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Abstract

The majority of competitions for administrative buildings in interwar Belgrade gave unsuccessful results, consequently constructed buildings present differences between their shapes and competition projects. In this thesis I analyze factors, which obstructed the work of competitions in the case of administrative buildings. The first part of research is based on the examination of key institutions involved in the architectural process and their influence on the competitive practice. Secondly, I investigate the development of the competitive practice on the whole and problems, which appeared in different stages. On the base of case studies presented in the third chapter this thesis reveals that unsuccessful results of competitions for administrative buildings were connected with the gap between architectural development and stylistic preferences of state institutions. The hypothesis of research is that the character of problems in the competitions changed during the growth of the divergence between directions of architectural searches and demands of state institutions.
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Introduction

After the First World War Belgrade, the capital of the Kingdom of Serbia, became the capital of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. The new state had great political ambitions and grandiose projects, which led to significant changes in the status and the image of Belgrade. Continuing pre-war trends to Europeanization and intensive urbanization¹, Belgrade acquired the features of ‘a modern European capital’² in the interwar period. Under the conditions of building boom, emerged in the aftermath of war damages and the population influx, a lot of residential and public buildings were constructed during interwar years, including representative governmental buildings. State institutions demanded the embodiment of such concepts as strength, stability and prosperity into these building. Moreover, the state requested to express Yugoslav identity through architectural means³, which led to the creation of a very specific architectural situation in interwar Belgrade.

On the whole, interwar Belgrade architecture was located at the intersection of the main trends: academism⁴, national-romanticism⁵ and modernism⁶. They co-existed with transitional forms⁷ and secondary tendencies as expressionism⁸ and art deco⁹. The stylistic diversity was supplemented by the diversity of architects’ groups and their backgrounds.

Besides Serbians, architects from western parts of the state\textsuperscript{10} and from other countries including also Russian emigrants\textsuperscript{11} were engaged in the architectural process of Belgrade. The dynamics of stylistic development in the case of Belgrade was determined by the delayed affirmation of modernism and the stylistic preferences of state institutions, which demanded the creation of Yugoslav architecture. As a result in the interwar period architecture of governmental and administrative buildings was characterized by backwardness and incompatibility with architectural development\textsuperscript{12}.

Governmental architecture is important for research, because it articulated and translated representations of state institutions. In interwar Belgrade the Ministry of Construction had a monopoly over shape of governmental buildings, controlling all stages of construction\textsuperscript{13}. Nevertheless it was common practice to organize competitions for preliminary sketches. Thus competitions were between interests of state institutions and the professional community. Tensions between them led to failures of the competition mechanism. On the whole competitive practice was full of problems, which embraced all stages of competitions: elaboration of a program, work of a jury, decision making and its implementation. As concerns administrative buildings the main problems were connected with ignoring results and changing projects.

Despite the abundance of literature devoted to architectural trends, professional biographies of architects, key buildings in interwar Belgrade, architectural competitions were rarely an object of research. On the one hand, there is a book about the competition for


the Master Plan and articles investigating competitions for particular buildings. Architectural competitions are also investigated within the framework of building case studies or biographies of architects. Thus there is a gap of research on the competition mechanism itself, its connections with other architectural institutions and its influence on stylistic tendencies in interwar Belgrade.

On the whole in history of architecture, investigations of competitions are on the stage of development. There are a number of collections of case-studies and mainly researches focus on the most significant competitions as for example for the Chicago Tribune Tower or the British Houses of Parliament. From the point of view of this thesis, the most useful approaches for competitions are presented in the book of Vadim Bass and the article of Andrew Shanken. Bass examined relations between competitive practice and stylistic trends on the material of Petersburg neoclassical architecture. Shanken suggested an approach in which competitions are considered as a mechanism, in which professional community, government and corporations interacted.

This thesis investigates unsuccessful competitions for administrative buildings in order to reveal how the gap between architectural development and preferences of state

---

institutions obstructed the competitive mechanism. The hypothesis of research is that the character of problems in competitions for administrative buildings changed during the growth of the gap between stylistic preferences. While in the 1920s the main problems were connected with the unregulated character of competitions, during the 1930s the competitive mechanism failed to work in the case of administrative buildings because of different logics of selection. The professional jury chose according to the criteria of functional space organization, but state institutions paid more attention to facades and their styles, which led to ignoring the results of competitions or changing the projects.

The methodology of this research is based on the idea to explain architectural characteristics of buildings through the analysis of competitions as a mechanism, in which political and professional influences are bound together. Research procedures included the examination of texts around competitions (among which announcements, jury reports, official correspondence and comments in the press) and the stylistic analysis of competition projects within the framework of political and ideological changes in the state.

The first chapter will lay out specifics of key institutions involved in the architectural process and their interrelations and influence on competitive practice. Besides the institutional context, the diversity of styles and also their political implications will be considered. The second chapter will engage with the competition mechanism itself. It aims to examine the organization of all stages of competitions and their regulations with the main focus to problems occurred in competitive practice. The third chapter will deal with the question how the discrepancy between stylistic preferences of state institutions and new architectural trends influenced competitions for administrative buildings on the basis of case studies.
Chapter One. The Architectural Process in Interwar Belgrade

In order to establish the role of competitions in the architectural process it seems necessary to examine the specifics of key institutions involved in it. Second important point is the stylistic diversity. Various architectural trends were different not only in terms of architectural features, but they also relied on different social interests and implied various strategies for the creation of Yugoslav architecture. Such differences led to divergence of stylistic preferences of institutions, which influenced competition practice. Complex and contradictory interactions of these factors determined specifics of urban transformations of interwar Belgrade.

1.1. Urban Transformations and the Institutional Context of the Architectural Process

Belgrade significantly changed its status and image in the interwar period. The kingdom was driven by a desire “to get involved to progressive course of history”21 and Belgrade became the visual representation of it. Moreover architects tried to find architectural expressions of the specific Belgrade modus of life22 and even “materialize Yugoslav spirit”23 in its architecture.

The Yugoslavization of Belgrade were conducted through representative architecture of new administrative centers24. Besides Yugoslav unity, the policy of the new state demanded the embodiment of stability and prosperity into key buildings. The whole process

---

of designed the proper capital for the new state was under influences of great ambitions\textsuperscript{25} and necessity to express new political and cultural identity\textsuperscript{26}.

As a center of the new state, Belgrade attracted migrants from all over the country and its population increased. For example, Belgrade had 90 000 inhabitants at 1918 and approximately 320 000 before the Second World War\textsuperscript{27}. The city territory increased approximately fourfold, but the population density remained low and some areas of the city kept the half-agrarian character\textsuperscript{28}. However, a quality of the urban infrastructure increased, for example, plumbing, sewage, the electrical network and the transport system were improved\textsuperscript{29}.

The necessity of reconstruction after war damages, unsatisfactory conditions of buildings, unsuitable allocation of state institutions and population influx led to building boom, which was possible because of the consolidation of investments from private capital and state and municipal institutions\textsuperscript{30}. Loans from the State Mortgage Bank significantly stimulated the construction activity, primarily in the city center\textsuperscript{31}. Notwithstanding the city territory was scattered with a lot of empty spaces\textsuperscript{32}. On the whole the construction activity was fluctuating: intense periods rotated with decreases due to economic reasons\textsuperscript{33}.

\textsuperscript{28} Gašić, “Problemni teritorijalnog širenja Beograda,” 65.
\textsuperscript{30} Kojić, \textit{Društveni uslovi razvitka}, 1.
\textsuperscript{33} “Koliko je u Beogradu podignuto zgrada posle rata,” [How many buildings were constructed in Belgrade after the war], \textit{Politika}, 30.12.1931. 5; S. Genić, “Arhitektonska delatnost,” [The architectural activity] \textit{BON} 1-3 (1934): 236.
In order to create an appropriate capital the Ministry of Construction and the Municipality started to work on creation programs and plans for urban development\textsuperscript{34}. The Association of Yugoslav Engineers and Architects (UJIA) suggested organizing an international competition for the Master Plan, which was announced in 1921\textsuperscript{35}.

The jury for the Master Plan competition contained representatives of the Municipality, the Ministry of Construction, the Ministry of Trade and Industry, the Belgrade University and two foreign architects (from Paris and Geneva)\textsuperscript{36}. Twenty three projects were sent to the competition from eight countries\textsuperscript{37}. Most of the participants were prominent architects and urbanists with experience of participating on such competitions and creating master plans\textsuperscript{38}. On the whole, the results of the competition were not satisfactory\textsuperscript{39}. The jury did not award the first prize, but three projects got the second: the French project ‘Urbs Magna’, the Austrian project ‘Singidunum novissima’ and the Hungarian ‘Santé, beauté, commerce et traffic’\textsuperscript{40}. As a result the Municipality decided to create a special commission for the elaboration of the final Master plan on the basis of the competition projects\textsuperscript{41}. The Russian architect emigrant Georgy Kovalyevsky elaborated the final decision, which was approved as the Master plan by the Ministry of Construction on the July 19, 1924\textsuperscript{42}.

The Master plan caused wide public discussions and a critique by experts\textsuperscript{43}. Firstly, as a plan designated to represent prosperity of the new state it was characterized as

\textsuperscript{34} “Za uređenje Beograda,” [For an arrangement of Belgrade] \textit{Politika}, 24. 7. 1920, 3.
\textsuperscript{35} Vuksanović-Macura, \textit{San o grada}, 53.
\textsuperscript{36} “Generalni plan Beograda,” [Belgrade Master Plan] \textit{Vreme}, 07.04.1922, 3.
\textsuperscript{37} Austria, Czechoslovakia, France, Germany, Hungary, Romania, Switzerland and the Kingdom of SHS (only two projects) Vuksanović-Macura, \textit{San o grada}: 74.
\textsuperscript{39} For example, the highest mark was 3,4 (in the range from 0 to 6). B. Maksimović, “Vrednosti generalnog plana Beograda od 1923. godine i njihovo poništavanje,” \textit{GGB} XXVII (1980): 239.
\textsuperscript{43} Dabović and Djordjević, “Ideologije i praksa planiranja Beograda,” 161.
megalomaniac and inopportune for given economic conditions. Secondly, the Master plan was criticized because it was not based on complex understanding of urban problems and left many questions unresolved. Moreover, the Master Plan concentrated on regulation of already developed part and was not flexible, which led to necessity to change it a lot of times in order to adapt it to the city needs. Besides changes, the Municipality often violated the plan and “worked as if there is no Master Plan”.

Under the circumstances of undeveloped legal basis, the insufficient elaboration of phases and priorities of the Master Plan implementation, a lack of control mechanisms and rapid construction in the conditions of emergency needs Belgrade continued to develop spontaneously and unplanned. Rapid population growth led to the appearance of illegally built neighborhoods with unsanitary conditions. Another urban problem was connected with a lack of defined city center and unsuitable regulations of squares.

In the early thirties the necessity to develop a new Master plan became obvious. The works began only in 1937, but as a result only a preliminary draft was made, which fixed the results of city development. In 1939 the Municipality prepared to organize international competition for the new Master plan, however this idea remained unimplemented as plans suggested by architects, including Dragiša Brašovan’s modernist

---

47 Somborski, “Razvoj Beograda između dva rata,” 45. Totally it was changed around 190 times (Minić, “Razvoj Beograda,” 182).
48 B. Maksimović, B. Problemi urbanizma, (Beograd: G. Kon, 1932), 34.
51 “Kakav će izgledati budući veliki Beograd,” [How will look future great Belgrade] Politika 27.05.1939, 8.
54 “Kakav će izgledati budući veliki Beograd,” Politika 27.05.1939, 8.
project for the left bank of Sava\textsuperscript{55} or the plan of Milan Pantović, inspired of CIAM ideas and implied radical reconstruction of Belgrade\textsuperscript{56}.

The implementation of the Master Plan was obstructed by a lack of urban legislation\textsuperscript{57}. During the elaboration and implementation of the Master Plan the obviously outdated Construction law from 1896 was valid\textsuperscript{58}. Intensive elaboration of urban legislation occurred in the 1930s (the Construction law (1931)\textsuperscript{59}, the Cadastre (1933)\textsuperscript{60}, the Construction Rulebook (1935)\textsuperscript{61}). Besides urban legislation, during the 1930s the legislation about activities of engineers and architects was elaborated\textsuperscript{62}. The Act about Authorized Engineers (1937) among other things determined who has right to design buildings and salary issues\textsuperscript{63}. Finally, the Rulebook about architectural competitions were accepted in 1938.

The Ministry of Construction had a key role in the elaboration of such legislation, because one of its functions was supervising engineering activities\textsuperscript{64}. Moreover, the Ministry of Construction controlled towns and settlements planning and construction of public buildings\textsuperscript{65}. Due to the unstable political situation ministers changed very often: changes occurred 46 times and the position was held by 24 persons\textsuperscript{66}. Most of them had no

\textsuperscript{55}\textsuperscript{55} “Kako će se širiti i razvijati Novi Beograd,” [How will expand and develop New Belgrade] \textit{Politika}, 23.02.1941
\textsuperscript{56} Dabović and Djordjević, “Ideologije i praksa planiranja Beograda,” 163.
\textsuperscript{57} Maksimović, \textit{Problem urbanizma}, 35.
\textsuperscript{58} Gašić, “Problem teritorijalnog širenja Beograda,” 60.
\textsuperscript{60} Gašić, “Problem teritorijalnog širenja Beograda,” 62
\textsuperscript{62} Toševa, “Arhitektonske odeljenje Ministarstva građevina,” 70.
\textsuperscript{63} \textit{Zakon o ovlašćenim inženjerima od 1937. god.} [The Act about authorized engineers] Beograd, Grafički umetnički zavod Planeta, 1937. Its supplement, the Rulebook about the division of competences between professions of authorized engineers caused complaints from architects (Kojić, \textit{Društveni uslovi razvitka}, 165).
\textsuperscript{65} Toševa, “Arhitektonske odeljenje Ministarstva građevina,” 43.
relation with architecture and held other ministerial posts as well\textsuperscript{67}.

The Ministry consisted of several departments: general, economic, hydrotechnical, postal, telephone-telegraph, architectural, road and railway\textsuperscript{68}. The Architectural Department was responsible for “design, construction and maintenance of all state buildings (except military buildings and maintenance of the Ministry of Transport buildings) and control over the design and construction of all buildings for public use”\textsuperscript{69}. Thus the Architectural department had a monopoly of control over administrative buildings.

On the whole, the state did not have a clearly defined architectural policy because of political instability. King Alexander was characterized as personally involved and interested in all kinds of problems including urban and architectural issues\textsuperscript{70}. His personal stylistic preferences included architecture of Russian emigrants architects\textsuperscript{71} and the national style inspired by Serbian medieval art\textsuperscript{72}.

