ALEKSANDRA STAMENKOVIĆ, PhD, Assistant Professor
Faculty of Digital Arts, Belgrade Metropolitan University
Belgrade, Republic of Serbia
a_stamenkovic@ymail.com

UDK 316.75:72.01(497.1)"1918/1941"
725.21:069.9(497.1)"1918/1941"

pregledni rad / review article
primljeno / received: 19. 12. 2021.
prihvaćeno / accepted: 25. 5. 2022.

https://doi.org/10.29362/ist20veka.2022.2.sta.301-322

YUGOSLAV PAVILIONS AT INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITIONS IN ARTISTIC AND POLITICAL DISCOURSE 1918–1941

ABSTRACT: *Exploring the context of constructing the Yugoslav national pavilions at international exhibitions in the period between the Two World Wars implies the analysis of the used architectural styles, also certain political ideologies that find their expression in architecture (thus lending it a role of social engagement). The parallel flows of socio-political discourses and architecture also require resolving the following dilemma: was the architect selected based on his or her education, sensibility and experience for a particular project, or forced to conform to the demands of the political authorities. The heritage, status of the nation, the architect, furthermore numerous social, cultural and, above all, political factors influence the variations in the art programs showcased in the pavilions. One such factor - the ideal of cultural connection and political cooperation among the South Slavs, supported by King Alexander Karadjordjević - plays an important role in defining the program and stylistic characteristics of the pavilions because it suggests a specific artistic expression. Attempts to develop this ideal into the ideology of Yugoslavism, that in certain respects sought to establish itself as the national identity, marked the period between 1918 and 1941. Such attempts represented both a prerequisite and a directive in the representative programs of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes/Kingdom of Yugoslavia.*

KEYWORDS: National Pavilions, International Exhibitions, King Alexander I of Yugoslavia (Karadjordjević), The Yugoslav Idea

A place where modern countries can present their culture and achievements while competing and, at the same time, encouraging each other has evolved since the very first International Exhibition held in London in 1851.[1] Far from being a modern phenomenon these spectacles with ephemeral charac-

[1] Colin Simkin, *Fairs: Past and Present* (Hartford: The Travelers, 1939), 3.

ter go back to the roots of our history and culture. Whatever the term used—International Exhibition, World Fair, Exposition Universelle, or even Expos—the meaning can encompass any acceptable form of showing-off. Over time, these displays with their linked themes were shaped by the socio-political, economic, and cultural determinants. As the concept of international exhibitions developed, the individual buildings for housing exhibits in suitable national surroundings were used. Eventually, they became the symbols of national pride and faith and came to serve as instruments of promoting political goals while the architectural construction began to possess a socially engaged function. This new role found its expression in increasingly monumental buildings which presented ideological rather than artistic goals.[2]

Pavilion and National Politics

Almost without exception pavilions at international exhibitions reflected the national ideal that has been merely a dream. Their designs were almost always based on historic decorative styles, very often being a mixture of many of these. That was the reason why the political elite saw them as items to be used for promotional purposes. To persevere in their accomplishments, the elite influenced the selection of functional and decorative elements or, even more, the engagement of certain architects. On the contrary, architects viewed pavilions as buildings with an experimental function, as they sought new possibilities in exploring a concept, plan, composition, or style.

The collapse of the Austro-Hungarian and Ottoman Empires provided the vital opportunity to achieve a historic idea—the unification of the South Slavs into one state. Preceding the Paris Peace Conference, on December 1, 1918, a new Balkan state was formed—the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats, and Slovenes.[3] Ruled by the Serbian Karadjordjević dynasty, the new kingdom included the previously independent kingdoms of Serbia and Montenegro and the South Slav territories in areas formerly subject to the Austro-Hungarian Empire: Dalmatia, Croatia—Slavonia, Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Vojvodina. In 1919 four small Bulgarian territories in the southeast, including Strumica, were ceded to the new state.[4] It was not known as Yugoslavia until 1929 when King Alexander Karadjordjević renamed the state in an effort to forge a common collective identity. The King hoped to achieve this by strictly controlling and homogenizing political and cultural life, identifying the Yugoslav nation and the state as strong and united, despite the ethnic, local and historical differences between the South Slavs which burdened everyday life. This statement

[2] Anthony Vidler, "A History of the Folly", in: B. J. Archer and Anthony Vidler (eds.), *Follies: Architecture for the Late-Twentieth-Century Landscape* (New York: Rizzoli 1983), 3.

[3] Aleksandar Ignjatović, „Sanjana prošlost, zamišljena budućnost: Arhitektura i nacionalni identitet u Srbiji 1918–1941", U: *Istorija umetnosti u Srbiji XX vek*, vol. III, urednik Miško Šuvaković, (Beograd: Orion Art, 2014), 143.

[4] Mirjam Rajner, *Fragile Images: Jews and Art in Yugoslavia, 1918–1945* (Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2019), 13.

was a result of the official attitudes of King Alexander and some political and intellectual elites.

Despite efforts by official political authorities to provide coherent territory, the new state often produced conflicting and inconsistent messages about Yugoslav cultural identity and its political background.[5] Not surprisingly, these messages demonstrated complex and contradictory, or even more problematic issues. The narratives of modernity, as well as collective identity, woven through the juxtaposed displays, continued to cause political instability and made it difficult to resolve the national question.[6] Attempts to connect the ethnically different people into a new community, and to define national identity by pursuing Yugoslavism as an official doctrine, could not thwart the strengthening of separatist ideas.[7] As a result, the ideological framework designed to shape a unified Yugoslav community faced increasing suppression, and by the end of the 1940s it was mentioned only in the context of the enthusiasm shown by a certain number of individuals prior to the end of the First World War.[8]

The ideological function of the newly established Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes will have a great influence on the art and architecture with the Yugoslav prefix. The years following the Great War, while rooted in the historical styles' rhetoric and propaganda derived from the idealization of the Industrial Revolution, nonetheless represented a period of optimism and faith in the possibility of change. While the artistic situation differed across the regions which formed the first Yugoslav state, the regional interwar architecture was characterized by a multitude of styles and themes, techniques and materials, forms and aesthetics. Different fields of artistic endeavor are intertwined. Many of them were given for political reasons and stimulated by some of the foreign displays. Compared to the local heritage and tradition, the characteristics of those building designs were either very similar or opposite.[9]

The first joint appearances at international exhibitions were indicative of a period of adjustment to the new socio-political reality. Originally selected design for the national pavilion at the International Exhibition in Paris in 1925 (*Exposition Universelle des Arts Décoratifs et Industriels Modernes*) displayed the incongruous relationship between the local environment, the provincial and regional understanding of art and architecture.[10] The Ministry of Foreign Affairs

[5] Aleksandar Ignjatović, "Peripheral Empire, Internal Colony: Yugoslav National Pavilions at the Paris World Exhibitions in 1925 and 1937", *Centropa*, vol. 8, no. 2 (May 2008), 186.

[6] See: Branko Petranović, *Istorija Jugoslavije 1918–1988. Kraljevina Jugoslavija 1914–1941* (Beograd: Nolit, 1988).

[7] A. Ignjatović, „Sanjana prošlost, zamišljena budućnost... ", 143.

[8] Dejan Đokić, "Yugoslovism: Histories, Myths, Concepts", in: *Yugoslovism: Histories of a Failed Idea 1918–1992,* Dejan Đokić (ed.), (London: Hurst, 2003), 1–10.

[9] The method of using these spectacles to educate the public and to project utopian visions resting on these same images was preferred and thus perfected. Since the position of art in new circumstances changed, this quote could be explicated as the constantly oppressed unifying principles of the multinational Kingdom and the local traditions.

