THE IMAGINARY CITY: REPRESENTATION OF YUGOSLAVISM ON JOVAN ŽIVANOVIĆ'S FILM *ČUDNA DEVOJKA* (1962)

A B S T R A C T

The interpretation of cities on film in societal (film) context is not a *mimesis*, but rather a model utilised in production of meanings that functions on the basis of signs organised in a visual language. As these meanings are produced within culture and history, cities on film are the products of societal (politically motivated) knowledge, language structures, open texts in societal and cultural fields that, through power, utilising productive network that pervades society, represents a certain system of values and, as one in the system of political, cultural, scientific, art texts, exhibits regimes of social identity forms an *archeology of knowledge*. The interpretations of cities on film from the standpoint of cultural studies indicated that the configurations of cities (and modern architecture) outside of its phenomenology are not confronted with the usual postulations of binary oppositions, on which the majority of interpretative traditions are based, but rather that they serve to achieve the fulfillment of cultural roles, and that they are open semiotic fields by which one community produces a desirable (moving) image of oneself.

Tatjana Karabegović

University of Belgrade - Faculty of Architecture

KEY WORDS

CITY
MODERN ARCHITECTURE
URBAN CULTURE
REPRESENTATION
FILM
IDEOLOGY
IDENTITY
YUGOSLAVISM

INTRODUCTION

Film interpretation of cities is a part of the praxis of construction of national identities. By considering representation as linguistic structure, which represents a certain system of values through power, thus forming and defining the body of knowledge and its dynamic structure, this paper discusses the interpretation of Belgrade in Yugoslav-production film *Čudna devojka* (1962), directed by Jovan Živanović¹, as a part of the system by which the Yugoslavism was constructed and the ideology of authentic journey towards communism of socialist Yugoslavia was legitimised.

After World War II, the new government in Yugoslavia promised a New world that ought to have been the one of equality and freedom – a New man's world, that could be reached, after the conflict with USSR in 1948 and after the foundation of ideological platform in the *authenticity* of the Yugoslav revolution, by socialist construction and transformation of society through authentic political, economic and cultural programme, dubbed the *Yugoslav way*. Proclaimed on the difference from the Soviet model of mass utopia and based on the values of socialist democracy, bound to a base point of constructing a New man, humanised the evolution of the society that moved toward post-statism, the condition that has been a key mark of the authentic transition from the socialist reality to the communist future in Yugoslavia. Among other things, this implied freedom of artistic creativity and identity politics based on the Western model of identification with liberalism that was transpositioned in the Yugoslav context, which was legitimised by the autonomy of art and the work of film authors.

Jovan Živanović interprets the dilemmas of the young population in the socialist capital. By using narratives of the Western models of urban culture and architecture of New Belgrade, which, as a planning and design model in modernisation process of the socialist Yugoslavia, was constructed as a functional city with corresponding ideas and principles, and through the paradigms of the International style and modern movement, he constructs urban landscape of a desirable future of new Yugoslavia. The interpretations of urban culture and modern architecture on film, as a product of creative freedom, was not only the content of Yugoslavism, but the normative framework for the author's interpretation of content, and for selection of contents of the projected future, and thus confirming the autonomy of art, confirms free society in regime of production and distribution of knowledge of Yugoslavism. Film image of Belgrade, which is formed within a relatively stable institutional framework of film production, or to be more precise, as film is understood as societal fact, within a relatively stable institutional framework of cinematography, the singular political mechanisms and associated concepts of production of knowledge and

power, i.e. ideologically consistent framework, is not just a reflection of the desired state of national identity, that is, an “ideological screen” of sorts, on which the content and borders of identity are projected, but also a key point of its construction and legitimization of ideology of the desired state.

THE PROMISE

In 1945, the monarchy was abolished in Belgrade, the Federal People’s Republic of Yugoslavia (FPRY) was proclaimed, and in 1946 the Constitution of FPRY was adopted, stipulating that sovereignty belonged to the people.² Although “none of its 139 members used the term ‘socialist’ or any other provision that referred to the Communist party of Yugoslavia (CPY)”³, the Constitution whose main parts were drafted by “following the model of the 1936 Soviet Constitution”⁴, had elements that marked the movement of the society towards socialism.⁵ The state and the government that tended to succeed the Kingdom and address the war devastations, had to be legitimated and, for that purpose, a sheer takeover of power was not sufficient.

The authorities in Yugoslavia interpreted National Liberation Movement in World War II as a socialist revolution in which the people, led by the Communist Party, participated “not as ethnos but as populous”⁶, and on whose victory the fundamental values of the new Yugoslavia were proclaimed: the 1941-1945 anti-fascist national liberation struggle, socialist revolution, brotherhood and unity. This allegedly resolved the previous key dilemmas of ethnic separation in the newly conceived community. Although the fundamental values proclaimed in this way can be considered as a stronghold in which “the communist history of success was represented and constructed”⁷, they cannot be interpreted only as the position from which the leadership of the communist party in the newly formed state was legitimated. If, according to Renan (Ernest Renan), a nation is “one big solidarity founded in the consciousness of sacrifice made in the past and willingness to make further ones in the future” and as “it supposes a past, it is consolidated, however, in the presence by a tangible fact: (...) the consent, a clearly expressed desire to continue common living”⁸, then proclaiming the fundamental values was at the same time also a necessary step, made in order to obtain consent from the population for the new community. However, was the existence of common history sufficient for imagining new Yugoslavia?⁹

The Communist Party of Yugoslavia promised the New World, which was supposed to become the world of freedom, equality, brotherhood, the world of the developed living standard. Those promises cannot be distinguished from what Buck-Morrs (Susan Buck-Morrs) calls the myth of industrial modernity,

which is characteristic for all mass democracies, from capitalist to real or state socialism.¹⁰ In Yugoslav case, it was a promise of a better future based on the Soviet model of mass utopia. Since the promise was not enough, “as ideology is not only a proposal, but also a project, choice and determination of the methods or procedures for implementation of that proposal”¹¹, and since with the introduction of the economic democracy based on the Soviet model the Yugoslav authorities could not be legitimated separately from Moscow, the myth of industrial modernity was in Yugoslavia positioned within a complex, ideological matrix.

AUTHENTICITY

The idea of the authentic development of Yugoslav society was first proclaimed at the 5th Congress of CPY in 1948, and not by accident.¹² The Congress was held one month after Yugoslavia was expelled from the World Communist Organization Cominform as a result of the conflict with Stalin and accusations that the CPY was “undemocratic” and its programme “non-socialist”¹³, the reasons for which can be found in political competition.¹⁴ The answers to the questions raised within the CPY were given after re-reading of Marxism and discovery of Marx’s (Karl Marx) social self-management principle, with expressed anti-bureaucratic and anti-statism implications.¹⁵ To use Sundhaussen’s (Holm Sundhaussen) interpretation, Stalin had got sidetracked, the theory in the USSR had reached the state of dogmatism, the state-owned property was above the socially-owned property, and “withering away of the state, demanded by the classics of Marxism, was unthinkable in such conditions”¹⁶. However, re-readings in the domain of art were not possible, as “Marx, Engels and Lenin did not leave any aesthetics”¹⁷, which made the criticism of the Soviet model more complicated. The authorities in Yugoslavia adopted Marx’s principle of “free association of laborers”¹⁸, and highlighted the idea of Lenin’s path, thus confirming loyalty to socialism and abandoning Stalinism. Besides the fact that it meant building socialism through withering away of the state as Petranović (Branko Petranović), Lampe (John Lampe) and Wachtel (Andrew Wachtel) have shown¹⁹, re-reading of Marxism based on the free approach to science, gave the reasons for venturing into an “exploration of critical thought and institutional innovations”²⁰. This constructed a possibility of choosing one’s own path, and also at the same time, a possibility of legitimating that path, based on the idea of freedom. Ever since 1949, the institutions in Yugoslavia started with the process of debureaucratization, decentralisation, democratisation through, in Rusinow’s (Dennison Rusinow) words, “emancipation from dogmatism (...) which reflected a new theoretical approach.”²¹ The development of the society, based the model of Yugoslav self-management system, which relied on socially-owned