The same preferences determined the specifics of architectural education in the interwar period. Before the First World War foreign education was a common practice for Serbian architects\textsuperscript{73}. In the interwar period the quality of domestic architectural education increased, so the Architectural Department of the Faculty of Engineering in the University of Belgrade became the main educational center for Serbian architects\textsuperscript{74}. Usually after graduation architects worked on probation in foreign architectural bureaus\textsuperscript{75}. Teaching on the Architectural Department was conservative and characterized by ignoring importance of

\textsuperscript{67} Toševa, “Arhitektonsko odeljenje Ministarstva građevina,” 58.
\textsuperscript{69} Ibid, 45.
\textsuperscript{73} Kojić, Draštveni uslovi razvitka, 6.
\textsuperscript{74} B. Nestorović i dr. Visokoškolska nastava arhitekture u Srbiji, (Beograd: Plato, 1996), 68.
\textsuperscript{75} Kojić, Draštveni uslovi razvitka, 6.
modernism and question of industrial architecture and social housing\textsuperscript{76}. The focus was on monumental symbolic building, academic stylizations and Byzantine studies\textsuperscript{77}. Such approach led to the fact, that majority of semester and diploma works had features of the romanticized Serbo-Byzantine style\textsuperscript{78}.

After graduation and an internship architects had to pass state technical exam to the commission from the Ministry of Construction in order to get the right to private practice\textsuperscript{79}. For future professional development architects had two main variants. The first way was employment in different organizations as ministries, municipal authorities or financial institutions\textsuperscript{80}. It was more assured and quite work than private practice\textsuperscript{81}, but architects faced the problem of creative freedom, which was restricted by stylistic preferences of institutions\textsuperscript{82}. The second way was a work in private bureaus as an assistant or head. In this case, the main problem was attraction of investors, who often also restricted creative freedom\textsuperscript{83}. Moreover, architects faced obscurity in a situation of strong competition\textsuperscript{84} also with architects employed in the civil service, who doing private projects and with civil engineers\textsuperscript{85}. On the whole the issue of the division of competences between engineers and architects was topical for professional interests of architects, as well as the distinction between terms ‘engineer’ and ‘architect’\textsuperscript{86}. The protection of professional interests included

\textsuperscript{76} Z. Manević, “Jučerašnje graditeljstvo,” \textit{Urbanizam Beograda} 53-54, prilog 9, 1979: 16.
\textsuperscript{78} Kadijević, \textit{Jedan vek traženja nacionalnog stila}, 212.
\textsuperscript{79} Toševa, “Arhitektonsko odeljenje Ministarstva građevina,” 75-76.
\textsuperscript{80} Kadijević, “Srpska arhitektura u 1926.godini,” 102.
\textsuperscript{82} A. Kadijević, “Državni arhitekta - stvaralac ili poslušnik?” \textit{Zbornik Seminarara za studije moderne umetnosti Filozofskog fakulteta Univerziteta u Beogradu} 10 (2014): 73.
\textsuperscript{83} M. Borisavljević, “Arhitekt i poslodavac,” [An architect and an employer] \textit{Pravda}, 10.03.1939, 5.
\textsuperscript{84} Stojanović, “Arhitekta Dragiša Brašovan,” 19.
\textsuperscript{86} Such distinction caused a discussion in the newspapers between two architects, Branislav Kojić and Milutin Borisavljević. Borisavljević claimed that Kojić’s education did not give him a right to call himself an architect (M. Borisavljević, “Arhitekt ili inženjer?” [An architect or an engineer?] \textit{Pravda}, 29.05.1928, 5; “Predavanje jednog inženjera o arhitekturi,” [The lecture by an engineer about architecture] \textit{Pravda}, 31.12.1929, 14; “Šta je to Ecole Centrale?” [What is Ecole Centrale?] \textit{Pravda}, 11.01.1930, 8 i 12.01.1930,5; “Jeste lii nije? G.
also issues of salary, the status of an architect as an artist and legal protection of the right to design\textsuperscript{87}.

In order to protect professional interests, architects united into professional organizations. The most significant was the UIJA, founded in 1919 by unifying professional organizations from all regions of the new state\textsuperscript{88}. Thus Engineers and Architects united in the Yugoslav association among the first\textsuperscript{89} and as mentioned Alexander Ignjatović the idea of national cohesion played an important role in its activities\textsuperscript{90}. The UIJA made efforts to improve competitive practice through seeking the adoption the Rules and intervening the process on account of architects’ complaints. The UIJA was divided into sections by city, in which the Clubs of Architects operated.

The Belgrade Club of Architects also aimed to protect professional interests; however, a number of participants were not enough for successful impact on the solution of complicated problems, especially in the case of competitions\textsuperscript{91}. According to B. Kojić’s estimates a quarter of Belgrade architects enrolled to the Club, and only 10% regularly participated in its meetings\textsuperscript{92}. The activities of the Club included regular meeting, lectures, exhibitions, statements in the press\textsuperscript{93}.


\textsuperscript{88} “Predpradnje za ujedinjenje inženjerskih društava u kraljevstvu SHS u jedinstveno Udruženje,” [Preparations for the unification of engineering organizations of the Kingdom of SHS in a single Association] Tehnički list 1 (1919): 7-8.


\textsuperscript{92} Kojić, Društveni uslovi razvitka, 4. Furthermore the third part of the members was employed in the Architectural Department of the Ministry of Construction.

\textsuperscript{93} Ibid., 49.
For example, the Club took part in the organization of the First Architectural Salon in 1929\textsuperscript{94}, which was a platform for communication between architects, sculpturers and painters, who represented different styles and trends. The Salon was held in the Art Pavilion ‘Cvijeta Zuzorić’, which was a center of artistic life in Belgrade\textsuperscript{95}. It also was a permanent place for architectural exhibitions also\textsuperscript{96}, for instance, exhibitions of modern architecture in 1931 and 1933\textsuperscript{97}. Besides modernist, exhibitions activities included foreign architectural exhibitions, participation of architects in exhibitions of art groups (as for example 'Oblik'\textsuperscript{98}, 'Zograf'\textsuperscript{99}, the group of Russian artists ‘K.R.U.G’\textsuperscript{100}), student exhibitions, organized by the Club of architecture students\textsuperscript{101}. Moreover, according to the Rulebook for architectural competitions, exhibitions of competition projects were obligatory, in order to provide opportunities for review and critique of results\textsuperscript{102}.

Exhibitions contributed to exchange of ideas and thus influenced architectural development. For architects exhibitions afforded a ground for recognition in professional circles and attraction of investors, which were important in conditions of strong competition. The press also provided opportunities for public presentation of projects.

On the whole, the publicity of architectural process increased during the 1930s. The discussions of urban problems, news about construction of significant buildings, architects’ opinions, announcement and results of competitions appeared in the press. Such materials

\textsuperscript{98} V. Rozić, \textit{Umetnička grupa „Oblik” 1926-1939}, (Beograd: Cicero 2005).
\textsuperscript{101} Kadijević, \textit{Jedan več traženja nacionalnog stila}, 212.
\textsuperscript{102} Kojić, \textit{Društveni uslovi razvitka}, 247.
were published in professional journals\textsuperscript{103} as well as in unprofessional daily newspapers\textsuperscript{104} or journals\textsuperscript{105}.

\subsection*{1.2. The Stylistic Context of the Architectural Process}

Various institutions involved in the architectural process had different stylistic preferences, state institutions remained conservative and preferred reviveralist styles. Such conservative tastes led to the fact that on the whole, interwar Belgrade architecture was behind its time and modern trends\textsuperscript{106}. However, it was characterized by stylistic diversity. The main trends were national-romanticism, academism and modernism. They co-existed with transitional forms and secondary tendencies.

The issue of style was connected with the creation of Yugoslav architecture. Because of the complex and changeable character of Yugoslav identity, this task was difficult for architects and implied several possible strategies: referring to the past, synthesizing different regional traditions, universalizing them or looking to the future.

The universalizing strategy based on academism as a style, which can represent Yugoslav unity and avoid any regional or national connotations\textsuperscript{107}. Academism dominated during the 1920s, especially in the area of public buildings\textsuperscript{108}, continuing the trend of the second half of the 19th century in this functional type\textsuperscript{109}. In interwar Belgrade architecture academic trends implied various eclectic combinations of Baroque, Renaissance, Neo-Classicism and Empire architecture\textsuperscript{110}. The use of European architectural models made academism the appropriate style for governmental buildings, because allowed reaching

\textsuperscript{103} Tehnički list (Technical newspaper), Građevinski Vjesnik (Construction Journal), Arhitektura (Architecture)

\textsuperscript{104} Politika (Politics), Vreme (Time), Pravda (Justice).

\textsuperscript{105} Beogradske opštinske novine (Belgrade municipal newspaper), Umetnički pregled (Art review)


\textsuperscript{107} Ignjatović, Jagošlovensko u arhitekturi, 428.

\textsuperscript{108} Kadijević, Estetika arhitekture akademizma, 354.


\textsuperscript{110} M. Popović, Heralički simboli na beogradskim javnim zdanjima, (Beograd: BMG, 1997), 88.
symbolically the level of “developed progressive civilized countries of Western Europe”\textsuperscript{111} and moreover can embody the stability and prosperity of the state. Meanwhile academism affirmed also in residential architecture, because customers from the middle and upper classes required architecture that clearly showed their social status\textsuperscript{112}. Despite its relevance, academism passed a period of crisis in 1928-1935, caused by the affirmation of modernism, but in the late 1930s academism in modernized forms spread again\textsuperscript{113} under the influence of tendencies for monumentalization\textsuperscript{114}.

Another style implied the use of architectural past was the Serbo-Byzantine style\textsuperscript{115}. In the middle of the nineteenth century among other revivalist architectural styles Neo-Byzantine style was widespread in Europe\textsuperscript{116}. Serbian architects tried to use not only a common Byzantine stylistic paradigm, but also to refer to authentic Serbian regional architectural traditions\textsuperscript{117}. Thus this style allowed to incarnate national values and the specific mode of traditional life\textsuperscript{118}. For sacred architecture it became the dominant paradigm, but also was used for some public buildings\textsuperscript{119}. In the interwar period the Serbo-Byzantine style kept its significance for sacred architecture. However, the use for public buildings was complicated by its national connotations. Despite attempts to express the Yugoslav identity through using neo-Byzantine elements\textsuperscript{120}, such imposition of the Serbian national style as the Yugoslav one and thus the ignoring of architectural traditions of other

\textsuperscript{111} Ignjatović, Jugoslovenstvo u arhitekturi, 428.
\textsuperscript{112} L. Blagujević, Moderna kuća u Beogradu (1920-1941), (Beograd: Zadužbina Andrejević, 2000), 24.
\textsuperscript{113} Kadijević, Estetika arhitekture akademizma, 354.
\textsuperscript{115} Kadijević, Jedan vek traženja nacionalnog stila, 183.
\textsuperscript{116} J. B. Bullen, Byzantium rediscovered: the Byzantine revival in Europe and America, (Phaidon, 2003).
\textsuperscript{119} Kadijević, Jedan vek traženja nacionalnog stila, 141-144.
regions led to critique of this style\textsuperscript{121}.

Thus combining particular historical architectural features of different regions appeared in the interwar period as the synthesizing strategy of creation the Yugoslav architecture. Such strategy met the requirements to represent the Yugoslav identity as synthesis of particular traditions\textsuperscript{122}. The projects implied combining features of Byzantine and Romanesque architecture took a significant place in designing practice, but most of them remained unimplemented. From an architectural point of view they were difficult for realization. Moreover, so complicated reminiscences were not always trapped and it was interpreted simply as the Serbo-Byzantine style\textsuperscript{123}.

Another strategy to create Yugoslav architecture through referring to the past implied the search for the common past and thus the use of traditions of vernacular architecture. This idea was the basis for such architectural direction as folklorism\textsuperscript{124}. Vernacular architecture was considered as the most common for all territories\textsuperscript{125} and moreover, as less foreign influenced, unchangeable and therefore the most authentic\textsuperscript{126}. However, folklorism was unsuitable for representative purposes because of the lack of monumental elements, thus it mainly was widespread in residential architecture\textsuperscript{127} and was used rarely in public buildings\textsuperscript{128}.

\textsuperscript{122} Ignjatović, \textit{Jugoslovenstvo u arhitekturi}, 311.
\textsuperscript{123} For example, the project of brother Krstić won the competition for the pavilion on the Philadelphia International Exposition in 1926. Their project was based on a combination of Byzantine and Romanesque architecture. According to the memoirs of Branko Krstic, artist Tomislav Krizman, officially appointed as an organizer of preparations for the exhibition, considered this project as unnecessarily Byzantine. (qv Ignjatović, \textit{Jugoslovenstvo u arhitekturi}, 332). Contemporary art historical interpretations of this project also may contain such considerations (Peter Krečič mentioned that the project was made “in form of Byzantine temple” qv P. Krečič, “Architecture in Former Yugoslavia: From the Avant-garde to the Postmodern” in \textit{Impossible Histories: Historical Avant-Gardes, Neo-Avant-Gardes, and Post-Avant-Gardes in Yugoslavia, 1918-1991}, eds. D. Djerić and M. Suvaković (Cambridge, MA: The MIT Press, 2006): 349).
\textsuperscript{124} Putnik, “Folklorizam u arhitekturi Beograda (1918-1950),” 176.
\textsuperscript{125} Ignjatović, \textit{Jugoslovenstvo u arhitekturi}, 187.
\textsuperscript{126} Ibid., 180.
\textsuperscript{127} Putnik, “Folklorizam u arhitekturi Beograda,” 194.
\textsuperscript{128} One of the main area of application was Sokol houses and stadions, V. Putnik “Sokolski domovi i stadioni u Beogradu,” \textit{Naslede} 14 (2013): 69–82.
In the course of their practice, architects noticed that basic principles of vernacular and modern architecture are similar. On the first stage they tired to modernize vernacular national architecture\(^{129}\), on the second stage, to nationalize International style\(^{130}\) through the detection of structural and conceptual similarities\(^{131}\). On the ideological level these architectural parallels served for the representation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia as “young progressive state, but ancient vital nation”\(^{132}\).

On the whole, modernism appeared in Belgrade architecture relatively late, because of stylistic preferences of private investors and state institutions, a lack of understanding of new trends, conservative architectural education and outdated construction technologies\(^{133}\). The development of modernism was under influence of different international trends\(^{134}\), but architects seek for creation own variant of modernism\(^{135}\).

