

ARCHITECTURE AS *CULTURAL* PRACTICE

A B S T R A C T

In this study my intention is to interpret the “discursive” and the “ideological” differences between the architecture of post-modernism and the architecture of globalism. I will point to the paradigmatic differences between these practices and also to some specific “local examples” of execution of social quality by means of architecture being the “cultural instrument” of actualities realization. This study was written by interdisciplinary methodology of cultural studies based on Fuko’s discursive analysis and Altizer’s ideological analysis of the architectural productions.

In the study that follows I will be discussing the models of contemporary architecture in relation to culture, society and politics. I will prove that the “historical models of architecture” have to be open¹ to debate, and that debate has to be free of the “traps of anecdotic narratives” and, thereby, theorized as critical and analytical discourse. That means that in rather specific conditions of the transition culture and social quality I will try to derive “hard” theories of the architecture, culture, society and politics as the material *theoretical practices*:

There is a practice of the theory. Theory is a specific practice which is carried out on a certain object and results in one’s own *product*; a *cognition*. Perceived in itself, each theoretical work presumes, therefore, the originally given substance and the *production means* (“theoretical” concepts and the manner of their utilization: a method)².

The notions “post-modern architecture”, “the architecture at the times of theory”, “the architecture of globalism” and the notion “transition architecture” are not the notions of the same order and type.

The notion “post-modern architecture” is a type of an open style or style-like determination of the architectural works in the western history of contemporary architecture. Post-modern architecture has emerged after the modern architecture and therefore belongs to the chronological order of style modifications. The notion “architecture at the times of theory” is an uncertain theoretical structure for identification of the late or borderline post-modern architectural practices which indicatively post-poetically refer to the structuralist and post-structuralist philosophical or social theories. It concerns the application of the philosophical or theoretical structures in establishing the references of architectural design or architectural work with the “themes” from contemporary philosophy and social theory. The notion “architecture of globalism” is some kind of cultural or ideological determination of architectural practices following the end of the cold war and forgoing the cultural policies of aesthetic pluralism in the name of the global synthesizing productions.³ The notion of “architecture of globalism” does not have a single-meaning style pattern, even though various style and quasi-style models have been joined into unique and integrative *architectural discourse* of “*world architecture*” – in other words, the local production or hybrid-style productions acquire a unifying expression of the global perceptability and “planetary unified universality”. Transitional architecture is a cultural social form of the “architecture of globalism” which is, first of all, linked to post-socialist European societies which in the political, economic, social and cultural sense are transformed from the socialist society,

for example self-management society, into market-oriented neo-liberal or liberal-bourgeois-national societies. These differences are essential and provide the orientation for further debate.

ARCHITECTURE OF POST-MODERNISM

The term post-modern was derived by Joseph Hudnut while writing about *post-modern* house (1940) and Nikolaus Pevsner, who, in his paper *Architecture in our Time, Anti-Pioneers* (1966) outlined the criticism of architects modernists who did not fit into the grand and canonical meta-story of modernism. Anticipations of the architecture of postmodernism can be considered to be the atypical, regional, anomalous, multiple-meaning, non-canonical and inconsistent examples of the modernist architecture: *The House of Majolica* by Otto Wagner in Vienna (1889-1899), the architectural works of Anthony Gaudi in Barcelona in the first decade of the twentieth century, *The Building of Goldman and Salatsch*, by Adolf Loos in Vienna (1910-1911), the *Einstein's Tower* by Eric Mendelsohn in Potsdam (1917-1921), the villa of Ludwig Wittgenstein in Vienna (1929), but also the villa on the cascades for Edgar J. Kaufmann in Bear Run in Pennsylvania (1935-1939) by Frank Lloyd Wright.

The architecture of postmodernism or post-modern architecture was derived as a determinant in the papers of the architect Robert Stern⁴ and the historian of architecture Charles Jencks⁵ around the year 1975. Stern and Jencks, each one of them in his own way, have with this term pointed out to the aesthetic, poetical, technological and cultural criticism of rationality, functionalism and universalism of the highly modernistic architecture of the international industrial capitalism. Stern and Jencks have taken the term post-modern from the literature and applied it to architecture. By establishing the concept of post-modern architecture the notions post-modern and post-modernism were in wider use and have become determining for the new eclectic and post-historical epoch following the modern one. Jenck's notion of post-modern architecture denotes:

the criticism of the modernistic elitism and advocacy for post-modern populism, namely, for relativizing of the limits of the high class and popular culture, visual arts and architecture.

the criticism of the modernistic historicism based on the ideas on the permanent *puristic* development or progress of architecture and the society, namely, indicating to post-historic and eclectic character of the post-modern architecture.

the criticism of the highly modernistic canonical unambiguousness in the name of advocacy for pluralism of functions, meanings and target user

groups, i.e. each post-modern building is at least double coded and that means that it is ambiguous (has multiple-meanings) and that it was meant for the different social classes.