[10] Arhiv Jugoslavije (AJ), fond 65, Ministarstvo trgovine i industrije (MTI), fascikla 821, arhivska jedinica 270, br. 3651; AJ, MTI, 65–821–270, br. 57, 9. 1. 1925.

had appointed Belgrade architect Miroslav Krajček as the main designer and gave him responsibility for the layout and visualization in general without previous competition. Although the architect attempted to evoke architectural patterns common in Šumadija, Macedonia, Dalmatia and Bosnia by repeating the decorative motives, the building design was not approved by the Committee for Participation at the Paris Exhibition because it was very reminiscent of vernacular Balkan architecture. This first appearance at an international exhibition was seen as an opportunity for the Yugoslav community to establish itself globally, as well as to affirm the continuity of the Yugoslav idea, which had been formed through the rhetoric of pavilions prior to the First World War.[11] However, the political authorities pursued Yugoslav idea forward policies that could evoke and frame a national sentiment. Indeed, this strategy implied a specific artistic expression. Accordingly, changes in the political attitudes towards this integrational ideology strongly influenced the artistic and promotional programs.[12]

The exhibition in Paris induced a complete reawakening of artistic appreciation in countries that until then had little awareness for matters of that nature. The Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes felt it was necessary to present itself to the world as an important political and cultural center. After the First World War and the savage destruction, the interests of the audience changed. How the newly kingdom should present itself became a priority. Accordingly, representative architecture had to be transformed, so the pavilions at exhibitions affect everyone with the greatest wonder. Regarding Krajček's building design, the organizers assumed that it did not adequately promote the idea of a unique and authentic Yugoslav identity that became relevant after 1918.[13] At the same time, they adopted the concept of modernity, deemed exceptionally appropriate for the new Yugoslav context. The authorities entrusted the design to one of the leading architects in Zagreb, Stjepan Hribar.[14] As a result, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes was represented with a pavilion styled in an expressionist manner, with classical segments and plain façades with Art Deco details.[15]

---

[11] See: Aleksandra Stamenković, „Arhitektura nacionalnih paviljona Srbije i Jugoslavije na međunarodnim izložbama 1900–1941", (doktorska disertacija, Univerzitet u Beogradu, Filozofski fakultet, Odeljenje za istoriju umetnosti, 2017), 44–49.

[12] The idea of "the ethnic unity of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes" was presented at exhibitions during the first quarter of the 20th century, while Yugoslavism as the unique nationality – "national oneness" – was propagated at exhibitions after 1918. See: Zoran Manević, „Izložbe jugoslovenske savremene arhitekture u Beogradu (1931, 1933)", *Godišnjak grada Beograda*, XXVII, (1980), 271–272; Zoran Manević, „Pojava moderne arhitekture u Srbiji", (doktorska disertacija, Univerzitet u Beogradu, Filozofski fakultet, Odeljenje za istoriju umetnosti, 1979), 155.

[13] Kosta Strajnić, „Za čast jugoslovenske kulture. Povodom našega učešća na međunarodnoj izložbi u Parizu (II)", *Srpski književni glasnik,* XV, sv. 6, (1925), 462.

[14] In order to overcome the tensions between the government authorities and the National Committee for Participation at the Exhibition, Miroslav Krajček was selected to assist the main organizer Branko Tanazević. AJ, MTI, 65–821–270, br. 3/1925.

[15] Aleksandar Ignjatović, „Jugoslovenski identitet u arhitekturi između 1904. i 1941. godine", (doktorska disertacija, Univerzitet u Beogradu, Arhitektonski fakultet, 2005), 139.

An idea of the voluminous and functional building was carried out by a new collective ideal. The representational policy was highly principled—ethnic unity of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes, desired years ago. Visually molded national space was equally marked by the return to tradition and affinities for the change caused by post-war euphoria. More than any previous performances, it was almost totally dominated by large socio-political propaganda displayed with the interaction of the state, artists and the audience.[16] The architect simply felt compelled to follow suit in adopting it, without regard for cultural, social, political and aesthetic differences. With a desire to overcome what he perceived as inadequately traditional, Hribar focused his efforts on emphasizing the achievements of all ethnic groups in the field of decorative arts. This found the best expression in the lavish wooden portal designed by Vojta Braniš.[17] In terms of the unifying ideology, the painted composition above this portal effectively verified the national paradigm. *The scene of the ideal Yugoslav Arcadia* was harmonized with the archaic portal, while painted figures resembled the archetypal characters of Ivan Meštrović, thus contributing to the idea of "primordial Yugoslav identity".[18]

The interior also developed an educational role.[19] Displays and items with historical themes clearly indicated the visual identity chosen to decorate the space.[20] The composition *Kolo* (national folk dance) influenced the general perception. It was painted along the staircase leading from the ground floor to the first floor. Through the diversity of Yugoslav folk costumes, the author, Vladimir Becić, symbolically portrayed the people who were united within the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes. More to the point, the seclusion of the *Bosnian Room*, *Dalmatian Dining Room* and *Slovenian Bedroom*, furthermore erection of a store in the form of a *Bosnian Kiosk*, could all be interpreted as completely independent units with specific national identity.[21] The reasons for this separation, especially the "Bosnian" culture, should not be sought in organizers' decision to displace foreign colonies from the official pavilions.[22] Referring to the isolated forms, the distinct attribution of Bosnian identity could be considered as a way to emphasize Western European character adopted by the state establishment. Everything that could be related to oriental heritage did not have a place in the pavilion. The role of a specific culture in the Yugoslav community was given to Bosnia because of its exoticism, so it had to be ex-

[16] See: John Shearman, *Only Connect: Art and the Spectator in the Italian Renaissance* (New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1992).

[17] A. Ignjatović, „Jugoslovenski identitet u arhitekturi…", 142.

[18] *Ibid.*, 143–144.

[19] Interior arrangement was entrusted to Stjepan Hribar and Tomislav Krizman. AJ, MTI, 65–821–270, br. 3/1925.

[20] Željka Čorak, "The 1925 Yugoslav Pavilion in Paris", in: Davidson, R. i Davidson, D. (trans.), *The Journal of Decorative and Propaganda Arts*, vol. 17, (1990), 36; A. Stamenković, *op. cit.*, 186.

[21] An architectural competition was held for the design of the Bosnian Kiosk. After voting, the jury selected Branislav Kojić to realize his plan. See: A. Stamenković, *op. cit.*, 190.

[22] A. Ignjatović, "Peripheral Empire, Internal Colony…", 189–190.

pressed by a different architecture, arrangement and ornaments.[23] This marginalization of Bosnian culture into a separate building did offer something like authenticity, but also put attention to a much wider social context.[24]

For a pioneer on the political scene, the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes did not receive any notable mention by the public or the press. It was just one of the attempts to improvise in an expression of modernity and values derived from tradition.[25]

The next attempt to make the Yugoslav entity international in scope at the exhibition was remembered by a conflict between Serbian and Croatian artists. As it gave a dominant role to Serbian-Byzantine motives, the first prized design in the architectural competition for the Exhibition in Philadelphia in 1926 (*The Sesqui-Centennial International Exposition*) caused great controversy.[26] Belgrade architects and brothers, Petar and Branko Krstić assigned this design. They used already tried and tested patterns to reawake the glory of the national past for the exhibition building. The whole pavilion would have been an example of mythical beauty seen in Rome 15 years earlier.[27] Meanwhile, the artists gathered around Tomislav Krizman, whom the organizers elected to be the main arranger of the pavilion, considered the building with emphasized Serbian-Byzantine elements inappropriate for the official state pavilion. The art used to adorn all the ethnic groups in the Kingdom could not have been labeled as Serbian or Byzantine. Placed into the Yugoslav context, its semantics had to stress all identity groups and their traditions. Those controversies completely ignored the fact that the Serbian-Byzantine Style was not the only stylistic expression in the selected exhibition design. There were elements directly related to Historicism and Expressionism, while Modern architecture was represented in elements of decoration.[28] However, Modernism in Serbia had not yet been accepted as adequate for grand designs with promotional purposes. And the segments linked with Serbian-Byzantine artistic heritage were used to make a final composition more representative.

Misunderstanding of representational policy reached its climax before the exhibition. Constantly opposed, interwar Belgrade and Zagreb performed

[23] Đura Đurović, „Naš paviljon na pariskoj izložbi“, *Politika*, 6. 7. 1925.

[24] See: A. Ignjatović, “Peripheral Empire, Internal Colony…”, 190.

