

ARHITEKTONSKE PRAKSE POSLIJERATNE BOSNE I HERCEGOVINE I ODнос PREMA NASLIJEĐU IZ RAZDOBLJA SOCIJALIZMA



NINA
STEVANOVIC

ARCHITECTURAL PRACTICES IN POST-WAR BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA: THE TREATMENT OF SOCIALIST LEGACY

PREGLEDNI RAD / REVIEW ARTICLE

PREDAN / RECEIVED: 28. 1. 2014.**PRIHVAĆEN / ACCEPTED:** 2. 4. 2014.**UDK / UDC:** 72(497.6):[316.323.72:159.953]

SAŽETAK: Pitanje odnosa suvremenih poslijeratnih arhitektonskih praksi u Bosni i Hercegovini prema vrijednostima modernog i postmodernog arhitektonskog naslijeđa nastalog u razdoblju socijalizma u fokusu je ovoga rada, pri čemu je vrednovanje značajki danog naslijeđa sagledano u odnosu triju uočenih pravaca u kojima se razvija suvremeni bosansko-hercegovački arhitektonski diskurs: prvo je tu jezik „čiste“ postmoderne, zatim su tu neopovijesne, tj. neoelektričke tendencije i na kraju pristup koji se oslanja na smjernice kritičkog regionalizma. Uspostavljanje odnosa između suvremenih arhitektonskih diskursa i naslijeđa iz razdoblja socijalizma promatrano je kroz prizmu nastojanja rekonstrukcije bosansko-hercegovačkog kulturnog identiteta, čime se nastoji uočiti veza između promjena na političko-ekonomskoj i društveno-kulturnoj razini nastalih na prijelazu iz socijalističkog u post-socijalističko, kapitalističko društvo i promjena u smjeru u kojem se razvijao poslijeratni arhitektonski diskurs.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: suvremena arhitektura, Bosna i Hercegovina, postmoderna, postsocijalizam, moderno naslijeđe

Razvitak suvremenih postmodernih arhitektonskih praksi na području Bosne i Hercegovine usporedan je razvitu novih postsocijalističkih okvira na političko-ekonomskoj i društveno-kulturnoj razini. Naime, nastojanje na rekonstrukciji nacionalnog i kulturnog identiteta u poslijeratnom razdoblju odrazilo se i na značajke lokalne postmoderne arhitekture.

Ako bosansko-hercegovački kulturni identitet promatramo kao „skup vrijednosti, tradicija, simbola, vjerovanja i modela ponašanja koji predstavljaju kohezivni element unutar grupe i djeluju kao supstrat, tako da pojedinci koji formiraju grupu mogu naći svoj osjećaj pripadnosti“,¹ tada se odnos prema identitetu uspostavlja između potrebe za njegovom afirmacijom kao statične kategorije koju odlikuju naslijeđena i već oblikovana svojstva i potrebe za njegovom manipulacijom kao dinamične i promjenjive konstrukcije koja se određuje na temelju drugosti.² Dakle, odnos prema kulturnom identitetu može se povezati s temeljnim obilježjima postmoderne, uočljivim u preuzimanju i interpretaciji tradicionalnih oblikovnih referencijskih, kako bi se (iznova) uspostavio kontinuitet između prošlosti i sadašnjosti, i u odbacivanju naslijeđa modernog pokreta³ koji se u novim lokalnim društvenim okvirima označava kao socijalistička baština.

Promatramo li vezu između oblikovanja prostora i razvita arhitektonskog postmodernog diskursa na području Bosne i Hercegovine nakon rata, a na temelju odnosa novih praksi

*RAZVJEL: SARAJEVO CITY CENTAR (GOLOŠ, 2009.–2013.) I ZGRADA PARLAMENTA BOSNE I HERCEGOVINE (JURAJ NEIDHARDT, 1988.–1980.), SARAJEVO.

¹POTOGRAFIJA: ZORAN HERCEG, 2014.

CONTACT: SARAJEVO CITY CENTRE (SEAD GOLOŠ, 2009–2013) AND THE
PARLIAMENT OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA (JURAJ NEIDHARDT, 1988–1980),
SARAJEVO. PHOTO: ZORAN HERCEG, 2014

SUMMARY: This paper focuses on the attitude of contemporary, post-war architectural practices in Bosnia and Herzegovina towards the values of modern and postmodern architectural legacy from the socialist period. The features of this legacy are evaluated and viewed through the correlation of three trends that can be observed in the contemporary architectural discourse in Bosnia and Herzegovina: the language of “pure” postmodernism, the neo-historical or neo-electric tendencies, and the approach that follows the guidelines of critical regionalism. The way in which contemporary architectural discourses and the socialist legacy come into interaction has been viewed here with regard to the efforts invested in the reconstruction of Bosnian and Herzegovinian cultural identity, while seeking to identify the link between the changes on the political/economic and social/cultural levels that resulted from the transition from the socialist society into the postsocialist or capitalist one, and changes in the direction of post-war architectural discourse.

KEY WORDS: Contemporary architecture, Bosnia and Herzegovina, postmodernism, post-socialism, modernist legacy

The development of contemporary, postmodern architectural practices in Bosnia and Herzegovina has run parallel to the evolution of new, postsocialist frameworks on the levels of politics/economy and society/culture. The tendency to reconstruct national and cultural identities in the period after the war in the former Yugoslav territories has also had an impact on the features of local postmodernist architecture.

Viewing the Bosnian and Herzegovinian cultural identity through “the whole complex of distinct spiritual, material, intellectual, and emotional features that characterize a society or a social group,”¹ one may say that its attitude towards identity has been shaped by the need of asserting itself as a static category, marked by inherited and predefined features, and of manipulating that very identity as a dynamic and alterable construct defined in terms of otherness.² Thus, the attitude towards one’s cultural identity can be linked to the basic features of postmodernism, which is evident in the appropriation and interpretation of references to traditional architecture in order to (re-)establish a continuity between the past and the present, and in the rejection of modernist legacy,³ which has been denounced by the new local social setting as something inherited from socialism.

When looking at the link between physical design and the evolution of postmodern architectural discourse in Bosnia and Herzegovina after the recent war, in terms of taking a stance

prema graditeljskom naslijedu iz razdoblja socijalizma, uočit ćemo tri tendencije: prva, vezana za „čistu“ postmodernu, koja vrijednosti naslijeda iz razdoblja socijalizma odbacuje iz oblikovnih razloga; druga, neopovijesna, koja ne prihvata dano naslijede kao osobitost bosansko-hercegovačkog kulturnog, a time i arhitektonskog identiteta; i treća, vezana uz promišljanja kritičkog regionalizma, koja u interpretaciji suvremenog u odnosu na lokalno u vrijednostima danog naslijeda vidi gradu za uspostavljanje veze između modernog i tradicionalnog. Pri tome možemo primijetiti kako su pristup obnovi naslijeda u poslijeratnom razdoblju i nakon njega i njegovo vrednovanje pokazali u kojem će se smjeru kretati gore navedeni odnos pa je taj odnos moguće sagledati kako na oblikovnoj tako i na prostornoj razini.

Utjecaj poslijeratne obnove prostora i naslijeda na razvoj suvremenog arhitektonskog jezika

Nakon rata naglasak je arhitektonskog djelovanja bio usmjeren na obnovu i revitalizaciju prvenstveno građevina stambenog fonda, a zatim i na obnovu građevina javne namjene. U prvom slučaju temeljni su zahtjevi bili efikasnost i hitrost obnove, pri čemu arhitektonska obilježja stambenog fonda naslijedenog iz razdoblja socijalizma bivaju tek nehotice unaprijeđena, što, s obzirom na lošu izvornu tehničku izvedbu i materijalizaciju te vrste

građevina, u konačnici utječe na njihovo suvremeno društveno vrednovanje. S druge strane, najvažnije obilježje revitalizacije javnih građevina jest primjena metoda koje možemo svrstati pod konzervatorske,⁴ a čija je svrha vraćanje i očuvanje izvornih arhitektonskih i vrijednosnih obilježja građevinama, sa svrhom očuvanja njihovih reprezentativnih, ali i simboličkih značajki. Pritom je naglasak obnove na rekonstrukciji vjerskih objekata, a zatim svjetovnih spomenika reprezentativnog karaktera, pa tek onda drugih građevina javne namjene koje su djelomično oštećene ili potpuno uništene ratnim razaranjima. Tako su građevine izgrađene u socijalističkom razdoblju, poput sarajevskog Historijskog muzeja Bosne i Hercegovine (ranije Muzej Revolucije BiH; Boris Magaš, Edo Šmidihen i Radovan Horvat, 1963.), Sportsko-kulturnog centra „Skenderija“ (Živorad Janković i Halid Muhasilović, 1969.), hotela „Igman“ (Ahmed Džuvić, 1983.) i hercegovačkih objekata Zlatka Ugljena: hotela „Ruža“ u Mostaru (1978.) i hotela „Bregava“ u Stocu (1979.); banjalučkog hotela „Bosna“ (Ante Džeba i Predrag Bulović, 1975.) ili hotela „Zelengora“ u Foči (Branimir Mück, 1955.), prepustene zubu vremena i nestručnim intervencijama – ili su ruinirane, ili potpuno izgubljene. Osim pristupa obnovi arhitektonskog naslijeda i drugim građevinama u poslijeratnom razdoblju, značajan utjecaj na percepciju socijalističke graditeljske ostavštine ima i

towards the architectural legacy of socialism, three tendencies can be discerned: the first is linked to “pure” postmodernism and rejects the values of socialist legacy for aesthetic reasons; the second may be termed neo-historical, as it negates the given legacy, including architecture, as anything specific of the Bosnian and Herzegovinian cultural identity; the third may be understood as associated with critical regionalism, which interprets the contemporary in the local setting and sees the values of the given legacy as a basis for establishing a link between the modern and the traditional. Thereby it can be observed that the approach to architectural restoration since the war, including its evaluation, has indicated the direction in which this positioning will evolve, which can be seen both on the level of architectural design and on that of physical planning.

