

CIAM *networking* – Međunarodni kongres moderne arhitekture i hrvatski arhitekti 1950-ih godina

TAMARA
BJAŽIĆ
KLARIN



IZVORNI ZNANSTVENI RAD

PREĐAN: 13.6.2016.

PRIHVAĆEN: 19.9.2016.

UDK: 316.772:72.036(497.5)“195“

SAŽETAK: Međunarodni kongres moderne arhitekture (CIAM) vodeći je arhitektonski i urbanistički forum u razdoblju od 1928. do 1959. predan zadacima rješavanja globalnih problema, krize stanovanja i suvremenih gradova. Zbog značaja CIAM-a, a zatim i Teama X, kako za lokalnu povijest hrvatske arhitekture i gradogradnje tako i one čitave bivše Jugoslavije, ovaj je rad pokušao rekonstruirati i istražiti osobne mreže dvaju glavnih aktera CIAM-a iz Hrvatske 1950-ih godina, arhitekata Drage Iblera (1894.–1964.) i Radovana Nikšića (1920.–1987.) koristeći se i metodama klasične historiografije i mrežnom analizom. Istovremeno, rad daje i prvi cjelovitiji uvid u djelovanje hrvatskih arhitekata unutar CIAM-a u drugoj polovini 1950-ih godina koje koincidira s organizacijom posljednjega Desetog kongresa, sletom okolnosti održanog u Dubrovniku 1956., te rasapa samog CIAM-a u Otterlou 1959.

KLJUČNE RIJEČI: Međunarodni kongres moderne arhitekture (CIAM), Team X, Deseti kongres CIAM-a, Drago Ibler, Radovan Nikšić, Jacob Berend Bakema.

SUDJONICI POSLJEDNJEG OKUPLJANJA CIAM-A U OTTERLOU, 1959.
(RADOVAN NIKŠIĆ U ČETVRTOM REDU, DRUGI S DESNA).
PRIVATNI ARHIV IJVANE NIKŠIĆ OLUJIĆ, ZAGREB.

PARTICIPANTS OF THE LAST CIAM MEETING IN OTTERLO, 1959
(RADOVAN NIKŠIĆ IS IN THE FOURTH ROW, SECOND ON THE RIGHT).
IVANA NIKŠIĆ OLUJIĆ PRIVATE ARCHIVES, ZAGREB.

ORIGINAL SCIENTIFIC PAPER

RECEIVED: JUNE 13TH 2016

ACCEPTED: SEPTEMBER 19TH 2016

UDC: 316.772:72.036(497.5)“195“

ABSTRACT: The International Congress of Modern Architecture (CIAM), operating from 1928 to 1959, was a leading forum on architecture and urbanism committed to solving global issues, the housing crisis and the problems of modern cities. Due to CIAM's and subsequently Team X's significance for the *local* Croatian as well as Yugoslav history of architecture and urbanism, this paper attempts to reconstruct and analyse *personal* networks of two CIAM's main actors from Croatia in the 1950s – the architects Drago Ibler (1894–1964) and Radovan Nikšić (1920–1987) – by using methods of classic historiography and network analysis. This paper also provides the first comprehensive insight into the work of Croatian architects within CIAM in the second half of the 1950s – the period that coincides with the last Tenth Congress which was held, by concatenation of circumstances, in Dubrovnik in 1956 and the dissolution of CIAM in Otterlo in 1959.

KEYWORDS: International Congress of Modern Architecture (CIAM), Team X, CIAM 10 in Dubrovnik, Drago Ibler, Radovan Nikšić, Jacob Berend Bakema.

Uvod

Po prirodi posla arhitekti su predodređeni za suradnju i timski rad koji, međutim, osim one praktične strane uvjetovane složenošću i obimom arhitektonskog ili urbanističkog zadatka često ima i *viši* cilj – profesionalni, društveni ili umjetnički. U Hrvatskoj u razmatranom razdoblju od kraja 19. stoljeća do 1960-ih godina modeli grupiranja, odnosno organiziranja slijede lako čitljivu razvojnu liniju, zajedničku i likovnim umjetnicima s kojima arhitekti često interferiraju, predodređeni općim društvenim i kulturno-povijesnim trenutkom. Utemeljiteljsko doba konca 19. stoljeća vrijeme je profesionalnog ustrojavanja različitih struka, društava i javnih ustanova, pa tako i onog inženjera i arhitekata.¹ Razumijevanje arhitekture kao autentične discipline koja balansira između inženjerstva i umjetnosti dovelo je do svojevrstne emancipacije – osnivanja Kluba hrvatskih arhitekata, a prvi ideološki prijevori, tj. kohezija istomišljenika i do uspostavljanja dva pola arhitektonske scene – revolucionarnih mladih i etabliranih starih. Ovo grupiranje i konfrontiranje u načelu je sastavni dio procesa etabliranja novog diskursa i stvaralačkog htijenja, arhitektonske i urbanističke misli i prakse – afirmacije modernizma započetog protofunkcionalizmom i nakon dionice klasiciziranog modernizma zaključenog *novim građenjem* (ostvarenim u cijelosti nakon Drugog svjetskog rata). Glavni mediji za iskazivanje te različitosti mišljenja, odnosno kohezije decenijima su bili manifesti ili programski članci te

CIAM *Networking* – International Congress of Modern Architecture and Croatian Architects in the 1950s

izložbe – od članka „Moderna arhitektura“ Viktora Kovačića i *Hrvatskog salona* na kojem 1898. sudjeluje kao jedini arhitekt, preko manifesta Udruženja umjetnika Zemlja i prvih projekata u duhu *novog građenja* Drage Iblera predstavljenih na prvoj izložbi Zemlje 1929. godine, do na isti način javnosti predočenog manifesta grupe EXAT-51 dva decenija kasnije.² Izložbe i časopisi, uz arhitektonske i urbanističke natječaje, bili su ujedno i sredstvo diseminacije i modus povezivanja – *umrežavanja* istomišljenika, uz rijetke iznimke, u načelu uglavnom na lokalnoj razini. Za onu internacionalnu presudni su, međutim, osobni kontakti hrvatskih arhitekata s vodećim autorskim osobnostima europske arhitekture i gradogradnje Ottom Wagnerom, Adolfom Loosom, Hansom Poelzigom, Peterom Behrensom, Le Corbusierom i Jacobom Bakemom. Osobni kontakt, tj. mreže bile su ujedno i najefikasniji i najplodonosniji način prijenosa spomenutih novih tendencija. U razdoblju od 1880-ih do 1919. godine, kada Hrvatska nema svoju arhitektonsku školu i arhitekti su integralni dio srednjoeuropskoga arhitektonskog kruga, *hubovi* su klase na likovnim akademijama poput onih Otta Wagnera i Petera Behrensa te arhitektonski odjeli na tehničkim visokim školama, u prvom redu Beča i Praga, ali i Dresdena i Karlsruhea, a nešto kasnije i Berlina.³ U godinama nakon osnutka zagrebačke Visoke tehničke škole, ali i zbog od 1931. godine sve prisutnije gospodarske krize, sve su rjeđi odlasci na studij u inozemstvo koje tek donekle nadomještaju tzv.

stručna usavršavanja, tj. rad u inozemnim arhitektonskim atelijerima uključujući Loosov i Le Corbusierov. Isto se događa i 1950-ih godina kada su usavršavanja uglavnom dio programa tehničke pomoći Jugoslaviji pa se zahvaljujući stipendijama nizozemske vlade mladim arhitektima otvaraju i vrata atelijera Johanna van den Broeka i Jacoba Bakema u Rotterdamu. … Umrežavanje se 1920-ih i 1930-ih godina odvija i posredovanjem angažmana u sve brojnijim međunarodnim organizacijama poput Međunarodne federacije za planiranje i vrtne gradove (*International Federation for Town and Country Planning and Garden Cities* preimenovana u *International Federation for Housing and Planning* = IFHP) i Međunarodnog udruženja arhitekata (*Réunions internationales d'architectes* preimenovano u *Union internationale des architectes* = UIA).⁴ Suradnja s potonjima ponovno se uspostavlja početkom 1950-ih u cilju međunarodne afirmacije socijalističke samoupravne Jugoslavije. Istovremeno od 1928. pa sve do 1959. godine s manjim prekidima postoji stalna veza s Međunarodnim kongresom moderne arhitekture (*Congrès International d'Architecture Moderne* = CIAM) – vodećim međunarodnim arhitektonskim i urbanističkim forumom koji je pokušao dati odgovore na aktualne posljedice intenzivne urbanizacije i ratnih razaranja – akutnu sveprisutnu stambenu krizu i artikuliranje suvremenog modela izgradnje grada. Ove su godine ujedno i važni markeri za hrvatsku arhitekturu i gradogradnju – 1928. godina u znaku je javne afirmacije *novog građenja*, dok konac 1950-

ih i početak 1960-ih nagoviješta početak kritike modernizma, prvenstveno sveprisutnog CIAM-ova modela funkcionalnog grada materijaliziranog izgradnjom novih zagrebačkih naselja (Voltino, Rapska, Folnegovićevo, Trnsko itd.), i implementiranje ideja Teama X u lokalni arhitektonski, a nešto kasnije i urbanistički diskurs. Osim njegove važnosti za historiografiju moderne arhitekture, ono što CIAM čini posebno zanimljivim jest i činjenica da nije riječ o klasičnoj profesionalnoj organizaciji, već međunarodnoj platformi pojedinaca predanih istim idejama. Angažman unutar CIAM-a bio je stoga pitanje osobnog opredjeljenja i inicijative pojedinaca, a ne nacionalne strukovne politike, što je pojedincima izravno umreženima u organizaciju omogućilo vođenje vlastite politike na nacionalnoj razini. Zbog kontinuiteta veza i značaja CIAM-a ovaj je rad, koristeći se istodobno metodama klasične historiografije i mrežnom analizom, pokušao rekonstruirati i istražiti upravo ove osobne mreže (kontakte, modele suradnje i propuštanje informacija s međunarodne na lokalnu razinu i *vice versa*) dvaju ključnih aktera CIAM-a 1950-ih godina, ne samo za Hrvatsku već i prostor bivše Jugoslavije – arhitekata Drage Iblera (1894.–1964.) i Radovana Nikšića (1920.–1987.).⁵ Nadalje, rad daje i prvi cjelovitiji uvid u djelovanje hrvatskih arhitekata unutar CIAM-a 1950-ih godina koje koincidira s organizacijom posljednjega Desetog kongresa (CIAM 10), spletom okolnosti Iblerovom zaslugom održanog u Dubrovniku, te rasapa samog CIAM-a u Otterlou 1959., čemu je nazočio i Nikšić.

Međunarodno umrežavanje Jugoslavije – UIA vs. CIAM
Pedesetih godina 20. stoljeća, nakon prekida odnosa s SSSR-om i kratkotrajne epizode socrealizma, socijalistička samoupravna Jugoslavija ustrajno radi na međunarodnoj afirmaciji na svim područjima kulturne produkcije, pa tako i arhitektonske, u cilju rehabilitacije modernizma. Arhitekti su usredotočeni na krovnu strukovnu organizaciju – Međunarodno udruženje arhitekata.⁶ U ozračju Rezolucije Informbiroa prijava arhitekata Jugoslavije za članstvo bila je predmet otvorene konfrontacije zapadnih i istočnih zemalja predvođenih poljskim arhitektima dirigitiranim iz SSSR-a. Usprkos ucjenama, Velika Britanija i SAD podržale su Jugoslaviju, a kongres na kojem se potonja predstavila reprezentativnom izložbom recentnih arhitektonskih i urbanističkih ostvarenja umjesto u Varšavi održan je u Rabatu i Casablanci 1951. godine.⁷ Sve do konca 1950-ih arhitekti agilno sudjeluju u radu UIA-a (na kongresima u Lisabonu, Haagu i Moskvi te na konferenciji mediteranskih zemalja u Ateni), o čemu redovito izvještavaju putem članaka u stručnim časopisima i javnih predavanja.⁸ Posredovanjem UIA-a ostvaren je i kontakt sa švicarskim arhitektom Alfredom Rothom, čija je riječ imala važnu ulogu kod donošenja odluke o održavanju Desetog kongresa CIAM-a u Dubrovniku. Naime, Roth – zajedno sa slovenskim arhitektom Otonom Gasparijem član sekcije za škole UIA 1953. u Lisabonu – odazvao se na poziv slovenskih arhitekata i u sklopu prvog

classicized modernism and *Neues Bauen* (the latter was achieved in its fullest extent after the Second World War). Manifests, programmatic articles, and exhibitions were used for decades to show the diversity of opinions and affiliations, e.g. Viktor Kovačić's article *Modern Architecture* and the 1898 *Croatian Salon* exhibition in which he participated as the only architect, the manifest of the Association of Artists Zemlja and the first Drago Ibler's designs in the *Neue Bauen* manner presented at the first Zemlja's exhibition in 1929, and finally, the group EXAT-51 manifest presented to the public in the same manner two decades later.² … In addition to architectural and urban planning competitions, exhibitions and journals were also the means of dissemination and the way of connecting, i.e. networking, of like-minded professionals, mostly at the local level. At the international level, on the other hand, personal relationships between Croatian and the most influential European architects and urban planners – such as Otto Wagner, Adolf Loos, Hans Poelzig, Peter Behrens, Le Corbusier, and Jacob Bakema – had the decisive role. Personal relationships, i.e. personal networks, were also the most effective and productive ways to transfer the abovementioned tendencies. During the period from the 1880s to 1919, when Croatia did not have its own school of architecture, Croatian architects belonged directly to the Central European architectural circle. Among its *hubs* attended by Croatian architects were Otto Wagner's and Peter

