

HRVATSKA ARHITEKTURA OVDJE I SADA



U roku kraćem od dva mjeseca nekoliko sam puta bio zamoljen da u europsku perspektivu pozicioniram ne samo suvremenu arhitekturu u Francuskoj, Portugalu i Hrvatskoj, nego i u Beču. (Sada se čeka i časna molba da se isto napravi i za neku četvrt ili ulicu.) Činjenica da sam za to zamoljen usko je vezana uz moje sudjelovanje u *A10 New European Architecture*, časopisu koji sam 2004. godine osnovao zajedno s grafičkim dizajnerom Arjanom Grootom. Ambicija nam je, pomoću našeg časopisa, dati paneuropsku sliku suvremene arhitekture, inspiriranu novom politikom, ekonomskom i kulturnom konstelacijom, koja je nastala nestankom željezne zavjese. Činjenica da mi se postavlja isto pitanje, istodobno na različitim mjestima u Europi, može se shvatiti kao indikator želje za prosuđivanjem i upoznavanjem koje je čije mjesto u ovoj novoj europskoj konstelaciji (iako u arhitekturi ne postoje europska prvenstva). Moja je prva namjera bila ustvrditi kako ne poznajem dobro odnos razvoja francuske, portugalske, hrvatske ili bečke arhitekture s razvojem drugdje u Europi. Bez lažne skromnosti smatram da je moje znanje, pa i nakon četiri godine rada za *A10*, još uvijek nedovoljno da bih mogao procijeniti cijelo područje od Islanda do Turske, zbog čega smatram teškim ne samo jasno formulirati što je europsko u suvremenoj arhitekturi, nego i reći koliko je tipična ili jedinstvena neka zemlja u usporedbi s ostatkom kontinenta.

HANS

IBELINGS

Within less than two months, I've been asked several times to place into European perspective not only the contemporary architecture of France, Portugal, and Croatia, but also that of Vienna. (What is expected now is an honourable request to do the same for a district or a street). The fact that they have asked me to do that is closely connected to my contribution to *A10 New European Architecture*, a journal that I founded in 2004 together with graphic designer Arjan Groot. Our ambition was to offer, through our journal, a pan-European image of contemporary architecture, inspired by the new political, economic, and cultural constellation created by the fall of the Iron Curtain. The fact that I was asked one and the same question in various parts of Europe at the same time may be understood as an indicator of the general wish to assess and understand who stands where in this new European constellation (even though there is no such thing as a European championship in architecture). My first intention was to say that I was not well acquainted with the relationship between the developments in French, Portuguese, Croatian, or Viennese architectures and those elsewhere in Europe. Without engaging in false modesty, I believe that my knowledge, even after working for four years at *A10*, is still insufficient for assessing the entire area from Iceland to Turkey, which is why I consider it difficult not only to formulate clearly what is European in contemporary



CROATIAN ARCHITECTURE HERE AND NOW

Osim toga, a to je možda čak i važnije, skloniji sam se sve više i više dvoumiti oko nacionalne raznovrsnosti – metode klasifikacije koja je potjecala iz potrebe 19. stoljeća da nacionalne države opskrbi prošlošću kao dokazom jedinstva i često kao legitimitetom za njihovo postojanje i djelovanje.

Mnoge povijesti arhitekture, kao i one što se danas pišu, još se uvijek temelje na konstrukciji zasnovanoj na spomenutom principu iz 19. stoljeća koji barem implicitno polazi od posebnosti svake zemlje. To ponekad vodi do zbunjujućih situacija, jer ono što sada pripada nekoj određenoj zemlji, vjerojatno joj nije pripadalo prije deset, pedeset ili sto godina. Takva je situacija evidentna u centralnoj Europi i na Balkanu, ali to jednako vrijedi i za Norvešku, Irsku ili Cipar koje su također tek u 20. stoljeću postale samostalne, točnije 1905., 1922. i 1960. godine. Osim toga, u zadnjih dvadeset godina neke su države prestale postojati – Njemačka Demokratska Republika (DDR), Čehoslovačka, Sovjetski Savez i, naravno, Jugoslavija – a formirao se i veliki broj drugih država. Ukratko, postoji niz razloga za prigovor na povijesti arhitekture na osnovi nacionalnih kriterija. Ipak, takve su povijesti arhitekture još uvijek prisutne (ja sam im također pridonio različitim knjigama o povijesti i sadašnjosti nizozemske arhitekture). Nacionalna perspektiva ponekad vodi u čudne komplikacije, kao što je na primjer slučaj s arhitektom Nikolom Dobrovićem koji čini dio jugoslavenske, srpske i hrvatske povijesti arhitekture, a zbog njegova ranog rada u Pragu on čini i dio češke (a do nedavno i čehoslovačke) povijesti arhitekture.