property, self-management and freedom, and which was initially set within economic sphere, was to be expanded to wider social currents. Eventually, Yugoslav society was supposed to become a direct democracy, however, to quote Ignjatović (Aleksandar Ignjatović), who referred to Koselleck (Reinhart Koselleck):

(...) transition did not mean simple passage or movement from historical symmetrical categories such as the past and the future, but something between what Reinhart Koselleck called meta-historical category, 'space of experience' (Erfahrungsraum) and 'the horizon of expectations' (Erwartungshorizont). The distinction between these temporal and value structures specific for all modern societies, was, in case of Yugoslavia, manifested between socialist revolution and communist evolution. The process, or hiatus, in the temporal structure was overcome by the idea of transition and progress, and marked as the road towards 'advanced and free', towards brighter and more humane future. (...), dethronement of history as *magistra vitae* is manifested in the concept of socialist revolution, and evolutionary progressive advancement towards freedom, liberation and termination of historical dependence of the society, can be understood right through the vistas of meta-historical and value based categories of 'experienced' and 'expected' as fundamental structures in a complex ideological construction of the socialist Yugoslavia. Bridging the gap between the 'space of experience' and the 'horizon of expectations' took place through a number of different systems in culture.²²

Although it could be said that socialism with a human face, as self-governed socialism in Yugoslavia was often called, was an "imaginary assemblage (bricolage), a pure dream, empty and vain, constituted by the 'day's residues' from the only full and positive reality"²³, it was actually the reality which, if it's referred to postmodern critics of ideology in the works of Althusser (Louis Althusser) and Žižek (Slavoj Žižek)²⁴, functioned when the man became the citizen of socialist democracy, and further, the reality in which the doctrine of self-governance and socialist democracy was legitimated as a natural state of things when the citizen put on himself a mask of a human face. The citizen with a mask of a human face imagined and produced the socialism with a human face, thus exercising his own freedom in institutions. The authors of Yugoslav-produced films have their place in that mechanism. Consequently, films and interpretations of cities on films have many possible meanings which were being temporarily fixed while film authors were winning their freedom through their own illusions and fantasies.

As a special military-administrative body, in 1944, the film section was founded, thus marking the beginning of the film industry in socialist Yugoslavia.²⁵ The reasons for positioning it under the most repressive state apparatus were based on the idea of the cultural revolution, which “is turning the masses into active creators of new cultural values”²⁶. As the emancipatory role of the film was proclaimed in promoting, building and accelerating the process of social progress, until “better future worthy of man”²⁷ was achieved, it could be considered that the model of institutionalisation of film industry in Yugoslavia, as Tadić (Darko Tadić) shown, was transplanted from the Soviet model of agitation and propaganda.²⁸ Nevertheless, at the Founding Congress of the Union of Film Workers of Yugoslavia, which was held in 1950, as a part of the wider movement of liberation of institutions which followed after 1948, it was proclaimed that “neither the most positive achievements recently made by the Soviet film nor the modern Soviet cinematography have to be followed”²⁹. What is more important, the Congress was the place of proclamation of freedom to create. Raspor (Vicko Raspor) said that “For every film artist, who sincerely wants to make works of art that represent a real contribution to the culture of our people and to the progressive mankind, there has never been so much freedom to create and such opportunities as there are today”³⁰. The above mentioned Congress was not the exception, considering all other fields of art.³¹ Even larger amount of freedom was given to the artists at the Third Congress of Writers, as stated in Krleža's (Miroslav Krleža) report *On Freedom of Culture*.³²

ANTIDOGMATISM

The film could show images of Yugoslav society and the images of the future it was going towards, and also, equally important, the images were products of the author's constructions, that is the product of the freedom to create. The film had significant, literal and substantive role in complex ideological matrix and could represent various ideas, at the same time legitimising the widest set of values. In the discourses of visual arts, the liberalisation was proclaimed through a thesis of anti-dogmatism, which was carried into film through the selection of topics, as well as through the abandonment of patterned schematic approach that were actually proclaimed to be the characteristics of the aesthetics of social realism. Social realism became precisely located ‘Other’ which was described as “culture socialist in form and national (that is, hegemonic and great-Russian) in content”³³. It was also a shift from the ‘other’ located in one's own recent past and/or in the outside world. The shift from the dogma “survived as a ‘structure of long duration’, connecting the decades and different, changeable if not non-coherent contents of the complex ideological system”³⁴. Anti-dogmatism produced its own criteria for valorisation of the film which were for years developed by critics:

The new Yugoslav film does not know and does not recognise thematic and aesthetic stereotypes. The creative rebellion of the film authors was directed against petrified aesthetic and ideological frames and inevitably brought something new (...). That new was not only in themes and contents but also in the way these themes and contents were transferred on the screen (...) Yugoslav, that is, socialist criterion cannot and must not be uniform. (...). The socialist criterion must exist out of dogmatic definitions, since both the concept and content of genuine socialism exist out of dogma and are constantly changing. (...) Socialist values have to be created.³⁵

The essence of the criteria for valorisation actually was “dogmatic anti-dogmatism”³⁶. A man was set in the middle of the criteria, and what the authors had in common was the fact that they gave up “every collective mythology in favour of (...) their intimate myths”³⁷. Yugoslav directors were grouped “around some general aesthetic features (...) by defending their personal concepts of the film”³⁸, which exactly was the most accurate instrument for the finest adjustments of the operational mechanism for legitimating values.

Jovan Živanović was just one of the directors who followed the shift from dogmatism through his own creative freedom, as already seen in his first film *Zenica* (1957), which critics received as one of the earliest examples of “surpassing the hypertrophic pattern”³⁹. Živanović was marked as the one who “apart from his implied talent, was worn out in frequent changes and drifts and stayed at the margin of our filming development”⁴⁰, and as such, he represented the example of an author who only partially reached hardly attainable ideal of freedom and autonomy. Paradoxically, the authorship which did not apparently reach clearly profiled contours, in fact ideally fitted in the concept of socialist values that had to be created in the interpretative stereotype of variety which makes “specific features of the film in Yugoslavia”⁴¹.