In his book *The Language of Post-Modern Architecture* (1977), Jencks pointed out to the examples of anticipation of the post-modern in evocation of historical form-related architectural practices (Paolo Portoghesi, Berthold Lubetkin, Robert Venturi) in the fifties and the sixties. Also, the post-modern is characterized by the unusual metaphysics and metaphoric use of materials and forms (Charles W. Moore, Minoru Takejama, Stanley Tigerman, Federigo Zuccaro, Charles Jencks). The works of Peter Eisenman, Robert Stern and John Hagemann also present the post-modern building constructions.

Parallel to these determinants and criteria of the post-modernity, Kenneth Frampton develops the concept of the critical regionalism and retrograde:

Today, architecture can be supported as a critical practice only if it takes the position of *retrograde* (*arrière-garde*), namely, if it distances itself to the equal extent from the enlightening myth of progress and from the reactionary, unrealistic impulse of reversing to the architectural form of the pre-industrial past.⁶

The first task for the post-modern architecture is therefore the deconstruction of the “international universal culture”, and the second task is the criticism, based on the synthesis of contradictions and the universality of the centric civilization. Frampton’s theoretical requirement in a concrete sense meant the criticism of the pure visuality based on metaphysics of the optical geometric perspective, and entering the region of complexity and multiple-meaning of the sense perception, for example, of the relation of visuality and tactility. On the other part, he was interested in the effects of the real resistance put up by a specific place-locality to the universal and hegemonic tactics of the modernistic practice by means of which the specific aspects of the concrete geographic “topos”-place are annulled.

According to Heinrich Klotz, the canonical highly modernistic architecture (Gropius, Le Corbusier) was oriented towards rejection of the autonomy of architecture and politically motivated synthesis of architecture and life. The synthesis of the art and life resulted in the reduction of the “immanent architectural fictionalities” to the literalness of presentations of the elements in architecture. According to him:

The history of modern architecture is the process of narrowing down the pluralistic abundance of meanings in the beginning as far as functionalistic emptiness of meanings in the late modern.⁷

The key break up with the modern, according to Klotz, was made by Robert Venturi with Vanna Venturi's villa in Chestnut Hill in Pennsylvania 1952-1964. Venturi's building is characterized by allusions to the historical construction forms, vagueness of the complex-formal relations, abandoning the distinct elementary geometrical solids. Besides Venturi's works, Klotz discusses the works of Charles Moore, Frank O. Gehry and the SITE (Sculpture in the Environment) group. The buildings by the SITE group realized as shopping malls of BEST corporations (Houston, 1975) are manifest examples of de-articulation of architecture as the functional building (Object) and articulation of architecture as the fictional building (object). Thus the architectural work has been placed as the interpretation and the comment of: the historical, the regional, the archaeological, the integral, the completed or the incomplete, namely falling to pieces. Architecture is a multiple-meaning material-spatial text which happens to the user or the observer in territorialization (enfolding, marking) and deterritorialization (relativization, annulling) of the living environment.

One of the special poetic phenomenon of post-modern architecture – moving of the “architecture” in direction towards the actual “theorizing”- is the de-constructivism in architecture or de-constructive architecture. The notion deconstruction was taken over from the philosophy of Jacques Derride at the moment when the “philosophical and literary deconstruction” have become great trans-national trends in the theory of art and in culture. The trend of deconstruction as cultural paradigm influenced literature, visual arts, sculpture, fashion, clothing and film at the beginning of the eighties of the 20th century.⁸ That was a unique case that an architectural phenomenon is named as the title of the philosophical action or hybrid theoretical movement.⁹ Translation of philosophy into architecture and the architecture into philosophical discourse is the area of relocation, multiple-meaning correspondences of the verbal and the visual, the visual and the spatial, metaphorical and allegorical, the present and the postponed. The difference between the philosophical and the architectural discourse creates an unstable territory open to interpretations:

But if it (meaning architecture) does not represent either theory, or ethics, or politics or narration (“No, no, never again narration“ La Folie du jour), then it gives a place to all that.¹⁰