The key actor of Belgrade modernism was the Group of Architects of Modern Direction (GAMP), founded by Branislav Kojić, Milan Zloković, Dušan Babić and Jan Dubovič in 1928\(^ {136}\). The main goal of the group was promotion of the principles of modern architecture\(^ {137}\) for such purpose their organize public lectures and exhibitions, cooperate with other professional organizations and published articles in the newspapers\(^ {138}\). Their


\(^{130}\) The adaptation of modernism to the needs of national representation through use of vernacular practice spread in the interwar period, for example in Turkey (B. Sibel, *Modernism and Nation Building: Turkish Architectural Culture in the Early Republic* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 2001)), Italy (M. Sabatino, *Pride in Modesty: Modernist Architecture and theory Vernacular Tradition in Italy* (Toronto: University of Toronto Press, 2010)).

\(^{131}\) For example, Kojić in his article “Balkan vernacular architecture” indicated among this similarities: a rejection of ornamentation, rationality and functionality of composition, penetration of internal and external space and some technical aspects. B. Kojić, “Balkanska profana arhitektura,” *Srpski književni glasnik* XL, br. 4 (16.10.1933): 273.

\(^{132}\) Ignjatović, *Jugoslovenstvo u arhitekturi*., 240.


\(^{134}\) Z. Manević in his dissertation about the appearance of modern architecture in Serbia mentioned rationalism, Czech functionalism, Adolf Loos and Bauhaus (Manević, “Pojava moderne arhitekture u Srbiji,” 47).

\(^{135}\) B. Kojić, “Arhitektura Beograda,” *Vreme*, 06.01.1929, 25.

\(^{136}\) B. Kojić, “Grupa arhitekata modernog pravca,” *Politika*, 20.12.1928, 5. The group was active until 1934.

\(^{137}\) Ibid., 181.

\(^{138}\) Ibid., 173-176.
writings rarely concerned aesthetic criticism and architectural theory. Despite occasional attempts to pay attention to social issues, their social engagement was negligible in comparison with modernists in general. Blagojevic explained such little attention to socio-political themes with desire to avoid leftist connotations, which can be problematic for the group’s activity under a dictatorship. Thus the GAMP concentrated its activities on the issue of a style, however demonstrated a gap between proclamations and actions, because modernist architects continued to use other styles in their work under the demands of investors.

The affirmation of modernism took place in the period from 1929 to 1934, which not accidentally corresponded with the period of the 6 January Dictatorship. Within the framework of dictatorship a break with the past was proclaimed and search for new methods became a basis of the cultural policy. The ideological basis was “Integral Yugoslavism” which presupposed a denial of differences between “tribes” (Serbs, Croats and Slovenes) and total integration into the single nation. Despite the private preferences of King Alexander in academism and national style, changes that occurred in the political climate facilitated the affirmation of modernism. The ideas of overcoming the past and the integration into the new Yugoslav community were consistent with modernist directions in architecture. Modernist architects enthusiastically started to create architectural expressions.

141Blagojević, Modernism in Serbia, 60.
142Đurđević, “60 godina od osnivanja grupe,” 87.
143Blagojević, Modernism in Serbia, 61.
144Manević, “Novija srpska arhitektura,” 22.
for Yugoslav identity as extremely modernized\footnote{For example, Yugoslav pavilions for international exhibitions in Barcelona (1929) and Milan (1931) were designed by D. Brašovan in the spirit of modernism (Blagojević, Modernism in Serbia, 95-104). On the whole, the use of modernism for the needs of national representation was common practice among new established or re-organized states in the interwar period (Ignjatović, Jugoslavenskost u arhitekturi, 239).}, which also helped to go beyond national patterns\footnote{B. Maksimović, “Težnje savremene arhitekture,” BON 15 (1930): 849.}. On the whole the new program was expressed by Milan Zloković in his lecture “Purposes of modern architecture”: “We ourselves created our national existence [...] we can create also our architecture without support of our or foreign past”\footnote{“Ciljecvi moderne arhitekture. Predavanje arh. g. Milana Zlokovica,” Vreme, 20.2.1930, 7.}. Important role for the affirmation of modernism had also an economical factor. Under the circumstances of world economic crisis, the faster and cheaper construction of undecorated highly functional modernist buildings attracted investors\footnote{Blagojević, Modernna kaća u Beogradu, 24.}

In the second half of the 1930s, the transitional forms were developed through combining modernist and neoclassical elements in the monumentalized way\footnote{Polovina, “Tranzitivni oblikovni koncepti,” 43.}. Another transitional form was Art Deco\footnote{Prosen, “Ar deko u srpskoj arhitekturi.”}. Both of them were under strong foreign influences: German\footnote{A. Kadijević, “Odjeci arhitektur totalitarizma u Srbiji.” DaNS 51 (2005): 46.} in the case of modernized academism and French for Art Deco\footnote{M. Bogdanović, “Francuski arhitektonski uticaj i palata Francuske ambasade u Beogradu,” Zbornik Narodnog muzeja. Istoriija umetnosti 19/2 (2010): 583.}. In general France had a strong influence on cultural and political life, especially during the 1920s. The main channel of French architectural influences was education. France was one of main centers in the pre-war period and kept its significance after war\footnote{Kadijević, “Pogled na francusko-srpske veze,” 169.}. Serbian architects mainly assimilated the ideas of French academist architects or moderate modernists\footnote{T. Premerl, “CIAM i naša međuratna arhitektura,” Arhitektura 189-195 (1984-1985): 50-52.}. As concerns radical modernist, for example, Le Corbusier and the CIAM, they were more influential among Croatian architects\footnote{Blagojevic, Novi Beograd: osporeni modernizam, 30.} with rare exceptions among Serbs (Branko Maksimović, Milan Pantović)\footnote{Blagojevic, Novi Beograd: osporeni modernizam, 30.}. 148 149 150 151 152 153 154 155 156 157 158 159
British architectural influence was relatively weak and only a small number of architects studied there\textsuperscript{160}. However, the British town-planning concept of the garden city was influential and the most of residential colonies in interwar Belgrade followed such model\textsuperscript{161}.

Czechoslovakia had a significant influence on modern architecture in Belgrade. Generally Czechoslovakia and Yugoslavia had strong political relations (as members of The Little Entente) and cultural contacts (under influence of Panslavist ideas)\textsuperscript{162}. The Exhibition of Czech Modern Architecture held in 1928 influenced the assimilation of modernist ideas, as well as Czech art groups became an example for the GAMP\textsuperscript{163}. The direct contacts were also intensive through a work of Czech engineers and construction firms in Belgrade\textsuperscript{164} and education of Serbs architects in Prague\textsuperscript{165}.

In the second half of the 1930s the foreign policy orientation was changed, that also intensified cultural contacts with Germany\textsuperscript{166}. In the field of architecture German (and Italian) influence affected the development of monumentalized modernist and academic forms in the spirit of totalitarian architecture\textsuperscript{167}.

1.3. Architects as Participants of the Architectural Process

The stylistic diversity was also related with co-existence of various groups of architects with different educations, backgrounds and experience. After the First World War Belgrade provided a wide field of works for architects, because of war damages and
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ambitions of the state to create a proper capital. The war influenced also a lack of relevant specialists in all spheres of society, including architecture. Thus the architects from western parts of the state, from other countries including Russian emigrants were engaged.

In the interwar period Serbian architects were divided by generations, which led to collisions between architects because of differences in their backgrounds and ideas. The first generation mainly continued their work in revivalist styles and was not ready to admit modernist trends. They faced difficulties with adapting to the new conditions and despite keeping high positions in the Ministry of Construction and the University, they participated rarely in the activities of professional organizations. The second generation was characterized by stylistic wavering between academism, national styles and modernism.

Belgrade as a capital of the Kingdom was open to the architects from other parts. The idea of creation a new representative Yugoslav capital caused suggestions to engage the most competent Yugoslav architects, especially Croatian and Slovenian. They were more progressive than Serbian, because of differences in their backgrounds: the formation of national traditions, the specifics of education and traineeships and the orientation to
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173 Manević, “Pojava moderne arhitekture u Srbiji,” 32.
177 While in the Serbian case national style appeared through the appeal to the medieval heritage, Croatian and Slovenian – through modernization. Against the background of dominance of revival styles imported from Vienna the modernist tendencies were considered to be a national alternative in architecture (T. Damjanovic Conley, “Conceptualizing National Architectures: Architectural Histories and National Ideologies Among the South Slavs” in Nationalism and Architecture, eds. Raymond Quok, Darren Deane and Sarah Butler (Farnham: Ashgate, 2012): 100).
178 Croatiants chose for traineeships studios of founders of modern European architecture: for example Adolf Loos, Hans Poelzig, Le Corbusier (T Premerl, Hrvatska moderna arhitektura između dva rata - nova tradicija. (Zagreb: Nakladni zavod Matice Hrvatske, 1990), 37).
modern trends. As a result modernism was more developed in Croatian interwar architecture and works of Croatian architects became examples for Serbian architects.

The involvement of Croatian architects in Belgrade was active, including long- and short-forms of cooperation. For example, they participated in the Exhibition of Modern architecture in 1931. However, later they often refused to participate on exhibitions in Belgrade, because of the problems which they faced during participation on competitions or their work there. For example, Croatian architects got significant results on competitions during the 1930s, but these project were not implemented because of financial and ideological reasons.

Another influential group was Russian emigrant architects. According to Kadijević’s estimates around seventy Russian emigrant architects worked in the Kingdom. As persons without citizenship, Russian architects could not open private architectural bureaus (therefore they worked as assistants) or get a permanent job (but could be employed by contracts). Thus a lot of architects were employed in the Technical direction of Belgrade Municipality, Administration of the Royal Court and the Ministry of Construction. On such civil service they occupied a privileged position, often received the most important orders directly, without competitions. Moreover, Russian architects enjoyed the support of King Alexander.

181 Kadijević, “Hrvatski arhitekti,” 469.
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Their dominating position was based on their education\(^{192}\), experience and stylistic orientations. They contributed to the Serbo-Byzantine style\(^{193}\) because of traditions of Neo-Byzantine revivalism in Russian architecture\(^{194}\). Also Russian architects had substantial experience in academic architecture\(^{195}\). Reminiscences of the Russian Empire and Classicism styles made academic projects of Russian architects relevant for governmental buildings, because contributed to the representation of the Kingdom “as a sort of empire with unified center of power”\(^{196}\).

Despite the role of Russian architects, architectural and professional development occurred without their influence\(^{197}\). Russian architects did not enroll in Yugoslav professional organizations\(^{198}\), rare participated in exhibitions, organized by Serbian architects\(^{199}\). On the whole, Serbian architects were dissatisfied with favoring and the privileged position of Russian architects, especially during the economic crisis\(^{200}\). Architects criticized their architecture for ‘clumsiness of forms’\(^{201}\) or ‘shortage of true stylistic feelings’\(^{202}\). After the death of King Alexander in 1934, Russian architects lost the state
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\(^{198}\) For example, there are no Russian architects in the list of members of the Club of architects, published by Branislav Kojić (qv Kojić, *Društveni uslovi razvitka*, 80). Mainly they acted within own organizations as “The Union of Russian engineers and technicians”. T. Milenković, *Ruski inženjeri u Jugoslaviji: 1919-1941*, (Beograd: Savez inženjera i tehničara Srbije, 1997), 64.

\(^{199}\) In general only a quarter of Russian architects participated in exhibitions and mainly in exhibitions organized by the group of Russian artists ‘K.R.U.G’. Kadijević, “Izložbe ruskih arhitekata,” 299.

\(^{200}\) Kadijević, “Uloga ruskih emigranata,” 139.

\(^{201}\) Borisavljević, “Arhitekt ili inženjer?” *Pravda*, 29. 5 1928, 5.

support and young generation of Serbian architect removed them from the architectural scene.

Under the circumstances of the economic crisis Serbian architects also protested against the engagement of foreign architects, although their invitation was rare practice. Suspicion and mistrust characterized relations of Serbian architects also to each other because of a strong competition. Their rivalries for attracting investors explained their adherence to the idea of competitions as a proper mechanism for finding best solutions. Thus professional community made efforts to improve competitive practice and supervise the course of competitions.

Chapter Two. Competitive Practice in Interwar Belgrade architecture

Architectural competitions in interwar Belgrade were connected with different problems. The unregulated character and difficulties in development of competitive practice already caused problems. Moreover, competitions involved different institutions which had their own interests, concepts and preferences. Discrepancies between them deepened problems and even obstructed competitive practice.

2.1. Making and Development of Competitive Practice

Architectural competitions appeared in the Serbian architectural process on the turn of 19th and 20th centuries and were organized for significant buildings. The affirmation of competitive practice was accompanied by a number of problems, including indefinite procedure, irregular evaluation criteria, close professional contacts of participants and the

203 Kadijević, “Uloga ruskih emigranata,” 140.
206 Blagojević, Moderna kuća u Beogradu, 23.
jury, which even led to conclusions that the Serbian architectural community was not able to hold competitions\textsuperscript{208}.

For example, one of the most significant competitions occurred in 1902 for the National Assembly building. The task of the competition required the adaptation of the previously designed project of Konstantin Jovanović to the needs of the bicameral parliament\textsuperscript{209}. The project of Jovan Ilkić won the competition\textsuperscript{210}, but the project itself and the whole course of the competition dissatisfied the professional community\textsuperscript{211}. Thus the competition caused the elaboration of the Rulebook of competitions in 1904\textsuperscript{212}, which regulated a composition of a jury, types of competitions, program of competitions, work of a jury and evaluation criteria\textsuperscript{213}. However as the initiative of the professional community, it did not have adequate effect.

Another important case for establishment of competitive practice was the building nowadays known as Hotel Moscow. In 1905 the Russian insurance company “Russia” announced a competition, in which all Yugoslav architects had right to participate. The first prize went to the Croatian architect Victor Kovačić. However, the administration of the company disagreed with the choice of the jury and the building was constructed according the project of Jovan Ilkić, which got the second prize\textsuperscript{214}. Such situation became a typical problem for competitions in Belgrade.

The competition for the Administration of State Monopoles in 1908 led to debates about styles and competition procedures. The jury members were three Serbian architects A. Stevanović, D. Živanović, D. Maslač, Russian architect V. Pokrovsky, Czech

\textsuperscript{208} Ibid., 99.
\textsuperscript{214} Nestrović, “Jovan Ilkić, beogradski arhitekta,” 268.
architect V. Polivka and represents of the Administration\textsuperscript{215}. The competition was Pan-Slavic and architects from all Slavic countries got a right to participate\textsuperscript{216}.