The film *Čudna devojka* (1962) (English translation *Strange Girl*) produced by Avala Film, was among the first examples that confirmed the aspirations of anti-dogmatism. By dealing with the issues of intimacy, it strived for the achievement of desirable values. It was stated that the author managed to “cross the border of socialist feuilleton” and “affirmed himself as competent”⁴². Lisinski wrote that “dynamic, skilled and inventive directing is the reason why the film looks extremely striking, vivid and vital”⁴³. However, almost at the same time, the film was marked as a miss – “Do we have to create our own measuring systems for the fear of getting lost in the universal ones? Absurd!”⁴⁴, Selem (Peter Selem) asked. Seemingly divergent reviews both confirm that

Čudna devojka was just one of the attempts to create Yugoslav standard system. The authorship approach in Živanović's case meant individualised reality, as Tirnanić (Bogdan Tirnanić) shown by writing that the

(...) the first work of Yugoslav film which looked at some tectonic movements of our reality through a frame of one person who took an active part in them. The epics (...) is here completely and definitively surpassed (...) the general course of things was reduced to the dimensions of one character (...) an integral participant of the social process.⁴⁵

Thus, *Čudna devojka* was interpreted as "a successful film about life issues of our modern intellectual youth in urban environment"⁴⁶. In the wider ideological context, Živanović's approach cannot be interpreted as an author's wish for *l'art pour l'art*, but as a need for the film to act lively and vitally as a specific screen representation of ideology, in order to, along with other texts in creative fields, become one of the regimes of the production of knowledge.

The prologue of the film *Čudna devojka* is a sequence in which a camera follows the footsteps in the sand. A woman is moving towards the horizon of sandy space. The sky above her is dramatically cloudy and in the distance on the horizon some trees can be seen. The space in the sequence could be anywhere. The prologue finishes with the whistle of the train on which, as it can be seen in the next shot, Minja, a nineteen-year-old girl is travelling to Belgrade to study. The film shows Minja's journey through painful affairs, through parallel stories, with Pedja, a journalist for a respected news editorial, who lives in Belgrade, and Nenad, a student of medicine, whom she meets in the student's campus. She becomes pregnant, and at Nenad's persuasion, she decides to keep the child and they get married. However, their life becomes even more complicated. As a rule, married students could not live on campus and had to move to the log hut as a temporary accommodation. In order to support the family, Nenad takes two jobs and almost drops out of studies. Minja decides not to allow this and finds a job.

If interpretation stops at the prosaic depiction of the film, as the main character "changes under the influence (...) of love"⁴⁷, is it to be understood that these changes directly imply the changes in the wider social context with love as a meta-historical category at the basis? It seems almost impossible; however, it is not as simple as that. Could Živanović's views of his heroine's dilemmas be understood as agents of ideology of evolution towards communism, that is, socialism with a human face? Živanović himself stated that he had never thought about life drama without interpreting the main female role and the way in which male and female principles interact.⁴⁸ After Minja finds out that Nenad

is leaving studies, she takes over the role of a strange girl. A common girl was transformed into a woman as a chief protagonist at the end of the film when Minja says “Tomorrow afternoon I am starting to work. Secondly, as of today at twenty-five past twelve, I am the one in this house who makes decisions about everything (...) you are just a student whose only job is to finish studies in the record time.” The character of Minja was interpreted as the most vivid, most authentic and most persuasive character in Yugoslav cinematography⁴⁹, a character transformed “from the myth to the subject”⁵⁰. The film was concerned with the emancipation of women, “women’s state of spirit and opportunities for women in Yugoslavia” as heroines “demand equality in emotions, in all aspects of life”⁵¹, thus pointing to one of the key parts film had in the production of knowledge, but this does not exhaust all the points.

CITY AND TRANSITION

Živanović sets the dramatic structures of all his films in urban and rural areas throughout Yugoslavia as he explores “opportunities for human interactions which these various environments offer”⁵². However, as the identity of the environment is not *mimesis* whose meaning lies within itself, the questions are how Živanović constructed environment in *Čudna devojka* so that he could use it for semiotization of human interactions, and *vice versa*, how human interactions semiotized that environment?

The film images are the images of Minja’s reality, showing the character of the New woman that cannot be interpreted as authentic without representing universal theme of nearly mythical quest for personal happiness through authentic Yugoslav metaphors. In the film, the metaphors were constructed through the interpretation of urban culture and architecture of Belgrade and New Belgrade. At the same time, a sort of urban culture and architecture were the content of Yugoslavism, even more, they were themselves made Yugoslav through the previous act of semiotization of the western models of urban culture and architecture which as a model of planning and design in modernising processes in Yugoslavia, as Blagojević (Ljiljana Blagojević) shown, was realised on the basis of ideas and principles of a functional city of modern movement and on paradigm of the International style.⁵³ Minja’s intimate dilemmas are set in the contemporary milieu of Belgrade and interpreted by the narratives of the western models of urban culture and architecture of Belgrade and New Belgrade, but at the same time, and crucially, by the narratives of unclear culturological and architectonic determinants. As a final result, film images were constructed as the topography of intimacy of The New woman, and as a landscape of the desirable future of New Yugoslavia at the same time.

The anecdotes of the main heroine, set in the real architectonic urban space in the film timeline, take place in parallel cycles until the moment when Živanović closes one of it and returns to the beginning to clarify it. The cycles will intercross at the spot of the accidental encounter of the main protagonists, Minja, Pedja and Nenad. Through an analysis of the dialogues and chronological reconstruction of the plot, it can be concluded that the cycles and parallel courses of narrative structures are actually constructed through editing, and that in the chronology of events, they do not exist. Živanović constructs them randomly as fragments of time. The cyclic and parallel nature was reached through use of scene that was shot in the student's campus, by depicting an ordinary day, where funny shouting of students can be heard from the balconies, and Minja, who is sunbathing and reading the journal *Film world* with the photograph of Elizabeth Taylor on the cover page could be seen. This scene can work independently, whereas in editing it can be set between any of the other two scenes. Also, there is a scene made of two shots. In the first one, Minja enters the café, and a group of young men can be seen, which call themselves a company of the indifferent, listening to jazz. Živanović adds another shot of an unknown girl in the same room, at which point the music changes and the company from the café stands up and begins to dance to the beat of rock'n'roll. This scene was constructed as a unique time and spatial fragment, but, in a single space, it was the union of two moments of time, through which the previous time was set as a future. The inversion of past and future creates a gap in which the present repeats itself by becoming cyclic and endlessly widened, clearly depicted as the construction of Minja's parallel affairs.

On the one hand, the present is signed by the images of Hollywood stars, sounds of jazz and rock'n'roll, which were a part of the process of Americanisation of Yugoslav popular culture.⁵⁴ The acceptance of the American culture in Yugoslavia "aimed at demonstrating how and to what extent Yugoslav system was liberal, and how and to what extent it was turning away from the Soviet model"⁵⁵. By means of the Americanised popular culture, Živanović constructs an alibi for intimate pursuits and, at the same time, also constructs one of the possible norms of the new urban culture, in which such a pursuit is possible.