[25] Milan Prosen, „Ar deko u srpskoj arhitekturi“, (doktorska disertacija, Univerzitet u Beogradu, Filozofski fakultet, Odeljenje za istoriju umetnosti, 2014), 60.

[26] Anonymous, „Filadelfijski rat naših umetnika“, *Politika*, 26. 12. 1925, 4; Aleksandar Kadijević, *Jedan vek traženja nacionalnog stila u srpskoj arhitekturi* (Beograd: Građevinska knjiga, 2007), 206; A. Stamenković, *op. cit.*, 195–199.

[27] A crucial role in unifying process involved depicting a mutual history of the constitutive nations. Representational patterns used in the first Serbian Pavilions, such as traditional, monastery-style buildings, could no longer be used, so it was necessary to find motifs appropriate for all the nations involved. The exhibition in Rome in 1911 was the first step in achieving that unity, because Serbian and Croatian artists gathered in the same, Serbian Pavilion. Amongst them was the famous Croatian artist Ivan Meštrović, who accepted and promoted Alexander’s Yugoslav idea.

[28] A. Kadijević, *Jedan vek traženja nacionalnog stila...*, 206–209.

their ideological inequality through this design election. Consequently, that would cause a gap between Serbian and Croatian artists regarding the phenomenon of the national idea, and the attempts to affirm the concept.[29]

Dragiša Brašovan and National Pavilions

Following the newly proclaimed official policy of national unification, these national displays seemed confusing, with too many different folk traditions of the people who made up the Kingdom. By that time, pavilions started merging traditional and contemporary styles, reflecting the political intent to foster a new unity, rooted in historic connections. The emancipation from Ottoman Turkish influences and the approach to European models showed the direction of daily politics, and also had an expression in architecture. For instance, the Yugoslav entry to the Exhibition in Barcelona in 1929 (*La Exposición Internacional de Barcelona de 1929*) dramatically broke from the state's previous representational policy. The exterior architecture of the pavilion was, morphologically, far from tradition, but structurally it was still related to historical examples. Dragiša Brašovan,[30] the designer, used wood as a traditional material for the edifice. However, he improvised the visual form, inspired by European architects, notably Adolf Loos.

Yugoslavian enthusiasm, and the overwhelming effect of the building and exhibition left an impression on nearly all who visited Barcelona in the summer and fall of 1929, surpassing the first two international exposures. Besides the pavilion being a mark of current thinking, it had all that the organizers of an exhibition needed: it was refined, abstract, not expensive and modern. Brašovan's building was so unusual in form and so elaborately imagined that it could be difficult to guess its intended use of it. All the constructive elements were supposed to induce surprise, delight and amazement. Wood, as a basic building material, compensated for the absence of a national aspect in appearance.[31] The architecture of that kind found its way into how the Yugoslavs saw, perceived and imagined the ruling ideology of the time. Thus, it was an integral part of a coherent interpretation of the modern nation. In the sense of an art form, and architectural language, the pavilion became a way of spatial experience, powerful to make people connect with their inner selves, with quality hidden in diverse, specific forms, all conforming to the same Modern style.

---

[29] A. Stamenković, *op. cit.*, 207.

[30] Dragiša Brašovan is considered one of the leading architects of the early 20th century in Yugoslavia. Specifically significant is his impressive opus, notably buildings with different types of units and in different styles, recognized by his architectural poetics. Despite the variety of requirements of the competition or the investors' wishes, he managed to emphasize his individuality and romantic spirit in every design. See: Bratislav Stojanović, „Arhitekta Dragiša Brašovan", *Urbanizam Beograda,* 51, (1979), 20−21.

[31] Zoran Manević, „Delo arhitekte Dragiše Brašovana", *Zbornik radova za likovne umetnosti Matice Srpske*, 6, (1970), 187–199.

Without architectural competition, Brašovan was commissioned to design the building, but he also organized a complete layout in Barcelona as a tribute to modern Yugoslav identity.[32] All the attempts to turn a great stylistic diversity between the provinces that made up the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes into national ideology did not have any success at previous expositions. That was causing problems in representational policy during the interwar period. Therefore, the Barcelona pavilion had to confess about unity, like the harmony between something old and something new, or the inflow of modern into traditional practices. Brašovan's commitment to modern architecture corresponded to the invitation for this project and tallied with the authorities' aim to play the usual role in this exhibition. The building he constructed embodied the image that King Alexander wanted to convey to the world: that of a prosperous country whose society reached the new values of modernity.[33] Anticipated traditional values were reduced to the level of feelings for the nation's past. Hiding them seductively behind thinly geometrical walls, in the best ways of modern practices, the architect experimented with the fundamental metaphorical concept, which can be further linked to other cultural values (in terms of time, language and history).[34] The theme of Yugoslav section, not being the exception of King Alexander's artistic taste, was entirely rooted in ideology. Brašovan eliminated spatial limitations to a considerable extent by toying with the visual and constructive properties of the material. Since it was an attempt to define a new style for the new nation that expressed its modernity while remaining faithful to local tradition,[35] its defining elements were the unusual cladding and alternated horizontal stripes of grey and white stained wood. As an environmental emblem, wood was fitting for the interpretation of the required national motif. At the same time, the choice of domestic wood symbolically indicated the greatest natural resource and the main export product in the state.[36]

Attending the international exhibition was always connected with the evolvement of national consciousness.[37] As national consciousness often was created through the vocabulary of art with an educational task, and vernacular language and motives (it was composed of) were cultural determinants that

[32] Dario Čupić i Milan Poznanović, *Misterija Brašovanovog paviljona* (Beograd: Muzej nauke i tehnike, 2020), 16.

[33] Aleksandar Kadijević, „Život i delo Dragiše Brašovana (1887−1965) ", *Godišnjak grada Beograda*, XXXVII, (1990), 155–156; Aleksandar Kadijević, „Jugoslovenski paviljon u Barseloni 1929. godine", *Glasnik Društva konzervatora Srbije*, 19, (1995), 213–214.

[34] A. Stamenković, *op. cit.*, 218.

[35] Stanislav Vinaver, „Veliki uspeh našeg paviljona – nacionalna i moderna umetnost", *Politika*, 5. 6. 1929, 6.

[36] O. G. Ambrož, „Izložba u Barseloni", *Vreme*, 16. 3. 1929, 1; A. Kadijević, „Život i delo Dragiše Brašovana…", 157; Đorđe Alfirević, *Ekspresionizam u srpskoj arhitekturi* (Beograd: Arhitektonski fakultet/Orion art, 2016) 145.

[37] Among other events in recent history, international exhibitions had a more dramatic influence on the expression of the culture of civilization. The aspiration to form a national character in architecture was supported by the creative ideas of the nation. See: Vladimir Mako, *Estetika–arhitektura* II (Beograd: Orion art, 2009), particularly pages 52–53.

could be associated with a unique and specific national identity. In many cases, finding national expression in art was conditioned by political and social circumstances. Accepting the design with highlighted modern structure contributed to avoiding the tension among two very strong entities in the Yugoslav community (Serbian and Croatian). Although the form of national character may not be confirmed at first glance, the façades of the Barcelona pavilion were imbued with political significance.[38] The message, expressed by the structure with walls treated as surfaces that visually indicated the external unity of the state where different cultural identities live in harmony, was changed under the pressure of manifesting the idea of authentic Yugoslav architecture.[39]

The pavilion experimented with the relationship between tradition and modernity.[40] This confrontation, caused by the crisis of the identifying process, expressed itself simultaneously with political and social changes.[41] Until the exhibition finished, the political situation in the country escalated to name changing and instead of the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes arose the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. This renaming was marked by the "phenomenon of Europeanisation"[42] and with the hope that tensity among the entities would resolve if national unity became an obligation. The differences were made in architecture, as well. Architects rejected the principles that inspired earlier generations and sought new solutions with spiritual, intellectual, but also material impact. The predominance of ideas with modern interpretations caused a deconstruction of certain historical and national symbols.[43] In order to avoid erroneous and superficial associations of artistic spirit in one of the most important periods in Yugoslav history, the national memory was presented in generally accepted forms, modernizing traditional culture. That moment made this pavilion extremely prominent. Its importance depended not so much on the author's individual style but rather on rhythms of space and construction in contemporary discourses.[44]

Treating traditional motives in a modern way was meant to emphasize the idea that invoking one's history was the primary path of modernization.[45] The aesthetics and symbolism of the pavilion were enhanced by the monumental

[38] A. Ignjatović, „Jugoslovenski identitet u arhitekturi…", 357.