Model nacionalne povijesti, uključujući i arhitekturu, s vanjskim utjecajem ili bez njega, građen je na misli da se u svakoj zemlji opažaju vlastita dinamika i razvoj koji su različiti od drugih. Pri tome je implicitna polazna točka da nacionalni kontekst najviše objašnjava.

architecture, but also to say how typical or unique a country may be with respect to the rest of the continent.

Besides, and perhaps even more importantly, I am increasingly prone to doubting all that issue around national diversity – a method of classification that originated in the 19th-century need of supplying national states with a past as the proof of their uniqueness and often as a means of legitimating their existence and activity.

Many histories of architecture, even those that are written today, are still based on a construct resulting from this 19th-century principle, which takes as its starting point, at least implicitly, the peculiarity of each separate country. That may sometimes lead to perplexing situations, for what now belongs to a particular country, may not have been in its possession ten, fifty, or a hundred years ago. That is the situation we are witnessing in Central Europe and the Balkans, but it is equally valid for Norway, Ireland, or Cyprus, since they also gained their independence in the 20th century, more precisely in 1905, 1922, and 1960. Besides, some states have ceased existing in the past twenty years – German Democratic Republic (GDR), Czechoslovakia, the Soviet Union, and of course Yugoslavia – and a considerable number of new state has emerged. Briefly, there are lots of reasons for criticizing such history of architecture, even on the basis of national criteria. Yet such histories of architecture are still present (I have contributed to their number myself with various books on the past and present of Dutch architecture). National perspective may sometimes cause strange complications, as in the case of architect Nikola Dobrović, who makes part of Yugoslav, Serbian, and Croatian architecture, while his early activity in Prague has also made him a part of Czech (and until recently also Czechoslovakian) history of architecture.

Arhitektura se isto tako određuje ekonomskim, političkim, administrativnim i društvenim okolnostima koje se mogu razlikovati ovisno o zemlji, provinciji ili gradu (ili ovisno o četvrti, a možda čak i o ulici), a u tom je slučaju pisanje nacionalne povijesti od velikog značenja. No, to prečesto vodi do opsjednutosti traženjem identiteta neke zemlje, tamo gdje ga možda i nema, s velikim naglaskom na ono što je u cjelini možda tek sporedna stvar. I sve to s rizikom da nova opažanja, zbog neprestanog ponavljanja, postanu zamorni klišeji koji previše naglašavaju političko-geografske dimenzije, dok se granice zemalja (koje su tijekom vremena često bile podložne promjenama) nisu uvijek podudarale s kulturnim definicijama, ponekad ni približno. To sigurno nije slučaj u arhitekturi koja ima veći međunarodni karakter nego što ga, na primjer, imaju književnost ili kazalište. Mnogi arhitekti imaju krug radnog utjecaja koji prelazi granicu ili barem međunarodni referentni kadar, zbog čega se u najboljem slučaju, ali djelomično, mogu pripisati specifičnom geografskom području, okarakteriziranom kao jedinstvo.

Nacionalne povijesti svake pojedine zemlje stvaraju zaseban svijet, mikrokozmos s mirijadom međusobnih odnosa, kontrasta, sukoba, sinteza itd. Ti pojedinačni svjetovi rijetko se dovode u međusobnu povezanost, pa čak i kada se to odnosi na susjedne zemlje. Veza između Španjolske i Portugala, Nizozemske i Belgije, Bugarske i Rumunjske rijetko se kada dovodi u međusoban odnos. Te pojedinačne zemlje najviše se vežu uz velike majstore koji su svjetlosnim godinama udaljeni od vlastitog svijeta i koji se, ovisno o samosvijesti dotičnih povjesničara, uglavnom koriste kako bi se usporednost superiornosti ili inferiornosti vlastite arhitekture mogla potkrijepiti ili dokazati. Te velike zvijezde nalaze se zajedno na najvišem stupnju kompleksnosti u nekom drugom planetarnom sustavu koji pripada drugom uobičajenom obliku pisanja povijesti i koji vodi do