The impact of urban and architectural restoration after the war on the evolution of contemporary architectural language
After the war, there was a special accent in architecture on restoring and revitalizing residential architecture, followed by the restoration of communal buildings. In the former case, the basic requirements were efficiency and promptness in restoration, whereby the architectural features of apartment buildings inherited from socialism were only inadvertently enhanced, which eventually, regarding their original substandard

performance and materialization, had a negative impact on their contemporary public evaluation. On the other hand, the crucial tendency in revitalizing public buildings was the application of a method that may be considered conservationist,⁴ since its purpose was to restore and preserve the original architectural and symbolic features of buildings in order to perpetuate their representative character. Thereby primacy was given to the reconstruction of sacral buildings, followed by the secular monuments of representational character and only then by the communal buildings that had been partly damaged or completely demolished during the war. Thus, buildings constructed in the socialist period, such as the History Museum of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Sarajevo (former Museum of the Revolution of Bosnia and Herzegovina; Boris Magaš, Edo Šmidihen, and Radovan Horvat, 1963), Sports and Cultural Centre “Skenderija” (Živorad Janković and Halid Muhasilović, 1969), Hotel “Igman” (Ahmed Džuvić, 1983), Herzegovinian buildings designed by Zlatko Ugljen: Hotel “Ruža” in Mostar (1978) and Hotel “Bregava” in Stolac (1979); Hotel “Bosna” in Banja Luka (Ante Džeba and Predrag Bulović, 1975), and Hotel “Zelengora” in Foča (Branimir Mück, 1955), were neglected and left to decay, or else subjected to unprofessional interventions – and are nowadays either badly damaged or completely lost. Besides this approach to the restoration of architectural legacy

postupak označavanja kulturno-historijskih nacionalnih dobara na državnoj razini. Na samom početku tog postupka arhitektonska dobra iz druge polovice 20. stoljeća ostaju na margini interesa te se tako na Privremenoj listi nacionalnih spomenika⁵, koju je Komisija/Povjerenstvo za očuvanje nacionalnih spomenika Bosne i Hercegovine prihvatiila 2000. godine, između sedam stotina i sedamdeset i šest građevina nalazi svega osam njih, prije svega spomeničkog karaktera, izgrađenih nakon Drugog svjetskog rata. Donošenjem Odluke o izmjeni⁶ Kriterija za proglašenje dobara nacionalnim spomenicima⁷ 2003. godine, a koja mijenja kriterij vremenskog određenja dobara koja mogu biti razmatrana kao nacionalni spomenik, izuzimaju se dobra nastala nakon 1960. godine.⁸ Odluku prati obrazloženje kako zaštita značajnog, vrlo starog, ugroženog naslijeđa ima prioritet u odnosu na građevine sagradene nakon Drugog svjetskog rata,⁹ što se može smatrati ispravnim s povijesno-arhitektonске točke gledišta, ali mora biti vrednovano i iz kulturno-društvene pozicije. Iako je Komisija proglašila šesnaest¹⁰ građevina i prostornih cjelina nastalih u razdoblju nakon Drugog svjetskog rata nacionalnim spomenicima Bosne i Hercegovine, a u skladu s mogućnošću da „u slučajevima kada se radi o izuzetno vrijednim djelima suvremene umjetnosti ili arhitekture koja su nastala nakon 1960. godine“ Komisija razmotri pojedine

slučajeve,¹¹ postupkom označavanja kulturno-povijesne baštine i uz konzervatorski pristup njenoj revitalizaciji, na samom začetku propuštena je prilika za iniciranje afirmativno-kritičkog odnosa prema spoznavanju vrijednosti i značajki navedenog naslijeđa. Tako je vrednovanje oblikovnih značajki naslijeđa druge polovice 20. stoljeća ostalo potčinjeno njegovu označavanju na ideološkoj osnovi, što je utjecalo na pozitivističku interpretaciju tih odlika u suvremenim arhitektonskim praksama.

Istdobno ćemo uočiti kako je odmak od urbanističkih praksi vezanih uz razdoblje socijalizma, uvjetovan društvenim i ideološko-političkim transformacijama koje su dovele do promjene u pristupu planiranju prostora, u velikoj mjeri vezan uz pitanje stava postmoderne o razvitku prostora i intervencijama unutar njega.

Postmoderni pogled na postsocijalističke urbanističke prakse na prostoru Bosne i Hercegovine

Ako suvremene urbanističke tendencije na prostoru Bosne i Hercegovine stavimo u kontekst postmodernih arhitektonskih promišljanja, gdje postmodernizam na globalnoj kulturnoj razini interpretiramo kao „kraj jednog idealja, neutralnog i univerzalnog, kako bi se napravilo mjesto za nove protagonisti: različite stvarnosti i kulture, u borbi za stvarne ideale, za jednakost u

ARHITEKTONSKE
PRAKSE POSLJERATNE
BOSNE I HERCEGOVINE
I ODNOŠ PREMA
NASLJEĐU IZ
RAZDOBLLJA
SOCIJALIZMA

ARCHITECTURAL
PRACTICES IN
POST-WAR BOSNIA
AND HERZEGOVINA:
THE TREATMENT OF
SOCIALIST LEGACY

and other buildings in the post-war period, state acknowledgment of the nation's cultural and historical patrimony had an important impact on the perception of socialist architectural heritage. At the very beginning of this process, architecture from the second half of the 20th century remained on the margins of interest, and so the Temporary List of National Monuments,⁵ compiled by the Commission for the Preservation of National Monuments in Bosnia and Herzegovina in 2000, included among the 776 buildings in total only eight, mostly monumental in character, that were built after World War II. The Decision on the Modification⁶ of Criteria for National Monuments,⁷ published in 2003, which changed the time span for buildings that may be considered as potential national monuments, excluded all those constructed after 1960.⁸ The decision was explained by the logic that the protection of very old, important and threatened heritage must have priority over buildings constructed after World War II,⁹ which may be considered justified from the standpoint of history of architecture, but shows a lack of cultural and social perspective. Even though the Commission proclaimed sixteen¹⁰ buildings and other structures constructed after World War II as national monuments of Bosnia and Herzegovina, in accordance with the decision that “in cases of exceptionally valuable works of contemporary art or architecture produced after 1960” the Commission was to consider specific cases individually,¹¹

the process of defining cultural and historical heritage with a conservationist approach to its revitalization missed from the very outset the chance to take an affirmative critical stance towards its values and character. Thus, the evaluation of architectural design in the legacy from the second half of the 20th century remained subjected to its ideological label, which resulted in a positivistic interpretation of these features in contemporary architectural practices.

At the same time, it may be observed that the detachment from urban practices linked to the socialist period, caused by the social and ideological/political transformations that brought about a new approach to physical planning, has been largely linked to the issue of postmodern stance towards urban development and interventions.

The postmodern view on postsocialist urban practices in Bosnia and Herzegovina

When considering the contemporary urban tendencies in Bosnia and Herzegovina in the context of postmodernist architectural discourse, where postmodernism is interpreted on the global cultural level as the “end of an ideal that was neutral and universal in order to make space for the new protagonists: for different realities and cultures struggling for actual ideals, for unity in diversity,”¹² one may see that, in case of Bosnia and Herzegovina,

različitosti¹² uočit ćemo kako kulturni i politički pluralizam,¹³ koji odlikuje postmodernu, u bosansko-hercegovačkom slučaju umjesto kao poticaj za stvaranje višeznačnosti prostora zapravo djeluje segregacijski na prostornoj, ali prije svega na kulturološkoj razini.

Urbani pluralizam, koji po mišljenju Charlesa Jencksa postoji kao društveni cilj i stilski strategija,¹⁴ i teži „preobražavanju starih i propadajućih gradskih centara u komercijalne festivalske centre, čuvanju tradicionalnih građevina, stvaranju otvorenih prostora rimske razmjere (ali) i generiranju velikih svota novca“,¹⁵ uz novo shvaćanje urbanizma koji proučava i razvija gradski fragment umjesto gradske cjeline, u bosansko-hercegovačkom slučaju doveo je do pojedinačnog i *ad hoc* pristupa izgradnji prostora. Izgradnja mikrolokacija koje su povezane na komunikacijskoj, ali ne i na funkcionalnoj, sadržajnoj i estetskoj razini ukazuje na odsutnost kontinuiteta u urbanističko-regulacijskom planiranju. Grad postaje tek skup nepovezanih arhitektonskih oblika i malih urbanističkih cjelina čijim umnožavanjem raste kao užurbana nakupina zgrada, prodajnih centara, ulica, trgovina, itd., uokvirenih u pojam „grada“, koji funkcionalno i oblikovno zapravo nisu povezani. Ujedno, odsutnost kontinuiteta planiranja prostora svelo je urbanističko djelovanje na pojedinačne i često nestručne zahvate unutar postojećih urbanih matrica. Matrice nastale u razdoblju nakon Drugoga svjetskog rata, kao i one

iz austrougarskog i otomanskog razdoblja narušene su, ili čak potpuno uništene ratnim urbicidom, a potom degradirane neartikuliranim i nekoherenntnim intervencijama. Degradacija matrica i prostora nastalih za vrijeme masovne urbanizacije u socijalističkom razdoblju ujedno je i posljedica odsutnosti ozbiljnog teorijsko-praktičnog promišljanja o prostornom djelovanju odnosa postmoderne prema urbanoj doktrini moderne te tranzicije iz socijalističkog u kapitalistički sustav. Tranzicija iz jednog u drugi ekonomski, ali i ideološki sustav vidljiva je u promjeni fokusa izgradnje vezanog uz promjenu glavnog izvora sredstava za gradnju. U socijalističkom razdoblju fokus je na izgradnji industrijskih sklopova i stambenih zona s pratećim građevinama, u vezi s potrebama države kao glavnog investitora. U poslijeratnom razdoblju fokus je prebačen na izgradnju građevina poslovne i komercijalne namjene, što je sukladno zahtjevima ulagača, među kojima su najzastupljeniji domaći i inozemni privatni poduzetnici. Kako istodobno nije razvijen i mehanizam dugoročnog planiranja prostora i kontrole njegove individualizacije, nisu uspostavljeni modaliteti kojima bi se očuvala obilježja prostora kao kolektivnog dobra. Rezultat je, u slučaju naselja i gradova izgrađenih u socijalističkom razdoblju, njihova izražena komercijalizacija koja ne doprinosi njihovu unapređenju u funkcionalnom ili oblikovnom smislu. Tako se stvaraju dva prostora, onaj jučerašnji i ovaj današnji, gdje „jučerašnji grad

the cultural and political pluralism¹³ that defines postmodernism actually acted as a trigger of segregation on the spatial and especially cultural level, instead of encouraging the creation of versatile spaces.

Urban pluralism, which according to Charles Jencks is a social goal and a stylistic strategy¹⁴ seeking a “transformation of old and decaying downtowns into commercial festival centers; saving traditional buildings, creating open space on a Roman scale and generating a great deal of money,”¹⁵ which corresponds to the new notion of urban planning, exploring and developing urban fragments rather than the urban whole, has resulted in case of Bosnia and Herzegovina in a peculiar and ad-hoc approach to the construction of space. The emergence of micro-localities, which are interconnected on the level of communication, yet lack any functional, conceptual, and aesthetic unity, indicates an absence of continuity in physical and urban planning. The city is transformed into a mere cluster of unrelated architectural features and minor urban units, which proliferate to create a busy heap of buildings, shopping malls, streets, and squares, held together by the label of “the city” although barely interlinked in terms of function and design. At the same time, the absence of continuity in physical planning has reduced the activity of urban planning to individual and often substandard interventions into the pre-existing urban matrixes, where many matrixes created after World

War II, or during the Austro-Hungarian rule and in the Ottoman period, have been damaged or even completely disrupted by the wartime urbicide, and afterwards degraded by unarticulated and incoherent interventions. The disruption of urban matrixes and spaces created in the socialist era of mass urbanization has also resulted from an absence of serious theoretical and practical reflection on spatial interventions, the attitude of postmodernism towards the urban doctrine, and the transition from socialism to capitalism.