Behrens's classes at art academies and departments of architecture at technical schools, primarily in Vienna and Prague, but also in Dresden and Karlsruhe, and somewhat later in Berlin.³ After the establishment of the Technical School in Zagreb, but also due to the increasingly dire economic crisis that had been exacerbated since 1931, studies abroad became less frequent. They were only partially replaced by the self-organised professional trainings, i.e. working in architectural studios, including those of Loos and Le Corbusier. A similar thing happened in the 1950s thanks to the technical assistance programmes for Yugoslavia funded by foreign governments. Some of Yugoslav experts, granted with the Netherlands Government fellowships for professional training abroad, thus reached the studio of Johannes van den Broek and Jacob Bakema in Rotterdam. … Since the 1920s and 1930s, networking had also occurred through the growing number of international organisations such as the *International Federation for Town and Country Planning and Garden Cities* (renamed to *International Federation for Housing and Planning* = IFHP) and the *Réunions internationales d'architectes* (renamed to *International Union of Architects* = UIA).⁴ The cooperation with the latter was renewed in the beginning of the 1950s in order to prompt the international recognition of the socialist self-managing Yugoslavia. During the same time, from 1928 to 1959, beside for a few brief interruptions, a stable relationship was established with the International Congress of

Modern Architecture (*Congrès International d'Architecture Moderne* = CIAM). CIAM was the leading international architectural and urban forum which attempted to provide answers to omnipresent impacts of intensive urbanization and ravages of war, i.e. the acute and pervasive housing crisis, and define a contemporary city-planning model. These years were also important for Croatian architecture and urbanism. In 1928, the *Neues Bauen* was publicly acknowledged, while the end of the 1950s and the beginning of the 1960s foreshadowed the introduction of the critique of modernism, primarily generally accepted CIAM's model of the functional city (achieved through construction of new housing settlements in Zagreb such as Voltino, Rapska, Folnegovićevo, Trnsko etc.), and the implementation of Team X's ideas into the architectural and, somewhat later, urban planning discourse. In addition to its significance for the historiography of modern architecture, what makes CIAM particularly interesting is the fact that it was not a *traditional* professional organization, but rather an international platform of individuals adhering to the same ideas. The engagement within CIAM was therefore a matter of personal preference and left to one's own initiative. As it had nothing to do with policies of national professional association those personally involved in the organization were enabled to run *their own* policies on the national level. Due to the long-term relationship with CIAM and its significance, this paper – using the

methods of classical historiography and network analysis – attempts to reconstruct and examine the personal networks (kind of contacts, models of cooperation, and *dissemination* of information from the international to the local level and vice versa) of two key protagonists of CIAM in the 1950s – the architects Drago Ibler (1894–1964) and Radovan Nikšić (1920–1987).⁵ This period coincides with the last CIAM Congress (CIAM 10) held, to Ibler's credit, in Dubrovnik and the dissolution of CIAM in Otterlo in 1959, witnessed by Nikšić. Furthermore, this paper also provides the first comprehensive insight into the activities of Croatian architects within CIAM in the 1950s that were relevant not only for Croatia but the whole former Yugoslavia.

International networking of Yugoslavia – UIA vs. CIAM

In the 1950s, after the split with the Soviet Union and a short period of socialist realism, cultural workers of socialist self-managing Yugoslavia were diligently working on its recognition in all the fields of cultural production, including architecture, in order to renew modernism. The Yugoslav architects focused their efforts on joining their professional umbrella organization – the UIA.⁶ In the light of the Cominform Resolution, the membership application of Yugoslav architects was the subject of a conflict between the Western and Eastern countries led by Polish architects and orchestrated by the USSR. Despite the considerable political pressure and Polish's threat of cancelling the Second UIA Congress planned in Warsaw,

jugoslavenskog savjetovanja o školama održao 1954. godine javno predavanje u Ljubljani.⁹ Dok Neven Šegvić, uz Andru Mohorovičića vodeći teoretičar arhitekture u Hrvatskoj, naziva CIAM „internacionalnom kapitalističkom arhitektonskom organizacijom“ (a njezine predratne članove Ernesta Weissmanna i Vladimira Antolića drži odgovornima za import rigidnog funkcionalizma) već početkom 1950-ih prvo zagrebački časopis *Arhitektura*, a zatim i ljubljanski *Arhitekt* postupno donose sve opširnije informacije o radu CIAM-a – od note preuzete iz švicarskog *Werka* o Sedmom kongresu (CIAM 7) u Bergamu 1949., preko vijesti o Osmom kongresu (CIAM 8) u Hoddesdonu 1951. pa do opsežnog izlaganja o Devetom kongresu (CIAM 9) u Aix-en-Provenceu 1953 godine.¹⁰ Jedan od priloga bio je i o knjizi *A Decade of New Architecture* Sigfrieda Giediona, osvrtno na rad članova CIAM-a od 1937. do 1947., pristigloj 1952. na adresu Urbanističkog zavoda grada Zagreba čiji je direktor spomenuti Vladimir Antolić, aktivan član od 1933. do 1941.¹¹ Antolićev kontakt obnovljen već 1951. godine nije urodio daljnjom suradnjom, budući da je 1953. napustio Hrvatsku

zbog neslaganja s političkim odlukom o izgradnji novih stambenih četvrti Zagreba južno od rijeke Save na štetu projekta sanacije međuratne periferije.¹² Promocija CIAM-a dio je kampanje kojoj je cilj bio reafirmiranje moderne arhitekture, s naglaskom na kreativni aspekt arhitektonskog stvaralaštva, u sklopu koje Savez društava arhitekata Jugoslavije (SDAJ) organizira i izložbu Le Corbusiera u pet od šest republičkih centara te u Splitu i Mostaru.¹³ Ipak, sredinom 1950-ih i dalje postoji stanovit zazor prema CIAM-u koji verbalizira Srebrenka Sekulić Gvozdanović: „Internacionalna unija arhitekata veoma je široko i demokratski udruženje (za razliku od ekskluzivnog C.I.A.M.-a – Congrès Internationaux de l'Architecture Moderne)“.¹⁴ Višegodišnji prekid od početka 1940-ih do početka 1950-ih, a zatim izostanak izravne komunikacije imao je za posljedicu loše poznavanje stvarnih prilika unutar CIAM-a – sazrijevanja kritičkog diskursa prema modernizmu, poglavito konceptu kod nas sve do sredine 1960-ih aktualnog modela funkcionalnog grada, i stalno prisutne ideje o reorganizaciji i neizbježnosti smjene generacija na vodećim pozicijama koja se

intenzivira nakon kongresa u Aix-en-Provenceu 1953., gdje se prvi put okupio i Team X, glavni inicijator i nositelj promjena. CIAM koji promišljaju zagrebački arhitekti i dalje se gotovo sve do 1960-ih godina identificiralo s predratnom avangardom – u prvom redu Le Corbusierom, ujedno i glavnim autoritetom sve do smrti 1965. godine.

Drago Ibler i Radovan Nikšić – o glavnim akterima i modusima njihova djelovanja

Profesionalna, ali i privatna poznanstva predstavljaju *modus operandi* CIAM-a – izgradnje velike mreže koja sredinom 1950-ih povezuje arhitekta sa svih kontinenata. Uspriko čestim najavama reorganizacije, CIAM je hijerarhijski ustrojena organizacija na čijem su čelu vijeće (*CIAM Council*) i s njim izravno povezani nacionalni delegati. Osim uglavnom vertikalne komunikacije usmjerene od vrha prema dnu strukture (od vijeća preko delegata do nacionalnih grupa), postoji i ona horizontalna, neformalna, između samih grupa.¹⁵ Povezivanje hrvatskih arhitekata s CIAM-om, i prije i poslije Drugog svjetskog rata, odvijalo se na isti način i u dvije etape.¹⁶ Prvom, od 1951. godine do Desetog kongresa u Dubrovniku u ljeto 1956., dominira Drago Ibler, dok drugu, od 1956. pa do službenog raspuštanja organizacije u Otterlou 1959. godine, predvodi Radovan Nikšić. Ibler i Nikšić predstavnici su dviju generacija arhitekata, od kojih je jedan, poput vodstva

CIAM-a, Le Corbusiera, Waltera Gropiusa i Sigfrieda Giediona, pri kraju, a drugi – povezan s vodećim članom Teama X Jacobom Bakemom – u sponu karijere. Iblera i Nikšića karakteriziraju i dva različita načina profesionalnog djelovanja koji su se izravno odrazili i na suradnju s CIAM-om. Potrebno je, međutim, napomenuti da su i Iblerova i Nikšićeva pozicija atipične, odnosno da odstupaju od standardne arhitektonske produkcije zasnovane na velikim projektnim organizacijama i malima – *personalnima*, nazivanim po glavnim projektantima. Neprijeporno zahvaljujući vezama s političkim vrhom, i nepoznatim nam zaslugama, Ibler je po svojem profesionalnom i društvenom položaju jedinstvena pojava u Hrvatskoj, ali i u Jugoslaviji – jedini je arhitekt-profesor s arhitektonskim djelom na Akademiji likovnih umjetnosti u Zagrebu prije Drugog svjetskog rata (s patronom kiparom Ivanom Meštrovićem), a nakon njega i majstor jedine Državne majstorske radionice za arhitekturu locirane na elitnoj zagrebačkoj adresi.¹⁷ Radionica, namijenjena usavršavanju diplomiranih inženjera arhitekture koje je stipendirala Vlada FNRJ-a, bila je u biti Iblеров privatni arhitektonski atelijer u kojem se uglavnom odrađuju njegovi poslovi (npr. državne rezidencije u Zagrebu i Beogradu te ambasada Jugoslavije u Moskvi) dobiveni izravnom narudžbom. Među rijetkim su natječajima oni za dom Matice iseljenika s koncertnom dvoranom te zgradu Radničkog sveučilišta u Zagrebu.¹⁸ Potonja je bila prva važna realizacija Radovana Nikšića



JACOB BAKEMA S KOLEGAMA, 1956., FOTO: RADOVAN NIKŠIĆ.
 PRIVATNI ARHIV IVANE NIKŠIĆ OLUJIĆ, ZAGREB.
 JACOB BAKEMA WITH COLLEAGUES, 1956, PHOTO: RADOVAN NIKŠIĆ.
 IVANA NIKŠIĆ OLUJIĆ PRIVATE ARCHIVES, ZAGREB.

the United Kingdom and the United States supported Yugoslavia. It became a full member at the Congress in the end held in Rabat and Casablanca in 1951 where it presented itself with a distinctive exhibition of recent architectural and urban planning achievements.⁷ Up until the end of the 1950s, the architects readily participated in the UIA activities (at the congresses in Lisbon, The Hague, and Moscow, and at the Mediterranean countries conference in Athens), and regularly reported on it in professional journals and public lectures.⁸ Through UIA, they came into contact with the Swiss architect Alfred Roth, who had a major say in the decision to hold the tenth CIAM Congress in Dubrovnik. Namely, Roth – who was, together with Slovenian architect Oton Gaspari, a member of the 1953 UIA commission on schools in Lisbon – on Slovenian architects' invitation, delivered a public lecture at the first Yugoslav conference on schools held in 1954 in Ljubljana.⁹ Although architect Neven Šegvić, one of the leading Croatian theorists of architecture alongside Andre Mohorovičić, described CIAM as “an international capitalist architectural organization”

(holding its pre-war members Ernest Weissmann and Vladimir Antolić responsible for the implementation of rigid functionalism), in the early 1950s, first the Zagreb journal *Arhitektura*, and then Ljubljana's *Arhitekt*, from time to time published increasingly more detailed information on CIAM's activities. They reported shortly on the seventh Congress (CIAM 7) held in Bergamo in 1949 (using the Swiss journal *Werk* as a source) and the eighth Congress (CIAM 8) in Hoddesdon in 1951, while the ninth Congress (CIAM 9) in Aix-en-Provence in 1953 was the subject of an extensive report.¹⁰ One of the articles was about Sigfried Giedion's book *A Decade of New Architecture*, an overview of CIAM's members' activities from 1937 to 1947. The book was sent to Zagreb City Planning Office, whose director at the time was the abovementioned Vladimir Antolić, an active CIAM member from 1933 to 1941.¹¹ Even though Antolić's contact with CIAM was restored in 1951, it did not lead to further collaboration. Antolić left Croatia in 1953 because of his opposition to the political decision on building a new residential area on the southern bank of the Sava River at the

expense of reconstructing the interwar periphery.¹² Promotion of CIAM was a part of a campaign aimed at re-establishing modern architecture (focusing on its creative aspects) within which the Union of Architects' Associations of Yugoslavia (*Savez društava arhitekata Jugoslavije* = SDAJ) organized Le Corbusier's exhibition in five out of six republics' capitals, in addition to Split and Mostar.¹³ However, in the mid-1950s, CIAM was still considered somewhat objectionable, or in the words of architect Srebrenka Sekulić Gvozdanović: “The International Union of Architects is a very large and democratic association (as opposed to the exclusive C.I.A.M. – Congrès Internationaux de l'Architecture Moderne)“.¹⁴ A several-year lack (from the early 1940s to the early 1950s) of cooperation and direct communication with CIAM resulted in poor understanding of the current situation within the organisation. The major issues were the emergence of a critical discourse aimed towards modernism, and especially the concept of the functional city (omnipresent in Yugoslavia up to mid-1960s), the ever-present idea of CIAM's reorganisation, and the necessity of generational shifts in leadership positions. The tensions escalated after the CIAM 9 in Aix-en-Provence in 1953, when Team X, the main initiator and harbinger of change, banded together for the first time. CIAM, as Zagreb architects understood it, was almost until the 1960s associated with the pre-war avant-garde – particularly with Le Corbusier. He was the major authority until his death in 1965.