The model of national history, including architecture, is based, with or without external influences, on the idea that in each country one can observe specific dynamics and development, different from any other. The implicit starting point is that the national context can explain most things. Therefore, architecture is defined through economic, political, administrative, and social circumstances, which may differ from one country, province, or city to another (or even one district or street to another), in which case the writing of national history is of foremost importance. However, that often leads to an obsession with searching for the country's identity, even when it is not there, with a strong emphasis on things that may be entirely unimportant in the large picture. And all that involves the risk that the new observations, being constantly repeated, will turn into tedious clichés overemphasizing the geopolitical dimension, even though borders between various countries (liable to change over time) have not always coincided with the cultural definitions, sometimes not even roughly. That has certainly not been the case with architecture, which character is more international than that of literature or theatre, for example. Many architects have a working sphere that surpasses the borders or at least an international reference frame, for which reason they can only partly be ascribed to a specific geographic area characterized in terms of unity. The national history of each particular country is a world in itself, a microcosm with a myriad of relationships, contrasts, conflicts, syntheses, etc. These separate worlds are rarely brought into connection, even when they belong to neighbouring countries. Links between Spain and Portugal, Belgium and the Netherlands, or Bulgaria and Romania are rarely established. These separate countries are mostly associated with some great masters, who are thousands of light years away from their own worlds and who are, depending on the self-confidence of historians, mostly used in order

upečatljivo statične opće povijesti gdje ima mjesta samo za priznate vrhunce iz cijeloga svijeta, što je za modernu arhitekturu na prvom mjestu Zapadna Europa sa slučajnom nekolicinom arhitekata iz Istočne i Južne Europe. Od 19. stoljeća u ovome sudjeluju i Sjedinjene Američke Države, a od sredine 20. st. i Japan i Latinska Amerika. U toj povijesti o događajima se često jednostavno raspravlja ili usporedno ili o jednim nakon drugih („Dok je Mies van de Rohe ovo radio u Chicagu, Le Corbusier je isto radio u Marseille“.) Ondje gdje u nacionalnim povijestima postoji sklonost situiranju svega u uzročnu povezanost i davanju konteksta i pozadine, opća povijest generira vlastitim kontekstom.

To općenito nije više od nabiranja, pri čemu je jednostavan niz zasebnih činjenica i događaja uspoređen ili stavljen jedan nasuprot drugomu, a samo na temelju sadržajnih i formalnih sličnosti i razlika.

Introvertnost pisanja nacionalne povijesti ima kao posljedicu činjenicu koja vrijedi za svaku zemlju, a ta je da se ono što se shvaća kao izniman događaj – početak *art nouveaoua*, nastanak funkcionalizma, proboj postmodernizma, početak visokogradnje, prva primjena armiranog betona ili štogod drugo – istodobno, ako ne i prije, događalo negdje drugdje, na sličan način. Jer, globalno gledajući, cijela je Europa iskusila odgovarajući razvoj, a to je još jedan argument protiv koncentracije na zasebne zemlje usprkos međusobnim razlikama između individualnih arhitekata i unatoč raznovrsnim okolnostima u kojima su radili (ili rade). Modernizam nije posvuda nastao točno u isto vrijeme i nije se svagdje jednako duboko ukorijenio, niti je svaka zemlja pokazala jednaku osjetljivost za *art deco*, monumentalizam ili brutalizam, ali svagdje se novija povijest arhitekture razvila po manje-više usporednom uzorku s ograničenim brojem devijacija. Arhitekti

to sustain or prove national superiority or inferiority.

These shining stars dwell together on the highest level of complexity in another planetary system, which belongs to a different tradition of writing history and which leads to a strikingly static general history that opens its doors only to well-established giants from all over the world – that world being Western Europe in case of contemporary architecture, with an occasional contribution from Eastern and Southern Europe. In the 19th century, the USA have joined in, and in the mid-20th century also Japan and Latin America. In this type of history, events are often discussed simply as parallel or subsequent (“While Mies van de Rohe was doing this in Chicago, Le Corbusier was doing that in Marseille”). Where national histories tend towards situating everything in causal relationships and assigning contexts and backgrounds, general history generates its own context. Mostly it can be reduced to creating lists, whereby a simple series of separate facts or events is compared or contrasted merely on the basis of thematic or formal similarities and differences.

