

Sonja Jankov
Independent curator
Novi Sad, Serbia

Full-Scale Architectural Models in Post-Yugoslav Art Practices

ABSTRACT: The paper focuses on chosen works by contemporary, post-Yugoslav artists Branislav Nikolić, Marko Lulić and Saša Tkaćenko, all of which contain full-scale architectural models. In order to define whether these objects are architectural doppelgangers, simulations, replicas, ready-mades, appropriations or products of an event, the paper gives insight into histories and original discourses of the buildings that were included into these artworks. For that purpose, the paper also turns to Rachel Whiteread and Simon Fujiwara who created similar works within different cultural context. The theoretic framework includes Henri Lefebvre's trialectics of space, Theodor Adorno's theory of art and *mimesis*, Jacques Lacan's psychoanalytic theory of the mirrored image and notions about the full-scale architectural models by Rem Koolhaas, Thea Brejzek and Lawrence Wallen. Apart from analysing the meanings of chosen works, the paper gives closer look to a specific occurrence in contemporary art practices - the full-scale architectural model.

KEYWORDS: full-scale model, architecture, contemporary art practices, post-Yugoslav

In 1912, young Mies van der Rohe created a full-scale wood-and-canvas model of Kröller House in Wassenaar, Netherlands. It was apparently one in string of twenty houses designed by various architects over the years before the owner decided for the final solution that was not Mies'. However, the model made a great influence on Mies' later work, which made Rem Koolhaas wonder "were its whiteness and weightlessness an overwhelming revelation of everything he did not *yet* believe in? An epiphany of anti-matter? Was this canvas cathedral an acute flash-forward to another architecture? [...] Did the canvas house lead to the curtain wall?" (1993: 63). Koolhaas suggested that the house that Mies did not make, was the house that made Mies and his tectonics of disappearance, dissolution and floating.¹ As it turned out later, this reality that had not taken place was not only a phantom house, but also a phantom model, since, according to Philip Johnson, who produced catalogue for the first MoMA Mies exhibition in 1947, it was fabricated, fake and never designed by Mies.

¹ It could be said that a 'house which built Le Corbusier' was constructed at the 2014 Venice Biennale of Architecture when Rem Koolhaas was the curator of the Biennale's theme *Foundations*. In 1914, Le Corbusier had begun to develop Dom-ino House – an open floor system which was to enable mass production of housing after the First World War. Although he never constructed it, leaving the concept at drawings, it made a great influence on him, as "a structure without loadbearing walls allowing for the free placement of internal/ external walls, facilitating Le Corbusier's planning ideology of plan libre" (Brejzek and Wallen, 2014: 99). It was made for the first time in 2014, in front of the Biennale's central pavilion, by architect Valentin Bontjes van Beek and students from the Architectural Association in London. The difference between the original Le Corbusier's concept and this 1:1 model is that the concrete was replaced by engineered wood (timber), which allowed the construction to be shipped and exhibited at different places.

Nevertheless, the story about Mies' model of the Kröller House points out function and significance of a full-scale model in architecture. It is a structure which is from the start convicted on a very short life that may have never get duplicated in a real building. It often differs from a prototype which is a uniquely made product with all functions, while an architectural model usually embodies only spatial characteristics of an imagined building. The goal of this paper is to analyse what happens when contemporary artists include full-scale models in their practices and move them into new discourse – whether these objects are architectural doppelgangers, simulations, replicas that make one building exist in more than one place,² ready-mades, appropriations, or something in between. According to Thea Brejzek and Lawrence Wallen, “relationship between the model and its realised sibling is a performative one, one that creates an event” (2014: 98). In case of (once) existing buildings, it is also important to analyse why artists chose to make the full-scale model of one specific building and not any other. For this reason, the paper will focus both on the works of artists and the buildings they chose.

The first part of the paper gives theoretic framework and a couple of examples from the British art practices which included full-scale models in 1993 and 2017. The second and the third part of the paper are historic and interpretational research, containing four case studies of works from the post-Yugoslav region, three of which are from Serbia. The third part also turns to the work of Vladimir Bojić who created a full-scale model of a car, instead of a building, but he did so in order to criticise the same social reality as those artists who turn to architecture. The closing chapter compares the theory to analysed cases, positioning the role of full-scale architectural models in contemporary art practices of the post-Yugoslav region.