Among the eleven submitted projects the jury reviewed six and awarded four\textsuperscript{217}. The project of Russian architects Nikolay Vasiljev and Stepan Krichinsky in the national-romanticism style got the first prize\textsuperscript{218}. The second prize was awarded to the project of Serbian architects Dragutin Đorđević and Nikola Nestrović in the spirit of academism\textsuperscript{219}. The third prize project by Vladimir Popović was the most close to the traditions of the Serbo-Byzantine style\textsuperscript{220}. Czech architect working in Bosnia and Herzegovina, František Blažek got the fourth prize with a project in the Neo-Gothic style\textsuperscript{221}. (Figure A.1). Despite the results of the competition, the Administration decided to chose for elaboration the second prize project as made by Serbian authors who know better local conditions\textsuperscript{222}. Such decision as well as the results on the whole were criticized because of the problem of close professional contacts of participants and the jury, which was unavailable in the conditions of relatively small size of the professional community. Architect and critic Dmitrije T. Leko\textsuperscript{223} noticed that Nestrović and the jury member Andra Stevanovic were partners and worked together\textsuperscript{224}, and moreover, Nestrović had a chance to know competitions conditions before
announcement\textsuperscript{225}. Finally, the idea to construct this building remained unimplemented because of political circumstances\textsuperscript{226}.

On the whole, problems in competitive practice remained the same after the First World War, but competitions became common and regular practice\textsuperscript{227} and their number increased (around 15 competitions in the 1920s and around 40 in the 1930s). Main functional areas for competition practice were town-planning, buildings for professional associations and financial institutions, administrative and governmental buildings. Competitions were used rare for sacral\textsuperscript{228} and industrial buildings\textsuperscript{229}.

From the professional point of view a competition was a mechanism of searching for the best solutions\textsuperscript{230}. Moreover, competitive practice served for progress of architecture, being 'a platform of developing new ideas’ and a way of discovering young talents\textsuperscript{231}. For architects it was an instrument of professional affirmation and attracting investors (because competitive projects were exhibited and published). For investors competitions contributed for receiving a large number of different ideas and having an opportunity to choose. However, in the case of a competition an investor was less bound by obligations, which was a problem for architects.

Thus the professional community made efforts for the recognition and implementation of competitions results. For example, the UJIA intervened in a course of a competition on account of architects’ complaints\textsuperscript{232}. The main step of the UJIA on the regulation of competitive practice was the adoption of “The Rules for competitions in the field of

\textsuperscript{225} D. T. Leko, \textit{Naše prilike}, 97.
\textsuperscript{226} A. Jahontov, i M. Prosen, “Stvaralaštvo arhitekte Nikolaja Vasiljevića Vasiljeva i njegov beogradski opus (maj 1921 - februar 1923),” \textit{Naslede} 14 (2013): 118.
\textsuperscript{227} Kojić, \textit{Društveni uslov razvitka}, 199.
\textsuperscript{228} For example, St. Sava’s Church, St. Mark’s Church, the Patriarchal building, the cathedral of the Roman Catholic Archdiocese.
\textsuperscript{230} Kojić, \textit{Društveni uslov razvitka}, 52.
\textsuperscript{231} Ibid., 219.
\textsuperscript{232} Kojić, “Arhitektura između dva svetska rata,” 186.
architecture and engineering”233 in 1921. As in the prewar case the acceptance by a professional association made the Rules ineffective. Thus the UJIA in cooperation with the Engineering Chamber sought an adoption of such Rulebook from the side of the Ministry of Construction, which was gained only in 1938234.

Both Rulebooks contained instructions about procedures, stages, obligatory program content and requirements to announce competition and its results in newspapers and to organize an exhibitions235. The important part was regulation a composition of a jury. The UJIA’s Rulebook implied that at least two-thirds should be professionals236, the Rulebook of 1938 suggested that just the majority of professionals is enough, but one member should be representative from the Engineering Chamber237.

Unlike the UJIA’s Rulebook, under the influence of negative experience in competitions the Rulebook of 1938 contained restrictions for participants, which excluded everybody who took part in a preparation of a competition and jury members, as well as persons who have family or close professional relations with them238. Also because of numerous scandals with appointments and final choice, the Rulebook of 1938 included exact prescriptions that an investor should delegate the elaboration of the detailed plan to the author of the first awarded project, with exceptions for state institutions which had technical bureaus (but state institutions paid to the author the value of copyright according to the Rulebook of the awards for authorized engineers)239. If an investor appointed another

233 “Pravila za raspisivanje natečaja (utakmica) u oblasti arhitekture i inženjerstva,” Tehnički list 6 (1921): 65–67; Tehnički list 7 (1921): 78–81.
234 “Pravilnik o obavljanju konkursa za izradu idejnih skica za javne građevine i o pravima učesnika,” u Kojić, Društveni uslovi razvitka, 239-251.
235 Kojić, Društveni uslovi razvitka, 239-251.
236 “Pravila za raspisivanje natečaja,” 66.
237 Kojić, Društveni uslovi razvitka, 241.
238 Ibid., 240.
239 Ibid., 244.
architect for elaboration of first awarded project or chose another project for elaboration, investor should pay double the amount of copyright\textsuperscript{240}.

Both Rulebooks implied different types of competitions on the basis of the right to participate. Common competitions could be International, Slavic or Yugoslav\textsuperscript{241}. 'Narrow' competitions implied participation of architects by invitation and with particular professional qualifications\textsuperscript{242}. Such competitions were organized mainly by private investors. According to the Rulebook of 1938, 'narrow' competitions were possible only as a second stage after the common one\textsuperscript{243}.

The most intensive debates raised around international competitions. Generally such competitions were recognized as necessary for significant tasks, especially for town-planning purposes. Nevertheless town-planning competitions were among unsuccessful and their results were unimplemented. Thus it led to criticism of international competitions, because their participants were not familiar with the specifics of the city\textsuperscript{244}. Under the circumstances of strong competition, architects opposed the idea of engagement of foreign specialists in general and especially regular holding of international competitions\textsuperscript{245}.

An especially important was the case of the State Opera House. As a first project of such cultural significance it attracted attention of the professional community and authorities. The Ministry of Construction in cooperation with the Ministry of Education and Belgrade Municipality held special conferences about public buildings. On the second special conference they decided to organize an international competition for the State Opera

\textsuperscript{240} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{241} Ibid., 240. All Yugoslav citizens and Russian emigrants got a right to participate in Yugoslav competitions.
\textsuperscript{242} "Pravila za raspisivanje Natečaja," 66.
\textsuperscript{243} Kojić, Drustveni uslovi razvitka, 241.
\textsuperscript{244} Maksimović, Problemi urbanizma, 34.
\textsuperscript{245} V. Potočnjak, "O arhitektonskim natječajima kod nas," [About architectural competitions at our country] Gradskeviški vjesnik 7 (1938): 33. According to architects, frequency of international competitions in Belgrade were higher than in other countries (qv M. Ivacić, "Rešavanje problema zgrade za Operu pored skupom arhitekata. Zašto pozivamo strance-stručnjake da rešavaju naše arhitektonske probleme," [Solving the problem of the Opera House building on the meeting of architects. Why do we invite foreign experts to solve our architectural problems] Pravda, 6.3.1939, 12).
House in order to 'use newest experience in architecture for this type of buildings'\textsuperscript{246}. However, the UJIA insisted on Yugoslav competition\textsuperscript{247}, pointing that Yugoslav architect should be engaged for such significant task in the field of culture\textsuperscript{248}.

Finally, the international competition was held\textsuperscript{249}. As many other competitions of this period, it gave unsuccessful results with no first or second awards. The two third prizes were divided between the Italian team (M. Pasquale, L. Orestan, T. Dante et al) and the Croatian (V. Turina and H. Gotvald). (Figure A.2). Also among awarded were the German, Belgian and American teams and Belgrade architect Ivan Savković\textsuperscript{250}. The jury's decision provoked critical debates. Critiques pointed that the jury gave awards to representatives of different countries and awards had distributive character\textsuperscript{251}, although worthy projects of Yugoslav architects remained without awards\textsuperscript{252}.

The engagement of foreign architects aggravated the problem of appointments without competitions. For example, state authorities invited German architect Werner March\textsuperscript{253} to designed the Olympic Stadium in Belgrade\textsuperscript{254}. The presentation of his projects for the Stadium near the Belgrade Fortress caused the critique by the professional

\textsuperscript{246} Zapisnik konferencije (br. 863 od 23.3.1938), fasc. 3, fond 81, AJ.
\textsuperscript{247} “Vesti iz udrženja,” Tehnički list 5-6 (1939): 76.
\textsuperscript{249} Works from Italy, Germany, Protectorate of Bohemia and Moravia, France, Denmark, England, USA, Romania, Bulgaria, Hungary, Belgium (qv document № 8906 from 27.3.1940, fasc. 3269, fond 66, AJ).
\textsuperscript{250} “Kakva će izgledati nova državna opera u Beogradu,” [How will look the new State Opera in Belgrade] Politika 29.03.1940, 14.
\textsuperscript{251} Representatives of different countries received awards, that can be explained by the complicated political situation in wartime (qv I. Zdravković, “Ishod konkursa za Beogradsku operu,” [The results of the competitions for the Belgrade Opera] Umjetnički pregled 4-5 (1940): 144).
\textsuperscript{252} “Beogradski arhitekti oštro kritikuju odlike donete na medjunarodnom konkursu za novu Beogradsku Operu,” [Belgrade architects harshly criticize the results of the international competition for the new Belgrade Opera] Politika 06.04.1940, 6.
\textsuperscript{254} The construction of the Olympic Stadium was a part of project to host the XIV Olympics games in Belgrade (qv D. Zec, “Proposed Olympic Complex in Belgrade – Project by Hitler’s Architect Werner March,” CD Proceedings / International Conference Architecture and Ideology (September 28-29, 2012), edited by Vladimir Mako, Mirjana Roter Blagojević, Marta Vukotić Lazar, (Belgrade: Faculty of Architecture University of Belgrade, 2012), 960).
Besides criticism of architectural and urban details of his project, architects opposed the procedure of the appointment itself. The UJIA suggested using the March’s drafts as the basis for the future competition. For architects the absence of a competition demonstrated the disbelief in their abilities. Moreover, as in the case of the State Opera house they insisted that such significant task as the construction of the first national stadium can not be delegated to foreigners.

The importance and mandatory character of competitions was among the main topics in debates around the Zemun Bridge over Sava (later named after King Alexander). This bridge was significant in terms of urban planning and furthermore on the symbolical level as a connection of “old Serbia with the new Yugoslavia.” The state authorities announced a competition for engineering works, but its result was criticized because of foreign companies domination. The project for pylons was requested to Nikolay Krasnov without competition, as well as the sculptural decoration was ordered to Ivan Meštrović. Besides the fact that appointments for such significant task was without competition, the whole project was criticized because of its urban and architectural shortcomings. As a result

256 “Beogradski inženjeri i arhitekti protiv toga da se poslovi poveravaju inostranim stručnjacima, bez konsultacija naših ljudi,” [Belgrade engineers and architects are against the fact that the tasks entrusted to foreign experts without consulting our people] Politika, 20.8.1940, 12.
257 “Vesti iz udruženja,” Tehnički list 5-6 (1939): 76.
259 “Arhitekte protiv podizanja stadiona u Donjem gradu,” [Architects are against the construction of the stadium in the Donji Grad] Pravda, 16.12.1940, 10.
261 Krstić, “Visoko staranje kralja Aleksandra,” 762. The left bank of Sava was a territory belonging to the Austro-Hungarian Empire.
265 U. Rajević, “Konjanici za most kralja Aleksandra I u Beogradu,” GGB XXXIV (1987): 210. The initial project with lions statues implied holding a competition organised by the contractor, but corruption problems caused the first wave of protests from the Association of Jugoslav Fine Artists with demand to organize state competition (qv “Prestavka udruženja likovnih umetnika,” Politika 10.3.1933, 5).
the professional community suggested organizing the new complex competition in order to engage the best Yugoslav engineers, architects and sculptors\(^267\).

### 2.2. Problems in Competitive Practice

The cases of the Olympic Stadium and the Zemun Bridge demonstrated architects’ commitment to competitive practice, although an abundance of problems might undermine their faith in its effectiveness. The problems embraced all stages of competitions: elaboration of a program, work of a jury, decision making and its implementation. Unsuccessful results of competitions led to intensive debates, critique and even disappointing conclusions that competitions abandoned the idea of searching for the best solutions\(^268\). Architects apprehended that competitions could turn into formal practice with results which are known at the beginning\(^269\). Despite the high level of corruption in the Kingdom\(^270\), competitions for architectural projects seem to be quite free of corruption influences, because did not involve a money question as much as auctions in which technical bureaus competed for engineering works and construction of the building. Architects were paid for the detailed elaboration of the whole project around 5-10\% of the total costs of a building\(^271\).

Although the selection of a winning project was not so related with embezzlement of funds, the procedure was complicated by prejudgment, favoritism and close relations between jury members and participants. As in the prewar practice collegial relations were unavoidable because of close professional contacts between architects. Although the regulation of competitions aimed to provide anonymity of projects (which were presented

---


\(^{269}\) Kojić, *Društveni uslovi razvitka*, 96.


\(^{271}\) Such payment was assured by the Rulebook of awards for authorized engineers, however practically payments were much less (qv Kojić, *Društveni uslovi razvitka*, 8).
by motto), the possibility that architects could inform colleagues in a jury about mottos of their projects can not be excluded. However, on the one hand, the juxtaposition between lists of the authors of the awarded projects and the jury members did not reveal essential professional connections between them. On the other hand, a jury should publish a report with comments about each project. Under the circumstances of high competition and even rivalry between architects supplemented by high publicity of architectural process any doubts of other participants in the impartiality of jury would be obvious and discussed in the press\textsuperscript{272}. However, besides close professional contacts, more problematic were family ties or commercial connections.

The biggest scandal occurred in the case of a competition for the Ministry of Finance buildings then the fact that the Jury Chairman was a father of an employee of a winning bureau was discovered\textsuperscript{273}. Subsequent reactions of the professional community influenced the development of competitive practice and discussed in the next chapter.

