gamulin. Nevertheless, I published at least two of his papers in each issue. Then they cut our funds, in effort to force me as the magazine’s editor-in-chief not to publish Gamulin. I continued to publish his

TONKO MAROEVIĆ

„Život umjetnosti je bio najbliže povijesti umjetnosti, suvremenost gledati sub specie historiae.”

Isječci iz razgovora vođenog

11. srpnja 2016.

Od prvog broja časopisa *Život umjetnosti* teško je izdvojiti broj u kojem se Vaše ime ne pojavljuje u ulozi autora, člana uredništva ili čak glavnog urednika. Vaša intenzivna suradnja s časopisom kreće od samih početaka. Sjećate li se vremena u kojem izlazi časopis i u čemu je bila njegova specifičnost i važnost?

TONKO MAROEVIĆ ... To je bilo jako zanimljivo vrijeme, vrijeme stanovitve obnove interesa za nacionalnu umjetnost. Ako hoćemo, prvi je broj koncipiran kao pokušaj određivanja našeg mjesta u Europi. To je bila skoro i reakcija i na ona aktualnu Karamanovu tezu o trojnoj obilježnosti našega prostora periferijom, granicom i miješanjem kultura. Moderna umjetnost, suvremena umjetnost tada je prošla onu prvu fazu hvatanja koraka s Europom. Pedesete su godine to više-manje obavile. Geometrijska apstrakcija i Nove tendencije

već su bile za nama. To je Zagreb tada uhvatio, apsolutno krajnje ažuriran. I onda je trebalo ocijeniti kako dalje. Postoji li samo jedna univerzalna umjetnost, isključivo ona koja je aktualna tog časa ili postoji jedna kompleksna slojevitost. U tom je smislu taj prvi broj bio jedan, ja bih rekao, programatski. Božo Gagro, Igor Zidić pisali su te uvodne temeljne tekstove, donekle Prelog i Gamulin koji su svaki na svoj način osjećali specifičnost našega prostora, istovremeno našu neospornu pripadnost Europi. Ja bih rekao da je u tom smislu časopis osnovan. Ja sam tada još bio medijevalist, pisao sam o temama kojima sam pokušavao ući u problematiku te duboke povijesti umjetnosti, da bih kasnije prešao na suvremenu koja mi je bila na svoj način lakša. Počeo sam onda pisati likovne kritike. Najveći je broj mojih suradnji kritika suvremenih izložbi. Ja sam tradicionalist, relativni. Imam relativno poznavanje neoavangarde, to je čak i moja generacija, ali to nije moja opcija. Moja je opcija u stanovitoj ideji dugog trajanja. Ja sam Mediteranac s neakvim osjećajem kontinuiteta. Moj prvi tekst, koji je objavljen u *Telegramu*, zvao se „Tradicija i kontinuitet”. Ja se nisam previše u 50 godina promijenio, ja sam dosta vjeran svojim polazištima, unatoč tome što sam nekoć imao možda više smisla za trend. Pisao sam o ornamentografu recimo, 50-ih godina. Riječ je o likovnom djelu nastalom posredstvom stroja. Prije kompjutera, to je bio stroj

articles and every time I received the same remarks: “refused, talk to editorial board”, “refused, talk to editorial board”. And then Ivo Vrhovec called me to have a talk which resembled to a conversation between a cat and a mouse. I asked him: “Please, if there is such a list of authors whose work I am not allowed to publish, give it to me.” “Ah, no, no! There is no such list. However, you as the editor-in-chief must have a sensibility for such things.” To which I responded: “Such a sensibility is necessary for a political magazine, whereas I run a professional magazine and my sensibility therefore concerns my profession, that other kind of sensibility I do not have...”. He realised that I was probing him on thin ice to make him express himself clearly, which he could not do because I would ask him to have it in written. So, the period during which I ran the magazine, was quite a critical time actually. The editorial board was little involved, I was practically carrying it in my briefcase and made jokes about it being a “travelling editorial board”. I had neither table nor room to work. And eventually I grew sick of it. I maintained good contact with Prelog. He asked who would be the new editor and Željka Čorak was chosen for the position. You know what Prelog used to say for Željka Čorak? He called her “the nuclear power plant”. Such energy... She had energy and she was smart. She came up with the concept of the issue on Bollé. There was a symposium on Bollé and the *Život umjetnosti* published an issue on his work. It was the first time that Bollé was rehabilitated as architect.

TONKO MAROEVIĆ

“Život umjetnosti was the closest to art history, to observe contemporaneity sub specie historiae.”

Excerpts from interview conducted

on July 7, 2016

Starting from the very first issue of *Život umjetnosti*, it is difficult to find an issue in which your name does not appear, be it in the role of author, member of the editorial board or even the magazine's editor-in-chief. You have collaborated intensely with the *Život umjetnosti* from the magazine's very beginning. What are your memories of the time when the magazine first started and what made such a magazine so specific and important?

TONKO MAROEVIĆ ... It was a very interesting period, a period of renewal of interest in national art. If we will, the first issue was conceived as an attempt to define our position in Europe. It was also almost a reaction to the then actual Karaman's thesis on the triple-marking our region by periphery, border and mix of cultures. Modern art, contemporary art was going at that time through the first phase of catching up with Europe. It was more or less done in the 1950s. Geometric abstraction, new tendencies were already behind us. Zagreb caught it then, being absolutely up to

koji je iscrtao i stvarao zanimljive ornamentalno-dekorativne forme. Zoran Radović bio je beogradski umjetnik koji je olovku stavio na njihalo i njihalo je stvaralo određene, reklo bi se, valovite oblike. Mene su zanimale tehnološke i tehničke stvari. Međutim, još uvijek držim da je umjetnost stvaranje nekog autonomnog svijeta, imaginativne kompenzacije i dopune nedostatnosti naše realnosti. Nisam nadrealist, ali nadrealizmu pridajem apsolutno epohalno značenje. Časopis je imao te brojeve koji su bili znak jedne otvorenosti, jednog pluralizma, interesa za takozvani domaći, nacionalni i regionalni prostor. Prostor koji je kroz prostor uvijek djelovao. Osim vremena, likovnost je komponenta prostora. I mladi ljudi koji žive samo u svojoj aktualnosti to često previđaju. Povijest umjetnosti neslučajno ima dvostruko ime. Ima umjetnost o kojoj se uvijek pitamo i ima povijest o kojoj nešto znamo. Na razini povijesti, neću reći i faktografije i pozitivizma, stvari se sagledavaju u jednom kontekstu koji nije samo kontekst individualne imaginacije nego doista nekih kolektivnih karakteristika određene epohe. *Život umjetnosti* stavio je povjesničare umjetnosti pred probleme suvremenoga života i pred probleme specifičnosti prostora u kojemu djeluje. Zidić, Željka Čorak, Domljan, Gagro, Eugen Franković, Stojan Dimitrijević... To su ljudi koji su dali prilog razumijevanju svijeta. Likovni je medij bio njima način kojima pomažu afirmaciju

instrumenata povijesti umjetnosti. Ja u povijest umjetnosti i dandanas vjerujem koliko god se ona beskrajno mijenja. Ja ne vjerujem da se ona može pretvoriti u neku primijenjenu književnost. Argan, Bonito Oliva, to je linija koju sam ja slijedio.