FULL-SCALE MODELS AND AN EMPTY SPACE

In 1993, Rachel Whiteread created the sculpture *House* by filling an existing house in London with concrete and removing later the original walls and windows. The sculpture was a concrete cast of the basement, ground floor and the first floor of a chosen Victorian terrace house, excluding the roof space. The process started with finding a house which had been already scheduled for demolition, change of ownership, construction of new foundations which would support all the concrete and the process of casting which alone took two months. The sculpture was demolished 11 weeks after its opening, becoming in the meanwhile a tourist attraction and subject of diverse critical response, one of which was a petition to turn it into permanent monument, signed by 3,300 people. The work brought Whiteread both the Turner Prize for the best young British artist and the K Foundation art award for the worst British artist. Produced as a sculpture/ monument, Whiteread's model became a trace which made the real object twice demolished, both as a home and as a work of contemporary art. Her work was a death mask of the building which lost its function, since it was destined for execution in order to make more space for larger and more profitable premises.

In 2017, Simon Fujiwara created the *House of Hope*, a full-sized copy of an Amsterdam house in whose hidden rooms lived Anne Frank. The artwork was based on the 3D model available in the house's gift shop and it intersected four storeys of the Dvir Gallery in Israel.³ It was cut in half, so that both interior and exterior of the house were visible. Fujiwara deliberately added modern elements, since some of such details were already in the house, like wallpaper that was made in the communist GDR and put

2 Replicas in architecture are contemporary global trend connected to spectacularization of architecture. Entire cities, such as Las Vegas, are made largely of copies of famous touristic attractions from all around the world. These copies are given different functions in the new settings.

3 Unlike Fujiwara who reproduces entire house, spreading it over storeys of the gallery, Simon Starling reproduces only the fifth storey of seven-storeys high Casa Scaccabarozzi (La Fetta di Polenta) in Turin, a specific building constructed by architect Alessandro Antonelli from 1840 to 1881. Starling places the 1:1 scale model (2.5 x 3.7 x 10.4m) in 2007 as part of his exhibition *Rree Birds, Seven Stories, Interpolations and Bifurcations*.

up after Anne's death. He found this very interesting for such a clearly ideological house, discovering that both "interiors and atmosphere were not 'authentic' but were largely staged only [...] to speak of a human truth: the nature of our pragmatism. That felt more authentic than a pure narrative of hope" (Fujiwara, 2017).

Fujiwara made the house exist at two places at once. Its altered copy was intersecting another building, being both exhibited and hidden within it, as Anne's rooms. The space which was once personal and unknown to others became firstly revealed to wider public when turned into the museum and later duplicated at different location. Added home appliances that are used nowadays make it even more relatable to today's viewers.

Both these works turn to buildings which had their own history⁴ through *mimesis*. According to Theodor Adorno, art establishes a critical relation with social reality precisely through *mimesis*. What is created in art points towards things which are not contained by it, since art "exists only in relation to its other; it is the process that transpires with its other" (Adorno, 1997: 3). In other words, "works of art yield a kind of knowledge of reality. This knowledge is critical because the mimetical moment is capable of highlighting aspects of reality that were not perceivable before" (Heynen, 1999: 186). Whiteread and Fujiwara used *mimesis* to go beyond simple copies of the houses. The architectural doppelgangers they created are not ready-mades, nor acts of appropriation, since both artists created objects to point towards the original buildings and the meanings that they carry.

Whiteread's *House* is a representative of the lost home which was there before the house disappeared. In Jacques Lacan's psychoanalytic theory the *little object a* (*objet petit a*) is a reminder of a lost object, whose absence leaves an empty space filled with a representative (*le représentant*) that urges the subject to reunite with the desired object (Lacan, 1988b: 217). This representative would have been a paradoxical asemantic signifier without the signified (*représenter l'irreprésentable*) if it were not driving the subject to act and express himself/ herself in relation to the lost object. For Jacques Derrida, the representative which embodies the absence is a *trace* left by the lost object (Derrida, 2002, 259), which in this case can be the full-scale model of a building. Either as representative or trace, the full-scale model is the object that embodies *otherness* and points directly to the lost object. Artists from the region of former Yugoslavia have chosen to (re)create buildings which are connected to the loss of specific social reality. Their works are critique, based on *mimesis*, of the empty space which is left behind that lost reality. Their works speak of Henri Lefebvre's trialectics of space and relation between physical, mental and social space, i.e. the relation between perceived, conceived and lived space (*l'espace perçu – l'espace conçu – l'espace vécu*), where space has an "active – the operational or instrumental – role, as knowledge and action" (Lefebvre, 1991: 11). Like Whiteread and Fujiwara, post-Yugoslav artists create the models in open public spaces or within galleries, in order to confront viewers to otherwise less visible aspects of social reality.

