

Stavba kot spomenik / *The Building as a Monument*

Maroje Mrduljaš

Maroje Mrduljaš

Medtem ko gradnja spomenikov socialistične Jugoslavije doživlja pozornost sve-tovne javnosti, so posebne arhitekturne tipologije, ki hibridizirajo komemoracijo in specifične oblike družbenega življenja, prezrte. V tem prispevku s študijama prime-rov kulturnih domov v Kolašinu in Nikšiću v Črni gori raziskujemo prenos komemo-rativne vsebine s spomenikov na arhitekturne tipologije. Ta prenos je vplival tako na arhitekturo kot na programe, ki so oblikovali nove pristope h komemoraciji. Ju-goslovanski samoupravni socializem je bil okvir za uskladitev spomeniških in per-formativnih vidikov novih tipologij, pa vendar emancipacijski potenciali koncepta niso bili nikoli v celoti uresničeni. Članek bo obravnaval sodobno usodo teh speci-fičnih tipologij, ki so očiščene svoje prvotne funkcije in ideološke vsebine.

Maroje Mrduljaš

Samoupravni socializem je bil uveden leta 1950 po izločitvi Jugoslavije iz sovjet-skega bloka dve leti prej. Sistem je domače izkušnje samoorganiziranja med proti-fašističnim odporom združeval z idejami iz zgodnjih del Karla Marxa ter idejami utopičnega socializma in anarhizma iz devetnajstega stoletja. Teoretično naj bi bil državni aparat nadomeščen z neposredno demokracijo, tako v gospodarskem kot v političnem življenju. Opolnomočenje delavcev in državljanov bi moralo potekati sočasno s sistemsko decentralizacijo vseh družbenih sfer. Sistem samoupravljanja je spodbudil razvoj v regiji, uvedel hitro urbanizacijo in bistveno izboljšal življenj-ski standard. Vendar je ustvaril tudi krize in številna nasprotja: med neposredno demokracijo in dejansko prevlado komunistične partije, med planskim gospodar-stvom in trgom, med instrumentalno racionalnostjo in socialnim idealizmom.

Arhitektura je pogosto igrala vlogo posrednika med temi nasprotji. Takšna vloga je bila mogoča zaradi niza pogojev, predvsem koncepta kulturne avtonomije, ki jo je ideologija samoupravnega socializma zagovarjala kot posebno jugoslovansko vre-dnoto. Kulturna avtonomija se v arhitekturi ni nanašala le na estetska vprašanja, ampak tudi na temeljna vprašanja vsebine, saj je bilo prav arhitekturi zaupano artikuliranje novih družbenih oblik in odnosov, vključno s komemoracijo.

Maroje Mrduljaš

Eden od ideoloških stebrov jugoslovanskega socialističnega sistema je bil protifa-šistični boj, ki je bil predmet obsežne spomeniške in monumentalizacijske aktiv-nosti. Bil je tudi eden redkih instrumentov konstruiranja vsejugoslovanske identi-tete. Preizkušenh je bilo mnogo pristopov do spomenikov, vendar spominjanje ni bilo omejeno le na artefakte, temveč je močno vplivalo na družbeno življenje z različnimi praznovanji, izobraževanjem in popularno kulturo. Sčasoma se je spre-minjalo tudi razumevanje spomenikov. Po začetni prevladi figuralnih spomenikov v štiridesetih in petdesetih letih prejšnjega stoletja je prevladujoča estetika posta-la abstrakcija, zlasti za najprestižnejše spomeniške naloge. Eksperimenti so segali od krajinskoarhitekturnih ureditev do obsežnih abstraktnih skulptur, v katere je mogoče vstopiti. Spomeniška mesta so bila razširjena s programi, ki so vključevali muzeje, izobraževalne prostore in gostinske objekte. V okviru izjemno razširjene-ga polja monumentalizacije protifašističnega boja je bil spominski pomen prene-sen tudi na hitro rastočo tipologijo kulturnih centrov.