Pojedini brojevi imali su specifične teme i sistemski obrađivali ili valorizirali neke pojave u likovnoj umjetnosti. Možete li izdvojiti neke?

TONKO MAROVIĆ ... Broj o nadrealizmu, recimo. U to vrijeme Hrvatska ima relativno malo nadrealizma, a nadrealizam je, skoro bi se reklo, unutar moderne avangarde bio kao prorok postmoderne. Nema morfološku jedinstvenost, nema stilsku karakteristiku, nego ima pravo na drugačiji svijet i ima pravo na kombinatoriku koja kasnije karakterizira postmodernu. U krajnjoj liniji, unutar nadrealizma, optuživalo ga se s razlogom da je morfološki i akademski. Mnogi su nadrealisti zapravo slikali, od Stančića pa nadalje, s klasičnom, gotovo bih rekao muzejskom disciplinom. Taj je broj o nadrealizmu važan, za mene, ja bih rekao, i do dana današnjeg... Brojevi posvećeni turističkoj izgradnji bili su silno aktualni. Prelog nam je doista otvorio interes za urbanizam. To je bilo silno važno, možda nema važnije stvari nego zaštita prostora. Socijalizam

date. And then we had to evaluate and see how things should proceed. Is there only one universal art, the one actual at that given moment or is there a complex layeredness. In that sense, I would say that the first issue was of a programmed concept. Božo Gagro and Igor Zidić wrote introductions, Prelog and Gamulin as well to some extent – both of the, each in his own way – felt the specificity of our region and at same time our undisputed belonging to Europe. The magazine was founded in that sense, I would say. At that time, I was still a mediaevalist, writing on topics through which I tried to enter the problematic of that deep history of art, only to later turn to contemporary art which in its way was easier for me. I started writing art reviews. Art reviews make up the largest part of my collaborations. I am a relative traditionalist. My knowledge of neo avant-garde is relative, it is even my generation, but it is not my option. My option lays in the idea of a long duration. I am a Mediterranean with a sense of continuity. The first paper I wrote was “Tradition and continuity”, published in *Telegram*. I have not changed much over the last 50 years, I am quite loyal to my starting points, despite of once having perhaps more sense for trends. In the 1950s I wrote about ornament graphics, works of art created through a machine. Before computers were introduced, this machine served to draw and create interesting ornamental and decorative forms. A Belgrade artist, Zoran Radović, created his works by putting a pencil on a pendulum which created specific waveforms.

I was interested in technological and technical things. However, I still believe that art implies creating an autonomous world, an imaginative compensation and a complement to the insufficiency of our reality. I am not surrealist, nevertheless I give an epochal significance to surrealism. The magazine offered such issues which were a sign of openness, pluralism and interest in the so-called domestic, national and regional space. Space that has always operated through space. Visual art is a component of both time and space. Young people who live only in their actuality often overlook that aspect. There is a reason why art history has a double name. There is art, on which we always ask question, and there is history on which we know something. On the history level - and I will not say the level of factography and positivism, the things are always observed within a context which is not only a context of individual imagination but one that really implies a period's collective characteristics. *Život umjetnosti* confronted art historians with the problems of contemporary life and the problems of the specificity of the environment in which it operated. Zidić, Željka Čorak, Domljan, Gagro, Eugen Franković, Stojan Dimitrijević... these people contributed to the understanding of the world. The medium of visual art was their way to help affirmation of instruments of the history of art. As much as history of art is infinitely changing, I still believe in it. I do not believe that art history can change into some form of applied literature. Argan, Bonito Oliva, I followed that line.

je stvarao određene instrumente za zaštitu prostora kakve smo unutar kapitalizma izgubili – moja mala politička nostalgija. To je bio prostor relativno slobodnog govorenja, ali nije bilo sasvim lako. Kad se Jadranska magistrala probijala, onda je Gamulin na nekom mjestu rekao da treba zaštititi prostore, čime je kao osporavao izgradnju. Onda je Tito u govoru rekao: „Neki ljudi profesor...” Gamulin je tada, 1960., predavao suvremenu arhitekturu Kenza Tangea. Bili smo vrlo „*up to date*”. Ja sam tada bio student druge godine. Povijest umjetnosti shvatila se ponajprije kao obrana prostora pa ima nešto protoekološkog... Ta naša svijest koja je tobože pasatiistička s druge je strane zapravo zaštita elementarnih vrijednosti. Tako da je časopis imao i tu funkciju, premda, naravno, ne velikog odjeka, časopis se uvijek kretao u malim krugovima recenzija. To je bila velika vrijednost i prednost da su se i arhitektura i urbanizam shvatili kao nužni elementi projekta i sudbine. To su Arganovi termini koji su nam bili silno važni. Ja sam prevodio Argana, bio sam nekoliko puta kod njega, imam čak malu korespondenciju. U dva se navrata pokušalo napraviti i nekakva salda. Ja znam da se radilo saldo 70-ih godina i nekakav saldo 80-ih. Kad je došla „nova slika”, onda smo tražili broj o „novoj slici”, transavangardi s prilozima.

Jedan od Vaših tekstova pod nazivom „S onu stranu zaglavnog kamena: nekoliko pretpostavki za raspravu o hrvatskoj likovnoj umjetnosti sedamdesetih godina” objavljen u *Životu umjetnosti* 1981. godine među ostalim problematizira 1968. godinu kao razdjelnu liniju u povijesti umjetnosti, ali i mnogo šire.

TONKO MAROEVIĆ ... I tako ja mislim doista. I tada sam doživio podgrijavanje starih stvari, što je tada bilo sablažljivo. Naime, pitanje potencijalne originalnosti, svi smo čitali Benjamina. Svijet je hipertrofirano informiran, nitko ne može početi ni iz čega. Zato je bio bijeg u naivu. U naivu su pobjegli ljudi koji su istovremeno radili kompjutore. Galerija suvremene umjetnosti i galerija primitivne – Putar, Kelemen, Bašičević bili su istovremeno na obje strane. Ja sam više za ovu emotivnu, a manje za tehnološku stranu. Za mene je umjetnost izrazito egzistencijalna kategorija vezana za čovjekovu propadljivost i čovjekovu želju da tu propadljivost nečim nadoknadi. Jugoslavija je već od 50-ih godina izabrala avangardu, jedan tip moderne umjetnosti zapadne orijentacije kao svoju legitimaciju, to je svakako pogodovalo. Ideja progressa bila je distinktivna. Ja sam sumnjao u progres i sad sumnjam u linearni progres, nikad nisam bio darvinist do kraja. Tako da mi je postmoderna na neki način dosta prirodno pala, ali ne zato da bih je shvatio kao regres. Neke

Certain issues covered specific themes and systematically dealt with or valorised some phenomena in the visual arts. Can you single out some of them?

