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LITERATURE, ARCHIVAL AND ONLINE SOURCES
Attempting to identify DAH’s promise and usefulness very quickly leads to questions about the epistemological tenets of the entire discipline. The intersection of art history and digital culture is just another – excellent – occasion to do so in our time. Otherwise, we risk ceasing to provide a useful contribution to our societies’ intellectual enrichment.  

If one would ask what has changed in the perception of digital art history over the last five years, since the publication of Johanna Drucker’s seminal text “Is There a ‘Digital’ Art History?”, which initiated a wider debate about the assumptions, possibilities, and consequences of applying digital technology in disciplinary practices of the history of art, the answer would be straightforward – Noting much. The fundamental division into the digitizing and digital art history, suggested by Drucker, namely, a division on the activities aimed at the advancement of digital tools for “everyday use” (facilitating access, browsing, retrieving and presenting data from digital sources), and on analytic techniques enabled by computational technology, still largely determines the configuration of this new research field. DAH’s recent increased visibility, summed up by the term “digital turn”, is simultaneously explained as an inevitable consequence of the global transformation in all areas of human activity, including all aspects of knowledge creation/dissemination, and as an opportunity of art history to catch up with other humanities disciplines that have much longer experience with the application of digital technologies. Thanks to the recently published, and well-documented studies on this subject, it is clear that the story of art history’s “delayed” inclusion in the realm of digital humanities is difficult to sustain. The interest of art historians in the computational methods was manifested already at the end of the 1960s, and continues ever since, but in the 1980s and early 1990s, when literary studies or linguistics made a significant advancements in that area, art history “lagged” behind not because of its innate conservatism and distrust in the technology, but because the ideas of how computing could be used in its disciplinary practices, largely exceeded available technological and software solutions. The present situation is quite the opposite. Digital technologies offer the array of new application opportunities, there are a number of open access software solutions, and almost endless possibilities for designing custom-made computer programs adjusted to quite specific research questions, but the developments in the field of digital art history are not following those technological advancements. For Jorge Sebastián Lozano, the possible reason for such situation, and for the restrained relation of art historians towards digital art history is its “alleged minimal interest for interpretive purposes connected to qualitative and quantitative methods”. The re-

3. The prototype of Zagreb Institute of Art History database, developed in 1992-1994, was never implemented, since at the time the software solutions allowing management of images, GIS visualizations, or 3D libraries of architectural elements, integral to concept of that database, were simply not available. Microsoft’s offer of cooperation on further development of that project was declined by the Institute.
sentiment of quantitative methodology, also explains – at least partially – rather strong criticism of some ground-breaking projects as it is Maximilian Schich's research in cultural history, published in the article "A Network Framework of Cultural History", and transformed into a very popular, animated network visualization Charting Cultures. The objective of that visualization was to characterize "processes driving cultural history" by reconstructing "aggregate intellectual mobility over two millennia through the birth and death locations of more than 150,000 notable individuals", whose movements through the space and time was meant to "retrace cultural narratives of Europe and North America using large-scale visualization and quantitative dynamical tools and to derive historical trends of cultural centres beyond the scope of specific events or narrow time intervals". The visualization, whose epistemic purpose was "to help the group of researchers to find and understand quantitative patterns" also serves as an argument supporting the proposition of "systematic science of art and culture", a new research paradigm that "integrates qualitative inquiry and observation, with methods of computation, natural science, and information design", applied in a "distributed, lab-style environment inspired by architectural think tanks, corporate design studios, and labs in physics or systems biology". Schich's visualization, focusing on the white male figures, suggests their pivotal role in transforming cultural history of the world, and disregarding "the power dynamics of gender, class, race, religion, and ethnicity, while obscuring social forces such as economics and politics", is often taken as an example of positivistic view of data which can "suppress important theoretical questions despite the appearance of giving us greater access to knowledge". Although a foreseen objections on the biases of their metadata, Schich and his team have addressed in the supplementary materials to the article "A Network Framework of Cultural History", the responses to above-mentioned 5’36" video animation of their visualization, and to the proposal of systemic science of art and culture remained strongly divided. The negative stance towards the application of quantitative methods in art history, articulated through the discussion on their epistemic usefulness, and following public presentation of Schich's research, can be summarized by Clair Bishop's opinion that "computational metrics can help aggregate data and indicate patterns, but they struggle to explain causality, which in the humanities is always a question of interpretation". Acknowledging the arguments of both sides involved in this discussion, and aware of the discomfort caused by the pronounced empiricism of digital art history's methodological landscape, Jorge Sebastián Lozano's assertion, given in the introductory quotation of this text that digital art history presents itself as an opportunity to re-examine "the epistemological tenets of the whole discipline", seems as a valuable suggestion aiming at bridging "the gap between traditional methods and innovative computational practices". Of course, it raises the question which "traditional" methods he has in mind, since in the each "turn" towards a specific, new set of problems that art history made in the last four decades, it has adapted and adjusted to its epistemological needs a series of methods developed in the framework of other, mostly humanistic disciplines. Digital art history undoubtedly implies even greater interdisciplinarity, but as Lozano says, "Computer scientists are just the last guests to an ongoing banquet where many and different diners have taken their share and enriched the conversation too." Practitioners of digital art history, such as Schich, have a bit different view. Highly critical towards the "definition of digital humanities according to leading practitioners [which] still implicitly assumes that the application of technology in art history is an engineering problem, producing means that the actual researchers doing their inquiry", they sustain a long-lasting debate on whether art historians entering that field of art historical inquiry require equal proficiency in disciplinary knowledge and knowledge of technology. There is not a definite answer to that question (yet), and the figure of the "translator" – the person who has the expertise in both humanities and computing, and serves as mediator in the communication between art historians and engineers – which regained importance in the most recent discussions on the future of digital art history, seems like juts a temporary solution. From our point of view, knowledge of art history that goes hand in hand with the understanding of digital technology is an essential precondition for practicing digital art history. It does not assume complex programming skills or deep understanding of system analysis, but rather the insight in the systemic way of thinking, which enables one to structure the meaningful research question and choose digital tools appropriate to the type of analysis it entails. We are using here the term art history in a meaning which does not entirely adhere to the traditional understanding of the discipline, but rather to the borderline between art history, social sciences, information sciences, art, and design. Methods and experiences of natural sciences can be a valuable addition to the interdisciplinary tissue of digital art history, but following the experiences acquired at the project ART-NET, whose results are partially presented in this book, it would be equally useful if the rational systemic thinking emerging from the cross-fertilization of art history, information science, and digital technology, would be supplemented by the insights of artist and designers. Somewhat different nature of their research might prompt the new ways of thinking, which are – in our opinion – the essential precondition for more imaginative, and yet

13 Jorge Sebastián Lozano, "Digital Art History at the Crossroads", 5.
14 Maximilian Schich, "Figuring out Art History", 10-11.
more complex approach to the object of art historical inquiry. In the case of project ARTNET, the objects of inquiry were the models of organization and communication in the background of modern and contemporary artists’ and architects’ networks. They were approached from the perspective of the hypothesis that there is some definite number of those models that can be identified, explained, described, and applied in the further research of the 20th and 21st century artists’ networking practices as a patterns pointing out to the elements which defy their characteristics as to the source of new research questions. Following the results of in-depth research on a few specific, individual examples of artists’ networks, conducted prior to the beginning of the project, it was also supposed to prove that a diversity of organisation and communication models underlying artist networks operative on a particular art scene, and at the particular historical moment within the observed period is proportional to the dynamics of that art scene’s participation in the transnational cultural exchange.

Two reasons motivated the choice of modern and contemporary artists’ networks as an object of the research. The first was an important role of artists’ groups and associations which – already at the beginning of the 20th century – invented new models of communication framing the development of transnational professional and social networks, which critically marked several periods in the history of modern and contemporary art. Often positioned at the margins of the institutional artistic culture, artists’ and architects’ networks are overcoming national, cultural and linguistic barriers, supporting new, and emerging art practices or – as in the case of architects’ networks – promoting new understanding of architecture and urban planning. Serving as a transnational platforms for cultural exchange and cooperation, they involve a variety of actors – visual artists, writers, poets, designers, architects, film-makers, photographers, art critics, gallerists, art dealers, intellectuals – whose complex and multiple relationships, were the second reason for choosing artist’s and architects’ networks as an object of research. Although they might seem as a quite well-researched topics of art history and history of architecture, information on the artists’ and architects’ networking practices are fragmentary, dispersed through multiple publications, and online resources. The latter are almost exclusively dedicated to the particular phenomena from the context of the historical avant-garde (Dadaism, Surrealism, Constructivism),6 neo-avant-garde (art group ZERO, Fluxus, Conceptual Art),7 and new media art, or to the artists who have a prominent position in the canonical narratives of modern and contemporary art. Charting the networks based on the relationships of well-known artists would be quite easy, but the results will only confirm the knowledge which is already there, although not presented in the form of network visualization. Since the intention of the project was also to reveal the unforeseen transnational histories of artistic exchange, the archival data, both analogue and digital, were used to track as many actors of a particular artists’ or architects’ network, as possible and to describe their ties with other network members by at least three out of 20 predefined types of social relationships. Due to the research conducted prior to the beginning of the project, we already knew that majority of artists’ networks related to the historical avant-garde and developed at the geographic peripheries of European cultural space, as well as in Latin America, were personal, ego-networks, frequently related to the particular avant-garde magazine, its editor, and close circle of associates. The other insight that we had prior to this project concerned the relationships between the avant-garde networks, which have formed – in different periods of the 20th century – a rather dynamic, although fragile ecosystems of their own. Within those ecosystems it was possible to distinguish at least four different types of tightly interwoven and complex networks – the ones formed by art magazines and publications, related by the same authors, editors, and publishing houses; the other one composed of artistic concepts, and ideas circulating among different locations, and acquiring location-dependent meanings; the network of exhibitions, and public events presenting those concepts and ideas, and social networks established both by professional and private contacts among their actors. Although the focus of the research was on the social networks, we could not overlook their multiple intersections with the networks of objects (magazines, publications), concepts, and events (exhibitions, actions, happenings, performances). A decision to pursue the research on artists’ and architects’ social networks, parallel to the investigations on the networks of objects, concepts, and events, came as an outcome of the debates following the identification of the problem that was not recognized prior to the beginning of the project, that is, the problem of high discrepancy between the available digital data sources on the (former) West and (former) Central-East European artists. While a number of large West European and USA museums provide open access to their datasets, similar datasets generated by the Central-East European museums – do not exist. Since they had to be collected, checked, and prepared using analogue data sources, it soon became clear that our data collections will be far from complete, meaning that any conclusions concerning organizational models of artists’ networks would not meet the criteria for generalization, required by the very concept of the pattern. Although we could accept the approach according to which “the lack of specific sources can be better overlooked as long as the general discourse can still hold together a forceful argument”,8 it was quite clear that bias in our datasets evident in the network visualizations just confirms the canonical narrative on the history of modern and contemporary art. Therefore, we have chosen to concentrate on the transformation of the ARTNET database network visualization interface into a multilingual collaborative real-time research platform open to the international research community invited to use and upgrade available datasets.


18 Jorge Sebastián Lozano, “Digital Art History at the Crossroads”, 5.
sequent gradual data accumulation might be the way for overcoming the said bias, allowing – sometime in the future – for another attempt in the visualization of artists’ networks, hopefully with more promising results. Apart from resolving the problem of data availability, the most demanding task at this project was, as Miriam Posner has already put it, the “reconstituting historical evidence into data that can be easily recognized by the computer”, and facing the fact that it “can distort the historical record by establishing definitive categories for entities that were originally ambiguous or more fluid”. However, that type of the constraint, coupled with the comprehension that “data are constructed as an interpretation of the phenomenal world, not inherent in it”, and that such construction bears both the imprints of all previous interpretations, as it will be also marked by the manner in which data were adopted to requirements of our research objectives, posed a rather serious question – How to make the users of our data aware of their constructed nature, and of the hypothesis framing the choices we have made while structuring our datasets? It is a very complex question, and – in our opinion – one which cannot be answered by new technical solutions.

The quantitative methods used in this project were already there when the ARTNET was launched. The possible difference it might have introduced lays in the fact that the usefulness of these methods was tested on datasets describing different types of networks (social networks, net domes, exhibition networks, networks of events), to which they were applied with different epistemic objectives. In comparison with the projects based on the big data processing, which best serves the inquiries on the irruptions and breaks in the historical flow of the events, the approach that was chosen at this project brought in the focus of the inquiry the reasons and nature of such irruptions. Therefore, a type of the research conducted at the Institute of Art History in Zagreb, between 2014 and 2018, could be described as the combination of close and distant data viewing, that is, as the combination of qualitative and quantitative analysis, where the latter was applied in its “soft mode”. The term “soft mode” was invented to describe the omission of certain procedures integral to network analysis that we did not find relevant for the selected model of interpretation. It also denotes a shared discomfort of the ARTNET’s research team regarding the limited potential of network visualizations to transfer the available data on the temporal dynamics of the network actors’ relationships, which is – in our opinion – quite serious technical, as well as a theoretical problem that will be addressed in the project’s next research cycle. Although they were strongly relying on the processing power of IT, the members of the research team tried to maintain the above-mentioned art historical epistemological awareness, conscious of the tense relationship between the analytic practices of art history and empirical, observer-independent quantitative methods. The ambition to design digital tools that will acknowledge „the ambiguity, uncertainty and the historical situatedness and constructed character of [art historical] knowledge”, and provide „the ways of working with these concepts within a digital environment”, remained – the ambition. In the case of the ARTNET project, it assumed the process of through analysis and deconstruction of the traditional model of art historical inquiry, and it’s subsequent (re)construction in digital environment in terms of the “open system”, which allows metadata flexibility that goes against the grain of the over formalized, and definite metadata content. However, and as in the prevailing number of ongoing DAH projects, a computationally remediated object of our inquiry was a discourse on art history, rather than visual object whose complexities require, in our view, a radical change in the way of thinking about how do we apply available digital tools, and with which purpose.

Turning back to the possibility of bringing some generally viable conclusions on the organization models of artists’ networks, that were the initial object of our research, we believe that close data viewing – the one which takes into account social aspects of artistic culture (class, gender, ethnicity, cultural differences) – cannot be eliminated from the account of the processes of art history. In comparison to big data-driven research, such an approach does not allow for general conclusions on the nature, and organization models of artists networks, but –in our opinion – the results of close data viewing, applied at this project, are epistemically more convincing, and could be rather useful in developing computational models responsive to already mentioned „ambiguity, uncertainty and the historical situatedness and constructed character of [art historical] knowledge”. Research conducted at the project is presented by the six case studies published in this book range from the examination of exhibition networks reflecting cultural exchange among different Central European locations at the beginning of the 20th century; ego-networks of individual artist which outlines the particular segment of his career, but also the spatial, and temporal trajectories that were followed by the number of other Central-East European artists active in the first decades of the 20th century; social network of CIAM formed around its regular, and thematic meetings, bringing to the fore different ideological, and political choices of its actors, taken as an important source of the network’s organization structure, its dynamics, and ruptures; the networks of exhibitions outlining the transition of the particular art phenomenon – the international art movement New Tendencies – from the framework of the neo-avant-garde subculture where it was situated in the late 1950s, to the realm of institutional culture towards the mid-1960s, also describing the relations among different artistic tendencies involved with the movement, and the role of art criticism in its dissolution; the network of sculptors and architects emerging from the public competitions for antifascist, and socialist monuments, a rather specific, local phenomena positioned at the ideologically most sensitive contact zone between the art and socialist state; the net dome of contemporary independent culture, its structural features, dynamics, together with shared artistic, and social values of its actors.

Along with the network visualizations, the results of quantitative data analysis, are presented by the different types of statistical calculations, and graphs, integral to the overall model of interpretation. Although it gives the advantage to the epistemic objectives of art history, rather than those of network analysis, the combination of both analytic methods, provides the view on the art phenomena encompassed by this publication that would be hardly possible without the application of digital technology.

The history of art exhibitions has become the subject of numerous scientific studies, particularly in the domain of the digital humanities, while exhibitions on exhibitions are emerging as a distinct museological variety, dealing with their reconstruction and the contextualization of art works in the time period of their conception. As a result of digitally processed data, exhibitions of art societies, as key points in the development of modern art, offer the possibility of a new way of viewing and interpreting the medium of the exhibition as such as well as the role and position of individual artists within a particular art association.23

The art scene developing in Central Europe, within the borders of the Austro-Hungarian Monarchy, at the turn of the 19th century, which involved the artistic networking of groups and individuals through an exchange of exhibitions, guest exhibitions of art associations and the exhibitions of works by individual artists at various exhibitions and different Central European locations, showed exceptional dynamic activity and mobility. In this, the central position was assumed by Vienna, a traditional hub of artistic life owing to the developed infrastructure based on its arts and crafts schools, Kunstgewerbeschule, and the Academy of Fine Arts, and the possibility of art exhibitions in the Künstlerhaus, the Secession, Hagenbund and smaller private galleries. This potential was recognized by numerous artists from smaller and artistically less developed cities from other parts of the Monarchy. Under the influence of Vienna’s gravitational pull, within a very short time period comparable phenomena began developing in the wider region, with local modernist artistic expressions and their presentation via exhibitions growing stronger. The budding visual art scene would orient itself towards the leading artistic trends of the time, determined by the Secession and Hagenbund. Their impact was inevitable precisely due to the fact that a majority of artists from smaller art centers of the Monarchy would come to Vienna for their education and would follow the development of the then modern art scene, which attracted great attention, from both the artistic milieu and the wider audience. The artistic secessions that soon followed, when groups of artists broke away from existing associations or established new ones stem from the 1897 to 1900 period. In this way, almost in succession, the following associations emerged: Association of Austrian Visual Artists – Secession (Vereinigung bildender Künstler Österreichs – Secession) and Hagenbund (Genossenschaft bildender Künstler – Hagen) in Vienna, the Association of Polish Artists “Art” (Towarzystwo Artystów Polskich “Sztuka”) in Krakow, the Association of Artists Mánes (Spolek výtvarných umělců “Mánes”) in Prague, the Association of Croatian Artists (Društvo hrvatskih umjetnika) in Zagreb and the Slovenian Artistic Association (Slovensko umetniško društvo) in Ljubljana. The artistic interconnection and networking of individuals and groups was the central subject of the interdisciplinary scientific project ARTNET—Modern and Contemporary Artists Practices of the 20th and 21st Century, which explored the exhibitions of Croa-

The example of the Société des Artistes Indépendants, which revolted against the established exhibition politics of the traditional Société nationales des beaux-arts in Paris in 1884, and whose separation was termed “une sécession,” inspired a series of similar secession art trends in the wider European cultural landscape. After a group of artists left the Munich Künstlergenossenschaft and established the Association of Visual Artists of Munich “Secession” (Verein Bildender Künstler Münchens “Secession”) in 1892, a group of Viennese artists, led by Gustav Klimt, followed suit, resigning from the Künstlerhaus in 1897 and establishing the Association of Austrian Visual Artists–Secession (Verein bildender Künstler Österreichs – Secession). The exhibition program carried out in the group’s exhibition pavilion, constructed according to the conceptual idea of Klimt and the demand of foreign artists abroad, and the, until now less familiar, archival resources on exhibitions by foreign artists in Zagreb. In addition to exhibits of individual artists of various nationalities at annual and thematic group exhibitions of the Vienna Secession and Hagenbund associations, guest exhibitions of the then new artistic associations from Krakow and Prague were recorded in the exhibition spaces of these two associations, as well as their less known guest exhibitions in Zagreb at the very cusp of the 20th century.


25 Irena Kraševac, ed., 150 godina Hrvatskog društva likovnih umjetnika. Umjetnost i institucija (Zagreb: Croatian Association of Visual Artists, Institute of Art History, 2018); The work on the research project ARTNET – Modern and Contemporary Artists Practices of the 20th and 21st Century coincided with the marking of the 150th anniversary of the Croatian Association of Visual Artists (HDLU) (1868–2018). In parallel with the creation of the project CAN_IS database (Croatian Artists Network Information System), systematic work was carried out to catalogue the exhibitions that were held during the 150 years of HDLU’s existence. From the very beginning, this task was assigned to Art Historian Petra Šlosel, whose work was of key significance for the project from the outset because her dedication and experience contributed to the creation of the CAN_IS database. Šlosel catalogued over 1,500 exhibitions organized by the then Art Society, today’s Croatian Association of Visual Artists.

sign of architect J. M. Olbrich, best speaks to the group’s openness to collaboration with contemporary artists throughout Europe. Thanks to numerous guest exhibitions, the Vienna art scene experienced a qualitative leap forward towards a modern artistic expression. 27 Of Croatian artists, Ivan Meštrović was a regular member of the Vienna Secession, while other artists that participated in exhibitions as guests included Vlaho Bukovac, Antonija Krasnik and Tomislav Krizman.

“Innovation through exchange” was the stance assumed by the second Viennese artistic association, Hagenbund, established in 1900, whose exhibition program would be shown in the converted premises of the former market building in the Zedlitzgasse (the so-called Zedlitzhalle), according to the design of architect Josef Urban. Hagenbund would soon become the key platform of modern art in Central Europe, assuming a position between the avant-garde and the mainstream of the time, characterized by late impressionism and symbolism. Of Croatian artists, the association included Artur Oskar Alexander as a regular member, and hosted guest exhibitions by Tomislav Krizman, Ivan Meštrović, Emanuel Vidović and Lona von Zamboni. Owing to these two critical artistic associations, the Vienna art scene experienced a greater freedom of creation and exhibition. On the other hand, Czech and Polish artists exhibited their work as part of both individual and collective guest exhibitions, which showed the recent works of the members of the associations Mänes and Sztuka.

In the autumn of 1902, an exhibition of the Association Mänes in Hagenbund and the Association Sztuka in the Secession were organized simultaneously. 29 The collaboration of Mänes and the Hagenbund would continue with an exhibition of the Prague artists in Vienna in 1908, and reciprocal exhibitions by French artists in Prague in 1908 and 1909. The second guest exhibition of the Polish Sztuka Association in the Secession was organized in 1906, and an exhibition in the Hagenbund in the early spring of 1908. 31

Zagreb established itself as a Central European center of art primarily due to the establishment of the Art Association in 1868. 32 As opposed to the then cultural and artistic centres of Central Europe that Croatia was gravitating towards, Vienna and Munich, in which art associations were founded on a basis of an already well-established art scene and infrastructure, comprising a network of arts and crafts schools, art academies and galleries, the specificity of the Zagreb scene was that the course of its development was the exact opposite – it was the establishment of the Art Association that would kick-start the foundation and creation of all those institutions that were fundamental for its activities and mission.

With the establishment and operation of the Art Association, focus was placed on artistic creation in a wider sense, fostering the appreciation of art works in the wider public and bolstering arts and crafts. It was only when the secession of a group of artists gathered around Vlaho Bukovac from the Art Association in 1897 that the paradigm would change. These artists advocated art for its own sake, and emphasized the national character of the group, as expressed in the association’s name Association of Croatian Artists. All of the group’s artists had previous experience with the studios or exhibitions of the artistic milieu of Paris, Vienna and Munich, in which the secession associations caused media uproar and instigated a division of artists into “old” and “new”. Based on Bukovac’s efforts, the new internal rules of the Association were adopted, and Bukovac was appointed its President. Robert Frangeš was appointed Deputy President, and Rudolf Valdec Secretary of the Association. The Association’s first members included Artur Oskar Alexander, Ivo Bauer, Menci Clement Crnčić, Bela Csikos Sesia, Oton Iveković and Ferdo Kovačević. These are the artists that launched Croatian modern art, declaring their intention to revive art through individual freedom, as demonstrated at the exhibition First Croatian Salon in the Art Pavilion in 1898/1899. At the very turn of the century, in 1900/1901, the association held its Second Exhibition, hosting art works of the Slovenian Artistic Association from Ljubljana. As early as 1902, a joint exhibition of the Art Association and the Association of Croatian Artists was organized in the Art Pavilion, and the next exhibition, held in 1903, demonstrated a fusion of both associations under the name Croatian Art Association. This shows that, in Croatian art history, rather than viewing the secession as a discontinuity within the Association, it should be understood as an indisputably sound and required interlude, after which...
a more modern artistic expression and focus on artistic creation gained momentum. Some of the important outcomes of the Croatian secession were certainly the opening of the Zagreb Art Pavilion as the first dedicated art exhibition space to be constructed in Zagreb (Ill. 1), the establishment of the Modern Gallery and the popularization of art in the public through exhibitions and the publication of the literature and art journal Život (Life) (Ill. 2). Also, numerous guest exhibitions of art associations from Ljubljana, Prague and Krakow were organized during the first half of the 20th century. The direct contacts made by Zagreb artists with artists from Prague and Krakow at exhibitions in Vienna put Zagreb on the map of Central European associations, which simultaneously contributed to the internalization of minor artistic milieus, and triggered the national visibility of artists belonging to the Slavic parts of the multinational Monarchy. Their common endeavour was to propagate the value of modern art through a strategy involving exhibitions, art criticism, and the creation of a new form of artistic collaboration, which produced a new type of exhibition event – the guest exhibition.