MODELS BETWEEN PROTOTYPES AND CONTEMPORARY ART

On the occasion of the 40th October Salon in Belgrade in 2002, Branislav Nikolić created a 1:1 replica of a typical Belgrade kiosk, using prefabricated wooden boards.⁵ As such, the created object

4 In contrast to that, American artist Alex Schweder creates new interactive building structures, describing his practice as *Performance architecture*.

5 Association Apsolutno had also approached the urban form of a kiosk, but through intervention within interior of one kiosk in Novi Sad which was out of function. In 1995, during the sanctions, media blockade and war on the territory of former Yugoslavia, Apsolutno built a brick wall behind the glass panes of a kiosk at the Fish market and titled the work *News(papers)*. The wall was the only visible thing behind the glass panes, in whose centre was the sign "Novine" [News(papers)] which they had placed there. Apart from relating the wall to the media blockade, the collective notes how "this form of 'remodelling' was a common technique used to avoid paying building permits and taxes" (Apsolutno, 2006: 48). As such, Apsolutno's kiosk was also an allegory of building strategies which start from temporary, movable objects in public space and end as permanent solid structures in private ownership.

did not have windows or doors, and it differed in materials from a regular kiosk. Placed in the central pedestrian zone in Belgrade, the object replicated the form and the context of a regular kiosk, but it was a full shape that could not contain anything and thus could not function as a kiosk. Being between a sculpture and the real object, Nikolić's *Kiosk* appears as an archetypal image of a typical kiosk in Belgrade, or as its idea, in Platonian sense. In the following year, on the occasion of the Belgrade Summer Festival, Nikolić made a model of a little church (130 x 190 x 260 cm), but again as a completely closed shape. The object was also located in the public space and perceived as the real object, although it could not have the full function of a church.

His more recent work is *Secondary Architecture* (2013). Here, as in many of his newer works, Nikolić is using found materials which were thrown away as garbage. Various pieces of wood (mainly doors) were recycled in his art practice into a scale model of a factory, a sculpture which served as a stage, columns which stood freely in space. After these, the *Kiosk* and the *Church*, Nikolić turned to a house, which is the basic architectural shape. *Secondary Architecture* is in fact a house made of secondary materials. During the production, Nikolić engaged Boban Mladenović, a member of Roma community who was making houses of secondary materials for his and other families. Mladenović had learnt this skill from his father, as a surviving strategy, and was able to contribute with his knowledge.

"House in the gallery was the final product of the process" (Nikolić, 2013) in which Nikolić and Mladenović worked together. The process started with finding wooden pieces in garbage containers,⁶ followed by transporting them on Mladenović's tricycle to the gallery and constructing the house *in situ* as a happening. The whole process was documented and edited in a video which was projected on the gallery wall in front of the finished house. The model/ prototype in this way turned into the multimedia artistic and social project, a 'right to the city' action, which also included a public round table discussion about favelas in Serbia.

The social problem of housing was again in the focus of Nikolić's practice in work *Superstructure* (2016) where he problematises the need for extending rooftops into new living spaces. Large proportions of the work (1760 x 1150 x 240cm) are in accordance with the building standard which requires height of minimum 240cm in flats. As such, the *Superstructure* is at the same time an installation and the 1:1 model that completely occupies the gallery. Except from the reference to architectural vocabulary, the title of the work is related to "Marxist theory in which social ideology and institutions are seen as additions or a superstructure to the base which comprises the forces and relations of production and the economy" (Erić, 2016: 6). Nikolić's art practice emphasises disappearance of the base in this structural diagram. In former socialist Yugoslavia the housing was considered to be the basic need and right of the workers, while after its fall, it is seen exclusively as a personal problem (Nikolić, 2015).

Yugoslav values from today's perspective, and especially the Yugoslav and International modernism, are in the focus of Marko Lulić's art practice since 2000s. His work *Lulić House No.1 (Weekend Utopia)*⁷ from 2005 contains references to both. The work is a wooden red house,⁸ which, after being exhibited for several times, is to be transported to the Istria region of the Adriatic coast (part of former Yugoslavia) to serve as residence of artists and architects. This process was already attempted once, but it was postponed due to long battle with administrative regulations and restraints that arise when someone turns an artwork into a permanent architectural object.

6 There is no systematic recycling in Serbia and citizens are not sorting their garbage. There are factories which pay for old cardboard, paper, glass, plastic and wood, but these secondary materials are gathered directly from containers or dump sites by the poorest strata of society.