[39] A. Stamenković, *op. cit.*, 221; Aleksandra Stamenković, „Nacionalni paviljoni na međunarodnim izložbama kao primeri državne umetnosti: 1918–1941.", u: Kadijević, A., Ilijevski, A. (ur.), *Arhitektura i vizuelne umetnosti u jugoslovenskom kontekstu: 1918–1941*, Beograd: Filozofski fakultet, 2021, 77.

[40] More about this in: D. Čupić, M. Poznanović, *op. cit.*

[41] Aleksandar Ignjatović, „Između žezla i ključa: nacionalni identitet i arhitektonsko nasleđe Beograda i Srbije u XIX i prvoj polovini XX veka", *Nasleđe*, IX, (2008), 54.

[42] Quoted from A. Ignjatović, „Između žezla i ključa…, 54. See also: Diana Mishkova, "The Uses of Tradition and National Identity in the Balkans", in: *Balkan Identities: Nation and Memory*, Maria Todorova (ed.), (New York: NYU Press, 2004), 269–293.

[43] Branislav Marinković, „Novi stil u arhitekturi", *Umetnički pregled,* 8, (1938), 248–250.

[44] Duality between the individual and national, but also the traditional and modern legacy was a very common motif in Brašovan's designs, and could be related to a long period of formation of his artistic personality.

[45] D. Mishkova, *op. cit.*, 269–293.

wooden sculpture *Ecce homo* by Toma Rosandić, leaning on a flagpole and on a pedestal in the shape of a ship's bow.[46] Therefore, all the elements used for the repertoire indicated that in the background of inherited local cultures and customs stood the authentic Yugoslav spirit—unique for the entire Yugoslavia.[47]

The architect's efforts, and those of the organizing committee, were well rewarded. Judging by its modern style, universalizing tone, and content, an eminent commission gave a second prize to the Yugoslav pavilion.[48] The holding of such a high prize was a striking achievement for the King's expectations. It was not just a source of legitimate pride to the Yugoslavs, but made them acknowledged in international circles.

Following the standard set in Barcelona, the government began to consider the possibility of increasing the scope of the modern state with exhibits led by the Modern style. The concept of a geometrically shaped building was reproduced in varying forms at many subsequent exhibitions. Repetition, often on a smaller scale, and without major alteration was not enough to ensure success. Bašovan's success as the architect of the 1929 pavilion was a decisive factor in his appointment to design the Yugoslav contributions to the International Exhibition in Milan in 1931 (*Esposizione e Congresso Internazionali di Fonderia*).[49]

The project objective for this pavilion was to design a structure that could be utilized in the future. Moving away from the traditional stereotypes, it was a simple, and empathic rectangle, with an autonomy springing from its clear geometry. Unlike other creations, it sat directly on the ground, with no podium to detract from the building's ideal shape. The simplicity of the round-edged rectangular form was obvious because it was a closed structure with almost no openings except the doorway, and the streamlined windows along the top on sides, that emphasized the solidity. Of particular importance was the opening of the direct path for Modernism, like replacement for international Academism, and National Style based on Serbian-Byzantine models.[50] Creating a representative pavilion that could reconstruct Classical harmony, order and symmetry, but exclusively in the context of emphasizing state ideology, has been the priority. It reflected a close relationship between certain ideologies and the façades. The abundance of heavily decorated, luxurious surfaces that were all but recycled and updated, and the historicist styles that the exposition officially claimed to denounce, brought forward the perception of architecture. In its treatment, the architect discarded the principal function of the wall, so it became an element that produced a formal display.[51]

---

[46] Anonymous, „Odlazak naših radnika u Barselonu", *Politika*, 3. 5. 1929, 3; AJ, MTI, 65–868–284, Izveštaj br. 12515/c, 25. 5. 1929; D. Čupić, M. Poznanović, *op. cit.*, 41.

[47] A. Ignjatović, „Jugoslovenski identitet u arhitekturi…", 354–357.

[48] A. Stamenković, *op. cit.*, 228–229.

[49] AJ, MTI, 65–282–862, br. 1584, 20. 1. 1931.

[50] Aleksandar Kadijević, „Terminologija srpske arhitektonske istoriografije: Pojam 'državnog' arhitekte", *Arhitektura: mesečnik za urbanizam, arhitekturu i dizajn*, 102, (2006), 12.

[51] Neil Leach, *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory* (New York: Routledge, 1997), 300–328.

Yugoslav representative architecture between the World Wars was both the outcome and consequence of ideology.[52] It also allowed finding answers for unresolved relations on the political stage. Despite their temporary character, the pavilions very often promoted ideas with a great impact on society. Through an exhibition as a medium, they constructed a specific image for the audience.[53] The influence of the political component on the perception of architecture was pronounced in Yugoslavia pavilions at exhibitions during the 1930s.[54] Under the influence of progressive ideas, the material remains of traditional architecture on pavilions were replaced by new media of visual culture before the Second World War. [55]

Having passed the stage marked by the search for roots and the return of tradition, representative national art showed the need to purify artistic requirements and forms. Earlier performances were based on a historical matrix that promoted different cultural and ethnic identities in a common state. Unfortunately, a proclamation of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia hindered the realization of the collective spirit, and caused a change in the understanding of the Yugoslav idea.[56] The intertwining circumstances indicated a novelty due to a different use of known patterns. As the idea of Yugoslavs as one nation began to be promoted, a new term was devised—Yugoslavism.[57] But, Yugoslavism from the fourth decade of the 20th century should not be viewed in the same way as the similar movement from the period before the Great War.[58] This assumption, as well as the opportunity to convey the image of prosperous European Kingdom of Yugoslavia, was visualized in the pavilion at the 1931 Exhibition in Milan.[59] The appearance came from the social function of architecture and thus announced a break with the previous copying of older models.[60] Considering all of its features, in the context of a moment of designing and realization, the architecture here was an indicator of free transfer of international ideas into Yugoslavia, especially Serbia.[61]

Making the pavilion suitable for the exhibition meant the state would be universally recognized. In true public relations fashion, it was important to provide necessary excuses for the use of historical or thematic motives and trans-

[52] Milomir Stepić, „Regionalizacija u funkciji unutrašnje političko-teritorijalne reintegracije Srbije“, *Zbornik za likovne umetnosti Matice srpske*, 112–113, (2002), 127.

[53] The same phenomenon was described by Aleksandra Ilijevski in: “The Cvijeta Zuzorić Art Pavilion as the Center for Exhibition Activities of Belgrade Architects 1928–1933”, *Zbornik Matice srpske za likovne umetnosti*, 41, (2013), 237–248 (particularly in the final paragraph).

[54] Aleksandar Ignjatović, “Architecture, Urban Development and the Yugoslovization of Belgrade, 1917─1941”, *Centropa*, vol. IX, no. 2, (2009), 120–122.

[55] Igor Marić, „Savremena interpretacija tradicionalnih arhitektonskih obrazaca u seoskoj arhitekturi“, *Arhitektura i urbanizam*, 12–13, (2003), 25.

[56] Dragutin Tošić, *Jugoslovenske umetničke izložbe 1904–1927* (Beograd: Filozofski fakultet, Institut za istoriju umetnosti), 35.

[57] A. Ignjatović, “Architecture, Urban Development and the Yugoslovization…”, 113–123.

[58] D. Tošić, *op. cit.*, 11–12.

[59] A. Ignjatović, „Jugoslovenski identitet u arhitekturi…“, 350.

