

EVENTUALNO



Vladimir Turina je u proljeće 1963., između 8. ožujka i 12. travnja, objavio u *Telegramu* četiri teksta: „Postoje li u arhitekturi autorska prava”, „Humanizam i antihumanizam novovjekog urbanizma”, „Sudar dviju sudbina” i „Eventualno!?... ka cilju”. Iste je godine navršio pedeset godina, iza njega je bilo bogato iskustvo prakticirajućeg arhitekta i sveučilišnog profesora. Aktivni član CIAM-a bio je od 1957. Pomislilo bi se da se radi o karijeri popločanoj uspjesima. Pa ipak, prije bi se moglo reći da su Turinini „uspjesi” zapravo njegova osobna, velika razočaranja. Kada su se pojavili tekstovi u Telegramu iza Turine su bile pobjede i visoki plasmani na velikim natjecanjima koji se nikada nisu ostvarili, kao i ostvarenja koja nikada nisu dovršena po njegovoj zamisli, nego po prinudi različitih okolnosti. Kronika građenja stadiona u Maksimiru kronika je Turinine borbe da se spasi što se spasiti može, Centar za zaštitu majke i djeteta napola je realizirani projekt. O

tome jasno svjedoče Turinina otvorena pisma Društvu arhitekata Hrvatske, u povodu najave devastirajućeg projekta maksimirskog stadiona, i ravnateljici, dr. Feđi Fischer-Sartorius, u povodu zamjene autora na drugoj fazi građenja Centra. U oba slučaja radi se o flagrantnom kršenju autorskih prava. Prije no što je prihvatio poziv Telegrama za seriju napisa, nezadovoljstva arhitektonskom praksom već su bila akumulirana. Ono što je bilo novo u tim tekstovima jest artikulacija sumnje u svekoliko djelovanje arhitekta, pa i u sama načela koja je stara jezgra CIAM-a uporno nastojala održati. Prvi se put u domaćoj publicistici pojavljuju tekstovi koji otvoreno iskazuju nepovjerenje dotadašnjim postulatima struke i sumnju u misiju koju bi arhitektura trebala imati u društvu. Te četiri rasprave jedinstven su slučaj rasvjetljavanja trenutka u kojem se arhitektura toga doba nalazila i nadahnuti nagovještaj promjena koje će uslijediti mnogo godina poslije.

VLADIMIR
MATTIONI

In the Spring of 1963, between March 8 and April 12, Turina published four articles in *Telegram* – “On the Issue of Copyright in Architecture,” “Humanism and Anti-humanism of Modern Urban Planning,” “The Clash of Two Destinies,” and “Perhaps!?... Towards the Goal.” He had turned fifty that very year, with rich experience of a practising architect and university professor behind him. He had been an active member of CIAM since 1957. You would call it a career paved with success. And yet, one might say that Turina’s “successes” were also his own great disappointments. At the time of publishing his articles in *Telegram*, he had victories and high scores at important competitions behind him, but his projects had never been built and if they had, it was not entirely according to his idea, but rather dictated by various circumstances. The chronicle of building the football stadium at Maksimir is a chronicle of Turina’s fight to save what could still be saved, while his Centre for the Welfare of Mother and Child has remained only half-realized. These facts are evident

from Turina’s open letters to Croatian Architects’ Association, in which he warned against the devastating plans regarding the Maksimir stadium, and his letters to the Centre’s director, Ms Feđa Fischer-Sartorius, after its architects were replaced in the second phase of construction. Both may be regarded as severe cases of copyright violation. By the time Turina accepted the invitation of *Telegram* to write a series of articles, he had already accumulated considerable frustration with respect to the architectural profession. The novelty was in his articulation of doubt regarding all aspects of architectural activity, including the very principles that the former core of CIAM had persistently guarded. It was the first time in the Croatian media that an author openly expressed his distrust with the very basics of his discipline and his doubt in the mission that architecture was supposed to have in the society. These four articles are a unique presentation of the state of architecture in those times and an inspired vision of the changes that would ensue only much later.