Execution of anti-essentialism and relativism in respect to great historical canons of space forming and designing, namely, the buildings, namely, the city in the tradition of modernism is characteristic for de-constructivism in architecture. Establishing of relative relations between the marginal and

dominant concepts of the actual architectural forming according to the historical, geographic and class-related systems of buildings is also characteristic.¹¹ In de-constructivism it is the rationalistic functionalism that is made an issue of and the principles of plurality of the arbitrary and de-centered possibilities of expression, presentation and re-shaping, namely, of the cultural appropriation are researched. Deconstructivistic architectural work appears as the open multimedia inter-textual production of the potential living world being the complex map of the non-consistent and de-centered, i.e. paradoxical fragments, quotations, samples or simulacrum which cannot produce enjoyment (meaning Lakan's *jouissance*) as the absolute.¹² The absolute has been challenged as the notion and as the sensual-physical manifestation. In formally-formed sense a deconstructivistic building is a heterogeneously visually compositional unstable order without a real or more often fictional center, with a relative relation of the interior and exterior, namely, gestalt and details. The deconstructivistic architecture is based on relativization of the borderlines between the architectural and the sculptural. The representatives of the deconstructivistic architecture were Frank Gehry, Zaha Hadid, Bernard Tschumi, John Hejduk, Peter Eisenman, Rem Koolhaas. Tschumi's Parc de la Villette in Paris, realized between 1982 and 1990, is the example of the program deconstructivistic work based on destabilization of the "framed" forms, and deferring (*différance*) of semantic effect of the architecture and the criticism of the modernistic certainty of building. Writing about this work, Jacques Derrida indicated that deconstruction was the matter of resistance and opposition to the stable and canonical presuppositions of building, namely constructing, execution, placing and deferring. Tschumi's project Glass Video Gallery from Groningen is a dynamic, transparent building which has the effect of a new media machine. Gehry realized his The Vitra Design Museum in Weil am Rhein in Germany or Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao (1991-1997) as the visual heterogeneous space of de-centered and displaced geometrical forms with the inconsistent relation of the interior and exterior space. Koolhaas executed deconstruction as the procedure of deferring and exposure of the open and arbitrary architectural products which the fictional and literalness of the receptive experience face. The characteristic example of the heterogeneous textualization of the architectural building is Villa dell'Ava in St. Calude in Paris (1991).

The architecture of the late postmodernism more increasingly identified itself with the theories which pointed to the field of immenseness of various architectural productions. These productions were the identifications of the cultural micro- and micro-identities inside globalizing cultures. It could

concern a post-socialistic transitional architecture, post-colonial architecture, regional architecture, globalistic pro-American architecture, queer architecture, etc.

For example, post-socialist architecture (Dimitry Velichkin, Vladimir Tyurin, Attila Kovács, Gábor Bachmna) emerges on the traces of confrontation of soc-realistic, neoclassic, western post-modern and early bourgeois national architecture from the epoch before the communist revolution or occupation. Whereas the western post-modern architecture is eclectic in the sense of stating the style aesthetic architectural samples, the post-socialist architecture of the nineties is eclectic in the sense of stating the ideological models and functions of representation. A characteristic example is the interior and exterior of Terror Háza (2002), the building of the Nazi and communist dictatorship museum , the work of Attila Kovács in Budapest.

THE ARCHITECTURE AT THE TIME OF THEORY

The syntagm of architecture at the time of theory points to the debate on the role and functions of theory, i.e. theoretical interventions and identifications in designing, production, exchange and consumption of the architectural “products”, i.e. construction and execution of the public and private forms of life. Post-structuralistic theories with the variant orientations towards the theory of media, theory of body, theory of view, pragmatism, hermeneutic, psychoanalysis, techno-theory, theory of simulations, the new phenomenology, theory of culture, critical theory or bio-politics start the turn from interpretation of architecture as an empirically centered problem of aesthetic-formal-utilitarian-technical execution of the living space. According to these new heterogeneous approaches, architecture has most often been interpreted as a complex multimedia material practice which is realized by form-shaped events in articulation of the public and private human life. It is in multimedia terms since it is not perceived only as a passive space of taking up residence but as the heterogeneous ideological instruments of constituting the interactive, living and communication public moment and public realities. Architecture is material, not only because the construction material for building is form-shaped, but, primarily, as per determining social practices of planning, execution and building of reality. Architecture is critical because it is structured as a system of problem-oriented events in the complex communication and existential public and cultural situations.¹³ Architecture is an event given that multimedia manifestation of architecture takes part in time intervals of constituting of the individual and collective everyday life. Architecture has not been assigned as

an invariant in the technical sense and as “universality” in the historical and geographical social time, but as a set of variables and first of all interactive parameters within social practices of forming the human life.