The transition from one economic and ideological system to another has also manifested itself in the change of focus when it comes to the main source of financing architecture. In the socialist period, the focus was on building industrial complexes and residential areas with the corresponding infrastructure, linked to the needs of the state as the principal investor. In the post-war period, however, the focus shifted to the construction of buildings for business and commerce, which corresponded to the demands of the investors, among whom the most prominent ones were now the local and international private entrepreneurs. Since no mechanism for long-term physical planning and control over its individualization evolved at the same time, no modalities were created to preserve the features of space as a collective good. In case of towns and cities built in the socialist period, this has resulted in their outspoken commercialization without

industrijske proizvodnje, siv i surov, suštinski nezainteresiran za svoju sopstvenu sliku“ živi pored „novog suvremenog grada koji živi od simboličkih transakcija i razmjena“.¹⁶

Paradigma „odvojenih sudbina“¹⁷ dvaju prostora, dvaju pristupa njihovu oblikovanju, pa, recimo, i dvaju pogleda na svijet, uočljiva je na primjeru stambenog naselja Alipašino polje u Sarajevu. Novoizgrađena komercijalna zona postavljena uz obod naselja i samo naselje predstavljaju dvije zasebne cjeline. Već i zbog svoje rubne pozicije, sadržaj komercijalne zone ne unapređuje razvoj naselja. Dvije funkcionalno nepovezane zone, pri čemu je komercijalna koncipirana po potrebama „više razine“, ne uspostavljaju kvalitativni odnos. Ujedno, problemi koji postoje unutar naselja (nedostatak javnih, kulturnih i rekreacijskih sadržaja) nisu riješeni tom prostornom „diversifikacijom“, čime to naselje nije ni sadržajno ni prostorno unaprijedeno. Štoviše, oblikovno nekonzistentna komercijalna zona (čini je niz objekata koji estetski ne komuniciraju jedan s drugim, a gabaritima, oblikovanjem i odnosom prema prvoj liniji stambenih građevina narušavaju odnose i načela koja isti uspostavljaju) degradira arhitektonске vrijednosti postojećeg naselja i ovog ansambla. Tako primjer naselja Alipašino polje može poslužiti kao uvod u razmatranje pitanja vrednovanja oblikovnih značajki socijalističkog arhitektonskog naslijeđa u okviru postmodernih arhitektonskih praksi poslijeratnog razdoblja.

ARHITEKTONSKE
PRAKSE POSLJERATNE
BOSNE I HERCEGOVINE
I ODNOŠ PREMA
NASLJEĐU IZ
RAZDOBILJA
SOCIJALIZMA

ARCHITECTURAL
PRACTICES IN
POST-WAR BOSNIA
AND HERZEGOVINA:
THE TREATMENT OF
SOCIALIST LEGACY

contributing to their function or design. The consequence was the creation of two parallel spaces – yesterday's and today's – whereby “the yesterday's city of industrial production was grey and oppressive, and essentially disinterested in its own image,” coexisting with a “new and modern city that lives off its symbolic transactions and exchanges.”¹⁶

The paradigm of “separate fates”¹⁷ of these two spaces and the two different approaches to their design, one may even say two worldviews, is evident in the case of Alipašino Polje, a residential district of Sarajevo. The newly built commercial zone, situated along the district's margins, creates a separate entity with regard to the district itself, while its marginal position prevents it from adding to its development. These two functionally unrelated zones, the commercial one being envisioned to cater for the needs of the “higher degree”, are simply not interconnected in terms of quality. Moreover, problems persisting within the district (the absence of public, cultural, and recreational facilities) have not been solved by means of this spatial “diversification”, as the new complex has not added to the district's evolution either conceptually or physically. Moreover, this architecturally inconsistent commercial zone (composed of a number of buildings that fail to communicate with each other aesthetically, while their dimensions, design, and relationship to the front line of apartment buildings violate the relations and principles

Odnos prema naslijeđu iz razdoblja socijalizma u procesu oblikovanja suvremenog bosansko-hercegovačkog arhitektonskog izraza

Na razini arhitektonskog jezika postsocijalističke arhitektonske prakse djeluju u tri pravca. Prvi je „čisti“ postmodernizam, pri čemu je od mjerodavnih arhitektonskih pothvata bitno razdvojiti „djelovanja“ koja su u području „turboarhitekture“,¹⁸ gdje pojmom „turbo“ proistječe iz sociološko-društvenog konteksta, i u arhitekturi, po mišljenju Srđana Jovanovića Weissa, označava spoj neotradicionalnih pristupa oblikovanju i suvremenih tehnologija materijalizacije. Takve prakse, opisane pojmom „balkanologija“¹⁹ Hansa Ibelingsa, obuhvaćaju „jedan paralelni univerzum, uglavnom poluzakonite neformalne arhitekture“,²⁰ koji se sastoji od „množine“ kuća, vila, restorana, „kafana“, benzinskih postaja, motela, prodavaonica i prodajnih centara te privatnih poslovnih, individualnih, ali i kolektivnih stambenih građevina širom Bosne i Hercegovine.

Drugi se kreće u okviru postmodernih neopovijesnih, tj. neoeklektičkih tendencijskih, gdje je u bosansko-hercegovačkom slučaju, a s obzirom na posebnost društvenog, kulturnog i političkog okvira u kojem se odvija oblikovanje navedenog diskursa, povratak tradicionalnim, povijesnim arhitektonskim jezicima prvenstveno vezan uz težnju prema (re)definiranju kulturnog/ih identiteta društvenih zajednica na bosansko-hercegovačkom prostoru.

established by them) diminishes the architectural values of the old district and even the complex itself. Thus, the case of Alipašino Polje can serve to illustrate the problem of evaluating the architectural qualities of socialist legacy in the context of postmodern architectural practices during the post-war period.

Attitude towards the socialist legacy in the process of creating the contemporary architectural expression in Bosnia and Herzegovina

On the level of architectural expression, postsocialist practices operate in three different directions. The first is “pure” modernism, whereby it is important to distinguish between the architectural projects proper and “actions” that fall into the category of the so-called “turbo-architecture”.¹⁸ The term “turbo” originates from the sociological and social context and, according to Srđan Jovanović Weiss, denotes in architecture a specific fusion of neo-traditional approaches to design and modern technologies of materialization. Such practices, which Hans Ibelings has termed “Balcanology”,¹⁹ represent “a parallel universe of mostly semi-legal, informal architecture,”²⁰ consisting of a “multitude” of houses, villas, restaurants, bars, petrol stations, motels, stores, and shopping malls, as well as private business venues, family houses, and collective apartment buildings all over Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Konačno, kao treći pristup uočavamo smjernice kritičkog regionalizma, pri čemu misao o novom proizlazi iz interpretacije obilježja bosansko-hercegovačkog prostora i njegovih posebnosti.

Postmoderne arhitektonske prakse u Bosni i Hercegovini

Ako analiziramo mjerodavne poslijeratne arhitektonske pothvate na prostoru Bosne i Hercegovine koji slijede tendencije „čiste“ postmoderne, a na temelju njihova odnosa prema arhitektonskom naslijedu iz razdoblja socijalizma, moramo uočiti kontinuitet koji, bez obzira na ratno razdoblje, postoji između arhitektonskog jezika kasnih '70-ih i '80-ih godina prošlog stoljeća i jezika poslijeratne postmoderne. Međutim, veza koja se uočava između prijeratnog i poslijeratnog postmodernističkog razmišljanja postoji tek na oblikovnoj razini, dok na konceptualnoj uočavamo glavno obilježe koje ih razlikuje. Prijeratni jezik postmoderne bio je ironičan²¹ odgovor na promjene u društveno-ekonomskim odnosima na globalnoj, ali i na lokalnoj razini, tj. komentar na "Kruz moderne arhitekture (koja) započinje u trenutku kada njen prirodni korisnik – veliki industrijski kapital – svojom ideologijom ide unatrag, ostavljajući po strani superstrukturu. Od tog momenta, arhitektonska ideologija je iscrpila svoju ulogu. Njena upornost da dokaže vlastite hipoteze se pretvara u sredstvo za prevladavanje zakašnjelih realnosti ili veoma neugodnu smetnju."²²

Prihvaćanje modernizma kao „stila i ideologije, njegovo preuzimanje od strane birokratskih struktura i njegovo kobno svrstavanje uz program modernizacije“²³ dovelo je do „odustajanja“ od načela koja obilježavaju taj stil u zapadnoj kulturi, i imalo je poseban ishod u zemljama koje su pripadale Istočnom bloku i Jugoslaviji. Budući da je nakon kratkog razdoblja priklanjanja stilu socijalističkog realizma od 1948. godine reintegracija Jugoslavije u mrežu internacionalnog modernizma²⁴ bila politički i ideološki motivirana, ali i interpretirana,²⁵ težnje socijalističkog sustava za uspostavom nove društvene stvarnosti i projekti industrijalizacije i kolektivizacije vezani su uz modernističko nastojanje za oslobođanjem arhitekture od arhitektonskih tradicija te za tehnološki napredak i navedeni „kobni program modernizacije“. Otuda i dovođenje u vezu postmodernizma (kao arhitektonskog odgovora na „probleme“ moderne kao što su formalizam, purizam i jednoličnost izraza, dekontekstualizam i težnja za homogenošću) s postsocijalizmom, kao društvenim prijelazom iz socijalističkog u kapitalistički sustav, u kontekstu postsocijalističkih zemalja. Ako je moguće uspostaviti usporedbu, onda su prijeratna djela postmodernog diskursa, koja su se „isticala raznovrsnošću [...] ostvarenja pri čemu su (autori) koristili i primjenjivali potpuno nove graditeljske postupke, nove

The second practice remains within the framework of postmodern neo-historical or neo-eclectic tendencies, whereby in case of Bosnia and Herzegovina, regarding the specificities of its social, cultural, and political setting, this return to the traditional, historical languages of architecture is primarily linked to the desire of (re-)defining the particular cultural identity or identities in the region. Eventually, the third approach shows some features of critical regionalism, whereby the idea of the new results from an interpretation of the local features and specificities of Bosnia and Herzegovina.

Postmodern architectural practices in Bosnia and Herzegovina

If analyzing the relevant architectural project in post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina that correspond to the tendencies of "pure" postmodernism on the basis of their relationship with the socialist architectural legacy, one must notice certain continuity, regardless of the war period, between the architectural expression of the late 1970s and the 1980s and the language of post-war modernism. However, this link between postmodernist thinking before and after the war is present only on the level of design, whereas the conceptual level shows a basic feature that distinguishes them. The language of postmodernism before the war was an ironic²¹ answer to the changes in socioeconomic relations on the global and local levels alike, that is, a commentary to the "crisis of

modern architecture, setting in at the moment when its natural user – the big industrial capital – receded with its ideology, leaving the superstructure aside. From that moment onwards, architectural ideology was exhausting its role. Its persistence in proving its hypotheses transformed into a means of surpassing its belated realities or even into a rather embarrassing obstacle."²² Accepting modernism as a "style and ideology, its adoption by the bureaucratic power structures, and its fatal alignment with the programme of modernization"²³ led to the "abandonment" of the principles that marked this style in Western culture, with very specific results in countries that belonged to the Eastern Bloc and Yugoslavia. Since after a brief period of adherence to the style of social realism, the reintegration of Yugoslavia into the network of international modernism²⁴ continued from 1948 onwards, politically and ideologically motivated and interpreted,²⁵ the ambitions of the socialist regime to establish a new social reality, including its various projects of industrialization and collectivization, were linked to the modernist tendency of liberating architecture from various architectural traditions and of pursuing the path of technological development and the aforementioned "fatal programme of modernization." Hence the link between postmodernism (as an architectural response to the "problems" of modernism such as formalism, purism, and the uniformity

materijale, složene i smjele konstrukcije, novo strukturiranje u kompoziciji volumena, te drastičnu upotrebu kolora u površinskoj obradi fasada,²⁶ i potraga za novim izrazom koji arhitekti tog razdoblja nalaze u sagledavanju lokalnih, tradicionalnih, ambijentalnih vrijednosti u njihovu tumačenju suvremenim izražajnim sredstvima (u neočekivanoj i neracionalnoj materijalizaciji, koncepciji i strukturalizaciji), sukladni novom pogledu na jugoslavensko, pa time i bosansko-hercegovačko društvo i transformacije koje se u njemu odvijaju. Transformacija kulturnog identiteta u tom razdoblju i redefiniranje odnosa lokalnoga prema globalnom, koje se nazire u postmodernom diskursu 70-ih i 80-ih godina, vidljiva je na istaknutim primjerima arhitekture navedenog razdoblja, kao što su Zgrada DPO (Gradska uprava) u Sarajevu (Vladimir Dobrović, 1980.), Olimpijska dvorana „Zetra“, Sarajevo (Lidumil Alikalić i Dušan Đapa, 1982.), hotel „Holiday Inn“, Sarajevo (Ivan Štraus, 1983.), hotel „Zenit“, Neum (Slobodan Jovandić, 1987.). Stoga te građevine postaju znakom jednog vremena i promjena koje se u tom vremenu odvijaju.