SLOVENIAN ART ASSOCIATION (SLOVENSKO UMETNIŠKO DRUŠTVO) IN LJUBLJANA

The first signs of the organization of visual arts associations in Slovenia date back to 1898 and 1899, when the Slovenian Art Association was established in Ljubljana, which, in addition to painters, included sculptors, graphic artists, literary and dramatic artists. Subsequently, this Association would separate into specialized artistic associations for the individual fields, among which the most prominent position was assumed by the Association of Slovenian Visual Artists (Društvo slovenskih upodabljajočih umetnikov) that exerted a strong influence on the entire Slovenian visual art of the 20th century. The Slovenian artists also took over the Munich and Vienna secessionism as their model of cultural politics.

The first exhibition of the Slovenian Art Association was organized in 1900 in Ljubljana, gathering 31 Slovenian artists, most of which lived in Ljubljana and Slovenia at the time, and a few notable artists with careers abroad or who were outside the country, in Munich or Vienna, at the time when the exhibition was held. With 186 paintings and sculptures exhibited, this was the largest exhibition held in Ljubljana at the time. Thanks to the contacts between Slovenian and Croatian artists, members of the Slovenian Art Association participated in the Second Exhibition of the Association of Croatian Artists in Zagreb, held in the Art Pavilion in 1900/1901 (Ill. 3). After the great

34 Beti Žerovc: Slovenski impresionisti (Ljubljana: Mladinska knjiga, 2013), 19.
35 Fran Goveker, ed, Šeznam in imenik istovečnih slovenskih umetnikov 1898-1900 (Ljubljana: Slovensko umetniško društvo, 1900). The exhibition was held from 15 September to 15 October 1900. The Commission for the selection of exhibits included Ivan Franke, Imperial advisor and professor, painter, Ivan Duffé, city advisor, Celestin Mess, professor and sculptor, and the painters Ferdinand Vesel and Matej Sterne, while the organization of the exhibition was entrusted to the painters Ivan Groh and Rikard Jakopič.
36 The exhibition was held from 22 December 1900 to 25 January 1901, according to the selection of the same commission, see note 13. http://dizbi.hazu.hr/?object=list&find=druga+izlo%C5%BE-
success of the Croatian Salon in 1898/1899, this was the first subsequent and last exhibition to be organized by this Association. Internal disputes that began to plague the Association of Croatian Artists resulted in the departure of its President Vlaho Bukovac for Cavtat, and then to Vienna and Prague, the Association lost its young promising artists Robert Auer and Bela Csikos Sesia, who left for New York. At the same time, the Association of Croatian Literary Artists was faced with difficulties regarding the publication of its journal *Život*, and was embroiled in a latent dispute with the Art Association, dominated by Iso Kršnjavi, resulting in the closing of the association. After Bukovac, Menci Clement Crnčić took over as President of the Association of Croatian Artists, thanks to whose efforts a new exhibition was organized from 22 December 1900 to 25 January 1901. The exhibition comprised three rather disparate parts: I. Exhibition of the Slovenian Art Association in Ljubljana, II. Collective Exhibition of M. Cl. Crnčić, and III. Alphons Mucha Exhibition. The part of the exhibition devoted to the first collective guest exhibition of Slovenian artists in Zagreb involved 15 male and three female artists: the painters Antun Ažbe, France Berneker, Ivan Franke, Ivan Grohar, Anton Gvajc, Rikard Jakopič, Marija Jama, Antun Koželj, Matej Šernar, Ferdo Vesel and P. Žmitek, sculptors B. Pogačnik, Alojzij Repić, Ivan Zajc and Jakob Žnider, and the female painters Ivana Koblica, Henrika Šantel and Jessie Vesel. The exhibition comprised 127 works that had just before been shown at an exhibition in Ljubljana, arousing great interest of the Zagreb public and critics. Vladimir Lunečak pointed out the works by Rikard Jakopič and Matija Jama as the “most modern and fresh paintings”, also commending the exhibitions of the three female artists. The critique of Iso Kršnjavi included an interesting comment that could equally apply to numerous other exhibitions of the time, which often merely threw art works together uncritically: “One cannot really judge Slovenian artists based on this exhibition: had they exhibited less works, it would have been better. Had they shown us the best works of their best artists, the entire exhibition would have been a success, but this slew of failed paintings by bad and good artists blights the overall success of Slovenian painters.” In any case, this exhibition prompted guest exhibitions of foreign art associations in the Art Pavilion in Zagreb, followed by guest exhibitions of the Czech Association Mánes and the Polish Association Sztkuka. Among the guest exhibitions processed, for the purposes of this article, using digital network visualization tools developed as part of the ARTNET scientific projects, the exhibition of the Slovenian Art Association in the Zagreb Art Pavilion was specific in the sense that the guest exhibition of the Slovenian artists was held in Zagreb at the end of the same year in which the first exhibition of this Association had already

37 Cf. the network display of the First exhibition of the Slovenian Art Association in Ljubljana in 1900 and the exhibition of the Slovenian Art Association held as part of the Second Exhibition of the Association of Croatian Artists in Zagreb in 1900/01.


The Czech art association emerged from a group of Czech students in Munich that took its name in 1890 after the renowned Romantic painter Josef Mánes. Mikoláš Aleš was the first president of the association. The association gathered painters, sculptors, architects, writers, and art critics like Otto Gutfriend, Karel Hlaváček, Vratislav Hofman, Bohumil Kafka, Jan Katéra, Josef Mařatka, Vladimír Županský, Antonín Hudeček, Jindřich Práčka, Antonín Slaviček, Jiža Úprka, Max Švabinský, Jan Preisler and many others. They organised their first exhibition in 1898 together with a journal named Volné Směry in which they published their aims and objectives and emphasised the importance of organising exhibitions of works by Czech and other European artists as well as fostering of artistic individuality. The exhibitions of works by foreign artists organised in Prague by The Mánes Association of Fine Artists left an important mark in the history of Czech art exhibitions, starting from 1902 and the exhibition of works by August Rodin to the exhibition of French avant-garde artists organised in 1914, which had a significant impact on Czech artists resulting in their inclination toward cubism.

The Mánes Association of Fine Artists from Prague presented the works of its members in Vienna at the 4th Hagenbund exhibition held in 1902. The exhibition was held in parallel with the exhibition of the Polish Sztuka Association, which had a guest exhibition at the Secession, thus demonstrating the openness of Vienna to art phenomena in other (national) centres of the Monarchy.

Viennese critics, primarily Ludwig Hevesi and Berta Zuckerkandl, pointed out the importance of švabinski, Uprka, Slavíček, Hudeček and Preisler together with Kupka and Šimon, as young rising stars.\textsuperscript{41} Hagenbund achieved a very good collaboration with the Mánes in Prague, which evolved in one of the most fruitful international art networks.\textsuperscript{42}

The connection between Prague and Zagreb resulted in guest exhibitions presenting works by Croatian artists at the Mánes Pavilion in 1903 and a reciprocal exhibition of the Mánes Association the Art Pavilion organised in May 1904. Documentation about those exhibitions has been preserved thanks to catalogues supported by the historical archives.\textsuperscript{43} (Ill. 4) The works by the following Croatian artists were presented in Prague at the 10th exhibition organised by the Mánes Association: Josip Bauer, Vlaho Bukovac, Joso Bužan, Menci Clement Crnčić, Bela Csikos Sesia, Tomislav Krizman, Ferdo Kovačević, sculptors Robert Frangeš, Ivan Meštrović and Rudolf Valdec together with Slava Raškaj as the only female artist. As many as 192 works by Czech artists were transported for the exhibition held in Zagreb including works by Rudolf Bém, Jugo Böttinger, Arnošt Hofbauer, Jan Honza, Antonín Hudeček, Josef Jelínek, Miloš Jiránek, Dušan Jurkovič, Franta Kavan, Ladislav Kofránek, František Kupka, Richard Lauda, Stanislav Lolek, Josef Loukota, Josef Mařatka, František Pečínka, Antonín Slavíček, Viktor Stretti, František Šimon, Max Švabinský, J. Tomec, Jóža Uprka, František Voves, sculptors František Bílek, Buhumil Kafka, Josef Kratina, Stanislav Sucharda, Ladislav Šaloun, O. Španiel, Jan Štursa, architects Jan Katéra and J. Letzel, and a single female artist, Anna Boudová. Isio Kršnjavi commented the collaboration by saying the following:

Exhibitions like this one have to be observed from a practical point of view. No matter how his profession might be noble and beautiful, an artist has to live of his work and he needs to, as any other worker, look for a compensation, wherever he might find one.\textsuperscript{44}

Apart from the review of art critique re-affirming art creation in particular countries, one of the results of the exhibition was selling of artworks by Croatian artists in Prague as well as selling of artworks by Czech artists in Zagreb, out of which the wooden relief showing Jesus and Magdalena by František Bílek became one of the first acquisitions of the collection of the Modern Gallery in Zagreb, founded in 1905.\textsuperscript{45}

\textsuperscript{41} Agnes Husslein-Arco, et. al., Hagenbund, p. 124.; http://digitale-bibliothek.belvedere.at/viewer/image/14147732019/1/LOG_0000/


\textsuperscript{43} The Croatian Academy of Sciences and Art, Fine Arts Archives, Documentation on the exhibitions held in Zagreb, Envelope F 594, the exhibition of the Manes Association. The catalogue of the exhibition of the Manes Association of Fine Artists, The Art Pavilion in Zagreb, 1904. The Croatian Academy of Sciences and Art – Fine Arts Archives, Zagreb

\textsuperscript{44} Izidor Kršnjavi, “Naša umjetnost”, Narodne novine, no. 261 (14 November 1903): 245.

\textsuperscript{45} The Croatian Academy of Sciences and Art, Fine Arts Archives, Documentation on the exhibitions held in Zagreb, Envelope F 594, The exhibition of the Manes Association of Fine Artists. The records indicate that works by Bela Csikos Sesia, Menci Clement Crnčić, and Josip Bauer were sold in Prague, while works by the Czech artists Josef Kratina, Stanislav Lolek, Antonín Slavíček, Viktor Stretti, Stanislav
The network display of all guest exhibitions covered here (Fig. 3) indicates the four exhibitions associated with the Mánes Association of Fine Artists located next to the left margin of the network. Having in mind that they do not have any participants in common, the guest exhibition of Croatian artists organised by the Mánes in Prague in 1903 is located more marginally in relation to the three exhibitions of works by Czech artists organised in Vienna in 1902 and 1908 and in Zagreb in 1904. In the part of the network display linked to the three guest exhibitions of Czech artists organised abroad, six groups of red nodes indicate the Czech artists. Three groups of nodes located marginally next to blue nodes, which indicate the exhibitions, present those artists who exhibited their works in the framework of a single and corresponding exhibition while three groups of red nodes located inside of the field bounded by blue nodes for the three exhibitions indicate the artists who participated in several exhibitions. At the same time, the central position is taken by the group of seven artists whose works were showcased on all the three exhibitions. Visualisation of the network clearly suggests that the exhibitions held in a short period of time, i.e. in Vienna in 1902 and in Zagreb in 1904, comprised a significantly higher number of common participants (19) in comparison to the parallel display of the two exhibitions in Vienna (7) or the exhibition held in Zagreb and subsequently the one held in Vienna (10).

THE ASSOCIATION OF POLISH ARTISTS “ART” (TOWARZYSTWO ARTYSTÓW POLSKIH “SZTUKA”) IN KRAKOW

The Association of Polish Artists Sztuka was established in opposition to then official The Association of Friends of Fine Arts in Krakow and Lvov. Józef Chelmoński and Jan Stanisławski in 1890 started the founding initiative in Paris. A Separate Exhibition of Painting and Sculpture was organised in 1897 in Krakow and in November a new association was founded with the aim “to improve artistic life in the homeland and organise exhibitions both at home and abroad.” This international cooperation comprised a number of exhibitions during the period 1897–1914 in the following cities: Vienna, St. Louis, Munich, Düsseldorf, Antwerp, Leipzig, Dresden, Rome, Venice, Prague, Budapest and Berlin. Having in mind that the Association of Polish Artists Sztuka appeared in public relatively frequently and that Polish artist had an open access to the European art market, the Association was not very active in organising reciprocal exhibitions of other art associations in Krakow.

Polish artists had individual exhibitions organised in the Secession in Vienna, and the first group exhibition of works by the members of the Sztuka Association was organised in the autumn of 1902 at the Secessio Pavilion in the framework of their 15th exhibition. The critics praised it – Ludwig Hevesi in particular who wrote about the national character of the Polish exhibition, describing it as a “grand pussée
Polish researchers were unable to establish if the Association of Polish Artists Sztuka had a guest exhibition organised in Zagreb in 191151. The Art Pavilion organised the exhibitions of works by Polish artists, members of the Sztuka Association and members of the Croatian Art Association in parallel, which provided a possibility to compare and critically appraise the two national segments of art production. Polish artists were present with 82 artworks as follows: 17 painters: Teodor Axentowicz, Stanislaw Czajkowski, Stefan Filipkiewicz, Gustaw Gwoźdecki, Vlastimil Hoffmann, Françoise Jabłczynski, Władysław Jarocki, Alfons Karpinski, Józef Krasnowolski, Józef Mehoffer, Tymon Niesiolowski, Jan Stanisławski Podgórski, Ignacy Pienkowski, Jan Rubczak, Ferdinand Ruszczy, Jan Stanisławski and Wojciech Weiss, 2 sculptors: Henrik Glicenstein, Bronisław Pelczarski, and one female painter, Olga Boznańska. Croatian artists were presented by the works of Robert Auer, Leopoldina Auer-Schmidt, Ivan Benković, Anka Bestall, Joso Bužan, Menci Klement Cmčić, Bela Csikos Sesia, Robert Frangeš Mihanović, Oton Iveković, Vilim Jenčik, Ferdo Kovačević, Miroslav Kraljević, Anka Lőwentał Mariocić, Celestin Medović, Franjo Pavačić, Zdena Pexír-Sríca, Zora Preradović, Elsa Rechnitz, Iva Simonović, Jelka Stuppi, Branko Šenoa, Nasta Šenoa-Rojc, Rudolf Spiegler, Antun Štefik and Rudolf M. Valič. Andrija Milčinović described the unconventional artistic vibrancy of the two art associations and nations, very much visible at this exhibition, by saying:

This wall around us does not allow us to breathe or to live. Our artists invited the Association of Polish Artists Sztuka in this politically charged atmosphere. One may support any kind of artistic perspective, one may foster artistic values in every working produced over the past few decades or one may neglect everything that piled up in old galleries; one may also be a vigorous opponent of this or that group, however, one must admit that inviting the members of the Sztuka to Zagreb is a great merit of the Art Association. The Art Association had invited the Czech artists from the Mánes at the time, it invited Vereščagin, Slovenian artists, Serbs and Bulgarians but never had they made such a distinct choice like in the case of the Sztuka. That act stands as a proof of self-awareness, enthusiasm, and patriotism to such an extent that one remains taken aback wondering: is this possible? Is it possible to inspire so much life, so much diversity and young aspiration by way of presenting so many already established artistic directions and significant artworks having recently emerged from those artistic directions. One cannot do anything but ask how is it that those paintings do not fall off the walls and those sculptures off their pedestals out of fear from that vehement antipathy, that disapproval and resistance so characteristic for such a heavy and suffocating atmosphere?... Upon inspecting all works by the Polish artists, one simply has to make the conclusion: The Poles do not know us, that is rather obvious, otherwise they would have not sent the works of art that so ruthlessly disturb our peace and ‘calm’ behind which we are hiding. (...) Nowadays, the Poles are most certainly the first among the Slaves in doing so because they were successful in preserving their authenticity while marching next to the French and the others who had opened the new horizons in art. And although they live in different cities and different parts of the country, in many ways they stand as one. A few more exhibitions like this and maybe the artistic life in Zagreb will breathe the life it was breathing ten or fifteen years ago. It is better to remain unpopular, criticised and even persecuted than adored and close to the audience that still has not developed a real interest in art.54

The critic evokes the inspiring and competitive early modern period before the First Croatian Salon and “the suffocating atmosphere” of the artistic life in Zagreb was a reflection of turbulent events taking place after the separation of a group of young Croatian artists that participated at the International Exhibition in Rome in parallel with this exhibition and thus showed their inclination toward the Serbian artists.55

In the framework of the network display of all of all guest exhibitions covered here (Fig. 3), the position of The Association of Polish Artists Sztuka is closest to the centre owing to the highest number of group exhibitions held according to the parameters attributed to the guest exhibitions organised by other central European art associations (five exhibitions in total), but also owing to the highest number of collaborations with other associations by way of cultural exchange in the form of exhibitions. As opposed to the Mánes Association, whose appearances in Vienna were organised exclusively by Hagenbund, the network display clearly indicates that the Association of Polish Artists Sztuka had two exhibitions organised at the Secession (one in 1902 and one in 1906) together with the exhibitions organised at the Hagenbund in Vienna (two exhibitions in 1908).

The position of red nodes representing Polish artists in relation to blue nodes indicating the exhibitions to which they are linked depending on their participation in this case reveals that those artists whose works were presented at one exhibition hold marginal positions on the network display on the one hand, and a more central position in the network of interconnections between the artists who took part in more than one exhibition on the other. Five artists who took part in all five group exhibitions of the works by the members of the Sztuka are located at the centre i.e. Teodor Axentowicz, Józef Mehoffer, Jan Stanisławski, Wojciech Weiss and Olga Boznańska as the only female artists.

51 Ibid.
54 Andrija Milčinović, “Umjetnička izložba,” Savremenič, no. 8 (1911), 526-529.
In addition to individual appearances at the exhibitions at the Secession and the Hagenbund in Vienna, both of which served as platforms for organising exhibitions to present modern art from Central Europe and meeting points and places to learn about artists from other parts of the Monarchy, a special attention was given to guest exhibitions presenting the work of art associations organised between Vienna, Krakow, Prague and Zagreb. In Vienna, The Association of Polish Artists Szuka had two guest exhibitions organised at the Secession in 1902 and 1906 and one exhibition at the Hagenbund in 1908 followed by one exhibition organised in Zagreb in 1911. The Mânes Association of Fine Artists had two exhibitions organised at the Hagenbund in 1902 and 1908, respectively and in 1904 they exhibited their works in Zagreb as a reciprocal visit following the guest exhibition of the Croatian Art Association in Prague in 1903. Taking into account that the guest exhibitions of the Mânes and the Szuka art associations that took place in Zagreb have not been in the focus of any research done by Czech or Polish art historians so far, by extending the network of exhibitions to cover Zagreb we are contributing to the network of modern art in Central Europe during the first decade of the 20th century by adding another overlooked art centre. Visualisation of digital data by way of different networks indicating artistic collaboration between art associations and artists demonstrated a rather high number of artists coming from the Slavic regions of the Monarchy whose works were exhibited thanks to organised guest exhibitions. All these art associations also included works by female artists although their number was limited i.e. only seven female painters in total exhibited their works. Ivana Kobilca, as a member of the Slovenian Art Association,
map2_1962-1963.pdf stands out with the quality of her paintings and the number of exhibitions in which she participated, the Association of Polish Artists Sztuka regularly included painter Olga Boznańska, while Anna Boudová exhibited her works together with other members of the Czech Mánes. The network display comprises 147 artists in total: 89 painters, 26 sculptors and 6 fine artists from Slovenian, Czech and Polish circle and their activities are indicated in the selected examples of guest exhibitions in Zagreb, Vienna and Prague.

56 Female Croatian artists who exhibited their works at the exhibitions organised by the Society of Croatian Artists, that is the Croatian Art Association, were more present than female artists who were affiliated to the Polish Art Association Sztuka or the Mánes. Jelka Stuppi, Leopoldina Auer-Schmidt, Zora Preradović, Slava Raškaj, Anka Löwenthal Maročić and Nasta Rojc had regular appearances on the exhibitions in Zagreb and abroad. To learn more about education of Croatian female artists and exhibitions of their works during the late 19th and the early 20th century see: Ljiljana Kolešnik, “(Ne) moguća priča. Utjecaj münchenske akademije na žensku umjetnosti ranog modernizma,” in Akademija likovnih umjetnosti u Münchenu i hrvatsko slikarstvo, eds. Irena Kraševac, Petar Prelog and Ljiljana Kolešnik (Zagreb: Institute of Art History, 2008), 88-107; Darija Alujević, “Beč kao mjesto formiranja umjetnica hrvatske moderne i njihov udio u likovnom životu Zagreba,” in Izazov moderni: Zagreb – Beč oko 1900 (exhibition catalogue), eds. Irena Kraševac and Petra Vugrinec (Zagreb: Klovičevi dvori Galery, 2017), 125-174; Darija Alujević, “Women Artists of Croatian Modernism,” in The Challenge of Modernism: Vienna and Zagreb around 1900 (exhibition catalogue), eds. Stella Rollig, Irena Kraševac and Petra Vugrinec (Vienna: Belvedere, 2017), 130-138.

This confirms that Czech and Polish artists made better use of their position in Vienna as a result of conditions provided by their art associations while Croatian and Slovenian artists had to organise themselves because their national associations did not have continuous or persistent activities. Bringing the Slovenian Art Association, the Mánes Association of Fine Artists and the Association of Polish Artists Sztuka to Zagreb open doors to a better critical angle for Croatian artists (artists from Zagreb), audience and critique and strengthened the domestic position of artists facing turbulent phases in the beginning of the 20th century due to their inner disputes. By switching their membership from one art association to another, their international position was weakened by the end of the 19th century after their appearance on the Millennial Exhibition in Budapest and guest exhibitions in Copenhagen, St. Petersburg and Paris after that.

57 Žerovc, Slovenski impresionisti, 75. The author explains that the Slovenian Art Association organised activities for only a brief period of time because of reasons related to its members’ reluctance and various political plots. Another association named “Sava” was more successful and managed to organise a group exhibition at the u Miethke Gallery in 1904. http://digitale-bibliothek.belvedere.at/viewer/image/1433925050448/1/LOG_0000/
One of the most significant Croatian sculptors in the 20th century, Ivan Meštrović (1883–1962), affirmed himself as a sculptor in the public eye mostly “ex-territorially”, i.e. outside of his homeland (Ill. 1). His starting point was Vienna, the city with a distinctive cultural climate where he completed his formal academic education (a three-year degree course in sculpture and a two-year degree course in architecture). He was also a member of the Association of Visual Artists Austria – Secession and a very active participant in the exhibitions held by the Association. In this text, his solo-exhibition at the Vienna Secession in 1910 is taken as the starting point of the period under scrutiny, which extends to the end of the First World War and the artist’s return to his homeland, enveloped in a brand new socio-political climate, at the beginning of the 1920s.

Wars always provide an interesting context for observing and analysing artists’ behaviours and creative outputs, and the same applies to Ivan Meštrović in the context to the Balkan Wars and the First World War, as well as to the Second World War at a later point in time.