TONKO MAROEVIĆ ... The issue on surrealism, to name one. Surrealism was relatively poorly present in Croatia at that time and within modern avant-garde surrealism was, we could almost say, somewhat of a prophet of postmodernism. It does not have a morphological uniqueness, it does not have a stylistic characteristic, but it holds a right to a different world and a combinatorics which later became characteristic for postmodern art. Ultimately, within surrealism, it was reasonably accused to be morphological and academic. Many surrealists, from Stančić and so on, actually painted with a classical museum discipline. That issue on surrealism is important. For me, it remains important even today. The magazine's issues on touristic developments were very topical. Prelog really opened our interest in urbanism. This was immensely important; perhaps nothing is as important as protection of space. Socialism created certain instruments for protection of space which we later lost in capitalism – my little political nostalgia. The freedom of speech was relatively present, but it was not so easy to do it. During the construction of Adriatic highway, Gamulin somewhere said that space should be protected, by which he in a way opposed the project. And then Tito

said in one of his speeches: “Some crazy professor...” It was in the 1960s, Gamulin taught contemporary architecture of Kenzo Tange at the time. We were very up to date, so to speak. I was on my second year at the university. The history of art was primarily understood as a way to defend a space, so there are also some proto-ecological elements... Our awareness, which is supposed to be outdated, on the other hand actually represents the protection of fundamental values. Hence, the magazine also had this other function, although of a limited echo as the magazine reached small circles of reviews. This was a great value and advantage – to have architecture and urbanism understood as indispensable elements of a project and destiny. These were Aragn's words which were very important to us. I translated Argan's papers and visited him several times; we even maintained a small correspondence. On two occasions the magazine tried to make a kind of résumé. As far as I know, they made a résumé of the 1970s and another one, of the 1980s. When *New Image* appeared, we looked up the issue on *New Image* and transavantgarde.

One of your papers, entitled “Beyond the headstone: a few assumptions for a debate on Croatian visual arts in the 1970s” and published in *Život umjetnosti* in 1981, problematizes, among other things, the year 1968 as a dividing line in the history of art and beyond.

pojave koje su izgledale da su marginalne i periferne pokazuju se iz povijesne perspektive mnogo dublje i gušće nego što su izgledale u onoj liniji neprekidnog, trajno novih -izama i tendencija. To brzo trošenje 1968. je dosta završeno. Onda nemamo nijedan morfološki sasvim novi pravac. Postoji samo način na koji se umjetnost kontekstualizira. Često za moj ukus presocijalno, ali ako je to potreba, ja se ne mogu tome suprotstaviti.

Na prostoru bivše Jugoslavije osim *Života umjetnosti* izlaze i drugi časopisi koji se bave umjetnošću, likovnošću i arhitekturom, primjerice beogradska *Umetnost*, ljubljanska *Sinteza* ili naš časopis *15 dana*...

TONKO MAROEVIĆ ... Ja sam odgojen s časopisima. Čitao sam svaki broj beogradske *Umetnosti*. U beogradskoj je sredini pisalo više umjetnika. Ovdje je više povjesničara umjetnosti, a tamo više umjetnika i tamo su profili umjetnika bili dominantni, predstavljanje pojedinih opusa. A kod nas je bila dominantna pokušaj teorijsko-kritičke interpretacije. *Sinteza* je bila bliska arhitektima. Časopis *15 dana*, vrlo dobar. Opet, on je sačuvao slobodu, s jednim humorom glavnoga urednika. Katkad bi slikovna dokumentacija bila izvanredna, iz svijeta. Oni su imali tu andragošku funkciju okretanja

javnosti koja nije stručna, a opet... *Život umjetnosti* bio je najbliže povijesti umjetnosti, suvremenost gledati *sub specie historiae*. Mislim da je to bila ambicija i da je to jednim velikim dijelom ostvareno, osobito u tim brojevima koje možemo pamtit. Prvi časopis na ovim prostorima koji je bio temeljno povijesnoumjetnički.

present is a way to contextualise art, which is often over social for my taste, but if such is the need, I cannot oppose it.

On the territory of the former Yugoslavia, alongside *Život umjetnosti*, other magazine were also published, dealing with art, visuality and architecture, such as *Umetnost* in Belgrade, *Sinteza* in Ljubljana or Croatian magazine *15 dana*...

TONKO MAROEVIĆ ... I grew up reading those magazines. I read every issue of *Umetnost*. Artists in Belgrade were more active in writing. Here we have more art historians, whereas Belgrade has more artists, the artist profile and presentation of individual work was more dominant. An attempt of a theoretical and critical interpretation was dominant in Zagreb. *Sinteza* was close to architects. The magazine *15 days* was very good, specific for keeping its freedom and the editor-in-chief's sense of humour. The visual documentation was sometimes excellent, with contributions from all over the world. They had this andragogic function of shifting the non-professional public and yet... *Život umjetnosti* was the closest to art history, to observe the contemporaneity *sub specie historiae*. I think it was the ambition, and it was partly achieved, especially in these issues that we can remember. It was the first magazine in the region that was basically art-historical.

TONKO MAROEVIĆ ... And I really think so. At that point, I witnessed to old things being reheated, which was scandalous at the time. Namely, the question of potential originality, we were all reading Benjamin. The world was informed in a "hypertrophied" manner, no one can begin from nothing. This resulted in escape to naïve art. Those who escaped to naïve art were people who were simultaneously involved in developing computers. The Contemporary art Gallery and the Primitive art gallery, Putar, Kelemen, Bašičević, they were at the same time active on both sides. I prefer more the emotional side to the technological one. For me art is a very existential category closely related to human's decay and desire to compensate this decay with something. Yugoslavia chose the avant-garde already in the 1950s, a West-oriented type of modern art, which surely made its contribution. The idea of progress was distinctive. I doubted progress and today I doubt linear progress, I have never been a Darwinist in the full sense. Therefore, postmodernity felt quite natural to me, but not so as to understand it as regress. Some phenomena that seemed marginal and peripheral are shown in historical perspective as much deeper and thicker than they appeared in the line of the continuous, of permanently new -isms and tendencies. The 1968 was rapidly exhausted and I have not seen a single morphologically entirely new direction since. The only thing

ZVONKO MAKOVIĆ**„Život umjetnosti bio je komplementaran”**

*Isječci iz razgovora vođenog
22. kolovoza 2016.*

U *Životu umjetnosti* počeli ste objavljivati tekstove od najranijih brojeva, a tri godine, od 1989. do 1991., radili ste i kao glavni urednik. Kako kontekstualizirate pojavu ovakvog časopisa 1960-ih godina i što je njegova pojava značila za struku u to vrijeme?