Architecture is not an aesthetic and aesthetical idealness derived analogously to the concept of the autonomous modernistic piece of art. Architecture is an instrument and the effect of instrumentalization of constituting post-plural ideologically determinable reality. It is an event of specific critical social practices and positioning of the subjects in the field of distinguishing the subjectivity and rationality. Architecture is a material “symptom” of constituting the public and political (according to Frederic Jameson, Martin Jayu, Slavoj Zizek, Boris Groys), sexual (various Froyds’ and Lacans’ traditions, cultural studies), customary (theorizing of the archaeology of knowledge according to Michael Foucault), technological (according to Jean Baudrillard, Paul Virili, Félix Guattari) or artistic (according to Victor Burgine) discourse. Therefore, architecture is the polygon of establishment of relative cultural positions between the civilization centers and margins (from Derridine’s deconstruction of metaphysics to post-colonial critical studies of Edward Said), but, and, then centering of the global paradigms as criteria of domination of American-West European approximate models of domination of the visible, formed and living.

Post-modernistic theories of architecture, now already with a historical distance, are pointed to as opening up of the post-structuralistic approaches within the social framework which has identified itself as a post historical and post metalingusitic practice. That means that the interpretation of architecture is not made in relation to the continuous and orientated history of modernity development. The interpretation of architecture is made in relation to the different and inconsistent historical and geographical architectural and artistic traces which become referential, both for the post-modern architects (Aldo Rossi, Robert venture, John Hejduk, Bernard Tschumi, Peter Eisenman, Charles A. Jencks, Rem Koolhaas, Michael Graves, Richard Rogers, Renzo Piano, Arata Isozaki), and also for the theoreticians which evoke the phenomenal or textual presentations of architecture within the field of cultural analysis (Georges Bataille, Roland Barthes, Michel Foucault, Jacques Derrida, Félix Guattari, Gilles Deleuze, Jean-Francois Lyotard, Jean Baudrillard, Paul Virilio, Fredric Jameson)¹⁴. Post-modern theory of architecture (Charles Jencks) primarily addresses the soft, the weak and the plural, and that means multiple-meaning and de-centered distinguishing and poetical suggesting of the eclectic citation and collage interpretations of the relative contextuallizations (Aldo Rossi, Michael Graves, Charles Moore) and de-contextuallizations (Frank Gehry,

Zaha Haidid, Daniel Liebeskind) of the architectural work in post-historical, informational-media termed or globalizing society in which the regions, the multicultural, international and nomadic samples paradoxically confront each other (Jacques Derrida, Bernard Tschumi).

Theoretical interpretation is nomadic, which means that it is seen in the continuous relocation or deferring (*différance*) of the standpoint/point of view of the architectural production and theoretical interpretation. Thereby, the theoretical interpretation is not a great metalanguage of syntheses of the new construction canon, as existed with the architects-theoreticians of the modern (Gropius, Le Corbusier, Wright). On the contrary, it concerns a multitude of transient, floating and transitional discourses which simultaneously interpret the questions on architecture and create the atmosphere of architecture in the post-modern technological epoch (Rem Koolhaas, Frank Gehry, Bernard Tschumi, Antoine Predock).

In cultural studies architecture has been placed as an important textual sample for the research, interpretation and production of the possibilities of presentation of micro-public and everyday executions, functions and effects of producing the living space in the global post-industrial and post-block world. The cultural studies move from the macro sociological studies of architecture as a social and historical event of the hegemonic western civilization to the issues on microstructures and micro-constructions of the cultural identities (geographical, racial, ethical, regional, class-oriented, religious, in terms of gender,¹⁵ sexual, generational, etc). Debating the context of architecture, from the room micro cell to the macro-geographical urbanism, one arrives to problematizing of how different cultural identities are constituted, reflected or presented in a specific artificial space. For example, how are ethical or professionally status related, namely gender related individual and micro-collective identities executed in relation to the private or public architectural space (Lynne Breslin, Susan Torre). Also, the cultural studies problematize the conditions of the transfer of geographical architectural identities from one culture to another. The cultural studies are groups of theories which have an interpretative academic function but also the poetic function in architectural creation and also the function of the instrument of the actual globalization politics (Michael Hardt, Antonio Negri).¹⁶

The theories of techno-culture start from the global transformation of the contemporary world by electronic, or to put it metaphorically, digital processing, construction and execution of the new techno-world. The new

artificial techno-world is not a projected metaphor of the future society and its architecture but the very actuality in which a contemporary man lives and acts. That world is the world which through intermediary of the aids (machines, instruments, prostheses) goes from the stage of natural resources treatment to the material products and, thereafter, from the stage of production, distribution, exchange and consumption of information to the constructed world of human being modifications, the *being* which is in *feed-back* relations with the technological systems. In techno-theories, basic ideas are set that the natural world is also a human in terms of media¹⁷ structure or, at least, articulation. Architecture is no longer interpreted as the set of produced buildings but as a system of machines which realize actual and virtual existential reality of the human body which becomes cybernatically integrated into the living space (Gilles Deleuze, Jean Baudrillard, Paul Virilio).¹⁸ The questions are raised on *cyborg*, *the Virtual Reality*, complex electronic-architectural prostheses by means of which the human body becomes elongated in the spatial-time possibilities of existence. As if the techno-theory shows that the historical architecture has become the material for software simulations of the real and fictional existential space.