Međutim, nakon rata postmoderni diskurs gubi komunikativni potencijal,²⁷ ne uspijevajući biti komentar društvene zbilje u kojoj nastaje. On postaje tek produktom dizajna kao isključivo oblikovnog procesa koji ne uspostavlja dijalog s kontekstom

na prostornoj i oblikovnoj, ili na društveno-kulturnoj razini. Tako građevine poput Knjižare Ziral (Marijan Antunović, Davorin Smoljan, 1998.) i Mepas Malla u Mostaru (Gradal Inženjering Split, 2009.-2012.), ili Administrativnog centra Republike Srpske (2005.-2007.), zajedno sa Zgradom RTRS u Banja Luci (2007.-2010., Integral inženjeringa d.o.o.) te poslovno-stambene zgrade Importane centra u Sarajevu (Sanja i Igor Grozdanić 2007.-2010.), ili pak sarajevski projekti Seada Gološa: Shopping centar „Merkur“ (2004.-2006.), BBI centar (2006.-2008.), Bosmal City centar, Sarajevo (2002.-2009.) i Sarajevo City centar (2009.-2013.), Faruka Kapidžića: Hypo Alpe Adria Banka (2000.), Radon Plaza Hotel, izgrađen na konstrukciji nekadašnje zgrade „Oslobodenja“ (2004.) te Avaz Queen Tower (2008.), iako svojom funkcijom i namjenom oslikavaju stvarnost u kojoj nastaju, pri čemu se prvenstveno sugerira njihov komercijalni karakter, dizajnom i projektom ne nastoje biti ironičan odgovor na istu tu stvarnost, komentirati je ili pak transformirati. Tako pored otklona od modernističkih praksi poslijeratne postmoderne na prostoru Bosne i Hercegovine ne uspostavljaju smislenu vezu s postmodernim naslijeđem iz razdoblja socijalizma, što pak zahtijeva kritički pristup analizi njihova doprinosa očuvanju naslijeđa iz navedenog razdoblja.

of expression, de-contextualization, and homogenization) and post-socialism as a social transition from socialism to capitalism in the context of postsocialist countries. If a parallel may be drawn, then the pre-war works of postmodern discourse, marked by “a variety ...] of expression, whereby the architects used completely new construction methods, new materials, complex and daring constructions, new structuring in the composition of volume, and drastic colours on façades,”²⁶ and a search for new forms of expression, which the architects of the time found in reinterpreting certain local, traditional, and contextual values by using contemporary means of expression (with unexpected and irrational materialization, conceptualization, and structuralization), corresponded to the new view of the Yugoslav society (including Bosnia and Herzegovina) and the transformations that it was undergoing. The transformation of cultural identity in that period and the redefinition of the relationship between local and global, which is discernible in the postmodernist discourse of the 1970s and 1980s, is evident in the prominent cases of architecture from that period, such as the building of DPO (Municipal Administration) in Sarajevo (Vladimir Dobrović, 1980), the Olympic Sports Centre “Zetra” in Sarajevo (Lidumil Alikalić and Dušan Đapa, 1982), Hotel “Holiday Inn” in Sarajevo (Ivan Štraus, 1983),

and Hotel “Zenit” in Neum (Slobodan Jovandić, 1987). Thus, these buildings have become the sign of the time and the transformations that defined it.

However, after the war, the postmodernist discourse lost its communicative potential,²⁷ failing in its role as a commentary on the social reality that surrounded it. It became a mere product of design, as a creative process which does not establish a dialogue with its context on the level of physical design or the socio-cultural level. Thus, buildings such as the “Ziral” bookshop (Marijan Antunović and Davorin Smoljan, 1998), the Mepas Mall in Mostar (Gradal Inženjering Split, 2009-2012), or the Administrative Centre of Republika Srpska (2005-2007), along with the building of RTRS in Banja Luka (Integral inženjering d.o.o., 2007-2010), the office and residential building of Importane Centar in Sarajevo (Sanja and Igor Grozdanić, 2007-2010), and the Sarajevo projects of Sead Gološ: the “Merkur” shopping mall (2004-2006), BBI centre (2006-2008), Bosmal City Centre Sarajevo (2002-2009), and Sarajevo City Centre (2009-2013); and Faruk Kapidžić: Hypo Alpe Adria Bank (2000), Radon Plaza Hotel, built by using the construction of the former building of “Oslobodenje” (2004), and Avaz Queen Tower (2008), although reflecting their environment in terms of function and purpose, expressing primarily their commercial character, do not seek to offer an ironic response to that reality by means of design or construction style, commenting



Neopovijesne arhitektonске prakse u poslijeratnoj Bosni i Hercegovini

Postsocialističke arhitektonске prakse utemeljene na neopovijesnom, eklektičkom izrazu imaju potpuno suprotnu agendu od prethodno analiziranih čistih postmodernih praksi. Za arhitektonski jezik koji proistječe iz referencijalnosti prema tradicionalnom karakteristična je potraga za značenjskim i simboličkim; u njemu bi se ogledale primordijalne značajke novog kulturološkog prostora za koji se dani jezik veže. Ta potraga se na prostoru Bosne i Hercegovine prvenstveno veže za nacionalno, etničko i vjersko, kao najvažnije referencije pojmove „tradicionalno“ i „eklektičko“, pri čemu možemo razlikovati tri simboličke referencije prema kojima se okreće postmoderni eklektički arhitektonski izraz: onu koja upućuje na naslijede iz osmanskog razdoblja, drugu koja uporiše nalazi u bizantskom stilu gradnje te treću koja se okreće prema klasičnim stilovima. Također, može se primjetiti kako je navedena referencija, ponovo, najjasnije uočljiva kod građevina javne namjene te osobito kod građevina religijske namjene. U analizi tog pravca moramo se osvrnuti na one prostore i gradiće koji su nastali kao proizvod površnih analognih rekonstrukcija. Izhod tih „rekonstrukcija“ su građevine koje su doslovno falsifikati, „nečega što je tu nekad davno bilo“, kao npr. građevina Bakr-Babiće džamije u Sarajevu (srušena

ARHITEKTONSKE
PRAKSE POSLJERATNE
BOSNE I HERCEGOVINE
I ODNOŠ PREMA
NASLJEDU IZ
RADOBILJA
SOCIJALIZMA

ARCHITECTURAL
PRACTICES IN
POST-WAR BOSNIA
AND HERZEGOVINA:
THE TREATMENT OF
SOCIALIST LEGACY

upon it or seeking to change it. Besides their detachment from modernist practices, the post-war modernisms in Bosnia and Herzegovina do not establish a meaningful relationship with the postmodernist legacy from the socialist times, which indicates the need of a critical approach to the analysis of their contribution to the preservation of that legacy.

Neo-historical architectural practices in post-war Bosnia and Herzegovina

Postsocialist architectural practices based on a neo-historical, eclectic expression have an agenda that is completely contrary to the previously analyzed, pure postmodern practices. A characteristic feature of this architectural language, which results from references to the traditional, is a quest for the semantic and the symbolic; it reflects the primordial features of the new cultural space to which the language in question is related. In Bosnia and Herzegovina, this quest has been primarily associated with the national, ethnic, and religious aspects as the crucial references of notions such as “traditional” or “eclectic”, whereby one can observe three main symbolic references in this postmodern architectural expression: the one quoting the Ottoman legacy, the one relying on the Byzantine style, and the one focusing on classical styles. Moreover, it should be noted that these references are most evident in communal, particularly sacral buildings.

1895., obnovljena 2011., Mufid Garibija), Mevlvijska tekija²⁸ u Sarajevu (srušena 50-ih godina, obnovljena 2013.), građevina katoličke crkve sv. Petra i Pavla u Mostaru (sagrađena 1875., srušena 1992., ponovo sagrađena u poslijeratnom razdoblju u novim gabaritima, s novim zvonikom koji „sada dominira cijelim gradom Mostarom“²⁹, građevina Saborne pravoslavne crkve „Hrista Spasitelja“ u Banja Luci (srušena nakon jakog oštećenja prilikom bombardiranja grada 1941., ponovo izgrađena kao replika 1993.–2004.). U krajnjem slučaju taj proces čak vodi prema izgradnji imaginarnog, tj. „onoga što je tu (kao) trebalo biti“, gdje je tzv. Andrićgrad u Višegradu (2011–...), imaginarni prostor iz Andrićeve „Na Drini ćuprije“, falsificiran kako u odnosu na samu sliku prostora iz književnog djela tako i u odnosu na stvarnost, onu prošlu i ovu sadašnju. Andrićgrad je neposredni primjer poigravanja s povijesnim i tradicionalnim u arhitekturi kako bi se u njoj afirmiralo političko-ideološko stajalište onoga koji gradi i onoga koji stoji iza izgradnje. Međutim, osim tih prostorno-vremenskih arhitektonskih ogleda koji se igraju s bosansko-hercegovačkom kulturno-historijskom materijalnom baštinom, postoji cijeli niz građevina, značajnih i onih manje značajnih, gdje se samo upućivanjem na neki od prepoznatljivih simbola ili oblika želi dati određeni identitet, i time same zgrade pretvoriti u simbole identiteta. Njihov broj je velik i

SUPROTSTAVLJANJE. AVAZ TWIST TOWER
(FARUK KAPIDŽIĆ, 2008), SARAJEVO.
FOTOGRAFIJA: ZORAN HERCEG, 2014.