PERHAPS

VLADIMIR TURINA POKRAJ ZGRADE YU61,
REMETINEC, 1961. (SNIMIO BRANKO BRCE)

I



I

VLADIMIR TURINA AT THE BUILDING OF YU61,
REMETINEC, 1961 (PHOTO BY BRANKO BRCE)

Tekst „Postoje li u arhitekturi autorska prava” započinje kao rasprava o biti arhitekture i arhitektonskog poziva. U uvodnom dijelu Turina arhitekturu poistovjećuje s cjelokupnim *fizisom*, sa svime što je samoniklo i proizvedeno, svime što sačinjava svijet za čovjeka. Za tako ocrtani predmet mišljenja postoji samo jedan mogući subjekt – Stvoritelj. Za pretpostaviti je da božja iskra pada i na biće kao što je arhitekt. Ali, da ovo nadahnuće ne bi ostalo neutemeljena vjera, Turina će reći: „Postoji mnoštvo stvari. Postoji ‚tezga’ i pravo uvjerenje. Postoji istina i laž. Postoji teza i antiteza – ukratko, svega ima među nama. Postoji ipak prava arhitektura, ona koja je s nama od dječjih nogu... kuća, staja, pojata, hambar, bunar.”

Arhitektura kao građenje pripada svima i zato se čini da su svi upućeni u arhitekturu. Nitko se neće upuštati u druge discipline, smatra Turina, ali arhitektura stoji izložena svačijoj volji. Pitanje koje Turina postavlja slijedom ovih okolnosti jest to ima li onda arhitekt u svekolikoj obuzetosti građenjem neku posebnu ulogu koja bi se mogla nazvati autorskom, poput autorskih izuma fizičara, biologa, literata i drugih. Turina primjećuje da arhitekt ne operira u domeni građenja, nego u domeni „intelektualnih usluga”, kako bismo danas rekli, gdje je on njihov vlasnik, pa prema tome i vlasnik autorskih prava. On ukazuje na apsurd po kojem

su „dućan, stolac, naslonjač, kuhinja, policica za knjige i pult jedne turističke agencije autorsko djelo, a parlament, muzej, škola, hotel, stadion, bolnica, dom kulture – to nisu!”. Na tom tragu Turina polemizira s praksom u kojoj je uloga arhitekta zamagljena nastojanjima brojnih suradnika da operative segmente arhitektonskog djela pripišu sebi i razmrve u depersonalizirani kolektivno-anonimni proizvod. U sredini u kojoj stvara Turina doživljava krizu autorstava kao odraz svekolike krize društva u kojem je pojedinac postao beznačajni subjekt. Tako se apostolsko poslanje suočava s banalnošću pohlepe i prevare, a svetinja arhitekture biva rastrgana i potisnuta u zaborav.

„Govoriti o ovoj temi nije jednostavno. O njoj se može pisati debelom stručnom terminologijom, pozivati u pomoć sve anđele i sve svece...”. Tako započinje tekst „Humanizam i antihumanizam novovjekog urbanizma” u kojem Turina pokušava naslovnim pojmovima dati nove sadržaje i sagledati sudbinu grada u mijenama.

Dok u prethodnom tekstu razmatra univerzalni smisao arhitekture i pragmatičnu sudbinu arhitekta, u ovome se članku upušta u raspravu o sudbini grada s obzirom na njegov humanistički smisao. Za tu nakanu, kako sam veli, hoće govoriti „drugim jezikom, jezikom arhitekta o izvjesnim prostornim i emocionalnim vizijama, jezikom spontanog

The article entitled “On the Issue of Copyright in Architecture” begins by discussing the essence of architecture and the architectural profession. In his introduction, Turina compares architecture to physis as a whole, to everything that is autochthonous or produced, all that constitutes the human world. There is only one subject for the topic thus outlined – the Creator. It may be supposed that the divine spark will also fall on someone like the architect. However, lest that inspiration should remain an ungrounded hope, Turina adds: “There are lots of different things. There is the “market” and the true conviction. There is truth and there are lies. There is thesis and there is antithesis – briefly, there are all sorts of things among us. And yet, there is true architecture, which has been with us from our childhood... the house, the stables, the shed, the barn, the well.” Architecture, in terms of building, belongs to us all, and therefore it may seem that we all know something about it. Nobody is likely to meddle with other disciplines, Turina observes, but architecture is there at everyone’s will. Given that, the question he asks is whether, in that overall obsession with building, the architect has any special role that might grant copyright to his work, as physicists, biologists, literary authors, and others do. Turina observes that the architect does not operate in the building domain, but in the domain of “intellectual services,”