Another case was the competition for the Belgrade Fairground, which was an important project for development of the left bank of Sava\textsuperscript{274}. The competition was organized by Municipality and right to participate had only architects from Belgrade\textsuperscript{275}. The project of architect Ignjat Popović, employee of Technical Directorate of the Belgrade Municipality, got the first prize\textsuperscript{276}. Later accusations that the jury chairman Milan Nešić participated in the creation of the winning project appeared in newspapers\textsuperscript{277}, as well as a

\textsuperscript{272} For example, as in the case of Belgrade Fairground
\textsuperscript{273} Anonim. ”Razne vesti—, Tehnički list, br. 19, (01.10. 1924), 248.
\textsuperscript{276} M. Zloković (second), M. Manojlović and I. Azriel (trird) qv D.S., “Beogradsko sajmište – prema idejnoj skici g. Ignjata Popovića koji je dobio prvu nagradu,” [Belgrade Fairgrounds - according to the project of Ignjat Popović who won the first prize] Vreme, 18.4.1936, 10.
\textsuperscript{277} “Afera sa beogradskim sajmištem: Pretsednik žiria inženjer Milan Nešić dodeljuje prvu nagradu svome proektu, ” [The affair with the Belgrade fairgrounds: The Jury Chairman Milan Nešić awarded the first prize to his project] Slobodna reč, 1.06.1936, 5.
critique of this project as the weakest and imperfect. However, the UJIA denied such accusations and claimed that made no doubt to the decision and the quality of the jury. Finally the job was entrusted to architects of the Technical Directorate of the Belgrade Municipality.

Another problem with jury work had more fundamental character: the issue of composition of jury and its professional qualifications. Despite that the Rulebook of 1938 regulated that majority should be professionals, architects proposed more restrictive suggestions as at least two-thirds should be engineers and architects or even with only architects. In practice a jury always contained representatives of an investor, even if architects doubt their abilities to evaluate architectural projects. A jury mainly included also representatives from professional organizations, the Ministry of Construction, the Technical Faculty of the University. Gradually, a group of architects who specialized on being a jury member appeared. However, despite efforts of the professional community and adoption of the Rulebook, problems with jury remained.

In the case of the State Opera House, architect Ivan Zdravković claimed that one of the reasons of the competition failure was the jury. The jury members were architects from universities of Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana, two representatives of the Ministry of Construction, three from the Ministry of Education and also directors of National theaters.

---

278 "Da li g.g. inž. Nešić i Popović imaju toliko morala da odgovore, " [Do Nešić and Popović have morale to answer] Slobodna reč, 17.06.1936, 6.
283 Ibid., 152.
284 From professional point of view it was obligatory, and finally the Rulebook of 1938 contained a requirement that one member should be representative from the Engineering Chamber (qv Kojić, Društveni uslovi razvijeka, 240).
285 For example, D.M. Leko, S. Jovanović, P. Bajalović, M. Korunović, D. Maslač, B. Kojić.
286 Zdravković, “Ishod konkursa za Beogradsku operu,” 144
from Belgrade and Zagreb\textsuperscript{287}. Since the competition was announced after the adoption of the Rulebook, the Engineering Chamber and the UJIA insisted that composition of the jury should meet the requirements, and moreover include at least one foreign member due to the international character of the competition\textsuperscript{288}. Zdravković in his article pointed out that the jury members was clearly divided into modernists and conservators\textsuperscript{289}, and such division explained why the highest awards got two principally different projects: the Italian monumental neoclassical project and the Croatian modernist project in the International style\textsuperscript{290} (figure A.2).

In general the split of opinions among the jury members and awarding completely different projects was common practice\textsuperscript{291}. Such cases demonstrated the main stylistic confrontations. For instance, on the competition for the Warrior’s House in 1929 the academism project of J. Jovanović and Ž. Piperski and the Byzantine-Romanesque project of B. Nestrović and J. Šnajder got the highest awards\textsuperscript{292} (figure A.3). Later the main confrontation occurred between modernist and academic projects, as in the case of the competition for the Administration of State Monopoles in 1937, which discussed in the next chapter.

The jury professional qualification influenced not only stylistic preferences, but also a quality of program. Architects claimed that unsuccessful results of competitions were caused by low quality of programs, which were made without understanding of architectural

\textsuperscript{287} Document №14885 from 21.4.1938, fasc. 3, fond 81, AJ.
\textsuperscript{288} Resolution from the UJIA to the ministries of Construction and Education, №436 from 10.8.1939, fasc. 344, fond 66, AJ.
\textsuperscript{289} Zdravković, “Ishod konkursa za Beogradsku operu,” 145.
\textsuperscript{291} Jurišić, “O faktorima konkursa,” 46.
and functional features, were often incomplete and rough-and-ready\textsuperscript{293} and contained contradictory tasks \textsuperscript{294}.

For example, the competition program for the State Printing House caused the intensive discussions. After the Ministry of Education announced the competition in 1933, architects firstly criticized the location which had no regulation\textsuperscript{295} and therefore made the elaboration of projects senseless\textsuperscript{296}. Secondly, architect Josif Najman claimed that the program was incomplete, did not contain information about machinery that made the elaboration of projects even impossible\textsuperscript{297}. Under pressure the Ministry made changes, but only for regulation of territory\textsuperscript{298}. Dragiša Brašovan won the first prize, the second went to the Croatian team Korka-Kiverov-Krekić) and Dragan Gudović and Dimitrije M. Leko got the third one\textsuperscript{299}. Finally, Brašovan’s project were implemented, but on the other location\textsuperscript{300}.

Besides incomplete programs, architects faced problems with contradictions between conditions in programs and final decisions. For instance, the State Mortgage Bank announced a competitions with requirement to unite a new building with existing one, at that architects could choose a way of combining\textsuperscript{301}. After giving awards, the Administration claimed that existing building should be preserved as significant and on this base requested the elaboration of a project for its architect Vojin Petrović\textsuperscript{302}. D.M. Leko insisted that such

\textsuperscript{293} Potočnjak, “O arhitektonskim natječajima kod nas,” 33.
\textsuperscript{294} Jurišić, “O faktorima konkursa,” 47.
\textsuperscript{298} “Izmena utakmice za izradu idejnih skica za novu zgradu Državne štamparije,” \textit{Pravda}, 14.05.1933, 19.
\textsuperscript{299} “Idejne skice za Državnu štampariju,”[Projects for the State Printing House] \textit{Politika}, 12.08.1933, 5.
\textsuperscript{300} Ilijevički, “Form and Function,” 270.
\textsuperscript{302} “Rešeno je pitanje palete Državne hipotekarne banke u Beogradu,” [The question of the building for the State Mortgage Bank is decided] \textit{Politika} 5.2.1930, 6.
actions were not only unacceptable from the point of view of competitive practice, but also impeached the qualification of architects.\(^{303}\)

Apart from the issue of quality, the content of a program was important for architects, because of probable restrictions. Some competition programs contained requirements to design in the specific style, that architects opposed in order to keep their creative freedom.\(^{304}\) In this sense competitions for sacral architecture were particularly problematic.

Among the significant interwar architectural projects was the Church of Saint Sava, which was important for the national identity.\(^{305}\) The competition was announced in 1926 with the main requirement to create a project in the Serbo-Byzantine style, based on the traditions of the time of Prince Lazar.\(^{306}\) The UJIA opposed such requirements and urged its members not to participate.\(^{307}\) Finally, the jury awarded only the second prize to the project of Bogdan Nestorović.\(^{308}\) The competition caused intense and long debates.\(^{309}\) Besides the issue of the style restrictions, the competition program was also criticized because ignoring urban issues and the specifics of the place.\(^{310}\) As regards critique of the style demands, on the one hand, architects opposed the idea of using the Serbo-Byzantine style because it did not meet the conditions of time or the idea of Yugoslav architecture.\(^{311}\) On the other, the fact of presence of restriction was criticized and architects demanded organizing a new competition with full creative freedom.\(^{313}\)

\(^{303}\) Leko, “Konkurs za izradu skice,” 66.

\(^{304}\) Kojić, Drašteni uslovi razvitka, 52.


\(^{308}\) Pešić, *Spomen-hram Sv. Save*, 41.


\(^{311}\) “Kako treba da izgleda budući monumentalni hram Svetoga Save,” [How should look the future monumental church of St Sava] *Vreme*, 24.1.1932, 1.

\(^{312}\) “Kako treba da izgleda budući monumentalni hram Svetoga Save,” *Vreme*, 27.1.1932, 5.

\(^{313}\) T. Damljanović, “‘Fighting’ the St. Sava,” 129.
The same problem occurred in the case of the Church of St. Mark. Initially the program contained the wider style demand as “old Byzantine”\textsuperscript{314}, but later the church administration changed the request and set an exact architectural model as Gračanica monastery\textsuperscript{315}. The jury contained two ecclesiastics and three architects (two of which were prominent specialist in Serbo-Byzantine style)\textsuperscript{316}. The competition was narrow, architects who distinguished in the competition for St. Sava's Church (brothers Krštić, Deroko and B. Nestorović) and some young architects (R. Tatić, Ž. Piperski and A. Vasić) were invited\textsuperscript{317}. However as well as in the previous case architects criticized the competition conditions as restraining and impoverishing\textsuperscript{318}. Consequently the results led to intense public debates. Brothers Krštić, who strictly adhered to requirements, got the first prize\textsuperscript{319}. Their project was criticized as a caricature, which reduces the structural features of the model to a simple decoration\textsuperscript{320}. The defender of their project in the press was a jury member Milan Minić\textsuperscript{321}, he pointed out that Krtstics proposed the best decision for such requirements\textsuperscript{322}.

The negative competition results, then the jury did not awarded the first, or even the second prize, troubled the professional community\textsuperscript{323}. Such results appeared sometimes in the competitive practice during the 1920s, but were typical for the majority of competitions in the late 1930s\textsuperscript{324}. Architects worried because this situation created the negative image of

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{itemize}
\item\textsuperscript{314} A. Kadijević, “Prilog proučavanju arhitekture crkve Svetog Marka na beogradskom Tašmajdanu,” \textit{Naslede} 1 (1997): 76.
\item\textsuperscript{315} “Kako će izgledati novi hram sv. Marka na nekadašnjem Starom groblju,” [How will look the new Church of St. Mark on the former Old Cemetery] \textit{Vreme}, 14.9.1929, 6.
\item\textsuperscript{318} Kojić, \textit{Društveni uslovi razvitka}, 254.
\item\textsuperscript{319} M. Đurđević, \textit{Arhitekti Petar i Branko Krštić}, (Beograd: Republički zavod za zaštitu spomenika kulture, 1996), 78.
\item\textsuperscript{322} M.C. Minić, “Nova crkva Svetog Apostala Marka u Beogradu,” \textit{Vreme}, 25.3.1932, 2.
\item\textsuperscript{323} Potočnjak, “O arhitektonskim natječajima kod nas,” 33.
\item\textsuperscript{324} Bajlon, “Javn arhitektonski natječaji u Beogradu,” 30–31.
\end{itemize}
\end{footnotesize}
architects’ abilities\textsuperscript{325} and claimed that unsuccessful results appeared as consequence of low quality of programs\textsuperscript{326}. They suggested that in any case the first prize should be awarded, because one project would be the best in comparison with others\textsuperscript{327}. Actually such results were profitable for investors, because help to avoid the prescription to elaborate final project on the base of the first prize project\textsuperscript{328}. For example, on the competition for the Ethnographical Museum in 1938, in the absence of the first prize, the jury awarded two seconds for Mate Bajlon and the Croatian team Korka-Kiverov-Krekić\textsuperscript{329}. However the Ministry of Education chose for elaboration the third prize project by Dragan Gudović as ‘most appropriate’\textsuperscript{330}. In the absence of the first award, an investor could choose even a not awarded project. For example, as in the case of the State Stamps Printing House in 1936, the jury awarded two seconds prizes for the Croatian team Haberle-Bauer and Serbian architect M. Prljević, the third one went to Croatian architect J. Korka\textsuperscript{331}. Finally the elaboration of project was entrusted to Josif Najman\textsuperscript{332}.

The main problem of competitive practice for the architects was the situation then the author of first awarded project often did not elaborate the final one. The first variant of this problem implied that the winning project was accepted for realization, but the elaboration was entrusted to another architect. According to the Rulebook, only state institutions can make such decisions, in other cases an investor should paid for copyright

\textsuperscript{325} Ivacić, “Rešavanje problema zgrade za Operu,” \textit{Pravda}, 6.3.1939, 12.
\textsuperscript{326} Kojić, \textit{Društveni uslovi razvitka}, 218.
\textsuperscript{327} Potočnjak, “O arhitektonskim natječajima kod nas,” 33.
\textsuperscript{329} Bajlon, “Javni arhitektonski natjecaji u Beogradu,” 32.
\textsuperscript{330} “Etnografski muzej u Beogradu imaće zgradu po uzoru na zgrade evropskih muzeja te vrste,” [Ethnographic Museum in Belgrade will have building based on the models of European museums of this type] \textit{Pravda}, 02.09.1938, 3.
\textsuperscript{331} “Izvještaj Ocenjivačkog suda sa utakmice za izradu idejne skice za novu zgradu Državne Markarnice u Beogradu,” (Beograd: Štampa Državna Markarnica, 1936), 14.
\textsuperscript{332} Kadijević, A. “Arhitekt Josif Najman (1890-1951).” [Architect Josif Najman]. \textit{Moment} 18 (1990): 100–106. M. Prljević commented the decision as “the elaboration of project was entrusted to the participant, who rated among the last and about whom it was know at the beginning that he would get the job” qv Kojić, \textit{Društveni uslovi razvitka}, 225.
twice\textsuperscript{333}. However, for architects such payment, the award and moral success could not be satisfying\textsuperscript{334}, because the final project elaboration was the best paid part of work\textsuperscript{335}. The second variant was even more problematic for competitive practice: ignoring the results and choosing other projects instead of the first awarded. Such cases deactivated the idea of competition as an instrument for searching the best solutions.

The two variants can be illustrated by cases of two competitions\textsuperscript{336} for the Mortgage Bank of the Commercial Fund (HBTF) in 1938. On the competition for the building in the corner of Kralja Milana and Frankopanova streets\textsuperscript{337} the jury distributed all prizes: the first went to M. Bajlon, the second to M. Prljević and D.Popović, the third to M. Zlokovic\textsuperscript{338}. Finally the construction was entrusted to Branislav Marinković according to his project\textsuperscript{339}.