7 The work is result to Kunsthau Bregenz's commission of a work which is related to architecture.

8 The house was fabricated according to the artist's specifications by the firm Oa.sys.

Naming the work *weekend utopia*, Lulić makes reference to Yugoslavia where “holidays were completely institutionalised, leaving no choice neither to workers nor to enterprises. Everyone had to take holidays” (Crvena Association for Culture and Art, 2018). These were subsidised by the country:

In 1946, the Yugoslav government decided that all workers were entitled to fourteen days annual paid leave or up to thirty days, if engaged in heavy labour. In 1947, it was decided that union members – which de facto meant every employee plus his or her family – would be entitled to discounts when taking holiday: 50 percent on travel costs (excluding air travel) and 25 percent on any accommodation booked for a minimum of five nights. (Zinganel, 2013: 162)

The system partly disappeared with the fall of Yugoslavia. The workers in public institutions in all sectors are entitled to a month of paid leave per year, but there are no extra discounts to accommodation booking.

Apart from that, Lulić makes a reference to the International modernism, since his work is adapted *Frey House no. 1* built by architect Albert Frey in 1940-1943, at Palm Springs, California, USA. Minimalist Frey’s house with flat roof embodied an experimental design and principles outlined in Frey’s book *In Search of a Living Architecture* (1939). It was located in such a way that it allowed the widest view on the desert and far away to the mountains of San Jacinto. With almost invisible boundary between the interior and the exterior, the house was closely connected to the environment and it changed together with sun, rain, wind, colours. Made of lightweight industrial materials – prefabricated wooden structure with corrugated aluminium claddings on the outside and cement slabs on the inside – the house was conceived as a model for future mass production. Unfortunately, it was not acknowledged in such way, which Frey explained with the fact that people are used to the type of architecture within which they grew up and which is closed and separated from the environment.

The house was a rectangular volume (4.9 x 6.1m) with large open part which was under long roof that made shade from the desert sun. It contained one living room/ bedroom, while a small guest room was behind. An important part of the house was an open terrace which was an extension of the interior, but in larger scale. As the extension of desert colours, the interior walls were pink and the furniture was orange. Nearby the house was a pool, while due to a climate control, it was possible to live in the house throughout entire year. Frey acknowledged influence of the Barcelona pavilion by Mies van der Rohe, calling the house a re-appropriation of the Mies’ pavilion into the residential house for one person.

Lulić made his re-appropriation of Frey’s re-appropriation of Mies using 2 x 2.4m wooden panes which allow the house to be constructed in different ways. The roof pane is larger, but instead of covering more of an exterior, as in the Frey House, roof in Lulić’s design covers more of an interior, making it larger than Frey’s and allowing more rooms. Lulić exhibits both the 1:1 model and fragments of the house as abstract objects in the gallery space. He embraces Frey’s principle of relation between the house and its environment both when exhibiting it in galleries (the artists’ environment) and on the Adriatic coast.

When turning an artwork into functional architecture, and vice versa, both Lulić and Nikolić examine where the boundary between art and architecture is.⁹ According to Thea Brejzek and Lawrence Wallen, “1:1 models shift the notion of the architectural model from one of representation and functionality to one of activation and co-authorship of space” (Brejzek and Wallen, 2014: 103), which is particularly enabled through contemporary art practices. The *Secondary Architecture* required skills of the contemporary artist and skills which are passed from father to son in Roma community. The *Lulić*

9 The same question asked Jorge Pardo with his work 4166 Sea View Lane (1998) which was completely functional house, produced as an artwork on the commission by the Museum of Contemporary Art in Los Angeles. Instead of referring to existing prototypes as Nikolić and Lulić, Pardo designed the house completely by himself.

House No.1 (Weekend Utopia) is based on concept and technology developed by Albert Frey, but its destiny will depend on whether administrative processes allow an artwork to be shipped to a city ground and used as architecture. When set as functional architectural object, a residence, *Lulić House No.1 (Weekend Utopia)* will be the ready-made of the same artwork. But apart from that, it is poli-referential object which is setting a piece of modern architectural history into today's administrative regulations.

DOPPELGANGER MODELS AS SYMBOLS OF A COUNTRY

Using cement, metal, plasterboard and wood, Saša Tkaćenko created an exact 1:1 replica of a small auxiliary object of the Museum of the Revolution of Yugoslav Nations and Ethnic Minorities in New Belgrade. The project of the Museum had begun with foundation of the institution in 1959¹⁰ by the decision of Yugoslav Central Committee and it was planned to be opened in 1981, on the occasion of celebrating 40 years of antifascist struggle of the Yugoslav people. In the meantime, numerous plans regarding the location of the Museum had been changed and by 1980 the works had completely stopped, leaving the foundations, the underground levels and the building replicated by Tkaćenko. By 1996, after the break of Yugoslavia and drastic inflation in Serbia, the idea of the Museum of the Revolution of Yugoslav Nations and Ethnic Minorities had been completely abandoned. The only building that is above the ground level within the area of the Museum is the object which Tkaćenko replicated and titled *Pavilion* (2015). Glass from the panes is long gone, if it were finished in the first place, and only the concrete shell remains. With dimensions 460 x 660 x 300cm, it is drastically smaller than the grandiose Museum building which would have 5,000 square metres in the base, as much as the nearby Federal Executive Council, nowadays the Palace of Serbia.¹¹