Drago Ibler and Radovan Nikšić – on key actors and modes of their actions

Professional, as well as personal contacts were CIAM's *modus operandi* – building a large network which in the mid-1950 connected architects from all continents. Although there were several announcements of CIAM's reorganisation, it remained a hierarchically structured organization governed by a council (CIAM Council) and national delegates in direct contact with it. Apart from the vertical top-down communication (from the Council, over the delegates and to the national groups), there was also the horizontal one, an informal line of communication between the groups themselves.¹⁵ The relationship between CIAM and Croatian architects before and after the Second World War was established along the same lines and in two stages.¹⁶ After the War, the first one took place from 1951 to the tenth Congress in Dubrovnik, held in the summer of 1956, and the second one from 1956 until the final dissolution of the organization in Otterlo in 1959. The first stage was dominated by Drago Ibler, and the second one by Radovan Nikšić – the representatives of two generations of architects. Like the CIAM's leadership, Le Corbusier, Walter Gropius, and Sigfried Giedion, Ibler was approaching the end of his career, while Nikšić's career, who was connected with Jacob Bakema (the leading member of Team X), was on the rise. Ibler's and Nikšić's approach to work was also different, which directly reflected on their

i jedna od ključnih zgrada koja je koncem 1950-ih i početkom 1960-ih godina naznačila i novi smjer promišljanja prostora, građenja i oblikovanja – iskorak prema koncepciji *mat building* – koncepciji kuće kao guste, internim vezama premrežene fleksibilne prostorne strukture.¹⁹ Nikšić je također dio svojevrzne elite zaposlene na Tehničkom fakultetu u Zagrebu – ali isključivo s gledišta slobodnog, kreativnog projektantskog rada – koja ima privilegij birati projektne zadatke manje opterećene danim društvenim prilikama, prvenstveno diktatom kratkih rokova.²⁰ Grupa mladih arhitekata uz nastavnički rad usredotočena je na arhitektonske natječaje putem kojih i dolaze do gradnji realiziranih u fakultetskom Zavodu za građevne konstrukcije.²¹ Riječ je 1950-ih o fleksibilnoj i dinamičnoj mreži od dvadesetak arhitekata koji dijele isti arhitektonski diskurs, ali i profesionalne i etičke vrijednosti. Konkretno, Nikšić surađuje na jedanaest natječaja s četrnaest arhitekata. Unutar ove mreže uz Nikšića glavni je nukleus Vladimir Turina s kojim Nikšić i surađuje na tri projekta, uključujući natječajni projekt za zgradu Centralnog komiteta Komunističke partije Jugoslavije u Beogradu 1947. Kroz natječaje suradnici se međusobno i upoznaju, pri čemu je za daljnji opstanak suradnji osim slaganja karaktera ključna metodologija projektiranja i potencijal za timski rad. Ako ekstrahiramo suradnje ostvarene preko Turine, najfrekventniji su Nikšićevi suradnici

Božidar Murković, Petar Kušan i Ninoslav Kučan te Aleksandar Dragomanović. U suradnji s Dragomanovićem i Edom Šmidihenom, jednim od najuspješnijih arhitektonskih timova 1960-ih godina, Nikšić je realizirao nekoliko školskih, poslovnih i trgovačkih zgrada.²² Pozicija i način rada Iblera i Nikšića jasno su čitljivi iz prvog prikaza – analize arhitektonske scene 1950-ih utemeljene na dvije javne platforme profesionalnog djelovanja – časopisu *Arhitektura* i arhitektonskim i urbanističkim javnim natječajima. Dok je Nikšić čvrsto integriran u mrežu aktualnih ili bivših djelatnika fakulteta kojoj su posredno ili neposredno pridruženi i članovi grupe EXAT-51 (Bernardo Bernardi, Zdravko Bregovac, Zvonimir Radić, Vjenceslav Richter i Vladimir Zarahović), Ibler egzistira izvan njezinih perimetara.²³ Akteri njegove personalne mreže gotovo su isključivo suradnici Majstorske radionice među kojima rijetki zapaženo zajednički nastupaju na natječajima. Osim privilegiranog položaja, razloge za Iblerovo ekskomuniciranje iz zagrebačkoga arhitektonskog kruga možemo tražiti i u međuraću – javno iznesenom zahtjevu arhitekata-inženjera za ukidanje školovanja arhitekata na likovnim akademijama.²⁴ Isti razlog bio je uzrok tenzijama na samom fakultetu, gdje su nakon 1945. profesure stekli Mladen Kauzlarić, Drago Galić i Neven Šegvić, svi redom graditelji s diplomama akademskih arhitekata Iblerove škole.²⁵

Zagreb – Zürich – Rotterdam: putovima Drage Iblera i Radovana Nikšića

Od početka 1940-ih nastanjen uglavnom u Švicarskoj, Drago Ibler povezo se s CIAM-om preko Pariza. Na poziv francuskih arhitekata i inženjera Marcela Lods i Vladimira Bodianskog učlanjuje se u grupu Bâtir, jednu od francuskih grupa CIAM-a među kojima je i Le Corbusierov ASCORAL.²⁶ Postoje vrlo čvrste indicije da je posrednik bio Ernest Weissmann. Naime, Weissmann od 1948. do 1951. radi u Ženevi, gdje „vida Iblera“, s Bodianskim je član projektnog tima za zgradu Ujedinjenih naroda u New Yorku, a s njim i sa švicarskim inženjerom Jean-Jacquesom Honeggerom angažiran je i na osnivanju Radne skupine za jeftino kolektivno stanovanje (Working Group on Low Cost Mass Housing) pri Ujedinjenim narodima.²⁷ Potonji u svibnju 1951. šalje Ibleru

informacije o predstojećem Osmom kongresu CIAM-a održanom te godine u Hoddesdonu, na kojem je u članstvo trebala biti primljena i grupa djelatna unutar UN-a s delegatima Ann van der Goot i Weissmannom.²⁸ Cilj je bio zajedničko rješavanje globalnih problema stanovanja i urbanističkog planiranja i pozivanje članova CIAM-a da sudjeluju u provedbi UN-ovih programa u zemljama Trećeg svijeta.²⁹ Prvi je Iblerov angažman sudjelovanje na CIAM-u 9 u Aix-en-Provanceu, kojem u statusu promatrača prisustvuju i mladi slovenski arhitekti Vladimir Braco Mušič i France Ivanšek.³⁰ Ibler je pak naveden i kao član grupe Bâtir i kao predstavnik Jugoslavije, koju je kandidirao za mjesto održavanja sljedećega Desetog kongresa.³¹ Motivi Iblera bili su politički, dovesti uglednu svjetsku organizaciju u Jugoslaviju, i osobni – visoko se pozicionirati na federalnoj strukovnoj sceni, u čemu

ATELIJER JOHANNESA VAN DEN BROEKA I JACOBA BAKEMA, J. ROTTERDAMU, 1956., FOTO: RADOVAN NIKŠIĆ. PRIVATNI ARHIV IVANE NIKŠIĆ OLUJIĆ, ZAGREB.

JOHANNES VAN DEN BROEK AND JACOB BAKEMA'S STUDIO IN ROTTERDAM, 1956., PHOTO: RADOVAN NIKŠIĆ. IVANA NIKŠIĆ OLUJIĆ PRIVATE ARCHIVES, ZAGREB.

collaboration with CIAM. Nonetheless, it is necessary to note that Ibler's and Nikšić's professional positions were uncommon. They deviated from the standard architectural production based in large offices or smaller, personal ones, named after the chief designers. Ibler was a unique phenomenon, not only in Croatia but on an all-Yugoslav scale. Undoubtedly due to his powerful political connections and other merits unknown to us, he held a privileged professional and social status. He was the only architect-professor to head the department of architecture at the Academy of Fine Arts in Zagreb before the Second World War (under the patronage of sculptor Ivan Meštrović), after which he became in charge of the only State Master Workshop for architecture located in the most elite neighbourhood in Zagreb.¹⁷ Ibler's Workshop – intended for the professional training of graduate engineers of architecture funded by the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia (FPRY) scholarships – was in fact his private architectural studio. Young architects almost exclusively worked on Ibler's commissions (e.g. State residences in Zagreb and Belgrade, and Yugoslav Embassy in Moscow). Among the few competition designs were the ones for the home of the Croatian Heritage Foundation with a concert hall and the Workers' University in Zagreb.¹⁸ The latter one was the first significant building designed by Radovan Nikšić and, at the same time, one of the key buildings which, at the end of the 1950s and the beginning of 1960s, marked a new direction in thinking about space, construction and design – a step towards

the *mat building* – the concept of a house as a dense, internally networked, flexible spatial structure.¹⁹ Nikšić also belonged to a social elite of sorts, i.e. a group of young architects employed at the Technical Faculty in Zagreb who – exclusively in regard to creativity – had the privileged to choose projects less burdened by given social circumstances, primarily in the sense of not being constrained by tight deadlines.²⁰ In addition to teaching, the group was focused on wining architectural competitions via which projects were realized at the Faculty's Department of Building Structures.²¹ This group can also be conceptualized as a flexible and dynamic network of around 20 architects, active in the 1950s, who shared the same architectural ideas, as well as professional and ethical values. In fact, Nikšić collaborated on eleven competitions with fourteen of these architects. Besides Nikšić, the leading figure of this network was Vladimir Turina with whom Nikšić collaborated on three projects, including the competition for the building of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Yugoslavia, in Belgrade in 1947. The associates got to know each other by working together on competitions. Their long-term collaboration was maintained on the basis of their compatible personalities, design approaches, and proclivity for teamwork. If we put aside the collaborations that Turina initiated, Nikšić most frequently worked with Božidar Murković, Petar Kušan and Ninoslav Kučan, as well as with Aleksandar Dragomanović. In collaboration with Dragomanović and Edo Šmidihen, one of the most successful architectural teams in the 1960s, Nikšić designed several

educational, business, and commercial facilities.²² Ibler's and Nikšić's positions and work approaches can be clearly discerned from the first network diagram – the analysis of the 1950s architectural scene based on two public platforms of professional activities: the journal *Arhitektura* and the architectural and urban planning public competitions. While Nikšić was tightly integrated into the network of current and former Faculty employees who were also directly or indirectly involved with the group EXAT-51 (Bernardo Bernardi, Zdravko Bregovac, Zvonimir Radić, Vjenceslav Richter and Vladimir Zarahović) while Ibler had no part in it.²³ The members of Ibler's network were almost exclusively the associates of his Master Workshop and only few of them successfully took part in competitions. Apart from his privileged position, the other reason for Ibler's excommunication from the Zagreb's architectural circle stems back to the interwar period. Resolved to protect their professional status, graduated engineers of architecture publicly

disclosed their demand for the abolishment of architectural education at art academies in early 1930s.²⁴ The same reason was the source of tensions at the Faculty where Mladen Kauzlarić, Drago Galić and Neven Šegvić – all of whom graduated architecture at Ibler's school – became professors after 1945.²⁵

Zagreb – Zürich – Rotterdam: following the path of Drago Ibler and Radovan Nikšić

From the beginning of the 1940s, Drago Ibler was residing in Switzerland and became involved with CIAM via Paris. Invited by the French architects and engineers Marcel Lods and Vladimir Bodiansky, he joined the group Bâtir, one of CIAM's French groups together with Le Corbusier's ASCORAL.²⁶ There are very strong indications that Ernest Weissmann acted as an intermediary. Namely, from 1948 to 1951, Weissmann worked in Geneva where he “crossed paths with Ibler”. He was also on the same design team in charge of the



je i uspio postavši predsjednikom Saveza društava arhitekata Jugoslavije.³² CIAM je odabrao Alžir, a odluka je izmijenjena u korist Jugoslavije zbog oružane pobune za oslobađanje Alžira od francuske vlasti.³³ Dodatan motiv pri odabiru Jugoslavije bilo je i eventualno sudjelovanje arhitekata i urbanista iz zemalja Istočnog bloka i SSSR-a u kojem je nakon Staljinove smrti iz pragmatičnih razloga, veće ekonomičnosti, došlo do promjene arhitektonskog diskursa, odmak od socrealizma prema modernizmu.³⁴ Tijekom organizacije Desetog kongresa u Dubrovniku, već tada glavnoj turističkoj i kongresnoj destinaciji na istočnoj obali Jadrana, Ibler je u stalnom kontaktu s Alfredom Rothom, CIAM-ovim glavnim organizatorom i koordinatorom. Ibler djeluje lokalno, posreduje između Züricha i Zagreba. tj. između Rotha i zagrebačke poslovne turističke agencije Centroturist. Na Iblerovu adresu redovito stižu cirkularna pisma CIAM-a, a pozvan je i na pripremni sastanak u Padovu, upriličen neposredno prije polaska iz Venecije

za Dubrovnik, na koji se nije odazvao.³⁵ Istodobno, dok se organizira dubrovački kongres, s temama restrukturiranja CIAM-a i donošenja *Chartre d'Habitat* (Povelje o stanovanju), Radovan Nikšić nalazi se u atelijeru Johannes van den Broeka i Jacoba Bakema u Rotterdamu. Zahvaljujući potonjem postao je drugi nukleus CIAM-ove mreže u Hrvatskoj 1950-ih godina i posredovao u umrežavanju i drugih zagrebačkih arhitekata, u čemu je najagilniji bio Vladimir Turina.³⁶ Nikšićev šestomjesečni boravak u Nizozemskoj dio je tehničke pomoći Jugoslaviji. Stationiran sa srpskom arhitekticom Milicom Šterić i Gradimirom Nedeljkovićem u atelijeru Van den Broeka i Bakema, Nikšić proučava domaću građevinsku industriju i recentne zgrade za školstvo i stanovanje. Uz pomoć dugogodišnjeg djelatnika atelijera arhitekta Jana Stokle i urednika nizozemskoga arhitektonskog časopisa *Forum* Reindera Blijstre Nikšić upoznae brojne arhitekate zaposlene u različitim stručnim službama, ali i pionire modernizma Geritta Rietvelde, J. J. P. Ouda, Cornelisa van