ZVONKO MAKOVIĆ ... Dakle, ja se časopisa sjećam zaista od najranijih dana, od početaka. Kad je prvi broj izašao ja sam upisao studij i počeo ga odmah pratiti. Vrlo brzo, za dvije-tri godine, postao sam suradnik. Časopis je vodio moj tadašnji profesor, asistent Božo Gagro, koji mi je kasnije postao kolega i prijatelj i časopis je imao vrlo važnu promotivnu ulogu da razgovara na jedan potpuno novi način o povijesti umjetnosti zahvaćene u cjelini. Dakle, tu su išle od srednjovjekovnih i urbanističkih tema pa sve do aktualnih. Jedan od prvih tekstova, i vrlo važnih, Gagrin, bio je posvećen Hrvatskom proljetnom salonu. Zatim je tu bilo apstrakcije, zatim je časopis otvarao čitav niz drugih tema. Mislim da ih je i apsolvirao za svoje

vrijeme na primjeren način. Ali ono što je također bila važna stvar to je praćenje izložaba. To je nešto što je, ja mislim, vrlo važno za takvu periodiku – da se izložbe negdje registriraju, da one imaju svoj povijesni kontekst.

U isto vrijeme izlazili su slični časopisi; u Beogradu *Umetnost*, u Ljubljani *Sinteza*. To je doba bilo sasvim drugačije iz političkog, društvenog ili kulturnog konteksta. Bili smo jedinstvena zemlja. Izlazile su i vrlo dobre tjedne novine za kulturu. *Telegram* je u to doba izlazio i redovito pratio sve izložbe koje su bile u Zagrebu. Zatim, ono što danas zaboravljamo i što je nama danas apsolutno neshvatljivo, a to je da su postojale dnevne novine s enormno visokom tiražom, da je postojao *Večernji list*, *Vjesnik* i takozvani omladinski listovi. Postojao je *Studentski list* s nešto dužom tradicijom. 1969. godine, točno nakon šezdesetosmaških događanja, pokreću se dva druga tjedna lista. Jedan koji pokreće Gradski komitet, to je *Omladinski tjednik*, i drugi, *Kolo*, koji pokreće Republički komitet, gdje su se također vodile kronike. Ali to je nešto što se smatralo potrošnom robom, što je bilo ograničenog vremenskog trajanja, nešto što prati izložbu čim se ona otvori, da je se komentira... *A Život umjetnosti* bio je zapravo komplementaran. On je birao, nije se o svim izložbama pisalo. Birao je značajnije izložbe pa se onda to napisalo jer se računalo da je to nešto što ostaje

145

ZVONKO MAKOVIĆ**„Život umjetnosti was complementary”**

*Excerpts from the interview conducted
on August 22, 2016*

You started to write for *Život umjetnosti* already in its very first issues and in the period between 1989 and 1991 you were the magazine's editor-in-chief. How do you contextualise the appearance of such a magazine in the 1960s and what did it represent for the profession at that time?

ZVONKO MAKOVIĆ ... My memories of the magazine go long back in time, to its very beginning. I enrolled in my first year at the university when the first issues were published and immediately started to follow it. Very quickly, within two-three years, I joined the magazine's team of collaborators. The magazine was run by my then professor, Božo Gagro, who later became my colleague and friend. The *Život umjetnosti* played a very important promoting role; it talked about the history of art in a completely new way, in a whole. It included a variety of topics, from middle-age and urbanism topics to then current ones. One of the first and very important articles, written by Gagro, dealt with the Croatian Spring Salon. Then there was abstraction, the magazine opened an array of various topics. I think

the magazine also absolved them in what was a convenient way for that time. Exhibition coverage was also very important. I believe it is very important for such publication to register such exhibitions, to give them a historical context. Other, similar magazines were also active during those years; *Umetnost* in Belgrade, *Sinteza* in Ljubljana. It was an entirely different period in regard to the political, social or cultural context. We were a unique country. We also had very good weekly publications for culture. *Telegram* was active during those years and covered regularly all exhibitions in Zagreb. Another thing, which we tend to forget and cannot understand today, is that daily newspapers had a huge print run back then, there was *Večernji list*, *Vjesnik* and the so-called youth newspapers. There was *Studentski list*, with a somewhat longer tradition than other publications. In the year 1969, exactly after the '68 events, another two weekly publications appeared, *Omladinski tjednik* founded by the City Committee and *Kolo*, started by the Republican Committee, where chronicles were also run. However, this was considered as expendable goods, of a limited life span, something to cover an exhibition as soon as it opens... *Život umjetnosti* was in fact complementary. The magazine did not cover every exhibition, the editors chose the most significant ones to write about, and it was considered as something of a longer value. In those years, when there was no television or Internet, the magazine had a very

za duže vrijeme. U vrijeme kad nije bilo televizije, kad nije bilo interneta, časopis je imao vrlo ozbiljnu misiju. On je, dakle, aktualne događaje komentirao, ali računajući da će ti komentari imati i svoju povijesnu težinu. Da će se na njih moći referirati.

Tiraže i naklade bile su mnogo veće, ali se i medij likovne kritike do danas bitno promijenio.

ZVONKO MAKOVIĆ ... O da, ja ne znam kolika je naklada bila u *Životu umjetnosti*, tisuću primjeraka uvrh glave. Ako vam kažem da je *Studentski list* u kojem sam radio imao mislim 12 000 1971. godine; da je *Vjesnik u srijedu* imao ne znam koliko tisuća; da je kasnije, krajem 80-ih godina, tjednik *Danas* zaista bio ravan *Nouvel Observateuru* ili bilo kojem drugom vanjskom tjedniku; da je imao nakladu negdje oko 340 000...

Ali s druge strane nije bilo društvenih mreža, nije bilo interneta i sve što je postojalo bilo je na papiru. Ja ne žalim za tim vremenom, ali ga cijenim jer je imalo neku ozbiljnost, jer je imalo težinu. Danas se sve promatra kao društveni događaj, kao virtualno. Ja se opirem tome, iako sam cijelo vrijeme na internetu, iako sve čitam na internetu, ali za neku ozbiljniju stvar to nije dovoljno. Hoću reći, upravo je na kritici važnost da distribuirao događaj koji nije samo društveni

događaj. Tko je došao na otvorenje, to je potpuno irelevantno, nego koje su posljedice ostavljene. Likovna kritika bila je jasno profilirana, znalo se što se piše u *Vjesniku*, *Večernjem listu*. Stavovi tih kritičara bili su poznati. *Vjesnik* je bio ono što je imalo legitimitet države. *Telegram* je, recimo, bio pomalo alternativan. *Studentski list* isto. I imali smo maksimalnu slobodu. Ali da bismo mi tu slobodu dobili, očito da su bili potrebni neki drugi preduvjeti. Ne govorimo samo o likovnoj umjetnosti već i o filmu. Film je bio najmoćniji. Film i književnost. Likovna je umjetnost bila, ruku na srce, benigna. Sve je to imalo manje rezonancije, društvene i političke, u odnosu na književnost i pogotovo film.