However, Meštrović is an extremely interesting phenomenon not only from the perspective of the visual art production, but also from the perspective of setting up a wide network of acquaintances, especially with prominent individuals from the cultural and political arena. His political engagement was most pronounced during the First World War, but his inclination to establish politically affiliated contacts was a constant in the decades to come, until the end of his life. This political engagement was of great importance to the artist, as attested in his first book of memoirs, first published abroad, in Buenos Aires in 1961, and then, posthumously, in his homeland in 1969. We are, of course, referring to the book Memories of Political People and Events (Uspomene na političke ljude i događaje), where he recounted the events spanning from his move to Belgrade in 1904 to his move to the United States in 1947. It is interesting to note that there are almost no protagonists from the art world featured in this book; Meštrović mentioned them – at least some of them – on other occasions. This book represents an outstanding contribution to political history, provided via autobiographical records and notes. However, Ivan Meštrović never considered himself to be a professional politician – he adamantly refused to be classified as such – and he used to point out that his vocation was exclusively that of an artist.

This text attempts to approach the interpretation of Ivan Meštrović’s activities by using entirely different tools than those usually implemented in art historical practice. It will show how to implement a quantitative analysis, more suitable – as hitherto perceived – to other disciplines, in the domain of art history research. The challenge

58 The most comprehensive study on the life and art of Ivan Meštrović was written by Duško Kečkemet, who dedicated a significant portion of his career to this artist and interpreting his works. See: Duško Kečkemet, Život Ivana Meštrovića (1883 – 1962 – 2002), vol. I and vol. II (Zagreb: Školska knjiga, 2009).

59 About the period that Ivan Meštrović spent in Vienna, see: Irena Kraševac, Ivan Meštrović i secesija: Beč – München – Prag (Zagreb: Institut za povijest umjetnosti, Fundacija Ivana Meštrovića, 2002).

60 Ivan Meštrović, Uspomene na političke ljude i događaje (Zagreb: Matica hrvatska, 1969).

Dalibor Prančević
is thus even greater because this kind of research usually deals in texts and textual explications, that is, they are, in most regards, logocentric. Indeed, from the very beginning, the question arises of how to reconcile the reflexive nature and approach to research in humanities – always verging on ambiguity, fluid, floating – with the exact and measurable data which quantitative analysis, as well as the new technology, necessitate. Actually, how do we even introduce quantitative analysis – and digital tools – into the field of art history, mostly perceived as being reflexive? Is there an antagonistic relationship between “traditional” and “digital” art history? Perhaps the answer to this and similar questions can be found in an optimistic note in the article “Debating Digital Art History”, where Anna Bentkowska-Kafel analyses this specific relationship. Namely, the author claims that the attribute digital has a mere provisional and temporary character, and that it will become completely irrelevant and without any precise demarcation in the near future. So, only the umbrella term of art history will remain, of course, with all the changes and turns in the discipline ushered in by technological advancements and the implementation of new techniques. Nobody will even think in terms of an antagonistic relationship but about the critical moment which will have marked the redefining point of transition, that is, the implementation of new methods in research defined by a temporal format and technological context. We will attempt to demonstrate such a coexistence – or a hybrid – of traditional and digital art history methods by interpreting Ivan Meštrović’s oeuvre and worldviews, that is, his global critical reception.


Right at the beginning, it should be noted that Ivan Meštrović’s social network was reconstructed herein based exclusively on his written correspondence, archived in Atelier Meštrović in Zagreb (Fig. 1). This is a special archival fund, stored as the property of Mate Meštrović. A total of 606 letters have been processed, with a focus on the period from 1910 to 1920. The basic information about the letters, as well as content excerpts, have been entered into the digital database Croatian Artists Networks Information System (CAN-IS) that stems from an intensive interdisciplinary work on a five-year research project Modern and Contemporary Artist Networks, Art Groups and Art Associations: Organisation and Communication Models of Artist Collaborative Practices in the 20th and 21st Century. Furthermore, the visual depiction of Meštrović’s social network was created via software visualization tools which were integrated into the database. As to be expected, this type of a reconstruction is not ideal. Namely, a large portion of the epistolary records lack a specified timeframe that cannot be inferred from its contents, so this analysis should not be taken at face value. However, it certainly does pave the way for future interpretations and will be complemented by each subsequent insight into the personal and official correspondence of Ivan Meštrović, stored in institutional or private archives. Nonetheless,
Ivan Meštrović

Based on this sample, we can clearly differentiate the key layers of social protagonists who are mutually intertwined and reflect the character of Ivan Meštrović and his collaborative-communicative disposition. The artist's network is not one-dimensional— as they rarely are!— and includes the protagonists not only from his intimate-familial and cultural-artistic surrounding, but also from the historical-political context since, during the First World War, Meštrović became engaged in a concrete— or we might even define it as nation-building— political activism.

Despite reconstructing the network based solely on the archived correspondence from one source, many key relationships with individuals whose letters were not contained within could be inferred. For example, especially important are the connections that Meštrović forged with the members of the ruling political class, such as the members of the Serbian royal family Karađorđević, since the very beginning of their rule in 1903.

In addition, by holding important exhibitions and capturing the attention of experts and the wider public, Ivan Meštrović also met other royalty to whom he acted as a guide at the exhibitions, as he did for the Italian King Victor Emmanuel III of Savoy and his wife Jelena of Savoy, daughter of the king of Montenegro Nikola I Petrović-Njegoš, at the International Fine Arts Exhibition in Rome (1911).63 Furthermore, the Grafton Galleries exhibition held in London in 1917, which he prepared with Mirko Rački and Toma Rosandić, was inaugurated by a member of the British royal family, Princess Patricia of Connaught. This omission, regarding domestic or international relations, also equally applies to numerous other protagonists from artistic and wider cultural circles.

First of all, we should address what social network analysis means and how it sheds light on certain issues related to art history. When we refer to social network analysis, this usually implies two basic approaches: the sociocentric and the egocentric. The egocentric approach anchors a social network on an individual agent and observes the forms of social relations that emphasize the personal nature of society. The sociocentric approach, on the other hand, relies on the principles and structural connectivity of the network as a whole.64 It is apparent that Ivan Meštrović's social network is of a personal— or in other terms— of an egocentric type. It cannot be conceived as a spatially delineated structure, in the sense of understanding the society itself as a territorially defined entity, but rather as a set of connections with the other actors who are part of the network. These are, of course, several kinds of connections (familial, friendship-based, cooperative, etc.) which belong to different geographical longitudes and latitudes, that is, to different socio-political and, in general, historical circumstances.

Ivan Meštrović's personal network— at least when it comes to its cultural-artistic and historical-political layer— is decidedly pragmatically motivated, that is, it is structured around organizing several key exhibitions, not just in regard to his personal affirmation, but generally in regard to the art history of this region and the political-ideological programme that permeated these exhibitions. There is no doubt that Meštrović's critical art narrative was directed against Austria and, in that sense, he was a prominent ideologue of one art association very significant for the

63 Meštrović, Uspomene na političke ljude i događaje, 18-19.

The association was founded in 1908 in Split, and dissolved in 1919, when there were no more justified – political or societal – reasons to continue with its activities. This was one of the first important forms of cooperative artistic undertakings which aligned its exhibition narratives with the anti-Austrian and anti-Hungarian political framework. It goes without saying that the central actor in the Association – in regard to its founding, work and promotion – was Ivan Meštrović, so one part of the archived correspondence relates exactly to this segment of his engagement.

Although the programmatic axis of the Association was representing and promoting class interests and supporting its members, one of its advocated narratives was, unquestionably, the ideology of South Slavic unification. This was particularly pronounced at the Association's big exhibition organized at the Art Pavilion in Zagreb, in 1910, under the slogan *Despite the Unheroic Times*, coined by the poet Vojnović. It is worth mentioning that this exhibition was preceded by Ivan Meštrović's solo-exhibition at the Vienna Secession held in the same year, that is, the exhibition Meštrović–Rački in Zagreb, where the concept of sculpture and architecture articulated through the Vidovdan or the Kosovo cycle was first presented to the public. However, the complete cycle and the associated display, which Meštrović had already begun to showcase in Vienna, launched these works to an entirely different sphere, the one of propaganda and political activism (Ill. 2).

The International Fine Arts Exhibition was to be held in Rome, in 1911. I was invited by the Vienna Ministry to participate with 'the most abundant number' of exhibits. I refused, prompted by the opinion that me, as a Croat, had no place there. After a little while, the Head of religion and education, Milan Amruš, invited me to talk and said that the Government had received an invitation, sent by the joint Hungarian Government, for Croats to participate in the exhibition in Rome. The “Hungarian pavilion” was to have a separate Croatian section, where all the Croats from the Triune would be able to participate. Pest would arrange it with Vienna not to run afoul of the Croats from Dalmatia, because they, the Hungarians, also believed that the territory belonged under the Crown of Saint Stephen. I laughed off the proposal and said that I wouldn’t participate, while I could not speak for others. 66

The conversation with Amruš spurred Meštrović to write to Belgrade, asking whether the Kingdom of Serbia would have its exhibition pavilion where one could showcase his works “if the Croatian Government will not want or be able to stage a Croatian pavilion.” 67 As early as 31 May

---


66 Meštrović, Uspomene na političke ljude i događaje, 16.

67 Ibid, 17.
The qualifier “friend” which defines the character of the relationship that Meštrović had with Pica and his wife Ana, whom he portrayed, is especially interesting. In any case, this collaboration turned out to be a success.

In addition to sculptures inspired by folk traditions and idea of Yugoslavism, at the 1914 Venice Biennale, the artist also exhibited the wooden model of the Vidovdan Temple, along with some other works inspired by religious motifs. The poet and prose writer Ettore Cozzani devoted an entire issue of L’erica magazine to Meštrović and his work, which had a resounding effect in the Italian and European intellectual circles. Due to the archived letters, it is possible to gain insight into the complicated network of Ivan Meštrović’s relationships with prominent protagonists from the Italian intellectual milieu at that time. These contacts were largely epistolary in character, but there were also meetings and conversations held outside the confines of written correspondences. Although many of these contacts were prompted by the cultural and artistic context, some of them belong to a more intimate and emotional sphere, in the sense that close friendships had been maintained throughout their lives and passed onto their descendants, for example, the one with the Signorelli family. On the other hand, Ivan Meštrović’s political engagement would gain momentum after the assassination in Sarajevo and the beginning of the First World War. At the time of the Sarajevo assassination, Meštrović was in Venice. After a short stay in Split, Meštrović went to Italy again to avoid being arrested. Namely, the Austrian authorities had arrested a large number of politically engaged individuals to halt their political activities and circumvent any problems that might have otherwise arisen.

Not only Ivan Meštrović, but also Ante Trumbić and Frano Supilo lived abroad, and this immigration enabled political activity. Thus, the historian Norka Machiedo Mladinić points out that: “Ivan Meštrović’s first contribution to the assembling of the expats at the beginning of the First World War consisted of encouraging our people to leave their homeland and move to neutral Italy. Trumbić, Supilo and Meštrović met in Venice. The main focus of their efforts was to achieve the liberation of Slovenes, Croats and Serbs from Austro-Hungary and their unification with Serbia and Montenegro in one country.” It is important to note that the idea of establishing a political body—the Yugoslav Committee—in charge of carrying out the project of the Yugoslav unification was conceived. Numerous letters and data from CAN-IS database refer to the work of this entity and its actors, providing a detailed account of the historical-political layer of Meštrović’s social network.

It is important to note that not a lot of people from the art circle were as exposed to the public as Ivan Meštrović was. That is why he was such a valuable asset in initiating first contacts and conversations...
with various political entities and delegations. For example, due to his connections, Meštrović was able to reach the Serbian emissary in Rome, Ljubomir Mihajlović, and inform him about the intention to establish the organization of Yugoslav expats. Consequently, via Mihajlović, the trio Supilo-Trumbić-Meštrović were granted an audience with the French (Camille Barrère), English (Sir James Rennell Rodd) and Russian (Anatolij Nikolajevič Krupenski) emissaries to Rome, at the end September, in 1914. They delegated the plan of the South Slavic unification to their respective governments. However, their work could not continue in Italy due to the Italian territorial pretensions aimed towards the east coast of the Adriatic, so they relocated it to London, the centre of Allied diplomacy. In London, there was only a handful of cultural workers and intellectuals familiar with the programme: Robert Seton-Watson (a scholar in Slavic studies and Ivan Meštrović’s close friend, who was portrayed by the artist and gifted some of his works), Wickham Steed (editor of the Foreign Policy section in The Times, also portrayed by Ivan Meštrović) and Arthur Evans (a renowned archaeologist who was a great admirer of Ivan Meštrović’s work).

One way or the other, the point of direct contact between the political and the artistic engagement were Meštrović’s exhibitions held primarily in London, during the First World War. The first one was held in the Victoria & Albert Museum in 1915 and had strong political implications affirming the Anti-Austrian sentiment embodied through the staging of the Kosovo Cycle and displaying the model of the Vidovdan Temple. The second exhibition was organized in the famous Grafton Galleries, which was also marked by a pronounced political stigma but without an explicitly political narrative footing, because the artist did not display his, so-called, Heroic Cycle but works inspired by religious themes and portraits that he made in London (Ill. 3).

Both exhibits are very interesting because they attest to the extremely wide social circle that Ivan Meštrović established in the UK at the time. His stay in the UK had resulted in the relationships forged with some of the most prominent cultural and social protagonists. The solo-exhibition in the Victoria and Albert Museum in London had ensured Ivan Meštrović a prestigious position in English society. The artist made a number of acquaintances and social connections with high-profile individuals in London, whom he often portrayed. He made portraits of Lady Maud Cunard and Sir Thomas Beecham, who were associated with the avant-garde theatre, in particular, with Sergei Diaghilev’s Ballets Russes. He also made a portrait of Eugenie Errázuriz, who was colloquially known as “Picasso’s Other Mother”, thus succeeding Gertrude Stein. Furthermore, he made a portrait of Tony Gandarillas, a controversial diplomat, and his wife Juana Edwards. Tony Gandarillas was the nephew & Albert Museum and its reception, see: Elizabeth Clegg, “Meštrović, England and the Great War,” The Burlington Magazine, no. 144 (December 2002), 740–51; and Dalibor Prančević, “Odjek Ivana Meštrovića u Velikoj Britaniji nakon izložbe u Victoria & Albert Museumu,” in Zbornik II. kongresa hrvatskih povjesničara umjetnosti (Zagreb: Institut za povijest umjetnosti, 2007), 395–403.


RUŽA MEŠTROVIĆ AND HER SOCIAL CAPITAL

Of course, there is a strong network connection between the two spouses, the one that is not based solely on emotional grounds, but one that is also social, because it is evident that Ruža occupies a prominent position in the articulation of Meštrović’s social contacts. We should take note of one anecdote which attests to Ruža Meštrović’s remarkable resourcefulness and social competence, the kind that promotes dialogue on equal terms and balances out the differences that arise from one’s social status or public recognition, but also to her youthful vehemence.

When Ruža and Ivan first went to meet Rodin, he returned the business card on a plate with 5 francs, because he thought that the young sculptor had come to ask him for something. Ruža found her bearings and return 10 francs to Rodin. 76

Although, in the beginning, a large part of Ruža Meštrović’s social network was defined by the artistic and social status of her husband and the general interest in his fine artworks that would soon change. Ruža was also engaged in creative artwork, producing something. Ruža found her bearings and return 10 francs to Rodin.


7 VIva Ćipiko and Vlaje Ilijadica. She could, therefore, be a very interesting conversationalist to various participants in the social sphere. Ruža would soon begin to make her own social connections from which arose her own social egocentricity and social capital. In visualizing Ivan and Ruža Meštrović’s contacts, it is evident that some names are only connected to Ruža. For instance, especially interesting are her hitherto unexplored contacts with the protagonists from the activist and suffragist enclaves. In that regard, we should mention Evelina Haverfield, who often took part in the suffragette protests. During the First World War, Evelina participated in the women’s humanitarian aid and relief efforts in Serbia, and closely cooperated with the Scottish suffragette and renowned doctor Elsie Inglis, spending some time with her in Serbia. Tellingly, Ivan Meštrović made a posthumous portrait of Elsie Inglis in 1918. Ruža Meštrović’s personal network became notably emancipated through her engagement in humanitarian activities, for example, via a charity tea party, that is, a concert that she organized in London in early 1916. It was a multifaceted event with the aim to present the richness of the cultural life and folk traditions, predominantly related to Serbia, for which voluntary donations were collected. Similar humanitarian events were also organized in Rome, for example in Villa Medici in November 1914, with Ivan Meštrović illustrating the programme’s cover. 77 Many high-profile protagonists from London’s social life participated in preparing and promoting Ruža’s event in London. For example, Lady Helen Primrose wrote in high praise of the event’s organization and sent the money she, herself, raised from ticket sales. 78 The initiative of the writer and the artist Muirhead Bone’s wife, Gertrude Bone, who had just completed one of her children’s books, and who wrote to Ruža Meštrović how she would gladly donate the book’s profits to helping Serbian children, can be examined within the same contextual framework. 79 Alice S. Green also offered to help with the ticket sales and donated to the cause. 80 Based on the archived letters, it is obvious that Ruža Meštrović put in a lot of effort in organizing this charitable event thus inviting the famous Vivian Edwards to perform her solos and recitals. 81 However, Edwards was unable to participate due to her health, but expressed hopes that, despite everything, she would be able to visit Ruža’s “Serbian Tea Room”. Based on the archived correspondence, it is evident that Vivian Edwards was on good terms with Ivan Meštrović and Dimitrije Mitrović. Furthermore, Ruža’s cooperation with Ananda Coomaraswamy, the cultural worker who ardently advocated for the reception of Indian culture and art in the West, is particularly interesting. 82 He was friends with prominent artists of the time, such as sculptors Jacob Epstein and Eric Gill, as well as many others. He was also friends with the Countess Sybil of Rockavage, to whom Ruža sent an invite to the concert. Coomaraswamy’s participation in the whole event was undoubtedly important because he sent Ruža the draft of the programme for corrections. He noted that, upon printing the programmes, Ruža should make a list of addresses where the programme was to be delivered, that is, that the printing bill was to be sent directly to him. Indeed, this was just one of the events that contributed to the spreading of Ruža Meštrović’s ego network, as attested by the data from the CAN-IS database and the accompanying visualizations. In addition, Ruža and Ivan were invited to social gatherings by many prominent hostesses of social salons in London, such as Lady Maud Cunard, Baroness Gladys Swaythling, Clara C. Bergheim (who was connected with the pianist Arthur Rubinstein and the violinist Eugene Yasaje), and many others. The data collected in the CAN_IS database – focusing on the correspondence dated between 1915 and the first half of the 1916 – and the accompanying visualization tools, make it possible to discern the value of social capital wielded by Ivan and Ruža Meštrović, but also the physiognomy of Ruža’s distinct network that would become increasingly emancipated in the years to come. Ruža mobilized that network, in its full capacity, when she started living alone, after a severe marriage crisis and divorce that ensued in the mid-1920s.

IVAN MEŠTROVIĆ AND THE SPATIAL DIMENSIONS OF HIS CRITICAL FORTUNE

Ivan Meštrović is one of the few artists from this region whose presence on the European art and the cultural scene, in general, was particularly noted. The various contextual frameworks in which he embedded his art, especially the political one, articulated just before and during World War I, contributed to this public standing. At this point, we should also mention the importance of large exhibition projects, organized in European cities, in which he participated – either individually, or collectively. Even in those cases where he exhibited his work alongside other artists, his
dominance was without question, as can be seen in the written reviews and critiques that followed these exhibitions.

We should thereby focus on several exhibition projects by Ivan Meštrović, within the given timeframe, and which proved to be important geographical markers and platforms around which the written reviews and newspaper articles about the author revolved: Vienna (XXXV Exhibition of the Vienna Secession, 1910), Zagreb (Meštrović–Rački, 1910, and Despite the Unheroic Times, 1910), Rome (the International Fine Arts Exhibition, 1911), Venice (Biennale, 1914), London (Solo-exhibition in the Victoria and Albert Museum, 1915, and Exhibition of Serbo-Croatian Artists: Meštrović, Rački, Rosandić in the Grafton Galleries, 1917). Based on the cities where these exhibitions were articulated, it is clear that Meštrović’s immediate point of interest was the Old Continent. Despite the fact that this part of the world was going through an extremely difficult period of geopolitical reconfigurations, accompanied by numerous human and material losses, demanding “sculpture” exhibitions – marked by Meštrović’s conspicuous activist nerve – were still being held. This political nerve, already affirmed in Vienna, albeit in a somewhat contained form, became clearly articulated in Rome, and finally in London, as it became completely attuned to the location of the source publication

Thus far, there were no attempts to use quantitative data analysis for examining Ivan Meštrović’s specific period of life, or his life in its entirety, nor was there an attempt made to analyse his reception through such a prism (Table1). Therefore, 1500 bibliographic units, which include various published materials that contributed to the dissemination of news about Ivan Meštrović and his art during the 1910s, were gathered in one place. Among such materials are exhibition catalogues, pamphlets, and expert texts in specialized magazines, published books, or book chapters, critical articles and reviews in daily, weekly, bi-weekly and monthly journals.

### Table 1. Number of articles on Ivan Meštrović published between 1910 and 1920, and ordered according the location of the source publication

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Place</th>
<th>Account for 1910-11</th>
<th>Account for 1912-15</th>
<th>Account for 1916-20</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zagreb</td>
<td>220 75 126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgrade</td>
<td>69 43 20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Split</td>
<td>63 28 45</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zadar</td>
<td>40 24 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vienna</td>
<td>22 2 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rome</td>
<td>16 5 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Novi Sad</td>
<td>12 1 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rijeka</td>
<td>11 4 /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dubrovnik</td>
<td>10 4 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sremski Karlovi</td>
<td>8 3 /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>London</td>
<td>5 64 58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague</td>
<td>5 3 /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sarajevo</td>
<td>5 5 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leipzig</td>
<td>4 /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Milan</td>
<td>4 1 /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saint Petersburg</td>
<td>3 /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ljubljana</td>
<td>3 2 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Munich</td>
<td>3 2 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Osijek</td>
<td>2 1 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bergamo</td>
<td>2 3 /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darmstadt</td>
<td>2 /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paris</td>
<td>1 1 21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuremberg</td>
<td>1 /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florence</td>
<td>1 /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turin</td>
<td>1 /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stuttgart</td>
<td>1 /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laskovac</td>
<td>1 /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cetinje</td>
<td>1 /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warsaw</td>
<td>1 /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Gorica</td>
<td>1 /</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leeds</td>
<td>/ 13 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New York</td>
<td>/ 12 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manchester</td>
<td>/ 7 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Punta Arenas</td>
<td>/ 6 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buenos Aires</td>
<td>/ 5 17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Glasgow</td>
<td>/ 4 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boston</td>
<td>/ 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Šibenik</td>
<td>/ 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venice</td>
<td>/ 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>La Spezia</td>
<td>/ 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amsterdam</td>
<td>/ 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nova Gradička</td>
<td>/ 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vinkovci</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dreluth</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trieste</td>
<td>/ 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Varaždin</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berlin</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kolkata</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aberdeen</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cape Town</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graz</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nottingham</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Liverpool</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budapest</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>/ 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madrid</td>
<td>/ 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva</td>
<td>/ 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brighton</td>
<td>/ 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bradford</td>
<td>/ 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oruro-Bolivia</td>
<td>/ 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Odessa</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valparaiso</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thassaloniki</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edinburg</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chicago</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Melbourne</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bizerta</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moscow</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vslac</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sussex</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marseille</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maribor</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subotica</td>
<td>/ 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
of texts published about Ivan Meštrović’s artistic activities, as well as about his life. Furthermore, Duško Kečkmet’s unpublished manuscript, Ivan Meštrović: Bibliografija, was used as an important source which contributed greatly to this analysis.86 However, the aim of this analysis is not to provide an exhaustive interpretation of Ivan Meštrović’s individual exhibition projects. Rather, it is to take note of and try to interpret certain interesting moments found through the application of procedures that differ from the traditionally established procedures in art history practice. This includes the use of digital tools which can set in motion an inert assembly of data to recognize new discourse platforms which enable us to examine one artist’s oeuvre or life trajectory.