The scenes of encounter and intimate moments with Pedja were shot on several locations. In the shot at Terazije Square, in the old part of Belgrade, the building of the Federal Chamber of Commerce can be seen, which by the design of Lavoslav Horvat was completed in 1959. In discourses of architecture it was marked as a facility which made Terazije Square "the permanent center of historic Belgrade"⁵⁶, as "a part of the valuable architectural fund", as a contribution to the development of contemporary architecture in Yugoslavia,

Figure 1. *Čudna devojka*, directed by Jovan Živanović (1962, FNRJ; Belgrade, RS: Delta Video, 2006), DVD.

which, at the time of renovation, was designed by the “followers of the modern orientation”⁵⁷. In the shots, the *Student City* can be seen as well, designed by Ilić and Vrbanić, as a complex for 5,000 students which was built simultaneously with nearby residential blocks in New Belgrade with over 3,000 flats.⁵⁸ Student City and the residential blocks were designed in the Institute for Research and concretization of New Belgrade. Since housing issues had to be addressed as priorities, the construction began according to the Investment Plan for 1949, during the First five-year development plan of Yugoslavia⁵⁹, whose objective became unreal after the cancellation of promised Soviet aid in 1948. The shots of intimate moments were made in the architectural space of a temporarily equipped studio, while in the parallel editing, during one of the telephone conversations, a modern office space can be seen. The film viewer meets Nenad in the scene in which he and Minja have love fights, and which were set in the space of the café and the nearby construction site. At the time of the film shooting, the café was located on the ground floor of a skyscraper in the blocks 1 and 2 in New Belgrade. These housing blocks with about 3,600 flats were built from 1959 to 1963 by the design of the team lead by Branko Petričić after the adoption of the Master plan of New Belgrade in 1958.⁶⁰ With the adoption of the urban plan and commencement of the works, New Belgrade “became the most concentrated building site in our country, a laboratory of experimental and study work”⁶¹. These realisations were in architectural discourses interpreted as the continuation of the construction of New Belgrade, initially conceived as “the capital city of newly founded federation (...) with the main function of the seat of power of new state bureaucratic structure”⁶² and/or with the more important role because of Yugoslav ambition until 1948.⁶³ The story with Nenad continues with the scenes in the above mentioned premises of the student’s campus, in public transport which the couple takes from New Belgrade to get to the old part of the city, where in the background of a casual chat about student’s everyday life, the size of the New Belgrade construction site can be seen. In the background of the couple’s walk along the old Belgrade are business facilities of *Serbia Project* and *Energoproject*, built for the consulting companies in Yugoslavia. Both of them, the first designed by Mihajlović, the other by Milica Šterić, are in architectural discourses marked as designs of exceptional significance.⁶⁴ The scenes of intimate moments were made in unclearly defined architectural space, neither in the village nor in the city, as Minja says, and on the construction site in the concrete prefabricated infrastructural element on an improvised depot in the sand, where the moments get interrupted by the workers who push the concrete element off the depot. In the background, Živanović shows a concrete skeleton structure of one of the architectural objects which is being built.

Figure 2. *Čudna devojka*, directed by Jovan Živanović (1962, FNRJ; Belgrade, RS: Delta Video, 2006), DVD.

By constructing Minja's reality through two parallel love stories, Živanović first of all cuts off the segments of real architectural and urban space by extracting with nearly surgical precision the newly built architectural structures from the existing urban matrix, or the architectural spaces which are being realised on the territory planned for the development of the new city, and then produces two incongruous topographies from the above mentioned segments. However, by intertwining them in just one spot, he creates a complex structure and unique physical environment, a film collage of the new contemporary city. If the motif from the prologue is understood as a mythical image of the path to an intimate oasis, or to any island of personal happiness, and if the film is interpreted as a metaphor of that quest, then the space in which the quest takes place is a metaphor of a desert, the topographies of Minja's quests are the topography of intimacy, and through the quest of the heroine, the architecture of the old part of Belgrade and New Belgrade are semiotized as the space of transit, as non-places at both of which ends are the spaces of privacy. From that standpoint, the imagined city is a personal heterotopy of The New woman in Yugoslavia, and the listed architectonic structures are transit islands of her own happiness. Truly, at the time of the film shooting, the area of New Belgrade under construction was appropriate for that kind of metaphor. In reality, it was an area on the left bank of the Sava River "between historically independently built cities of Zemun and New Belgrade"⁶⁵, "previously uninhabited soil"⁶⁶, "so far unusable marshland", which "had to be 'colonised' through urbanisation by the state"⁶⁷. Apart from the Blocks 1 and 2, Students City, the Colony at Tošin Bunar and a couple of facilities the construction of which had just started, New Belgrade was the location covered with sand and ready for building works.

Although Yugoslav identity was interpreted in one seemingly non-historical key of opinion, the construction of an authentic identity in the film was far more complex than the construction of *ab novo* realities. Cultural locating of the above mentioned models in architectural discourses was quite clear; it represented a contemporary product of practice of Yugoslav architects, the last instance of the development of Yugoslav architecture, the synonym of cultural, political progress, and at the same time, the last instance of Yugoslav civil engineering industry, the synonym of economic and technological progress. Both of them testified to the need that the new Yugoslav authorities should create a positive picture of an authentic path, which would verify the discontinuity with the previous regimes, the heritage of social standards, the outcome of World War II, the true belief in the right position after the Cominform in the bipolar world, as well as a shift from its own Sovietised past, and finally, a realistic projection of the future, that is, "optimal projection which brings one dynamic model of movement towards optimal variant of prevailing reality"⁶⁸ by which the regime, having made the "unambiguous shift from the

classic concept of utopia”⁶⁹distanced itself from the East. Locating of urban culture was not completely defined, but in its important segment it represented an echo of models of popular cultures whose presence was a result of the international political relationships of Yugoslavia. Through the constructions of Minja’s reality, Živanović constructs a collage of a modern city, but in a way that clearly excludes any historical model or connection with the past, by which, through inexistence of the past, he precisely locates a historical model of transition – it does not exist. Živanović’s city is a film image of discontinuity through which Yugoslavism asserts itself on the idea of vitality, which develops, despite the otherness in its own and undesired history, which was the first step in the construction of authenticity. It was necessary to make direct relationships between the imagined Yugoslavism as the future community, and the one which was being built, the contemporary community, and this was exactly the key of Živanović’s complex construction of Yugoslavism. The environment of the main heroine, apart from representing a film image of the present, which was at the same time within the socialist Yugoslavia an image of the desirable future, was also a film image of the ‘other’ present, which was not promised but necessary. By finding a source of authenticity in ‘other’ Yugoslav present, he throws light on its most sensitive aspects, as these different presents could be interpreted in different ways. Putting the model of transitional norms at stake could certainly blur the general perspective of imagining future community and point out that Yugoslavism is an artificial category which can hardly be developed from the actual conditions, so that Yugoslavia objectively cannot reach future further than it can be discerned from its existing outlines, which were actually the darkest forebodings of the discourse. The discourse, however, mythologised bright future, golden age that is set on the horizon of expectations as an outcome of Yugoslavism. However, this clear contradiction which Živanović pointed out was not at all accidental. The need to represent the present as a promised and imagined future and to shift from it, was a symptom of the mechanism of signification of the model of planning and designing of New Belgrade, the reconstruction of Belgrade and the model of urban culture as Yugoslav not by the idea of discontinuity, but by the equally important idea of the authentic transition. However, from the perspective of Živanović’s non-historicism, the western models of urban culture and architecture of Belgrade, and especially of New Belgrade, historically metamorphosed in the turning point of the last part of the film, through film images of the environment in which Minja’s transformation takes place, and through which the mentioned models and Minja’s reality will definitely be set in the Yugoslav historical context of transition and Yugoslavia’s own progress, which as an interpretative procedure required fulfilling a few conditions. Živanović had already done the first one in the previous step by filming the collage of the modern city, as a collage of discontinuity. Wiping off the architecture and urban culture of the past as undesirable actually meant