Život umjetnosti među ostalim afirmira suvremene umjetnike, o njima je redovito pisao Ješa Denegri. Vi također rano počinjete pratiti najnovija zbivanja na likovnoj sceni 1970-ih godina i objavljivati u časopisu.

ZVONKO MAKOVIĆ ... Sjećam se, prvi moj tekst bio je o Saši Srncu, o Richteru, o Novim tendencijama, o konceptualnoj umjetnosti... Na primjer sadašnja generacija, recimo eufemistički, mlađe starije dobi, današnji 70-godišnjaci – od Borisa Bućana, Sanje Iveković, Dalibora Martinisa, Brace Dimitrijevića, Gorana Trbuljaka, Jagode Kaloper... To je moja

important mission of commenting the current events, all the while keeping in mind that these comments would have their historical weight; they could serve as reference in the future.

Print runs were much larger back then, and the medium of visual arts has fundamentally changed today.

ZVONKO MAKOVIĆ ... Oh yes, I do not know what was *Život umjetnosti* print run at that time, a thousand copies perhaps. *Studentski list*, where I worked, had a print run of 12000 copies in 1971, the Wednesday edition of *Vjesnik* ran in I do not know how many thousand copies; in late 1980s the weekly newspapers *Danas* ran in around 340000 copies, a print run that could match *Nouvel Observateur* or any other foreign weekly publication... On the other hand, there were no social networks or Internet, everything was on paper. I do not regret that time, yet I appreciate it because it was serious in a way, there was a certain weight about it. Today everything is observed as a social event, as something virtual. I defy it, even though I am constantly *online* and read everything on the Internet, but it does not suffice for something more serious. What I am trying to say is that the critique is important in distributing an event which is not a mere social event. Who came to the exhibition opening is completely irrelevant, the consequences are what matters. The art critique was clearly profiled,

we knew what would the critics in *Vjesnik* or *Večernji list* write, their viewpoints were well-known. *Vjesnik* was considered as a “state-newspaper”, *Telegram* and *Studentski list* were more alternative. And we had absolute freedom. But in order to have that freedom, it was obviously necessary to meet some other preconditions. Here I do not refer only to the visual arts, but to the film as well. The film was the most powerful. Film and literature. Visual arts were benign, to tell the truth. Compared to literature and film, all of it socially and politically resonated less.

Život umjetnosti, among other things, affirms young artists, Ješa Denegri regularly wrote about them. You also started quite early to follow and write about the newest events on the visual arts scene in the 1970s.

ZVONKO MAKOVIĆ ... I recall my first paper, it was about Saša Srnc, New tendencies and conceptual art... The then young generation, they are 70-year old today, Boris Bućan, Sanja Iveković, Dalibor Martinis, Braco Dimitrijević, Goran Trbuljak, Jagoda Kaloper, they are 70-year old today... this is my generation, we studied and spent time and our formative years together. It was thus very normal to follow each other's work.

generacija, zajedno smo studirali, zajedno smo se družili, formirali smo se zajedno. Najnormalnije je bilo da smo se i pratili.

Riječ je o generaciji koju se nerijetko povezuje s izvaninstitucionalnim umjetničkim praksama, ali su je istovremeno poticale, prepoznavale i afirmirale brojne institucije, voditelji galerija i kustosi. Među ostalim, i *Život umjetnosti* redovito je ostavljao prostora za suvremenu umjetnost.

ZVONKO MAKOVIĆ ... Pojam institucionaliziranje pojedinim je tim mojim prijateljima generacijskim stran. Ne zaboravimo da nisu oni bili nikakva margina, da su oni kao 23-godišnjaci, 25-godišnjaci dobili izložbu u najelitnijem prostoru. Davor Matičević radi *Mogućnosti za 71.*; prije toga su imali samostalne izložbe; o njima smo pisali i Matičević i ja i Košćević; i ušli su u muzej. I od tog momenta počinje njihovo institucionaliziranje. Istog časa dobar ravnatelj, dobro vodstvo Galerije suvremene umjetnosti, budućeg muzeja, s Božom Bekom, Borisom Kelemenom, Radoslavom Putarom – otkupljuju te radove. Dovoljno je pogledati samo inventarnu knjigu. Hrvatska suvremena umjetnost ili novija povijest umjetnosti može se najbolje promatrati ako se gleda inventarne knjige. Kako je što otkupljivo, za koja sredstva, to je nešto što je isto danas nezamislivo, a mi smo

kao kritičari to pratili i tražili smo da se negdje to afirmira, tražili smo prostor za sebe, što je legitimno za svakog mladog čovjeka. Ne zaboravimo da smo imali 23, 24 godine.

Od 1981. godine osim suradnika postajete i član uredništva. Kako je funkcionirao rad uredništva i koje Vas teme u to vrijeme zanimaju?

ZVONKO MAKOVIĆ ... Nije se u to doba baš pazilo, glavni urednik je netko morao biti. Ali se timski radilo. Sad si ti, sad ću ja, nije bila tako striktna podjela. Naš stariji kolega Božidar Gagro, meni stariji, njima ne – on je bio glavni urednik, to se znalo, to je bila posebna misija. Ali kad smo mi došli negdje 70-ih, 80-ih, u toj redakciji u kojoj sam ja bio tada se to timski radilo. Dogovorili smo se, sad bismo mogli otvoriti tu temu, sad bismo mogli drugu. Ja sam u to doba krenuo s postmodernom, *novom slikom*, transavangardom. To me zainteresiralo, jer sam pratio i upoznao jednu drugu generaciju 70-ih godina koja je tada bila još na Akademiji, koja je krenula s nečim što je isto tada bilo vrlo aktualno, što sam ja prepoznao kroz svoju generaciju, konceptualnu umjetnost. To je primarno, analitičko slikarstvo. Onda sam vidio da ti mladi ljudi na Akademiji; Sokić, Bijelić, Rašić, Kipke, Maračić, Molnar... rade nešto na tome tragu. Ni to nije imalo dugog vijeka, to je mene naprosto zasitilo i javila se jedna druga generacija koja je oponirala

That generation is often related to non-institutional art practices, but they were at the same time encouraged, recognised and affirmed by numerous institutions, gallery directors and curators. *Život umjetnosti* regularly devoted some of its pages to contemporary art.