Maroje Mrduljaš

Teorija samoupravnega socializma je zahtevala aktivno vključevanje in sodelova-nje državljanov v političnem in gospodarskem življenju. Udeležba je zahtevala emancipacijo državljanov, da bi lahko razumeli svoj položaj, vlogo in interese v širšem družbenem kontekstu. Slovenski politik Edvard Kardelj, vodilni ustvarjalec sistema samoupravljanja, je to emancipacijo označil za »globoko kulturno in etično revolucijo /.../, transformacijo celotne zavesti delovnega človeka«. Pomemben instrument emancipacije so bili kulturni centri, kjer so se prepletale profesional-na, amaterska in popularna kultura, zabava, izobraževanje in politične dejavnosti. Kot takšni naj bi kulturni centri ustvarjali nove oblike javnih prostorov, kjer bi se

While the production of monuments under socialism in Yugoslavia has been rece-iving international exposure during recent years, specific architectural typologies that hybridised commemoration and specific forms of social life are being overlo-oked. Using the case studies of the cultural centres in Kolašin and Nikšić in Monte-negro, this paper examines the transfer of commemorative meaning from monu-ments to architectural typologies. This transfer affected both architectural forms and programmes, which potentially opened up new approaches to commemora-tion. Yugoslav self-management socialism provided the framework for the reconc-iliation of commemorative and performative aspects of new typologies, yet the emancipatory potentials of the concept were not fully realised. The paper will tackle the contemporary destinies of these specific typologies, which are stripped of their original functions and ideological support.

Maroje Mrduljaš

Self-management socialism was instituted in 1950, in the wake of Yugoslavia’s expulsion from the Soviet bloc two years earlier. The system combined the indige-nous experiences of self-organisation during the anti-fascist resistance with the ideas from Karl Marx’s early works, as well as nineteenth century utopian sociali-sm and anarchism. Seen as an “alienating political force”, the state apparatus was to be replaced, in theory, with direct democracy in both the economic and political life. The empowerment of workers and citizens was meant to be accomplished by the systemic decentralisation of all social spheres. The system instigated unprece-dented development in the region, introduced rapid urbanisation, and fundamen-tally improved the living standard. However, it also produced crises and numerous contradictions, e.g. between direct democracy and the de facto dominance of the Communist party, between a planned economy and the market, between instru-mental rationality and social idealism.

Maroje Mrduljaš

Architecture often played the role of an intermediary between these contradicti-ons. Such agency was possible because of a set of preconditions, most notably the concept of cultural autonomy, which the ideology of self-management socialism defended as a specifically Yugoslav value. Cultural autonomy in architecture, however, referred not only to aesthetic questions, but also to the essential issues of programming, which entrusted architecture with the agency of articulating new societal forms and relations, including commemoration.

Maroje Mrduljaš

One of the ideological pillars of Yugoslav socialist system was the anti-fascist str-uggle, which was the subject of a vast practice of commemoration and monumen-talisation. It was also one of the few instruments of constructing a pan-Yugoslav identity. A plethora of approaches to monuments were tested, yet the commemo-ration was not exclusively tied to objects in that it significantly informed social life through various celebrations, education, and popular culture. How monuments were understood also changed through time. After the initial proliferation of figu-rative monuments in the 1940s and 1950s, abstraction became the dominant ae-sthetic, reserved for the most prestigious commemorative tasks. Experiments spanned from the site-specific land-form interventions to the inhabitable large-scale abstract sculptures. Memorial sites have been expanded with auxiliary pro-grammes which included museums, educational spaces, and catering facilities. Within the context of the extremely expanded field of monumentalisation of the anti-fascist struggle, commemorative meaning was also transferred to the fast-growing typology of the cultural centre.

Maroje Mrduljaš

The theory of self-management socialism demanded active involvement and par-ticipation of citizens in political and economic life. This participation required the emancipation of citizens who could comprehend their position, role, and interests

Maroje Mrduljaš

družabne skupine srečevale zunaj delovnega in družinskega okolja. Po ideji decen-tralizacije je morala nova kulturna krajina doseči vse državljane in zajeti celotno ozemlje nerazvite Jugoslavije. Medtem ko je bilo kulturno življenje v velikih urba-nih središčih večinoma organizirano prek mreže že obstoječih institucij, se je ra-zvoj novih kulturnih središč zgodil predvsem v manjših mestih manj razvitih regij. Prav v takih robnih pogojih so kulturni centri sprožili nove oblike družbenega ži-vljenja. Postali so najbolj izpostavljene javne zgradbe, ki so prevzele položaj cerkva in mošej, kar je poudarilo njihov simbolni in spomeniški potencial.