For instance, it is interesting to examine where the largest frequency of texts on Ivan Meštrović, during 1910 and 1911, can be noted (Map. 1): Zagreb (220), Belgrade (69), Split (63) and Zadar (40). Unsurprisingly, Zagreb takes precedence, since there were two exhibitions held in that city in 1910, where Ivan Meštrović became synonymous with artistic-political expression. Regardless, the numbers related solely to his name are truly impressive, which speaks volumes about the propulsive nature of the artist who, at that time, had not even turned thirty. His artistic talent was unquestionable, which can be attested by the fact that he had already exhibited his work in important exhibitions, and received positive reviews. Even Auguste Rodin, himself, spoke highly of him.87 Nevertheless, all of this cannot be examined separately from the socio-political configurations present during the 1910s, in the period of consolidating the “New Course” policy, that is, the political programme whose primary goal was to improve the constitutional status of Croatian territories within the Austro-Hungarian Empire, i.e., their unification (Banovina of Croatia and Dalmatia). This policy was promoted by Ante Trumbić, Franjo Supilo, and Pero Čingrija, all of whom Meštrović knew personally, maintained correspondence with (especially later on), and even made portraits of some of them. That policy, through the adoption of two documents, the Zadar and Rijeka Resolutions, enacted the prerogative of forming a Croatian-Serbian alliance, that is, the founding of the Coalition in 1906 – at first with Supilo at the head, and after he stepped down, with Svetozar Pribičević. All of these names are present in Meštrović’s correspondence, and they constitute important elements of his later “political” networking. The conversion of the data into a digital medium, and its processing, in fact, point to the overlapping of the crucial locations of Meštrović’s critical fortune with locations of important political activities, with the ramifications thereof becoming most pronounced during the 1910s: Zagreb-Belgrade-Split-Zadar.

Nevertheless, the appearance of Saint Petersburg on the map of Meštrović’s reception during these early years is definitely surprising. It should be mentioned that the number of published texts is not large, but it is more than sufficient to raise the question of Ivan Meštrović’s presence within the artistic discourse of that city, but also Russia in general. Most of the texts refer to Meštrović's reception in Russia, and they are published in local newspapers and journals, as well as in the works of Russian artists and critics. Barack Vujanović, in her essay “Dotočaji umjetnica: Auguste Rodin i Ivan Meštrović,” in Rodin u Meštrovićevo Zagreb, eds. Jasminka Poklečki Stošić and Barbara Vujanović (Zagreb: Umjetnički paviljon, Muzej Ivana Meštrovića, 2015), 60–84.

87 See more in: Barbara Vujanović, “Dotočaji umjetnica: Auguste Rodin i Ivan Meštrović,” in Rodin u Meštrovićevo
Meštrović’s success at the Rome exhibition.\textsuperscript{88} It is especially interesting that one of the texts was written by Alexandre Nikolayevich Benois, Russian artist and art critic known for his close collaboration with Sergei Diaghilev. The domestic public also took notice of that text and the “Russian opinion” on Meštrović.\textsuperscript{89} Indeed, Ivan Meštrović’s connections with the Russian cultural circle of that time have not been particularly noted up to this point. A digital map, of sorts, raises the question on the possibility to analyse and reconstruct these connections, while this text will later provide a “rough” sketch of their possible physiognomy. The following two maps clearly show the dissemination of information on Meštrović’s work and his engagement as a sculptor, after successful exhibitions in Europe (Map 2 and Map 3). After his successful London exhibition, he also toured other British cities, thus frequent written mentions of the artist were to be expected in the British cultural circle. However, it is relatively surprising that there is a certain number of texts from South America that also referred to the artist. It is intriguing that Meštrović also received letters from South America, primarily due to the economically motivated immigration wave from Croatia, starting at the end of the 19th century, but also due to the more recent immigration waves. Immigrant communities disseminated information about cultural events and political initiatives, especially about the work of the Yugoslav Committee.  

\textsuperscript{88} Yakov Tugehhol’d, “O Meštrovićevim djelima na Rimskoj izložbi,” Apollon (1911); Alexandre Nikolajevič Benois, “O Meštroviću povodom Međunarodne izložbe u Rimu”, Ryech (1911).  

\textsuperscript{89} “Rus o Meštroviću”, Srbozan, 4 April 1911; “Ruski sud o Meštroviću”, Brankovo kolo, 13 October 1911; “Ruski glas o Meštroviću”, Narodni list, 9 September 1911.  

For example, in Argentina, the magazine Jadran was launched in Buenos Aires, and it published texts about Meštrović and his European exhibitions. The texts were written by Meštrović himself, his friend and English critic, James Bone, and the prominent members of the Yugoslav Committee, Josip Jelélovský, Ljubo Leontić, and Marjan Marjanović. Naturally, this geographic distribution of critical texts is also accompanied by the respective Meštrović’s correspondence. For example, whereas Ljubo Leontić wrote very favourably to Meštrović about his life in South America – Antofagasta in Chile, and Buenos Aires in Argentina – expressing his opinions on the Yugoslav question and the work of the Committee, Marjanović was not overly satisfied with his stay in Valparaíso in Chile, where he lived in 1918.\textsuperscript{90}  

Furthermore, the maps show that Meštrović’s success was recorded even in India, namely, Kolkata. The direct connections between the artist and India have not yet been established – at least not in that period – but certain individuals linked to Meštrović were in direct contact with the Indian cultural milieu.

In that regard, we should mention Ananda Coomaraswamy, whose efforts in promoting Indian art might have had a certain morphological effect on Meštrović’s art in 1917 or 1918, which definitely requires further study and comparative analysis. Also worth mentioning is Abdullah Yusuf Ali, from Bombay by birth and part of the Islamic tradition, who published a booklet on Meštrović’s art in London, in 1916, and who exchanged correspondence with and even met with the artist in London and Paris. Therefore, such a geographical dispersion of texts about Meštrović, and their visualization, actually prompt the need to reconstruct Meštrović’s presence in certain cul-

\textsuperscript{90} Meštrović’s Correspondence: Leontić, Ljubo, ident. 508 and Marjanović, Milan, ident. 542 (AAM, Zg, pup).
tures or continents, which, in large part, has not yet been addressed or emphasized in the interpretations of the artist’s work or life. This also applies to the African continent, where certain texts were also published, but which cannot be further explicated at this point. However, with additional insights into the issue of the modernist heritage in Africa, this predicament is sure to change.

UNREALISED EXHIBITIONS
IN RUSSIA AND AMERICA

The data on the reception of Ivan Meštrović’s work in Russia, i.e., Saint Petersburg, were noted as early as 1911, and result from Meštrović’s intense exhibition activities and success at the International Fine Arts Exhibition in Rome. The connections with Russian culture are not one-sided, and they were most certainly mediated by Signorelli’s social salon in Rome because Olga was of Russian origin and many important cultural protagonists from Russia gathered in her Salon. Furthermore, it is important to mention Meštrović’s exchange of letters with writer and journalist, Alexander Amfičatov, who had connections with Saint Petersburg and Sergei Diaghilev. However, the initiative for organizing an exhibition in Saint Petersburg was undertaken at a somewhat later date in 1916. We should also mention a very interesting letter which was sent to Meštrović from Odessa, on 29 March 1916, by writer Josip Kosor (Ill. 4). Kosor had been truly excited that he would see Meštrović at the exhibition in Saint Petersburg, and he informed Maksim Gorki of that occasion, so he expressed regret over postponing the exhibition till autumn. As he notes, he was asked to put off the publishing of his essay until the beginning of autumn when the exhibition would open. However, he already had the text translated into Russian and sent it to Gorki in Saint Petersburg for his chronicle. Kosor wrote to Meštrović that the ambassador of the Kingdom of Serbia in Russia, Miroslav Spalajković, would certainly support Meštrović’s exhibition and help in its realization.

Meštrović would soon receive a letter from university professor Pavle Popović, a renowned philologist and a politically active member of the Yugoslav Committee, urging him to cancel the exhibition in Russia, and reorient to Paris, due to financial obstacles. This turn of events cannot really be explained by one specific event, but it might have resulted from a discussion that certain political protagonists had in relation to the question of the South Slavic unification, which certain individuals in Russia did not support. On 15 June 1916, Miroslav Spalajković sent an official telegram to Meštrović, informing the artist that the committee in Saint Petersburg can only provide moral and not financial support for his exhibition. He furthermore suggested that the organization of the exhibition be funded by the Yugoslav Committee or the Government of the Kingdom of Serbia.

During May 1916, Ivan Meštrović sent letters to Ante Trumbić, inquiring about the exhibition. Namely, he made all the necessary arrangements for the transport of the artworks, and it was his intention to also send new artworks, religious in character, which he created in Geneva. He pointed out that

91 Meštrović’s Correspondence: letter from Josip Kosor to Ivan Meštrović, ident. 461 A1 (AAM, Zg, Pup).
92 Meštrović’s Correspondence: Popović, Pavle, ident. 698 (AAM, Zg, Pup).
93 Meštrović, Uspomene na političke ljude i događaje, 39-40.
94 Meštrović’s Correspondence: Spalajković, Miroslav, ident. 799 (AAM, Zg, Pup).
95 Meštrović’s Correspondence: Trumbić, Ante, ident. 868 (AAM, Zg, Pup).
he only expected that which the Prime Min-
ister of the Kingdom of Serbia, Nikola Pašić,
instructed to be done. In a letter sent at the end of May, he broached the issue of insur-
ance, without which the artworks could not be transported, so it was necessary to issue
an order from Saint Petersburg demanding procurement of the insurance either via the
Russian or Serbian embassy. He also wrote to Milenko Vesnić, ambassador of the King-
don of Serbia in Paris, concerning this issue, asking him to get in touch with Spalajković.
In June he also sent letters to Trumbić, asking for urgent action.

In the letters sent to him at the end of June, Ante Trumbić mentioned that both Pašić and
Vesnić, with whom he personally discussed the exhibition in Russia, were very positively
inclined. However, on 5 August 1916, in a letter Trumbić sent to Meštrović, it is obvious
that he was taken aback by the changes which had perspired in Saint Petersburg, and
advised Meštrović to write to Pašić as soon as possible, and to inquire about further ac-
tions regarding the exhibition. Organising an exhibition without political
implications and support was unfeasible, but since the support had been overdue,
even the information on the initiative to stage an exhibition of Meštrović’s works in
Saint Petersburg eventually dissipated. It was important to present this information to
demonstrate Meštrović’s aptitude in discus-
sions with politicians about organising an
exhibition as a cultural and political project.
However, as one initiative was discontinued,
another gained momentum: the affirmation
of Ivan Meštrović in America.

It a well-known fact that the initiative to
stage Meštrović’s exhibition in America
was set off by his great success at the In-
ternational Fine Arts Exhibition in Rome,
1911, and primarily prompted by Cornelia

Sage-Quinton, the director of the Buffalo
Fine Art Academy – Albright Art Gallery in
Buffalo. Furthermore, it is indicative that on
30 June that same year, Christian Brinton –
who would conceive and curate the exhibi-
tion in the Brooklyn Museum in New York
in 1924 – sent Meštrović a letter, because
he saw some of his works in Europe, giving
special praise to the works exhibited in Mu-


Il. 5

The letter of Catherine D. Groth to Ivan Meštrović, New York, dated 16 December,
1916. Letter from the Correspondence collection of Atelier Meštrović Archives,
Zagreb, ident. 345 A7, courtesy of Mate Meštrović)
was an exceptionally successful manager who could bring Meštrović not only moral but also material success in America. This exhibition was a collaborative project on a higher political level as well. Namely, at the beginning of November, Milenko Vesnić sent a telegram to Groth from Paris, informing her that the prince regent, Alexander Karadorđević, agreed to be the patron of the exhibition. Groth informed Meštrović about this, providing a lot of interesting information in the letter sent on 16 December 1916 (Ill. 5). Namely, Christian Brinton was mentioned in the letter as the person in charge of the catalogue, and Cornelia Sage for museums outside New York. Also of interest is the naming of prominent New York cultural figures who promised initial financial support. Among those mentioned was the wife of Harry Payne Whitney, Gertrude Vanderbilt Whitney, a well-known patron of the arts and a sculptor herself, future founder of the famous New York museum, Henry Clay Frick, an industrialist, patron of the arts, and future founder of the Frick Collection in New York, Thomas Fortune Ryan, industrialist and businessman, and Otto Hermann Khan, a banker, philanthropist and patron of the arts. Of course, the key figure was the scientist Mihajlo Pupin. However, the war and the precarious transport conditions interrupted the organisation of the exhibition and it was postponed until it was finally scrapped. Throughout the correspondence, it is interesting to take note of Catherine D. Groth’s resolute business attitude, since Meštrović’s former associates had certain complaints about her, especially Božo Banac, who was in charge of the transport of the artworks. This is made clear in the letters he sent to the sculptor, where he commented, among other things, that the names Groth mentioned were truly the wealthiest people in New York, but that he should be wary because she would demand a hefty percentage. It seems that things got more complicated over the following months, leading Milan Ćurčin to write to Ivan Meštrović on 5 March 1917, saying he did not think that there was any conspiracy on the part of Groth, since she still wanted to manage the entire project, but that it was obvious that she was also, naturally, working in her own favour. He stated that she actually perceived everything as a business arrangement. Shortly afterwards, in March, all the packaged artworks were returned to London, supposedly because trans-Atlantic ships were in danger of being torpedoed. Looking at the geographic distribution maps of texts about Ivan Meštrović, it is interesting to note his gravitation towards the western hemisphere, which would, in a way, ensure his affirmation in America in the following period, attested by his solo exhibitions held – first in the Brooklyn Museum, and then in other American cities – and the fact that he was commissioned to create a sculpture of the Equestrian Indians by the city of Chicago. On these occasions, Cornelia Sage and Malvina Hoffman proved to be very apt “managers”. It is especially interesting to note that women were the ones who undertook much of the initiative and activity in organizing Meštrović’s exhibitions in America, as well as in his promotion in that cultural space.
Active between 1928 and 1959, the International Congress of Modern Architecture (CIAM - Congrès Internationaux d’Architecture Moderne) was a leading forum on modern architecture and urbanism, playing a key role in their affirmation and dissemination both before and after the Second World War. Over the course of ten thematically focused congresses, several executive committee and council sessions, and numerous meetings, CIAM evolved as an extensive international network of architects. The logic of its organisation combined two opposing models, which were typical for architecture and fine arts of the 19th and 20th century – a model of artistic/architectural groups that were founded on ideologically and formally close standpoints, and a model of professional association. Whereas the first model of organisation is often based on informal, non-hierarchical relations, the second model is often characterised by a centralised decision-making process. As we argue in this paper, the frictions of these essentially different organisational concepts, are one of the main causes of discursive ruptures that lie behind the turbulent evolution and finally the end of CIAM. Although gathered around a common idea of modern architecture, CIAM members did not have the possibility of independent creative action and expression of personal stances, nor any real opportunity to participate in the overall decision-making. Aspiring to overcome academism and secure a predominant position of new architecture within an official public discourse, CIAM followed a strictly defined hierarchical structure, similar to the organisation of professional associations.

The second, not less significant reason of discursive ruptures were the differences in the understanding of architecture’s social role and the associated political views of CIAM’s members. From the perspective of groups close to the left political spectrum, the role of architecture surpassed the technical and formal aspects of the profession and delved into the domain of social and political action. This view was opposed to the idea of architecture as a technical discipline with no predefined ideological position, which can easily align with different political standpoints. Ideological conflicts were also the conflicts between generations that were advocating different models of CIAM’s organisation and action. Therefore, there was the “revolutionary youth” yearning for democracy on one side, and older generation prone to opportunism on the other. The latter primarily refers to Le Corbusier, CIAM’s secretary Sigfried Giedion and Walter Gropius, who were in favour of an autocratic type of management of CIAM.

Despite different standpoints and frequent conflicts, CIAM was perceived as a monolithic organisation. Along with Le Corbusier, its co-founder and ideologist, CIAM became the synonym of modern architecture rooted in the canonical concepts of “a functional city” and “five points of modern architecture”. As pointed out by Kenneth Frampton, the image of CIAM began to be perceived differently because of the research and publications that the positions assumed significantly affected the approach to planning, building and design. The subject of controversy was the level of typifying, standardisation and prefabrication. While the Nazis were the opponents of Neues Bauen, which was deemed a communist and Jewish creation, the Italian group was in its favour.

104 They belonged to different political orientations – radical left, centre and right. While the Nazis were the opponents of Neues Bauen, which was deemed a communist and Jewish creation, the Italian group was in its favour.

105 The positions assumed significantly affected the approach to planning, building and design. The subject of controversy was the level of typifying, standardisation and prefabrication. Whilst the first group saw these as tools, the other understood them as a necessity.
by Ulrich Conrads and Eric Mumford, the author of the first comprehensive overview of CIAM's work, *The CIAM Discourse on Urbanism, 1928–1960*, which provided an insight into all its congresses, working bodies and participants.\(^{106}\) This book provides an insight into the role of each member of CIAM in the tailoring of its history and thus directly or indirectly – in the tailoring of the history of architecture and urban planning of the 20th century. In order to get a comprehensive view of the pre-war history of CIAM, it is equally important to look at the research undertaken within the project *Atlas of the Functional City: CIAM 4 and Comparative Urban Analysis* and to explore the research on Cornelis van Eesteren carried out by Kees Somer, while for the history of Team 10, Alison Smithson's *Team 10 Meetings 1953–1984* and the study of a group of authors Team 10: *In Search of a Utopia of the Present 1953–1981* were crucial.\(^{107}\) Based on the abovementioned sources, as well as on the research of archival materials from the Institut für Geschichte und Theorie der Architektur (gta) ETH in Zürich, the Fondation Le Corbusier in Paris and Het Nieuwe Iemand.\(^{106}\) 

---

**Fig. 1.**

Visualisation of the CIAM network differentiates participation on the pre-war (blue) and post-war (pink) congresses, pointing to the clear cut in the CIAM's history, as well as a number of omnipresent (overlapped) figures in the centre of visualisation.
Instituut in Rotterdam, this paper will for the first time show and analyse CIAM as a social network. The aim of this approach is to trace formation and transformation of left tendencies within the overall network and detect discursive ruptures which they directly or indirectly caused. This research was carried out using digital tools for network analysis and data visualisation developed within ART NET project. The network is visualised in a circular form, defined by the events that chronologically (clockwise) concatenate on its perimeter. Each of these events is linked with a line to the persons who participated in it. The participants of a single event remain outside the circle’s perimeter, whereas those who participated in two or more events are located within the circle. Based on a calculation of the measure of centrality, specific positions of persons within the circle point to their greater contribution to CIAM’s discourse (Fig. 1). Furthermore, the circle’s topography enables mapping of social encounters in time and space of individuals with a mission to promote modern architecture, CIAM very soon articulated an atypical organisational structure that serviced the main working platform – so-called working congresses. Set up according to the bottom-up model, CIAM national groups were the basis of this structure. Its members participated in the work of the CIAM’s general assembly, which was held during each congress.

The groups produced congress material used to articulate CIAM’s strategic documents – recommendations of relations between the persons within a clique requires processing additional archive material (the content of mutual correspondence, different types of cooperation, mentorships, friendships etc.), which goes beyond a mere presence at a same event. The latter is key to the overview and analysis of ruptures, which are in the focus of this paper.

MODUS OPERANDI OF CIAM AND ITS RUPTURES

Gathered in La Sarraz in 1928 as a group of individuals with a mission to promote modern architecture, CIAM very soon articulated an atypical organisational structure that serviced the main working platform – so-called working congresses. Set up according to the bottom-up model, CIAM national groups were the basis of this structure. Its members participated in the work of the CIAM’s general assembly, which was held during each congress. The groups produced congress material used to articulate CIAM’s strategic documents – recommendations of the work of Swedish geographer Torsten Hägerstrand (1916-2004). See: Torsten Hägerstrand, “What about people in regional science?”, Papers of the Regional Science Association no. 1 (1970): 6-21.

Although established as a biannual event, the congresses were held in 1928 (CIAM 1), 1929 (CIAM 2), 1930 (CIAM 3), 1933 (CIAM 4), 1937 (CIAM 5), 1947 (CIAM 6), 1949 (CIAM 7), 1951 (CIAM 8), 1953 (CIAM 9) and 1956 (CIAM 10).

The assembly provided personal contacts among CIAM members, enabled voting on declarations, and dissemination of CIAM’s objectives (Commission II. Reorganisation, in: CIAM 5 documents, Bridgewater, 1947 (Zürich: gta ETH, 42-AR-1-9).

106 The data on 331 architects, members of CIAM, 22 corresponding national groups and 32 events – CIAM congresses and related executive committee and council meetings was processed. The materials from the mentioned archives were used as a source of data on congresses, meetings and their participants, while the complete list of CIAM events brought by Eric Mumford was used as a reference point. (Mumford, The CIAM, 275-276).

107 The simultaneous and multiple type of space and time overview, as well as social events linked to it, which are the backbone of the proposed visualisation, theoretically relies on the concept of time geography, and more specifically on

for further development of urban planning and habitat of the 20th century. The themes (tasks) became more complex over time. Prior to the Second World War, these involved minimum dwelling (CIAM 2) and rational planning of residential areas (CIAM 3), functional cities (CIAM 4) and regional planning, i.e. “logis et loisir” (CIAM 5). After the Second World War, the congresses entailed several architectural and urban planning issues focusing on habitat (CIAM 7, CIAM 9 and CIAM 10) and the city “core” (CIAM 8) discussed through recent projects. Nominally, until the Second World War, the main body of CIAM organisation was the (Executive) Committee for the Solution of the Problems of Modern Architecture (CIRPAC – Comité international pour la réalisation des problèmes d’architecture contemporaine), CIRPAC directed and organised the work of CIAM. It was composed of two representatives – delegates – from each national group who controlled the flow of information from CIRPAC to the national base and who introduced new national members to CIAM. This type of organisational structure entirely relied on personal contacts, friendships and connections. Unlike international professional organisations, whose members are nominated by national professional entities, this type of organisational structure is another particularity of CIAM, and the argument in favour of approaching it in terms of a social network. Regardless of the official organisational structure, decisions were taken from 1931 onward within the circle – Le Corbusier, Sigfried Giedion and Walter Gropius, who were later joined by José Luis Sert. The central position of core actors within CIAM’s network confirms their influence (Fig. 1). At last their position was formalised during the first post-war congress by their appointment to the newly founded executive body – Council, while CIRPAC lost its importance. National groups continued to have their delegates, but they no longer participated in the work of CIAM’s executive body. Taking into consideration the desire for democratisation of CIAM, the establishment of the Council, whose task was “to meet more frequently for the direction of CIAM and the representation of CIAM aims”, produced quite the contrary effect. The position of national groups remained the same (each country was allowed to be represented by several groups, and so France had groups Ascoral and Bâtir, and the Netherlands Opbouw and De8), while the impact of the delegates on CIAM’s policy and programme was significantly reduced and extremely localised. Furthermore, as the visualisation shows (Fig. 1), there is a clear cut between CIAM’s network prior and post war, which is confirmed by a relatively low number of names appearing in both periods. The group with a continuity of presence, having thus the biggest impact

111 The setting up of the council was the result of reorganisation, which was the topic of the first post-war congress in Bridgewater in 1947. A separate commission was in charge of discussed congress topics. This practice was already established before the Second World War.

112 The delegates or vice-delegates shall be accepted as the intermediaries for ensuring that the work of the local groups is in conformity with the aims of CIAM.” Commission II. Reorganisation, in: CIAM 5 documents, 9.
on CIAM, is the mentioned clique that is located in the central position within the network’s topography.