to make it Yugoslavian. In the second one, Živanović makes dichotomisation, where he separates the author's architecture and 'other', western model of urban culture and 'other', and where paradoxically 'other' does not have a clear form. By depicting the log huts in inhumane conditions in the collective centre and the culture of common living as necessity, that is, in the way which does not offer any alternative model of living for married students in the city, Živanović's interpretation has a key importance. By constructing the necessary presence, he determined a cultural type as an artifact of transitional Yugoslavism, a kind of original 'other', a negative model, which stands within Yugoslav times, and, as it does not have any distinguished cultural features, it is actually out of the reach of undesirable influences. By setting direct relations between 'other' necessary present and present as already imagined future, he normed the ideal present. He did this by constructing the models of urban culture and architecture of Belgrade, especially New Belgrade, as the only alternative which does not have clear conceptual and structural differences when compared to the 'other', but flows into the necessity of progress. This does not only ironically metamorphose the differences he creates into a conceptual similarity, but it also translate the American popular culture and ideas and principles of functional city of modern movement and paradigm of international style into authentic model of transition and modernisation processes of Yugoslavia. In this way, the idea of Yugoslavism, which asserted itself on the idea of vitality despite otherness from its own and undesirable history, is further developed through an idea that it also asserts itself despite otherness from its own unavoidable present.

The connection between the imagined Yugoslavism and the one that was being built, was created by constructing the Yugoslav 'other', in its own in-historical transitional present. Ironically, the present, which was not exemplar in any aspect, was not the one against which the new arising Yugoslav modernity would assert itself, but the one which arises despite the worthless present.

This was the construction of the Yugoslav own transitional identity through drawing its own boundary within its own chronological body of the nation.

However, the choice of the idea of making internal boundaries of Yugoslav own time, as a result of constructing the author's relevant 'other', confirmed the degree of available freedom, by which it ultimately legitimated the proclaimed set of values, and liberalisation particularly, the doctrine of socialism with human face as a natural state of being. Film interpretation of the contemporary city of its own content, and by the practice of the author as a citizen with a mask of a human face, which was imagining the Yugoslavia's own path to communism, confirmed dominant stereotypes of the importance of contemporary culture as guardians of authentic Yugoslavism, a culture which allegedly nursed the original *Zeitgeist*.

The screenplay for the film was written on the motifs of the novel *A day trip to the sky*⁷⁰, that speaks about a girl Minja, who had “a critical view of the ‘bright horizons’, famine and poverty in the country in which ‘paradise is awaiting’”⁷¹, and in which there is no transformation of the main character. The manuscript, which was approved for publishing after winning the state competition among 157 works, was censored by nearly its third because of amorality and an ugly picture of Yugoslav youth.⁷² The play *Čudna devojka*, based on the motifs of the novel and performed at the Belgrade Drama Theatre in 1959, was soon taken off the repertoire as scandalous.⁷³ At the 9th Festival of Yugoslav Feature Film in Pula, held in 1962, which had been founded in 1954 with the aim of uniting Yugoslav cultural space⁷⁴, the film *Čudna devojka*, although made on the motifs of the novel, hiding indifference as the consequence of the war, wondering as the quest for shelter from the feeling of personal failure, was awarded the “appraisal for its orientation towards the content of the contemporary life”⁷⁵. Soon after the festival, it seemed at first sight, that Živanović’s ‘other’ was still not an adequate norm for symbolising the desirable present, because of the, as Novaković said, “acceptable transformation which Minja experienced” which“(…)took place in a psychological and social vacuum. The whole story, skillfully directed, turned inwards to its interior construction, without any contact with the environment in which it rises and blooms.”⁷⁶ In fact, that ‘other’ was perfect for imagining a city which would represent Yugoslavism on film, but, just a few days after the film received the award, it seemed that ‘other’, on the journey to the promised future, was already outdated.

NOTES

- 1 Jovan Živanović, *Čudna devojka*, DVD Delta Video (1962; Belgrade: Avala film, 2006).
- 2 Branko Petranović, *Izgradnja socijalizma u Jugoslaviji 1945-1963* (Beograd: Centar za ideološko-političko obrazovanje, 1963).
- 3 Džon R. Lempi, *Jugoslavija kao istorija: bila dvaput jedna zemlja*, trans. Milovan Jauković (Beograd: Dan Graf, 2004), 208.
- 4 Холм Зундхаусен, *Историја Србије од 19. до 21. века*, trans. Томислав Бекчић (Београд: Слио, 2009), 382.
- 5 Petranović, *Izgradnja socijalizma u Jugoslaviji 1945-1963*.
- 6 Зундхаусен, 379.
- 7 Ibid., 377.
- 8 Ernest Renan, *Qu'est ce qu'une nation?* (Paris: Calmann-Levy, 1882), 88, quoted in: Ibid., 373.
- 9 See: Benedict Anderson, *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism* (London, New York: Verso, 1991).
- 10 Suzan Bak-Mors, *Svet snova i katastrofa: Nestanak masovne utopije na istoku i zapadu*, trans. Aleksandra Kostić (Beograd: Beogradski krug, 2005).