OPPOZITION. AVAZ TWIST TOWER
(FARUK KAPIDŽIĆ, 2008), SARAJEVO.
PHOTO: ZORAN HERCEG, 2014

When analyzing this trend, one should consider those areas and buildings that emerged as a result of superficial analogous reconstructions. Such “reconstructions” resulted in structures that are literally forgeries of “something that used to stand here once,” such as Bakr-Baba’s mosque in Sarajevo (demolished in 1895, rebuilt in 2011, Mufid Garibija), Mevlvi Takiyah²⁸ in Sarajevo (demolished in the 1950s, rebuilt in 2013), the Catholic church of St Peter and Paul in Mostar (built in 1875, demolished in 1992, rebuilt in the post-war period in altered proportions and with a new belfry, which “now dominates the entire city,”²⁹ or the Collegiate Orthodox Church of Christ the Saviour in Banja Luka (heavily damaged during the bombardment in 1941 and then demolished, rebuilt as a replica in 1993-2004). In extreme cases, this development can even lead to the construction of something imaginary, something that “must have (sort of) stood here.” Thus, the so-called Andrićgrad in Višegrad (2011–...), an imaginary space from the novel *The Bridge on the Drina* by Ivo Andrić, is a forgery both in regard to the image from the novel itself and in regard to the reality, past or present, a direct example of playing with the historical and the traditional by means of architecture in order to assert the political and ideological stance of the person or group that constructs the building or finances its construction. However, besides these spatial and temporal essays in architecture, which play with the cultural and historical material

javlja se kako kod zgrada javnog karaktera tako i u stambenim opusima. Međutim, iako većina građevina koje možemo uvrstiti u navedenu grupu spada u područje praksi „balkanizma“ (koji nekriticikim i neprirodnim spajanjem suvremenih materijala, konstrukcija i oblika s lokalnim, tradicionalnim građevinskim načelima proizvodi niz kičastih, trivijalnih i često estetski vulgarnih građevina), građevine poput Ambasade Republike Turske (Hasan Ćemalović, 2013.), nove zgrade Gazi Husrev-begove biblioteke (Kenan Šahović, 2013.) i Studentskog doma „Izvor nade“ u Sarajevu (autor nepoznat, 2012.), ili pak zgrade ambulante u Donjoj Mahali u Mostaru (Edo Kadribegović, godina izgradnje nepoznata), čine ozbiljnim cjelokupni koncept na koji se referira, budući da se arhitektonski pristup oblikovanju tih objekata ipak ne zasniva na pukom preuzimanju tradicionalnih simboličkih referencijskih, nego na njihovu tumačenju za potrebe uspostavljanja odlika identiteta koje se želi naglasiti.

Konačno, u vezi sa specifičnošću težnji koje se skrivaju za prihvatanje i širenje neopovijesnih tendencija, arhitektonsko naslijede iz socijalističkog razdoblja biva odbačeno ne zbog svojih prostorno-oblikovnih svojstava, kao u slučaju prethodno razmatranih „čistih“ postmodernih praksi, nego se razlozi za osporavanje njegove vrijednosti nalaze prvenstveno u njegovu političkom i društvenom karakteru, te, kako navodi Tanja Petrović, u „prirodi samog procesa ‘stvaranja’ kulturne baštine“, pri čemu

je „Taj proces smešten u institucionalne i autoritatивne centre moći i sporovodi se ‘odozgo nadole’; kao takav, on je u velikoj meri selektivan, isključiv i etnocentričan. Socijalističko nasleđe neizbežno evocira nadnacionalni, jugoslovenski kontekst i zato se teško može bez nelagode uključiti u nacionalne narative o kulturnoj baštini.“³⁰

Budući ne može biti izdvojeno iz „nadnacionalnog“, tj. multinacionalnog okvira u kojem je nastalo, moderno i postmoderno naslijede iz razdoblja socijalizma predstavlja materiju koja nema kulturološku vrijednost za proces jačanja kulturnih identiteta društvenih zajednica na području Bosne i Hercegovine. Stoga kao takvo i biva odbačeno u poslijeratnoj arhitektonskoj praksi koja se kreće u neopovijesnim okvirima.

Ideje kritičkog regionalizma u bosansko-hercegovačkim okvirima

Ako pitanje odnosa naslijeda iz razdoblja socijalizma i suvremenih arhitektonskih praksi promatramo u odnosu na ideje kritičkog regionalizma Kennetha Framptona, pri čemu „Temeljna strategija kritičkog regionalizma je posredovanje između utjecaja univerzalne civilizacije i elemenata indirektno proizašlih iz naročitosti date lokacije. Iz gore navedenog jasno je da kritički regionalizam ovisi o održavanju visoke razine kritičke samosvijesti. Glavnu inspiraciju on nalazi u pojavama kao što su domet i kakvoća ovdašnjeg

heritage of Bosnia and Herzegovina, there are many buildings, more or less prominent, both communal and residential, which only hint at a particular identity by means of using a clearly recognizable symbol or form, thus turning the buildings themselves into symbols of that identity. However, even though most buildings that fall into this group belong to the domain of “Balkanizing” practices (which uncritically and artificially merge the contemporary materials, constructions, and forms with the local and traditional architectural principles in order to produce tacky, trivial, and often aesthetically vulgar structures), such as the Turkish Embassy (Hasan Ćemalović, 2013), the new building of Gazi Husrev-beg’s Library (Kenan Šahović, 2013), the student dormitory “Izvor nade” in Sarajevo (anonymous, 2012), or the clinic in Donja Mahala in Mostar (Edo Kadribegović, date unknown), make the concept that is referred to rather serious, since their architectural design is, after all, not based on mere appropriation of traditional symbolic references, but rather on their interpretation, which serves to establish those features of identity that need to be emphasized.

Eventually, as for the specific hidden ambitions linked to the appropriation and dissemination of neo-historical tendencies, the postsocialist architectural heritage is not rejected for its features related to physical planning or design, as in the case of formerly considered “pure” postmodern practices. Instead,

the reasons for denouncing its value must be sought primarily in its political and social character or, according to Tanja Petrović, in the “nature of the very process of ‘creating’ cultural heritage,” whereby “that process is anchored in the institutional and authoritative power centres and directed ‘from above’, which is why it is largely selective, exclusive, and ethnocentric. The socialist legacy inevitably evokes the supranational, Yugoslav context and therefore cannot be included in the national narratives of cultural heritage without major problems.”³⁰ Since it cannot be separated from the “supranational” or multinational context in which it was created, modern and postmodern heritage from the socialist period has no cultural value for the process of empowering the cultural identities of social communities in Bosnia and Herzegovina. It is therefore rejected by the post-war architectural practice, which moves in the neo-historical frameworks.

Ideas of critical regionalism in the context of Bosnia and Herzegovina

If the relationship between socialist legacy and contemporary architectural practices is considered with regard to the ideas of critical regionalism as suggested by Kenneth Frampton, whereby “[T]he fundamental strategy of Critical Regionalism is to mediate the impact of universal civilization with elements derived indirectly

svjetla, ili u tektonici izvedenoj iz naročitosti strukturalnog modaliteta, ili topografiji danog prostora.“³¹ uočit ćemo kako se tragovi stavova kritičkog regionalizma u Bosni i Hercegovini mogu nazrijeti još u razmišljanjima Dušana Grabijana i arhitektonskoj praksi Juraja Neidhardta, gdje tradicionalne vrijednosti bosansko-hercegovačkih urbanističkih koncepata i arhitektonskih ideja bivaju simbolički interpretirane modernim arhitektonskim jezikom. Tako možemo reći kako su Grabijanova i Neidhardtova kritička promišljanja o kontekstualizaciji bosansko-hercegovačke moderne u odnosu na tradicionalne, tj. osobite vrijednosti prostora u kojem se odvija izgradnja, predstavljene u knjizi Arhitektura Bosne i put u savremeno (1957.), zapravo preteča filozofije kritičkog regionalizma na ovim prostorima. Stoga građevine poput Planinskog doma Trebević (1948.) i Doma inžinjera i tehničara na Boračkom jezeru (1957.) Juraja Neidharta, ili pak porodične kuće u Konjicu (1952.) Andrije Čičin-Šaina, hotela „Zelengora“ u Foči (1955.) Branimira Mücka te Odmarališta na Jablaničkom jezeru (1958). Milivoja Peterčića moramo promatrati kao materijalnu baštinu te ideje u samom njezinu začetku. Taj otklon prema promišljanju o arhitekturi kao srednjem putu između lokalnog, tj. regionalnog i globalnog na prostorima Bosne i Hercegovine još je jače uočljiv na građevinama postmoderne koje se oslanjaju na interpretaciju vernakularnog, sagradenih u razdoblju kasnih 70-ih i potom do kraja 80-ih godina. Građevine

ARHITEKTONSKE
PRAKSE POSLJERATNE
BOSNE I HERCEGOVINE
I ODNOŠ PREMA
NASLJEDU IZ
RAZDOLJA
SOCIJALIZMA

ARCHITECTURAL
PRACTICES IN
POST-WAR BOSNIA
AND HERZEGOVINA:
THE TREATMENT OF
SOCIALIST LEGACY

from the peculiarities of a particular place. It is clear from the above that Critical Regionalism depends upon maintaining a high level of critical self-consciousness. It may find its governing inspiration in such things as the range and quality of the local light, or in a tectonic derived from a peculiar structural mode, or in the topography of a given site,”³¹ it can be observed that the traces of ideas of critical regionalism in Bosnia and Herzegovina can be found as early as the reflections of Dušan Grabijan and the architectural practice of Juraj Neidhardt, where the traditional values of urban concepts and architectural ideas in Bosnia and Herzegovina were symbolically interpreted by using modern architectural language. We may thus say that Grabijan's and Neidhardt's critical reflections on contextualizing modernism in Bosnia and Herzegovina with regard to the traditional, or rather peculiar values of space in which the construction is taking place, as presented in the book Architecture of Bosnia and Its Road into the Contemporary (1957), were actually heralding the philosophy of critical regionalism in this region. Therefore, buildings such as the Mountaineering Centre Trebević (1948), Centre of Engineering and Technology on Boračko Lake (1957) by Juraj Neidhart, the family house in Konjic (1952) by Andrija Čičin-Šain, Hotel “Zelengora” in Foča (1955) by Branimir Mück and the Motel on Jablaničko Lake (1958) by Milivoj Peterčić must be considered as the material legacy of that idea from its earliest period.

kao što su Morića han u Sarajevu (revitalizacija, Husref Redžić i Nedžad Kurto, 1976.), Robna kuća u Jajcu (Džemaludin Karić i Nedžad Kurto, 1976.), obiteljska kuća „Dino“ u Sarajevu (Amir Vuk - Zec, 1987.); ili pak djela Zlatko Ugljen poput hotela „Ruža“ u Mostaru (1978.), hotel „Bregava“ u Stocu (1979.), dragulj bosansko-hercegovačke prijeratne postmoderne arhitekture Šerefudinova Bijela džamija u Visokom (1980.), hotel „Vučko“ na Jahorini (1984.) ili pak Katolička crkva s franjevačkim samostanom u Tuzli (1987.) jasno oslikavaju Framptonovu ideju kako se “arhitektura danas može održati samo kao kritička praksa ako podrazumijeva arričre-garde stajalište. To je ono koje se ograđuje jednakod od prosvjetiteljskog mita napretka kao i od nazadnog, nerealnog impulsa prema povratku arhitektonskim formama predindustrijske prošlosti. Kritički arričre-garde mora se otkloniti kako od optimizacije napredne tehnologije tako i od sveprisutne tendencije za povratkom nostalgičnom historicizmu puke dekorativnosti.”³²

Ideje kritičkog regionalizma uočljive su u poslijeratnom razdoblju u radovima Amira Vuka-Zeca: od već navedene kuće „Dino“ (izgrađena u razdoblju prije rata) do poslijeratnih gradevina zgrade Turskog kulturnog centra (2003.) i restorana „Golf Club“ u Sarajevu (2005.), džamije u Ostojićima (koautor Kenan Brčkalija, 2007.), ili pak hotela „Han“ na Bjelašnici (2009.). Kritičko promišljanje o odlikama i kvaliteti prostora u kojem se