as we would call it today, where he is the owner of these services and thus also the owner of their copyright. He points out the paradox that “a shop, chair, armchair, kitchen, bookshelf, or counter in a tourist agency may have copyright, whereas a parliament building, museum, school, hotel, stadium, hospital, or cultural centre – may not!” In relation to this, Turina discusses the practice in which the architect’s role is veiled by the efforts of numerous collaborators to appropriate various operational segments of architectural work and to fragment them into a depersonalized collective and anonymous product. Owing to the environment in which he was active, Turina experienced a crisis of authorship as a reflection of the general crisis of the society, which transformed the individual into a meaningless subject. For this reason, the apostolic mission had to face the banality of greed and fraud, while sanctity of architecture was torn apart and forced into oblivion.

“It is not easy to write about this topic. One can write about it in the thick terminology of our profession, to invoke all saints and angels to help us...” That is the beginning of “Humanism and Anti-humanism of Modern Urban Planning,” an article in which Turina tried to confer new meanings to the terms from his title and to view the city’s destiny in its change. Whereas the first text discusses the universal meaning of

ili – ako hoćete – jezikom ljudske spoznaje”. Uvodeći u diskurs pojmove kao što je emocionalno i spoznajno, Turina inaugurira jedno novo i za arhitekturu posve izuzetno jezično balansiranje koje obuhvaća kako ono predočeno i predmetno tako i ono neodređeno i neuhvatljivo. Taj će se tip diskursa nadalje razvijati u preostala dva teksta – „Sudaru dviju sudbina” i „Eventualno!?... ka cilju”. Poetični će jezik sve više prodirati u strukturu analitičnog govora, da bi na kraju preuzeo dominantnu poziciju i nametnuo se kao forma kojom se skicira rješenje postavljenih pitanja. Poetski je govor postao pribježište, zaklon od nedaća svakodnevnice i uzlaz prema nedosegnutom. To je samosvojni jezik koji je nastao bez uzora i usporedbi u svekolikoj arhitektonskoj publicistici, način govora onih kojima je preostala još samo nada. U raspravu o humanizmu Turina uvodi pojam „ljudska intima” koji koristi kao vrijednosni kriterij u ocjeni modernog grada. On ne raspravlja o javnom i privatnom, što su samo dva lica iste stvari, nego o intimnom, kojem će izgraditi poetsku kuću, kako bi ga zaštitio od propadanja. Danas kada je dokinuta razlika između javnog, privatnog i intimnog - kada se čini da ništa nije ostalo od kuće u koju se ljudsko može skloniti - poetsko je napokon marginalizirano. No, u vrijeme kada su tekstovi pisani još uvijek su se tražili putovi kako bi se ne-pjesnička sudbina mimoišla.

Turina je tragač za putovima koji vode izvorima. On vidi čovjeka budućnosti koji će u tom traženju nalaziti još samo ostatke, fragmente zavičajnih ambijenata kao neku vrstu „tematskih parkova” u kojima će se povremeno rekreirati. Takvu budućnost mi već živimo u turističkim zonama, trgovačkim centrima, vikend-naseljima, „reality”-predstavama i nadasve u virtualnoj realnosti medija. To je Turina vidio: „Stalno me prati osjećanje da će se i za osamdeset godina, računajući od danas, ljudi tadašnjeg vremena rado vraćati u stare urbane jezgre, pod stare krovove, u uske kale i na male trgove, jer je taj prostor nekako njihov, osobno njihov. Oni će odlaziti tamo da se rekreiraju! Iz novorođenih 'svijetlih' gradova budućnosti oni će tamo poći po svoju rekreaciju, po svoju savjest...”. Načas će podastri arkadijsku viziju budućnosti da bi je potom zamijenio slikom realnosti „tehničkog diva” i u završnici reći: „U tome što to nismo uspjeli naći – bilo da nismo znali ili da nismo htjeli, ili da nismo mogli – u tome što čovjek najteže prepoznaje samog sebe, u tome što smo prije reda potpali pod svemoć ili pod nemoć – kako hoćete – tehnokratskog božanstva sheme i materije, u tome leži naš zajednički, posebno ljudski antihumanizam.” U tako ocrtan scenarij suvremene civilizacije Turina smješta dva aktera svojeg narednog članka – čovjeka i stroj. U tekstu „Sudar dviju