Eesterena i Willema van Tijena, što je za ishod imalo doživotnu Nikšićevu fascinaciju nizozemskim racionalizmom, koju je prenio i na kolege, u prvom redu Aleksandra Dragomanovića.³⁷ Nizozemska arhitektura bliska je zagrebačkim arhitektima suočenima s teškim uvjetima aktualne arhitektonske produkcije u Jugoslaviji – kratkim rokovima, minimalnim normativima, nestašicom građevinskog materijala i zahtjevima za što jeftinijim građenjem. Izravan kontakt s nizozemskom arhitektonskom scenom ostvaruje se 1956. i posredovanjem boravaka Blijstre i Van den Broeka u Zagrebu. Blijstra priprema reportažu o Jugoslaviji za nizozemski socijaldemokratski dnevnik *Het Vrije Volk*, a posjet je iskoristio da održi javno predavanje o suvremenoj nizozemskoj arhitekturi u Društvu arhitekata Hrvatske i upozna jugoslavensku arhitekturu.³⁸ Aktive zagrebačke arhitektonske i urbanističke scene – Vladimira Turinu, Branka Vasiljevića, Zdenka Kolacija, Marijana Haberlea, Božidara Rašica i Kazimira Ostrogovića te recentne realizacije, upoznao je i Van den Broek za posjeta Zagrebu, na putu iz Dubrovnika za Rotterdam, u funkciji predstavnika Komiteta za stanove Europske ekonomske komisije Ujedinjenih naroda. Nikšić sudjeluje u organizaciji obaju posjeta.³⁹

CIAM networking – zagrebački arhitekti i CIAM 1956. – 1959.

Dva glavna događaja koja su 1950-ih godina povezale hrvatske arhitekate s CIAM-om čitljiva na drugom mrežnom prikazu jesu



IZLAGANJE RADOVANA NIKŠIĆA NA POSLJEDNJEM OKUPLJANJU CIAM-A U OTTERLOU, 1959. PRIVATNI ARHIV IVANE NIKŠIĆ OLUJIĆ, ZAGREB.
RADOVAN NIKŠIĆ'S PRESENTATION AT THE LAST CIAM MEETING IN OTTERLO, 1959. IVANA NIKŠIĆ OLUJIĆ PRIVATE ARCHIVES, ZAGREB.

United Nations building in New York as Bodiansky and worked with him and the Swiss civil engineer Jean-Jacques Honegger on founding the *Working Group on Low Cost Mass Housing* at the United Nations.²⁷ In May 1951, Honegger informed Ibler about the upcoming CIAM 8 that was to be held that year in Hoddesdon. On the same occasion, the group active within the UN – with Ann van der Goot and Weissmann as its delegates – was to become a member of CIAM.²⁸ The aim was to jointly address the global housing and urban planning issues and invite the members of CIAM to participate in the UN programmes in the Third World countries.²⁹ Ibler first attended the CIAM 9 in Aix-en-Provence just like the young Slovenian architects Vladimir Braco Mušič and France Ivanšek who were present as observers.³⁰ Ibler was listed as a member of the group *Bâtir* and as the representative of Yugoslavia, which he nominated to host the tenth CIAM congress.³¹ His motives were political – to bring a prestigious

international organization to Yugoslavia – and personal – to attain a highly ranked position within the federal professional scene, in which he succeeded by becoming the president of the Union of Architects' Associations of Yugoslavia.³² CIAM's first choice was Algeria, but the decision was revised in favour of Yugoslavia due to Algerian liberation war against French colonialism.³³ An additional reason for choosing Yugoslavia was the possible participation of architects and urban planners from the Eastern Bloc and the USSR. After Stalin's death, they experienced a change in architectural discourse – a shift from socialist realism to modernism. The reason was pragmatic: greater cost efficiency.³⁴ During the preparations of the tenth CIAM congress in Dubrovnik, already then established as a major tourist and congress destination at the east Adriatic coast, Ibler was in close contact with Alfred Roth, the chief organizer and coordinator on behalf of CIAM. Ibler acted locally as an intermediary between Zürich and Zagreb, that is, between Roth and the Zagreb office

of the tourist agency Centroturist. He regularly received CIAM's circular letters and was also invited to a preparatory meeting in Padua, held shortly before departing from Venice for Dubrovnik, which he did not attend.³⁵ While the Congress in Dubrovnik on the topic of CIAM's reorganisation and the adoption of *Chartre d'Habitat* (Charter of Habitat) was being organized, Radovan Nikšić was working in Johannes van den Broek and Jacob Bakema's studio in Rotterdam. Due to this engagement, Nikšić became the second *nucleus* of CIAM's network in Croatia in the 1950s and initiated the networking of other Zagreb architects, with Vladimir Turina being the most active member within this network.³⁶ Nikšić's six-month stay in the Netherlands was a part of the technical assistance programme provided to Yugoslavia. Stationed with Serbian architect Milica Šterić and Gradimir Nedeljković in Van den Broek and Bakema's studio, Nikšić studied the Dutch construction industry and contemporary residential and school buildings. With the help of architect Jan Stokla, the studio's long-time employee, and Reinder Blijstra, the editor of the Dutch architectural journal *Forum*, Nikšić got acquainted with several architects working in various professional services, as well as with the pioneers of modernism: Geritt Rietveld, J. J. P. Oud, Cornelis van Eesteren and Willem van Tijen. This experience resulted in Nikšić's life-long fascination with Dutch rationalism which he passed over to his colleagues, primarily to Aleksandar Dragomanović.³⁷ Faced with difficult working conditions characteristic of the architectural

participiranje na CIAM-u 10 u Dubrovniku 1956. i izrada prijedloga reorganizacije CIAM-a iz 1957. oko kojeg se okupila *jugoslavenska*, tj. *zagrebačka grupa*. Od 1951. do 1956. grupu se u izvještajima CIAM-a regularno navodi u statusu „grupe u reorganizaciji“, a vodstvo CIAM-a smatralo je kongres prilikom za njezino osnivanje, do čega nije došlo iz dva razloga.⁴⁰ Kongres je protivno CIAM-ovoj politici popularizacije kongresa i suradnje s lokalnim stručnjacima i vlastima održan u svojevrsnoj strukovnoj i medijskoj izolaciji zbog ozbiljnost situacije i značaja predstojećih odluka.⁴¹ Nadalje, ni aktivniji angažman unutar CIAM-a ni osnivanje grupe nisu se uklapali u Iblerove planove, iako ga se titulira „predstavnikom jugoslavenske grupe“. ⁴² Slijedom navedenog Ibler je u Dubrovniku jedini sudjelovao u radu kongresa na kojem je u funkciji promatrača bio prisutan i određen broj njegovih kolega – Bogdan Teodorović, Božidar Rašica, Zvonimir Radić i Srđa Šeferov iz Zagreba, Oliver Minić iz Beograda, Branko Kalajžić iz Sarajeva, Vladimir Braco Mušič iz Ljubljane, te Vladislav Pačić.⁴³ Za pretpostaviti je da listu sastavlja Ibler.⁴⁴ Izravne veze Iblera sa Šeferovim (članom Majstorske radionice i osobnim asistentom) i Rašicom (suraduje s Iblerom za vrijeme studija) vidljive su na prikazu zagrebačke arhitektonske scene 1950-ih, ali ne i ona sa Zvonimirom Radićem, predavačem na Akademiji primijenjenih umjetnosti i istaknutim teoretičarom i zagovornikom produkt-dizajna. Sudjelovanje Minića, a vjerojatno i Kalajžića nedvojbeno je povezano s funkcijama u

production at that time (tight deadlines, substandard norms, building material shortages and demands for the cheapest construction possible) Zagreb architects were attracted to Dutch architecture. A direct contact with the contemporary Dutch architectural scene was also made thanks to Blijstra and Van den Broek's visits to Zagreb in 1956. Blijstra wrote an article about Yugoslavia for the Dutch social-democratic daily newspaper *Het Vrije Volk* and spent his time in Yugoslavia getting to know Yugoslav architecture. He also used this occasion to deliver a public lecture on contemporary Dutch architecture at the Society of Croatian Architects.³⁸ Van den Broek, on the other hand, got acquainted with the leading Zagreb's architects and urban planners – Vladimir Turina, Branko Vasiljević, Zdenko Kolacio, Marijan Haberle, Božidar Rašica and Kazimir Ostrogović, among others – and the recently constructed buildings. He visited Zagreb – as a representative of the Committee on Housing of the United Nations Economic Commission for Europe – in August of 1956, on his way from Dubrovnik to Rotterdam. Nikšić was engaged in organizing both visits.³⁹

CIAM networking – Zagreb architects and CIAM 1956 – 1959

Two main events which connected Croatian architects with CIAM, visible from the second network analysis diagram, were their participation on CIAM 10 in Dubrovnik in 1956 and the drafting of the proposal for the reorganization of CIAM in 1957 that brought together the *Yugoslav*, i.e. *Zagreb group*. The group was regularly mentioned in

SDAJ-u, dok je za ono Bogdana Teodorovića (člana predratne grupe CIAM-a za Jugoslaviju i sudionika Četvrtog kongresa u Ateni 1933.) zaslužan Ernest Weissmann. Budući da je bio spriječen sudjelovati, Weissmann je uputio sudionicima dobrodošlicu putem telegrama.⁴⁵ Naposlijetku, kongresu prisustvuje i Vladimir Braco Mušič, domaćin sudionicima kongresa na brodu Partizanka tijekom plovidbe od Venecije do Dubrovnika.⁴⁶ Dok je Ibler ustupio Giedionov tekst o kongresu za objavljivanje u časopisu *Arhitektura*, Mušič je jedini od svih nazočnih domaćih arhitekata objavio opsežan osvrt u *Arhitektu*, izražavajući žaljenje zbog „fizičke i duhovne odsutnosti jugoslavenskih arhitekata“. Osim lokalne dnevne tiskovine *Dubrovački vjesnik* kongres je popratio i zagrebački *Narodni list* kritički intoniranim tekstom „Tko su i što hoće“ Ljube Babića. Nikšić nije mogao sudjelovati na kongresu, iako ga je mimo Iblera osobno pozvao Van den Broek.⁴⁷ Razlog su bile profesionalne obveze u Zagrebu nagomilane za vrijeme boravka u Nizozemskoj zaključenog u ljeto 1956.⁴⁸ Daljnji angažman hrvatskih arhitekata, održavanje uspostavljenih kontakata i pokušaji aktiviranja lokalne scene i uključivanja u rad CIAM-a, odvija se u vrijeme njegove postupne dezintegracije. Započeti trogodišnji proces bio je izravna posljedica odluka donesenih u Dubrovniku – raspuštanja vijeća, CIRPAC-a i nacionalnih grupa (kako bi ponovno postao „kongres pojedinaca“ što je i bio na samom početku) i pasivnosti Komisije za

reorganizaciju imenovane sa zadaćom da predloži moguće daljnje moduse djelovanja.⁴⁹ Tajnik je komisije Bakema, uslijed čega dolazi i do preusmjerenja komunikacije između CIAM-a i Zagreba s Iblera na Nikšića. Iblerovi kontakti s grupom Bâtir, ali i s Alfredom Rothom u načelu odumiru nakon Dubrovnika, što dodatno potvrđuje tezu da je njegov glavni zadatak bio dovesti CIAM u Jugoslaviju i ništa više od toga. Vjeran ideji timskog rada, Nikšić nesebično dijeli materijale s kolegama, odnosno Turinom. Posredovanjem poznanika alžirskog arhitekta Pierrea Andréa Emeryja i nakon osobnog obraćanja Bakemi Turina je s Nikšićem i srpskim arhitektom Alexisom, tj. Aleksandrom Josićem (članom tima Candilis – Josic – Woods) „izabran za člana jugoslavenskog CIAM-a“.⁵⁰ Vjerojatno je riječ o listi od 30 arhitekata koju je Emery predložio koncem 1956. godine i koja je priložena kao primjer Bakeminom pozivu za predlaganje mogućih načina reorganizacije CIAM-a i osoba koje će ih izraditi.⁵¹ Prijedlog Iblera, Radića, Rašice, Nikšića i Turine iz Zagreba naslovljen *CIAM in reorganisation* (CIAM u reorganizaciji), bio je, međutim, odgovor na drugi Bakemin poziv iz srpnja 1957. u kojem traži članove da za predstojeći sastanak u La Sarrazu „predlože radne zadatke koje bi mogao provesti *Advanced Study of the Visual Design of Habitat*“ i daju prijedlog organizacije potrebne za taj rad.⁵² Zagrebački arhitekti pozivaju se na prijedlog Joséa Luisa Serta, Waltera Gropiusa i Jacqueline Tyrwhitt o tome da se osnuju *Exchange Information Center* (CIAM) i