[60] A. Stamenković, *op. cit.*, 233

[61] A. Kadijević, „Život i delo Dragiše Brašovana…“, 157; M. Prosen, *op. cit.*, 221.

ferred them into a nationally inspired building. It was necessary that the local and regional identities, inherited with the name *Yugoslavia*, remained hidden. This impression clearly followed modern architectural trends declaring the experience of representative and presented values. Although the topography of the country made that universal quality difficult to achieve, the architects' ambition made an ideological goal visible. Brašovan managed to create an ambiance where intangible elements were turned into symbols of the environment Yugoslavs lived in.[62] Figural scenes decorated the space, and gave it a simple scenography effect. Depicted displays were integrated into the architecture as an essential part of the interior design, promoting King Alexander's representational policy.[63] Due to this ideological side, the bust of King Alexander I by Ivan Meštrović had a prominent, central position in the main hall.

The Yugoslav pavilion in Milan was not just an architectural shell directed by a political framework. Despite reduced elements, the presence of the author's personality was crucial.

Pavilions and Totalitarian/European Politics

As national pavilions became more and more monumental, social and ideological goals surpassed artistic ones. Thus, by the 1930s, the Yugoslav pavilions were more greatly influenced by other European architectures, especially the countries to which the current ruling elite wanted to connect.

In a time marked by the constant threat of another war, tourists from across the world were flocking to Paris, the site of the 1937 International Exhibition (*Exposition Internationale des Arts et des Techniques dans la Vie Moderne*). Before the Second World War, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia was dominated by the political maneuvers of Prime Minister Milan Stojadinović.[64] As the outlines of a new international order were becoming clearer, he wanted to get closer to the German political bloc. Hitler advocated political architecture, and argued that certain buildings should evoke a sense of unity, strength and togetherness in people.[65] Stojadinović thought that architecture could offer the Kingdom of Yugoslavia a similar opportunity to replace its unstable political position and permanent identity crisis. But unlike Hitler's exclusive visions for German national identity, Stojadinović pursued a more complex ideological picture—one that simultaneously included the Yugoslav state, nation and cultures. Nowhere was this embodied more clearly than in the Yugoslav pavilion built for the International Exhibition in Paris in 1937.

---

[62] Marc-Alain Maure, "Identité, écologie, participation, Noveaux musées, nouvelle muséologie", *Musées*, vol. 8, no. 1, (1985), 21; Robyn Autry, "The political economy of memory: the challenges of representing national conflict at „identity driven" museums", *Theory and Society*, vol. 42, no. 1, (2013), 57–80.

[63] Read the explanation of the Milan pavilion in: A. Ignjatović, „Jugoslovenski identitet u arhitekturi…", 353.

[64] See: A. Ignjatović, „Jugoslovenski identitet u arhitekturi…", 151–158.

[65] Richard James Overy, *Diktatori – Hitlerova Nemačka i Staljinova Rusija* (Zagreb: Naklada Ljevak, 2005), 228.

Before Paris, many prominent names of Yugoslav interwar architecture applied for the competition for the pavilion design. After two rounds of voting, the jury, which included eminent personalities from the Serbian, Croatian and Slovenian art scene, selected Josip Seissel's project with Ernest Weissmann as the supervising engineer.[66]

Like in previous cases, the building was not constructed in line with the design selected in the competition. Seissel had to change certain details to bring the pavilion closer to the current ideology—promoting the idea of a representative state that brought ethnic, local and historical differences in harmony.[67] In the social context, the emphasis was on the communication between the elements of architecture, and the local and international public opinion.[68] Thus, the pavilion showed a simple, refined architecture and a clear interior space. Its calm and flat surfaces, balanced plasticity and harmonious shapes nevertheless left a strong impression on visitors. Instinctively, they turned to the building and entered to see what is hidden inside.

Among other remarkable buildings, the Yugoslav Pavilion was modeled in a strict cubic form. Its façade was ennobled with four marble pillars without a base or constructive function. They stood as a testament to Yugoslavia's ancient roots and its wealth of natural stone and mineral resources.[69] Because of the recent quarrel with the organizers, some of the leading Yugoslav sculptors and painters did not send their work to Paris.[70] Although there was no expected ideological Yugoslav display, the interior was filled with splendid marble, steel and glass, which gave the pavilion a simultaneously modern, yet classical look.[71] The marble cladding also suggested a return to classical values, and the need to construct more formal types, reflecting the nation's collective efforts to create an image of its own social, technological and economic structure.[72] Therefore, it should come as no surprise that the art program of the pavilion derived from the interpretation of the German reception of ancient culture.[73]

Yugoslavia's monumental 1937 pavilion was perhaps modeled on the aesthetics of the totalitarian ideology, because it embodied the authorities' dou-

---

[66] A. Stamenković, *op. cit.*, 245–250.

[67] Aleksandar Ignjatović, „Politika predstavljanja jugoslovenstva: jugoslovenski paviljon na Svetskoj izložbi u Parizu 1937. godine", *Godišnjak za društvenu istoriju*, 11, sv. 2–3, (2006), 71.

[68] Towards the end of 1930s architecture was frequently used to depict the ruling ideologies of political elites. Read more in: Aleksandar Kadijević, „Ideološke i estetske osnove uspona evropske monumentalne arhitekture u četvrtoj deceniji dvadesetog veka", *Istorijski časopis*, XLV–XLVI (2000), 255–272; Aleksandar Kadijević, „Odjeci arhitekture totalitarizma u Srbiji", *DaNS*, 51, (2005), 44–47.

[69] A. Ignjatović, "Peripheral Empire, Internal Colony…", 192.

[70] Among the artists who refused to take a part in the pavilion was one of the first admirers of the Yugoslav idea, Ivan Meštrović. See: A. Stamenković, *op. cit.*, 259–261.

[71] A. Ignjatović, "Peripheral Empire, Internal Colony…", 192.

[72] A. Ignjatović, „Jugoslovenski identitet u arhitekturi…", 159.

[73] See: Robert Taylor, *Word in Stone – Role of Architecture in the National Socialist Ideology* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974); R. J. Overy, *op. cit.*, 352; Danilo Udovički-Selb, „Arhitektura i propaganda", *Republika*, br. 508–51,1 (2011), 13–22.

ble goal—of presenting the internal unity of the nation, and the external strength of the state. The pavilion's monumentality was highlighted exclusively by the materials used: marble, onyx and copper.[74] But compositionally, it was also divided into three constitutive elements: the entrance zone, the central part with the courtyard and a separate building, the so-called Bosnian Log Cabin. This structure was purposefully designed to determine how visitors would move through the space. It symbolized the idea of presenting the search for identity and creating a unified Yugoslav nation.[75]

The South Slavs shared turbulent histories, being under imperial domination, especially the Ottomans, so visual representations often used the iconic images of struggle as a unifying identity. Perhaps this democratic vision for interethnic unity challenged the imperial hegemony, characteristic of nationalism in Europe at the time. Toma Rosandić's sculpture *The Fight* was placed beyond the pillars, at the pavilion's main entrance.[76] It represented a strong and nude young man kneeling, bent forward under the weight of a large stone, holding hands on his back and shoulders. Like the pillars, the figure was supposed to connect with the idea of the ancient tradition of Yugoslavia—the embodiment of the struggle for progress and peace.[77] That moment of the formation of the Yugoslav nation was present in all Yugoslav pavilions, so its antiquity and mythical history were displayed with already tested identity patterns.[78] While the pillars embodied the national spirit, the marble sculpture presented the racial unity of the Yugoslavs type. Here, Yugoslav identity expressed itself as unique and autochthonous.[79]

But to fulfill the purpose of the national pavilion, it also had to prove how the foundations of contemporary culture were deeply rooted in Yugoslavia's national folk traditions. As such, the main façade was completed with a mosaic by Milo Milunović depicting Serbian, Croatian and Slovenian women in characteristic folk costumes and a natural environment.[80] Through this scene regional, historical and ethnic cultural differences, as external varieties of Yugoslav nation, were shown.[81] In that sense, the sculpture and the mosaic can be interpreted as a symbolic representation of a state which, after the struggle for

[74] AJ, MTI, 65–275–833, Josip Sajsl, Tehnički opis i obrazloženje projekta za jugoslovenski paviljon na izložbi u Parizu 1937, 29. 11. 1936.