The author duplicated today's appearance of the object and placed it in the Belgrade City Museum,¹² a location that changed its functions over time, serving as military academy and a printing house. Drawing attention to changed symbolic and cultural values of objects within different political, economic and social contexts, Tkaćenko shows how "fragile status of social ideas is put into question and the inability of their accumulation is being provoked in the space of the object" (Tkaćenko, 2017). The *Pavilion* exhibits the history and destiny of the Museum and is at the same time unable to present all those things and ideas the Museum should have had presented. Together with the foundations, it is a remainder of the *empty space* for that museum. It is mirrored, duplicated object which is the form of conscious critique. While analysing the dialectics of consciousness, ego and mirror, Lacan notes that an imaginary space in the mirror within which we locate the realistic object, is "a phenomenon of consciousness as such" (Lacan, 1988a: 46), since "the real object isn't the object that you see in the mirror" (Lacan, 1988a: 46). Tkaćenko's *Pavilion* is not the object beside the foundations of inexistent Museum, it is a reflection which points out how hard it is to maintain and build the grand idea of Yugoslavism, as well as how it turns to a kiosk-size when the system starts to fall apart. His work also points out how memory of Yugoslavia is still rooted in collective memory, as well as numerous projects that are left unfinished with the break of the state.

Tkaćenko expressed his interest in pavilions and Yugoslav heritage in several more recent works – *Eternal Flame* (2018), *Sketch for Utopia* (2018) and *Melancholy, Proposal for a Monument* (2018). The

10 The Museum of Contemporary Art in Belgrade was founded in 1958.

11 The Museum would have been surrounded with the first buildings in New Belgrade, the city which was conceived by the end of 1946 as the new Yugoslav capital. These buildings were finished in the 1960s and they include the Federal Executive Council, the Building of Social and Political Organisations (Central Committee building) which is the New Belgrade's first skyscraper, hotel and the Museum of Contemporary Art. The miniature object which Tkaćenko replicates is standing there among these buildings, instead of the Museum of Revolution.

12 Within the exhibition *Tracks and Traces* (16 May – 6 June 2015) curated by Katharina Schendl.

latter is 1:1 reconstruction in plaster of the fontal segment of Serbian pavilion in Venice, which used to be the pavilion of Yugoslavia. In this work, Tkaĉenko takes a step further from dislocating the replica, as in case of the *Pavilion*. Since the name of the former country is still present in the relief of the faade, he juxtaposed it with textual neon intervention which reads *Melancholy*, relating thus the topos of the real, now imagined and symbolic country, to the topological space within language. He chose precisely the part of the faade which contains word “Yugoslavia” to replicate it, to move it from Italy to former Yugoslavia in process of dislocating the sign from one symbolic system to another, and to add the new word. By introducing the semantic level in form of the *other* word, Tkaĉenko conceals “the main word through the agency of ruins, utopia and future” (Paunić, 2018).

The fragment of the full-scale model was located as an installation inside of a gallery “as a response to the impossibility of installing the work on the original faade in the Giardini” (Tkaĉenko, 2018). The fragment, according to Maurice Blanchot, “tends to dissolve the totality which it presupposes” (1995: 60) and this dissolution can be related both to (memory of) Yugoslavia and to the current constellation of pavilions at the Venice biennale which still contains name “Yugoslavia” within it. By ascribing fragmentary appearance to the full-scale model of the pavilion, Tkaĉenko draws parallel to an unfinished project for the Museum of the Revolution, establishing a direct relationship between the pavilion in Venice, which is the internationally most representative place of the country, and his *Pavilion*, which emphasises the fallacy of social representation within one architectural object. Through combination of images, text and architecture, Tkaĉenko is, according to Đorĉe Miketić, “finding balance between signs and objects, intimate and collective memory, uniqueness and serial production, past and future, decadent and revolutionary, possible and impossible” (2018).