Exchange of Information of Architectural Education u funkciji međunarodne razmjene između članova te sugeriraju proširivanje *Public Relations Centerom*.⁵³ U La Sarrazu u kasno ljeto 1957. u nazočnosti Iblera raspuštene su sve dotadašnje grupe, oformljen je *CIAM research group for social and visual relationships*, supstituit CIAM-a, a odluka o reorganizaciji povjerena isključivo novoimenovanom Odboru za koordinaciju i dalje s Bakemom u funkciji tajnika. Nikšić odgovara na Bakemin upit s konca listopada u kojem najavljuje sastanak s temom „Definiranje aktualnih zadataka arhitekata“ i traži popis arhitekata voljnih za buduću suradnju u CIAM research groupi.⁵⁴ *Nova grupa zagrebačkih arhitekata* s tzv. *stalnom skupinom* i *skupinom za suradnju* generirana je iz dva smjera – činili su je sudionici Desetog kongresa – Ibler, Radić i Rašica – s jedne i Nikšić i Turina te njihovi bliski suradnici i djelatnici Tehničkog fakulteta s druge strane – Bernardo

Bernardi, Aleksandar Dragomanović, Ninoslav Kučan i Srebrenka Sekulić Gvozdanović. Pridružili su im se i Vjenceslav Richter kao član prve i Zdravko Bregovac kao član druge skupine. Za uključivanje Richtera, koji od 1956. do 1958. intenzivno surađuje s Bregovcem na nizu projekata u Alepu, osim članstva u EXAT-u i međunarodne afirmacije vjerojatno je bio zaslužan i status predsjednika Društva arhitekata Hrvatske.⁵⁵ Osim prisnih prijateljstava te kreativnih i profesionalnih suradnji kriterij pri okupljanju arhitekata bila je, dakako, i izvrsnost, dok se opredijeljenost za modernistički arhitektonski diskurs, što je, uostalom, bila i osnovna postavka CIAM-a, podrazumijevala sama po sebi. Jedan od razloga nezainteresiranosti nedvojbeno je bio i zatvoreni karakter kongresa u Dubrovniku. Naime, sudjelovanje u radu međunarodnih organizacija bilo je dodatno motivirano odlascima u inozemstvo, a CIAM za razliku od UIA-a nije

RADOVAN NIKŠIĆ, ALEKSANDAR DRAGOMANOVIĆ I LOTTE STAM-BEESE PRIGODOM STUDIJSKOG PUTOVANJA ZAGREBAČKIH APSOLVENATA ARHITEKTURE U NIZOZEMSKU, 1964. PRIVATNI ARHIV IVANE NIKŠIĆ OLUJIĆ, ZAGREB.

RADOVAN NIKŠIĆ, ALEKSANDAR DRAGOMANOVIĆ AND LOTTE STAM-BEESE AT THE ZAGREB ARCHITECTURE GRADUATES STUDENTS' TRIP TO THE NETHERLANDS, 1964. IVANA NIKŠIĆ OLUJIĆ PRIVATE ARCHIVES, ZAGREB.

the reports from 1951 to 1956 as “a group in formation”.⁴⁰ At first, the leadership of CIAM regarded the Congress in Dubrovnik as an opportunity for founding the Yugoslav group. However, this did not happen for two reasons. Contrary to CIAM’s policy on promoting their congresses and collaborating with local professionals and the authorities, the Congress in Dubrovnik was closed to the public and the media. It indicated the seriousness of the situation and the importance of the upcoming decisions.⁴¹ Furthermore, even though Ibler was titled as “the representative of the Yugoslav CIAM group”, as if one actually existed, he was neither interested in founding of the group, nor in more active engagement within the organization.⁴² In Dubrovnik, he was the only Yugoslav architect who participated as a member in the work of the Congress, while a certain number of his colleagues attended it as observers - Bogdan Teodorović, Božidar Rašica, Zvonimir Radić and Srđa Šeferov from Zagreb, Oliver Minić from Belgrade, Branko Kalajžić from Sarajevo, Vladimir Braco Mušič from Ljubljana and Vladislav Pačić.⁴³ One can assume that the list of observers was compiled by Ibler.⁴⁴ Ibler’s direct connections with Šeferov (the member of the Master Workshop and his personal assistant) and Rašica (who collaborated with Ibler during his studies) can be seen in the diagram of the Zagreb architectural scene in the 1950s, while his liaison with Zvonimir Radić (the lecturer at the Academy of Applied Arts and a prominent theorist and advocate of product design) cannot be discerned. The attendance of Minić’s, and probably

Kalajžić’s, was undoubtedly connected to their positions within SDAJ, while Teodorović (the member of the pre-war national CIAM group for Yugoslavia and participant of the Fourth CIAM Congress in Athens in 1933) was invited by Weissmann.⁴⁵ Weissmann, who was unable to attend the Congress, welcomed the participants via a telegram. And finally, Vladimir Braco Mušič was the host to the Congress participants on board the ship *Partizanka* during their voyage from Venice to Dubrovnik.⁴⁶ While Ibler published Giedion’s text on CIAM 10 in the journal *Arhitektura*, Mušič himself wrote an extensive article in *Arhitekt* expressing his regret about “the physical and spiritual absence of Yugoslav architects”. In addition to the announcement of the Congress in local papers *Dubrovački vjesnik*, CIAM was the subject of a critical review titled *Tko su i što hoće* (*Who Are They and What Do They Want*) in Zagreb daily newspaper *Narodni list*, written by the eminent art historian and painter Ljubo Babić. Nikšić himself could not attend the congress although he was invited by Van den Broek, going over Ibler’s head.⁴⁷ The reason for his absence was a backlog of work accumulated during his six-months stay in the Netherlands from which he returned in the summer of 1956.⁴⁸ The subsequent involvement of Croatian architects with CIAM – maintaining established contacts and encouraging architects to take action on local and international level – was marked by its gradual *disintegration* that lasted for three years. This was the inevitable outcome of the major decisions made in Dubrovnik to dissolve the CIAM council, CIRPAC, and groups (in

order to turn it into a “congress of individuals” as it was at the very beginning), and the passivity of the Reorganization Committee appointed to propose further modes of action.⁴⁹ Bakema’s appointment as Committee secretary shifted CIAM - Zagreb communication away from Ibler and onto Nikšić. Soon after Dubrovnik, Ibler ceased almost all contacts with the group Bâtir and Alfred Roth which supports the claim that his main goal was to bring CIAM in Yugoslavia and nothing more than that. Committed to teamwork, Nikšić generously shared available materials with his colleagues, with Turina in particular. With a help of his acquaintances, the Algerian architect Pierre André Emery and thanks to his personal correspondence with Bakema, Turina, together with Nikšić and Serbian architect Alexis, i.e. Aleksandar Josić (the member of Candilis-Josic-Woods), was “elected a member of Yugoslav CIAM”.⁵⁰ Their names were probably included on the list of 30 architects proposed by Emery at the end of 1956

and, as an example, attached to Bakema’s call addressed to all members. He asked them to propose possible ways of reorganizing CIAM and names of individuals who would be interested in dealing with this matter.⁵¹ The proposal sent from Zagreb titled *CIAM in Reorganisation* and signed by Ibler, Radić, Rašica, Nikšić and Turina, was in fact a response to the second Bakema’s call from July 1957. Bakema asked members to submit “a formulation of the work which they think it could be done by means of Advanced Study of the Visual Design of Habitat” and the necessary proposals for the reorganization, to be discussed at the upcoming meeting in La Sarraz.⁵² Zagreb architects supported the proposal made by José Luis Sert, Walter Gropius and Jacqueline Tyrwhitt on founding the *Exchange Information Centre* (CIAM) and the *Exchange of Information of Architectural Education* dedicated to establishing an international exchange between CIAM members. In addition, they suggested its further expansion, that is, the establishment of the *Public Relations Center*.⁵³



nakon Dubrovnika nudio nove mogućnosti za sudjelovanje većeg broja arhitekata, tj. putovanja. Jugoslavenski arhitekti u velikom broju sudjeluju na regionalnoj konferenciji UIA-a u Ateni 1954. i Četvrtom kongresu u Haagu 1955. ……… Daljnji kontakti s CIAM-om ograničeni su isključivo na one Nikšića i Radića s Bakemom. Obojica su se našla na listi sudionika posljednjeg okupljanja planiranog u jesen 1959. u Nizozemskoj s temom „Doprinos razumijevanju aktualnih prilika u arhitekturi i urbanizmu“.⁵⁶ U Otterlo je na kraju doputovao samo Nikšić, a o posljednjem skupu CIAM-a obavijestio je i zagrebačke kolege na predavanju u Društvu arhitekata ubrzo po povratku.⁵⁷ I nakon rasapa CIAM-a Nikšić njeguje prijateljstva sa Stoklom i Bakemom, čiji se kontakti s hrvatskim arhitektima intenziviraju u prvoj polovini 1960-ih. Bakema boravi u Hrvatskoj u više navrata, 1958., 1961. i 1965. godine, kada posjećuje Poreč i Split, izrađuje projekt centra Novog Zagreba i drži na zagrebačkom Arhitektonskom fakultetu tri predavanja.⁵⁸ Osobni kontakt sa zagrebačkim studentima ostvario je i prigodom absolventskih putovanja Nizozemskom u organizaciji Nikšića, Dragomanovića i Berislava Radimira 1961. i 1964. godine.⁵⁹ Bakemina periferna pozicija na zagrebačkoj arhitektonskoj sceni 1950-ih jasno je vidljiva i na mrežnom prikazu. Isti su se pokazali iznimno korisnim alatom. Naime, položaj pojedinih arhitekata unutar mreže, kao i jasno diferenciranje pojedinih grupa, znatno su pridonijeli povezivanju tradicionalnim,

historiografskim istraživanjem prikupljenih činjenica u jasno strukturiran i prohodan narativ. Nadalje, ukazali su i na iznimno slab intenzitet djelovanja i malen broj izravnih veza hrvatskih arhitekata s CIAM-om i Teamom X 1950-ih godina koji osim toga nisu djelovali u domeni urbanističkog planiranja i stambene arhitekture za velike brojeve. Tek tijekom 1960-ih godina došlo je do znatnijeg odmaka od fascinacije s likom i djelom Le Corbusiera i koncepta tradicionalnoga *funkcionalnog grada*, tj. od eksperimentiranja s urbanističkim modelima na tragu Teama X. I taj su put glavni posrednici bili arhitekti usavršavani na inozemnim školama ili u atelijerima, poput Vladimira Brace Mušića, studenta fakulteta Harvard School of Design, ili Ivana Čižmeka, suradnika Candilisa, Josića i Woodsa.⁶⁰ Osim za veze daljnje će istraživanje biti usredotočeno i na njihovu manifestaciju, projekte i realizacije proistekle iz njih o kojima nije bilo riječi, a koje su i dalje primarni interes povjesničara arhitekture.

* Ovaj je rad financirala Hrvatska zaklada za znanost projektom 6270 *Moderne i suvremene umjetničke mreže, umjetničke grupe i udruženja: Organizacijski i komunikacijski modeli suradničkih umjetničkih praksi 20. i 21. stoljeća*.

……… In late summer of 1957 at La Sarraz meeting, in the presence of Ibler, all previous groups were dissolved, and *CIAM research group for social and visual relationships* was formed as a substitute for CIAM. Once again Bakema was appointed secretary of the newly formed Committee on Coordination, solely entrusted with CIAM’s reorganization. In a memo sent at the end of October to all the members, Nikšić included, Bakema announced a meeting on the topic “the current duties of architects” and asked again for a list of architects who would be willing to cooperate with the *CIAM research group*.⁵⁴ The *new group* of Zagreb architects with the so-called *permanent group* and the *collaborative group*, was generated from two directions – it consisted, on the one hand, from the participants at the CIAM 10 – Ibler, Radić and Rašica – and Nikšić, Turina and their close associates and employees of the Technical Faculty – Bernardo Bernardi, Aleksandar Dragomanović, Ninoslav Kučan and Srebrenka Sekulić Gvozdanović, on the other. They were joined by Vjenceslav Richter as a member of the first group and Zdravko Bregovac as a member of the second one. Richter and Bregovac closely collaborated on a number of projects in the period from 1956 to 1958, including the first prize-winning design for the Museum of Antiquities in Aleppo. In addition to Richter’s EXAT-51 group membership and gaining international recognition, one of the reasons why he was invited to join the *permanent group* was his

status of the president of the Croatian Architects Association.⁵⁵ The criterion for architects gathering were close friendships and creative and professional collaborations and, of course, excellence. The adherence to modernist architectural discourse – as one of the foundations of CIAM – was implicitly presupposed. One of the reasons for the lack of interest of Zagreb architects had undoubtedly been the fact that the Congress in Dubrovnik was closed for public. Namely, an additional motivation for joining the work of international organizations were the opportunities they offered for travelling abroad. Namely, CIAM after the Congress in Dubrovnik, unlike UIA, was no longer offering traveling opportunities to a larger number of architects. A lot of Yugoslav architects attended the UIA regional conference in Athens in 1954 and the Fourth Congress in The Hague in 1955. ……… All further contacts with CIAM were exclusively limited to those of Nikšić and Radić with Bakema. They were both on the list of participants at the last meeting that aimed to “contribute to the understanding of the current situation in architecture and urbanism”. The meeting was planned in autumn of 1959, in the Netherlands.⁵⁶ In the end, only Nikšić went to Otterlo. Upon his return, he held a lecture at the Architects Association and informed his colleagues about CIAM’s last assembly.⁵⁷ Even after the dissolution of CIAM, Nikšić continued his friendship with Stokla and Bakema, whose connections with Croatian architects intensified in the first half of

¹ Društvo je često mijenjalo ime. Osnovano je 1878. pod imenom Klub inžinirah i arhitekatah, a 1884. prvi put mijenja ime u Društvo inžinira i arhitekata u Zagrebu.