The introvertedness of writing national history has resulted in a fact that is valid for all countries: something that is understood as an exceptional event – the birth of *art nouveau*, the emergence of functionalism, the breakthrough of modernism, the debut of highrise, the first use of reinforced concrete, or anything else – was at the same time, if not earlier, happening somewhere else in a similar form. That is because, globally speaking, all of Europe has experienced comparable development, which is another argument against focusing on separate countries instead of the differences between individual architects, despite the various circumstances in which they were (or are) active. Modernism did not emerge everywhere at exactly the same time and it did not strike roots equally deeply everywhere, nor did all countries show equal sensibility for *art deco*,

su, također, svagdje bili zauzeti istom vrstom zadataka, izgradnjom stanova, gradova i javnih zgrada kao glavnim dijelom i radili su pomoću srodnih pristupa, strategija, metoda, modela, oblika, stilova i moda. To je bio slučaj još prije nego što je postojala ujedinjena Europa i sada je to zbog raznoraznih razloga sve naglašenije, čak i u zemljama koje se zbog političkih ili ekonomskih razloga (još uvijek) nalaze izvan EU.

Sve je ovo duga uvertira za moju tvrdnju da je za suvremenu hrvatsku arhitekturu „suvremeno“ važnije od „hrvatskog“. Pritom ne želimo negirati specifično stanje u kojem se nalazi Hrvatska kao mlada zemlja s dugom poviješću, kao zemlja koja je u fazi s pripadajućim pridjevom „poslijeratan“. Usprkos tome, hrvatska arhitektura sada je prvenstveno „suvremena“, a tek onda „hrvatska“. Predodžba suvremene arhitekture gotovo je uvijek i posvuda, i to u velikoj mjeri, određena mlađom generacijom, a isti je slučaj i u Hrvatskoj. To potvrđuje izbor što su ga Stefano Boeri i Manuel Gausa napravili za Zagrebačke salone 2003. i 2006. godine, ali i ono što je *A10* do sada objavio iz Hrvatske. Većina njihovih i naših predstavljenih arhitekata rođena je 60-ih i 70-ih godina prošlog stoljeća. Oni su predstavnici suvremene arhitekture – i to one kakva se može naći i u ostatku Europe, bez „mediteranskog“ formalizma, kao što je to više prisutno u Španjolskoj i Portugalu, bez stava *in-your-face*, koji je Nizozemska neko vrijeme distribuirala na veliko, bez neumoljivosti Swiss Boxa i – a to je najveća sreća – bez hiperbole ikonskih *signature*-zgrada koje u cijelom svijetu stvaraju ushićenje. Prije se u suvremenoj hrvatskoj arhitekturi nailazilo na ugodan, lagani osjećaj i slobodan duh koji je otvorio prostor novim pristupima i nekonvencionalnim rješenjima. I još nešto što sam primijetio jest to da suvremena arhitektura, ne samo u Hrvatskoj, nego i na mnogim mjestima u centralnoj Europi, od Poljske do Rumunjske, i u zemljama kao što su Portugal

monumentalism, or brutalism, but the recent history of architecture has evolved everywhere according to a more or less comparable pattern, with only a limited number of deviations. Architects have been engaged everywhere in the same type of tasks: primarily in building housing estates, cities, and public buildings by using analogous approaches, strategies, methods, models, forms, styles, and fashions. That was the case long before the emergence of united Europe and today it is more evident than ever, even in those countries that have not (yet) joined the EU for various political or economic reasons.

All that I have just said is actually a long overture for my statement that being “contemporary” is more important for contemporary Croatian architecture than being “Croatian”. I do not wish to negate the specific condition of Croatia as a young state with long history, a state that is still in a phase that may be characterized as “postwar”. Despite that, contemporary Croatian architecture is primarily “contemporary” and only then “Croatian”.