Maroje Mrduljaš

Kulturni centri so bili instrumenti emancipacije, pa tudi prostori ideoloških pred-stav, tako da so nekateri od njih izrecno imeli status spomenika. Toda simbolične vloge spomenika ni bilo preprosto povezati s prvotnimi nameni samoupravnega kulturnega centra, ki naj bi bil dinamična in odprta institucija. Spomeniška vloga arhitekture je morala tekmoвати z običajnimi spomeniki. V večini primerov je funk-cija prevladala nad formalno monumentalizacijo. Spomeniški pomen je zastopalo ime institucije, ideološko funkcijo so izpolnjevali dogodki, ki so se odvijali v njej. Kljub temu so preizkušali različne možnosti uskladitve monumentalne oblike in različnih programskih shem. Najvidnejši protagonist takšnega pristopa je bil slo-venski arhitekt Marko Mušič.

Maroje Mrduljaš

Mušič je študiral v Ljubljani pri Edvardu Ravnikarju in v začetku šestdesetih let prejšnjega stoletja sodeloval v biroju Louisa Kahna. Po vrnitvi v Jugoslavijo je bil izjemno uspešen na domačih arhitekturnih natečajih in je postal eden najbolj iz-postavljenih arhitektov svoje generacije. Izkušnja sodelovanja s Kahnom je najbrž bistveno pripomogla k Mušičevi naklonjenosti dosodobne monumentalnosti, kar se je izkazalo za posebej uspešno v nizu natečajev za kulturne centre. V nekaj več kot desetletju je zmagal na šestih natečajih, v Zagrebu (1966), Kolašinu (1970), Bitoli (1970), Prištini (1970), Bosanskem Šamcu (1976) in Nikšiću (1978). Medtem ko se ti projekti med seboj razlikujejo po svojih konceptih in nekateri od njih niso bili realizirani, sta bili kulturni središči na Kolašinu in v Nikšiću v Črni gori vrhunec sinteze spomeniškega pomena in državotvornih funkcij. Ni naključje, da je do te sinteze prišlo ravno v odročnih krajih Črne gore. To je bila ena najmanj razvitih republik federativne Jugoslavije. Bila je eden od epicentrov protifašističnega boja, toda na črnogorskem ozemlju ni bilo pomembnejših bitk ali koncentracijskih tabo-rišč, najpomembnejših prostorov monumentalizacije. Zaradi tega je šla gradnja obsežnih spomenikov v petdesetih in šestdesetih letih prejšnjega stoletja večino-ma mimo Črne gore. V tistem obdobju je imela prednost industrializacija te pre-težno podeželske republike; ta je porabila večino naložb, zato je mreža kulturnih ustanov ostala šibka ali nerazvita. V sedemdesetih letih pa so se zgodili nekateri poskusi odprave te pomanjkljivosti.

Maroje Mrduljaš

Mestece Kolašin leži na odročnem gorskem območju in je bilo eden od epicentrov protifašističnega boja v Črni gori in Jugoslaviji. Spominski dom (1970, 1971–1975) je bil zasnovan po formuli »javna stavba je spomenik«. Njegov simbolični namen je bila spomeniška obeležitev prvega zбора Nacionalnega protifašističnega sveta Črne gore, ki je bil v Kolašinu leta 1943. Skupščina je bila ključnega političnega pomena in Kolašin je veljal za glavno mesto Črne gore v času druge svetovne voj-ne. Novo kulturno središče bi moralo spomniti na zgodovinske dogodke, hkrati pa zagotavljati različne javne storitve, tako da je bil dejanski program stavbe mešani-ca spominskega muzeja, kulturno-kongresnega centra in komunalne službe. Mu-šičev projekt, izbran na javnem arhitekturnem natečaju, je izpolnilvse tri zahteve.

Maroje Mrduljaš

Stavba je dolga točno 100 m in tvori središče glavnega mestnega trga. Zasnovana je kot impozantna skulptura, geomorfna aglomeracija trianguliranih volumnov,

Maroje Mrduljaš

in the broader social context. The Slovenian politician Edvard Kardelj, the leading creator of the self-management system, described this emancipation as a “profo-und cultural and ethical revolution... a transformation of the complete consciou-ness of the working man.” An important instrument of emancipation were cultu-ral centres, where professional culture, cultural amateurism, popular culture, en-tertainment, education, and political activities were all intertwined. As such, cul-tural centres were meant to create new forms of public spaces where different social groups would meet outside of the work-family pattern. Following the idea of decentralisation, a new cultural landscape had to reach all citizens and cover the whole territory of the underdeveloped Yugoslavia. While the cultural life in large urban centres was mainly organised through the network of already existing institutions, the development of new cultural centres occurred mainly in smaller towns of the less developed regions. It was precisely under such peripheral condi-tions that cultural centres initiated new forms of social life. Cultural centres beca-me the most exposed public buildings, taking over the position of churches and mosques, which emphasised their symbolic and monumental potential.