² Viktor Kovačić, „Moderna arhitektura“, u: *Život*, 1, 1900., 26–28.; *Izložba Udruženja umjetnika Zemlja*, Zagreb, 1929. (katalog izložbe); *D.H.U. Katalog*, Zagreb, 1898. (katalog izložbe); *Kristl – Picelj – Rašica – Srnec: 18. Februar – 4. Mart 1953. Izložba*, Zagreb, 1951. (katalog izložbe)

³ Pojam *hub* označava mjesta, središta određene arhitektonske i planerske filozofije važna za njezinu diseminaciju.

⁴ IFHP je osnovan 1913. u Londonu, a UIA 1948. u Laussani. Réunion internationale des architectes (RIA) osnovan je 1932. Jugoslavenski arhitekti sudjelovali su na sastanku RIA u Milanu u rujnu 1933. (N. N., Iie Réunion Internationale des architectes organisée par L’Architecture d’aujourd’hui avec la Collaboration du Syndicat national des architectes Italiens et de la Triennale de Milan, Septembre 1933., u: *L’Architecture d’aujourd’hui*, 4, 1933.)

⁵ Ibler se školovao u Dresdenu i usavršavao kod Hansa Poelziga u Berlinu. (Aleksander Laslo i Višnja Flego, „Dragutin Ibler“, u: *Hrvatski bibliografski leksikon*, Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, Zagreb, 2005., 1-4.)

⁶ Veze s UIA-om postoje već 1948. (N. N., „Na Međunarodnom kongresu arhitekata u Lausanni“, u: *Arhitektura*, 13–17, 1948., 139–141.)

⁷ Tamara Bjažić Klarin i Marcela Hanáčková, „Networking into the International Union of Architects (UIA) – Poland vs. Yugoslavia“, međunarodna konferencija *Transnational Networking Practices of Central and Southeast European Avant-garde*, Institut za povijest umjetnosti i Filozofski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, Zagreb, 2014.; N. N., „Plenum sekcije arhitekata, Predsjedniku jugoslavenskog odbora međunarodne unije arhitekata i savezu društava inženjera i tehničara FNRJ“, u: *Arhitektura*, 5–6, 1950., 4.

⁸ Ljiljana Blagojević, „Itinereri: moderna i Mediteran. Tragovima arhitekata Nikole Dobrovića i Milana Zlokovića“, Univerzitet u Beogradu – Arhitektonski fakultet, *Službeni glasnik*, Beograd, 2015., 67.; Zdravko Bregovac, „Haag. Izložba

the 1960s. ……… Bakema visited Croatia on several occasions: in 1958, 1961 and 1965, when he visited Poreč and Split, developed the project for the centre of the new housing district Novi Zagreb, and held three lectures at the Faculty of Architecture in Zagreb.⁵⁸ He had already met some of Zagreb’s students in 1961 and 1964. Alongside Van den Broek, he was one of the hosts to the groups of architecture students from Zagreb on their senior trips to the Netherlands, organized by Nikšić, Dragomanović and Berislav Radimir.⁵⁹ Bakema’s peripheral position at the 1950s architectural scene in Zagreb is clearly discernible from the network analysis which has proven to be an extremely useful tool. Namely, the positions of individual architects within the network, as well as the clear differentiation of individual groups, have significantly contributed to connecting data collected via traditional historiographical research into a well-structured and coherent narrative. Furthermore, the analysis have revealed the very low frequency and number of contacts established between Croatian architects, CIAM and Team X in the 1950s, who were otherwise not actively involved in urban planning nor in the architecture of mass housing. It was only in the 1960s, when the fascination with the life and work of Le Corbusier and the common concept of *the functional city* had started to wane, that architects began experimenting with the urban planning models along the lines of Team X. In this instance, the principal intermediaries were also the

naše arhitekture“, u: *Čovjek i prostor*, 35, 1955., 1 i 3.; Stjepan Gomboš, „Treći kongres UIA“, u: *Čovjek i prostor*, 2, 1954., 1–2.; Sena Gvozdanović, „Četvrti kongres arhitekata u Haagu. Arhitekt i evolucija stanovanja“, u: *Čovjek i prostor*, 40, 1955., 1.; N. N., „Uz međunarodnu izložbu arhitekture u Rabatu“, u: *Arhitektura*, 9-12, 1951., 84–85.; N. N., „Prvi regionalni sastanak urbanista Istočnog Mediterana (25. – 26. 6. 1954. u Ateni)“, u: *Čovjek i prostor*, 9, 1954., 8.; N. N., „Rezolucija V-og kongresa UIA (Moskva, 20. – 28. 7. 1958.)“, u: *Čovjek i prostor*, 77, 1958., 1–2.

⁹ N. N., „Savjetovanje o gradnji suvremene škole“, u: *Čovjek i prostor*, 3, 1954., 2.; N. N., „Arhitekt Alfred Roth“, u: *Čovjek i prostor*, 3, 1954., 2.; N. N., „Commission des constructions scolaires“, u: UIA. Organe officiel de l’Union Internationale des Architectes, 1, 1954., 32.; Alfred Roth, Pismo José Luis Sertu, 14. studenoga 1955., gta Archiv, ETH Zürich (gta ETHZ), 42-AR-22.

¹⁰ Časopisi nisu donijeli informaciju jedino o Šestom kongresu CIAM-a u Bridgewateru 1947. (France Ivanšek, „IX. Međnarodni kongres za moderno arhitekturo (CIAM)“, u: *Arhitekt*, 10, 1953., 20–21.; Neven Šegvić, „Stvaralačke komponente arhitekture FRNJ“, u: *Arhitektura*, 5–6, 1950., 5–40/29.; N. N., „Bibliografija“, u: *Arhitektura*, 5–8, 1951., 131–134.; N. N., „Stanovanje za ‘najmnogobrojnije’“, u: *Arhitektura*, 1, 1952., 44.)

¹¹ Weissmann je član CIAM-a od 1929. te član skupine CIAM Chapter for Relief and Post War Planning. Antolić i Weissmann našli su se 1947. na listi delegata CIRPAC-a. (Proces verbal de la séance du CIRPAC du 13 Septembre 1947., gta ETHZ 42-AR-21; Arhiv Tamare Bjažić Klarin, Zagreb)

¹² Na Osmom kongresu CIAM-a u Hoddesdonu 1951. na popisu grupa u reorganizaciji nalazi se i jugoslavenska. U Antolićevu arhivu sačuvana su i cirkularna pisma povezana s Devetim kongresom CIAM-a u Aix-en-Provenceu 1953. upućena Antoliću. (CIAM 8. Report of Hoddesdon Conference, gta ETHZ, JT-6-11; Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Hrvatski muzej arhitekture (HAZU, HMA), Osobni arhivski fond (OAF) Vladimir Antolić, kutija 6.)

¹³ Tamara Bjažić Klarin, „With Le Corbusier in Person – Hosting the Exhibition ‘Le Corbusier’ in Yugoslavia in 1952 and 1953“, međnarodna konferencija *Western Temptations in Cold War Times. International influences in Yugoslav architecture (1945–1990)*, Muzej za arhitekturo in oblikovanje (MAO), Ljubljana, 2015. (preuzeto

architects who were professionally trained at international schools or studios, such as Vladimir Braco Mušić, who studied at the Harvard School of Design, or Ivan Čižmek, the associate of Candilis, Josić and Woods.⁶⁰ In addition to the established connections, further research will also focus on their manifestations, the projects and buildings arising from this network, which have not yet been discussed, but which are still in the primary focus of architectural historians.

* This work has been fully supported by Croatian Science Foundation’s funding of the project 6270 *Modern and Contemporary Artist Networks, Art Groups and Art Associations: Organisation and Communication Models of Artist Collaborative Practices in the 20th and 21st Century*.

¹ The Club of Engineers and Architects, founded in 1878, changed its name on a regular basis. It changed its name for the first time in 1884 into the Association of Engineers and Architects in Zagreb.

² Viktor Kovačić, “Moderna arhitektura”, in: *Život*, 1, 1900, 26–28; *Izložba Udruženja umjetnika Zemlja*, Zagreb, 1929 (exhibition catalogue); *D.H.U. Katalog*, Zagreb, 1898 (exhibition catalogue); *Kristl – Picelj – Rašica – Srnec: 18. Februar – 4. Mart 1953. Izložba*, Zagreb, 1951 (exhibition catalogue).

³ Hubs are the centers of certain architectural and urban planning philosophy important for its dissemination.

Ernest Weissmann

Alfred Roth, Pismo Joséu Luisu Sertu

s: http://videolectures.net/westerntemptations 2015_bjazic_klarin_corbusier/, pristupljeno 25. lipnja 2016.)

¹⁴ Sena Gvozdanović, „Unija arhitekata 1955“, u: *Buletin Instituta za likovne umjetnosti JAZU*, 9–10, 1955., 86–87.

¹⁵ Grupe nisu bile nacionalne po sastavu, već po području djelovanja.

¹⁶ Prije Drugog svjetskog rata prva faza se odvijala od 1929. do 1933., tj. Četvrtog kontresa u Ateni, a druga od 1934. do 1941. U prvoj je glavni predstavnik Jugoslavije Ernest Weissmann, a u drugoj Vladimir Antolić. (Tamara Bjažić Klarin, *Ernest Weissmann: društveno angažirana arhitektura, 1926.-1939. / Ernest Weissmann: Socially Engaged Architecture, 1926 – 1939*, HAZU, HMA, Zagreb, 2015.)

¹⁷ Sve ostale radionice osnovane 1947. po uzoru na sovjetske bile su namijenjene edukaciji kipara i slikara „u cilju podizanja i razvoja umjetničke kvalitete radova likovne umjetnosti“. (N. N., „Uredba o osnivanju državnih majstorskih radionica likovnih umjetnosti“, u: *Republika*, 7–8, 1947., 540.)

¹⁸ Željka Čorak, *U funkciji znaka. Drago Ibler i hrvatska arhitektura između dva rata*, Institut za povijest umjetnosti i Društvo povjesničara umjetnosti, Zagreb, 1981.

¹⁹ Tom Avermaete, „Stem and Web: a Different Way of Analysing, Understanding and Conceiving the City in the Work of Candilis-Josic-Woods“, u: *Sociology, Production and the City, Team 10 – between Modernity and the Everyday*, TU Delft, 2003. (preuzeto s: http://www.team10online.org/research/studies_and_papers.html, pristupljeno 11. studenoga 2016.)

²⁰ Ivana Nikšić Olujić, „Arhitekt Radovan Nikšić 1920.–1987. / Architect Radovan Nikšić 1920-1987“, u: Boris Magaš (ur.), *Radovan Nikšić 1920.–1987. Arhiv arhitekta / Radovan Nikšić 1920-1987. Architect’s Archive*, HAZU, HMA, Zagreb, 2005., 7–28.

²¹ Natječajni projekt Nikšić je izradio u zajednici s Ninoslavom Kučanom i Petrom Kušanom, a realizirao ga s Kučanom. (Tamara Bjažić Klarin i Ivana Nikšić Olujić, Katalog zbirke arhitekta Radovana Nikšića / The Catalogue of the Radovan Nikšić’s Collection, kao bilj. 20, 99–121.)

²² Kao bilj. 20.

²³ Grupa EXAT 51 raspuštena je 1956. godine.

²⁴ Vladimir Šterk, „Umjetnička akademija i savremeni arhitekti“, u: *Arhitektura*, 1–2, 1933., 26–27.; Marko Vidaković, „Umjetnička akademija i savremeni arhitekti“, u:

Arhitektura, 1–2, 1933., 27–30.

²⁵ Međusobne odnose ilustrira članak „Stvaralačke komponente arhitekture FN RJ“ u kojem Šegvić kritizira rad Antolića, Weissmanna i Turine, dok istovremeno potencira produkciju i važnost Iblera i Kaulzarića te još dvojice Iblerovih učenika – Stjepana Planića i Lavoslava Horvata. *Zategnuti* odnosi Šegvića i Turine odrazili su se i na strukturu *jugoslavenske grupe* CIAM-a 1957. godine. (Arijana Novina, „Škola za arhitekturu na Akademiji likovnih umjetnosti u Zagrebu – Iblerova škola arhitekture“, u: *Peristil*, 47, 2004., 135–144.; Neven Šegvić, „Stvaralačke komponente arhitekture FRNJ“, u: *Arhitektura*, 5–6, 1950., 5–40.)

²⁶ Bodiansky je član grupe ATBAT-Afrique s Georgesom Candilisom i Shadrachom Woodsom. (CIAM 9. Aix-en-Provence 19-26 Juillet 1953. Rapports des commissions, gta ETHZ, 42-JT-K-1; Marcel Lods, Pismo Dragi Ibleru, 20. travnja 1951. i Drago Ibler, Pismo Marcelu Lodsu, 21. travnja 1951., HAZU, HMA, OAF Drago Ibler)

²⁷ Bodiansky i Honegger bili su delegati Pododbora za stanovanje Ujedinjenih naroda (Subcommittee on Housing of UNO) u Ženevi. (Ellen Shoshkes, *Jaqueline Tyrwhitt: A Transnational Life in Urban Planning and Design*, Routledge, New York, 2013.; Ernest Weissmann, „Imali smo drugu verziju povelje“, u: *Arhitektura*, 189–195, 1984. – 1985., 32–37.; Le Corbusier, Pismo Ernestu Weissmannu, 10. travnja 1947., Zbirka Marc Dessauce, Arhiv Ernesta Weissmanna, UBU Gallery, New York, kutija 4.2.)