In the same way a fragmented, dislocated faade containing name “Yugoslavia” is a symptom of one former country, its place in collective memory and its international representation, so is a cardboard replica of automobile model Yugo. Vladimir Bojić in his work *Yugo* (2007) turned to this model which was developed by Yugoslav factory Zastava in 1970s and widely used, being one of the cheapest, smallest and most convenient models for the city. It was “the fastest-selling European product of all time in the first year of sales in the USA” (Vuic, 2010: 6). Aesthetically, it looked similar to Fiat’s model 147 from 1976, which the Italian factory was producing in Brazil.

Bojić created a cut-and-fold cardboard model of the car¹³ and subsequently placed it in several cities, usually in zones where parking is not allowed. The project included development of technical design of the cardboard model, its production and the action of manual relocation of the model through cities. All segments were documented, as well as reactions of drivers and pedestrians when realising that an immovable Yugo is made of cardboard. Using a simulation of an industrial product, Bojić based the project “on the idea of opposing the social reality by simulation of the car” (Bojić, 2007: 25). With an action in public space, he located the model into Yugo’s natural environment, reversing its function from a means of transportation to the object which needs to be carried around on foot by four people, as a coffin. This degradation, as well as degradation in material, is symbolic at several levels.

Yugo was mass produced and affordable model which remained with families long after the break of Yugoslavia, war and sanctions to Serbia which followed it. As such, it degraded and kept breaking by

13 Being a cardboard replica of Yugo, instead of a ready-made object, Bojić’s work differs from those made by students of Kevin O’Callaghan, an artist, a teacher and a set designer for films, television and theatre. For the assigned spring term exhibition *Yugo Next* in 1995, 29 O’Callaghan’s students from the New York’s School of Visual Arts turned cast-off vehicles into a confessional, a movie theatre, a fireplace, a foosball table, a cigarette lighter, a post office box, the Moai monument, a telephone, a grocery store ride, an accordion, a shooting range, a shower, a slot machine, a submarine, a subway car, a toaster, a concert piano, a police car, a junkyard, a photo booth, a barbeque, a moving toilet... The exhibition and works within it gave new purpose to the car model which could not be used any longer, because Yugoslavia, the country which used to produce reserve parts, does not exist any longer. For images, see Tom Magliery’s album <<https://www.flickr.com/photos/mag3737/sets/72157630309734414/>>.

time, almost never being able to start an engine with the first turn of the key. It also remained related in collective memory to petrol shortage when people would wait in lines in front of gas stations for days. Yugo is described by many users as the worst car ever made, yet people in former Yugoslavia could not afford any other for a very long time. Having a symbolic name, it is also representation of decline of Yugoslavia and its industrial production on the global market, since it was the only Yugoslav car sold in the USA. According to Slavko Timotijević,

Bojić's project analyses, interprets and artistically articulates the syndrome of political ambition, which simply pushed technologically, economically and socio-politically unprepared society for precise and serious industrial production, into a rigorous global competition without any realistic preconditions for achieving its goal. (2007: 5)

Although Bojić does not turn to architecture, his immovable and static urban object is not a simply *mimesis* of a car. He deliberately chose the Yugo model (although Zastava also produced other models) so that the object and the name are embodying the idea of socialist Yugoslavia and its non-alignment. The act of carrying it on hands is reference to working brigades that built the first buildings in New Belgrade and that would build the Museum of the Revolution of Yugoslav Nations and Ethnic Minorities. However, instead of the affordable, convenient product offered to the global market, Yugo became an obstacle in traffic and in progress. Both Bojić and Tkaćenko reflect on drastic difference between the started progress and the subsequent fall.

CONCLUDING REMARKS

Full-scale models of buildings within contemporary art practices are rarely exact copies, but even if so, the act of duplication and dislocation into a new context gives new meanings and values to the object, as in Saša Tkaćenko's *Pavilion*. Even in this work, the model is not representative of the object it copies, but of the never built ideological building whose proportions were supposed to be so large, that they are beyond comparison to the small *Pavilion*. Architectural models within contemporary artworks are neither ready-made objects since each of the artists had built them from nothing. They are also not simple appropriations, since each artist added some new aspect to the objects, emphasizing the relation of models to their other (the real architecture) and the contexts which surround them. In each of the studied cases, there is a complex critical relation towards the past and current social reality. Apart from direct quoting of architectural forms which are the best representatives of those changed social realities, each work contains a degree of innovation which is a critical instrument. For that reason, these models require an emancipated viewer who is aware of the changed political and social contexts of both the buildings in their original appearances and locations, and of their 'copies' in form of models within contemporary artistic practices.