Notwithstanding the significance of Le Corbusier’s role in the history of architecture or his unique talent, from the very beginning, CIAM existed in Le Corbusier’s shadow. The uncompromising imposition of his own vision of architecture and urbanism, his professionally dubious actions and political views, elitism, egocentrism and desire for power placed him at the very centre of CIAM’s network. At the same time, his central position was also an incentive to develop a different vision of CIAM’s organisation and to rethink the social role of architecture. Le Corbusier’s most fervent critics and opponents were recruited from the circle of his collaborators. Therefore, Le Corbusier can be seen as the centre of CIAM’s network but also the main cause of the abovementioned ruptures.

Le Corbusier was continuously opposed by the cliques of left-wing architects, the advocates of the idea of an egalitarian democratic society, which they wished to introduce into CIAM organisation. The composition, dynamics and mode of action of these cliques changed in sync with the changes of social and political circumstances. Given the historical context, the roles of cliques moved from founders/leaders (1928–30) and opposition/rebels (1932–37) to reformers (1953–59). They all shared a common understanding of architecture as a tool for developing a more equitable society and advocated

Fig. 2
Visualization of the CIAM network shows distribution of the members of the three left-oriented cliques (founders, rebels, reformers) and the CIAM leadership along with the participation of each person in different congresses (grey lines).

116 The first and the second clique was focused on the existential minimum (slums clearance and social housing) while the third clique delved into a stimulating living environment under the conditions of constant growth and mass housing production in a welfare state.
participation and teamwork as opposed to the hierarchy imposed by the CIAM leadership. In the centre of each of these three left-wing cliques of CIAM, there were one, or more individuals who were either initiators or mediators of ideas, capable of gathering like-minded individuals around them. The first clique included Ernst May (b. 1886), Hans Schmidt (b. 1893) and Mart Stam (b. 1899), the second was made of Ernest Weissmann (b. 1903) and José Luis Sert (b. 1902), while the third one gathered Georges Candilis (b. 1913) and Jaap Bakema (b. 1914). All three cliques have already been explored and their genealogies are known. The first clique gathered the members of the constructivist Swiss ABC group and the associates of Ernst May involved in the construction of Neue Frankfurt, later the so-called May’s brigade. The second clique was made mostly of young European architects who worked in Le Corbusier’s studio in the late 1920s and early 1930s, and the third one involved the members of Team 10, among whom was another Le Corbusier’s collaborator, Georges Candilis. Personal contacts and cooperation with Le Corbusier seemed to be a precondition for the critical attitude towards his political, architectural and urban planning con-


Fig. 3
Visualization of the CIAM network shows CIAM leadership and distribution and the shape of the left-oriented cliques, pointing to their evolution and interconnectivity in space and time.
The analysis of the visualisation of the CIAM's network helps to locate the ruptures caused by the formation of the mentioned cliques – to determine a place and time of their beginning and to identify the mediators – persons who provide their continuity. The first one took place between the CIAM’s Second Congress in Frankfurt in 1929 and “Special Congress” in Berlin in 1931. The second rupture occurred during the Fourth Congress in Athens in 1933, while the third one came to be exactly two decades later, on the occasion of the Ninth Congress in Aix-en-Provence in 1953.

May, Schmidt, Stam and their like-minded associates briefly led CIAM, from its founding congress in La Sarraz in 1928, until the preparation of CIAM 3 when all participants were acquainted with the achievement of the Weimar Republic – new workers’ housing estates and social standard facilities. Only after this group left to the USSR in 1930 and formed the so-called May’s Brigade, did Le Corbusier come to power.119

After this first wave of exodus of German architects to the USSR, the second exodus occurred in the mid-1930s when the Nazis came into power. Many left-wing and Jewish architects, including those who returned from the USSR disappointed with Stalin’s politics, left for the Great Britain and the USA. As a consequence, the engagement of May’s Brigade members in the further work of CIAM was limited to a minimum, but their contribution was never irrelevant. They were the ones to encourage the young, both directly and indirectly, to rebel in 1933 and 1937. In this year, Eugen Kaufmann and Mart Stam participated in CIAM 5 in Paris along with Arthur Korn (Fig. 2).121

After the Second World War, two of Meyer’s “brigadiers” continued to be active in CIAM – Margarete Schutte-Lihotzky, acting as the delegate for Austria, and Werner Hebebrandt, representing West Germany. The post-war position of West German architects within international organisations was far from obvious. In the topography of the CIAM’s network, Schutte-Lihotzky is very close to Michel Ecochard and Vladimir Bodiansky, while Hebebrand is close to the members of Team 10. Their potential direct personal contacts with Team 10 are yet to be explored. Hans Schmidt and Ernst May, as the founders of the first left clique, participated only in one congress after CIAM 2 in Frankfurt. While May’s presence at the last CIAM congress in Dubrovnik was almost a symbolic one, the presence of Hans Schmidt at CIAM 7 in 1947 in Bergamo seems to be an important one. His participation marked a first direct link between the founders and reformers, future members of Team 10. Schmidt is therefore, given his particular mediating position, located closer to the centre of the network’s topography (Fig. 2). The same can be said for Mart Stam who took part in introducing Ernest Weismann, and thus the second generation of “rebels”, to CIAM as early as in 1928.

“The rebels” were doomed to fail because of the lack of their authority. They were mostly young architects, born in the beginning of the 20th century, who were unable to achieve their potential amidst the omnipresent economic crisis. An exception to this was José Luis Sert, a member of GATCPAC, involved in the construction of a respectable number of public buildings during the Second Spanish Republic. Furthermore, together with Weismann and Sert, the core of the “rebels” involved Josep Torres Clavé, Charlotte Perriand, Pierre Jeanneret (Le Corbusier’s partner) and Jean Bossu. All of them, except Torres Clavé, worked in Le Corbusier’s studio where they were introduced to Sigfried Giedion and Mart Stam. The studio was a meeting point of CIAM’s senior leadership and members who would stop in Paris on their journeys through Europe. Le Corbusier rarely involved his collaborators in the discussions about CIAM and its organisation. For example, it was Weismann who proposed Sert’s participation at Frankfurt congress to Giedion, not Le Corbusier. Moreover, in a letter sent to Giedion, Weismann complained that Le Corbusier did not share any information with his collaborators. For him, CIAM was a circle of elite architects, rather than a polygon for the affirmation of young generations.122

Weissmann and Sert are centrally located in the CIAM’s network helps to locate the ruptures caused by the formation of the mentioned cliques – to determine a place and time of their beginning and to identify the mediators – persons who provide their continuity. The first one took place between the CIAM’s Second Congress in Frankfurt in 1929 and “Special Congress” in Berlin in 1931. The second rupture occurred during the Fourth Congress in Athens in 1933, while the third one came to be exactly two decades later, on the occasion of the Ninth Congress in Aix-en-Provence in 1953.

119 Mumford, The CIAM, 59.

120 Hannes Meyer also participated in CIAM 1. Hans Schmidt left for Moscow in 1930 to fill the position of advisor to the People’s Commissariat of Heavy Industry. Along with his international reputation, acquired in the 1920s thanks to publicist and theoretical work, Le Corbusier also realised his first public building at that time.

121 Arthur Korn was not the Brigade member, but he shared its fascination with USSR.


123 This is explicitly seen in the invitations sent for CIAM 1, one of these being addressed to Weismann’s professor Hugo Ehrlich. Weismann attended CIAM 2 together with Sert and Kunio Maekawa. Ernest Weismann, Letter to Sigfried Giedion, November 19, 1930 (Zürich: gta ETH, 42-K-1930-4).

124 Giedion and Van Eesteren’s visit to Moscow preceded the cancellation of the congress. The congress was postponed in order to prepare a thorough overview of new soviet cities with the aim of comparing them to the cities of the capitalist West. The visit was possible, since the same year L’Architecture d’Aujourd’hui organised an excursion of French architects to the USSR Anon., “Architecture et urbanisme en U.R.S.S.”, L’Architecture d’Aujourd’hui no. 8 (1932): 49-96.

125 They planned a trip to the USSR in 1933 prior to CIAM 4.
Focused on the pre-war “hemisphere” of CIAM’s activity, as the opponents to the leading figures (Fig. 2, Fig. 3). In the summer of 1933 in Athens, rebellious Croatian, Spanish and French architects were joined by their English, Polish and Dutch like-minded peers (Wells Coates, Szymon Syrkus, Helena Syrkus and Wim van Bodewegena). Dissatisfied with the intention to limit urban planning merely to technical aspects, the group suggested an alternative version of the Athens Charter, in order to bridge a gap between the political ‘inherent’ professionalism of architects, urban planners and civil-engineers and their real social-political functions in societies with different economic systems, at different levels of technology and industrialisation.126

A prerequisite for realising an alternative charter was the necessary change in the modality of land use and appropriation of the means of production. In order to achieve it, Weissmann proposed a radical political act – abolition of private ownership on behalf of the common good and the “distribution of urban elements irrespective of private interests”.127

Quite expectedly, the requests of young architects were unacceptable to the pragmatic leadership of CIAM. To Le Corbusier, architecture was the means to ensure status quo, and to prevent a possible revolution. At the first CIRPAC meeting held after CIAM 4 in London in 1934, Corbusier and Giedion managed to restrain the revolutionary youth’s ambitions.128 Once again, CIAM was designated as a par excellence professional association, providing exclusively technical solutions for the problems of the modern city. Their implementation was politicians’ responsibility. Afterwards, “rebels” briefly retreated into a “grey zone” but remained in contact and active, both within the British MARS Group and in the French CIAM Group.129 Aware of this shift, Gropius warned Giedion of the “communist” activity of certain CIAM members and urged him to decisively oppose to the intentions to push CIAM in a different direction.130

From 1935 on, Paris was the centre of CIAM’s left-wing tendencies, which reached peak during the time of the Popular Front government. Due to the rise of Nazism and the Spanish Civil War, the French group of CIAM took over the organisation of CIAM 5 in Paris in 1937.131 The French Group had already accrued an extremely complex and colourful history, both because of the conflict between Le Corbusier and leftist architect André Lurçat and because of a relatively large number of fluctuating foreign members such as Paul Nelson, now emigré José Luis Sert, and Weissmann. From 1935, the latter one continued to be the main mediator of the left-wing opposition. At CIRPAC meeting held in the same year in Amsterdam, the group was joined by Mart Stam who had just returned from the USSR. His engagement united the founders (May’s brigades) and the new generation of the CIAM left. Interestingly enough, Weissmann’s political role during the pre-war period, was three decades later assumed by Jaap Bakema, Stam’s graduate student, and a centralfigure of Team 10 (Fig. 3).

The second generation of rebels, born in the 1900s, suffered the greatest burden of the Second World War. Their personal participation in CIAM events dropped significantly after the War (Fig. 1). Within the network, rebels’ visibility is reduced, among other things also due to the mentioned reorganisation – foundation of Council and reduction of CIPRAC authority. Those who remained in CIAM joined the unaltered composition of leaders – Le Corbusier, Sigfried Giedion and Walter Gropius. José Luis Sert was an elected president, while Helena Syrkus became vice-president. The War marked a great cut, after which the work of the entire

126 Weissmann, “We had another version of the charter”.
127 Radna grupa Zagreb. The first draft of the alternative version of the Athens Charter, August 10, 1933 (Zagreb: Hrvatska akademija znanosti i umjetnosti, Hrvatski muzej arhitekture, Vladimir Antolčić Personal Archive)
128 Weissmann, Sert, Szymon Syrkus, Coates and Torres Clavé attended the meeting.
129 The “rebels” followed the established working agenda. Limited by funding they gathered right before the CIRPAC meetings.
131 It was initially planned to continue to work on the issue of the functional city discussing particular projects and then to proceed with regional planning. In January, it was then decided to go for a more populist theme, interesting to a broader public. The Congress was held at the time of the Paris International Exhibition.
132 The exhibition was held from 12 February until 9 March, 1935.
133 Other members of the commission were:
organisation had to begin from scratch (Fig. 1). The new beginning was not followed by enthusiasm and new themes and approaches. Instead of dealing with urgent social needs, such as post-war reconstruction and housing crisis, CIAM leadership continued to deal with the issues relevant to architectural profession, specifically, with the concept of synthesis in architecture. At that very moment, the huge post-war construction projects such as rebuilding Le Havre, Rotterdam and Warsaw had already started.

The new generation of left-wing architects born in the 1910s and 1920s took part in CIAM already in the 1940s. Jaap Bakema attended the first post-war congress in Bridgewater, CIAM 6 in 1947, and Georges Candilis the next one, CIAM 7 in Bergamo, in 1949.135 Both of them took part in anti-fascist resistance during the War and openly sympathized with the communist ideas. Thanks to the post-war welfare state, unlike their predecessors, they had a unique opportunity to take part in the construction of welfare facilities and housing for large numbers. Jaap Bakema and Georges Candilis boasted their first large public projects, international recognition and credibility already in the early 1950s. They also partially owed it to their successful business partnerships— Bakema to Johannes van der Broek, an established architect of the older generation, and Candilis to Le Corbusier’s ASCORAL and ATBAT-Afrique, whose members were Shadrach Woods and Vladimir Bodiansky.136 The reuniting with Eastern European architects was one of the major reasons for organising the last CIAM 10 in Dubrovnik, Yugoslavia, the country “in-between” the two blocks.137

Already during CIAM 7, the reformers started a discussion along the same lines of their predecessors.139 They acknowledged the lack of free distribution of land as the major issue of urban planning. Candilis, who attended discussions at CIAM 4 on the social assignment and role of “urbanists”, proposed the setting up of a special commission that would study “various possibilities of land mobilisation”.140 The request by Ernesto Nathan Rogers followed the same line of thought – he advocated the concept of humanist urbanism achieved by “communication du sol” as the official CIAM’s policy.141 Expectedly, Le Corbusier rejected all these proposals. He strongly believed that legislators, rather than architects, were obliged to provide conditions for the implementation of plans.142 In Bergamo, a discussion on the artistic aspect of architecture took place and Rogers reiterated the stances of the pre-war “left”. He argued that architecture must act economically, while the artistic expression should remain within the artistic field.143 The same was perceived by Marcel Lods who considered any discussion on the architectural form academism, and thus a complete failure. Lods focused on the pressing issues such as distribution of land and prefabricated housing.144 This discussion was probably one of the reasons for abandoning habitat as the theme of the next congress in Hadddeson in 1951. At CIAM 8, the theme was “the heart of the city”.145 The thematic change, however, did not stop polemical tones. The group of young architects argued for the necessity of reorganisation of CIAM and its leadership. After the three post-war congresses, it was obvious that CIAM lost its direction and the differences between the leadership, at that moment based in the United States, and the new generation in Europe were growing. The new generation was encouraged by the temporary appointment of Dane Vilhelm Lauritzen, Brit William Howell and Georges Candilis as Council members.146 Unlike the

135 Aldo van Eyck also participated in the work of CIAM from the mid-1940’s (Eric Munford, The CIAM, 172).

136 http://www.team10online.org/team10/candilis/index.html

137 The council members were József Fischer and Josef Havliček.

previous generation of rebels, positioned in the very centre of visualisation along with the core leadership, this threesome appears at its very rim. Along with Team 10 members, the threesome contributed to the formation of a dynamic clique that for the first time broke the perimeter of visualisation, implicating further turbulences and the final fall of CIAM (Fig. 3).

At the congress in Hoddesdon, Weissmann re-established contacts with CIAM. Immediately after his appointment to the position of director of the Housing and Town and Country Planning Section (Department of Social Affairs, The United Nations, New York), he offered to CIAM a cooperation on the issues of habitat and urban planning – through a newly established CIAM United Nations’ group. Sert refused the proposal, claiming that this was contrary to the UN rules. The collaboration was established through a working group appointed to develop a UN technical assistance programme. Gathering Jean Jacques Honegger, Vladimir Bodiansky, Georges Candilis, Michel Ecochard and Weissmann, the group established another direct link between the pre- and post-war leftist tendencies and once again, among its members were Le Corbusier’s collaborators (Fig. 3). Before the Second World War, Weissmann collaborated with Charlotte Perriand, Pierre Jeanneret and Jean Bossu, and on this very occasion, he was after members of ATBAT-Afrique – Bodiansky and Candilis. They were chosen for their experience in the underdeveloped countries. The working group in charge of the technical assistance programme became active in November 1952 in-between two events decisive for CIAM – a CIAM council and delegates meeting in Sigtuna in June 1952 and a breakthrough CIAM 9 in Aix-en-Provence in July 1953. In Sigtuna, the reformers met for the first time without the presence of Le Corbusier, Sigfried Giedion, Walter Gropius and Jose Luis Sert, discussing “what was to become of CIAM,” while in Aix-en-Provence Team 10 gathered for the first time on the roof of the Unité. Known as the congress of the youth, CIAM 9 marked the beginning of leadership “hand over”. Candilis emphasised the similarities between CIAM 4 and CIAM 9. Both congresses aimed to establish a charter (of functional city and habitat) and brought about the association of the leftists, who were critical of CIAM’s undemocratic decision-making and outdated approaches to the problems of the city. This time, the political issues were not in question. The young architects gathered around Team 10 were fed up with high modernism, architecture based on “five points” and the functional city. They were eager to start their own pursuit for new architectural and urban planning models that would correspond to the new urban programmes and new social needs. As Alison Smithson concluded, the interwar battle “for éspace, soleils, verdure” was over and they were eager to create the architecture of “hope, freedom, identity, change” and “invent architectural language appropriate to the evolving present.”

Already in Aix-en-Provence, Jaap Bakema and André Wogenscky made their way into the CIAM Council and the organisation of CIAM 10, entitled The Habitat: problem of inter-relationships. CIAM’s first proposals, statements and resolutions, was entrusted to Team 10 – Bakema, Georges Candilis, Peter Smithson and Rolf Gutmann. Although they were supervised by the leadership, their appointment gradually launched a “takeover” and reorganisation of CIAM. This was done with Le Corbusier’s support as he excluded himself from the leadership and directly supported Team 10 in his public address to CIAM 10’s participants. His letter was addressed to the pioneers of modern movement and to a new generation yet to come – the so-called “réaliseurs” – who would continue the mission of their predecessors and secure the future of CIAM.

148 ATBAT-Afrique was the African branch of ATBAT, Atelier des bâtisseurs, founded in 1947 by Le Corbusier, Vladimir Bodiansky, André Wogenscky and Marcel Pyl, with Jacques Lefèbvre as commercial manager. This so-called atelier was conceived as a research centre, where architects, engineers and technicians could work in an interdisciplinary fashion. Along with Candilis, Shadrach Woods was the second member of Team 10 active in Le Corbusier’s atelier. (Projet d’assistance techniques des Nations Unies (Zürich: gta ETH, 42-JT-12-317/353; http://www.team10online.org/team10/candilis/index.html)

149 Smithson, Team 10, 18.

150 CIAM 9 gathered around 3000 participants, including students. Handover was agreed during the meeting between Le Corbusier and Giedion in July 1955 in Paris. (Aspects of Program for CIAM X at Dubrovnik to be given final form at Padova, Aug. 2/3, 1956. (Zurich: gta ETH, 42-AR-14-130/131).

151 In CIAM manner, Team 10 produced its first official document – the Doorn Manifest – in early 1954.

152 Smithson, Team 10, 9–10.

153 The generation born in the 1900s was not neglected; they were also included in the group of founders. Le Corbusier was willing to step down from his role after appointed in Dubrovnik and headed by Jaap Bakema, the commission for re-organisation of CIAM was dysfunctional. Peter Smithson, one of its prominent members, openly advocated for CIAM’s dissolution. Negotiations between the commission on one side and Sigfried Giedion, Walter Gropius and Jose Luis Sert did not produce any results. After a three-year long search for a model of CIAM’s reorganisation, the young abolished all national groups and in Otterlo in 1959 re-established a flexible network of free, equitable and accountable individuals committed to the ideas of new architecture in the making. The gathering in Otterlo marked the end of CIAM and, officially, the end of a significant part of the history of architecture of the 20th century.

CONCLUSION

Due to the circumstances of its establishment, specific model of organisation and its internal dynamics, CIAM represents a paradigmatic example of an international social network that defined a modernist canon in architecture and urbanism. Given the impact of the leading figures, Le Corbusier in particular, this network was highly centralised (egocentric), with a hierarchical model of decision-making. It was precisely this feature of the network that produced repeated episodes of resistance, based on generational and ideological confrontations. By analysing personal contacts and various types of links within the ideologically and generationally close group of architects, this paper aimed at following the trajectory of the left-orientated clique of CIAM and detecting the moments of discursive ruptures that called the meeting with Team 10 in November 1954 (Message of Le Corbusier to the X Congress CIAM at Dubrovnik, in: CIAM 10 Dubrovnik 1956 (Zurich: gta ETH, 42-X-115A))
into question the views of the CIAM leadership. Since the left-oriented clique in general terms presents part of the official historiography of CIAM, the purpose of this research was to analyse this case in depth, deploying the new methodology that we deem a fundamental contribution of this paper.

The paper aimed to open up a new analytical field by relying on the relational database and network visualisations. Within this field, the history of architecture can be observed in terms of social networks (centrality, relations, social cliques), while the evolution of discourse can be put in relation to the social constellations within particular spatio-temporal coordinates. As the case of CIAM’s left suggests, this approach to data visualisation focuses on the detection of alternative or parallel historical trajectories, “small histories” and peripheral phenomena that destabilise and question the positions of power of central historical narratives and predominant, mostly male figures who defined them.

Specifically, some of the visualised social relations open a question of potential links between architects that were not in the focus of research up until now. At the same time, the proposed methodology points to a further research of the spatio-temporal trajectories of individuals, dynamics of CIAM’s national groups and the modality and medium of dissemination and transition of architectural and urban concepts in particular cultural settings and under specific historical circumstances. With the need to streamline the entry of a greater amount and more detailed data from primary and secondary sources in the database, this phase of research is yet to be reached.

154 The database developed within the ARTNET project allows for the entry of data on architectural projects, competitions, journals, publications, exhibitions and architectural and artistic groups.
INTRODUCTION

History of international art movement New Tendencies, attracted researchers attention just recently, following a (re)discovery of the series of discursive events (seminars, conferences, colloquia), and exhibitions (Computers and Visual Arts, Tendencije 4, Art and Computers, Tendencije 5), held in Zagreb, at the end of the 1960’s, and at the beginning of 1970s. Shortly after they were “discovered” – between 2006, and 2010 – New Tendencies became the subject of several large international exhibitions, presenting legacy of the movement in terms of an important and forgotten episode of new media art history. Art works and printed materials (exhibition catalogues, magazines, working papers), private and official correspondence among the artists, curators, and theorists engaged in discussions on the “computer supported visual research”, a central theme of New Tendencies between 1968 to 1973, were carefully collected, described, and interpreted in order to provided a discursive framework for the inclusion of that particular episode from the overall story of the movement.


157 See, for example, Rosen, A Little Known.

descriptions of working procedures, communication practices, personal, and professional relationships among artists, art groups, and cultural professionals involved with the movement, they also provided a detailed, theoretically informed analysis of New Tendencies’ ideological, and social aspirations, presented on the background of the global Cold War politics, and in relation to the transition from industrial to post-industrial, information society. Descriptions of New Tendencies as an attempt in formulating a socially progressive artistic practice engaged with science and technology, also assumed explanations of its inner conflicts, and contradictions grounded in a thorough examination of historical documentation (publications, private and official letters, manuscripts), public responses (exhibitions reviews in daily press and specialized magazines, critical studies, polemics), and comparison with similar artistic tendencies at other European locations.

As a consequence, some previous explanations of the important turning points and well-known events from the overall history of the movement were proven to be ideologically biased, and superficial. The same could be claimed for the contact points, divergences and borderslines among certain political and aesthetic choices constituent to its programmatic orientation, seeming to be quite different if approached from the perspective informed by the social and political history of the 1960s, and 1970s. In other words, those recent findings, and accounts made it clear that it is necessary to conduct a thorough reexamination of both poetic and political configuration of New Tendencies.