²⁸ CIAM 8. Report of Hoddesdon Conference, gta ETHZ, JT-6-20; Jean-Jacques Honegger, Pismo Dragi Ibleru, 10. svibnja 1951., HAZU, HMA, OAF Drago Ibler.

²⁹ Osnivanju CIAM-ove grupe UN-a usprotivio se José Luis Sert, smatrajući je protivnom ustavu UN-a. (CIAM 8. Report of Hoddesdon Conference, gta ETHZ, JT-6-20, 23, 101/102.)

³⁰ Ivanšek, kao bilj. 10.

³¹ Ibler je s Lodsom i član Komisije za zakonodavstvo zadužene za izradu izvještaja naslovljenog *Utilitasion du sol*. Dio cirkularnih pisama povezanih s Devetim kongresom sačuvan je u HMA, HAZU-u, OAF Drago Ibler. (CIAM 9, kao bilj. 26.)

³² U funkciji predsjednika Ibler sudjeluje na Petom kongresu UIA-a u Moskvi 1958. (Laslo i Flego, kao bilj. 5.)

³³ Alžir je godinama bio željeno odredište CIAM-a. Nakon kontakta s Iblerom u jesen 1955. odluka o održavanju kongresa u Jugoslaviji donesena je početkom 1956., o čemu

je obaviješten i Ernest Weissmann. (José Luis Sert i Sigfried Giedion, Pismo Dragi Ibleru, 10. siječnja 1956. i José Luis Sert, Pismo Alfredu Rothu, 25. siječnja 1956., gta ETHZ, 42-AR-14-154, 179.)

³⁴ Alfred Roth, Pismo Joséu Luisu Sertu, 14. studenoga 1955., gta ETHZ, 42-AR-22-188/189.

³⁵ Kongres je prvotno planiran u Miločeru kraj Budve u Crnoj Gori, a u Dubrovniku u Sorkočevićevu ljetnikovcu Jugoslavenske akademije znanosti i umjetnosti (danas HAZU) koja je naknadno otkazala gostoprimstvo. Kongres je održan u prostorijama Moderne galerije. (Alfred Roth, Pismo Centroturistu (poslovnica Zagreb), 22. svibnja 1956., José Luis Sert, Pismo vijeću CIAM-a, članovima Teama X, Alfredu Rothu i Dragi Ibleru, 12. lipnja 1956., Drago Ibler, Telegram Alfredu Rothu, 1. kolovoza 1956., gta ETHZ, 42-AR-14-85, 123/124, 128/129.)

³⁶ Nikšić se umrežava na sličan način poput Weissmanna koji kasnih 1920-ih i 1930. radi u atelijeru Le Corbusiera. (Vladimir Turina, Pismo Jacobu Bakemi, 10. veljače 1957., u: Vladimir Mattioni (ur.), *Rukopisi Vladimira Turine*, UPI-2M Plus, Zagreb, 2006., 251.)

³⁷ Ivan Juras, „Aleksandar Dragomanović (1921. – 1996.)“, u: *Čovjek i prostor*, 500–501, 1996., 60.; Radovan Nikšić, Izvještaj Komisiji za kulturne veze s inostranstvom u Beogradu za razdoblje od 18. 1. do 18. 4. 1956. i Dnevnik za vrijeme boravka u Nizozemskoj od 18. 1. do 7. 7. 1956., HAZU, HMA, OAF Radovan Nikšić.

³⁸ Predavanje o suvremenoj nizozemskoj arhitekturi održano je 22. svibnja 1956. (Erika Piffl, „Holandija“, u: *Čovjek i prostor*, 51, 1956., 4–5.; Radovan Nikšić, Pismo Zvonimiru Vrkljanu, 19. travnja 1956., HAZU, HMA, OAF Radovan Nikšić.)

³⁹ Zdenko Kolacio, „Sjećanje na Većaslava Holjevca“, u: *Čovjek i prostor*, 212, 1970., 7–8.; Program posjeta Johannaesa van den Broeka Zagrebu, kolovoz 1956., Udruženje hrvatskih arhitekata (UHA), Arhiva, Zagreb.

⁴⁰ Addresses of council members, delegates of CIAM groups and groups in formation. Stockholm June 1952. Aix-en-Provence, July 1953, 1955, Participants of CIAM X. i CIAM 8. Report of Hoddesdon Conference, gta ETHZ, 42-AR-22 i JT-6-11.

⁴¹ CIAM 6 Documents, gta ETHZ, 42-AR-1-9.

⁴² Alfred Roth, CIAM X. August 3rd – 13th, 1956 at Budva, Jugoslavia. To all CIAM groups, delegates and members, 12. veljače 1956., gta ETHZ, 42-AR-14-140.

Ernest Weissmann

Alfred Roth, Pismo Joséu Luisu Sertu

⁴³ Kongresu su prisustvovali i promatrači iz Alžira, Australije, Francuske, Italije, Nizozemske, Njemačke, Švicarske i Velike Britanije.

⁴⁴ CIAM X. Addresses of Yugoslavian Architects at CIAM X i CIAM X. Dubrovnik. Not for Publication, gta ETHZ, 42-JT-18-220 i 42-X-115-12.

⁴⁵ Telegram from Ernest Weissmann, CIAM 10. Dubrovnik 1956. Not for Publication, gta ETHZ, 42-X-115-33.

⁴⁶ Naime, Jacqueline Tyrwhitt tražila je jednog domaćeg arhitekta da pomogne ako dođe do eventualnih problema tijekom putovanja. Mušić je nakon kongresa također razmišljao o osnivanju nacionalne grupe CIAM-a u Ljubljani. (Vladimir Braco Mušić, Pismo Alfredu Rothu, 20. rujna 1956. i Alfred Roth, Pismo Vladimiru Braci Mušiću, 1. listopada 1956., gta ETH, 42-AR-22; Iz razgovora autorice s Vedranom Mimicom, 23. svibnja 2016., Zagreb)

⁴⁷ B., „Završio Međunarodni kongres arhitekata“, u: *Dubrovački vjesnik*, 17. kolovoza 1956., 1.; Ljubo Babić, „Tko su i što hoće. Uz kongres predstavnika CIAM-a u Dubrovniku“, u: *Narodni list*, 26. kolovoza 1956., 4.; Sigfried Giedion, CIAM X., u: *Arhitektu*, 1–6, 1956., 3–4.; Vladimir Mušić ml., „Deseti dubrovniški CIAM, u: *Arhitekt*, 20, 1956., 36–37.; M. M., „Svjetski arhitekti u Dubrovniku. X. kongres organizacije CIAM“, u: *Dubrovački vjesnik*, 11. kolovoza 1956., 1.

⁴⁸ Radovan Nikšić, Pismo Zvonimiru Vrkljanu, 4. srpnja 1956., HAZU, HMA, OAF Radovan Nikšić.

⁴⁹ O rasformiranju CIAM-a više u: Eric Mumford, *The CIAM Discourse on Urbanism, 1928 – 1960*, The MIT Press, Cambridge Mass. & London, 2000, 258–260.

⁵⁰ Vladimir Turina, Pisma Jacobu Bakemi i P. A. Emeryju, 10. veljače 1957., kao bilj. 36, 251–252.

⁵¹ Pismo R. Nikšiću, 2. siječnja 1957., HAZU, HMA, OAF Radovan Nikšić; Jacob Bakema, CIAM in Reorganization, 5. prosinca 1956. i P. A. Emery, CIAM X – Congres de Dubrovnik. Reorganisation des CIAM, 1. studenoga 1956., gta ETHZ, 42-JLS-28-3/9.

⁵² Jacob Bakema, Cirkularni dopis („CIAM in reorganization“), 12. srpnja 1957., gta ETHZ, 42-JLS-33-28/29.

⁵³ Drago Ibler, Radovan Nikšić, Zvonimir Radić, Božidar Rašica i Vladimir Turina, CIAM in Reorganisation, Walter Gropius, José Luis Sert i Jaqueline Tyrwhitt, Pismo

^[1] IFHP was founded in 1913 in London, while UIA was founded in 1948 in Lausanne. The Réunion internationale des architectes (RIA) was founded in 1932. Yugoslav architects took part at the RIA meeting in Milan in September 1933 (N. N., Ile Réunion Internationale des architectes organisée par L’Architecture d’aujourd’hui avec la Collaboration du Syndicat national des architectes Italiens et de la Triennale de Milan, Septembre 1933., in: L’Architecture d’aujourd’hui, 4, 1933).

^[2] Ibler was educated in Dresden and continued his professional training under Hans Poelzig in Berlin (Aleksander Laslo and Višnja Flego, “Dragutin Ibler”, in: Hrvatski bibliografski leksikon, Leksikografski zavod Miroslav Krleža, Zagreb, 2005, 1-4).

^[3] The connections with UIA were already established in 1948 (N. N., “Na Međunarodnom kongresu arhitekata u Lausanni”, in: Arhitektura, 13–17, 1948, 139–141).

^[4] Tamara Bjažić Klarin and Marcela Hanáčeková, “Networking into the International Union of Architects (UIA) – Poland vs. Yugoslavia”, international conference Transnational Networking Practices of Central and Southeast European Avant-garde, Institute of Art History and Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Zagreb, 2014; N. N., “Plenum sekcije arhitekata, Predsjedniku jugoslavenskog odbora međunarodne unije arhitekata i savezu društava inženjera i tehničara FN RJ”, in: Arhitektura, 5-6, 1950, 4.

^[5] Ljiljana Blagojević, “Itinereri: moderna i Mediteran. Tragovima arhitekata Nikole Dobrovića i Milana Zlokovića”, University of Belgrade - Faculty of Architecture, Službeni glasnik, Belgrade, 2015, 67; Zdravko Bregovac, “Haag. Izložba naše arhitekture”, in: Čovjek i prostor, 35, 1955, 1 and 3; Stjepan Gomboš, “Treći kongres UIA”, in: Čovjek i prostor, 2, 1954, 1–2; Sena Gvozdanović, “Četvrti kongers arhitekata u Haagu. Arhitekt i evolucija stanovanja”, in: Čovjek i prostor, 40, 1955, 1; N. N., “Uz međunarodnu izložbu arhitekture u Rabatu”, in: Arhitektura, 9-12, 1951, 84-85.; N. N., “Prvi regionalni sastanak urbanista Istočnog Mediterana (June 25th - 26th, Athens)”, in: Čovjek i prostor, 9, 1954, 8; N. N., “Rezolucija V-og kongesa UIA (Moskva, 20. – 28. 7. 1958.)”, in: Čovjek i prostor, 77, 1958, 1–2.

^[6] N. N., “Savjetovanje o gradnji suvremene škole”, in: Čovjek i prostor, 3, 1954, 2; N. N., “Commission des constructions scolaires”, in: UIA. Organe officiel de l’Union Internationale des Architectes, 1, 1954, 32; N. N., “Arhitekt Alfred Roth”, in: Čovjek i prostor, 3, 1954, 2; Alfred Roth, Letter to José Luis Sert, November 14th 1955, gta Archiv,

^[7] ETH Zürich (gta ETHZ), 42-AR-22.

^[8] The only congress which the journals had not covered was the CIAM 6 in Bridgwater, held in 1947 (France Ivanšek, “IX. Međnarodni kongres za moderno arhitekturo (CIAM)”, in: Arhitekt, 10, 1953, 20-21; Neven Šegvić, “Stvaralačke komponente arhitekture FRNJ”, in: Arhitektura, 5-6, 1950, 5-40/29; N. N., “Bibliografja”, in: Arhitektura, 5–8, 1951, 131–134; N. N., “Stanovanje za ‘najmnogobrojnije’”, in: Arhitektura, 1, 1952, 44).

^[9] Weissmann was a CIAM member since 1929, and a member of CIAM Chapter for Relief and Post War Planning. Antolić and Weissmann were on the CIRPAC’s list of delegates in 1947 (Proces verbal de la séance du CIRPAC du 13 Septembre 1947, gta ETHZ, 42-AR-21; Tamara Bjažić Klarin’s Archives, Zagreb).

^[10] At the CIAM 8, held in Hoddesdon in 1951, the Yugoslav group was listed on the list of groups undergoing reorganization. Circular letters sent to Antolić about the CIAM 9 in Aix-en-Provance in 1953 been preserved in his archives (CIAM 8. Report of Hoddesdon Conference, gta ETHZ, JT-6-11; Croatian Academy of Sciences and Arts, Croatian Museum of Architecture (HAZU, HMA), Personal record group (PRG) of Vladimir Antolić, box 6).

^[11] Tamara Bjažić Klarin, “With Le Corbusier in Person – Hosting the Exhibition ‘Le Corbusier’ in Yugoslavia in 1952 and 1953”, International Conference Western Temptations in Cold War Times. International influences in Yugoslav architecture (1945–1990), Muzej za arhitekturu i oblikovanje (MAO), Ljubljana, 2015 (http://videolectures.net/westerntemptations2015_bjazic_klarin_corbusier/, last accessed on: June 25th 2016)

^[12] Sena Gvozdanović, “Unija arhitekata 1955”, in: Buletin Instituta za likovne umjetnosti JAZU, 9–10, 1955, 86–87.