EVENTUALNO

PERHAPS

35

architecture and the pragmatic destiny of architects, this one considers the city's destiny with regard to its human significance. In order to do that, Turina says, he intends to speak “about certain spatial and emotional visions in a different language, the language of architects, of the spontaneous, or – if you wish – the language of human knowledge.” By introducing into his discourse notions such as emotion or epistemology, Turina inaugurates a new dimension of language, which includes both what is visualized or objective and what is vague and evasive. He will develop this type of discourse in his other two texts – “The Clash of Two Destinies,” and “Perhaps!?... Towards the Goal.” Poetic language will penetrate ever deeper into the structure of his analytical discourse and eventually take over the dominant role, imposing itself as the form with which the author will outline the solution to the proposed questions. Thus, the poetic discourse will become a refuge, a shelter from everyday life and a ladder to the yet unreached. It will become Turina's authentic language, created without models or parallels hitherto unknown in architectural journalism, a language of those who remain with hope and nothing else. In his debate on humanism, Turina introduces the notion of “human intimacy” as an assessment criterion in evaluating the modern city. He does not discuss public and private,

since they are merely two faces of the same thing, but rather the intimate, for which he will build a poetic house in order to save it from destruction. Today, when the difference between public, private, and intimate has been cancelled – when it seems that nothing is left of the house in which man can take a refuge – the poetical is finally marginalized. But at the time when these texts were written, one was still searching for ways to avoid this non-poetical destiny. Turina was always seeking ways that led to the sources. He saw that the man of the future would be able to find only some remnants on that search, mere fragments of once homely environments, a sort of “theme parks” for occasional recreation. We already live that future in tourist districts, shopping malls, agglomerations of weekend-houses, reality shows, and above all in the virtual reality of the mass media. That is what Turina saw clearly: “I am constantly haunted by the feeling that even in eighty years from now, people of those times will like to visit old urban settings, ancient houses, narrow streets, and small town squares, for in a way those spaces will belong to them, to them alone. They will go there for recreation! They will leave the newborn ‘cities of light’ of the future and go there to seek their relaxation, their conscience...”. For a brief moment, he presents an Arcadian vision of the future, only to replace it with an image

sudbina” uz pomoć poetskog i filozofskog jezika razmatra se odnos čovjek - stroj na vrhuncu industrijskog doba. Gradeći postupno svoju metaforičnu sliku sukoba, Turina uviđa kako se tehničko na neki neobjašnjiv način odvojilo od ljudskog i postalo jedno novo vladanje u kojem ljudsko stoji naspram tehničkog kao David prema Golijatu, kao da se tehničko odvojilo poput usuda i više nije proizvod ljudskog. U tom rascjepu zjapi sudbina novovjekog čovjeka. Iz tog rascjepa Turina promatra čovjeka kao nevinu žrtvu a ne kao biće koje je zaboravilo da je uzročnik vlastite ugroze. Takvom su skicom otvoreni putovi dijalektičkim opservacijama i tužbalica nad ljudskim usudom može se samo ponavljati u beskraj. Koegzistencija suprotnosti? To je zaključak dijalektike. Što više, kako se tekst odvija, čitatelj sve više gubi tlo, reference su nejasnije i on zapravo ima posla s jednom apstraktnom slikom modernog grada koji može biti bilo gdje, u bilo kojoj kulturi, posve univerzalan. Ma koliko bio kritičan prema gradu kao tehničkoj strukturi, Turina i dalje ostaje u okvirima apstraktnih ideja univerzalnog identiteta grada i njegovih transformacija koje su jednake za sve uvjete. On vjeruje „da je svaki današnji pokret suvremenog urbanizma usmjeren prema relativnoj mogućnosti integracije obiju sudbina – ljudske i strojne –