case study:

MARKET APPROPRIATION OF THE SOCIAL AND IDEOLOGICAL MULTITUDE IN SERBIA

In this paper architecture will be studied as a “symptom” of the changes of perceptions of social relationships in Serbian transitional society as from the fall from the power of Slobodan Milosevic’s regime via globalization-transitional economic expansive practices from the beginning of the global economic crisis of neo-liberalism in the second half of the first decade of this century. Architecture is not interpreted as a collection of “characteristic or great works” within one state, national culture or summary of the national cultures, but as a “symptom” – *fluctuating indicator* – by means of which the manner and modes are shown with the help of which one society visualizes and spatially presents itself by developing its public and private life. Architecture is then a sort of “spectacle” in which social relationship becomes visible. Unlike, for example, Charles Jencks’ concept of “new paradigm in architecture”¹⁹, in transitional societies it does not concern great architectural masterpieces or expensive spectacular openings of the “cultural politics” to the perception by means of the museums, opera houses, theatres, cultural centers, shopping malls, business centers, etc, but through architectural-visual-spatial theatricality of the political, ideological and economic structural changes of the identity of the contemporary citizen.

In Serbian and Yugoslav architecture during the times of self-management socialism, by means of architecture, the social relation of “self-management” and “techno-bureaucratic” sociability of the real socialism became visible, for example, the construction of the residential areas and blocks being a part of upgrading the working class standard of living, namely, by constructing the public spaces the success and power of the socialist public and cultural politics was presented.²⁰ Architecture and urbanism, regardless the individual important works, were the expression of the social entropy and disintegration of the “real socialism” and its public apparatuses in the nineties of the twentieth century.²¹ It concerns the entropy of the “politics of rational urbanism and architecture” and the impossibilities of distinguishing the characters of social quality without referring to the populist and chaotic socialist-nationalistic discourse. The urbanism and architectural chaos of the nineties by all means is the symbol of the contradiction of the society which cannot resolve its conflicts and internal contradictions in a rational and pragmatic manner. The architecture in Serbia after the year 2000 was executed as a discursive, ideological and political historically and geographically determined practice within transitional society. It was based on the development, syntheses or contradictory confrontations of the socialist, global neo-liberal and national-bourgeois market reproduction and production of the individual and collective life situations. The architecture of globalizing transition is spectacular exactly in that way in which Guy Deboard defines spectacle as *the capital* in the phase of accumulation in which it becomes the image.²² Capital-as-architectural image is essentially defined and is guided by the most characteristic architectural realizations after the year 2000, being: shopping malls, business centers, business-residential centers and minor industrial architecture.²³

Architecture as discursive practice is a “visual-spatial speech” or the manifestation of the special social institutions of articulation, production, control and consumption of the living space, namely, the life in the articulated, restricted and executed space. Architectural work or the effects of the architectural work are executed within the public institutions which are established, presented and controlled by the characteristic historical and geographic social shaping of the living forms, knowledge, identity, meaning and value in realization and consumption of the living space and time. Architecture as an institution, discipline, practice or object is a discourse because it constructs visual-spatial and existential individual and collective interpolations and identifications of the historical and geographic society, namely the social subject. For that reason the architecture of today can be discussed as the architecture in the global and transitional postfordism.

According to the contemporary theoretician of politics, Paolo Virno, the crucial determinants of the contemporary society are multitude, work, postfordism and power.²⁴ Virno pointed out to the critical analysis of the fundamental changes in the character of capitalism of the eighties and the nineties of the twentieth century. That change was marked by him as an essential role of multitude and “socialist” character of postfordism: “postfordism is the communism of capital”. Unlike the people, multitude is the plurality which denies political unity and which does not transform the rights into sovereignty, and which resists the submissiveness and does not aspire to the representative democracy. “Multitude”, according to Virno, differs from “mass” in the popular culture, even though that difference nowadays does not seem that clear. Change in the character of work leads to the new forms and relations of the production, exchange and consumption – the turn from the industrial production of the “objects” to rendering of services, but also to the new forms of decision making on the relation which has been regulated by increasingly greater deletion of borderlines between the politics and work. Therefore, the industry of communication, i.e. of the spectacle (cultural industry) is the industry like any other. That which is a novelty is that the industry of communication becomes also the industry of the production of the means of production. Traditional Marxist division into the foundation and superstructure acquires a new character of “innovation” of the mode of communication, perception and event inside public reality. Within such context “urbanism” and “architecture” are not national superstructures of the foundations of the everyday life, but the forms of cultural services and thus the implementation of the cultural politics which now is not the representative of the “superior values” but the *agent* of the very expansive capital and economic requirements in overpowering (controlling) the multitude, i.e transforming the multitude into the mass.