The other building was constructed in the place of destroyed kafana “Albania”, which was important in the terms of town-planning and the future of this corner was a subject of professional discussions\textsuperscript{340}. For such significant location the HBTF demanded a monumental building\textsuperscript{341}. The competition attracted 84 participants, but the jury did not award the first prize\textsuperscript{342}. The Croatian team Haberle-Bauer got the second prized, the jury also awarded two third prizes for another Croatian team Dumendžić–Vrkljan–Dumendžić and M. Bajlon\textsuperscript{343}. One more project was intended to be awarded the third prize, but the

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{333} Kojić, Društveni uslovi razvitka, 244.
\textsuperscript{334} D.P., “O raspisu natječaja i njihovom uspjehu,” 66.
\textsuperscript{335} Kojić, Društveni uslovi razvitka, 224.
\textsuperscript{336} In both cases architects in the jury were the same (P.Bajalovic, D.M. Leko, B. Kojic), only two representers of the HBTF differed.
\textsuperscript{337} nowadays Resavska street
\textsuperscript{338} “Izveštaj Ocenjivačkog suda za izradu idejne skice za novu zgradu HBTF u Beogradu, uglo Kralja Milana 23 i 25 i Frankopanove ulice,” (Beograd: Štampa fabrika Marinić i Janković, 1938), 15.
\textsuperscript{340} “Na zemlji „Albanije“ počće na proleće podiyanje velike Hipotekarne Banke Trgovačkog fonda,” [On the place of “Albania” will begin construction of the Mortgage Bank of Commercial Fund in the spring] Politika, 14.01.1938, 12.
\textsuperscript{341} “Natječaj zaizradu idejne skice za novu zgradu hipotekarne banke Trgovačkog fonda u Beogradu,” Gradevinski vjesnik 4 (1938): 49.
\textsuperscript{342} The results was criticizes in the article “Daj šta daš” – Izložba nacrta za zgradu »Albanije« na Tehničkom fakultetu. Rđav običaj ukidanja prve nagrade,” Politika, 21.04.1938, 8.
\textsuperscript{343} “Konkurs za zgradu »Albanije«: žiri nije dodelio prvu nagradu za »Albaniju«,” [Competition for building “Albania”: the jury has not awarded the first prize for “Albania”] Politika, 6.4.1938, 7.
\end{flushleft}
education of the authors (B. Bon and M. Grkalić) did not meet the requirements of competitions\textsuperscript{344}. However, the administration of the HBTF chose their project as the most appropiable\textsuperscript{345}. Because of problems with their status as authorized designers, M. Prljević was engaged for the project elaboration\textsuperscript{346}, according to him after narrow competition between awarded and purchased projects\textsuperscript{347}. Later the HBTF informed Bon and Grkalić about the decision not to construct\textsuperscript{348}. As a result Bon and Grklić realized that their idea was used for the construction from an article in a newspaper\textsuperscript{349}. After their public protests\textsuperscript{350}, Prljević answered that although their designed initial projects together, they had no relation to the final project\textsuperscript{351}.

Even then the first awarded project was accepted for elaboration, an investor could insist on changes in the project not only because of technical and functional reasons, but also because of his stylistic preferences. For architects it meant a violation of an original idea of the author. Such changes can be made by the architect himself (for example, the PRIZAD building\textsuperscript{352} or the House of the Craftsmen’s Club\textsuperscript{353}) or by another architect (the third competitions for the UJIA building\textsuperscript{354} or the building for the District Office for Workers’ Insurance\textsuperscript{355}).

\textsuperscript{345} “Hipotekarna Banka Trgovačkog fonda uskora pristupa građenju nove „Albanije“ i još jedne palate na uglu ulice Kralja Milana i Frankopanove,” Vreme, 6.4.1938, 7.
\textsuperscript{347} “Po čijim je planovima sagrađena palata »Albanija« (odgovor projektanta palate »Albanije« arhitekte g. Miladina Prljevića na izjavu zagrebačkih arhitekata g.g. Graklića i Bona),” [According to whose plans palace "Albania" was built] Pravda, 20.02.1940, 6.
\textsuperscript{348} Ceranić, “Istoria i arhitektura palate ‘Albanije’ u Beogradu,” 151.
\textsuperscript{351} “Po čijim je planovima sagrađena palata »Albanija«,” Pravda, 20.02.1940, 6.
\textsuperscript{354} Ignjatović, “Dom Udruženja jugoslovenskih inženjera i arhitekata u Beogradu,” 104.
Mainly investors complained that projects were not representative enough, especially in cases of administrative buildings. However, the reverse situation leading to modernization of a building image was possible. The competition for the building Pension Fund of the National Bank was held in 1937. Against the backdrop of an abundance of modernist projects, the academism project of Russian emigrant architect Grigory Samojlov got the first prize. The commentary of the jury implied that facade was too representative and expensive for this type of buildings. As a result, in the final project Samojlov modernized the building in order to simplify and reduce the costs.

Correspondingly architects adapted the idea of post-competitions changes for their own purposes. Thus the competition project met all requirements, but during the project elaboration an architect can make changes. For example, the competition for the Endowment of Sima Igumanov in 1938 was ‘narrow’ and had a requirement to create project in the Serbo-Byzantine style. Brother Krstić won the first prize, but designing the detailed project they simplified the initial project in the spirit of modern architecture.

Sometimes projects were changed under the influence of modification of conditions as for example a change of a location. In the case the Art Pavilion ‘The Cvijeta Zuzorić’ the requirement to use vernacular architecture appeared in the competition program because of the location initially chosen for pavilion. B. Kojić won the competition. Later the location was changed and the head of Belgrade Municipality insisted on the changes of the

356 “Zapisnik ocjenjivačkog suda za ocenu idejnih skica za novu zgradu Penzionog fonda činovnika i služitelja Narodne banke Kraljevine Jugoslavije na Terazijama u Beogradu,” 15. T: 111.181/1, Muzej Nauke i Tehnike. The second prize got M. Prljević with I.Bijelić, the third one got M. Ivačić.
357 Ibid., 7.
360 The investor invited brother Krstić, A. Deroko and G. Samojlov to participate.
363 near the key heritage building as Princess Ljubica’s Residence (konak) qv Putnik, “Folklorizam u arhitekturi Beograda,” 178.
style, because there was no more reason to use folklorism. Instead he proposed to follow European models and final project was created by Kojić in the academism style.

In some cases a change of a location did not prevent realization of competition projects or led only to adaptations, but mainly it caused inapplicability of results and consequently renouncement of them (for example Kolarac Popular University Building or the second competition of the UJIA building). On the whole, remaining of competitions results unimplemented idled the competitive mechanism. Some projects from competitions which was held in the late 1930s were not realized because of the Second World War. However, another unimplemented projects demonstrated underlying problems of the architectural process.

In general results of international competitions were not realized, especially it concerns town-planning competitions: most of them were international and most of them gave unrealizable results. However, unlike competitions for buildings, town-planning competitions involved interests of a lot of institutions and had higher financial demands. Among town-planning competitions held in the interwar period, the competition for the Terazije Terrace attracted substantial attention of the professional community. Behind the competition was the idea to create a complex of monumental public buildings. Representatives of five countries with 25 projects participated in the competition. The

365 Moreover to him folklorism caused negative associations with "the dark period of the Ottoman rule" qv Putnik, “Folklorizam u arhitekturi Beograda,” 179.
367 For example, the State Printing House.
370 For example, Tašmajdan, Topčider, Slavija Square, Theatre Square (qv Somborski, “Razvoj Beograda između dva rata,” 45).
373 The Kingdom of Yugoslavia, Germany, France, Czechoslovakia (qv “Pitanje Terazijske Terase se rešava. Otvaranje i procena skice,” [The question of the Terazije Terrace is solving. Opening and evaluation of projects] Vreme, 15.06.1930, 10).
first prize went to Serbian architect Nikola Dobrović, who studied and worked in Prague. The German architect O. Kurz got the second award, M. Hečimović and G. Bohutinski from Prague got the third, and the fourth prize went to B. Marinković and D. Jovanović. The project of Nikola Dobrović played a significant role for the affirmation and development of Serbian modernism. Moreover, it was one of the most progressive town-planning projects of its time. However, his project implied serious financial contributions that complicated its realization.

On the whole, the abundance of problems caused refusals to participate or appeals from the professional organizations to boycott incorrectly announced competitions. Although some architects actively took part during all their career, mainly only young architects participated. Problems in competitive practice influenced also architectural development in a negative way. For example, Branislav Kojić claimed that backwardness of public buildings in Belgrade was caused by wrong course of competitions, because their results were ignored.

Chapter Three. Competitions and Administrative Buildings: Case Studies

3.1. The issue of governmental buildings

After the First World War Belgrade faced a problem of unsuitable allocation of state institutions. War damages caused a lack of premises and unsatisfactory quality of preserved buildings. On the other hand, territorial expansion and changes of character of the state led

---

375 In addition six project were purchased (two Yugoslav and four German) q.v. B. Popović, “Kako će izgledati Terazijska terasa,” [How will look the Terazije Terrace] Politika, 6.07.1930, 7–8.
379 For example, M. Korunović (qv A. Kadijević, A. Momir Korunović, (Beograd: Republički zavod za zaštitu spomenika culture, 1996), 30) or B. Kojić (qv S. Toševa, Branislav Kojić, 56).
381 Kojić, Društveni uslovi razvitka, 96.
to the institutional reform, which called for establishment of new institutions and reorganization of existing. The state had to allocate new institutions in leased buildings, which mainly were unsuitable\textsuperscript{382} and moreover costly, because of rent charges\textsuperscript{383}.

Furthermore, symbolic reasons were of relevance – temporary housing of state institutions was giving an impression of weakness. For example, the very proclamation of the new Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was announced in the private house of Krsmanović, moreover the proclamation of the first constitution (the Vidovdan Constitution) took place in former building of Cavalry barracks\textsuperscript{384}, in which the National Assembly finally was allocated during the 1920s\textsuperscript{385}. Therefore an effort was made to remedy this situation and constructed appropriate representative buildings for state institutions. It was planned that the state would vacate private buildings as soon as possible\textsuperscript{386}. For construction purpose state institutions could get a loan and whole process was regulated by special committee\textsuperscript{387}.

In the beginning of the 1920s the Belgrade Municipality got offers from foreign companies to construct a whole complex of governmental buildings\textsuperscript{388}, which were rejected\textsuperscript{389}. The administration failed to create a coherent plan\textsuperscript{390}, and each institution organized a construction process on their own\textsuperscript{391}. Because of economical problems and complications in coordination of interests, the necessity of proper allocation for state institutions was relevant until the Second World War\textsuperscript{392}.

\textsuperscript{386}“Za podizanje Beograda,” [For Construction of Belgrade] \textit{Politika}, 02.07.1920, 3.
\textsuperscript{388}“Za obnovu Beograda,” [For Reconstruction of Belgrade] \textit{Politika}, 10.10.1920, 3.
\textsuperscript{390}Kušević, \textit{Jugoslavija na tehničkom polju 1919 – 1929}, 60.
\textsuperscript{391}Leko, “Nova zgrada Ministarstva poljoprivrede i voda,” 193.
\textsuperscript{392}Toševa, “Arhitektonsko odeljenje Ministarstva građevina,” 84.
The construction of governmental buildings was connected with an idea to create administrative centers. During urban transformations of Belgrade after 1878 such idea was not implemented and as a result existing ministerial buildings mainly were located in different parts\textsuperscript{393}. The task of creating administrative centers was among significant requirements during the elaboration of the Master Plan. For example, the program for the international competition included a list of areas allotted for governmental buildings\textsuperscript{394}. According to the final version of the Master Plan these areas were reserved for state institutions\textsuperscript{395}.

The first area was conceived as adjoined to the Knez Miloša street. The Master Plan implied the creation of the complex of ministerial buildings in the area between streets Knez Miloša, Nemanjina, Hajduk Veljkova and Birčaninova\textsuperscript{396}. This area had good transport accessibility and was located near some of existing ministerial buildings\textsuperscript{397}, because since the 1880s the Knez Miloša street became a “representative state buildings axis”\textsuperscript{398}. Consequently during the interwar period this axis ‘was a gathering line’ for governmental building projects\textsuperscript{399}. Another administrative area was also related to pre-war urban development, because was designated near the National Assembly building\textsuperscript{400}, where in addition the Knez Miloša street starts.

The issue of governmental buildings was in terms of reference of the Ministry of Construction, which conducted all stages of construction\textsuperscript{401}, but announced competitions for

\textsuperscript{394} Vuksanović-Macura, San o gradu, 31.
\textsuperscript{395} Maksimović, Problemi urbanizma, 35.
\textsuperscript{396} B.M. Pajević, Regulacija Beograda 1867–1923. godine, (Beograd: Grafički institut „Narodna misao“, 1923), 73.
\textsuperscript{397} The document № 5650 from 03.03.1921, facs. 1371, fond 62, AJ.
\textsuperscript{398} Roter Blagojević and Vukotić Lazar, “Between East and West,” 128.
\textsuperscript{399} Ignjatović, “Architecture, Urban Development, and the Yugoslavization,” 122.
\textsuperscript{401} Toševa, “Arhitektonsko odeljenje Ministarstva građevina,” 112.
projects, because such buildings were significant\textsuperscript{402}. Despite the fact that Rulebooks implied the same competitive procedure for private and state institutions\textsuperscript{403}, for administrative buildings the main problems of competitive practice were ignoring the results and changing the projects. With the exception of projects that were not implemented at all, the majority of constructed administrative buildings presented differences between their shapes and competition projects. Thus the cases revealed the gap between architectural development and preferences of state institutions. This gap had two dimensions: stylistic and functional.

On the one hand, stylistic preferences of state institutions came to the discrepancy with the new architectural trends. While modernism gradually affirmed in Belgrade architecture, the state authorities continued to support revivalist styles. Academism was considered as a style which can embody the stability and prosperity of the state, represent the Yugoslav unity, and thus was the most suitable for governmental buildings. From such point of view, modernism did not meet requirements of representative architecture, because of simplistic and undecorated facades. These considerations demonstrated the gap not only in stylistic preferences, but also in very understanding of the essence of architecture.

During the interwar period, the direction of architectural searches started to diverge with requests of governmental architecture. Architects paid attention to solving social problems\textsuperscript{404} in the spirit of ‘leveling between palaces and huts’\textsuperscript{405}. In addition functional and rational organization of space became crucial and made the issue of facades insignificant.

In the case of Belgrade architecture, a turning point was revealed by a questionnaire about architecture, initiated by Belgrade Municipal Newspaper in 1932. Although the

\textsuperscript{402} Kojić, Društveni uslovi razvitka, 211-212.

\textsuperscript{403} The main difference was that according Rulebook of 1938 state institutions had a right to entrust final elaboration to its technical bureau without paying copyright fees twice. From the other hand, private institutions more broadly interpreted prescriptions of Rulebooks and rarely reacted to interventions of the UJIA.


questions themselves and the majority of answers demonstrated that the issue of facades remained its significance, some responses questioned relevance of facades for architecture and claimed that such obsolete accentuation on facades obstructed architectural development of Belgrade. Croatian modernist architect Stjepan Planić published a review of this questionnaire, in which emphasized that the focus of modern architecture is on the content rather than the form. Moreover, he indicated that ‘members of the ruling class’ paid attention to facades in order express their power and prosperity.

For administrative buildings, a facade functioned as a kind of a screen, which articulate and translate representations of state institutions. In the case of new established states such representation became crucial. Thus the Kingdom put efforts to constructed rich-decorated monumental administrative buildings, which were criticized by architects. They claimed that such primitive demands raised the price of buildings without avail, while problems of urban planning and social housing were relevant.