The attempt in describing process of articulation, and dissemination of the discourse on art and technology created in the context of that art movement between 1961 and 1965, that is, the attempt in describing series of exhibitions, and discussions comprising for the chronology of the movement’s transition from the framework of neo-avant-garde artistic subculture to the realm of institutional culture, grounded on the reconstruction and analysis of exhibition, which is in the focus of this study, represents a contribution to this effort in reexamination, and reinterpretation of New Tendencies. Period between 1961 and 1965, that is, from the first to the third Zagreb exhibition,159 critical for the articulation of New Tendencies’ view on the art-science-technology relation, is distinguished from the next phase in their history (1968-1973), as a phenomenological, artistic, and – in terms of the engaged approach to the existential reality of modern, industrial society – cultural entity on its own right, which is, as such, also included in the historic narratives on kinetic and programmed art of the 1960s. Although inscribed in those narratives as an international art movement, the insistence on self-imposed theoretical, and formal rigor, and on the “ideological concentration and commonality of goals”, typical for the organization model of art movement, was apparent only in period between 1963 and 1965. What New Tendencies were before that short-time interval, and after 1965, how they were organized and which was their modus operandi is another, serious question.

Some authors as, for example, Piotr Piotrowski, perceive New Tendencies as an ambitious, periodical exhibition of contemporary art,160 which managed to transcend national and ideological borders established by the Cold War politics. Preferring the signifier “New Tendencies biennale”, and basically referring to the rhythm of Zagreb exhibitions, such approach tends to overlook the overall meaning and effects of numerous discussions, working meetings, publications, international conferences, competitions, and other events configuring temporal landscape of New Tendencies. It is, of course, true that Zagreb exhibitions sustained their biannual rhythm – with the single exception of the interval between the third and fourth exhibition – throughout the entire period between 1961 and 1973, but at the moment when Zagreb City Council brought a decision to turn New Tendencies in the periodical presentation of contemporary art, at the beginning of 1962, the intensive discussions on its potential to outgrow such format, were already underway.161 In that respect, describing New Tendencies as just another, although important “biannual exhibition” of the Cold War era, might be unjustified, but it is – from my point of view – as inappropriate, as it is a widely accepted signifier “international art movement”. Gathering, over the period of twelve years a several hundred artists from three continents, and from both sides of the Iron curtain, New Tendencies were simply too big, and lasted too long, to maintain the level of formal coherence, poetic integrity, and theoretical rigor implied by the term “artistic movement”. There were, however – as in the period between 1963 and 1965 – some serious attempts in defining a common program, shared goals and rules of conduct intended to provide New Tendencies with the prerogatives of an art movement. However, both the nature of these prerogatives, that have been too formal, and restrictive, and the oppressive manner of the attempts of their impositions were met with the resistance. The response to such attempts in a wider cultural context sympathetic to the concept of “art as research”, was a mixture of approval and restraint, or as American artist and art critic Georg Rickey has put it, “There is something necrological about isolating and labeling a movement, at any rate by an outsider. But if the participants become aware of what they have in common and begin to pool their thinking, an event of some importance in history takes place”.162 It is quite possible that Rickey’s opinion was

---


160 Piotr Piotrowski, “Why were there no great Pop art curatorial projects in Eastern Europe in the 1960s?” Baltic Worlds 3-4 (2015), 10-16.

161 Among the meetings on that subject, the most important was the one held at the studio of group GRAV, in Paris, in November 1962.

modeled according to his involvement in the sphere of influence of group ZERO – a loose, and unrestrictive type of associations among artists, art groups and art collectives – which, regardless of poetic and theoretical similarities, did not make any attempt in “labeling and isolating” those similarities. Most probably because then, in mid-1960s, it was simply at odds with the period’s Zeitgeist.

The opinion of Armin Medosch is a bit different, and he claims that the failure to carry on such transformation was one among the important reasons why New Tendencies found themselves at the brink of dissipation in mid-1960s.163 If approached from the perspective of their social, and political aspirations, the attempt to counteract the intensified commodification of art and devastating influence of art market, assumed – apart from disciplined, joint action guided by clearly defined objectives – the “historical (self)consciousness”, and “theoretical awareness”164 that – in case of New Tendencies – was not achieved to the extent required for the transformation into an art movement. From the perspective of the events comprising for the story of New Tendencies in late 1960s, however, the very fact that such transformation did not happen, seems as a very important reason because of which they have managed to survive – not only the severe crisis in the aftermath of the 1965 exhibition, but also some tensions, and critical situations generated both inside, and outside of their ecosystem. That what kept them going – in my opinion – was gradual and spontaneous development of New Tendencies as a social network running in the background of the pursuits for a more structured – formalized, restrictive and exclusive – model of organization. Grounded both in institutional and interpersonal ties, its core was established between 1961 and 1965, due to skillful exploitation of its communication potentials, from 1967 on developed into a versatile social structure, which had an important role in changing the course of New Tendencies. Enlarged and invigorated by the influx of new artists, art groups, and – in particular – art theorists, it has become a strong reining point of the activities conducted the last phase of New Tendencies, which also involved charting of the their new organizational structure165 that was dynamic, flexible, open towards different, experimental art practices, much closer to the present-day concept of artistic platform, than to the notion of art movement.


However, since in the observed period between 1961 and 1965, New Tendencies were at least partially operating as art movement, I am going to use that signifier in this study, more as a matter of convenience, than as a reference to the model of organization to which they pertained.

METHODOLOGY

As it was already stated, the articulation and dissemination of New Tendencies’ discourse on art and science, and their transition from the social and artistic context of neo-avant-garde artistic subculture to mainstream institutional culture, will be described on the background of the exhibitions held between 1961 and 1965, interconnected by same participants (artist, art groups, curators, organizers), and presented through the series of network visualizations. Methodology applied is a combination of narrative interpretation of textual sources, network visualizations, and corresponding maps, that is, a combination of cultural and quantitative analysis, applied in a “soft mode” – that is, in a manner that gives the advantage to epistemic objectives of art history, over those of network analysis, relayed on customary concepts of centrality, detection of strong and weak ties, identification of structural holes, etc. It is focused on the structure of the whole network, and the relationship between network topography to the real-life situation of European avant-garde art scene in late 1950s and 1960s, captured and presented by the network visualizations.

The networks to which such analysis is applied is based on data about 213 single, collective, and thematic exhibitions, divided – in the interest of analysis – into four temporal groups: exhibitions held between 1958 and 1961, providing insight into the neo-avant-garde art scene at the time, that was also presented at the first New Tendencies exhibition; exhibitions organized in 1962-1963 representative for the configuration of the movement’s artistic environment in the stage of their consolidation, and recognition in terms of an authentic response to mainstream artistic culture; the exhibitions staged in 1964-1965, indicative of the New Tendencies’ appropriation by the institutional culture, and global art market. Professional and social network of New Tendencies, which brought together artists, art groups, and art collective who took part in all five Zagreb exhibitions, is also reconstructed, presented by network visualization, and explained in terms of ruptures and discontinuities in the overall history of the movement.

Analysis of exhibition networks, where the exhibitions are also understood as representative of particular artistic tendency, was expected to answer the following questions: How are the exhibitions in the network connected (through which artist, art groups, curators, art critics)? Which is the measure of their centrality? Which exhibitions / artists / art groups, are bridging the network or network’s structural holes? Do they play such role in just one time interval, or throughout the entire observed period? Data on the exhibitions, artists, art groups and exhibition spaces, which served as a foundation for network analysis and visualizations were collected from a variety of digital and analogue sources.166

165 It is Darko Fritz’s thesis that it is justified to describe New Tendencies as a network, rather than as art movement, due to the methods and practices of communication – combination of meetings, travels, and correspondence – adopted and widely used in the course of movement’s history; see see Darko Fritz, “New Tendencies”, Oris 54 (2008): 176-191.; by the same author, “Histories of Networks and Live Meetings. Case Study: [new] Tendencies 1961-1973 (1978)”, in Re-live09, Melbourne 2009. It was, however, the same communication model applied already in the late 1950s in the framework of neo-avant-garde subculture, but also in number of other social systems (economy, science, education), resulting from development of postal services, railroad and highway networks, and telecommunications, also stimulated by the changes in visa regimes in Europe after 1957.

166 The list of the used sources is far too long to be given in this study. References to the sources are entered in the ARNET database, and accessible at http://artnet.s2.novenaweb.info/web/Login.aspx?ReturnUrl=%2f-web%2fizlozba%2fPageIzlozbaList.aspx?page=3%26query=3%26period=0%26period=0%26tag=10%26sort=datum.
stored, and processed with the application of network visualization, and spatial data presentation interfaces, a built-in digital tools of ARTNET database.

Narrative interpretation of textual and visual sources, network visualizations, maps and data obtained by quantitative analysis is structured according Dieter Pörschmann's model of periodization applied in his recent study on the manifestations of artist-as-curator phenomena in the practice of group ZERO / ZERO movement. It assumes a subdivision of a series of events comprising for the overall history of certain phenomena, into a short-time intervals provided with the inner ("micro-scale") periodization of their own. Such division allows for more precise identification of key events and breaking points within the observed period's general chronology, also enabling a more precise determination of their role and meaning in the overall story on particular phenomenon, or process subjected to such type of analysis. Pörschmann's apportionment of the short-time intervals to which he subdivided account on the group ZERO, was also partially adopted and applied to periodization of the observed period in the New Tendencies early history, which therefore does not follow the usual chronology defined by the rhythm of exhibitions. In the interest of more precise description of New Tendencies' relationship with the artistic subculture of the neo-avant-garde, the period between 1958 and 1961 is also included, and approached as a "gestation phase" of the movement, which defined its initial poetic stratification.

**GESTATION PHASE: 1958 – 1961**

New Tendencies had its origins in the neo-avant-garde artistic subculture - a complex social structure, comprised of artist, art groups, art collectives, art critics, independent production, and dissemination spaces, and their public, sharing common psychological, physical, and emotional space, and loosely related by the common, critical view of the mainstream culture. From its nascent in mid-1950s, it was based on solidarity, mutual support, and, upon "the awareness that together you are strong, while alone you are lost in a world that does not understand and does not want to perceive what you are doing," shared among the representatives of different, not always clearly distinguishable artistic positions, brought together by the same sense of belonging to the new, technologically driven society, and by the shared fascination with its accelerated development that was radically transforming both human environment and sphere of social life. The generation which created social space of neo-avant-garde subculture, articulated its position not only in terms of the resistance to conservative cultural establishment, unresponsive to "visual requirements" of contemporary society, but also in opposition to postwar idea of social stability, reflected in the mainstream visual culture and its detachment from existential reality. Intense communication and exchange among the locations of most dynamic avant-garde activities - Düsseldorf, Munich, Paris, Antwerp, Amsterdam or Bern, but also among Padua, Udine, Ulm or Chalon - outlined in late 1950s, and at the beginning of 1960s outlined the (shifting) contours of a complex, rhymatistic social, artistic, and economic substructure that was created of numerous interconnected, intersected or just loosely related personal, and collective networks that were unified - regardless of poetic differences among their actors - by the strong opposition to the excessive subjectivity and existential anxiety of Art Informel's "loopy paintings full of pep and wild gestures, filthy wrinkles and antique oxidations." It's overwhelming, suffocating presence encouraged search for a different concept of art, assumed - in the mid-1950s - the feeling of loneliness, exclusion, and complete dependence on one's own devices. It will change towards the end of the decade into awareness that "other artists had the same feelings and were engaging in similar actions and approaches", and a desire for communication, which - according to Heinz Mack - in the case of group ZERO led to the formation of what we call nowadays a network and ... since all these artists in different countries had been at one stage in connection to one another, this word 'network' goes along with the fact that a net can capture everything, and can hold things together that might be lost if they are alone.


168 Term "gestation period" was first used by Armin Medosch in the similar context; see Medosch, Automation, 69.


Established between 1958 and 1961 by Otto Piene, Piero Manzoni, and Enrico Castellani, the Galleria Schmela formed part of a network of artist-run galleries that supported and showcased the works of key figures in the New Tendencies movement. This network, which included Galleria J, Galerie Schmela, Galerie Køpcke, and Galleria Azimut, among others, played a crucial role in promoting the neo-avant-garde artists' ideas and practices. The Galleria Azimut, for example, was a hub for the exhibition of works by Piero Manzoni, Lucio Fontana, and Heinz Mack, among others, and it contributed significantly to the development of the international art scene during this period.
the eight ZERO Abendausstellung, held in Otto Piene’s Studio in 1958. Taking the most prominent position in the network topography in the category of independent exhibition spaces, and established two years before Gallery Azimut, it was exemplary of artists’ self-organization in late 1950s, when, according to Heinz Mack, both his and Piene’s studios, were acting as “workshops, platforms for discussions and were used occasionally as gallery spaces, opening for one-night events, or used as meeting points for a few artists and friends”. In the course of 1957 and 1958, Piene and Mack organized there eight group exhibitions (Abendausstellungen 1 – 8), and several happenings involving artists from Belgium, Netherlands, Switzerland, and France. Collaboration with Italian artist started, as it was already mentioned, in 1958, at the end of that cycle. From 1959 on, Otto Piene’s Studio remained the stronghold of ZERO’s communication and networking, but curatorial activities, almost exclusively related to presentation of the group / ZERO movement/ were performed at other exhibition venues, both independent and commercial. In the category of commercial galleries, the most prominent position in network topography is occupied by Galerie Schmela. Established in 1957 in Düsseldorf, it owes such prominent position, and much of its real-life fame, to early, and close cooperation with Mack and Piene. Except


177 Heinz Mack even claims that he and Günther Uecker were the persons whom Alfred Schmela asked for advice on how to open his private gallery, and what to exhibit there. Schmela opening exhibition, Klien’s Yves, Propositions monochromes (1957) was organized, according to Mack, on the suggestion of artist Norbert Kricke; see in Bailey https://ocula.

for preparing their own exhibitions held in that gallery, Mack and Piene were also informally involved in organization of the exhibitions of their fellow artists (Yves Klein, Jean Tinguely, Lucio Fontana), and served as Alfred Schmela’s liaison with a wider neo-avant-garde community. Through Ira Moldow, whom Mack first met in Milan, he established relations with American artists, and was first in Germany – a few years later – to show the works of Robert Motherwell, and Kenneth Noland. Group ZERO also had contacts with Parisian Gallery Iris Clert, which staged Heinz Mack’s solo exhibition in 1958. However, a highly visible position of that gallery in network topography, is primarily the result of its ties with other exhibition venues, established through Yves Klein, and his numerous exhibitions held at both artist-run, and commercial galleries, and within a wide geographic area from Milan, Düsseldorf, Antwerp, London, and Amsterdam to Paris. It is also important to notice, that both Iris Clert and Gallery Schmela were – at the time – important liaisons of the neo-avant-garde artists with art-market, and institutional culture. Gallery Denise Réne performed the same function for the members of group GRAV, and for few Croatian artists, representatives of neo-constructivism, who entered the international art scene in 1958-1959. Through both of these groups her gallery established ties with New Tendencies, reaffirmed with the exhibition Art abstrait constructif international (Paris, 1961; Leverkusen, 1962), held three months after the New Tendencies, Com/magazine/conversations/heinz-mack/ Accessed June 23, 2018.

involving quite a few artists who also exhibited in Zagreb. Other artist-run galleries, as Gallery Nova, or Studio F, organized solo exhibitions of prominent artists with multiple ties to quite a few other, exhibition spaces, which lends to their importance. Both are positioned at edge of the network, together with few other exhibition spaces and artist-run galleries that were either established towards the end of the observed period (Studio N, Internationale galerij OREZ, New Vision Centre Gallery), or hosted the exhibitions held in late 1960, and 1961 (Galleria Pater, Galerie J, Galerie Køpcke). In spatial terms, network of neo-avant-garde’s infrastructure covered a large geographic area, spanning from northern Italy (Milan, Padua, Rome, Torino), over Switzerland (Zürich, Bern, Lausanne), Austria (Vienna), Germany (Düsseldorf, Munich, Berlin, Wes- baden, Ulm, Frankfurt), Netherlands (Arnhem, Amsterdam, Rotterdam, The Hague), Belgium (Antwerp), France (Paris), Great Britain (London), to Denmark (Copenhagen), to Socialist Yugoslavia (Map 1).

Representation of exhibitions’ spatial distribution also includes location of few public museums, not integral to the neo-avant-garde exhibition infrastructure network, but included in its structure because of the large exhibitions they have organized at the time, and which were firmly tied to other network actors. Up to the beginning of the 1960s, the majority of museums, curators, art critics and other professionals from cultural establishment, did not express particular interest in the neo-avant-garde artistic subculture. However, due to its intense exhibition activity, a divers neo-avant-garde artistic tendencies articulated during the above-described “gestation” phase, started to surface discourse on contemporary art at the end of the observed period. It will require at least three more years - from 1961 to 1964 - before those tendencies will start to attract the interest of art market. However, since the pre-

Fig. 2
Network of exhibitions held between 1958 and 1961, denoting relations between the neo-avant-garde subculture, and institutional, mainstream culture
condition to their inclusion in the economy of institutional culture was the establishment of a proper contestation framework, exhibitions _Kinetics Kunsth_ organized at Stadt Kunstgewerbemuseum in Zürich (1960), _Konkrete Kunst: 50 Jahre Entwicklung_, organized by Helmhau, also in Zürich (1960), and Mono-chrome Malerie, held at Museums für Grenzwarte Kunst Marsbroach (1960), were intended to provide them with the proper set of historical references. Therefore, in all three cases, contemporary art was presented as integral to continuity of ideas, and problems related to historical development of art phenomena from the focus of the exhibition. While the position of the museums in network topography reflects their real-life distance from the neo-avant-garde subculture, the central position of the exhibitions they have organized, and their multiple ties with other network actors, denote such strategy.

The relation between the institutional culture and neo-avant-garde subculture is presented with greater clarity by the visualization of the same data used for the visualization of neo-avant-garde exhibition infrastructure, but approached through the perspective of bipartite exhibition – artist network (Fig. 2). At the level of its topography, the center of the network, crowded with number of tightly interconnected exhibitions, represents the real-life space of neo-avant-garde artistic subculture, while the exhibitions surrounding that space, with just few exceptions, outline a real-life realm of institutional mainstream. Strength of ties among network actors, denoted by the thickness of connecting lines depends – in case of exhibitions – upon number of common participants among exhibitions, while in case of exhibition – person ties, thickness of the connecting line points to the role (organizer, catalogue editor, author of the text in the catalogue) particular person played in the exhibition. Therefore, a tick line connecting the exhibition _Art abstrait constructif international_, (Paris, 1961), and exhibition _Groupe de recherche d’art visuel_, (Paris, 1961) points that they had a strong tie, since the entire group GRAV participated in both of them; the thick tie between Matko Meštrović and _New Tendencies_, points to his multiple roles in the exhibition (assistant curator, author of the text in the exhibition catalogue). Robert Rauschenberg, on the other hand, had only one role in the exhibitions _ Bewegung/Beweging_ and _Le Nouveau Réalisme à Paris et à New York_, that of participating artist, meaning that his connection to them was weak, and therefore presented by the thin lines. Rauschenberg’s position in the topography of the network, much closer to the second of these two exhibitions, reflects his closer real-life relationships with _Le groupe des Nouveaux Réalistes_. Although each and every connection between two network actors could be described in these terms, from the perspective of New Tendencies’ relation to neo-avant-garde artistic subculture, structure of the whole network is much more interesting and informative, since it also presents the relations among different artistic tendencies constitutive to its social space. Quite similar to the position of certain galleries, and exhibition spaces in the topography of infrastructural network, artistic tendencies articulated towards the end of the observed period, and presented in this network visualization with the series of exhibitions, are also positioned at the very edge of the area representing the real-life space of neo-avant-garde subculture. Therefore, the exhibitions related to the group of _Nouveaux Réalistes_, formed on Pierre Restany’s initiative, and officially established in October of 1960, occupy the upper left corner of network visualization. It is true that some of group’s members – Jean Tinguely, Yves Klein, and Daniel Spoerri – were strongly involved with the international neo-avant-garde much before the group was formed, but since the rest of its members did not have previous artistic or social relations with other network actors, the position of the _Nouveau Réalisme_ in network topography is bit remote from its core.

Gruppo N, and Gruppo T, represented by the exhibitions placed on the opposite side of the network, and also distanced from its central area, were established just a few months before _Nouveaux Réalistes_, but their position in the topography of the network – both in relation to French group, and towards each other – is a bit different. In contrast to the _Nouveaux Réalistes_, Gruppo T had a multiple strong ties with key personalities of Lombardian neo-avant-garde (Manzoni, Castellani, Fontana, Dorflies) established much before it was formed towards the end of 1959. Moreover, members of the group Davide Boriani, Giovanni Aneschi, Gianni Colombo, and Gabriele Dervacchi, were directly involved in technical preparations for the opening of Gallery Azimut, and were also integral to the group of young artist who belonged, as well as Manzoni and Castellani, to Lucio Fontana’s circle.179 Reasons why Gruppo T was placed at the edge of the neo-avant-garde’s social space, are the dates of their inaugural, programmatic exhibitions (Miorirama’s 1-11), held in 1960-1961, and the fact that for the first time, which also included Manzoni, Fontana, Munari, Tinguely, and Enrico Baj, participants at all other exhibitions from that series were only group members. Gruppo N, on the other hand, was located in Padua, and except from initial connections with Milan avant-garde milieu, established through the participation of Manfredo Massironi and Eduardo Landi in the exhibitions organized at Gallery Azimut, it had just a few other connections with Milanese artistic. It was also formed towards the end of the observed period, and early exhibitions by which it is represented in the visualization, were held at group’s atelier (Studio N), not yet integrated into the existing neo-avant-garde infrastructure.

In the center of the network there is Spoerri’s _Editions MAT - Multiple d’Art Transformable_, exhibition displayed for the first time in Paris, in Galerie Loeb, at the end of 1959. Described as “an anthology of multiples in sculpture, with the theme of real or perceptual movement”,180 it was the collection of small-scale transformable kinetic objects, produced on affordable price in a series of one hundred items resulting from Spoerri’s collaboration with artists of different generations – from Dieter Roth to Joseph Albers, and Marcel Duchamp.181 Organized and managed by Spoerri, and touring Europe throughout 1960 (Munich, Zurich, Krefeld), it was a very important reference for New Tendencies, both in regard to the for...

---

179 See in MANZONI: Azimut, exhibition catalogue, Gagosian Gallery, 17.11.2011 – 6.1.2012 (London: Gagosian Gallery, 2011). A good impression on how young generation of artists perceived Lucio Fontana, gives Heinz Mack: “Fontana was a kind of colleague who supported and inspired us, giving us this affirmation and awareness that we were on the right path... his work was so useful to us; so near to what we were doing.”, in Baily _https://ocula.com/magazine/conversations/heinz-mack/_ Accessed June 23, 2018.


In comparison to the exhibitions situated within the central network area, tightly inter-connected by common participants (curators, organizers, authors and editors of the catalogues), according to the calculations of centrality none of the large, professionally curated exhibitions — Kinetic Kunst (Zürich, 1960), Monochrome Malerei (Leverkusen, 1960), Konkrete Kunst: 50 Jahre Entwicklung (Zürich, 1960) and Abstraktes Konstruktiv Inter-national, (Paris, 1961), except from the Bewogen / Beweging, (Amsterdam, Stockholm, Copenhagen 1961-1962), managed to enter the group of five even ten important exhibitions at the time.

The largest of these exhibitions, Bewogen / Beweging, opened in March, 1961, first at Stedelijk in Amsterdam, was transferred and restaged a month later at Moderna Museet, in Stockholm under the title Rörelse Konsten /Movement in Art/, and moved again, at the end of 1961 to Louisiana Museum, in Copenhagen. The objective of the exhibition, curated by Pontus Hultén, with the assistance of Daniel Spoerri, was to outline “the history of artists’ interest in movement, from Futurism to contemporary art,” and across the broadly understood field of visual arts, which included “kinetic art, performance, happenings and film, along with a host of ‘static’ artworks”.