Architecture is an ideological²⁵ practice, because architectural production and consumption are materially instrumental and functional factors of the social and cultural, namely, political and public-law, i.e. economic “reality” of the everyday life of each historical and geographic society, and therefore also the contemporary transitional society in Serbia. Therefore, architecture is not the mimesis of the public reality but an essential instrument of constituting and execution of the public “reality” in its actuality and universality here and now. For example, soc-realistic architecture of the forties and the fifties is not the mimesis of the realized socialist society, the existing and present space in the revolutionary real-socialist societies, but the manner in which real-socialist societies with their institutions presuppose, execute and publicly or privately inhabit the potential or ideal architectural articulated space by means of which

the real-socialist identity of the ruling working class and its advance party, i.e. the communist party, namely, its techno-bureaucracy is “spectacularly interpreted” and identified with all the optimal projections and projects.

The paradox of the socialist realism and therefrom developed “socialist estheticism”²⁶ lies in the fact that the “social public space”, the place where the center of the social quality and public decision making is placed, is relocated from the everyday life into the “closed protocol-related space” of the bureaucratic institutions – for example, the Trade Union building in Belgrade, The Federal Executive Council building or the Social Political Organizations building (the Central Committee building). All these buildings construct the closed inner spaces of the bureaucratic representation of the working class which has somehow been removed from the actual implementation of politics even though mentioned and referenced. With humanization of the socialist realism – the implementation of the politics of “Marxism with a human face” – in the political turnover from the real socialism to the self-management socialism there came to the “controlled opening up of the institutions for the people” (for example, the Fair grounds complex, The Airport “Belgrade” building, departments stores in larger cities²⁷ the top-line of which was the Department store in “Beogradjanka” high rise, the Cultural Center “Sava Center”) and execution of the “humanized” and “modern” everyday life in the urbanized residential areas and blocks (New Belgrade blocks, satellite residential areas around Belgrade).

On the contrary, the ideologies of the transitional globalism are orientated towards the open but economically controlled, supervised and managed space, first of all: the business centers and shopping malls²⁸ (Ušće shopping mall, Ušće (former Central Committee building) Business center, etc). Ušće Business center emerged by symbolic transformation of the destroyed building of the Social Political organizations building (the Central Committee building) during NATO air strikes. The reconstruction was carried out by the *European Construction 2005* team. Here it is almost symbolically observed in which way capitalism in the period of transition “absorbed” and transformed the architectural symbols of the real and self-management socialism epoch.

In all these potential possibilities of execution of the architectural context of life in Serbia, it was the explicit ideology of execution of position finding for the individual as a social subject in real socialism, in self-management socialism and in transitional global society that was addressed. The individual who becomes the subject²⁹ of socialism or transitional globalism, i.e. neo-

liberal capitalism, is guided by subordination of the *Subject-Master*. *Subject-Master* was the Party and its management/leader in socialism, and in modern capitalism *Subject-Master* is a non-personalized topology of power-capital. Therefore, *Subject-Master* is not the direct “personality” from life, but the *Subject* mediated by bureaucratic and technocratic apparatuses, practices and representatives-agents of execution of life itself in given conditions and circumstances.

By means of architecture, for example, the shopping mall (Merkator, Tempo, Ušće, Delta City, Rodić) comes to confrontation and recognition between the individual who becomes the subject and the *Subject-Master* which provides the protocols of behavior for the originating subject. For example, the trade union delegate used to come to the Trade Union building as the representative of its working and union unit, and a buyer or a “window-shopper” comes to the shopping mall as a potential and realized consumer in circulation of commodities, information and money, i.e. “digitalized values”. In such framework the ideology is a set of manifestations, images, meanings and symbolic values. These *images* guarantee to the individual that in such space he would act in the right manner and perform his existence as the subject of socialism or capitalism in the expected and “the correct manner” and affirm the function and the concept of the “architectural space” he comes into. The ideology is not explicitly expressed, but is designed by the external manifested appearance of the institution, and which means by its architecture which motivates realization of the individual as the subject in relation to *Subject-Master*. Architecture is the instrumental part of such motivational process and its *objectivizations into reality* of human life. A good example is the comparison between the Avala TV tower (1965) and the PINK television building (2000) - the difference is pointed out between the state real socialist and private neo-liberal construction and marking of the “public identity”.