- 11 Giulio Carlo Argan, „Umjetničko i estetsko,“ in *Studije o modernoj umetnosti*, ed. Ješa Denegri (Beograd: Nolit, 1982): 251-264, 264.
- 12 V kongres Kомунистичке партије Југославије, Извештаји. Реферати (Београд: Култура, 1948).
- 13 Lempi, 221.
- 14 Ibid.; Зундхаусен; Стеван К. Павловић, Србија историја из имена, trans. Ивана Казикаловић-Павловић (Београд: Clio, 2004)
- 15 Dennison Rusinow, *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, for the Royal Institute of International Affairs, London, 1977).
- 16 Зундхаусен, 386.
- 17 Dušan Bošković, *Estetika u okruženju: sporovi o marksističkoj estetici i književnoj kritici u srpsko-hrvatskoj periodici od 1944. do 1972. godine* (Beograd: Institut za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju “Filip Višnjić”, 2003), 100.
- 18 Milovan Đilas, *Unperfect Society: Beyond the New Class* (New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc, 1969), quoted in: Rusinow, 51.
- 19 Petranović, *Izgradnja socijalizma u Jugoslaviji 1945-1963.*; Lempi; Endru Baruh Vahtel, *Stvaranje nacije, razaranje nacije: književnost i kulturna politika u Jugoslaviji*, trans. Ivan Radosavljević (Beograd: Stubovi kulture, 2001).
- 20 Rusinow, 48.
- 21 Ibid., 52.
- 22 Aleksandar Ignjatović, ”Tranzicija i reforme: arhitektura u Srbiji 1952-1980,” in *Istorija umetnosti u Srbiji XX vek. Realizmi i modernizmi oko Hladnog rata*, ed. Miško Šuvaković (Beograd: OrionArt, Katedra za muzikologiju Fakulteta muzičke umetnosti, 2012): 689-710, 691. See: Reinhart Koselleck, “‘Space of Experience’ and ‘Horizon of Expectation’: Two Historical Categories,” in *Future’s Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, (New York: Columbia University Press, 2004): 255-275.
- 23 Luj Altiser, *Ideologija i državni ideološki aparati*, trans. Andrija Filipović (Loznica: Karpos, 2009), 49, 50. Althusser interprets Marx and Engels (Friedrich Engels) statements published in their work *Die Deutsche Ideologie*, written 1845-1846 and translated as *The German Ideology*. See: Karl Marx, Friedrich Engels, *Nemačka ideologija: kritika najnovije nemačke filozofije u licu njenih predstavnika Foerbacha, B. Bauera i Štrintera i nemačkog socijalizma u njegovim različitim prorocima I, II* (Beograd: Kultura, 1964).
- 24 Altiser; Slavoj Žižek, *The Sublime Object of Ideology* (London, New York: Verso, 1999); Slavoj Žižek, “The Spectre of Ideology,” in *Mapping Ideology*, (London, New York: Verso, 1995): 1-33.
- 25 Petar Volk, *Istorija jugoslovenskog filma* (Beograd: Institut za film i Partizanska knjiga, 1986).
- 26 Aleksandar Vučo, “Naša mlada filmska proizvodnja,” *Film* (Beograd), no. 1 (1946): 1-5, 2.
- 27 Ibid., 4.
- 28 Darko Tadić, *Propagandni film* (Beograd: SpektrumBooks, 2009).
- 29 Vicko Raspor, “Problemi naše filmske umjetnosti i zadaci filmskih radnika Jugoslavije,” *Filmska kultura* (Beograd), no. 1, (1950): 1-14, 5.
- 30 Ibid., 6.
- 31 See: “Данас се одржава конгрес Савеза композитора ФНРЈ,” Политика, Фебруар 12, 1950: 5.; “Други дан заседања основачког конгреса Савеза репродуктивних музичких уметника Југославије,” Политика, Април 24, 1950: 4.; “Пуна стваралачка слобода омогућиће истински успех наше ликовне уметности,” Политика, Мај 7, 1950: 4.; “Rezolucija Drugog kongresa Saveza likovnih umjetnika Jugoslavije,” *Umetnost* (Beograd), no. 2 (1950): 79.
- 32 Miroslav Krleža, “Govor na Kongresu književnika u Ljubljani,” *Republika*, no. 10,11 (1952): 205-243; Miroslav Krleža, *Govor na Kongresu književnika u Ljubljani* (Zagreb: Državno izdavačko preduzeća Hrvatske, 1952).

- 33 Raspor, 2.
- 34 Ignjatović, 691.
- 35 Mirko Bošnjak, "Činjenice i fikcije," *Filmska kultura* (Zagreb), no. 63,64 (1968): 5-9, 8.
- 36 Ratko Božović cited in: Branko Petranović, *Istorija Jugoslavije, knjiga III – Socijalistička Jugoslavija 1955-1988*, (Beograd: Nolit, 1981), 318.
- 37 Slobodan Novaković, "Kuda posle Pule?," *Filmska kultura* (Zagreb), no. 57, 58 (1967): 1-12, 9.
- 38 Ibid.
- 39 Bogdan Tirnanić, et. al., "Dvadeseta godina jugoslavenskog filma," *Filmska kultura* (Zagreb), no. 46, 47 (1965): 61-124, 113.
- 40 Volk, 182.
- 41 Mira Boglić, "Geografija u kinematografiji," *Filmska kultura* (Zagreb), no. 61 (1968): 17-24, 20.
- 42 Volk, 181.
- 43 Hrvoje Lisinski, "Čudna devojka," *Filmska kultura* (Zagreb), no. 27 (1962): 75-77, 75.
- 44 Peter Selem, "Za estetski kriterij," *Filmska kultura* (Zagreb), no. 28 (1962): 59-61, 61. Selem is speaking of Jerzy Kawalerowicz, Jerzy Passendorfer, Alain Resnais, Jean-Luc Godard.
- 45 Tirnanić, 113.
- 46 Lisinski, 75.
- 47 Momčilo Ilić, ed., *Filmografija jugoslovenskog filma 1945-1965* (Beograd: Institut za film, 1970), 231.
- 48 Živanović gave this statement in the documentary У свету тајни (2000) directed by Pablo Fero Živanović, quoted in: Ljiljana Bogoeva Sedlar, "European Shakespeare on Film: Jovan Živanović, *How Romeo and Juliet Loved*," *Facta Universitatis* (Niš), no. 9 (2002): 269-280.
- 49 See: Lisinski.
- 50 Mira Boglić, "Putovanje u neizvjesnost: od mita do subjekta (1969)," in *Mit i antimit: povjesno kritičke bilješke o jugoslavenskom filmu*, (Zagreb: Spektar, 1980): 121-126, 124.
- 51 Ibid.
- 52 Bogoeva Sedlar, 271.
- 53 Љиљана Благојевић, "Стратегије модернизма у планирању и пројектовању урбане структуре и архитектуре Новог Београда: период концептуалне фазе од 1922. до 1962. године" (PhD diss., University of Belgrade, 2004).
- 54 Radina Vučetić, *Koka-kola socijalizam: Amerikanizacija jugoslovenske popularne kulture šezdesetih godina XX veka* (Beograd: Službeni glasnik, 2012).
- 55 Ibid., 16.
- 56 Bratislav Stojanović, "Urbanizam," in *Beograd 1945-1975: urbanizam arhitektura*, ed. Bratislav Stojanović, Uroš Martinović, (Beograd: Tehnička knjiga, 1978): 9-103, 82.
- 57 Uroš Martinović, "Arhitektura: autori i ostvarenja," in Ibid., 105-247, 115.
- 58 See: Благојевић.
- 59 "Закон о Петогодишњем плану развјатка народне привреде ФНРЈ у годинама 1947-1951", *Борба*, Мај 1, 1947: 13-19.; "Закон о Петогодишњем плану развјатка народне привреде ФНРЈ у годинама 1947-1951", *Службени лист ФНРЈ*, no. 36 (1947).
- 60 See: Благојевић.
- 61 Бранко Петричић, "Прве урбанистичке реализације, Нови Београд 1955-1975," *Годишњак града Београда*, Vol. XXII (1975): 219-233, 223.
- 62 Благојевић, 1.