ka jednoj granici susreta, ka jednom limesu. Što taj limes nije dokučen – razlog leži po mojem shvaćanju u činjenici da elementarna filozofija urbanog prostora, u odnosu prema čovjeku i njegovom životu, nije našla odgovarajuću interpretaciju na crtačoj dasci”. Tako se čitav problem vraća pred oči arhitekta, na njegov stol. Daljnje se opservacije o ugrozi grada odvijaju samo na razini alternativnih tipologija i mogućnosti izbora. Izgleda kao da smo vraćeni na početak a da nismo više sigurni niti gdje smo bili. Put prema izlazu iz labirinta mišljenja ne nazire se. Ostaje samo dojam nagomilanog nezadovoljstva dostignutim i uzaludni pokušaji da se otvore novi smjerokazi. Posljednji tekst u nizu ne nosi uzalud naslov „Eventualno!?...ka cilju”. U njemu se gomilanje nedoumica nastavlja i umnožava. „Ovo 'eventualno' želio sam u naslovu posebno naglasiti. Zbog relativnosti svega zbivanja i mnogih okolnosti koje diktira život. Naravno – koje diktira život. Kondenzirana masa života ima svoje neminovne zakone, stoga je često i gruba u mjerilima, u ocjenama i svojoj realnosti. Poetske vizije ‚dobrog‘ ne mogu se lako provoditi. One traže izvanredna zalaganje i – mnogo puta – donkihotske ambicije.” Pristanje na diktat života, kao da će nas načas udaljiti od dijalektičkog kruga, no Turina ne može odustati od misije arhitekta pa bila ona i „donkihotska”.

of reality of the “technological giant” and conclude: “The fact that we have been unable to find it – because we didn’t know how, because we wouldn’t or we couldn’t – the fact that man finds it extremely difficult to recognize himself, the fact that we have fallen prematurely into the omnipotence or rather impotence – as you wish – of the technocratic divinity of scheme and matter: that is our common, specifically human anti-humanism.” Into this scenario of contemporary situation, Turina places the two agents of his next article – man and the machine. In his essay on “The Clash of Two Destinies,” he reflects upon their relationship in the heyday of the industrial age with the help of philosophical language. While gradually construing his metaphorical image of conflict, Turina concludes that the technological has in some inexplicable way separated itself from the human and turned into a new rule, in which the human relates to it as David relates to Goliath, as if the technological had separated from man like a destiny and were no longer his product. The destiny of modern man gapes in that breach. From that breach, Turina observes man as an innocent victim rather than a being who has forgotten that it is the very cause of its own threat. Such a project opens up various paths of dialectical observation and thus the lamentations over human destiny can only be repeated eternally. The coexistence of

oppositions? That is the conclusion of dialectics. Moreover, as the essay proceeds, the reader loses the ground under his feet, since references become vague and one is left with what is actually an abstract image of the modern city, which could be anywhere, a part of any culture, utterly universal. As critical as he is towards the city as a technological structure, Turina remains within the framework of an abstract idea of universal urban identity and urban transformations, equal in all circumstances. He believes that “each move in contemporary urban planning is today directed at the relative possibility of integrating the two destinies – that of man and that of the machine – at the borderline of contact, the limes. As for the fact that the limes has not been reached – I explain it through the fact that the elementary philosophy of urban space, in the relationship between man and his life, has not yet found an adequate interpretation on the drawing board.” Thus, the entire problem comes back to the architect and onto his desk. Further observations on the threats imposed on the city are made merely on the level of alternative typologies and the possibilities of choice. Apparently, we have been pushed to the beginning and are even no longer sure where it is that we have been. We cannot even begin to see the way out of the labyrinth of thought. What we are left with is merely a sense of accumulated frustration with

U potrazi za „izvanrednim zalaganjima“ zadovoljit će ga i nasumično odabrani fragment iz kojeg se, vjeruje on, može pokrenuti velika promjena.