The divergence existed not only on the level of ideas, but also pervaded the organization of competitions. The competition programs were based on functional requirements about space organization and quite rare contained the style or any other demands about facades. The jury decisions and distributions of awards were made on the base of successfulness of the functional use of a space. Conversely on the final stages of the decision making process, the issue of facades became significant. Thus results of competitions differed from the final shape of buildings. For example, modernists projects

---

406 The journal adressed to professionals following questions:
1. What you think about contemporary facades of new constructed building after the war in Belgrade?
2. Is it any kind of progresse in designing more beautiful facades?
3. In what direction should develope future architectural shape of the capital according to current architectural design and construction opportunities?
409 Ibid.
started to win in competitions for administrative buildings during the 1930s, but after interventions of state investor projects were designed in the academic style. As a result the professional community criticized backwardness of governmental architecture and its incompatibility with architectural development.

### 3.2. Ministerial buildings

For construction of ministerial buildings, the Ministry of Construction organized competitions, but mainly problems with final decisions occurred. Only one ministerial building was constructed according to the competition winning project: the building for the Ministry of Transport. According to the Master Plan, the Ministry got a territory in the area designed for a complex of ministerial buildings near the Knez Miloša street. The competition was announced in 1922 with requirements to satisfy contemporary functional and aesthetic standards. The first prize got the project of Sverozar Jovanović, who was a representative of the pre-war generation of Serbian architects, the professor of the Belgrade University and a long-term employee of the Ministry of Construction. His project was considered as one of the best examples of the academic style, producing the effect of monumentality by strict harmonious composition. Thus it met expectations of the Ministry about representative architecture. However, the financial reasons delayed the

---

412 Kojić, *Društveni uslovi razvitka*, 96.
419 Nestorović, “Postakademizam u arhitekturi Beograda,” 347.
implementation of the project and the construction started only in 1927, after receiving loan from the State Mortgage Bank. In the beginning of the 1920s the gap between professional and governmental view on styles and architecture was not relevant, thus the competition occurred without problems.

However, in this period problems could emerge because of difficulties in development of competitive practice itself, as for example in the case of the building of the Ministry of Forestry and Mining and the Ministry of Agriculture and Waterworks.

The Ministry of Agriculture and Waterworks got a place in the area designated for ministerial complex in 1921 and invited without a competition the architect Nikola Nestorović to create a project and control the construction. Nestorović was one of the most fruitful representatives of the pre-war generation. For the Ministry he created the project, which characterized by combination of Art Nouveau elements with Neo-Classical monumentality (figure 1).

\[423\] M. Pavlović, “Život i delo arhitekte Nikole Nestorovića,” (PhD diss., Univerzitet u Beogradu, 2014), 352. Pavlović supposed that he was invited because of his membership in the Serbian agricultural society.
The Ministry of Forestry and Mining got for its building the neighboring sector\(^{426}\) and requested holding a competition to the Ministry of Construction\(^{427}\). Requirements for the project included imposing monumental building with rich decoration in order to ‘worthily and pronouncedly represent the Ministry, which manages overground and underground natural wealth’\(^{428}\). Under the influence of the idea of creating an administrative center, the Ministry of Construction suggested to design both buildings in accordance and harmony with each other, and for this purpose to conduct a competition for a joint project\(^{429}\). The competition requirements implied relations with existing Nestorović’s project\(^{430}\). Among fifteen projects, the jury awarded three and purchased two\(^{431}\).

The winning project was created by the technical bureau “Architect” of Dragiša Brašovan\(^{432}\) (figure 2). As it was mentioned in the accompanying text, they tried to follow and develop the ideas of existing Nestorović’s project. The jury characterized architecture of

---

\(^{426}\) Vladišavljević, “Zgrada Ministarstva poljoprivrede i voda,” 214.
\(^{427}\) The document №8842 from 10.04.1921, fasc. 1371, fond 62, AJ.
\(^{428}\) The document №2191 from 25.01.1921, fasc. 1371, fond 62, AJ.
\(^{429}\) Toševa, “Arhitektonsko odeljenje Ministarstva građevina,” 112.
\(^{430}\) Vladišavljević, “Zgrada Ministarstva poljoprivrede i voda,” 217.
\(^{431}\) Leko, “Nova zgrada Ministarstva poljoprivrede i voda,” 194.
this project as “serious, quiet with simple contemporary forms”\textsuperscript{433}. Other awarded and purchased projects were in different variants of neoclassical academism\textsuperscript{434}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=\textwidth]{figure2.jpg}
\caption{The competition project by the bureau “Architect” for the building of the Ministry of Forestry and Mining.}
\end{figure}

After the competition a conflict between the Ministry of Construction, the bureau “Architect” and Nestorović started about the issue of the project elaboration. Firstly, according to the contract with the Ministry of Forestry and Mining, Nestorović got this right\textsuperscript{435}. The bureau “Architect” appealed to the UJIA and after its intervention the decision was changed in favor of the bureau and the contract was assigned\textsuperscript{436}. Finally they elaborated the project together, but the Ministry of Construction was not satisfied by it\textsuperscript{437} (figure 3).

\begin{flushright}
\textsuperscript{433} Leko, “Nova zgrada Ministerstva poljoprivrede i voda,” 194.
\textsuperscript{434} The second prize project called “Ministarsvo” (unknown author) was characterized by academic monotonous facade with colonnade. The Russian emigrant architect Victor Lukomsky got the third award with project followed traditions of Russian Empire style. His idea for connection two institutions in one building referred to the Senate and Synod building in Saint Petersburg. Another Russian emigrant architect Aleksej Vasiljev proposed the project in the spirit of Petersburg neoclassical architecture of the 1910s, which was purchased. Maybe the author of this project was Nikolay Vasililjev, who also was in the Kingdom at that moment and this project has similarities with his project for the the Administration of State Monopoly from 1908. Although Aleksej Vasiljev arrived in 1920, he became an architect later (graduated in 1932) qv A. Arsenjev, “Biografski imenik ruskih emigranata,” u \	extit{Ruska emigracija u srpskoj kulturi XX veka}. T. 2., ur. M. Sibinović, (Beograd: ČIP Stampa, 1994), 238. The second purchased project was created by Milan Zloković, who later became prominent modernist architects. Unlike other awarded projects, Zloković’s solution was more rational and simplified and under influence of French modernized classicism (qv L. Blagojević, L. “Transpozicija duha i karaktera italijansko-mediteranske arhitekture u ranim projektima Milana Zlokovića,” \textit{Arhitektura i urbanizam} 34 (2012): 4-5). (Figure A.4).
\textsuperscript{435} Vladsavljević, “Zgrada Ministerstva poljoprivrede i voda,” 215.
\textsuperscript{436} The contract from 13.05.1921, fasc. 1371, fond 62, AJ. \textit{Arhiv Jugoslavije, fond Ministerstva Gradevina 62, fascikla 1371. ugovor od 13.5.1922}
\textsuperscript{437} Pavlović, “Život i delo arhitekte Nikole Nestorovića,” 368.
\end{flushright}
stylistic terms their project was “convergence of stylistic streams”\textsuperscript{438} with Neo-Renaissance and Neo-Baroque elements\textsuperscript{439}.

\begin{figure}[h]
\centering
\includegraphics[width=0.5\textwidth]{figure3.png}
\caption{The final project by N.Nestorović and the bureau “Architect” (1924)}
\end{figure}


The representatives of the Ministry of Construction claimed that the facade was too pretentious and luxury\textsuperscript{440} and based on the unacceptable mix of styles, which was against “aesthetic and architectural rules”\textsuperscript{441}. Thus referring to the inadequacy of the facade, the Ministry insisted that its Architectural Department should elaborate the final project. This task was entrusted to Russian emigrant architect Nikolay Krasnov, who created “typical project for such kind of buildings”\textsuperscript{442}. This project was implemented, after cancellation of the contract with the “Architect” and Nestorović\textsuperscript{443}.

On the base of this case, the Ministry came to the conclusion that “experiments of private architects on governmental buildings” should be not allowed\textsuperscript{444}. Thereby it led to establishing as a rule that state institutions entrust the final project elaboration to their technical bureaus.

The building of the Ministry of Finance also demonstrated deregulation of competitive practice during the 1920s. The competition for the new building was announced

\textsuperscript{439} Ignjatović, \textit{Jugoslavenstvo u arhitekturi}, 343.
\textsuperscript{440} Protocol 22700/1923, fasc. 1371, fond 62, AJ.
\textsuperscript{441} Protocol 14.241 from 04.06.1926, fasc. 1371, fond 62, AJ.
\textsuperscript{442} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{443} Protocol 68049 from 01.09.1926, fasc. 1371, fond 62, AJ.
\textsuperscript{444} Protokol 14241 from 27.05.1926, fasc. 1371, fond 62, AJ.
in 1924\textsuperscript{445}. The location was chosen near the old ministerial building and the building of the Ministry of Trade and Industry under construction\textsuperscript{446}. The jury contained of the representatives of key architectural institutions – Nikola Nestrović as professor of University, Petar Popović as chief of the Ministry of Construction, Momir Korunović and Croatian architect Edo Šen as representatives of the UJIA. From the Ministry of Finance was Đorđe Rašić\textsuperscript{447}.

Among twenty-six competition projects, the jury did not find a one, which could get the first prize\textsuperscript{448}. The project created by the technical bureau “Architect” got the second prize\textsuperscript{449}, as exactly following the program (figure 4). The jury decided that other projects can not be awarded and disturbed award amount for purchasing seven projects\textsuperscript{450}. The majority of project were in the academic style\textsuperscript{451}.

![Figure 4. The project of the bureau “Architect” for the first competition for the Ministry of Finance. Source: Istorijski arhiv Beograda, 2770-K6, 10-12.](image)

The results of this competition caused the professional discussions and protest from the UJIA. Edo Šen appealed to the Zagreb Section, questioned the quality of the jury

\textsuperscript{445} Konkurs za izradu idejnih skica za novu palatu Ministarstva finansija TL 11 1924 III
\textsuperscript{446} Situacija za izradu skica, 2770-K6, IAB.
\textsuperscript{447} Rezultat javne utakmice za izradu skica za zgradu Ministarstva Finansija u Beogradu. 2770-K6, IAB, 1.
\textsuperscript{448} Ibid., 22
\textsuperscript{449} Among awarded and purchased projects, this project implied the most expensive building (approximately 84 millions of dinars, while others on the average 60 millions). Ibid., 23-45.
\textsuperscript{450} Ibid.
\textsuperscript{451} With the exception of the Serbo-Byzantine project of Žarko Tatić. Four of these projects were created by architects, who worked in the Architectural Department of the Ministry of Construction. Nikolay Krasnov participated twice: in cooperation with Dmitrij Leko and with his own project, and both projects were purchased (qv M. Madanović, “Prilog proučavanju beogradskog opusa Nikolaja Petrovića Krasnova (1922-1939),” Naslede 16 (2015): 77-78). (Figure A.5).
work\textsuperscript{452}, because the single awarded project was created by the bureau, in which the son of the Jury Chairman worked\textsuperscript{453}. As a result the UJIA suggested to the Minister of Finance\textsuperscript{454} not to confirm the jury decision\textsuperscript{455}, after his refusal the UJIA appealed also to the Minister of Construction Nikola Uzunović and Prime-Minister Nikola Pašić\textsuperscript{456}.

As a result of the intervention of the UJIA, the Ministry of Finance announced a new competition\textsuperscript{457}. However, it concerned only the facade and contained requirements to design in the Byzantine style. The UJIA was no satisfied, because competition requirements included the specific style and the jury remained the same (except Edo Šen)\textsuperscript{458}, and invoked its members not to participate\textsuperscript{459}.

Finally, only five architects participated\textsuperscript{460}, and the project of D. Brašovan won\textsuperscript{461}. (figure 5). His project combined features of Roman and Byzantine architecture\textsuperscript{462}. The conclusion that finally this project was rejected and Krasnov was appointed out of competition became a commonplace in historiography\textsuperscript{463}.

\textsuperscript{453} Later on to this accusation was added the fact that Nikola Nestorovic with the bureau Architect elaborated projects for the Ministry of Forestry and Mining and the Ministry of Agriculture and Waterworks.
\textsuperscript{454} At the moment it was Mehmed Spaho. However, the competition was announced under the control of Milan Stojadinović, who returned to the office on 6.11.1924.
\textsuperscript{456} “Vesti iz udruženja,” Tehnički list 4 (1925): 63-64.
\textsuperscript{458} “Vesti iz udruženja,” Tehnički list 2, 01.12.1925, 358.
\textsuperscript{459} “Odluka inženjera i arhitekata povodom konkursa za fasadu palata Ministarstva Finansija,” [The decision engineers and architects about the competition for the facade of the palace of the Ministry of Finance] Politika, 25.4.1925, 5.
\textsuperscript{460} As punishment for participation two members the Club of Archtiects were excluded for one year from sessions (qv “Zapisnik VIII Redovne Godišnje Skupštine UJIA – Sekcija Beograd,” Tehnički list 7 (1926): 107. Besides the winner, Brašon, it might be Branislav Kojić (qv Manević, “Arhitekt Branislav Kojić,” 56).
\textsuperscript{461} Kadijević, “Život i delo arhitekta Dragiša Brašovana,” 151.
Figure 5. D. Brašovan's project for the second competition for the Ministry of Finance.
Source: Collection of Miloš Jurašić.

However, the Ministry abandoned the idea to construct a building in that place. In the spring of 1924 the Ministry of Finance already bought the building which the Ministry of Trade and Industry ordered for itself to Krasnov, in order to create a complex of buildings in the whole area. Finally, the Ministry of Finance was allocated in this building on the corner of Nemanjina and Knez Milosa streets. This case was important for development of practice of the UJIA’s interventions to the competitions. From the other hand, it demonstrated how under the conditions of the incoordination between institutions projects remained unimplemented.

The building of the Ministry of Education is also an example of unrealized construction for ministerial buildings. Since 1879 the Ministry of Education got a private building near Terazije, which later was reconstructed and adapted with creation new façade in the Serbo-Byzantine style by Branko Tanazevic. However, after the First World war the building was not enough for the new state. After a number of adaptations, the Ministry decided to construct a new building. The preparations started in the April of 1937 for new building in corner of Knez Miloša and Birčaninova streets. The Ministry of Education

---

466 Document №1296 from 15.04.1924, fasc. 1371, fond 62, AJ.
467 in front of the building of the Ministry of Forestry and Mining and the Ministry of Agriculture and Waterworks
469 *Skica za novu zagradu Ministarstva Prosvete*, 7/5, fasc. 2, fond 81, AJ.
announced a competition in the July with the jury contained two architects (S. Jovanović and D. Leko) and three representatives of the Ministry of Education. The program remained the question of a style for architects, but with demands for facades “to have a character of public buildings.” The result was typical for end of the 1930s: no first prize. Two second prizes went to Haberle-Bauer and M. Čakelja. M. Bajlon and E. Šamanek got the third. Among other participants were Milan Zloković, Miladin Prljević, Bogdan Nestrović, Grigorij Samojlov.