The image of contemporary architecture has been almost always and everywhere largely determined by a younger generation, which is also the case in Croatia. Evidence for this fact is the selection made by Stefano Boeri and Manuel Gausa for the Zagreb Salons of 2003 and 2006, as well as the choice of what *A10* has published from Croatia so far. Most architects, both theirs and ours, were born in the 1960s and 1970s. They are the representatives of contemporary architecture – such as can be found in the rest of Europe, without a “Mediterranean” formalism as is present in Spain or Portugal, without the *in-your-face* attitude that the Netherlands were selling big for a while, without the mercilessness of Swiss Box, and – which is the greatest luck – without the hyperbole of iconic *signature* buildings that have thrilled the entire world. Contemporary Croatian architecture rather shows a pleasant and

i Irska, koje su dugo vremena znale za ekonomski zaostatak, može donijeti promjene. U nekim bogatijim zemljama značenje je arhitekture do te mjere institucionalizirano da se svi javni i kolektivni zadaci mogu interpretirati kao *conspicuous design*, parafrazirajući pojam Thorstena Veblensa o tome što je *conspicuous consumption*. U takvim se okolnostima arhitektura vrlo brzo može razviti u preveliku dozu dizajna i zatim nastupa zakon opadajućih prinosa. *Conspicuous consumption* funkcionira svojstveno samo ako ne mogu svi sudjelovati (recimo, što je Armani ako svi mogu kupiti takvu torbu, kapu ili majicu?). Tako je i s arhitekturom u nekim zemljama: ima sve beznačajniji efekt. To je možda romantična projekcija, ali meni se čini da u zemlji kao što je Hrvatska postoji kontekst u kojem je arhitektura relevantnija nego, recimo, u Francuskoj gdje već svaki gradić ima novi multimedijalni centar, ili u Njemačkoj gdje su posvuda novi muzeji. U usporedbi s tim jako veliki utjecaj ima dobro dizajnirana škola na Krku, muzej u Vidu, sportska zgrada u Balama ili stambena zgrada na Cresu: one nude, u svakom slučaju, nadu da su više od arhitektonskog dizajna i da mogu formirati stupanj kristalizacije za socijalne i društvene razvoje, odnosno da mogu provesti promjene. Možda ima raznih razloga zašto arhitekti u Hrvatskoj s nekom zavišću gledaju na ono što se drugdje dogodilo: na harmoniju nacrta ili proporcija, na budžet, narudžbe ili kvalitetu izvedbe; ali ja ipak mislim da arhitekti iz drugih dijelova Europe mogu biti zavidni na činjenicu da arhitektura ovdje može biti više nego samo još jedna lijepa zgrada.

S NIZOZEMSKOGA NA HRVATSKI PREVELA
ŽELJANA PANCIROV CORNELISSE

HRVATSKA
ARHITEKTURA
OVDJE I SADA

CROATIAN
ARCHITECTURE
HERE AND NOW

107

light feeling, a free spirit which allows for new approaches and unconventional solutions. There is something else about contemporary architecture: it can bring change, not only to Croatia, but also to many other places in Central Europe, from Poland to Romania, and also to countries such as Portugal and Ireland, which were economically disadvantaged for quite a while. In richer countries, the impact of architecture has been institutionalized to such an extent that all public or collective tasks can be considered *conspicuous design*, paraphrasing the idea of conspicuous consumption by Thorsten Veblens. In such circumstances, architecture can quickly evolve into an overdose of design and suffer under the law of diminishing returns. *Conspicuous consumption* characteristically functions only when most people are left out (for example, what would Armani be if everyone could buy his bag, cap, or T-shirt?). That is what architecture is like in some countries: its impact is becoming less and less significant. Perhaps it is a romantic projection, but it seems to me that a country like Croatia may be a context in which architecture can be more relevant than, for example, in France, where almost every small town has a new multimedia centre, or in Germany, where new museums are everywhere. Compared with such contexts, a well-designed school on the island of Krk, a museum in Vid, a sports hall in Bale, or a housing block on the island of Cres can have a great impact: they certainly raise hopes that they could be more than merely architectural design: that they can introduce a degree of crystallization in social development and bring change. There may be various reasons why architects in Croatia cast a look of envy upon what is happening elsewhere: in terms of budget, commissions, or quality of performance; however, I think that architects from other parts of Europe can be envious for the fact that here architecture can still be more than just a series of pretty buildings.