The architecture of neo-liberalism is open and, often contradictory architectural-political platform by means of which the concept and horizon of action and affectivity of the economic liberalism has been made spectacular. The economic liberalism is founded on the instruments of encouragement of the continuous and expansive economic development, and provision of the political and individual human freedoms in the market-oriented system being the basic social system. The architecture of neo-liberalism is doubly market orientated: it is the expression of the *market-oriented general intellect* and its spaces are the spaces of the market protocols. The linguistic game in differentiating “residential” building from the times of socialism and the

“apartment” building from transitional global capitalism indicates two completely different levels of ownership: the flat in socialism was social ownership which was granted for use, the apartment in neo-liberal capitalism is private ownership which one owns or rents. If this concept is intensified to the pragmatic extreme, it can be stated that “the flat in socialism was occupied by the family” involving the belief on generations-long occupation of the *habitat*, and that the apartment is rented by an individual in some limited period of his professional life. Therefore, in neo-liberal architecture, a “doctrine” is set, quite different from the modernistic utopism of workers’ flats, for example, Gropius (Walter Gropius) or Le Corbusier, that the market activity and market characterization of architecture is “ethical value in itself and coming from itself”, and thereby the “business ethics” becomes a dominant paradigmatic determinant of other human activities and forms of life in the society.

Neo-liberalism in real-political sense is the *political protocol* on reconstitution and limitation of government competences and powers in relation to the economic requirements of the continuous and expansive market development which is implemented by means of privatization of finances and market globalization. This concept the introduction of which “modestly” started in Serbia during the nineties, and in expansion after the year 2000, experienced the “global crisis” in the second half of the first decade of the twenty-first century. In Serbia the situation of neo-liberalism rise and its global crisis is more complex than in the western countries. In relation to architecture the following have been faced by:

- the traces of architectural socialism and its emancipations by high modernism and post-modernism,
- production of populist populism and aspirations to traditional national architecture,
- arbitrary un-architectural and non-urban solved constructions of the new suburban residential areas with individual construction,
- production and post-production of neo-liberal, globalistic³⁰ expansive architectural and urban execution of public and private spaces with references to the global market.

Therefore, a thesis can be established that the synthetic image of transitional architecture in Serbia, first of all in the cities such as Belgrade, Niš, Novi Sad, Kragujevac, etc. is founded as a hybrid confrontation of different systems of “visibility of construction” in style/iconographic sense and “spectacularization” of the human life from “ghetto: (Roman settlements) via individual construction (the residential areas of the settlers from the war regions during the nineties)

to the distribution of the private capital into individual buildings (post-modern residences with regional or traditionalistic symbolic solutions) and to public business and commercial space which auto-referentially is identified as “neo-liberal” or “capitalistic” or “market-oriented space” (business centers, shopping centers). The exposure to view of the architectural buildings become a hybridized and individualized “code” of users identification and “public micro-ecology” in which the user recognizes himself as the subject of contemporary society. The style “post-modernism” ended exactly with the requirement for globalization and departing from the eclectic and eccentric expression. The last post-modern examples of architectural works are The *Dayton* gas station (architect Mario Jobst) built between 1992 and 1995; as well as the Yugoslav Drama Theatre building (architects Zoran Radojčić, Dejan Miljković) built between 1997 and 2003. Transitional globalism as “style characteristic” started and was developed with numerous buildings such as Radio Television PINK in Belgrade (architect Aleksandar Spajić) completed in 2000, the Belgrade Arena (architect Vlada Slavica) built between 1992 and 2001, NIMAX business and manufacturing center (architects Vladan Nikolić, Mladen Nikolić) built between 2003 and 2005; Delta City shopping mall in Novi Beograd (architect Disraeli Moore Yaski Sivan Architects), completed in 2006, IDEA super retail store in Subotica (architect Jasna M. Živković), realized in 2007, MERCATOR center in Novi Sad (architect Vladimir Koželj) constructed between 2006 and 2007, PORSCHE Beograd North – business service center (architect Goran Vojvodić) Belgrade, 2006-2007, PUTEVI Požega business building (architect Vladan Drndarević) realized in 2007-2008, Hotel Holiday Inn and EXPO XXI hall in Novi Beograd (architect Vladimir Lojanica) constructed between 2005 and 2007, ALBON AGENA company business and production complex in Šimanovci (architects Zoran Bulajić and Katarina Bosnić) constructed between 2006 and 2008, etc.