Maroje Mrduljaš

Cultural centres were the instruments of emancipation but also the sites of ideo-logical performances so some of them received the explicit status of a monument. But the symbolic role of a monument was not easily integrated with the original intention of a self-managed cultural centre, i.e. a dynamic and open institution. Also, the commemorative role of the buildings had to compete with the prolifera-tion of more conventional monuments. In most cases, formal monumentalisation was discarded in favour of a functional approach. The memorial meaning was entrusted to the name of the institution and the ideological role was fulfilled thro-ugh events that took place in the centres. Still, the possibility of the reconciliation of monumental form and the heterogeneous programmatic schemes of cultural centres was investigated. The most prominent advocate of such an approach was Slovenian architect Marko Mušič.

Maroje Mrduljaš

Mušič studied in Ljubljana under Edvard Ravnikar and worked with Louis Kahn in the early 1960s. After returning to Yugoslavia, Mušič was extremely successful in Yugoslav architectural competitions and became one of the most exposed archi-tects of his generation. The experience of working with Kahn is believed to have significantly contributed to Mušič’s affection for the modern monumentality wh-ich proved to be especially useful in the series of competitions for cultural centres. In the course of scarcely more than a decade, he won 6 competitions in Zagreb (1966), Kolašin (1970), Bitola (1970), Priština (1970), Bosanski Šamac (1976), and Nikšić (1978). While these projects vary in their concepts and some of them were not realised, the cultural centres in Kolašin and Nikšić in Montenegro were the pinnacle of the synthesis of commemorative meaning and civic functions. It was not a coincidence that the breeding ground for this synthesis were two remote towns in Montenegro. Montenegro was one of the least developed republics of federal Yugoslavia. Though one of the epicentres of the anti-fascist struggle, the territory of Montenegro featured no key battle sites or concentration camps, the prime sites of monumentalisation. Consequently, the construction of large-scale monuments mostly bypassed Montenegro during the 1950s and 1960s. During the same period, the industrialisation of the predominantly rural Montenegro was a priority which used up the majority of investment, and the network of cultural facilities and institutions remained weak or underdeveloped. In the 1970s, at-tempts got underway to resolve these deficiencies.

Maroje Mrduljaš

The small town of Kolašin is situated in a remote mountain area and was one of the epicentres of the anti-fascist struggle in Montenegro and Yugoslavia. The Me-

*Price’s radical designs of civic centres and at the same time as the design of Centre Pompidou in Paris, the project that aimed to fundamentally reform the concept of the cultural institution through the idea of an open system. Unlike these new visions of cultural life, the Home of the Revolution was aggregation of old functional typologies. Mušič had to deal with an overblown scale and created a collage that, following the expansion of the programme, became a giant Merzbau.*¹

The sheer scale of the building and interior spaces guaranteed a monumental effect. In order to resolve the amorphous massing, Mušič developed a compositional strategy of concealment. Exaggerated pretensions were there to mask one another. A spectacular workers’ club on the top of the complex provided a privileged view and became the new symbolic crown of the city. It was placed onto the enormous tower above the stage in order to complete the otherwise dull skyline of the complex. Thanks to its odd shape, the building got one of many nicknames: the Sphinx. The exteriors were designed as inhabitable extensions of the urban landscape in order to alleviate visual massiveness. Yet the external terraces and auditoriums were not clearly connected with the urban tissue or with the interior of the building. It seems that they were planned to host the iconography of various ideological rituals rather than being designed as places of informal spatial practices. Even the large entrance plaza was contradictory because the complex had created a break in the urban structure that prevented the continuity of public urban space. Many architectural features of the Home of Revolution are thus ambiguous.