ZVONKO MAKOVIĆ ... The notion of *institutionalisation* was foreign to some of my generation friends. Let us not forget that they were not marginalised, at the age of 23-25 they had the opportunity to exhibit in the most elite exhibition space. Davor Matičević did *Mogućnosti for 71*; the held independent exhibitions prior to it; Matičević, Košćević and I wrote about them; and they entered a museum. That moment marked the beginning of their institutionalisation. At the same moment, a good director and the good leadership of the Contemporary Art Gallery (which would later become a museum) with Božo Bek, Boris Kelemen and Radoslav Putar – bought these works. Suffice it to take a look at the inventory books. The inventory books provide the best insight into Croatian contemporary art or its recent history of art. How certain works of art were bought and for how much, this is unimaginable today, yet we as critics followed it and wanted it to be recognised; we wanted to have our place, which is legitimate for every young individual. Let us not forget that we were 23, 24 years old at the time.

In the year 1981 you became a part of the editorial board. How did the editorial board function and what topics were you interested in at the time?

ZVONKO MAKOVIĆ ... We did not pay much attention to it back then, someone had to be the editor-in-chief. But there was team-work. Now you'll do it, now I'll do it, our work was not strictly divided. Our senior colleague, Božidar Gagro, senior to me, not to them – was the editor-in-chief, it was well-known and it was a special mission. But it transformed into a team-work when we joined the editorial board in the 1970s, 1980s. We would all agree together on which topic we could open. During that time, I started writing on post-modern art, New Image Painting and transavangarde. I became interested in it because I was following another generation in the 1970s who was still studying at the Academy and started something that was also very actual at the time, which I recognised through my generation, the conceptual art. This is primary, analytical painting. I realised that these young people at the Academy; Sokić, Bijelić, Rašić, Kipke, Maračić, Molnar... were doing something along that line. However, that also did not last very long, I simply grew tired of it and a new generation appeared who opposed it all. This generation discovered "the joy of painting", as it was pathetically referred to at the time, bringing in a story, emotions and coincidence. In the year

svemu tome, koja je otkrila „radost slikanja”, kako se to tada patetično govorilo, unoseći priču, emocije, slučajnost, a ne unaprijed smišljeno. Onda sam 1981. napravio izložbu *nove slike*. Uredio sam jedan tematski broj posvećen *novoj slici*. Štoviše, izdali smo kao separat sve te tekstove gdje sam izabrao tekstove stranih kolega i ja sam napisao svoj tekst. Ranih 80-ih...

DARJA RADOVIĆ MAHEČIĆ

„Postoji nešto više od kronologije”

Isječci iz razgovora vođenog

28. kolovoza 2016.

Vaš prvi tekst u *Životu umjetnosti* objavljen je 1989. godine i, za razliku od nekih starijih kolega i bivših urednika, nešto ste kasnije počeli surađivati u časopisu. Možete li se, međutim, osvrnuti općenito na društvenu klimu i kontekst 1960-ih godina, u vrijeme osnivanja časopisa, kao i na njegovu važnost za struku godinama kasnije?

DARJA
RADOVIĆ
MAHEČIĆ

... Dakle, u trenutku kada se pojavio *Život umjetnosti* 60-ih godina, umjetnički je časopis kao medij bila jedna vrlo priznata i raširena forma. 60-ih godina umjetnički je časopis medij broj jedan, bilo domaći bilo inozemni, za distribuciju misli, ideja. To je jedan procvat časopisa. Obično se uspoređujemo s nekim drugim našim poznatim časopisima, to je prije svega *Čovjek i prostor* koji je bio i novine i revija, puno ambiciozniji jer je želio izlaziti kao polumjesečnik u početku, kasnije se stabilizirao kao mjesečnik. *Život umjetnosti*, koliko god da se pojavio u trenutku kad je bila velika potreba za časopisom, ipak je pucao na puno uži krug ljudi.

148

1981, I curated the exhibition *New Image Painting*. I also prepared a thematic issue dedicated to the *New Image Painting*. Moreover, all of these papers were published in a separate publication, for which I chose texts written by foreign colleagues and wrote an article myself. It was back in the early 1980s...

DARJA RADOVIĆ MAHEČIĆ

“There is more than a chronology”

Excerpts from interview conducted

on August 28, 2016

Unlike some of your senior colleagues and former editors, your collaboration with the magazine started later – your first article in *Život umjetnosti* was published in 1989. However, can you reflect on the social climate and the context of the 1960s in general, the time when the magazine was founded, as well as to the magazine’s importance for the profession in the years that followed?

DARJA
RADOVIĆ
MAHEČIĆ

... When *Život umjetnosti* appeared in the 1960s, the medium of art magazine was already a very recognised and well-spread form. During the 1960s, the art magazine, domestic or international, was the number one medium to distribute thoughts and ideas. It was a blooming time for magazines. We usually compare ourselves to some of our other well-known magazine, primarily to *Čovjek i prostor*, which was both a newspaper and a magazine. *Čovjek i prostor* was much more ambitious as its editors’ first intention was to publish it biweekly, later it stabilised into a monthly periodical. *Život umjetnosti*, although launched in a moment of a large need for a magazine, aimed at a much narrower circle of readers. The art historians were

Povjesničari umjetnosti svakako su imali veći utjecaj 60-ih godina negoli imaju danas. To je bilo respektabilno zanimanje. Umjetničke kritike bile su česte i utemeljene na znanstvenim istraživanjima. Utjecaj takvih kritika, baš zato što se nije previše publiciralo, bio je puno dalekosežniji. Svaka ozbiljnija izložba imala je svoju ozbiljnu kritiku u raznim medijima, a u umjetničkim časopisima ona je bila obavezna. Dakle *Život umjetnosti* je na početku, svakako odraz vremena. Međutim, tim rijetkim ritmom izlaženja *Život umjetnosti* nije se nametnuo kao recimo *ČIP*, kao aktualno. On je okupljao tekstove koji su pokušali objediniti jedno razdoblje ili možda prikazati monografski malo ambicioznije stvaralaštvo jednoga autora ili grupe autora. A s druge strane, našlo se mjesta i za kritiku kakve izložbe ili vrijedne publikacije. I na taj jedan rahli način, ali uvijek s vrlo zanimljivim autorima, taj je časopis krenuo svoj život.

Kako je i kada započela Vaša suradnja s časopisom?

DARJA
RADOVIĆ
MAHEČIĆ ... 1985. godine postala sam vanjska suradnica Instituta za povijest umjetnosti, međutim ovdje je u fokusu bila graditeljska baština. Treba spomenuti da je apsolutno centralna figura Instituta za povijest umjetnosti, kasnije, naravno, izdavača *Života umjetnosti*, bila graditeljska baština i profesor Milan Prelog. On je, dakle, 1975.

upravo u *Životu umjetnosti* objavio članak „Grad kao umjetničko djelo“. To je utjecalo na sve nas, na cijeli Institut od 70-ih godina nadalje, a mi u 80-im godinama koji smo se približili tom istraživanju u Institutu svakako smo osjetili te njegove metode. On je inaugurirao novi model integralne topografske obrade povijesnih urbanih sredina. Treba znati, dakle, 80-ih je hrvatska i općenito jugoslavenska kulturna scena intenzivna, vrlo zanimljiva. Postojala je, rekli bismo, zdrava konkurencija između Zagreba, Beograda, Ljubljane i Sarajeva. Plečnik izlazi izvan granica Jugoslavije. Velike kazališne predstave, *novi val* u muzici i likovnost. To su vrlo intenzivne i zanimljive godine. *Život umjetnosti* prati ta zbivanja, međutim, u svom jednogodišnjem tempu, jer i dalje je to bio otprilike tempo izlaženja. Profesor Maković koji je bio mlađi i nama bliži, poticao nas je da se prijavimo u neki časopis, objavimo neki tekst. I kako je on 1989. bio urednik *Života umjetnosti*, nas par studenata koji smo tada bili na radiju pozvao je da neke od tekstova objavimo u *Životu umjetnosti*. Tako smo negdje na mala vrata prišli i *Životu umjetnosti*.