![Figure 6. The project of Bajlon and Šamanek for the Ministry of Education.](image)


According to Samojlov’s memoirs, the Minister of Education, Dimitirje Magarašević proposed him to elaborate the final project. In contrast to the winning modernist projects, Samojlov’s project was typical academic with neo-classical and neo-renaissance elements (figure 7). Thus while the jury chose the project from the point of view of functional organization, the Minister paid attention to project, which “had a character of public buildings’, that meant for him the academism.

---

471 “Uslovi utakmice i građevinski program za izradu idejnih skica za novu zgradu Ministarstva prosvete u Beogradu,” Muzej Nauke i Tehnike T: 111.183/1, 3.
473 The project in the collection of Museum of Science and Technology, T: 111.183/4-5.
Despite the loan from State Mortgage Bank\textsuperscript{477}, the construction was delayed. The location was changed in 1939 and the Ministry got a loan to buy a new site on the corner Balkanska and Nemanjina\textsuperscript{478}. As a result the building remained unimplemented, as many in the case of other competitions of the late 1930s with exception the competition for the Ministry of Construction.

As many other state institutions the Ministry of Construction faced a problem of insufficient allocation, and the initial plan was to reconstruct the old building and Architectural Department created the project\textsuperscript{479}. Finally, the Ministry of Finance provided a site near the Financial park on Nemanjina street for its new building\textsuperscript{480}. The competition was announced in the July of 1938 and the jury was all from the Ministry of Construction: two architects (Momir Korunović and Milica Krstić) and three engineers\textsuperscript{481}. As many others, the competition was unsuccessful, from 35 project jury reviewed 15, but did not awarded no first and second prize, however nine projects were purchased\textsuperscript{482}. Only the third

\begin{footnotesize}
\begin{enumerate}
\item[477] The document № 13524 from 5.7.1937, fasc. 590, fond 66, AJ.
\item[478] The document №36382 from 2.10.1939, fasc. 590, fond 66, AJ. This location was near the Ministry of Construction.
\item[479] “Izvestaj o izgradnji Palate Ministarstva Građevina,” 843, fasc. 3, fond 81, AJ.
\item[480] The letter from the Minister of Construcion to the Minister of Finance, №14781 from 11.04.1938, fasc. 269, fond 42, AJ.
\item[482] “Izveštaj ocjenivačkog suda za ocenu idejnih skica za zgradu Ministarstva građevina u Beogradu,” fasc. 1838, fond 62, AJ.
\end{enumerate}
\end{footnotesize}
prize was awarded to the project of Dragan Gudović in cooperation with Ante Lorencin. Gudović worked in the Ministry of Construction since 1930 and probably was a relative of Milica Krstić. The jury characterized his project as original with good disposition and modern look.

Finally, the Ministry appointed ministry official Gojko Todić, who presumably participated and got repurchase. The Ministry was not obliged to choose for realization the third-prize project. However, in conditions of chose between architects with similar positions (both were employees of the Ministry) and similar stylistic specifics, differences in their projects seems to be the main factor. Both projects were monumental, but Gudović’s was late modernist, while Todić’s was neoclassical with an accented colonnade. According to Zoran Manević, this project was under direct influence of Nazi architecture. However, such features of the project as Corinthian columns, the facade division, the specifics of the portico indicated more common neoclassical influence. As a result of policy of state institutions all ministerial buildings constructed in the interwar period had features of academism.

3.3. Other administrative buildings

As well as in the case of the pre-war unrealized competition for the Administration of State Monopoles, a number of interwar competitions for it was unsuccessful and their
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483 Ibid.
485 Z. Manević, ur., Leksikon srpskih arhitekata XIX i XX veka, (Beograd: Gradevinska knjiga, 1999), 86.
486 Izveštaj ocjenjivačkog suda za ocenu idejnih skica za zgradu Ministarstva gradevina u Beogradu,” fasc. 1838, fond 62, AJ.
487 V. Banković, “Nova zgrada Ministarstva gradevina Kraljevine Jugoslavije,” Naslede 6 (2005): 164. The building was constructed according his project in monumental modernized asademism from 1939 to 1940.
489 Kilibarda, “Pregled delatnosti i uloga Dragana Gudovića,” 222.
results also remained unimplemented. The first idea was one of the most megalomaniac projects in interwar Belgrade and implied the creation of a huge monumental building for the Administration of State Monopoles, the State Cadastre and the Government. The location was chosen between Nemanjina and Geprata streets, near the ministerial complex. The jury members were three architects (N. Nestorović, B. Kojić and B. Maksimović) and two representatives of the Administration of State Monopoles. Among nineteen projects the jury awarded two and purchased five.

Two awarded projects represented completely different solutions. The first prize project of Croatian modernists M. Haberle and H. Bauer implied the complex of connected buildings with simplified modernist facade (figure 8).

![Figure 8. The project of Haberle and Bauer for the Administration of State Monopoles. Source: H. Bauer and M. Haberle, “Idejna skica za novu zgradu Uprave državnih monopola,” Građevinski Vjesnik 5 (1937): 66-67.](image)

The second project of Serbian architects R. Tatić and J. Ranković proposed the one monumental building with the central part (for Government) emphasized by columns and tower, which was in accordance with existing ministerial buildings (figure 9).

495 “Zgrada Uprave monopola u kojoj će biti smešteno i pretsedništvo vlade biće najveća i najreprezentativnija u zemlji,” [The building of Monopoly Administration where they will be located the Government will be the largest and most representative in the country] Vreme, 13.04.1937, 12.
The Administration of State Monopoles decided to organize the narrow competition between the authors of awarded and purchased projects. On this competition one of awards went to Russian emigrant architect Petar Anagnosti for his neoclassical project with monumental colonnades. However, results of both competitions remained unimplemented because of the location change. Another location was chosen near the National Bank on the street Kralja Petra. The next competition was held in 1939. Despite a lack of the first prize, the competition demonstrated the triumph of modernism, in which eight modernists projects got awards (figure 10). However the project was not realized because the Second World War.

Besides the complex on the Knez Miloša Street, another administrative area was conceived near the National Assembly building. The Master Plan reserved a location to the south of the Assembly building for the Belgrade Municipality. However, as a result of

497 Đurđević, “Prilog proučavaju života i dela arhitekte Petra Dimitrijevića Anagnostija,” 247.
disputes about the land ownership between the Municipality and the St. Mark’s Church, the site was sold to the Post administration, which decided to construct there a monumental building for the Main Post Office, Main Telegraph and Postal Savings Bank.

The competition was announced in 1930 and contained complicated requirements because was designated for allocation of different institutions on the very asymmetrical site. The competition requirements implied the freedom of architects in the question of a style. The jury consisted of representatives of the Ministry of Construction, the head of Postal Savings Bank and university professors of architecture from Belgrade (Dragutin Đorđević), Zagreb (Janko Holjac) and Ljubljana (Josip Plečnik). As mentioned Snežana Toševa, such composition of the jury showed the significance of the competition and the building itself.

Among fifteen projects, the jury awarded three and purchased four. Modernism and architects from western parts of the state dominated: Croatian architect Josip Pičman in cooperation with Andrij Baranja got the first prize, (figure 11). Slovenian architect Ace Lovrenić was awarded the second and Croatian architect Mijo Hečimović got the third award. (Figure A.6)
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According to the jury, Pičman’s project offered the most suitable and rational organization of space\textsuperscript{510}. The project was progressive in technical and stylistic terms and had the simplified façade with an abundance of glass\textsuperscript{511}.

His approach to the façade design displeased the investor\textsuperscript{512}. In this case also the location of the future building near the National Assembly building influenced the change of the project. The idea to create administrative center caused the necessity to harmonize architecture of other building with the National Assembly building which was designed in Neo-Renaissance style\textsuperscript{513}.

One of the existing versions is that King Alexander himself demanded the changes of the facade, because it was not monumental enough to be constructed near the National Assembly\textsuperscript{514}. However, according to archival documents, such initiative came from the side of the Ministry of Transport, taking into account that this Ministry was the owner of the future building. The Minister of Transport, Lazar Radivojević, after receiving the project,
requested to design 2-3 variants of more monumental and representative facade. For that reason the chief of the Architectural Department engaged Nikolay Krasnov, Vassily Androsov, Vladimir Dević and Dragomir Tadić for this task. As a result the Ministry of Construction sent to the Minister of Transport five projects, among which the draft of Androsov was chosen (figure 12). Although Androsov during his work in Yugoslavia mainly designed churches in Serbo-Byzantine style, he had experience for public buildings during his work in Petersburg. However, his contribution was connected only with facade in monumentalized neoclassicism, because the organization of space and plans were kept from Pičman’s modernist project.

![Figure 12. Androsov’s project for the Main Post Office](image)

Figure 12. Androsov’s project for the Main Post Office

From the other side of the National Assembly, the building for the Privileged Agrarian Bank was constructed. The Privileged Agrarian Bank was founded in 1929 in order to finance agricultural loans and accumulate peasants’ debts to the state. Although it was in mixed ownership, but its activities was under strict state management.
At the end of 1930 the Privileged Agrarian Bank announced a mixed competition: eight architects were invited, but others could also participate. Among invited architects, Croatian architects got the first and second prizes (Edo Šen and Stjepan Hribar). The Serbian team, brothers Krstić, got the third prize (figure 13). The projects were exhibited and attracted the attention of journalists; a lot of projects were published, besides the two awarded modernist Croatian projects.

The project of Edo Šen was characterized by well-organized space, which met all requirements, with modern, but simplified façade, which according to articles in newspapers was not able to attract attention and impress. Hribar’s project was criticized both by the jury and by journalist, because of problems with the entrance. Branko Maksimović describing Kristićs’ project indicated that their modern facade still contains elements of traditional compositions. This project can be considered as an example of Serbian Art Deco. The project of N. Krasnov and D.M. Leko, designed in modernized academism, attracted attention of journalists (was published in the most of articles about the exhibition), and was even called “the best project”. The jury also was satisfied with the façade of this project, because of its classical character (figure 14).
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Taking into account the journalist remark about the inability of Šen’s project to impress, and the fact that both first and second prize projects were not even published, they obviously could not satisfy the investor. Thus the Bank Committee for construction chose for realization the project, which was awarded the third prize\footnote{M. Stojanović, “Arhitektura banaka i štedionica u Beogradu: 1918–1941,” (Thesis, Univerzitet u Beogradu, 2013), 39.}. The Bank Committee was satisfied with Kristić’ whole concept of the project\footnote{Manević, Z. Gradijeli. 1, (Beograd: Zavod za zaštitu spomenika kulture, 1986), 46.}, but requested the modification of the facade\footnote{M. Đurđević, “Zgrada Agrarne banke u Beogradu,” Flogiston 8 (1998): 159.}. In the spirit of ideas about administrative buildings, the facade was classicized by adding doric columns and classical roof cornice\footnote{Manević, Z. Naši neimari Braca Krstić 12 (1980) 46.}. As a result, the final project can not be considered as academicist or modernist\footnote{Polovina, “Arhitektura klasicizma,” 103.} (figure 15).

As the cases from the 1920s demonstrated problems in regulation and development of competitive practice, this two cases revealed the gap between functional concepts. While
the projects were chosen according to the criteria of functional space organization, the facades were changed under the pressure of institutions and finally were designed with neoclassical elements.
Conclusions

The thesis explored the problems in competition practice in interwar Belgrade with the focus on administrative buildings. The competitions were characterized by the abundance of problems, which embraced all competition stages: program elaboration, work of a jury, decision making and its implementation. As concerns administrative buildings, almost all competitions were unsuccessful. State institutions rather ignored the results of competitions or demand significant changes of the competition project during the elaboration of the final versions. Despite the high level of corruption in the Kingdom, competitions for architectural projects seem to be quite free of corruption influences, because did not involve a money question. Moreover, the juxtaposition between the lists of the authors of awarded projects and the jury members did not reveal close professional connections, which will be enough to claim that prejudice and favoritism were reasons of unsuccessful results.

The thesis demonstrates that unsuccessful results of competitions for administrative buildings were connected with the gap between architectural development and preferences of state institutions. This gap was connected not only with stylistic preferences, but also with a very understanding of the essence of architecture. On the one hand, modernism spread among architects, while state institutions continued to support revivalist styles. On the other, architects paid attention to the functional and rational organization of space in contrast to state institutions, which requested representative facades.

During the growth of the divergence between directions of architectural searches and demands of state institutions, the character of problems in competitions changed. The case studies revealed that in the 1920s the main problems appeared because of difficulties in development of competitive practice on the whole. However, when the gap in stylistic preferences increased, competitions could not work as an instrument of searching for best
solutions. Different understandings of the essence of architecture led to contradictions in selection criteria. The competition programs was based on functional requirements about the space organization, the jury decision and distribution of awards were made on the basis of the implementation of these requirements. However, state institutions paid more attention to facades and their styles, which led to ignoring the results or changing competition projects. Thus the competitive mechanism was obstructed by this gap.

Further investigations can be continued in two directions. On the one hand, the examination of competitions in other cities of the Kingdom will clarify the factors which led to obstruction of competitions in various functional areas. On the other, the comparison of Belgrade with other capitals in the region will contribute to understanding of the influences of competitive practice on governmental architecture.
Appendix: Additional Projects

Figure A. 1. Competition projects for the Administraion of State Monopoles (1908).

Figure A. 2. The second prize projects for the State Opera House: the Italian team (left) and the Croatian team (right)

Figure A. 3. The projects for the Warrior’s House: J. Jovanović and Ž. Piperski (left) and B. Nestrović and J. Šnajder (right)
Source: “Skice za Ratnički dom u Beogradu,” Vreme, 16.05.1929, 3; “Projekti za Ratnički dom u Beogradu,” Vreme, 17.05.1929, 3.
Figure A. 4. The awarded and purchased projects for the Ministry of Forestry and Mining and the Ministry of Agriculture and Waterworks: unknown author, Lukomsky, Vasiljev, Zloković.

Figure A. 5. Competition projects for the Ministry of Finance by architects from the Architectural Department of the Ministry of Construction: Ž. Tatić, D.M. Leko, N.P. Krasnov, G. Todić.

Figure A. 6. Hečimović’s project for the Main Post Office
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