A specific of the selection was an overstated number and position of Tinguely’s works in the exhibition display, and the inclusion of other representatives of Nouveaux Réalistes, Raymond Heins, and Niki de Saint Phalle. Concerning a pronouncedly critical view of their work, in particular in the milieu of the contemporary French art scene, stemming, amongst others, from Nouveaux Réalistes affirmative relation towards American pop-art, it was a rather brave curatorial decision. The selection also included a group of artists — Heinz Mack, Julio Le Parc, Otto Piene, Dieter Roth, Paul Talman, Günther Uecker — who, in just a few months, attend the first Nove Tendecije exhibition.

Although its venue belonged to the system of institutional culture, the exhibition Nove Tendencije (Zagreb, 1961) was firmly embedded in the neo-avant-garde subculture. It was conceived, and curated by Brazilian artist Almir Mavignier, and closely followed “do-it-yourself” principle typical for the practice of group ZERO, with whom Mavignier was associated from 1958, and therefore strongly relied on his wide personal network that included artists from both Europe, and Latin America. Mavigier’s assistant was young Croatian art critic Matko Meštrović, a well-informed intellectual, also not the employee of the Gallery of Contemporary art, who will play a very important role in the overall history of the movement. Claim that Nove tendecije – for the first time – brought together works of young European artists from diverse backgrounds, who for the most part never met, or seen of each other’s work, was only partially true. It was true for Croatian artists, who started to forge their way towards international art circles only at the end of the 1950’s, and probably for few other authors called after the initial participants list, based on Mavignier’s personal network has been exhausted. Guided by his understanding of shared artistic, aesthetic and social values, and by the similarities in technical aspects of art production, Mavignier put together a complex overview of diverse art practices opposing the excessive subjectivity, individualism, and idiosyncrasy of Art Informel. Bringing to the fore value system of the first postwar generation, its radical stance against hegemonic model of high modernist artistic culture, and concept of art “growing out of the diverse structures of modern life”, Nove Tendencije achieved international success, although within still limited circles of neo-avant-garde artists, and among art critic sympathetic to their critical stance on the Informal mainstream.

184 Still another peculiarity of Hulten’s selection was also the inclusion of Robert Rauschenberg, who already had a firm, contacts with both Parisian and Lombardian neo-avant-garde. Few months after Bewogen / Beweging he took part in restany’s exhibition Le Nouveau Réalisme à Paris et à New York, with artworks recognized in the Parisian intellectual circles, in particular those close to Galerie Denise Réne, as an epitome of “Americanization”, a (political) strategy meant to undermining European postwar culture. Such perception strongly affected the position of Nouveau Réalisme at the Fench, and consequently European art scene at the time; see, for example, Catherine Dossin, “To Drip or to Pop? The European Triumph of American Art”, Artl@ Bulletin, Vol. 3, Issue 1 (Spring 2014), 79-103.

185 For the reconstruction, and visualization of Almir Mavignier’s personal network in 1960, see in Kolešnik, Bojić, Šilić, 079_kolesnik_Bojic_Silić.pdf

186 For ad detailed story on organization of the first New Tendencies exhibition see Rosen, A Little Known; Rosen, Weibel bit international; Medosch, New Tendencies.

However, the position of that exhibition in the topography of exhibitions network (Fig. 2) does not have much to do with the real-life reception of the exhibition, but rather confirms that New Tendencies provided a comprehensive overview of neo-avant-garde tendencies with – broadly defined – neoconstructivist orientation.188 Placement of Nove Tendencije along the upper right side of the network core, is determined by the number of Italian, and German, and artists from other locations of ne-avant-garde activities who took part in the exhibition, and also with the absence of Dutch authors, and Nouveaux Réalistes, positioned on the opposite side of the network. The connections of Nove Tendencije with other network actors are predominantly weak, but numerous and direct, which provide the exhibition – when translated into the measures of centrality (Tables 1–3) – with the third position within the group of five most important exhibitions held between 1958 and 1961. Other exhibitions organized by the museums and encompassed by this visualization, were excluded from the calculations since their relations to the neo-avant-garde subculture was mediated by the system of institutional culture. If they would have been taken into account, Nove Tendencije would take the position of the fifth most important exhibition in the observed period.

PHASE OF ESTABLISHMENT, AND CONSOLIDATION: 1962 – 1963

Except from his approach to organization, and curation of New Tendencies, the influence of Mavignier’s affiliation with ZERO, was also manifested through his communication with Matko Meštrović, precending the exhibition. Consistent with ZERO’s expansion strategy, which assumed the support to persons, and locations responsive towards group’s concept of art, in one of the letters they exchanged at the time, Mavignier outlined “the opportunity of young critics”, like Meštrović, “to come to Germany, and have contacts with people, artist and ideas that might help give impulse to some new forces among you”189 as perhaps the most important outcome of Nove Tendencije exhibition. Fulfilling the promise lurking behind the lines of that letter already at the beginning of 1961, Mavignier provided Meštrović with the opportunity to stage the exhibition of Yugoslav contemporary painting at Galerie F, in Ulm.190 The exhibition was followed by Meštrović’s visit to Düsseldorf, and Zürich, where he missed a desired meeting with Max Bill, establishing, instead, contact with Karl Gerstner. From Zurich, Meštrović went to Munich to meet with Gerhard von Graevenitz, whom he will to know much better during his stay in Paris, at the beginning of 1962. For the young art critic, with few previous direct contacts with the foreign artists, it was crucially important encounter with the artistic, cultural, and social milieu to which he will be firmly tight thought the 1960s, and equally important for the future of New Tendencies.

Artists who were later invited to recall their impressions of the first New Tendencies exhibition, often described that event in terms of ‘epiphany’ – a singular moment of a sudden, shared awareness that right there, behind those exhibited artworks, there was already the entire art movement, nameless and invisible to the general public, but ready to articulate its artistic, aesthetic and social objectives. Following that “instant recognition”, discussions on the programmatic orientation of the movement started while the exhibition was still running, and continued throughout 1962, creating the core of New Tendencies’ social and professional network. Communication model in the background of that process was common to neo-avant-garde of the late 1950s assuming working meetings, frequent travelling among groups of people and locations involved in the project, and a lot of circular correspondence. Almost immediately after the first Zagreb exhibition – in October 1961 – Meštrović received the grant for visiting Paris,191 and in the following months – until February 1962 – joined forces with group GRAV, Equipo 57, Gerhard von Graevenitz, and other like-minded artists on creating the programmatic outline of the new art movement. Meštrović’s personal benefit gained from those meetings was, according his own statement, “the encounter with the new ideas” and development of “vocabulary, relating to emerging new notions in art”.192 If one compares his articles written before New Tendencies, with those from 1963 to 1965, the advancement in type, structure, and vocabulary of his critical, and theoretical discourse is simply – astonishing. It was even more important concerning the fundamental transformations happening in his immediate cultural environment. At the beginning of the 1960s, and corresponding to changes in Yugoslav internal and foreign politics,193 Zagreb, a local cultural center with lively, but conventional mainstream art, suddenly turned into a vibrant location of international experimental art, hosting New Tendencies, Music Biennale (MBZ), the international biannual survey of avant-garde, and experimental music, and festival of amateur experimental film (Genre Film Festival – GEFF),194 which all required a proper critical response, impossible without acquisition of new epistemic, and discursive devices. In that respect, Meštrović was well ahead of its colleagues from Gallery of Contemporary Art, which appointed him the chief-curator of Nove Tendecije 2. Gallery also provided finances for his participation in the meetings, and discussions on the fundamentals principles and program objectives of international art movement New Tendencies, that was formed in 1962 and by the intense communication among Zagreb, Paris and Milan.195 French Groupe de Recherche d’Art Visuel (GRAV), established in 1960, with the ambition “to fashion Marxist aesthetics compatible with works ascribable to the tradition of abstract art”,196 played a very important

---

188 Term neoconstructivism is used as a signifier for art practices which put forward Futurism, Constructivism, Bauhaus, and De Stijl, as their historical references.

189 Medosch, Automation, 55.

190 Meštrović’s selection was an overview of Yugoslav art scene at the time, and encompassed a rather wide range of art practices – from geometric abstraction to naive art. After Ulm, it was supposed to be restaged in Berlin, but it did not happen due to the political tension between Germany and Yugoslavia, issuing from Yugoslav recognition of DDR.


role in that process, imposing itself as a leading force of the movement by the series of its programmatic texts, published in the immediate aftermath of Nove Tendencije – declaration Assez de Mystifications/Stop with Mystification/ issued in September 1961, along with GRAV’s participation at the second Bienal de Paris, and the pamphlet Transformer l’actuelle situation de l’art plastique, issued in October 1961, explaining group’s view on the relationship between art and society, on the traditional value of visual art, and on certain aspects of visual reception. They were followed by the group’s statement Nouvelle Tendance, published along the exhibition L’Instabilité (Paris, March, 1962), as a summary of discussions led between Paris and Milan, emphasizing that the term employed in its title “was already used on the occasion of the Nove Tendencije exhibition in Zagreb in 1961”, as a signifier of phenomena which “appeared simultaneously among young designers at different points in the world”, and just “began to give a more homogeneous character to human eye, as opposed to the “eye of the intellectual, the specialist, the aesthete, the sensitive”. The idea of “art as continuous (visual) research”, introduce by that GRAV’s statement, also highlighted the understanding of art – science relation, specific for New Tendencies as art movement, akin with the questions of its approach to the concept of authorship. Drawing on Umberto Eco’s term “epistemological metaphor”, Jacopo Galimberti, describes such understanding as quasi-scientific, and as an example of “appropriation of scientific values and practices”, with the purpose to “evoke an approach to knowledge and society without actually trying to turn art into a science”. According to Galimberti, the appropriation and mediation of scientific paradigm, also allowed GRAV (New Tendencies) to...

… borrow the notion of authorship typical of the scientific community, in which discoveries and publications are generally accredited to a team. On the other hand, it engaged with abstract and process-based works devoid of individual signature supplemented by the descriptions of artistic engagement which resembles the process of scientific research.

The programmatic insistence on clarity, therefore, assumed the act of creation which is based on the same type of rational reasoning which is guiding scientific research, fully transparent, and devoid of any mystification. In comparison to other art groups, coming together at this period to define a common program of the movement, devoted to the social aspects of art production, and to the operation of art-market mechanisms, the position of GRAV was more pragmatic, and concerned with the means and devices that will allow for better understanding of visual perception, in order to apply that knowledge in creation of new art objects / spatial situations that will induce viewers’ active response, and the awareness of their own perceptive, sensory capacities. In other words, and articulated in theoretical terms, the objectives of “art as research” was to “determine objective psycho–physic bases of the plastic phenomenon and visual perception”, to change our “manner of perceiving visual phenomena … [and] enhance our entire perception apparatus”, in order to facilitate better understanding of the “phenomenology of the world and society”. The important consequence of defining art as research, was the change in the status of artwork that members of New Tendencies understood rather as a report on particular stage of the research process, than as definite, completed visual statement, or – more precisely – as a “strictly visual situation” without any element outside its “homogenous” structure that does not allow any kind of interpretation beyond its purely physical features. Similar to the scientific research, which approves repetition of experiments, and recreation of the results obtained by other scientist, the objective of New Tendencies was to create artworks that could be endlessly modified in the course of visual research, and endlessly reproduced by anyone willing to follow artist’s instructions.

At the beginning of the 1960s, forms of artistic behaviour which diminished importance of authorship, endorsed collective authorship (Gruppo N, Equipo 57) and production of anonymous, unsigned artworks (GRAV), undermining the fetishization of a unique, authorial personality, were not new. In case of New Tendencies they were also accompanied by the propositions on new forms of organization that would make it integral to the operative principles of the movement that were discussed but not fully implemented.

Programmatic orientation of New Tendencies in regard to the institutional art mainstream gained a more comprehensive articulation in Bulletin N° 1, document published shortly after the exhibition Nove Tendencije 2, held in Zagreb, in August 1963, with the intention to summarize the actual situation of the movement, and to identified the risks coming from its social context. Along with the possibility that NT would be absorbed into the art scene, or turned into the new form of academicism due to repetition of its...
formal solutions, particular emphasis was put on danger that by shifting the focus from the interests of the viewer, towards the aesthetic properties of the object, the research results might easily turn into works of art, and movement’s members into the “stars’ behaving like ‘artists’”. 207
From the present perspective, that was a rather objective, sober-minded assessment of the situation, since Nove Tendencije 2 fell short of providing the image of a coherent collective effort in visual research. The exhibition had twice as many participants as in 1961, and much more exhibits – paintings, reliefs, sculptures, and kinetic objects, intended to interact with their environment, and pertaining – one way, or another – to the concepts of “active viewing”, and “viewers participation”. However, a number of displayed artworks had a repetitive features, encapsulated by the term “academism” which surfaced the critical reviews of Nove Tendencije 2. Critical objections on the character and quality of artworks exhibited in Zagreb, and awareness of disintegrating influence of art market, required a serious discussion on the clarity of movement’s objectives. The attempt in bringing about such clarity was Bulletin N° 1, document which explained, once again, movement’s relation to artistic mainstream, described its basic programmatic principles, proposed a range of formal criteria governing inclusion/exclusion from New Tendencies, and introduced rules of conduct for its members. However, instead of contributing to the inner cohesion of the movement, rules and regulations made things worse, prompted conflicts, tensions and strong objections regarding the oppressive manner in which they were imposed. The list of 46 artists expelled from the movement208 according to the alleged

207 Ibidem., 147.
208 According to that list, excluded were

Fig. 3
Network of the New Tendencies-related exhibitions held in 1962–1963, indicating the division/tension between the “idealist” (left) and the “rational” (right) wing of the movement
the problems of visual arts. The exhibition Arte programmata. Arte cinetica. Opere multiplec. Opera aperta (Milano, 1962) intended to present that new art phenomenon, first at the Italian, then international arts scene,211 accelerated a wider recognition of both New Tendencies, and other – broadly defined – neoconstructivist trends concurrent to gestural abstraction. Notion of arte programmata certainly contributed to the ongoing discussions on the state of contemporary art, at the time particularly intense at the Italian cultural scene, but also indicative – due to the role of Venice Biennale in the global Cold War cultural politics – of general atmosphere and directions at the international art scene. They assumed an astringent criticism of individualism, and social disinterestedness of Informalist mainstream, and involved the most influential art critics at the time, as Giulio Carlo Argan, who were advocating closer relations between art and science, and collective work practices, as opposed to excessive subjectivity of gestural abstraction. Critical assessment of artistic mainstream, was backed up by the series of concomitant exhibitions – Oltre la Pittura – Oltre la Scultura, Milano and Torino, April – May 1963; the international Biennale di San Marino – Oltre l’informale, July 1963; nueva tendencia 2, Venice, December 1963 – pointing to art phenomena from the context of New Tendencies, as an important, and convincing response to Art Informel. Discussions on the state of contemporary art scene acquired international dimension due to the strategic, and simultaneous staging of Biennale di San Marino and Annual AICA Congress (Convegno internazionale artisti critici e studiosi d’arte) organized in Rimini, and attended by large Croatian delegation supportive to New Tendencies, by Latin American radical art critics, and moderated by both Argan, and Pierre Restany who, at the time, was the most important liaison between American Pop-art and European art scene. The contribution of art critics, and of the discussions led in Rimini to the wider recognition of New Tendencies cannot be overstated. They were reflected in Argan’s articles published in the most-read Italian daily newspapers, and art magazines shaping both public opinion, and interests of art-market. While such critical interventions into the public sphere, and above-mentioned exhibitions provided discursive framework for the inclusion of New Tendencies, that is, inclusion of art practices pertaining to the concept of “art as (visual) research” into the system of institutional culture, other segments of the movement, closer to the views and practices of group ZERO continued with its geo-cultural expansion. Differences between those two parallel flows within New Tendencies, demonstrated in Bulletin N° 1, were clearly articulated, by Jean-Pierre Yvaral, at the end of 1963.

Zero and NUL whose spirit is a little touched with Neo-Dada, are slightly earlier movements than NTrc [ Nouvelle Tendance - recherche continue]. Several of their members joined NT at the start, but strayed later, their positions being too far from the general spirit of NTrc and one can say that there is no affinity with the exhibitions called Zero and NUL.212

Division lines between those two groups, that were together structuring the poetic field of New Tendencies, were obvious already at the first Zagreb exhibitions. Nove Tendencije 2, made them even clearer, justifying Jack Burnham’s proposed differentiation of the movement on the proponents of “experimental objectivity, anonymity, perceptual psychology, and socialism” and those who were advocating “individual research, recognition, poetry, idealism, immateriality, luminosity, and nature”.213 According to Burnham, the representatives of the “idealistic” group affiliated with group ZERO in Düsseldorf, were Dutch group NUL, part of the Munich group, Piero Manzoni, and artists from Lucio Fontana, and Yves Klein’s circles. “Frankfurt Grupe”, which pertained to the same “idealistic” wing of NT, Burnham either consciously omitted, or simply did not recognized as separate entity. On the other isle of that great divide, there was French group GRAV, Italian Gruppo N, and Gruppo T, part of the Munich group affiliated with Gallery Nata and Gehrad von Graevenitz, Yugoslav (Croatian) artists, and artists from other socialist countries.

Although it is almost impossible to miss the echoes of ideological bias implied with such division,214 and a rather simplified application of certain categories essential for understanding the overall story of New Tendencies, visualization of exhibition network related to New Tendencies in 1962-1963 (Fig. 3), confirms Burnham’s division on two groups, differentiated by both the understanding of art – science relation, the objectives of that relationship, but also by their relation to the mainstream culture. The gap caused by these differences, which could be explained in the terms of structural hole would be also clearly visible in the network topology, if it was not bridged by the intervention of art critics, that is, by the international Biennale di San Marino, which brought them together outside and beyond the framework of New Tendencies, and give the equal attention to both “neo-Dadaists”, and “rationalists/socialists”,214 The artists from the Eastern bloc (art group Dvženije USSR; Edward Krasinski, Sándor Szandai, Hungary; Zdeněk Sýkora, Czechoslovakia), took part only in NT’s third exhibition – Nova teudencija 3, held in 1965. Considering that next, Fourth NT exhibition was held in 1969, a year after Burnham published his book, a decision to include them in the group of “rationalists/socialists”, is arbitrary, ideologically biased, and cannot be confirmed either by the chronology of the movement, characteristics of their artworks, or personal political choices.

---

210 Medosch, Automation, 130.
211 With the ample financial support by Olivetti, the exhibition was touring Europe, and from 1964 through the USA as well. After Milan, where it was first displayed, it was restaged in Venice (joined by GRAV), Düsseldorf, London, and at the twelve locations in USA, finishing its journey in MOMA, in 1966.
213 Jack Burnham, Beyond Modern Sculpture: The Effects of Science and Technology on the Sculpture of This Century. (New York: George Braziller, 1968), 247; cited according Medosch, Automation, 71-72.
ist” layer of the movement. Result of such strategy was a rather interesting, and quite important proposition of the new poetic configuration of the European art scene that doubtlessly influenced the next, XXXII Venice Biennale. The importance of the 1963 international Biennale di San Marino is also confirmed by the calculations of centrality measures, according to which it was most important of twenty-seven exhibitions related to New Tendencies, and encompassed by this visualisation (Table 4–6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Betweenness centrality</th>
<th>Biennale di San Marino - Oltre informale</th>
<th>10284.0518</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nove tendencije 2</td>
<td>6942.808422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europäische Avantgarde</td>
<td>6017.02097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ZERO - Der neue idealismus</td>
<td>3553.34186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oltre la pittura oltre la scultura</td>
<td>2868.075843</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bewegte Bereiche der Kunst</td>
<td>1988.979946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Eigencentrality</th>
<th>Nove tendencije 2</th>
<th>0.810169</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biennale di San Marino - Oltre informale</td>
<td>0.769657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oltre la pittura oltre la scultura</td>
<td>0.694803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>nuova tendenza 2</td>
<td>0.648735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europäische Avantgarde</td>
<td>0.550563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. 5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Closeness centrality</th>
<th>Biennale di San Marino - Oltre informale</th>
<th>0.507968</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nove tendencije 2</td>
<td>0.50495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Europäische Avantgarde</td>
<td>0.479323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Arte programmata</td>
<td>0.463636</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bewegte Bereiche der Kunst</td>
<td>0.458633</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T. 6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Still another reason for high ranking of Biennale di San Marino was the inclusiveness of its selection encompassing both gestural and geometric abstraction, figurative painting, and almost all art groups involved with New Tendencies. According to the same calculations, Nove Tendencije 2 is ranked as second most important among exhibitions held in 1962-1963, followed by other exhibitions both those close to the concept of “art as research”, and to the poetics of group ZERO. A dense layer of ties among the exhibitions positioned on the right side of the network visualization, where the exhibition Nove Tendencije 2 is also placed, points to the process of movement’s consolidation, but also to the establishment of its relationship with the institutional culture. In comparison, the exhibitions related to group ZERO, including the most important one ZERO – Der Neue Idealismus, were still firmly embedded in the exhibition infrastructure of neo-avant-garde subculture. Even the exhibition Nul [62], important and early survey of art production emerging from ZERO’s sphere of influence, held in Amsterdam in Stedelijk Museum, was organized, prepared, designed and financed by group Nul, while the museum provided only its technical support. While both Zagreb exhibitions were collectively curated by artists, all other exhibitions related to the

215 According to the interview with Hank Peeters: “Nul62 only happened because of an unexpected gap in the museum’s schedule, an intensive lobbying effort and the artists agreeing to shoulder the costs themselves – including transport, set-up, insurance and even posters and catalogues. Willem Sandberg’s contribution was limited to making the exhibition space available”, see in nul = 0. The Dutch Nul Group in an International Context, exhibition catalogue, eds. Colin Huizing, Tijs Visser (Schiedam, Amsterdam: Stedelijk Museum & NAI Publisher, 2011), 18.
of its efforts informed by the concept of art as continuous research. However, the right moment for achieving the inner cohesion of New Tendencies has passed, and all the risks coming from the social environment, already identified in 1963, were growing with each new exhibition.

From the point of view of its public perception, 1964 was the year of movement’s unquestionable success at the international art scene. In March 1964 the restaged version of Nove Tendencije 2, was transferred from Venice to Museum Morsbroich in Leverkusen, displayed under the title Neue Tendenzen. The curator was Udo Kultermann, art critic and then director of the Museum, well-known to Meštrović, and Lombardian avant-garde with whom he had close contacts from the end on the 1950s. Opened with the lectures by Umbro Apollonio, the most vocal advocate of New Tendencies in Italy, and Matko Meštrović, the exhibition was quite successful. Exactly a month before the Leverkusen exhibition was closed, New Tendencies had their debut in Paris. The title of the exhibition was Propositions visuelles du mouvement international Nouvelle Tendance, it was organized by the Musée des Arts Décoratifs, staged in Louvre, at the Pavillon de Marsanoff, and opened in late April of 1964. Intended as solo exhibition of group GRAV, it was turned into the presentation of New Tendencies, since the group extend that invitation to all movement members. The selection of artworks was made by ballots, the exhibition design and presentation were impeccable, and – as Matko Meštrović said, recalling the event – it was a large and “beautiful exhibition”. However, the reactions of the public were not at all enthusiastic, and from the perspective of the exhibiting artists – it was a big disappointment.