This shift towards the idea of architecture as the middle way between the local/regional and the global in Bosnia and Herzegovina is even more evident in postmodernist buildings that rely on an interpretation of the vernacular and were built during the late 1970s and the 1980s. Building such as Morić-han in Sarajevo (revitalization by Husref Redžić and Nedžad Kurto, 1976), Department Store in Jajce (Džemaludin Karić and Nedžad Kurto, 1976), family house “Dino” in Sarajevo (Amir Vuk - Zec, 1987), or those designed by Zlatko Ugljen, such as Hotel “Ruža” in Mostar (1978), Hotel “Bregava” in Stolac (1979), Šerefudin’s White Mosque in Visoko as a pearl of pre-war postmodern architecture in Bosnia and Herzegovina (1980), Hotel “Vučko” on Mount Jahorina (1984), or the Catholic church with the Franciscan monastery in Tuzla (1987), clearly illustrate Frampton’s idea that “[A]rchitecture can only be sustained today as a critical practice if it assumes an arričre-garde position, that is to say, one which distances itself equally from the Enlightenment myth of progress and from a reactionary, unrealistic impulse to returning to the architectonic forms of the preindustrial past. A critical arričre-garde has to remove itself from both the optimization of advanced technology and the ever-present tendency to regress into nostalgic historicism or the glibly decorative.”³²

Ideas of critical regionalism are manifested in the post-war period as early as in the designs of Amir Vuk - Zec: from the

gradi odlikuje i neke od projekata arhitekata srednje generacije, kao što su „Smart House“ u Sarajevu (Dušan Jovanović i Zorica Penusliski, 2007.), „Nova Avlja“ (Kvadrat d.o.o., 2013.), građevina benzinske postaje i odmorišta na Nišićima (Vesna Halebić, 2010.), projekt obnove tvrđave Mala kula (Adnan Pašić, 2009.-2011).³³ i poslovni objekt Širbegović u Sarajevu (Adnan Drnda, 2008.) te projekti biroa „Normal-architektura“ Emira Salkića i Muhameda Serdarevića sa suradnicima (poslovna građevina „FedEx Express“ u Sarajevu iz 2007., individualna stambena zgrada u Miševićima iz 2008., „Music Farm“ u Sarajevu iz 2009. i zgrada Vinarije „Nuić“ u Ljubuškom iz 2012.). Međutim, kritičko sagledavanje prostora i vremena nazire se i u idejnim postulatima i arhitektonskim promišljanjima mladih arhitekata i studija, gdje se kao ilustracija mogu predstaviti idejno rješenje Spomen-obilježja 2. maj 1992. u Sarajevu (Emir Muratbegović, Ervin Prašljivić, Asmir Šabić i Adnan Zvonić, 2012.) koje u konačnici nije ostvareno iz formalno-ideoloških razloga, iako je prvonagrađeno natjecajno rješenje,³⁴ projekt „Vile Radava“ u Sarajevu (PROMO studio i Mirna Lončarica, 2012.), pristup dizajnu prostora Trga sevdaha (Nedim Mutevelić, Prašljivić Ervin i Asmir Šabić, 2007.) te idejni projekt Omladinskog skijaškog centra na Bjelašnici (Vedad Kasumagić, Feda Hadžibegović i Gorica Mehić, 2012.-2016.). Predstavljeni opusi nastoje kritički sagledati vrijeme u kojem nastaju i prostor u kojem se formiraju. Istodobno, dok nalaze

uporiše u lokalnim, tj. ambijentalnim, pejzažnim, topografskim, klimatskim, ali i naslijedenim vrijednostima prostora u kojem nastaju, idu ukorak sa suvremenim promišljanjima o arhitekturi kao ishodu tehnoloških, strukturalnih i materijalnih mogućnosti novih tehnologija. Time, iako se ponekad javljaju prostorne nesuglasice između novih i prostora koji pripadaju naslijedu iz razdoblja socijalizma, kao što je to slučaj s odnosom građevine „Smart House“ i Spomen-parka „Vraca“ u Sarajevu, gdje vizure koje karakteriziraju taj memorijalni sklop bivaju degradirane smještajem i gabaritom nove građevine, djela koja prate smjernice kritičkog regionalizma ipak u najvećoj mjeri prihvaćaju modalitete i kvalitete koje je arhitektonska baština iz razdoblja socijalizma ostavila u naslijeđe.

Zaključak

Zanemarivanje modernog i postmodernog arhitektonskog naslijeđa izgrađenog u socijalističkom i poslijeratnom razdoblju vezano je kako uz konzervatorski pristup obnovi ratom degradiranih ili potpuno uništenih građevina tako i uz proces proglašavanja kulturno-historijskih dobara nacionalnim spomenicima na državnoj razini iz kojeg je naslijeđe druge polovice 20. stoljeća gotovo posve izuzeto. Na prostornoj razini devalvacija našelja i matrica nastalih urbanizacijom za vrijeme socijalizma prouzročena je

(ŠČEZAVANJE. HISTORIJSKI MUZEJ BIH (BORIS MAGAŠ, EDO ŠMIDHEN I RADOVAN HORVAT, 1963.)
I IMPORTANE CENTAR, SARAJEVO (SANJA I IGOR GROZDANIĆ, 2007.-2010.); SARAJEVO. FOTOGRAFIJA: NINA STEVANOVIĆ, 2011.
EVANESCENCE. HISTORICAL MUSEUM OF BOSNIA AND HERZEGOVINA (BORIS MAGAŠ, EDO ŠMIDHEN, AND RADOVAN HORVAT, 1963)
AND IMPORTANE CENTRE, SARAJEVO (SANJA AND IGOR GROZDANIĆ, 2007-2010), SARAJEVO. PHOTO: NINA STEVANOVIĆ, 2011)

NINA
STEVANOVIĆ

abovementioned family house “Dino” (built before the war) to the post-war buildings such as the Turkish Cultural Centre (2003) and the restaurant “Golf Club” in Sarajevo (2005), the mosque in Ostojići (co-authored by Kenan Brčkalija, 2007), or Hotel “Han” on Mount Bjelašnica (2009). Critical reflection on the features and quality of space in which something is to be constructed features in some of the projects by architects of the “middle generation,” such as the “Smart House” in Sarajevo (Dušan Jovanović and Zorica Penusliski, 2007), “Nova Avlja” (Kvadrat d.o.o., 2013), the petrol station and motel in Nišići (Vesna Halebić, 2010), project for the reconstruction of the Small Tower (Adnan Pašić, 2009-2011),³³ and the office building “Širbegović” in Sarajevo (Adnan Drnda, 2008), as well as designs by “Normal - arhitektura”: Emir Salkić and Muhamed Serdarević with collaborators (office building of “FedEx” in Sarajevo (2007), individual apartment building in Miševići (2008), “Musical Farm” in Sarajevo (2009), and the building of “Nuić” winery in Ljubuško (2012). However, a critical view of space and time is also evident in the conceptual postulates and architectural reflections of young architects and university programmes. As an illustrative example, one may mention the monument commemorating May 2, 1992 in Sarajevo (Emir Muratbegović, Ervin Prašljivić, Asmir Šabić, and Adnan Zvonić, 2012), which was eventually not realized because of formal and ideological reasons, although it was the first-awarded project,³⁴ the “Villa Radava” in Sarajevo (PROMO

Studio and Mirna Lončarica, 2012), the design of Sevdah Square (Nedim Mutevelić, Ervin Prašljivić, and Asmir Šabić, 2007), and the concept for the Youth Ski Centre on Mount Bjelašnica (Vedad Kasumagić, Feda Hadžibegović, and Gorica Mehić, 2012-2016). These opuses seek to critically assess the time in which they have been created and the space that has shaped them. At the same time, while anchored in the local values, that is, in the ambience, landscape, topography, climate, and heritage of their region, they still keep pace with the time and the contemporary reflections on architecture as a result of technological, structural, and material potentials of modern technology. Thus, although there are occasional discrepancies between the new structures and those that belong to the socialist legacy, as is the case with the relationship between “Smart House” and the Memorial Park “Vraca” in Sarajevo, where the vistas characteristic for this memorial complex have been degraded by the positioning and the dimensions of the new building, projects made in the spirit of critical regionalism nevertheless mostly accept the modalities and qualities inherited from the architecture of socialism.

Conclusion

The neglect of modern and postmodern architectural legacy from the socialist and post-war period is linked, on the one hand, to the conservationist approach to the reconstruction of buildings

ARHITEKTONSKIE
PRAKSE POSLJERATNE
BOSNE I HERCEGOVINE
I ODNOŠ PREMA
NASLJEDU IZ
RAZDOBLJA
SOCIJALIZMA

ARCHITECTURAL
PRACTICES IN
POST-WAR BOSNIA
AND HERZEGOVINA:
THE TREATMENT OF
SOCIALIST LEGACY



nedorečenošću prostornih koncepcija nastalih u tom vremenu, kao i površnih intervencija nakon 1995. godine, a koje su funkcionalno i sadržajno, a zatim i oblikovno i likovno, umjesto nadogradnje najčešće degradirale navedene prostore.

S druge strane, u okviru arhitektonskih postsocijalističkih diskursa možemo uočiti kako je zanemarivanje naslijeda socijalističkog modernizma vezano uz oblikovne i konceptualne razloge u slučaju „čistih“ postmodernih praksi te da se odbacivanje navedenog naslijeda javlja kao posljedica kulturno-političkih težnji za (re)definiranjem kulturnih identiteta u slučaju neopovijesnih arhitektonskih praksi.

Stoga pristupi razvijanju suvremenog arhitektonskog jezika koji prate ideje kritičkog regionalizma najbliže označavaju mogućnosti pozitivnog odnosa prema arhitektonskom naslijedu iz razdoblja socijalizma.

Međutim, za uspješno očuvanje naslijeda moderne i postmoderne socijalizma nuždan je pozitivistički i kvalitativan pristup sagledavanju njegovih doprinosova i vrijednosti. Odlike prostornih praksi modernističkih projekata urbanizacije iz socijalističkog razdoblja, kao što su cjelovitost promišljanja prostora na makroubanističkom planu i inzistiranje na zaštiti vrijednosti zajedničkih cjelina na mikroubanističkoj razini, potrebno je revalorizirati sadašnjim prostornim djelovanjima te ih sagledati u odnosu na specifičnost potreba vremena u kojem nastaju. Valorizaciji jednostavnosti i

čistoće arhitektonskog izraza, koje proistječu iz funkcije i sadržaja moderne, a koje povezujemo uz specifična nastojanja za masovnim poboljšavanjem kvalitete života radnika i srednje klase građana, te ekspresivnosti i specifičnosti strukture postmoderne, povezane uz promjenu društvene paradigme u navedenom razdoblju, ne bi se smjelo pristupati samo s društvenoga i kulturnoga gledišta, nego prvenstveno kao arhitektonskom uporištu u daljem razvoju suvremenih oblikovnih i vizualnih zamisli. Istodobno, promatrajući poslijeratni arhitektonski diskurs u globalnom kontekstu, a imajući na umu proces globalizacije i nastojanja za očuvanjem osobitosti kulturnih identiteta koji iz njega proistječu, bitno je primijetiti da značajke moderne i postmoderne arhitekture, u kojima su sadržani pojmovi koherentnosti, moderniteta i progresa, također predstavljaju vrijednosti na kojima se treba zasnovati proces rekonstrukcije i nadogradnje suvremenog identiteta bosansko-hercegovačkog društva. Stoga, ako arhitektura, kao i jezik, tradicija, kultura, simbol, predstavlja jedan od elemenata u kojima se ogleda društvo, doprinos arhitektonskih praksi iz razdoblja socijalizma u izgradnji karaktera kulturnog identiteta bosansko-hercegovačkog društva mora biti uzet u obzir.