- 63 Vladimir Kulić, "Land of the In-Between: Modern Architecture And The State In Socialist Yugoslavia, 1945-65" (PhD diss., University of Texas, 2009).
- 64 Михајло Митровић, *Новија архитектура Београда* (Београд: Југославија, 1975).
- 65 Željko Škalamera, "Područje Novog Beograda na istorijskim planovima," *Urbanizam Beograda* (Beograd), 5(25) (1973): 37-40, quoted in: Благојевић, 13.
- 66 Kulić, 137.
- 67 Благојевић, 39.
- 68 Ignjatović, 699.
- 69 Ibid.
- 70 Grozdana Olujić, *Izlet u nebo* (Sarajevo: Narodna prosvjeta, 1958).
- 71 Ibid., quoted in: Зоран Радисављевић, "Цензура романа Гроздане Олујић," Политика, Мај 19, 2010, accessed February 5, 2015, <http://www.politika.rs/scc/clanak/135372/Култура/Цензура-романа-Гроздане-Олујић>.
- 72 Зорана Опачић, "Одрицање од правила у име унутарње слободе у романима Гроздане Олујић: поетика омладинског романа," Зборник Матице српске за књижевност и језик (Нови Сад), Vol. 57. no.3 (2009): 591-611.
- 73 See: Радисављевић.
- 74 Branka Doknić, *Kulturna politika Jugoslavije 1946-1963* (Beograd: Službeni glasnik, 2013).
- 75 "Nagrade na IX festivalu jugoslavenskog filma," *Filmska kultura* (Zagreb), no. 29, 30 (1962): 102-103, 103.
- 76 Slobodan Novaković, "Jedno neslaganje sa 'neslaganjima' (ispravka)," *Filmska kultura* (Zagreb), no. 31 (1962): 71-72, 72.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Altiser, Luj. Translated by: Andrija Filipović. *Ideologija i državni ideološki aparati*. Loznica: Karpas, 2009.
- Anderson, Benedict. *Imagined Communities: Reflections on the Origin and Spread of Nationalism*. London, New York: Verso, 1991.
- Argan, Giulio Carlo. "Umjetničko i estetsko." In *Studije o modernoj umetnosti*, edited by Ješa Denegri, 251-264. Beograd: Nolit, 1982.
- Bak-Mors, Suzan. Translated by: Aleksandra Kostić. *Svet snova i katastrofa: Nestanak masovne utopije na istoku i zapadu*. Beograd: Beogradski krug, 2005.
- Boglić, Mira. "Geografija u kinematografiji," *Filmska kultura* (Zagreb), no. 61 (1968): 17-24.
- Boglić, Mira. "Putovanje u neizvesnost: od mita do subjekta (1969)." In *Mit i antimit: povjesno kritičke bilješke o jugoslavenskom filmu*, 121-126. Zagreb: Spektar, 1980.
- Bogoeva Sedlar, Ljiljana. "European Shakespeare on Film: Jovan Živanović, *How Romeo and Juliet Loved*," *Facta Universitatis* (Niš), no. 9 (2002): 269-280.
- Bošković, Dušan. *Estetika u okruženju: sporovi o marksističkoj estetici i književnoj kritici u srpsko-hrvatskoj periodici od 1944. do 1972. godine*. Beograd: Institut za filozofiju i društvenu teoriju "Filip Višnjić", 2003.

- Bošnjak, Mirko. "Činjenice i fikcije," *Filmska kultura* (Zagreb), no. 63, 64 (1968): 5-9.
- Doknić, Branka. *Kulturna politika Jugoslavije 1946-1963*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik, 2013.
- Đilas, Milovan. *Unperfect Society: Beyond the New Class*. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World, Inc, 1969.
- Ignjatović, Aleksandar. "Tranzicija i reforme: arhitektura u Srbiji 1952-1980." In *Istorija umetnosti u Srbiji XX vek. Realizmi i modernizmi oko Hladnog rata*, Edited by Miško Šuvaković, 689-710. Beograd: Orion Art, Katedra za muzikologiju Fakulteta muzičke umetnosti, 2012.
- Ilić, Momčilo, ed. *Filmografija jugoslovenskog filma 1945-1965*. Beograd: Institut za film, 1970.
- Koselleck, Reinhart. "'Space of Experience' and 'Horizon of Expectation': Two Historical Categories." In *Future's Past: On the Semantics of Historical Time*, 255-275. New York: Columbia University Press, 2004.
- Krleža, Miroslav. "Govor na Kongresu književnika u Ljubljani," *Republika* (Zagreb), no. 10, 11 (1952): 205-243.
- Krleža, Miroslav. *Govor na Kongresu književnika u Ljubljani*. Zagreb: Državno izdavačko preduzeća Hrvatske, 1952.
- Kulić, Vladimir. "Land of the In-Between: Modern Architecture And The State In Socialist Yugoslavia, 1945-65." PhD diss., University of Texas, 2009.
- Lempi, Džon R. Translated by: Milovan Jauković. *Jugoslavija kao istorija: bila dvaput jedna zemlja*. Beograd: Dan Graf, 2004.
- Lisinski, Hrvoje. "Čudna devojka," *Filmska kultura* (Zagreb), no. 27 (1962): 75-77.
- Martinović, Uroš. "Arhitektura: autori i ostvarenja." In *Beograd 1945-1975: urbanizam arhitektura*, Edited by Bratislav Stojanović, Uroš Martinović, 105-247. Beograd: Tehnička knjiga, 1978.
- Marx, Karl, and Friedrich Engels. *Nemačka ideologija: kritika najnovije nemačke filozofije u licu njenih predstavnika Fojebraha, B. Bauera i Štrintera i nemačkog socijalizma u njegovim različitim prorocima I, II*. Beograd: Kultura, 1964.
- "Nagrade na IX festivalu jugoslavenskog filma," *Filmska kultura* (Zagreb), no. 29, 30 (1962): 102-103.
- Novaković, Slobodan. "Jedno neslaganje sa 'neslaganjima' (ispravka)," *Filmska kultura* (Zagreb), no. 31 (1962): 71-72.
- Novaković, Slobodan. "Kuda posle Pule?," *Filmska kultura* (Zagreb), no. 57, 58 (1967): 1-12.
- Olujčić, Grozdana. *Izlet u nebo*. Sarajevo: Narodna prosvjeta, 1958.
- Petranović, Branko. *Istorija Jugoslavije, knjiga III – Socijalistička Jugoslavija 1955-1988*. Beograd: Nolit, 1981.
- Petranović, Branko. *Izgradnja socijalizma u Jugoslaviji 1945-1963*. Beograd: Centar za ideološko-političko obrazovanje, 1963.
- Raspor, Vicko. "Problemi naše filmske umjetnosti i zadaci filmskih radnika Jugoslavije," *Filmska kultura* (Beograd), no. 1 (1950): 1-14.
- Renan, Ernest. *Qu'est ce qu'une nation?* Paris: Calmann-Levy, 1882.
- "Rezolucija Drugog kongresa Saveza likovnih umjetnika Jugoslavije." *Umetnost* (Beograd), no. 2 (1950): 79.
- Rusinow, Dennison. *The Yugoslav Experiment 1948-1974*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, for the Royal Institute of International Affairs, London, 1977.
- Selem, Peter. "Za estetski kriterij," *Filmska kultura* (Zagreb), no. 28 (1962): 59-61.
- Stojanović, Bratislav. "Urbanizam." In *Beograd 1945-1975: urbanizam arhitektura*, Edited by Bratislav Stojanović, Uroš Martinović, 9-103. Beograd: Tehnička knjiga, 1978.