^[13] Groups were not national in the sense of their members’ nationality. National refers to the area of their activities.

^[14] Before the Second World War, the first stage lasted from 1929 to 1933 (the CIAM 4 in Athens), and the second one from 1934 to 1941. In the first period, Weissmann was the main representative for Yugoslavia while Antolić was in charge in the second stage (Tamara Bjažić Klarin, Ernest Weissmann: društveno angažirana arhitektura, 1926.-1939. / Ernest Weissmann: Socially Engaged Architecture, 1926 – 1939, HAZU, HMA, Zagreb, 2015).

Jacobi Bakemi, 19. travnja 1957., gta ETHZ, 42-SG-48-1/5 i 42-JLS-33-38; Zvonimir Radić, Dopis Dragi Ibleru, 30. listopada 1957., HAZU, HMA, OAF Radovan Nikšić.⁵⁴ Povod sastanku u La Sarrazu bila je pasivnost Odbora za reorganizaciju CIAM-a i potreba da se riješi status quo. Na popisu sastavljenom u ljeto 1957. bila su imena Alexisa Josića, Jurja Neidhardta (Le Corbusierova predratnog suradnika), Radovana Nikšića i Vladimira Turine. (CIAM. CIRPAC / LA SARRAZ / 31. Aug. – 4. Sept. 1956. Anmeldungen, Sigfried Giedion, An den Council und die Delegierten CIAM, Alfred Roth, Poziv na sastanak u La Sarraz, 10. kolovoza 1957., 13 àout 1957. Liste des noms propose comme member individual, Drago Ibler, Telegram Alfredu Rothu, 16. kolovoza 1957. i Jacob Bakema, Cirkularni dopis („CIAM in reorganization”), 22. listopada 1957.), gta ETHZ, 42-AR-18-1/2, 36, 39 i 42-JLS-33-3, 25/27.

⁵⁵ Nikšić uz navedene arhitekta u pismu Bakemi predlaže i Dragu Galića i Nevena Šegvića, koji nisu navedeni u pismu Turine Bakemi u kojem daje svoju suglasnost na listu koju je primio od Bakeme. (kao bilj. 49, 2000, 337.; Ivana Nikšić Olujić, Zdravko Bregovac. Arhiv arhitekta, HAZU, HMA, Zagreb, 2015.; Vladimir Turina, Pismo Jacobu Bakemi, kao bilj. 36, 256; Radovan Nikšić, Pismo Jacobu Bakemi, 13. prosinca 1957., Het Nieuwe Instituut Rotterdam (HNI), Arhiv Jacoba Bakeme, BAKE_0151_g4).

⁵⁶ Zvonimir Radić se tada nalazio u Velikoj Britaniji. (Jacob Bakema, Pismo Radovanu Nikšiću, 27. veljače 1958. i Grupa za koordinaciju, Cirkularno pismo upućeno Radovanu Nikšiću, 9. svibnja 1958., Het Nieuwe Instituut Rotterdam (HNI), Arhiv Jacoba Bakeme, BAKE_0151_g4)

⁵⁷ Predstavio je zgradu Radničkog sveučilišta i stambenu zgradu u Karlovcu te natječajne projekte za spomenik u Jajincima, sportski centar u Karlovcu, plivalište u Rijeci i hotel na Plitvicama. (Jacob Bakema, Telegram Radovanu Nikšiću, 25. srpnja 1958., Lista sudionika sastanka u Otterlou 9. rujna 1959. i Popis sudionika u Otterlou i izloženih projekata, HAZU, HMA, OAF Radovan Nikšić)

⁵⁸ Jacob Bakema, „Arhitektura kao instrument u procesu identifikacije čovjeka“, u: *Arhitektura*, 89, 1965., 11–34.; Jacob Bakema, „Pokušajmo učiniti da zgrade ponovno jedna drugoj pruže ruke“, u: *Arhitektura*, 89, 1965., 35–42.; Radovan Nikšić, „Bakemino rješenje centra Novog Zagreba“, u: *Čovjek i prostor*, 152, 1965., 3.; Jacob Bakema, Telegram Radovanu Nikšiću, 25. 7. 1958., HAZU, HMA, OAF Radovan Nikšić)

to Centroturist [Zagreb office], May 22th 1956; José Luis Sert, A letter addressed to CIAM Council, members of Team X, Alfred Roth and Drago Ibler, June 12th 1956; Drago Ibler, Telegram to Alfred Roth, August 1st 1956, gta ETHZ, 42-AR-14-85, 123/124, 128/129).

³⁶ Nikšić's mode of networking was similar to Weissmann's who, during the late 1920s and 1930, worked in Le Corbusier's studio. (Vladimir Turina, Letter to Jacob Bakema, February 10th 1957, in: Vladimir Mattioni (ed.), *Rukopisi Vladimira Turine*, UPI-2M Plus, Zagreb, 2006, 251).

³⁷ Ivan Juras, “Aleksandar Dragomanović (1921 – 1996)”, in: *Čovjek i prostor*, 500–501, 1996, 60; Radovan Nikšić, The Report to the Commission for Cultural Relations with Abroad in Belgrade, for the period from January 18th to April 18th 1956, and the journal kept during the stay in the Netherlands from January 18th to July 7th 1956, HAZU, HMA, PRG of Radovan Nikšić.

³⁸ The lecture on contemporary Dutch architecture was held on May 22nd 1956 (Erika Piffl, “Holandija”, in: *Čovjek i prostor*, 51, 1956, 4–5; Radovan Nikšić, Letter to Zvonimir Vrkljan, April 19th 1956, HAZU, HMA, OAF Radovan Nikšić).

³⁹ Zdenko Kolacio, “Sjećanje na Večeslava Holjevca”, in: *Čovjek i prostor*, 212, 1970, 7–8; The itinerary of Johannes van den Broek's visit to Zagreb, August 1956, Croatian Architects' Association (CAA), Archiva, Zagreb.

⁴⁰ Addresses of council members, delegates of CIAM groups and groups in formation. Stockholm June 1952, Aix-en-Provence, July 1953, 1955, Participants of CIAM X. and CIAM 8. Report of Hoddesdon Conference, gta ETHZ, 42-AR-22 and JT-6-11.

⁴¹ CIAM 6 Documents, gta ETHZ, 42-AR-1-9.

⁴² Alfred Roth, CIAM X. August 3rd – 13th, 1956 at Budva, Yugoslavia. To all CIAM groups, delegates and members, February 12th 1956, gta ETHZ, 42-AR-14-140.

⁴³ Congress was attended by observers from Algeria, Australia, France, Italy, Netherlands, Germany, Switzerland and Great Britain.

⁴⁴ CIAM X. Addresses of Yugoslavian Architects at CIAM X and CIAM X. Dubrovnik. Not for Publication, gta ETHZ, 42-JT-18-220 and 42-X-115-12.

⁴⁵ Telegram from Ernest Weissmann, CIAM 10. Dubrovnik 1956. Not for Publication, gta ETHZ, 42-X-115-33.

⁴⁶ Jacqueline Tyrwhitt asked that one Yugoslav architect should be present in case

⁵⁹ Arhitektonski fakultet Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, *Studijsko putovanje apsolvencata 63–64 po Holandiji*, Zagreb, 1964.; Razgovor autorice s Ivanom Čižmekom, 4. studenoga 2016.

⁶⁰ O Vladimiru Braci Mušiću više u: Luka Skansi (ur.), *Streets and Neighbourhoods: Vladimir Braco Mušić and Large Scale Architecture*, MAO, Ljubljana, 2015.

some problems ocured during the journey. After the Congress, Mušić considered the founding of the national CIAM group in Ljubljana. (Vladimir Braco Mušić, Letter to Alfred Roth, September 20th 1956. and Alfred Roth, Letter to Vladimir Braco Mušić, October 1st 1956, gta ETHZ, 42-AR-22; Conversation of author with Vedran Mimica, May 23rd 2016, Zagreb).

⁴⁷ B., „Završio Međunarodni kongres arhitekata“, in: *Dubrovački vjesnik*, August 17th 1956, 1; Ljubo Babić, „Tko su i što hoće. Uz kongres predstavnika CIAM-a u Dubrovniku“, in: *Narodni list*, August 26th 1956, 4; Sigfried Giedion, CIAM X., in: *Arhitektura*, 1–6, 1956., 3–4; Vladimir Mušić ml., „Deseti dubrovniški CIAM, in: *Arhitekt*, 20, 1956, 36–37.; M. M., „Svjetski arhitekti u Dubrovniku. X. kongres organizacije CIAM“, in: *Dubrovački vjesnik*, August 11th 1956, 1.

⁴⁸ Radovan Nikšić, Letter to Zvonimir Vrkljan, July 4th 1956, HAZU, HMA, PRG of Radovan Nikšić.

⁴⁹ On CIAM disseverment in: Eric Mumford, *The CIAM Discourse on Urbanism, 1928–1960*, The MIT Press, Cambridge Mass. & London, 2000, 258–260.

⁵⁰ Vladimir Turina, Letters to Jacob Bakema and P. A. Emery, February 10th 1957, 251–252.

⁵¹ Letter to Radovan Nikšić, January 2nd 1957, HAZU HMA PRG of Radovan Nikšić; Jacob Bakema, CIAM in Reorganisation, December 5th 1956 and P. A. Emery, CIAM X – Congres de Dubrovnik. Reorganisation des CIAM, November 1st 1956, gta ETHZ, 42-JLS-28-3/9.

⁵² Jacob Bakema, Circular letter (“CIAM in reorganization”), July 12th 1957, gta ETHZ, 42-JLS-33-28/29.

⁵³ Drago Ibler, Radovan Nikšić, Zvonimir Radić, Božidar Rašica and Vladimir Turina, CIAM in Reorganisation, Walter Gropius, José Luis Sert and Jaqueline Tyrwhitt, Letter to Jacob Bakema, September 19th 1957, gta ETHZ, 42-SG-48-1/5 and 42-JLS-33-38; Zvonimir Radić, Memo to Drago Ibler, October 30th 1957, HAZU, HMA, PRG of Radovan Nikšić.

⁵⁴ The meeting in La Sarraz was called up due to the complacency of the CIAM Reorganization Committee and the need to resolve the status quo. The list drafted in 1957 contained the names of Alexis Josić, Juraj Neidhardt (Le Corbusier's prewar associate), Radovan Nikšić and Vladimir Turina. (CIAM. CIRPAC / LA SARRAZ

/ 31 Aug. – 4 Sept. 1956. Anmeldungen, Sigfried Giedion, An den Council und die Delegierten CIAM, Alfred Roth, A call for meeting in La Sarraz, August 10th 1957, 13 àout 1957., Liste des noms propose comme member individual, Drago Ibler, Telegram to Alfred Roth, August 16th 1957 and Jacob Bakema, Circular letter (“CIAM in reorganization”), October 22nd 1957, gta ETHZ, 42-AR-18-1/2, 36, 39 and 42-JLS-33-3, 25/27).

⁵⁵ In addition to the abovementioned architects, Nikšić also proposed Drago Galić and Neven Šegvić in his letter to Bakema. However, in Turina's letter to Bakema, in which he approved of Bakema's list, the two architects were not mentioned (Ibid. note 49, 337; Ivana Nikšić Olujić, Zdravko Bregovac. Architect's Archive, HAZU, HMA, Zagreb, 2015; Vladimir Turina, Letter to Jacob Bakema, Ibid. note 36, 256; Radovan Nikšić, Letter to Jacob Bakema, December 13th 1957, Het Nieuwe Instituut Rotterdam (HNI), Jacob Bakem's Archives, BAKE_0151_g4

⁵⁶ Zvonimir Radić was in Great Britain at that time (Jacob Bakema, Letter to Radovan Nikšić, February 27th 1958 and Group for Coordination, Circular letter addressed to Radovan Nikšić, May 9th 1958, HAZU, HMA PRG of Radovan Nikšić).

⁵⁷ He presented the building of the Workers' University, the residential buildings in Karlovac and the competiton designs: the monument in Jajinci, the sport centre in Karlovac, the pool in Rijeka and the hotel at Plitvice (Jacob Bakema, Telegram to Radovan Nikšić, July 25th 1958, The list of participant in Otterlo, September 9th 1959 and The list of participant in Otterlo and presented projects, HAZU, HMA, PRG of Radovan Nikšić).

⁵⁸ Jacob Bakema, “Arhitektura kao instrument u procesu identifikacije čovjeka”, in: *Arhitektura*, 89, 1965, 11–34; Jacob Bakema, “Pokušajmo učiniti da zgrade ponovno jedna drugoj pruže ruke”, in: *Arhitektura*, 89, 1965, 35–42; Radovan Nikšić, “Bakemino rješenje centra Novog Zagreba”, in: *Čovjek i prostor*, 152, 1965, 3; Jacob Bakema, Telegram to Radovan Nikšić, July 25th 1958, HAZU, HMA, PRG Radovan Nikšić.

⁵⁹ Faculty of Architecture, University of Zagreb, *Studijsko putovanje apsolvencata 63–64 po Holandiji*, Zagreb, 1964; Conversation of author with Ivan Čižmek, November 4th 2016, Zagreb.

⁶⁰ On Vladimir Braco Mušić, see: Luka Skansi (ed.), *Streets and Neighbourhoods: Vladimir Braco Mušić and Large Scale Architecture*, MAO, Ljubljana, 2015.