¹ UNESCO Mexico City Declaration on Cultural Policies, Mexico City, 1982, Preamble, Paragraph 6. http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/files/35197/11919410061mexico_en.pdf/mexico_en.pdf

damaged or demolished during the war, and on the other hand to the way in which certain elements of cultural and ethnical legacy have been acknowledged as national monuments on the state level, whereby heritage from the second half of the 20th century has been almost completely ignored.

On the level of physical planning, the devaluation of towns and urban patterns from the socialist period has been a consequence of inconsistent spatial concept and superficial interventions after 1995, since these spaces were mostly degraded rather than enhanced in terms of function and content, as well as design and visual impression. On the other hand, postsocialist architectural discourses reveal that the neglect of socialist modernist heritage has, in case of “pure” postmodernist practices, been linked to both formal and conceptual consideration, whereas in the neo-historical architectural practices the rejection of this legacy has been a consequence of cultural and political aspirations aimed at a (re-)definition of cultural identities.

Therefore, critical-regionalist approaches to the evolution of contemporary architectural expression may best describe the potential of developing a positive attitude towards the architectural legacy from the socialist period.

However, in order to successfully preserve the legacy of socialist modernism and postmodernism, it is important to adopt a positivistic and qualitative approach to its contributions and

values. Features of urban planning in modernist projects from the socialist period, such as the totality of physical planning on the macro-urban level and the insistence on preserving the values of common entities on the micro-urban level, must be re-evaluated in present-day physical planning, and also viewed in the context of present-day needs. Acknowledging the simplicity and purity of architectural expression that are typical of modernism in terms of both function and content, and were related to the specific, large-scale efforts at improving the quality of life for the working and middle classes, as well as the expressivity and structural specificity of postmodernism as linked to the change of social paradigm in that period, should not be approached from the social and cultural standpoint alone, but primarily as an architectural fundament for the further evolution of contemporary design and visual concepts. At the same time, when considering the post-war architectural discourse in the global context, and keeping in mind the process of globalization and the ensuing tendency to preserve the specificities of cultural identities, it is important to note that the features of modern and postmodern architecture that contain notions such as coherence, modernity, and progress, are values that should also serve as a basis for the process of reconstructing and developing the contemporary identity of Bosnian and Herzegovinian society. Therefore, if architecture is an element in which the society is

² Manuel Castells, *The Power of Identity*, Blackwell Publishing Ltd, Oxford, 2004; Stuart Hall, „Cultural Identity and Diaspora“, u: J. Rutherford (ur.), *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference*, Lawrence & Wishart, London, 222–37; Stuart Hall, “Who needs ‘Identity’?”, u: Stuart Hall (ur.), *Questions of Cultural Identity*, SAGE Publications Ltd, London, 2003, 1–17; Lawrence Grossberg, “Identity and Cultural Studies – Is That All There Is?”, u: Stuart Hall (ur.), *Questions of Cultural Identity*, SAGE Publications Ltd, London, 2003, 87–107; Kathryn Woodward, “Concepts of Identity and Difference”, u: Kathryn Woodward (ur.), *Identity and Difference: Culture, Media and Identities*, SAGE Publications Ltd, London, 2002, 7–62; David D. Laitin, *Identity in Formation: The Russian-Speaking Populations in the New Abroad*, Cornell University Press, New York, 1998; Mustafa Koç, „Cultural Identity Crisis in the Age of Globalization and Technology“, u: *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology – TOJET*, Januar 2006, Vol. 5 br. 1, 37–43.

³ Charles Jencks, *Post-Modernism: The New Classicism in Art and Architecture*, Academy Editions, London, 1987, 337.

⁴ Određenje pristupa obnovi graditeljskog naslijeđa preuzeto je iz istraživanja magistrske teze: Nina Stevanović, *The Revitalization of Architectural Heritage and (Re)Interpretations of Cultural Identity*, Escuela Técnica Superior de Barcelona, Universidad Politecnica de Catalunya, Barcelona, juni 2011, 3.

⁵ http://kons.gov.ba/main.php?id_struct=165&lang=1 i http://kons.gov.ba/main.php?id_struct=115&lang=1 (zadnji pregled: 27. 3. 2014.).

⁶ Komisija za očuvanje nacionalnih spomenika Bosne i Hercegovine, *Odluka o izmjeni Kriterija za proglašenje dobara nacionalnim spomenicima*, br. 01.2-6-792/03, 6. – 12. maja 2003. godine, Sarajevo. http://www.kons.gov.ba/main.php?id_struct=40&lang=1 (zadnji pregled: 27. 3. 2014.).

ARHITEKTONSKIE
PRAKSE POSLJERATNE
BOSNE I HERCEGOVINE
I ODNOŠ PREMA
NASLJEDBU IZ
RAZDOBLJA
SOCIJALIZMA

ARCHITECTURAL
PRACTICES IN
POST-WAR BOSNIA
AND HERZEGOVINA:
THE TREATMENT OF
SOCIALIST LEGACY

reflected, just like its language, tradition, culture, and symbols, then the contribution of architectural practices from the socialist period must be taken into account as an important element in the construction of Bosnian and Herzegovinian identity.

¹ UNESCO Mexico City Declaration on Cultural Policies, Mexico City, 1982, Preamble, Paragraph 6, http://portal.unesco.org/culture/en/files/35197/11919410061mexico_en.pdf/mexico_en.pdf

² Manuel Castells, *The Power of Identity* (Oxford: Blackwell Publishing Ltd, 2004); Stuart Hall, “Cultural Identity and Diaspora”, in: J. Rutherford (ed.), *Identity: Community, Culture, Difference* (London: Lawrence & Wishart, 1990), 222–237; Stuart Hall, “Who needs ‘Identity’?”, in: idem (ed.), *Questions of Cultural Identity* (London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2003), 1–17; Lawrence Grossberg, “Identity and Cultural Studies – Is That All There Is?”, in: Stuart Hall (ed.), *Questions of Cultural Identity* (as before), 87–107; Kathryn Woodward, “Concepts of Identity and Difference”, in: Kathryn Woodward (ed.), *Identity and Difference: Culture, Media and Identities* (London: SAGE Publications Ltd, 2002), 7–62; David D. Laitin, *Identity in Formation: The Russian-Speaking Populations in the New Abroad* (New York: Cornell University Press, 1998); Mustafa Koç, “Cultural Identity Crisis in the Age of Globalization and Technology,” *The Turkish Online Journal of Educational Technology – TOJET* 5/1 (January 2006), 37–43.

³ Charles Jencks, *Post-Modernism: The New Classicism in Art and Architecture* (London: Academy Editions, 1987), 337.

⁴ The definition of this approach to the reconstruction of architectural heritage was a part of my MA research, cf. Nina Stevanović, *The Revitalization of Architectural Heritage and (Re)Interpretations of*

⁷ Komisija za očuvanje nacionalnih spomenika Bosne i Hercegovine, *Kriteriji za proglašenje dobara nacionalnim spomenicima*, br. 01-203/02 od 3. – 9. septembra 2002. godine, Sarajevo. http://www.kons.gov.ba/main.php?id_struct=40&lang=1 (zadnji pregled: 27. 3. 2014.).

⁸ Član Odluke glasi: “U Kriterijima za proglašenje dobara nacionalnim spomenicima (‘Službeni glasnik BiH’, br. 33/02), u točki II.A. Vremensko određenje, riječi i brojke: ‘do kraja XX stoljeća’ zamjenjuju se rijećima i brojkama: ‘do 1960. godine’.”

⁹ U Obrazloženju Odluke navodi se: “Komisija za očuvanje nacionalnih spomenika primila je veliki broj peticija za proglašenje dobara nacionalnim spomenicima, od kojih se veći broj odnosi na građevine koje su sagradene nakon rata, a ne na one koje predstavljaju značajno, vrlo staro i ugroženo naslijeđe. Shodno tome, Komisija je zaključila da, s obzirom na ugroženost spomenika koji su stari i više stoljeća, odnosno neugroženost spomenika za koje se podnose peticije, u toku svog potgodišnjeg mandata razmatra samo one spomenike koji su nastali u toku bosanskohercegovačke historije do 1960. godine. To ni u kom slučaju ne znači da kada navedeni spomenici budu zakonito inventirani i kategorizirani i kada budu poduzete neophodne mjere zaštite kojima će se sprječiti njihovo uništavanje, Komisija neće donijeti odluku o pomjeranju vremenskog okvira i otvoriti mogućnost većeg hronološkog obuhvata zaštićenog naslijeđa u Bosni i Hercegovini.”

¹⁰ Zaključno s datumom pisanja članka sedamstotinapadesetipet (755) dobara je proglašeno nacionalnim spomenicima Bosne i Hercegovine, dok se još četiristotinčećetrdesetipet (445) dobara nalazi na Privremenoj listi nacionalnih spomenika Bosne i Hercegovine.

¹¹ *Odluka o izmjeni Kriterija za proglašenje dobara nacionalnim spomenicima*, br. 01.2-6-792/03 od 6 – 12. maja 2003. godine, Sarajevo,

Cultural Identity (Barcelona: Escuela Técnica Superior de Barcelona, Universidad Politecnica de Catalunya (June 2011), 3.

⁵ http://kons.gov.ba/main.php?id_struct=165&lang=1 i http://kons.gov.ba/main.php?id_struct=115&lang=1 (last accessed on March 27, 2014).

⁶ Commission for the Preservation of National Monuments in Bosnia and Herzegovina, *Odluka o izmjeni Kriterija za proglašenje dobara nacionalnim spomenicima* [Decision on the modification of Criteria for National Monuments], no. 01.2-6-792/03 (Sarajevo, May 6–12, 2003), Sarajevo, http://www.kons.gov.ba/main.php?id_struct=40&lang=1 (last accessed on March 27, 2014).

⁷ Commission for the Preservation of National Monuments in Bosnia and Herzegovina, *Kriteriji za proglašenje dobara nacionalnim spomenicima* [Criteria for National Monuments], no. 01-203/02 (Sarajevo, September 3–9, 2002), http://www.kons.gov.ba/main.php?id_struct=40&lang=1 (last accessed on March 27, 2014).

⁸ An article in the Decision runs as follows: “In the Criteria for National Monuments (*Gazette of Bosnia and Herzegovina* 33/02), pt. II.A on Time Limitation, the wording and number ‘before the end of the 20th century’ are replaced by the wording and number ‘before 1960.’”