U nasumičnom traganju prilagodit će se i idejama *Teama X* kao svjetlu koje vodi k izlazu iz diktata života. No, bilo kamo da se uputio, jasno je da naslućuje promjene koje dolaze, poziva mlade da se angažiraju, kao da sluti da njega tu neće biti. Tekst okončava u misaonoj zbrci, nervozno, kao da mu se suviše žuri, ali ne zna kamo bi. Svuda vidi mogućnosti promjene i nove pojave, nesiguran je kojoj bi se priklonio. Načas mu se jedna čini kao spasonosna, a već u sljedećem trenutku nameće se druga – čini se da je cilj na dohvatu ruke, ali se ne nazire. Misli se roje, proturječe jedna drugoj, asocijacije ostaju nedorečene i nejasne - kao i sam naslov. „Eventualno“ s prethodna tri teksta čini neraskidivu cjelinu koja je prijelomna u našoj arhitektonskoj publicistici. Premda će doktrina moderne još dugo živjeti u različitim derivacijama naše prakse, ti će tekstovi svjedočiti kako je vjera u paradigmu moderne arhitekture ozbiljno poljuljana. Činjenica da je CIAM X održan u Dubrovniku i promjene koje su nakon toga nastale kao da nisu imali odjeka u lokalnoj sredini. Stečene ideje i pozicije nisu se mijenjale. Jedino je Turina imao dovoljno smjelosti progovoriti u ime vlastite savjesti i

ukazati na sve očitije neuspjehe domaćih „uspjeha“. To što se čini da iz jednog uskog horizonta govori o pojavama koje daleko nadilaze stvarni vidokrug sudbina je koje je on svjestan i koja se ne da mimoići.

EVENTUALNO

PERHAPS

37

what we have reached, as well as our futile attempts to create new signposts. The last essay in this series is entitled “Perhaps!?... Towards the Goal” – and with a purpose. This is where the accumulation of dilemmas is continued and multiplied. “Particularly I wish to emphasize that ‘perhaps’ in my title. Because of the relativity of all events and because of many circumstances dictated by life. To be sure – dictated by life. The condensed mass of life has its own inevitable laws, which is why it is often coarse in its measurements, assessments, and reality. The poetic visions of the ‘good’ are not easily applicable. They require an extraordinary effort and – quite often – a quixotic ambition.” It seems that succumbing to the dictate of life may draw us away from the dialectic circle for a moment, but Turina cannot give up on the architect’s mission, as “quixotic” as it may seem. In his quest for “extraordinary effort,” he will be satisfied even by a randomly selected fragment, since he believes that great change may come out of it. In his random quest, he will adapt himself even to the ideas of *Team X*, as a beam of light that leads out of the dictate of life. However, no matter where he may be heading, it is clear that he has sensed the change that is underway, since he invites young people to become engaged, as if knowing that he will no longer be there. He ends his essay in a confusion of thought, nervously, as

if he were in a great hurry, yet not knowing where to go. Everywhere he can see possibilities of change and new phenomena, but he is not sure which one to take. For a moment, one or the other may seem helpful, but a second later another will prevail – the goal may be there, at hand, but then again it may seem too far to see. Thoughts are multiplying and contradicting one another, while associations remain unfinished and vague – just as the title itself. That “perhaps” forms an inseparable entity with the previous three essays, which is a breakthrough in our architectural writing. Even though the doctrine of modernism may have survived for some time in various derivations of our local practice, these essays will remain witnesses to the fact that faith in the paradigm of modernist architecture has been seriously shaken. The fact that CIAM X took place in Dubrovnik and the ensuing changes appear not to have found any echo in our local environment. The established ideas and positions would not be disturbed. Only Turina had enough courage to speak out in the name of his own conscience and to point out the increasingly conspicuous failures of our local “successes”. Although it may seem that he was speaking from a narrow standpoint of phenomena that were beyond his immediate eyeshot, these were circumstances that he was aware of, though unable to avoid.