Vaš rad u časopisu iz pozicije glavne urednice traje od 1992. do 1999. godine, u jednom od najturbulentnijih i najkritičnijih razdoblja od osnutka časopisa. Kako su se manifestirale brojne političke i društvene promjene na struku, Vaš rad i vođenje časopisa?

undoubtedly much more influential in the 1960s than they are today. It was a respectable profession. Art reviews were frequent and based on scientific research. Their influence, precisely because there was not much publication, was more far-reaching. Every serious exhibition was accompanied by a serious review in various media, and such reviews were mandatory for art magazines. Therefore, *Život umjetnosti* absolutely reflects its own time. However, with such a rare rhythm of publication, *Život umjetnosti* could not impose itself as *ČIP* [Čovjek i prostor] did, as something actual. The magazine assembled articles that tried to unite a period or perhaps to present in a monographic way a more ambitious work of an author or a group of authors. On the other hand, there was also room for a review of an exhibition or a relevant publication. In such a friable way, but always with interesting topics, the magazine started its life.

How and when did you start to collaborate with the magazine?

DARJA
RADOVIĆ
MAHEČIĆ ... In the year 1985, I became the external associate at the Institute for Art History, however its focus was on architectural heritage. We need to mention that architectural heritage and professor Milan Prelog were the central figure at the Institute for Art History, the future publisher of *Život umjetnosti*. In the year 1975, *Život umjetnosti* published Prelog's article "City as a work of

art". This has influenced us all, the entire Institute from the 1970s onwards. My colleagues from the Institute and I felt his methods when we approached this research in the 1980s. Prelog introduced a new model of integral topographic analysis of historical urban centres. It should be known that the 1980s were a very intensive and lively period for culture scene in Croatia and Yugoslavia in general. There was a healthy competition between Zagreb, Belgrade, Ljubljana and Sarajevo. Plečnik even works beyond the borders of Yugoslavia. Great theatrical performances, New wave in music and visuality. Those were very intensive and interesting years. *Život umjetnosti* followed it, although in its own annual pace because it continued to be its pace of publication. Professor Maković, who was younger and closer to us, encouraged us to apply to write for a magazine, to publish an article. As he was the magazine's editor-in-chief, in 1989 he invited us, several students who were active on the radio at that time, to publish some of our articles in *Život umjetnosti*. Hence, we entered the *Život umjetnosti*.

You were the magazine's editor-in-chief from 1992 until 1999; which was one of the most turbulent and the most critical periods since the magazine's foundation. How did numerous political and social changes manifested on the profession and your work in running the magazine?

DARJA
RADOVIĆ
MAHEČIĆ

... Cijeli je Institut nastao oko proučavanja graditeljske baštine. Nakon što je Milan Prelog umro 1988. godine, generacija njegovih najbližijih suradnika (iz Instituta ću samo navesti), odlazi, naprasno, u roku od par godina. Žarko Domljan odlazi u Sabor, Marija Planić Lončarić odlazi u prijevremenu mirovinu i vrlo brzo umire. Nada Grujić odlazi iz Instituta na Odsjek za povijest umjetnosti Filozofskog fakulteta. Biserka Tadić odlazi u prijevremenu mirovinu, Eugen Franković je malo poguran u mirovinu, Josip Stošić par godina poslije također odlazi u mirovinu. I onda se dešava krajem 90-ih da neke novoprimitljene kolegice počinju govoriti; povijest umjetnosti i arhitektura. A znamo da je Prelogova ideja bila; da, povijest umjetnosti, ali povijest umjetnosti jest arhitektura, kiparstvo, slikarstvo, a onda sve ostalo. Dakle, taj jedan veliki rez, ne samo u našoj struci koja se nakon toga jako počinje specijalizirati, ne samo u našoj državi. Radeći tada *Život umjetnosti* bili smo ne samo mladi nego nismo se još vidjeli u povijesti i to je bila možda naša najveća snaga i kvaliteta. Živjeti u trenutku. Nismo vidjeli kakva će biti budućnost. U tom kontekstu uređivanje *Života umjetnosti* živjelo je od entuzijazma. Bilo nam je drago okupiti sve generacije, nismo bili ekskluzivni. Od starih suradnika pa do potpuno mladih ljudi. Jedini je možda negativan komentar koji sam tih godina dobila – zašto Ješa Denegri još

objavljuje u *Životu umjetnosti*. Apsolutno je tu puno argumenata zašto objavljuje – jer je prije objavljivao i objavljivat će i poslije, jer je bio stalni izvršni suradnik toga časopisa. Možemo biti samo ponosni da je i tih godina ostao s nama, trebali smo mi njega kao što je on trebao nas.

Svojevrsnim iskazom vremena o kojem govorite možemo promatrati 51. broj *Života umjetnosti* iz 1992. godine, izdanje koje je gotovo misijski zaokruženo i posvećeno problematici rata, vremenu i prostoru izvanrednog stanja i propadanja na svim planovima.

DARJA
RADOVIĆ
MAHEČIĆ

... Meni se čini da su te 90-e još bile jedno relativno iskreno razdoblje, barem iskrenog čuđenja. Jedno fer razdoblje. Možda se vidi i u tom *Životu umjetnosti*; profesori tipa Ivančević pisali su neke molbe za pomoć. Željka Čorak je tražila pažnju međunarodne javnosti. Mi nismo mogli vjerovati da nam se to dešava. Povijest umjetnosti s tim Dubrovnikom koji je UNESCO-ovoj listi da netko puca po njemu i ništa se ne zbiva... To sve ide protiv onog što ste učili na fakultetu. Mi smo ipak htjeli ići s brojem. Bilo bi ludo ne reći ništa o tome što se oko nas tada dešava. Naravno da izvještaji s neke izložbe tada nisu više bili uopće zanimljivi za izvještavanje jer se nismo mogli načuditi tim promjenama. Danas