The Home of the Revolution appeared as a kind of an adventure that exhausted the material and organisational resources. The construction was financed from different funds, including Federal ones. The entire Nikšič community participated through financial contributions made compulsory following a public referendum. In 1989, after more than 10 years, the construction was halted. The break-up of the socialist Yugoslavia in 1991 may have been a fortunate circumstance for the builders of the Home of the Revolution because no one was responsible for the waste of resources. Nikšič then found itself in a radically different context, first as a part of the union of Serbia and Montenegro, and from 2006 in an independent country with 600,000 citizens compared to Yugoslavia’s 21 million. The heavy industry of Nikšič faced a serious decline. What remained of the Home of the Revolution was a magnificent ruin, a monument to an aborted ideology and an abandoned urban landscape despised by the locals.

Even the demolition proved to be too expensive. Mušič remained frantically devoted to the project and proposed a redesign, but the building only grew larger owing to the inclusion of a department store. At the same time, the Home of the Revolution became a popular topic of numerous student works and diplomas in the region and abroad. Finally in 2015, encouraged by the success of the Montenegrin pavilion at the 2014 Venice Architecture Biennale, which featured 4 modernist ruins including the Memorial Home in Kolašin and the Home of the Revolution in Nikišić, the Ministry of Tourism and Sustainable Development of Montenegro launched an international competition for the Home of the Revolution reconstruction project. The brief was open, without any predefined programme, and asked for a strategic approach to the rejuvenation of the structure. The author of this paper was a member of the international jury.

The history of the project proved that it was not possible to finish the Home of the Revolution, it was necessary to embrace its uncompleted state. The material remnants of recent history became pending spatial resources. Under the conditions of the atomisation of post-socialist societies and the narrowing of the public domain, can such a project serve as a trigger for collective action? The biggest challenge of the reconstruction of the Home of the Revolution was the mobilisation of all the stakeholders, from the political elite on the State and municipal level to the local community. Can architecture not only encourage but also co-ordinate the process of societal cohesion?

^[1] Merzbau ??????

Že sama velikost objekta in notranjih prostorov je zagotovila monumentalen učinek. Da bi razrešil amorfnost dimenzij, je Mušič razvil kompozicijsko strategijo prekrivanja. Pretirane gesteje uporabil tako, da bi se medsebojno prekrivale. Spektakularni delavski klub na vrhu kompleksa je omogočil privilegiran pogled in postal nova simbolična krona mesta. Postavljen je bil na ogromen stolp nad odrom, da bi razgibal sicer umirjen obris kompleksa. Zaradi svoje nenavadne oblike je stavba dobila enega izmed svojih mnogih vzdevkov: Sfinga. Zunanost je bila zasnovana kot podaljšek urbane krajine, da bi ublažila vizualno masivnost. Vendar zunanje terase in avditoriji niso bili jasno povezani niti z mestnim tkivom niti z notranjostjo stavbe. Zdi se, da je bila stavba načrtovana za prireditve z ikonografijo različnih ideoloških ritualov, ne pa kot kraj neformalnih prostorskih praks. Tudi velika vhodna plaza je bila vprašljiva, saj je kompleks povzročil prekinitev urbane strukture, ki je preprečila kontinuiteto javnega mestnega prostora. Številne arhitekturne značilnosti Doma revolucije so tako dvoumne.

Dom revolucije se je pojavil kot nekakšna avantura, ki je izčrpala materialne in organizacijske vire. Gradnjo so financirali iz različnih skladov, vključno z zveznimi. Celotna mestna skupnost je sodelovala s finančnimi prispevki, h katerim se je zavezala na javnem referendumu. Leta 1989 je bila gradnja po več kot desetih letih ustavljena. Razpad socialistične Jugoslavije leta 1991 je bil za graditelje Doma revolucije morda srečna okoliščina, saj so bili odvezani vsakršne odgovornosti. Nikšić se je znašel v radikalno drugačnem kontekstu, najprej kot del zveze Srbije in Črne gore, od leta 2006 pa kot del neodvisne države s 600.000 državljani – v primerjavi z Jugoslavijo z 21 milijoni prebivalcev. Težka industrija Nikšića se je soočila z resnim upadom. Od Doma revolucije sta ostali veličastna ruševina, spomenik ukinjeni ideologiji, in zapuščena urbana pokrajina, ki jo domačini prezirajo.