- Škalamera, Željko. "Područje Novog Beograda na istorijskim planovima," *Urbanizam Beograda* (Beograd), 5(25) (1973): 37-40.
- Tadić, Darko. *Propagandni film*. Beograd: Spektrum Books, 2009.
- Tirnanić, Bogdan et. al. "Dvadeseta godina jugoslavenskog filma," *Filmska kultura* (Zagreb), no. 46, 47 (1965): 61-124.
- Vahel, Endru Baruh. Translated by: Ivan Radosavljević. *Stvaranje nacije, razaranje nacije: književnost i kulturna politika u Jugoslaviji*. Beograd: Stubovi kulture, 2001.
- Volk, Petar. *Istorija jugoslovenskog filma*. Beograd: Institut za film i Partizanska knjiga, 1986.
- Vučetić, Radina. *Koka-kola socijalizam: Amerikanizacija jugoslovenske popularne kulture šezdesetih godina XX veka*. Beograd: Službeni glasnik, 2012.
- Vučo, Aleksandar. "Naša mlada filmska proizvodnja," *Film* (Beograd), no. 1 (1946): 1-5.
- Živanović, Jovan. *Čudna devojka*. DVD. Belgrade: Delta Video. 1962; Belgrade: Avala film, 2006.
- Žižek, Slavoj. "The Spectre of Ideology." In *Mapping Ideology*, 1-33. London, New York: Verso, 1995.
- Žižek, Slavoj. *The Sublime Object of Ideology*. London, New York: Verso, 1999.
- Živanović, Jovan, dir. *Čudna devojka*. 1962, FNRI; Belgrade, RS: Delta Video, 2006. DVD.
- Благојевић, Љиљана. "Стратегије модернизма у планирању и пројектовању урбане структуре и архитектуре Новог Београда: период концептуалне фазе од 1922. до 1962. године." PhD diss., University of Belgrade, 2004.
- "Данас се одржава конгрес Савеза композитора ФНРЈ." Политика, Фебруар 12, 1950: 5.
- "Други дан заседања основачког конгреса Савеза репродуктивних музичких уметника Југославије." Политика, Април 24, 1950: 4.
- "Закон о Петогодишњем плану развита народне привреде ФНРЈ у годинама 1947-1951." *Борба*, Мај 1, 1947: 13-19.
- "Закон о Петогодишњем плану развита народне привреде ФНРЈ у годинама 1947-1951", *Службени лист ФНРЈ*, no. 36 (1947).
- Зундхаусен, Холм. Translated by: Томислав Бекчић. *Историја Србије од 19. до 21. века*. Београд: Clío, 2009.
- Митровић, Михајло. *Новија архитектура Београда*. Београд: Југославија, 1975.
- Опачић, Зорана. "Одрицање од правила у име унутарње слободе у романима Гроздане Олујић: поетика оmlадинског романа," *Зборник Матице српске за књижевност и језик* (Нови Сад), Vol. 57. no. 3 (2009): 591-611.
- Павловић, Стеван К. Translated by: Ивана Казикаловић-Павловић. *Србија историја иза имена*. Београд: Clío, 2004.
- Петричић, Бранко. "Прве урбанистичке реализације, Нови Београд 1955-1975," *Годишњак града Београда*, Vol. XXII (1975): 219-233.
- "Пуна стваралачка слобода омогућиће истински успех наше ликовне уметности." Политика, Мај 7, 1950: 4.
- Радисављевић, Зоран. "Цензура романа Гроздане Олујић." Политика, Мај 19, 2010. Accessed February 5, 2015. <http://www.politika.rs/scc/clanak/135372/Култура/Цензура-романа-Гроздане-Олујић>.
- V конгрес Комунистичке партије Југославије.Извештаји. Реферати. Београд: Култура, 1948.

FILOZOFSKA PLATFORMA ARHITEKTE. ZAŠTO FILOZOFI CRTAJU TAKO DOBRE CRTEŽE?

Snežana Vesnić

Teorijska tumačenja i praktični pokušaji instrumentalizacije veze i razmene između filozofije i arhitekture uglavnom su usmereni na pitanja jezika ili na institucionalizaciju discipline arhitekture. U ovom tekstu predlažem jedan drugačiji pristup angažovanja filozofije u arhitekturi: istovremenom upotrebom u metodologiji arhitektonskog projekta i konstituisanju filozofije arhitekta, kao integralni deo potpunih arhitektonskih procesa, pri čemu filozofija zadržava svu svoju izvornu autentičnost. Moj pristup je dvostruk: objašnjava samu metodologiju pristupa i iscrta svoj okvir, ali i postavlja pitanje “šta je filozofska platforma arhitekta”. U tu svrhu ću pokušati da izgradim tri modela: 1) prvi model delimično zalazi u polja fikcije i iluzije, i to je model u kome arhitekta preuzima ulogu (poziciju) filozofa, 2) drugi model je arhitektonsko angažovanje filozofskih pojmova i, 3) treći, upotreba filozofskih koncepata u kreiranju arhitektonskih koncepata. Naspram sva tri, predložiću *aktivnost* “ponavljanja razlike” kao mogućnost stvaranja autentičnog arhitektonskog koncepta.

KLJUČNE REČI: KONCEPT, ARHITEKTURA, RAZLIKA, FILOZOFIJA, PLATFORMA

ZAMIŠLJENI GRAD: REPREZENTACIJA JUGOSLOVENSTVA U FILMU ČUDNA DEVOJKA (1962) JOVANA ŽIVANOVIĆA

Tatjana Karabegović

Interpretacija gradova na filmu u društvenom (filmskom) kontekstu nije *mimesis*, već model u proizvodnji značenja koji funkcioniše na osnovu znakova organizovanih u vizuelni jezik. Kako su značenja proizvedena unutar kulture i istorije, gradovi na filmu su proizvodi društvenog (politički motivisanog) znanja, jezičke strukture, otvoreni tekstovi u društvenom i kulturnom polju koji, posredstvom moći, tj. produktivnom mrežom koja prožima društvo, zastupaju određeni sistem vrednosti i, kao jedan u sistemu političkih, kulturalnih, naučnih, umetničkih tekstova, režima iskazivosti društvenih identiteta, formiraju *arheologiju znanja*. Tumačenje interpretacija gradova na filmu sa stanovišta studija kulture pokazuje da konfiguracije gradova (moderne arhitekture) van njihovih fenomenologija nisu konfrontirane uobičajenim postavkama binarnih opozicija na kojima je većina njihovih interpretativnih tradicija i zasnovana, već da služe ostvarenju određenih kulturnih uloga i da su otvorena semiotička polja kojima jedna zajednica proizvodi poželjnu (pokretnu) sliku o sebi.

KLJUČNE REČI: GRAD, MODERNA ARHITEKTURA, URBANA KULTURA, REPREZENTACIJA, FILM, IDEOLOGIJA, IDENTITET, JUGOSLOVENSTVO

hibridnost u i izvan arhitekture: liminalno stanje Ivana Jevremović

Fokus istraživanja je na hibridima i hibridnosti, sa akcentom na njihovom liminalnom karakteru i programskoj i formalnoj ne-konačnosti. Ovaj rad daje uvid u istraživanje sprovedeno za potrebe izrade doktorske disertacije i predstavlja granični teorijski okvir za diskusiju i definisanje hibridnosti u arhitektonskoj teoriji i praksi. Hibridnost se raspravlja kroz društveno-humanistički diskurs i arhitektonsku teoriju u kontekstu kulture i arhitekture. Rad predstavlja hibrid kao stanje koje se može posmatrati kroz koncept liminalnosti i konstantne promene nasuprot konačnosti bilo koje vrste. U tom kontekstu, cilj rada je da se hibridnost problematizuje i pozicionira u savremenom arhitektonskom diskursu, a na osnovu etimoloških i konotativnih odlika ustanovljenih kroz dodirne discipline iz oblasti društveno-humanističkih nauka.

KLJUČNE REČI: hibrid; hibridnost; liminalnost; kultura; transkultura; arhitektura