DARJA
RADOVIĆ
MAHEČIĆ

... The entire Institute was built around the architectural heritage research. After Milan Prelog died in 1988, a generation of his closest associates also left, suddenly, within several years. Žarko Domljan went to the Parliament, Marija Planić Lončarić went to early retirement and died very shortly afterwards. Nada Grujić left the Institute and transferred to the Department for Art History at the Faculty of Humanities and Social sciences in Zagreb. Biserka Tadić went to early retirement, Eugen Franković was a bit “pushed into” his retirement, several year later Josip Stošić also retired. And then, in the late 1990s some of the newly-accepted colleagues started to speak; history of art and architecture. And we know that Prelog’s idea was; yes, history of art, but history of art primarily implies architecture, sculpture, painting and then everything else. So, there was this big cut, not only in our profession which afterwards started to become very specialized, not only in our country. While working at *Život umjetnosti* during those years, we were not only young, but we had not yet seen ourselves in history, and that was perhaps our biggest strength and quality. To live in the moment. We did not see what the future would be like. In such a context, the editing process of *Život umjetnosti* was bursting with enthusiasm. We were glad to gather all generations, we were not exclusive. We worked with both old collaborators and very young individuals. The only negative Remarque I was given in those years was – why was Ješa Denegri still

publishing in the *Život umjetnosti*. There is plenty of arguments as to why – because he published before and will continue to publish, because he was an outstanding contributor to *Život umjetnosti*. We can only be proud to have him remained with us during those years, we needed him as much as he needed us.

Through a certain expression of time, which you mention, we can approach the 51st issue of *Život umjetnosti*, published in 1992. This issue was almost like a mission, dedicated to the problematic of war, time and space of emergency and decay in all aspects.

DARJA
RADOVIĆ
MAHEČIĆ

... For me the 1990s were a relatively sincere period, a period of sincere amazement at least. A fair period. This we can perhaps notice in that particular issue of *Život umjetnosti*; professors, such as Ivančević, wrote aid requests. Željka Čorak sought the international public attention. We could not believe what was happening to us. The history of Art and Dubrovnik, a city listed by UNESCO, to have someone shoot and bomb it and nothing is happening... It was against all what you have studied at the university. However, we wanted to publish the issue. It would have been crazy to remain silent about what was happening around us at that time. Of course, exhibition reports were no longer interesting to write about because we were bewildered by the changes that were taking place. When I

kad o tome razmišljam, i ti profesori, od Radovana Ivančevića do nas početnika... Nikome nije bilo ispod časti početi se baviti takvim agitiranjem, jer to je bilo zapravo agitiranje za pažnju – „Gledajte što nam se dešava, je li to moguće?”

Osim borbe za sam opstanak časopisa, postojala je i konstantna borba za vidljivost i čitatelje. Kako je zatvaranje na političkom planu utjecalo na distribuciju i medijaciju časopisa?

DARJA
RADVIĆ
MAHEČIĆ ... Osim toga, to je i početak kraja knjižara. Devedesete su godine su vrijeme kada se knjižare polako gase. Časopisi se nesigurno financiraju ako se uopće financiraju. Dobivate sugestiju da se treba tržišno orijentirati, dakle tražiti sponzore. S druge strane mi postajemo jedna vrlo zatvorena sredina, časopis izlazi u smiješnim nakladama od par stotinjaka primjeraka. Mi vidimo, ako želimo predstavljati svoju umjetnost, ako želimo pisati o svojoj umjetnosti, mora se nešto napraviti, mora se moći prodrijeti do nekog čitača tamo negdje izvan Hrvatske i zato počinjemo polako uvoditi engleski jezik. Potpuno su se izmijenila pravila distribucije časopisa, tko se time bavi, zašto se time bavi, počele su postojati privatne knjižare, međutim to ide vrlo slabo. Sama priprema časopisa, tehnološki proces tih se godina vrlo izmijenio. Nama je u

Životu umjetnosti 90-ih možda najviše falila brzina. Stvari su se vrlo brzo počele mijenjati, željeli smo brzo reagirati na neke stvari. Rat se nije mogao maknuti iz našega očista i to je nešto čime smo svi bili zaokupljeni. Bilo bi najjednostavnije da se, recimo, časopis zatvorio, da smo osnovali jedan novi časopis, napravili manifest, jedan generacijski časopis, krenuli od nule. Nismo to htjeli. Htjeli smo kontinuitet, htjeli smo nastaviti nešto što se brižno radilo u raznim kombinacijama, htjeli smo nastaviti s nečim u što je već uloženo do tada puno truda. Mi smo bili naraštaj koji sada radi i djeluje, u trenutku. Koji sada pokušava napraviti časopis, oblikovati se u kulturi koja se raspadala, čije su norme bile i nejasne i promjenjive, vrijednosti nesigurne, s jedne strane rasplinute, s druge strane previše krute. Jednostavno postoji nešto više od kronologije, a to je upravo taj kontinuitet, barem prebacivanje te štafete s jednog na drugog. Neka *Život umjetnosti* postane nešto drugo i nešto treće... Ali već to da netko predaje tu palicu iz ruke u ruku, ja mislim da je to vrijedno toga truda.

think about it today, all professors, from Radovan Ivančević to us – beginners back then..., no one felt it “below his dignity” to start to agitate in such a way, for it was in fact an agitation for attention – look what is happening to us, can this be possible.

Apart from the struggle for the magazine’s survival, there was also a constant struggle for visibility and readers. In what way the political closure affected the magazine’s distribution and mediation?

DARJA
RADVIĆ
MAHEČIĆ ... Not only that, that moment also marked the beginning of the end of the bookstores. The bookstores started to close in the 1990s. Financing a magazine, if there was any financing to begin with, was very unstable. You realize at that point that you need to orientate towards the market, that is to say, to search for sponsors. On the other hand, we became a closed environment, with *Život umjetnosti* being published in a ridiculous run of several hundred copies. We were aware that something had to be done. If we want to represent our art and write about it, we need to be able to reach a reader outside of Croatia and therefore we slowly started to introduce English language. The rules of magazine distribution changed completely, who does it and why, private bookstores were launched but with not much results. The technological process of

preparing a magazine greatly changed during those years. Speed was what we perhaps lacked the most at *Život umjetnosti*. Things began to change rapidly; we wanted to react swiftly/quickly to some things. We could not remove the war from our viewpoint, it occupied us all. It would have been the simplest to, let us say, shut down the magazine and to found a new one, to make a manifesto, a generation magazine, to start from the scratch. We did not want to do that. We wanted continuity - we wanted to continue something that was carefully done in various combinations. We wanted to continue something into what many efforts had already been invested. We were a generation to act now, in the moment. A generation that was trying to make a magazine, to form itself in a culture that was falling apart, whose norms were both unclear and changeable, whose values were unsteady, at the same time fuzzy and too rigid. There is simply something more than a chronology, this continuity, or at least the process of “passing the relay stick” from one to another. *Život umjetnosti* can transform into something else... But, already to have someone pass it from one hand to another, I believe it is worth the effort.

Translated by Ivana Bertić