[75] A. Ignjatović, „Jugoslovenski identitet u arhitekturi…", 155–156.

[76] A. Ignjatović, „Politika predstavljanja jugoslovenstva…", 71, 73.

[77] This idea is further elaborated by Aleksandar Ignjatović in the previously mentioned article „Politika predstavljanja jugoslovenstva…", 74–75.

[78] A. Ignjatović, „Jugoslovenski identitet u arhitekturi…", 156. See also: Tamara Biljman, „Jugoslovenski paviljon na Svetskoj izložbi u Parizu 1937. godine. Enterijer nacionalnog paviljona i Bosanske kuće kao instrument propagande", *Zbornik Matice srpske za likovne umetnosti,* 44, (2016), 276.

[79] Read more in: Aleksandar Ignjatović, "Peripheral Empire, Internal Colony…", 192–195.

[80] Ivana Simeonović Ćelić, *Milo Milunović: nepresušna težnja suštini slikarske materije i boje* (Beograd–Podgorica: SANU–CANU, 1997), 107–108, 137–138.

[81] A. Stamenković, *op. cit.*, 257–258.

unification, enabled people with different heritage to live in harmony in one state, perhaps King Alexander's greatest wish.[82]

Against the modern pavilion stood the picturesque "Bosnian House", a traditional, wooden log cabin.[83] The main pavilion gave visitors the impression of a modern national territory in which different folk cultures were presented. Meanwhile, the Bosnian Log Cabin reflected a typical difference within Yugoslavia's cultures.[84] By applying folk style and modern architecture side-by-side, the authorities' indicated that the state, regardless of external modernity, was taking care of tradition and roots. Of all nations, Bosnia and Herzegovina was particularly diverse in ethnic and religious heritage. By moving it into a separate unit, the architects[85], led by ruling ideologies, wanted to specifically point out how its diversity could be unified within the Kingdom of Yugoslavia.[86] The Bosnian House should thus be considered as an extension—rather than a separate entity—of the Yugoslav Pavilion. As such, it served the same function as the sculptures of Ivan Meštrović in the earlier pavilions.[87]

Nevertheless, the authorities' long-term lobbying finally achieved its goal. The Yugoslav Pavilion subsequently was awarded the first prize, and the Bosnian Cabin won two first prizes. Because of the great attention evoked among the visitors, the Bosnian Cabin was later donated to Paris, and located in the Bois de Boulogne, after the exhibition closed.[88] Le Corbusier was particularly impressed, as the "geometrical purity of the building revealed in respecting tradition and breaking academic rules at the same time".[89] But, this performance did not have the appropriate reception in Yugoslavia, where many believed it did not adequately represent the possibilities and achievements of Yugoslav architecture in the late 1930s. Situated next to the main entrance, it was the face of prewar architecture in Europe, presenting Yugoslavia's progressively modern culture, but one that was still rooted in a long history. Though as "noble as an ancient temple",[90] its elegant design was forward—and European-facing, presenting itself as a bridge to Yugoslavia's bright post-imperial future. Thus the

[82] A. Ignjatović, „Jugoslovenski identitet u arhitekturi…", 160.

[83] There are several ideological interpretations of the architecture and position of the Bosnian House in relation to the national pavilion, but all of them are derived from the symbolical and physical exclusion of Bosnia and Herzegovina. Aleksandar Ignjatović has provided an answer to this question regarding the reasons in his articles on the topic of integral Yugoslavism.

[84] A. Stamenković, *op. cit.*, 266.

[85] The competition was held for a suitable Bosnian building, and won by the team of architects – Vojta Braniš, Đorđe Krekić, Đuko Kavurić, Edo Kovačević and Ernest Tomašević, all supervised by Ernest Weissmann. AJ, MTI, 65–276–837, Bosanska kuća, 2. 3. 1937.

[86] A. Ignjatović, „Jugoslovenski identitet u arhitekturi…", 176.

[87] *Ibid.*, 176–177.

[88] AJ, MTI, 65–276–837, Bosanska kuća darovana Parizu, 5. 2. 1938.

[89] Tamara Bjažić Klarin, "Le Corbusier s'il vous plait? - Oui, mais... Inter-war Architecture between Zagreb and Paris", in:, *French Artistic Culture and Central-East European Modern Art*, Ljiljana Kolešnik and Tamara Bjažić Klarin (eds.), (Zagreb: Institut za povijest umjetnosti, 2017), 140.

[90] A. Ignjatović, "Peripheral Empire, Internal Colony…", 192.

1937 pavilion remains one of Yugoslavia's best known, precisely because it exposed how the state history was politically interpreted and reinterpreted to articulate a certain socio-political, economic and cultural context—one that would dramatically change over time.

On the other side of the Atlantic, the Americans had begun to plan a major international exhibition. The newly named *New York World's Fair* was scheduled for 1939/40. It was not a good year for such an event. With war spreading throughout Europe,[91] a more pragmatic mood prevailed in the administration of the exhibition. Gone was the optimism of the first year with its message of better living through collective planning, so carefully crafted. The new theme was adopted a second year, for an exhibition that claimed to be a temple of peace, bringing all nations together in concord.[92] That was the last exhibition the Kingdom of Yugoslavia was involved in.[93]

The program of representation for the New York exhibition was supposed to sublimate Yugoslavia's efforts to make cultural and economic connections with Europe and the United States. Therefore, the pavilion had to confirm the abundance of traditional models, but also an affirmation of modern and functional architecture in Yugoslavia. The adoption of Western ideals, democracy and totalitarianism[94] was a formal connection leading to a closeness of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes.

Ernest Weissmann was interested to submit a design for this entry before Yugoslavia committed to be a part of the event, and his design at first did not fit the site.[95] However, the financially limited Kingdom of Yugoslavia decided not to erect the pavilion in New York. Although the government had exceedingly daring plans, none had taken a truly thematic approach and steered it forward to any logical conclusion. Despite initial interest and support, the Kingdom of Yugoslavia rented the pavilion in the Lagoon of Nations instead of constructing it, and appointed Weissmann to make an expression worthy of state representation.[96]

---

[91] The report of the opening day celebration shared the front-page headlines of the *New York Times* with the latest news of Hitler's ultimatum to Poland. Unfortunately, the war in Europe was soon present at the fair. Before closing, the flags of the French and Polish exhibits were draped in black, and a notice outside the uncompleted Czech Pavilion was an apology for the fact that work had to stop due to the Nazi invasion. Germany did not participate, and Japan brought the United States into the war in 1941. See: John Alwood, *The Great Exhibitions* (London: Studio Vista, 1977), 145, 148.

[92] Jessica Weglein, Wendy Scheir, Jill Peterson, Susan Malsbury, and Michelle Schwartz, New York World's Fair 1939 and 1940 Incorporated Records 1935-1945, The New York Public Library Manuscripts and Archives Division, 2008, https://www.nypl.org/sites/default/files/ archivalcollections/pdf/nywf39fa.pdf, (accessed 14. 5. 2021).

[93] Katarina Bušić, "Salamon Berger and the Beginnings of the Exhibition Activity of the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb", *Ethnological Researches,* (2009), 312.

[94] The end of the 1940s was marked by the improvement of relations with Italy and Germany. See: Ljubodrag Dimić, *Kulturna politika Kraljevine Jugoslavije*, 1–3 (Beograd: Stubovi kulture, 1997), 329–395.

[95] Tamara Bjažić Klarin, „Ernest Weissmann, arhitektonsko djelo 1926–1939", (doktorska disertacija, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet, 2011), 466.

[96] More about it in: T. Bjažić Klarin, „Ernest Weissmann, arhitektonsko djelo...".