NOTES

- 1 Michael Baldwin, Charles Harrison and Mel Ramsden, "Art History, Art Criticism and Explanation", *Art History* vol. 4 no. 4, Oxford, December 1981, pp. 432-456.
- 2 Luj Altise, „A. Marksistička teorijska praksa“, u „O materijalističkoj dijalektici – o nejednakosti početka“, iz *Za Marksa*, Nolit, Beograd, 1971, str. 152.
- 3 Luigi Prestinenza Puglisi, *New Directions in Contemporary Architecture: Evolutions and Revolutions in Building Design Since 1988*, John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, West Sussex, 2008.
- 4 Robert Stern, *Architecture on the Edge of Postmodernism: Collected Essays, 1964-1988*, Yale University Press, New Haven, 2009.
- 5 Charles Jencks, *The Language of Post-Modern Architecture*, Rizzoli, New York, 1977.
- 6 Kenneth Frampton, "Towards a Critical Regionalism: Six Points for an Architecture of Resistance", from Foster, H. (ed.), *Post-modern culture*, Pluto Press, London, 1983, p. 20.
- 7 Hajnrih Kloc, *Umetnost u XX veku / moderna - postmoderna - druga moderna*, Svetovi, Novi Sad, 1995, str. 125.
- 8 Peter Brunette, David Wills (eds), *Deconstruction and the Visual Arts - Art, Media, Architecture*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, New York, 1994
- 9 Andreas Papadakis, *Deconstruction*, Rizzoli, New York, 1989.

- 10 Jacques Derrida, "Point de folie – Maintenant l'architecture", iz K. Michael Hays (ed), *Architecture – Theory / since 1968*, The MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 1998, p. 581.
- 11 Peter Eisenman "The End of the Classical: The End of the Beginning, the End of the End" (1984), from K. Michael Hays (ed), *Architecture – Theory / since 1968*, The MIT Press, Cambridge MA, 1998, p. 1984-538.
- 12 Bernard Tschumi, *Architecture and Disjunction*, The MIT Press, Cambridge Ma, 1994.
- 13 Jane Rendell, Jonathan Hill, Mark Dorrian, Murray Fraser (eds), *Critical Architecture*, Routledge, London, 2007.
- 14 Neil Leach (ed), *Rethinking – A Reader in Cultural Theory*, Routledge, London, 1997.
- 15 Manuel Gausa, Vicente Guallart, Willy Müller, Fernando Porras, José Morales, *Metapolis Dictionary of Advanced Architecture: City, Technology and Society in the Information Age*, Actar editorial, 2003
- 16 V. Andermatt Conley (ed), *Rethinking Technologies*, University of Minnesota Press, Minneapolis, London, 1993.
- 17 Charles Jencks, *The New Paradigm in Architecture: The Language of Postmodernism*, Yale University Press, New haven, 2002.
- 18 Ljiljana Blagojević, „Materijalizacija: modernizam upotrebne vrednosti, 1948-1965“ i „Ideologija: moguća tumačenja“, iz *Novi Beograd: osporeni modernizam*, Zavod za Udžbenike, Arhitektonski fakultet, Zavod za zaštitu spomenika kulture grada Beograda, Beograd, 2007, str. 120-193 i 242-251.
- 19 Ljiljana Milić Abramović, „Arhitektura kontradiktornosti konfliktnog, haotičnog društva u tranziciji“, iz *Paralele i kontarsti – Srpska arhitektura 1980-2005*, Muzej primenjene umetnosti, Beograd, 2007, str. 66-85. Guy Debord, "Dovršeno odvajanje", iz *Društvo spektakla & komentari društvu spektakla*, Arkzin doo, Zagreb, 1999, p. 47.
- 20 „Industrijska arhitektura“ (temat), *DaNS* br. 41, Novi Sad, mart 2003, pp. 12-25.
- 21 Paolo Virno, *A Grammar of the Multitude*, Semiotext(e), New York, 2004.
- 22 Luj Altiser, "Ideologija i državni ideološki aparat", *Marksizam u svetu* br. 7-8, Beograd, 1979, p. 77-117.
- 23 Miloš R. Perović, „Arhitektura socijalističkog estetizma“, iz *Srpska arhitektura XX veka – od istoricizma do drugog modernizma*, Arhitektonski fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu, Beograd, 2003, str. 148-209
- 24 Vladimir Mitrović, „Prilog istoriji: arhitekture socijalističkog šopinga / Samoposluga, robna kuća, l buvljak, megamarket“, iz "conQUEST: ARHITEKTURA KUPOVINE", *DaNS* br. 60, Novi Sad, decembar 2007, str. 13-15.
- 25 "conQUEST: ARHITEKTURA KUPOVINE", *DaNS* br. 60, Novi Sad, decembar 2007, str. 4-19.
- 26 Luj Altiser, "Ideologija i državni ideološki aparat", *Marksizam u svetu* br. 7-8, Beograd, 1979, str. 116
- 27 Aleksandra Stupar, *Grad Globalizacije – izazovi, transformacije, simboli*, Arhitektonski fakultet Univerziteta u Beogradu i Orion Art, Beograd 2009.