When it comes to primary use of full-scale models, their role in architecture is temporary, specific and related to development of ideas. They rarely exist in spatial discourse beyond that point, except perhaps in museums of architecture. Once the models are seen by investors and explained by architects, they are torn down, regardless of whether the project turns into a real building or not. In case of once existing architecture, full-scale models present buildings that cannot be experienced any longer. In case of existing architecture in other places, full-scale models make them approachable at several places at once. Within contemporary art practices, models gain both different spatial and cultural contexts, as well as new temporal appearance that has nothing to do with the architectural process itself. They become referential objects that represent all those ideas that architecture represents, and far more.

BIBLIOGRAPHY:

- Adorno, Theodor, *Aesthetic Reory*, London: The Athlone Press, 1997 (original published in 1970)
- Association Apsolutno (Zoran Pantelić, Dragan Rakić, Bojana Petrić, Dragan Miletić), *Re Absolute Report*, Frankfurt am Main: Revolver, Archiv für aktuelle Kunst, 2006
- Blanchot, Maurice, *Re Writing of the Disaster*, Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1995
- Bojić, Vladimir, *Yugo*, artist statement, Zemun: G.L.O.R.I.J.A, 2007
- Brejzek, Thea and Wallen, Lawrence, "The 1:1 Architectural Model as Performance and Double," in: Wayan Jatasya Adrianic, Noor Fajrina F. Istiani, Arif Rahman Wahid (eds.), *[in]arch international conference proceedings*, 10-11 September 2014, Faculty of Engineering, Universitas Indonesia, 2014, 95-103
- Derrida, Jacques, *Writing and Di\$erence*, London, New York: Routledge, 2002
- Erić, Zoran, "On the Exhibition Title", in: Branislav Nikolić, *Superstructure*, Belgrade: Salon Muzeja savremene umetnosti, 2016, 5-12
- Heynen, Hilde, *Architecture and Modernity: A Critique*, Cambridge, Massachusetts, London, England: MIT Press, 1999
- Koolhaas, Rem, "The House That Made Mies", in OMA, Rem Koolhaas and Bruce Mau, *S,M,L,XL*, The Monacelli Press, 1995, 62-63
- Lacan, Jacques, "A Materialist Definition of the Phenomenon of Consciousness," in: Jacques-Alain Miller (ed.), *Re Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book II: Re Ego in Freud's Reory and in the Technique of Psychoanalysis 1954-1955*, London: Cambridge University Press, 1988 (original published in 1973), 40-52
- Lacan, Jacques, "The Subject and the Other: Aphanisis," in: Jacques-Alain Miller (ed.), *Re Seminar of Jacques Lacan. Book XI: Re Four Fundamental Concepts of Psychoanalysis*, London: Cambridge University Press, 1988 (original published in 1973), 216-229
- Lefebvre, Henri, *Re Production of Space*, Oxford, Cambridge, MA: Basil Blackwell, Inc., 1991 (original published in 1974)
- Timotijević, Slavko, "Art Against Simulacrum, or Exorcism of Ghosts to Open Space of Realistic Reading of Reality", in: Vladimir Bojić, *Yugo*, Zemun: G.L.O.R.I.J.A, 2007, 4-7
- Vuic, Jason, *Re Yugo: Re Rise and Fall of the Worst Car in History*, New York: Hill and Wang, 2010
- Zinganel, Michael, "From 'Social Tourism' to a Mass Market Consumer Paradise. On the Democratization and Commodification of Seaside Tourism in Croatia," in: Elke Beyer, Anke Hagemann and Michael Zinganel (eds.) *Holidays after the Fall: Seaside Architecture and Urbanism in Bulgaria and Croatia*, Berlin: Jovis Verlag GmbH, 2013, 155-170

ONLINE SOURCES:

- Fujiwara, Simon, "Why Artist Simon Fujiwara Rebuilt Anne Frank's House Inside an Israeli Gallery," interviewed by Hili Perlson, September 11, 2017, online magazine Artnet, last accessed July 28, 2018, <<https://news.artnet.com/exhibitions/simon-fujiwara-anner-frank-house-israel-1075127>>.
- Miketić, Đorđe, "Kakvoća nostalgije," March 7, 2018, online magazine Supervizuelna, last accessed July 28, 2018, <<http://www.supervizuelna.com/kakvoca-nostalgije/>>.
- Nikolić, Branislav, "Krov i fabrika," artist statement, November 4, 2015, online magazine Supervizuelna, last accessed July 28, 2018, <<http://www.supervizuelna.com/branislav-nikolic-krov-i-fabrika/>>.
- Nikolić, Branislav, "Sekundarna arhitektura," interviewed by Žolt Kovač, December 24, 2013, online magazine Supervizuelna, last accessed July 28, 2018, <<http://www.supervizuelna.com/razgovori-branislav-nikolic-sekundarna-arhitektura/>>.
- Paunić, Natalija, "Saša Tkaćenko – Ruins of Future Utopia," February 23, 2018, last accessed July 28, 2018, <http://eugster-belgrade.com/static/uploads/files/Sasa_Tkacenko_-_Ruins_of_Future_Utopia_-_exhibition_text.pdf>.
- Tkaćenko, Saša, "Melancholy, Proposal for a Monument," artist statement, last accessed July 28, 2018, <<http://sasatkacenko.com/portfolio/melancholy-proposal-for-a-monument/>>.
- Tkaćenko, Saša, "Pavilion," artist statement, July 4, 2017, last accessed July 28, 2018, <<http://sasatkacenko.com/2017/07/04/pavilion/>>.