The optimism of the organizers appeared to be justified. Their focus had to be set and resolved in accordance with the true meaning of the social function of architecture.[97] It was difficult to indicate an idea that would span the cultural differences in the Yugoslav community.[98] Therefore, the visual representation of national metaphor transferred to the furniture and room settings that promoted the "complexity of the Yugoslav ideology".[99] For the first time the exhibition layout was directly influenced by a style that looked into the future.

Using architecture for political purposes was not unknown to Yugoslav art circles in this period. The political and technical problems of enforcing a Yugoslav idea had proved too great. Equalizing the political and national context through art also showed how difficult it was to maintain unity, because the politically and culturally united Yugoslavs had problems in proving the correctness of the Yugoslav idea, as well as its feasibility in national programs.

By the end of the noted period, state authorities encouraged the use of architectural symbolism as an integral part of modernization policy. The development of national memory, which promoted cultural and social transformation, was a parallel process with political emancipation, and was contributed by the participation in world fairs.

Compared with previous exhibitions, when national symbolism was expressed through the pavilion's façades, the rental building imposed the fear that regional cultural identity would be endangered. This pavilion was almost completely overlooked by the simple, understated design. Its neutral and solid nature, unlike the spectacular forms of previous buildings, did nothing to make the pavilion stand out in the surroundings. It had no engaging façades, was not reflective of tradition, and had nothing purely local. The organizers dictated its form, so the pavilion could not express the varieties and values of the social context in Yugoslavia. Exterior arrangement and motive combination directly implied how the Kingdom of Yugoslavia perceived itself by conveying the messages about representative policy designed by the authorities. Furthermore, that pointed to the status of Yugoslavian art, also a growth comparable to the main industrialized countries. Discrepancies caused by dualities of international and national were covered with discrete ornaments. As transparent elements explicitly indicating the country that rented the space was not to be used in this case, the symbolic "interventions" on the façade had to be limited. Besides the evident formal solidity, clean lines of large white faces were interrupted only by the inscription *Yugoslavia*, a map and a figure of a female who symbolically represented a healthy and strong Yugoslav woman, "mother, and the incarnation of Yugoslavia".[100]

With minimal details, within the entrance part, a message was hinted that would only get its full meaning after visiting the complete display. Thus, at the

[97] A. Stamenković, *op. cit.*, 318.
[98] A. Ignjatović, "Architecture, Urban Development and the Yugoslovization of Belgrade…", 114.
[99] *Ibid.*
[100] T. Bjažić Klarin, „Ernest Weissmann, arhitektonsko djelo...", 469.

beginning and getting acquainted with the Yugoslav culture, the visitor would meet the figural "Yugoslav mother" and the relief map of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. The lesson that was already symbolized in Paris in 1937 with Milunović's mosaic, is now expressed in simpler terms. Figural representations of women, as common indicators of ethnic differences, fit well into the dominant stereotypes of the ideology of nationalism.[101] However, this female figure, without specific racial characteristics, showed a wider range in the understanding and creative transposition of certain formal features, returning to the idea of the primordial unity of race and nation. Accordingly, the relief map of Yugoslavia did not show a clear division into regions either, suggesting that it was a unique state (Yugoslavia), with a unique people (Yugoslavs), and as such was a part of Europe. The regionalisms that made up the Yugoslavs were shown only in the interior, in a much freer interpretation of the traditional representative content.[102]

Despite the limitations, the arrangement of Weissman's setting displayed the idea of social order and distinctive architectural expression. In an atmosphere of ideological indoctrination, he did not abandon the usual representativeness, he merely had to use another form of vocabulary.[103] He found the reason for shifting the focus from observation to function, in a broader sense, in the characteristic spiritual climate which found its full expression in post-war architecture.

Conclusion

The Yugoslav pavilions stand as a testament to the parallel flows of socio-political discourses and architectural style, highlighting the politically engaged function of architecture. Yugoslavia's latest pavilions exemplified King Alexander's idea of post-imperial Yugoslav unity, in an attempt to equalize the political and national contexts through the arts. But it also showed how difficult it was to maintain that unity, as politically and culturally united Yugoslavs struggled to define and make feasible the Yugoslav idea.

The prevailing ideologies of nationalism imposed new models for artistic creations, and the integration of the national communities that made up the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. Yet for many Yugoslavs, the impression was that these attempts to unite people of the same origin into one state instead emphasized their cultural, ethnic and regional differences, and thus separated them even more. Such a status was the result of the assimilation of Western modernity, particularly pronounced in the pavilions born from Yugoslavia's post-imperial, interwar history.

[101] See: A. Ignjatović, „Jugoslovenski identitet u arhitekturi…", 161.
[102] A. Stamenković, *op. cit.*, 328.
[103] *Ibid*.

REFERENCES

- Alfirević, Đorđe. *Ekspresionizam u srpskoj arhitekturi*. Beograd: Arhitektonski fakultet/Orion art, 2016.
- Alwood, John. *The Great Exhibitions*. London: Studio Vista, 1977.
- Archer B. J. and Anthony Vidler (eds.). *Follies: Architecture for the Late-Twentieth-Century Landscape*. New York: Rizzoli 1983.
- Autry, Robyn. "The political economy of memory: the challenges of representing national conflict at „identity driven" museums". *Theory and Society*, vol. 42, no. 1 (2013), 57–80. DOI: 10.1007/s11186-012-9185-5
- Biljman, Tamara. „Jugoslovenski paviljon na Svetskoj izložbi u Parizu 1937. godine. Enterijer nacionalnog paviljona i Bosanske kuće kao instrument propaganda". *Zbornik Matice srpske za likovne umetnosti*, 44, (2016), 273–291.
- Bjažić Klarin, Tamara. „Ernest Weissmann, arhitektonsko djelo 1926–1939". Doktorska disertacija, Sveučilište u Zagrebu, Filozofski fakultet, 2011.
- Bjažić Klarin, Tamara. "Le Corbusier s'il vous plait? - Oui, mais... Inter-war Architecture between Zagreb and Paris". In: *French Artistic Culture and Central-East European Modern Art*. Ljiljana Kolešnik and Tamara Bjažić Klarin (eds.), 121–156. Zagreb: Institut za povijest umjetnosti, 2017.
- Bušić, Katarina. "Salamon Berger and the Beginnings of the Exhibition Activity of the Ethnographic Museum in Zagreb". *Ethnological Researches,* (2009), 301–319.
- Čorak, Željka. "The 1925 Yugoslav Pavilion in Paris". Davidson, R. i Davidson, D. (trans.). *The Journal of Decorative and Propaganda Arts*, vol. 17, (1990), 36–41. DOI: 10.2307/1504076
- Ćupić, Dario, Milan Poznanović. *Misterija Brašovanovog paviljona*. Beograd: Muzej nauke i tehnike, 2020.
- Dimić, Ljubodrag. *Kulturna politika Kraljevine Jugoslavije*, 1–3. Beograd: Stubovi kulture, 1997.
- Đokić, Dejan. "Yugoslovism: Histories, Myths, Concepts". In: *Yugoslovism: Histories of a Failed Idea 1918*–1992. Dejan Đokić (ed.), 1–10. London: Hurst, 2003. DOI: 10.7152/ssj.v1i1.4293
- Ignjatović, Aleksandar. „Jugoslovenski identitet u arhitekturi između 1904. i 1941. godine". Doktorska disertacija, Univerzitet u Beogradu, Arhitektonski fakultet, 2005.
- Ignjatović, Aleksandar. „Politika predstavljanja jugoslovenstva: jugoslovenski paviljon na Svetskoj izložbi u Parizu 1937. godine". *Godišnjak za društvenu istoriju,* 11, sv. 2–3, (2006), 65–83.
- Ignjatović, Aleksandar. "Peripheral Empire, Internal Colony: Yugoslav National Pavilions at the Paris World Exhibitions in 1925 and 1937". *Centropa*, vol. 8, no. 2, (May 2008), 186–197.