Tudi rušenje se je izkazalo za predrago. Mušič je ostal fanatično predan projektu in je predlagal preprojektiranje, vendar je projekt zaradi vključitve veleblagovnice še narasel. Obenem je Dom revolucije postal priljubljena tema številnih študentskih del in diplom v regiji in tujini. Nazadnje, spodbujeno z odmevnostjo črnogorskega paviljona na beneškem arhitekturnem bienalu leta 2014, na katerem so bile predstavljene štiri modernistične ruševine, vključno s Spominskim domom na Kolašinu in Domom revolucije v Nikšiću, je črnogorsko ministrstvo za turizem in trajnostni razvoj leta 2015 razpisalo mednarodni natečaj za projekt obnove Doma revolucije. Razpis je bil odprt, brez vnaprej določenega programa, in je zahteval strateški pristop k pomladitvi strukture. Avtor prispevka je bil član mednarodne žirije.

Zgodovina projekta je dokazala, da Doma revolucije ni mogoče dokončati, treba je sprejeti njegovo nedokončano stanje. Materialni ostanki polpretekle zgodovine so postali razpoložljiv prostorski vir. Ali lahko v razmerah atomizacije postsocialističnih družb in zmanjševanja pomena javnega tak projekt spodbudi kolektivno akcijo? Največji izziv obnove Doma revolucije je bila mobilizacija vseh vpletenih deležnikov, od politične elite na državni in občinski ravni do lokalne skupnosti. Ali lahko arhitektura ne samo spodbuja, ampak tudi usklajuje proces družbene kohezije?

Na natečaju je zmagala ekipa arhitektov HHF iz Basla in arhitektov Sadar + Vuga iz Ljubljane; predlagaliso realen koncept, ki temelji na delitvi obstoječega prostora: na 10% notranjih celic s konkretnimi funkcijami, 20% obnovljenih javnih površin in prometne poti ter 70% zavarovanih nedostopnih prostorov, katerih uporaba bo določena v prihodnosti. Vsi posegi so predvideni v pritličju stavbe. Projekt se tako spretno izogne pasti pretirane ambicije in ne ponuja nemogočih scenarijev uporabe. V takšni viziji kompleks še vedno ostaja monumentalna ruševina, ki se aktivira

The competition was won by the team of HHF Architects from Basel and Sadar+Vuga from Ljubljana, who proposed an ultimately realistic concept based on the division of the existing space into 10% of interior containers with concrete functions, 20% of renovated public areas and circulation routes, and 70% of safe and unaccusable spaces whose use would be defined in the future. All the interventions are focused only on the ground floor of the building. The project thus cleverly avoids the trap of an overblown ambition and does not create impossible scenarios of use. In such a vision, the complex still remains a monumental ruin activated by an approach which is more similar to flexible urban planning than to architecture. The existing structure was treated as an urban landscape which is gradually colonised in accordance to the actual needs. Architects insisted that the original Mušič project should formally remain intact, respecting its status of the monument and recognising the scale of the spaces as a unique quality. They resolved the original contradictions by opening up the whole structure, which became porous and better connected with the surrounding urban tissue. Rather than a free-standing and detached monumental object, the Home of the Revolution should finally become an organic part of the city, a covered and inhabitable public space.

s pristopom, bolj podobnim fleksibilnemu urbanističnemu načrtovanju kot arhitekturi. Obstoječa struktura je bila obravnavana kot urbana pokrajina, ki se postopoma kolonizira v skladu z dejanskimi potrebami. Arhitekti so vztrajali, da mora prvotni Mušičev projekt formalno ostati nedotaknjen, pri čemer je treba upoštevati njegov status spomenika in prepoznati njegove dimenzije kot edinstveno kakovost. Prvotna nasprotja so odpravili tako, da so celotno strukturo odprli; tako je postala porozna in bolje povezana z okoliškim mestnim tkivom. Namesto samostoječega in izoliranega spomeniškega objekta bi moral Dom revolucije končno postati organski del mesta, pokrit in naseljen javni prostor.

Za uspeh projekta je bil bistven sistem dodeljevanja prostorov novim uporabnikom, ali z drugimi besedami, odprta politika upravljanja prostorov. Le usklajevanje različnih zahtev in spodbujanje programske raznolikosti bi projektu zagotovilo vitalnost. Država je prispevala začetna sredstva, za izvedbo del pa je bila zadolžena občina Nikšić. Narejen je bil izvedbeni projekt in izdano gradbeno dovoljenje. Lokalna skupnost je pozdravila možnost, da se problem zloglasne »modre grobnice« v središču mesta dokončno razreši. Še en zgodovinski preobrat pa je pobudo spodkopal. Dela so se začela marca 2018, junija pa je postalo očitno, da se ne uresničuje projekt arhitektov HHF in Sadar + Vuga, ampak nekaj drugega. Velike prostore stavbe so zaprli, druge pa odrezali, v nasprotju z idejami o pretočnosti prostorov in celovitosti prvotne strukture. Dela so zato ustavili in stanje projekta trenutno ni jasno.