OTHER:

Crvena Association for Culture and Art (Sarajevo), excerpt from “*We Have Built Cities for You: An Exhibition on the Contradictions of Yugoslav Socialism*”, curated by Vida Knežević and Marko Miletić (Kontekst kolektiv), 13. 6 - 2. 7. 2018, Pavilion Cvijeta Zuzorić, Belgrade

Arhitektonski modeli razmere 1:1 u post-jugoslovenskim umetničkim praksama

SAŽETAK: Rad se fokusira na odabrane radove savremenih umetnika koji sadrže u sebi arhitektonske modele u razmeri 1:1, to jest u realnoj veličini. Ti radovi su *Kiosk* (2002), *Crkva* (2003), *Sekundarna arhitektura* (2013) i *Superstruktura* (2016) Branislava Nikolića, potom *Lulić kuća br. 1 (vikend utopija)* Marka Lulića (2005), dva rada Saše Tkačenka - *Paviljon* (2015) i *Melanholija, predlog za spomenik* (2018), kao i rad *Yugo* (2007) Vladimira Bojića koji ne sadrži arhitektonski model, nego nepomični model automobila u razmeri 1:1 i kao takav urbani element postiže isti efekat. Rad ima dvostruki cilj - da analizira ove umetničke radove i da osvetli poziciju 1:1 modela u savremenim umetničkim praksama. Modeli u realnoj veličini se pojavljuju kao kopije zgrada, njihove replike, dvojnici, simulacije, redi-mejd objekti, skulpture, instalacije, aproprijacije i produkti događaja. Kako bi se stekao širi uvid u odnos savremene umetnosti prema 1:1 arhitektonskim modelima, rad uključuje i analizu dva rada britanskih umetnika Rejčel Vajtrid (Rachel Whiteread) i Sajmona Fudživare (Simon Fujiwara) koji odabiraju isti koncept u svojim radovima *Kuća* (1993) i *Kuća nade* (2017). Teorijski deo uključuje trijalektiku prostora Anrija Lefevra (Henri Lefebvre), teoriju umetnosti i mimezisa Teodora Adorna (Theodor Adorno), psihoanalitičku teoriju ogledala Žaka Lakana (Jacques Lacan), kao i zapazanja Rema Kolhasa (Rem Koolhaas), Tee Brejzek (Thea Brejzek) i Lorenasa Valena (Lawrence Wallen) o 1:1 arhitektonskim modelima. Rad zaključuje da svaki umetnik svojim radom postavlja kritiku određene društvene stvarnosti i da je za svakog od njih od izuzetne važnosti koje konkretne arhitektonske objekte izrađuju u formi 1:1 modela i uključuju u svoje prakse.

KLJUČNE REČI: modeli u realnoj veličini, arhitektura, savremene umetničke prakse, post-jugoslovensko

Primljeno: 27. septembar 2018.

Prihvaćeno za objavljivanje: 12. oktobar 2018.

Visual attachment
(unedited)



Rachel Whiteread, *House*, London, 1993-1994, photo by John Davies, 1994



Simon Fujiwara, *Hope House*, 2018, exhibition view of the third floor, Kunsthau Bregenz, photo by Markus Tretter



Branislav Nikolić, *Secondary Architecture*, 2013, Gallery Magacin, photo by Nebojša Vasić



Branislav Nikolić, *Superstructure*, 2016, Salon of the Museum of Contemporary Art, photo by Nebojša Vasić



Marko Lulić, *Lulić House No. 1 (Weekend Utopia)*, 2005, Kunsthhaus Bregenz,
photo by Markus Tretter



Albert Frey, *Frey House no. 1*, 1940-1943, Palm Springs, California, USA



Saša Tkačenko, *Pavilion*, 2015, Belgrade City Museum, photo by Ivan Zupanc



Saša Tkačenko, *Melancholy, Proposal for a Monument*, 2018, Gallery Eugster, Belgrade, photo by Ivan Zupanc