⁹ The explanation for the Decision includes the following statement: “Commission for the Preservation of National Monuments has received numerous petitions that ask for acknowledging various cultural goods as national monuments, most of which are buildings constructed after the war rather than important, very old, and endangered heritage. In accordance with that, the Commission has concluded that, regarding the endangered state of monuments, some of which are centuries old, as compared to the non-endangered state of monuments to which these petitions refer, we will in the course of our five-year mandate take into consideration only those monuments which form part of the history of Bosnia and Herzegovina before 1960.”

- Obrazloženje, Stav III.
- ¹² Josep María Montaner, Zaida Muxi, *Arquitectura y política*, Editorial Gustavo Gili, SL, Barcelona, 2011, 17.
- ¹³ Charles Jencks, *Post-Modernism: The New Classicism in Art and Architecture*, Academy Editions, London, 1987, 336.
- ¹⁴ Isto, 249.
- ¹⁵ Isto, 245.
- ¹⁶ Isto, 33
- ¹⁷ Gisdomenico Amendola, *La ciudad postmoderna*, Celeste Ediciones, Madrid, 2000, 31–32.
- ¹⁸ Srdan Jovanović Weiss, "Turbo Architecture", u: *Atlas of Transformation*: <http://monumenttotransformation.org/atlas-of-transformation/html/t/turbo-architecture/turbo-architecture-srdjan-jovanovic-weiss.html> (zadnji pregled: 27. 3. 2014.).
- ¹⁹ Hans Ibelings, "Restart", u: Hans Ibelings (ur.), *Restart – Arhitektura u Bosni i Hercegovini 1995 – 2010*, Buybook, Sarajevo, 2010, 11.
- ²⁰ Isto, 12.
- ²¹ O ironiji, dvoznačnosti i kontradikciji kao odlikama postmoderne arhitekture vidi: Charles Jencks, *Post-Modernism: The New Classicism in Art and Architecture*, Academy Editions, London, 1987, 310; Charles Jenks, *The Story of Post-Modernism*, John Wiley / Sons Ltd, West Sussex, 2011, 74–79; Nan Ellin, *Postmodern Urbanism*, Blackwell Publishers Ltd, Cambridge, 1996, 118–122.
- ²² Manfredo Tafuri, „Para una crítica de la ideología arquitectónica”, u: Manfredo Tafuri, Massimo Cacciari, Francesco Dal Co, *De la vanguardia a la metrópolis: Crítica radical de la arquitectura*, Editorial Gustavo Gili, SL, Barcelona, 1972, 70.
- ²³ Charles Jencks, *Post-Modernism: The New Classicism in Art and Architecture*, Academy Editions, London, 17.
- ²⁴ Vladimir Kulić, Maroje Mrduljaš, Wolfgang Thaler, *Modernism*
- In-Between: The Mediatory Architecture of Socialist Yugoslavia*, jovis VerlagGmbH, Berlin, 2012, 37.
- ²⁵ Isto, 38.
- ²⁶ Ivan Štraus, *99 arhitekata sarajevskog kruga 1930.-1990.*, TKD Šahinpašić/BTC Šahinpašić, Sarajevo/Zagreb, 2010., 71.
- ²⁷ Charles Jencks: *The New Paradigm in Architecture*, Yale University Press New Haven and London, 2002, 29.
- ²⁸ Tekija je islamska samostanska građevina u kojem se okupljaju, vrše vjerske obrede, često i žive pripadnici mističkog učenja o Islamu tasavufa: sufiji, u Bosni i Hercegovini znani pod nazivom derviši.
- ²⁹ <http://www.apostolskiprvaci.info/stranice/povijest> (zadnji pregled: 20. 1. 2014.).
- ³⁰ Tanja Petrović, *Yurope. Jugoslovensko nasleđe i politike budućnosti u postjugoslovenskim društvima*, Fabrika knjiga, Beograd, 2012., 171–172.
- ³¹ Kenneth Frampton, „Towards a Critical Regionalism: Six Points for an Architecture of Resistance”, u: Hal Foster (ur.), *The Anti-Aesthetics: Essays on Postmodern Culture*, Bay Press, Port Townsend, Washington, 1987, 21.
- ³² Isto, 20.
- ³³ Konačni izgled tvrđave Mala kula u Sarajevu u značajnoj mjeri razlikuje se od projektnog rješenja Adnana Pašića budući da je u izvedbenoj fazi Općina Centar Sarajevo kao investitor dala izvršiti znatne preinake autorova djela.
- ³⁴ Odlukom Asocijacije arhitekata Bosne i Hercegovine, kao provodjica konkursnog natječaja za Općinu Centar Sarajevo za idejni projekt rješenja Spomen-obilježja 2. maj 1992.,(2012.) 1. nagrada dodijeljena je navedenom idejnom prijedlogu. Međutim, nakon provedenog natječaja Općina Centar Sarajevo konkurs proglašava nevažećim te donosi odluku za raspisivanje novog konkursa, gdje se navodi da su razlozi za raspisivanje novog konkursa proceduralno-tehničkog karaktera.

NINA
STEVANOVIC

That being said, it by no means implies that, after these monuments have been adequately listed and categorized, and when proper measures have been taken to protect them and prevent their further deterioration, the Commission would not be willing to shift the time framework and allow for a wider chronological inclusion of protected heritage in Bosnia and Herzegovina.”

¹⁰ Until this date, 755 cultural goods have been proclaimed national monuments of Bosnia and Herzegovina, and 445 more have been included in the Temporary List of National Monuments in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

¹¹ *Odluka o izmjeni Kriterija za proglašenje dobara nacionalnim spomenicima* (as in n. 6), no. 01.2-6-792/03 (Sarajevo, May 6-12, 2003), Explanation, Statement III.

¹² Josep María Montaner and Zaida Muxi, *Arquitectura y política* (Barcelona: Editorial Gustavo Gili, SL, 2011), 17.

¹³ Charles Jencks (as in n. 3), 336.

¹⁴ Ibid., 249.

¹⁵ Ibid., 245.

¹⁶ Gisdomenico Amendola, *La ciudad postmoderna* (Madrid: Celeste Ediciones, 2000), 33.

¹⁷ Ibid., 31-32.

¹⁸ Srdan Jovanović Weiss, "Turbo Architecture", in: *Atlas of Transformation*, <http://monumenttotransformation.org/atlas-of-transformation/html/t/turbo-architecture/turbo-architecture-srdjan-jovanovic-weiss.html> (last accessed on March 27, 2014).

¹⁹ Hans Ibelings, "Restart", in: Hans Ibelings (ed.), *Restart – Arhitektura u Bosni i Hercegovini 1995 – 2010* [Restart: Architecture in Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1995-2010] (Sarajevo: Buybook, 2010), 11.

²⁰ Ibidem.

²¹ On irony, ambiguity, and contradiction as characteristics of postmodern architecture, see: Charles Jencks (as in n. 13), 310; idem, *The Story of Post-Modernism* (West Sussex: John Wiley / Sons Ltd, 2011), 74-79; Nan Ellin, *Postmodern Urbanism* (Cambridge: Blackwell Publishers Ltd, 1996), 118-122.

²² Manfredo Tafuri, "Para una crítica de la ideología arquitectónica", in: Manfredo Tafuri, Massimo Cacciari, and Francesco Dal Co, *De la vanguardia a la metrópolis: Crítica radical de la arquitectura* (Barcelona: Editorial Gustavo Gili, SL, 1972), 70.

²³ Charles Jencks (as in n. 13), 17.

²⁴ Vladimir Kulić, Maroje Mrduljaš, and Wolfgang Thaler, *Modernism In-Between: The Mediatory Architecture of Socialist Yugoslavia* (Berlin: Jovis, 2012), 37.

²⁵ Ibid., 38.

²⁶ Ivan Štraus, *99 arhitekata sarajevskog kruga 1930.-1990.* [99 architects of the Sarajevo circle, 1930-1990] Sarajevo and Zagreb: TKD Šahinpašić/BTC Šahinpašić, 2010., 71.

²⁷ Charles Jencks: *The New Paradigm in Architecture* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press, 2002), 29.

²⁸ Takiyah is an Islamic monastic building used for the gatherings, religious rituals, and sometimes accommodation of the Sufi, adherents of the *tasavufa*, a mystical teachings on Islam, who are known as the Dervish in Bosnia and Herzegovina.

²⁹ <http://www.apostolskiprvaci.info/stranice/povijest> (last accessed on January 20, 2014).

³⁰ Tanja Petrović, *Yurope. Jugoslovensko nasleđe i politike budućnosti u postjugoslovenskim društvima* [Yurope: The Yugoslav legacy and the politics of future in post-Yugoslav societies] (Belgrade: Fabrika knjiga, 2012), 171-172.

Međutim, možemo tvrditi da su stvarni razlozi za odbacivanje konkursa, a time i nagradjenog rješenja, ipak formalno-ideološke prirode, a što se može iščitati iz riječi predsjedavajućeg Općinskog vijeća, gosp. Slavena Kovačevića, koje oslikavaju smjernice u kojima se kreće novi konkursni okvir: "Bez nekog nastojanja da utičemo na idejni projekt, želim istaći da u široj javnosti prevladava želja da se gradi spomenik koji bi svojom monumentalnošću i izgledom odmah asocirao na važnost događaja od 2. maja 1992. Odjeci koje primam iz javnosti jasno govore da je Sarajevu dosta staklenih spomenika, te da je vrijeme za jedan sadržajan klasičan i lako prihvatljiv spomenik za sve naše građane, posebno one koji su preživljavali najteže trenutke tokom agresije, napomenuo je Kovačević." ("Oslobodenje", 18. 5. 2012.)

ARHITEKTONSKE
PRAKSE POSLJERATNE
BOSNE I HERCEGOVINE
I ODNOŠ PREMA
NASLJEDU IZ
RAZDORIJA
SOCIJALIZMA

ARCHITECTURAL
PRACTICES IN
POST-WAR BOSNIA
AND HERZEGOVINA:
THE TREATMENT OF
SOCIALIST LEGACY

³¹ Kenneth Frampton, "Towards a Critical Regionalism: Six Points for an Architecture of Resistance," in: Hal Foster (ed.), *The Anti-Aesthetic: Essays on Postmodern Culture* (Port Townsend and Washington: Bay Press, 1983), 21.

³² Ibid., 20.

³³ The final appearance of the Small Fortress in Sarajevo significantly differs from the original design by Adnan Pašić, since the investor, the Central District ordered major alterations to be introduced during the construction phase.

³⁴ According to a decision by the Association of Architects of Bosnia and Herzegovina as the initiator of the competition for the Central District of Sarajevo, the first-awarded concept for the monument commemorating May 2, 1992 (2012) was the abovementioned. However, the Central District of Sarajevo retroactively proclaimed the competition invalid and announced a new competition, where it stated its reasons to be related to the technical aspects of the procedure. One may, however, assume that the actual reasons for rejecting the competition, including the selected project, were after all formal and ideological in character, which is confirmed by the words of the President of the District Council, Mr Slaven Kovačević, which illustrate well the orientation of the new competition: "Although it is not our intention to exert any influence on the concept, I would like to state that the wider public shows a wish to have a monument whose monumental appearance would be immediately associated to the importance of the event of May 2, 1992. Comments that I have received clearly indicate that Sarajevo has had enough of glass monuments, and that the time has come to erect a meaningful, classical, and universally acceptable monument that would address all our citizens, especially those who lived through the most difficult moments of our history at the times of aggression, as stated by Kovačević." (*Oslobodenje* on May 18, 2012).