Spominski dom v Kolašinu je bil poskus uskladitve oblikovne monumentalnosti in državljskega programa. Prevlada oblike nad programsko zasnovo je ovirala razvoj stavbe v novih družbenih in kulturnih pogojih. Iracionalnost prvotnega projekta Doma revolucije v Nikšiću je izhajala iz poskusa konstrukcije monumentalnosti s pretiranim kulturnim programom. Tako monumentalne ambicije kot program kulturnega središča so zastareli že v času gradnje, kar kaže na nezmožnost ortodoksne socialistične ideologije, da bi sprejela naslednjo stopnjo v razvoju družbe. Megalomanski idealizem, vpet v Dom revolucije, je ustvaril spektakularno razvalino, ki je komaj primerljiva s čimerkoli, kar se gradi po svetu. Trenutna parcelacija Doma revolucije je posledica izvajanja zasebnih interesov z javnimi deli. Je žalosten kazalnik parohializma, pomanjkanja idealizma in propadanja javnega dobrega. Če je bil pozni socializem, izražen s stavbami-spomeniki, ujet med preteklostjo in prihodnostjo, so sodobne postsocialistične družbe ujete v neprekinjeno sedanjost, ki zanika preteklost in prihodnost. Ko se zgodovina ustavi, ni prostora za spomenike.

Prevedel: Miha Dešman

The competition was won by the team of HHF Architects from Basel and Sadar+Vuga from Ljubljana, who proposed an ultimately realistic concept based on the division of the existing space into 10% of interior containers with concrete functions, 20% of renovated public areas and circulation routes, and 70% of safe and unaccusable spaces whose use would be defined in the future. All the interventions are focused only on the ground floor of the building. The project thus cleverly avoids the trap of an overblown ambition and does not create impossible scenarios of use. In such a vision, the complex still remains a monumental ruin activated by an approach which is more similar to flexible urban planning than to architecture. The existing structure was treated as an urban landscape which is gradually colonised in accordance to the actual needs. Architects insisted that the original Mušič project should formally remain intact, respecting its status of the monument and recognising the scale of the spaces as a unique quality. They resolved the original contradictions by opening up the whole structure, which became porous and better connected with the surrounding urban tissue. Rather than a free-standing and detached monumental object, the Home of the Revolution should finally become an organic part of the city, a covered and inhabitable public space.

Essential for the success of the project was the management of the allocation of the spaces to new users, or, in other words, open-source politics of space. Only the harmonisation of various demands and the encouragement of programmatic diversity would guarantee the emergence of urban vitality. The State ensured the initial funds, and the Municipality of Nikšić was in charge for conducting the works on the site. The execution project was designed and the building permit issued. The local community applauded the possibility of a breakthrough on the notorious “blue tomb” in the centre of the city.

Yet one more historical turn undermined the initiative. The works started in March 2018, but in June, it became obvious that what was being realised was not the HHF and Sadar+Vuga project but something else. Large spaces of the building had been enclosed and others were being chopped off, contrary to the ideas of the porous space and the integrity of the original structure. At the moment, the works are on hold and the status of the project is unclear.

Memorial Home in Kolašin was an attempt to reconcile formal monumentality and a civic programme. The predominance of form over programmatic performance obstructed the evolution of the building in new social and cultural conditions. The irrationality of the original project of the Home of the Revolution in Nikšić stemmed from an attempt to construct monumentality out of an overblown cultural programme. Both the monumental ambitions and the cultural centre’s programme were outdated already in the time of their construction, indicating the inability of orthodox socialist ideology to embrace the next stage in the development of society. The megalomaniac idealism embedded in the Home of the Revolution created a spectacular ruin hardly comparable to anything else being built worldwide. In its present divvied-up state, the Home of the Revolution is a result of conducting private interests through public works. It is a pitiful testament to parochialism, a lack of idealism, and expiration of public good. If late socialism, as evidenced by buildings-monuments, was suspended between the past and the future, the contemporary post-socialist societies are trapped in the continuous present, denying both the past and the future. When history stops, there’s no space for monuments.