- Ignjatović, Aleksandar. „Između žezla i ključa: nacionalni identitet i arhitektonsko nasleđe Beograda i Srbije u XIX i prvoj polovini XX veka“. *Nasleđe*, IX, (2008), 51–73.
- Ignjatović, Aleksandar. “Architecture, Urban Development and the Yugoslovization of Belgrade, 1917─1941”. *Centropa*, vol. IX, no. 2, (2009), 110–126.
- Ignjatović, Aleksandar. „Sanjana prošlost, zamišljena budućnost: Arhitektura i nacionalni identitet u Srbiji 1918–1941“. U: *Istorija umetnosti u Srbiji XX veka*, vol. III. Urednik Miško Šuvaković, 143–156. Beograd: Orion Art, 2014.
- Ilijevski, Aleksandra. “The Cvijeta Zuzorić Art Pavilion as the Center for Exhibition Activities of Belgrade Architects 1928–1933”. *Zbornik Matice srpske za likovne umetnosti*, 41, (2013), 237–248.
- Kadijević, Aleksandar. „Život i delo Dragiše Brašovana (1887−1965) “, *Godišnjak grada Beograda*, XXXVII, (1990), 141–173.
- Kadijević, Aleksandar. „Jugoslovenski paviljon u Barseloni 1929. godine“. *Glasnik Društva konzervatora Srbije*, 19, (1995), 213–214.
- Kadijević, Aleksandar. „Ideološke i estetske osnove uspona evropske monumentalne arhitekture u četvrtoj deceniji dvadesetog veka“. *Istorijski časopis*, XLV–XLVI, (2000), 255–272.
- Kadijević, Aleksandar. „Odjeci arhitekture totalitarizma u Srbiji“. *DaNS*, 51, (2005), 44–47.
- Kadijević, Aleksandar. „Terminologija srpske arhitektonske istoriografije: Pojam ’državnog’ arhitekte“. *Arhitektura: mesečnik za urbanizam, arhitekturu i dizajn*, 102, (2006), 12.
- Kadijević, Aleksandar. *Jedan vek traženja nacionalnog stila u srpskoj arhitekturi (sredina XIX – sredina XX veka).* Beograd: Građevinska knjiga, 2007.
- Leach, Neil. *Rethinking Architecture: A Reader in Cultural Theory*. New York: Routledge, 1997.
- Mako, Vladimir. *Estetika–arhitektura* II. Beograd: Orion art, 2009.
- Manević, Zoran. „Delo arhitekte Dragiše Brašovana“. *Zbornik radova za likovne umetnosti Matice Srpske*, 6, (1970), 187–199.
- Manević, Zoran. „Pojava moderne arhitekture u Srbiji“. Doktorska disertacija, Univerzitet u Beogradu, Filozofski fakultet, Odeljenje za istoriju umetnosti, 1979.
- Manević, Zoran. „Izložbe jugoslovenske savremene arhitekture u Beogradu (1931, 1933)“. *Godišnjak grada Beograda*, XXVII, (1980), 271–272.
- Marić, Igor. „Savremena interpretacija tradicionalnih arhitektonskih obrazaca u seoskoj arhitekturi“. *Arhitektura i urbanizam*, 12–13, (2003), 25–37.
- Marinković, Branislav. „Novi stil u arhitekturi“. *Umetnički pregled*, 8, (1938), 248–250.
- Maure, Marc-Alain. “Identité, écologie, participation, Noveaux musées, nouvelle muséologie”. *Musées*, vol. 8, no. 1, (1985), 17–21.

- Mishkova, Diana. "The Uses of Tradition and National Identity in the Balkans". In: *Balkan Identities: Nation and Memory*. Maria Todorova (ed.), 269–293. New York: NYU Press, 2004.
- Overy, Richard James. *Diktatori – Hitlerova Nemačka i Staljinova Rusija*. Zagreb: Naklada Ljevak, 2005.
- Petranović, Branko. *Istorija Jugoslavije 1918–1988. Kraljevina Jugoslavija 1914–1941*. Beograd: Nolit, 1988.
- Prosen, Milan. „Ar deko u srpskoj arhitekturi". Doktorska disertacija, Univerzitet u Beogradu, Filozofski fakultet, Odeljenje za istoriju umetnosti, 2014.
- Rajner, Mirjam. *Fragile Images: Jews and Art in Yugoslavia, 1918–1945*. Leiden–Boston: Brill, 2019. DOI: 10.1163/9789004408906
- Shearman, John. *Only Connect: Art and the Spectator in the Italian Renaissance*. New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1992.
- Simeonović Ćelić, Ivana. *Milo Milunović: nepresušna težnja suštini slikarske materije i boje*. Belgrade–Podgorica: SANU–CANU, 1997.
- Simkin, Colin. *Fairs: Past and Present*. Hartford: The Travelers, 1939.
- Stamenković, Aleksandra. „Nacionalni paviljoni na međunarodnim izložbama kao primeri državne umetnosti: 1918–1941.", in: Kadijević, Aleksandar, Ilijevski, Aleksandra (eds.), *Arhitektura i vizuelne umetnosti u jugoslovenskom kontekstu: 1918–1941*, Beograd: Filozofski fakultet, 2021, 75–80.
- Stamenković, Aleksandra. „Arhitektura nacionalnih paviljona Srbije i Jugoslavije na međunarodnim izložbama 1900–1941". Doktorska disertacija, Univerzitet u Beogradu, Filozofski fakultet, Odeljenje za istoriju umetnosti, 2017.
- Stepić, Milomir. „Regionalizacija u funkciji unutrašnje političko-teritorijalne reintegracije Srbije". *Zbornik za likovne umetnosti Matice Srpske*, 112–113, (2002), 137–146.
- Stojanović, Bratislav. „Arhitekta Dragiša Brašovan". *Urbanizam Beograda*, 51, (1979), 20−21.
- Strajnić, Kosta. „Za čast jugoslovenske kulture. Povodom našega učešća na međunarodnoj izložbi u Parizu (II)", *Srpski književni glasnik*, XV, no. 6, (1925), 461–464.
- Taylor, Robert. *Word in Stone – Role of Architecture in the National Socialist Ideology*. Berkeley: University of California Press, 1974.
- Tošić, Dragutin. *Jugoslovenske umetničke izložbe 1904–1927*. Beograd: Filozofski fakultet, Institut za istoriju umetnosti, 1983.
- Udovički-Selb, Danilo. „Arhitektura i propaganda". *Republika*, br. 508–511, (2011), 13–22.
- Weglein, Jessica, Wendy Scheir, Jill Peterson, Susan Malsbury and Michelle Schwartz. *New York World's Fair 1939 and 1940 Incorporated Records 1935–1945*. The New York Public Library Manuscripts and Archives Division, 2008, https://www.nypl.org/sites/default/files/archivalcollections/pdf/nywf39fa.pdf (accessed 14. 5. 2021)

ALEKSANDRA STAMENKOVIĆ, PhD, Assistant Professor
Faculty of Digital Arts, Belgrade Metropolitan University
Belgrade, Republic of Serbia
a_stamenkovic@ymail.com

YUGOSLAV PAVILIONS AT INTERNATIONAL EXHIBITIONS IN ARTISTIC AND POLITICAL DISCOURSE 1918-1941

Summary

This article is supposed to reveal insufficiently researched facts about the Serbian and Yugoslav performances at international exhibitions between the Two World Wars. The focus was on the architecture of national pavilions. Since the specific ideologies symbolically shaped the pavilions, this engaged function demanded a correlation of observing methodology with the other scientific areas. Researching the context imposed a review of the pavilions in which the Kingdom of Serbs, Croats and Slovenes/Kingdom of Yugoslavia represented itself during this period. In terms of the applied styles, those buildings were an acceptable model for national architecture. Because of the vocabulary leaned towards Modernism, it was necessary to look at the ideological frameworks imposed by time and motives rhetoric. All the examples illustrated the attempts to create a model suitable for representative purposes, with the possibility of adapting to different ethnical traditions and historical narratives. Accordingly, architecture became the materialization of social processes that promoted suitability as a new aesthetic category. That feature can be followed in different periods and modes, initiating simultaneously new, but more specialized research.

KEYWORDS: National Pavilions, International Exhibitions, King Alexander I of Yugoslavia (Karadjordjević), The Yugoslav Idea