Paris exhibition was closed just nine days before the opening of Documenta III in Kassel. New Tendencies were presented at Bienalle in the central, Italian pavilion with artworks and environments of Gruppo N, Gruppo T, Ercico Castellani and Enzo Mari. The response was better than in Paris, but still quite disappointing, since in the focus of both art critics, and public were American Pop-Art, and minimalism. However, the success or disappointment with the presentation in Venice, was far less important regarding the future of New Tendencies, than astonishing fact that the very idea of taking prat in the exhibition that was setting the trends, and strongly affecting international art market, pointed out – just a few months before – as a most serious threat to New Tendencies, has not been put in question. Perhaps the artists exhibiting at the Italian pavilion were convinced that it is possible for the movement to retain its artistic and ideological integrity, while displaying the results of visual research shoulder to shoulder with the “fetished commodities” of institutional visual culture, but it also might be that majority of movement’s members were not interested any more in checking the results of such appraisal. Instead, and parallel to Biennale, GRAV and Zero also took part in a special exhibition Light and Movement organized within the framework of Documenta III in Kassel. However, and opposite to both Parisian debut and Venice Biennale, the Light and Movement exhibition or – more precisely – the selection of works by Mack, Piene, Uecker and group GRAV put together in a haste just before Documenta opening, and displayed in one, single room were met with critical appraisal as the example of genuinely innovative art. The year 1964 came to an end with the establishment of Nove tendencije 3 Organizacija Committee intended to assess the situation, and propose possible solutions and lines of action, that could counteract the damaging influence of art market and almost completed inclusion on New Tendencies in the mainstream culture. The latter became a matter of urgency, after William Seitz’s exhibition The Responsive Eye opened in MOMA, in February 1965. Seitz included in his selection number of artworks produced in the framework of New Tendencies, framed by the explanatory discourse which has stripped them off their ideological, and socially engaged pretext, and described as... art without relationships— more accurately, an art with a different order of relationships. The asymmetrical dialogues between large and small, above and below, empty and full, or bright and dull that took place across picture surfaces have been ended either by central placement or uniformity. Too much diversity of form impedes perceptual effect. Certain of these works therefore have a stronger family resemblance to mechanical patterns, scientific diagrams, and even to screens and textured surfaces than to relational abstract art.”


Fig 4.
Network of group exhibitions held in 1964-1965, related to New Tendencies
The exhibition Responsive Eye, according to Pamela Lee, soon became the most popular exhibition in MOMA’s history attended by more than 180,000 visitors. Contrary to the general approval by the New York art audience, it was severely and unanimously attacked by art critics, as trivial and shallow. Mass-media visibility of artists experimenting with physical properties of color, and movement, propelled by this exhibition and framed by the proliferation of terms Kinetic, and Op-Art applied to both the production of New Tendencies, and a growing number of artworks that successfully emulated some of movement’s formal solutions, while striving for the superficial, and playful optical effects, quickly endorsed and appropriated by the fashion industry, popular culture, and art market, undermining and degraded New Tendencies’ grounding aesthetic principles, and its confidence in the socially transformative potential of art – science relation. Already in the course of 1964, but in particular after MOMA exhibition, it has become clear that initial, shared commitment to resist the inclusion in the economy of institutional culture, was forgotten somewhere along the way towards the individual, or group affirmation. New Tendencies became vulnerable to commodification and trivialization of its results, and divisive regarding their consequences. The topic of Nova tendencija 3 – “ideological concentration and commonality of goals”, reflected the awareness of the situation, prompting exhibition’s Organization Committee to instigate a serious (political) discussion on the objectives of the movement, and its obvious crisis. Integral to that decision was the competition for the “Dissemination of examples of [visual] research” conceived as application of the results of the visual research, emphasizing the possibility of New Tendencies stronger contribution to “visual requirements” of industrial society. Design will become the subject of New Tendencies’ theoretical considerations only much later, in 1968, and its appearance at the horizon of the exhibition at the time, could be related to the conviction that more pragmatic orientation might prevent its pending dissipation. It also might be the reason why – for the first time – the organizers of the exhibition were art historians, art critics and theorists, instead of artists themselves. However, compared with other sections of the exhibition, overview of projects concerning the problem of disseminating research examples, was disappointing, regardless of unexpectedly enthusiastically artists’ response to the competition, and intensified the feeling that New Tendencies have come to a dead end. It was a bit paradoxical, since Nova tendencija 3 was still another large, and “beautiful exhibition” with 114 participants, presenting at two locations 137 examples of bold experiments with light, movement, and space; the objects with intriguing optical effects whose smooth, slick surfaces introducing new type of “industrial” aesthetics, and first interactive environments, and playful, ludic, engaging ambiances, but also quite a few artworks that were repetitive, superficial, and – redundant. It is not to say that rigor, rationality and quasi-scientific discipline of earlier artworks was completely gone in favor of a more frivolous and eye-pleasing results, but it was quite obvious that the movement, as it presented itself at this exhibition, was incongruent with the radicalism of its theoretical discourse. Perhaps the best account of the exhibition, and of the reasons causing the crisis of New Tendencies at the time, was given by Manfredo Massironi, who concluded, with resignation that … when one is looking around he sees that … mediocrity is spreading and decay threatening, and that these are dangers characteristic of all kinds of intellectual work taking place within a capitalist society.

The network visualization of exhibitions held in 1964-1965 (Fig. 4) is encompassing 43 group exhibitions held mainly in the museums and influential, commercial galleries, which played a crucial role in the final transition of New Tendencies formal solutions to artistic mainstream. In the same period there was at least twice as many solo-exhibitions of artists involved with movement, organized by the private galleries, because – up to 1964 and in 1965 – majority of independent spaces, and artist-run galleries comprising for the neo-avant-garde infrastructure already ceased to exist. The sheer number of these exhibitions that would be concentrated in the central area of the network, would make it illegible, and since the concentration of collective exhibitions on the same position in network topography convincingly denotes dynamics of New Tendencies assimilation in the institutional mainstream

221 The opening of the exhibition was recorded in the documentary The Responsive Eye, filmed by Brian de Palma. https://www.mymovies.it/film/1965/the-responsive-eye/
culture, solo-exhibitions were excluded from the visualization. Network structure is composed out of two main, clearly distinguished and almost equally large segments – one, occupying the right and upper part of network graph is related to art practices integral to New Tendencies, and includes exhibition *The Responsive Eye, Nova tendencija 3*, and number of other art shows mainly presenting kinetic, and optic art; the other segment, positioned on the left lower side of network visualization is occupied by *Documenta III* that with its 353 participants, including the representatives New Tendencies, was the largest exhibition held in 1964–65. Area in the center of the network (marked with a light read ellipsoid), integral to the sphere of kinetic, and optical art related to New Tendencies, covered by a dense layer of multiple ties among number of smaller exhibitions, is concentrator of network activities, also bridging the gap between exhibitions related to New Tendencies, and *Documenta III*. Those exhibitions constituent to that area were either disseminating results of the research on visual perception according to the grounding principles of New Tendencies, or providing the overview of art practices integral to the movement, and those developing at its “edges”, presented as a new mainstream paradigm. *Nova tendencija 3*, ranked as the second most important exhibition in the observed time interval according to calculations of centrality measures (Table 7–9) is positioned at the edge of the “concentration” zone, in whose center there is the exhibition *Licht und Bewegung – Kinetische Kunst – Lumière et Mouvement* – the most important collective exhibition held in 1964–1965, due to its to poetic configuration, tied to almost each, and every exhibition in the central network zone. Curated by Harald Szeeman, and first displayed at Bern Kunsthalle, it was a comprehensive overview of art practices dealing with the subjects of light, and movement and operating at the borderline of art and technology. Other exhibitions constitutional to the “concentration zone” with almost similar objectives were *Kinetic and Optic Art Today* (Albert Knox Gallery, Buffalo, 1965), *Art and Movement* (Royal Scottish Academy, Edinburgh, 1965; curated by Frank Popper, and Guy Brett) *Art et Mouvement: Optique et Cinétique / Omanut utena’u: ‘omanut optit veqintit I* (Galerie Denise Réne, Museum of Modern Art in Tel Aviv, 1965; collaboration Jaen Cassou, Frank Popper), end number of other, more or less ambitious shows pertaining to certain aspect of kinetic or optic art.

Perhaps the earliest among them was the exhibitions *Le Mouvement 2*, opened at the end of 1964, at Galerie Denise Réne, echoing *Le Mouvement 1*, the first, legendary presentation of kinetic art after WWII, curated by Pontus Hulten and staged at the same gallery in 1955. The authors of explanatory texts in the catalogue of *Le Mouvement 2* were Frank Popper, art critic of younger generation, and future theorist of new media art, and Jean Cassou, then director of the National Museum of Modern Art. The selection of exhibited art works was both the statement on pending, and insuppressible penetration of American pop–art into European cultural space, and attempt in reconfiguration of New Tendencies (extended to Latin America) in terms pertaining to the Denise Réne’s profile at the international art market, symbolically closing the story on New Tendencies, which happened between the two exhibitions, even before it was officially over.
The number of collective exhibitions related to New Tendencies in this period contributed to overall growth of exhibition activities in 1964-1965, they will soon become typical for years when two large art exhibitions – Venice Biennale and Documenta – “met”. Some of those exhibitions either crossed the Atlantic (Map 3), or were organized in USA, as the first presentation of particular individual oeuvre, or production of particular art group. The exhibition Arte programmatà, arte cinetica, opere moltiplicate, opera aperta, started its tour through American museums in 1964, and was displayed, with the support of Smithsonian Museum at twelve different locations, commencing its journey at MOMA in 1966. After the successful presentation in New York, the exhibition Responsive Eye, which included a number of European artists, was also displayed at several other locations in USA (Seattle, St. Louis, Pasadena, and Baltimore). In 1964 Howard Wise Gallery in New York organized the first exhibition of group ZERO (Group ZERO – Mack, Piene, Uecker), and in 1965 the exhibition of both ZERO group, and artists from the sphere of its influence. Also in 1964, in the same gallery, Georg Rickey curated the exhibition On the Move: Kinetic Sculpture, which brought together European and American artists and served as the announcement of ZERO’s exhibition. In 1964, GRAV’s exhibition L’instabilitè was still touring Latin America, reaching few locations in Brazil, and Buenos Aires, and by the solo-exhibition of Bruno Munari at Isetan stores in Tokyo, in 1965, the aesthetics, and view on art, close to the optics of New Tendencies, extended also to Asia, as final touch on the image of that art movement as an art phenomenon with the global outstretch. Exhibition The Responsive Eye was just one albeit the most important event in the series of events comprising for the operation of the institutional culture performed upon New Tendencies aiming at the inclusion, and assimilation of that new art phenomenon in the institutional system of arts. MOMA exhibition contributed to that process by glancing over the ideological, and social objectives of New Tendencies, and providing the grounds for the “invention” of appropriate signifiers which de-contextualized, and singled out art practices integral to that movement in terms of their obvious marketability. The assimilation and dispersion of its formal solutions into the mainstream art and visual culture, went parallel to the process of disintegration of New Tendencies social tissue. Art groups (Nul, Gruppo N) were dissolved, number of artists involved in the movement – as, for example, central figure of Dutch group Nul, Hank Peetres – decided, at about 1965, to give up on art and change their profession, while others left Europe for USA – some for good, some just temporally – trying to build their careers in New York, and after 1964, the unquestionable metropolis of modern art. Others continued with their work in framework of international art mainstream, developing their personal discourse on art in different directions. In the light of such developments the organization of next, the fourth New Tendencies exhibition under the aegis of continuity with the period between 1961 and 1965, was not only pointless, but simply – impossible. CONCLUSION A frequent objection to digital art history is the claim that the results obtained by the application of empirical methods, that is, of quantitative analysis, developed in response to the requirements of social sciences, cannot give any fundamentally important contribution to the epistemological objectives of discipline. Network analysis is often in the focus of such critical observations, taken as an example of dry, and more or less pointless calculations of number of ties between people or objects, by which digital art history intends to replace “carefully reasoned historical narrative”. Superficial, and uniformed such a view disregards the simple fact that network analysis could be conducted in different manners, on both big, and small datasets, and depending on how it was used could answer both simple and rather complex research questions. In this study it is applied – as it was already stated – in a ‘soft’ manner, resting upon a substantial body of operative knowledge on the approach of art historical phenomenon, so that readers can comprehend the level of its artistic, social, and political complexity. Unless such type of analysis is preceded by research findings that bring essentially important, new information, the basic precondition for its application is a clear idea on how already available data should be reused in order to reveal the information that are already there but have been concealed, or overlooked due to the generally accepted narrative on the art phenomena in question. In the case of New Tendencies it assumes the concentration on micro-situations, that is on the short time periods in-between the first and third Zagreb exhibition, and on the ‘gestation’ period preceding the very appearance of that art phenomena. It is already framed by “carefully reasoned historical narrative”, or – more precisely – several historical narratives differentiated by the perspective from which they approach the New Tendencies. The knowledge provided by those narratives, and data on which they are based, informed the choice of the angle, and analytic approach exercised in this study. It is focused on New Tendencies’s transition from independent, to institutional culture, observed in relation to the parallel process of movement’s poetical articulation, and attempts at establishing its activities, and model of the organization according to the principles of art movement. Since the existing studies on the history of New Tendencies, which encompass the period between 1961 and 1965 are focused either on the relationship of the movement to its social and political context, or on its...
programmatic principles – the manner in which they were conceptualized, theoretically funded and applied – the relation of New Tendencies to the mainstream culture is explained in somewhat general terms. It is pointing to the deterioration of those programmatic principles under the influence art-market / market logic of capitalism, as the main reasons for both the unsuccessful transformation of New Tendencies into a “proper” art movement and its inability to resist the absorption into mainstream culture.

The intention of this study was not to question such explanations, but rather to give a closer look to the process of programmatic articulation, and self-representation of the movement, including the identification of key moments, and decisions that have, or have not been made, and whose consequences strongly affected New Tendencies’s early history.

The most important insight provided by such an approach, and by the application of network analysis is a role of art critics in the process of New Tendencies’s transition to institutional culture, which is either systematically overlooked or described in a manner which is encompassing both artists, and art critics with the same ideological, and political objectives. It is not a persuasive argument since it disregards the inner dynamics of the movement before, and after its inclusion in the economy of institutional culture. According to William Altshule it is a transition “From ground-breaking shows assembled by artists themselves, to those conceived by art-dealers, art critics, gallerists, and impresarios”, resulting with “artist becoming increasingly less able to control the circumstances under which their work came before public”, and leaving them “disempowered just as their commercial and social prospects were improving”. In that respect, and according to network visualization it was possible to indicate the Biennale di San Marino, as the critical moment when that process of disempowerment has begun. It did not assume the change in the intensity of art production, at least not in the immediate aftermath of that exhibition, but rather the regard of New Tendencies from retrospective, historical perspective both by artists themselves (XXXII Venice Biennale, New Tendencies Paris exhibition), and by art historians, and art critics as well (The Responsive Eye, Licht und Bewegung – Kinetische Kunst – Lumière et Mouvement).

In the next stage of the research, based on such conclusion, the exhibition networks generated and analyzed for the purposes of this study could be extended to include art critics involved in New Tendencies, and to provide a bit different angle from which the relation between art production, writing on art and interests of art-market in the 1960s could be approached and examined.
INTRODUCTION

Public competitions for monuments and memorials have always attracted the attention of historians of art and architecture; whether due to the formal innovations and/or visionary concept they tend to generate, or their role in establishing new standards and procedures for the evaluation and selection of public art and architecture. Needless to say, some of the major international public competitions and their winning projects, such as that for the Unknown Political Prisoner in Berlin (1953), or the competitions for monuments commemorating victims of the Holocaust in the former Nazi concentration camps in Germany and Poland, have become indispensable references in the history of the post-war modernism, and important case studies for studying underlying mechanisms of Cold War cultural politics. More recently, public competitions for war memorials, such as the Vietnam War Memorial in the United States, and the growing number of memorials to Holocaust victims and victims of “totalitarianism” in Europe and North America, have played a significant role in tackling contemporary relationships between aesthetic and political concerns.

If research on 20th-century architectural competitions – itself a relatively young field of academic enquiry – is still predominantly focused on the big centres in a divided Europe, the academic interest for an analytic approach to this topic appeared in the late 1980s to early 1990s. See, for example: Helene Lipstadt: The Experimental Tradition: Essays on Competitions in Architecture (Princeton Architectural Pr, 1989). One of the reasons for such interest in that particular time period “may be found in the deregulation and market orientation of the building constructions sector during the 1980s and the deregulation in the 1990s through the European Parliament and Council directive”. Jonas E. Andersson, Gerd Bloxham Zettersten, and Magnus Rönn, “Editors’ Comments,” in Architectural Competitions – Histories and Practice, ed. Jonas E. Andersson, Gerd Bloxham Zettersten, and Magnus Rönn (The Royal Institute of Technology and Rio Kulturkooperativ, 2013), 7-8.


the West, the scope of knowledge on the specific niche of war memorial competitions is even more limited, or more tightly embedded into grand-narrative schemes. The history of the commissioning and production of post-WWII monuments and memorials, especially those related to wartime events that are tasked with embodying and transferring traumatic experience and social memory, serve as imprints of cultural, political and social issues of the Cold War era. In this regard, a comprehensive survey of international competitions for monuments, and their role in cultural and political exchange and networking, could be especially useful. However, in South-Eastern Europe, the potential for architectural competitions to become the subject of academic research has only recently been recognized. In former Yugoslavia, competitions for monuments were mostly dealt with through individual case studies. More systematic and problem-oriented approaches have been pioneered only recently. Not only do such surveys reveal forgotten artistic and architectural projects, but they broaden our knowledge on the “history of ideas”, and open up new perspectives on the cultural and political circumstances that conditioned the acceptance or refusal of innovative concepts. Such research is, however, encumbered by various practical obstacles. The models and drawings for competition entries have not always been preserved, mainly because their authors (especially visual artists), immersed in the spirit of the forward-looking progress of modernism, were at the time often unaware of their importance, or simply uninterested in the process of self-archiving. Another important obstacle is the lack of institutional upkeep of the documentation for competitions. This issue is especially pertinent in the local context, which – largely due to political reasons – has undergone drastic infrastructural changes since the 1990s, being exposed to the negative social attitudes to the legacy of post-war modernism, especially its more ideologically overt segments, such as monuments and memorials from the socialist era. The present study, however, takes a different path in an effort to approach this complex, yet crucial, segment of the modernist production of the second half of the 20th century. Instead of analyzing individual competition proposals, the aim is to approach the phenomenon of federal public competitions for monuments as platforms for social networking and exchange, and as a source of valuable statistical data that can outline the overall configuration of high-level memorial production in Yugoslavia. In other words, the aim of this paper is not to discuss the artistic and architectural achievements of awarded competition entries, but to outline and discuss the structural parameters of the very system that conditioned the production of memorials in the given context. The basic tenets of the present approach rely on the idea that the production of monuments in the period of Socialism in former Yugoslavia was a dynamic process, defined by different practices present in various levels of production, involving diverse social agents with distinctive roles and dynamic interrelations. These processes were directed and managed by various federal, republic or local organizations, or individual stakeholders, whose actions and decisions on collective commemorative activities, including the construction of monuments, were conditioned by available material resources and guided by legal regulations. Different models and levels of production constantly coexisted and merged throughout the socialist period, resulting in various scales, types and degrees of formal and/or morphological innovation. In order to understand the overall system of production and its artistic and architectural achievements, historians should – as fully and as comprehensively as possible – take into account and understand the interactions and relations between various and numerous actors participating in these processes. Due to the obvious limitations regarding reconstruction of an all-encompassing social network of these processes, this analysis is focused on examining a clearly detectable and fixed segment of the said production, defined by the same legal framework, and a limited number of involved actors – namely, the federal public competitions, and the networks of its jury members and awarded participants. The methodology applied in this case study challenges the predominant approach to authorship in the field of production of post-war monuments in Yugoslavia. Instead of focusing on the formal aspects of particular realized projects, the combination of historiographical research and the results of quantitative and network analysis aims to analyse what was happening ‘behind the scenes’: What were the mechanisms and who were the actors that enabled the production of the phenomenon referred to as ‘Yugoslav monuments’? Apart from their common historical and ideological references, what else contributed to the notion of shared heritage associated with these objects today? What were the main features of awarded participants and jury members in terms of their gender, profession, place of origin, and what can this data tell us about the function of federal competitions for monuments in Socialist Yugoslavia? One particularly important aspect of this analysis is the equal treatment of jurymembers, that is, acknowledging their active role in the field of memorial production, and their introduction to the (hi)story of monument-making. This very notion opens up new perspectives on several important issues regarding the physiognomy of the whole field and the structural roles of certain central figures within the system: How were the roles of the two different types of involved actors – those of the competitor and the evaluator – distributed, and what can we learn from their conflicting positions within the system? What are the implications of the fact that one of the most prominent and important authors of monuments in Socialist Yugoslavia appears as the central figure in jury member networks? What...
does the fact that the proportion of women among the awarded projects’ teams is higher than the average seen in the field of memorial production mean? However, while trying to answer the above questions, the primary aim of this case study is not to provide definitive conclusions, but to test the possibilities, and indicate the pros and cons of quantitative and network analysis when it comes to relatively small datasets on temporally and spatially limited historical phenomena.

TOWARD A QUALITATIVE ANALYSIS: A BRIEF HISTORY OF FEDERAL COMPETITIONS FOR MONUMENTS IN SOCIALIST YUGOSLAVIA

An anonymous public competition is a democratic procedure through which communities aim to secure the most aesthetically and functionally adequate solutions for objects of common or public interest. Apart from the rebuilding of the war-devastated country, one such interest in post-war Yugoslavia was the construction of memorials and monuments that paid homage to the huge human losses, honoured the heroes and hundreds of thousands of antifascists that fought in the war, commonly referred to as the Yugoslav People’s Liberation Struggle.236 The collective effort to commemorate the dead and celebrate the achieved freedom and progress based on proclaimed social and ethnic equality was aligned with the dominant political interests of the ruling Communist Party. The temporal and thematic scope of commemorated events often transcended the period of the Second World War, incorporating historical episodes that had previously remained uncommemorated, such as workers’ struggles and peasant uprisings. The cult and memory of contemporary politicians, intellectuals and political movements, such as the geo-political position of Non-Alignment, was also mediated in public space through monuments and memorial parks. Artists and architects were heavily involved in the task of monument building, while their personal poetics, expressed through contemporary artistic means, became more and more encouraged, resulting in distinctive individual embodiments of collective traumas based on innovative and collaborative practices that aimed to surpass traditional disciplinary boundaries. These solutions were no longer simply expected to narrate the past events, but also to emphasize their progressive character through the use of contemporary artistic and architectural means.

The organization of public competitions for monuments began immediately after the war had ended, based in part on the standards and practices inherited from the interwar period. Some fundamental competition regulations had been established as the result of professional architects’ associations’ continuous strive for more open and democratic procedures.237 Despite the different ideological framework, architectural competitions had already played an important role in the cultural exchange of knowledge and ideas on national level during the interwar period. Although some projects were submitted by the architects who had gained experience and knowledge by living abroad, competitions primarily functioned as the connecting tissue of the Yugoslav cultural space, and as an important platform for experiment and innovation. Already at that time, as Grozdana Šišković claims, competitions had the potential to spread new ideas and concepts within the public cultural sphere. In this way, architectural projects not only influenced the trends within a single architectural scene, but their mediative role often proved to be the central facet of architectural competitions.238

In the first post-war decade, federal Yugoslav competitions for monuments rarely gave rise to satisfactory results. Conventional typologies and relatively conservative formal solutions prevailed until the early-to-mid-1950s. But perhaps more importantly, the engagement of a wider public in critical discussions on this topic had not yet been achieved or even welcomed. The aim seems not to have been to foment experimentation and innovation, but to achieve the greatest possible efficiency and quality of production. For that reason, projects were often directly commissioned from highly skilled and experienced authors who had established themselves during the interwar period. They were now promoted to the position of masters who supervised and controlled production through a system of State Masters’ Workshops (Državne majstor-ske radionice) for sculpture, painting and architecture, established in the immediate wake of the war in Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana. Even when federal competitions were organized, the ambitious proposals for monuments were often rejected or the decisions for casting or installing them would be postponed, as if juries were anticipating a different course of development of memorial production in the following decade.239

Typified production was not only based on ideological concerns. The social request for memorials exponentially grew in the early 1950s, putting pressure on sculptors and architects to achieve a rapid and efficient production rhythm, which was manifested in standard typologies and repetitive motives, at times even recycled from the interwar period. With recognizable imprints of big architectural names, such as Jože Plečnik in Ljubljana, distinctive architectural schools were formed. However, due to the disciplinary division in workshops, architects’ involvement in monument-making was primarily manifested though collaborative assistance. The focus upon the formal qualities of central sculptural elements meant that projects would usually be credited to sculptors alone. For a change to occur, it was not only necessary to modernize the formal treatment of individual segments, but to come up with new collaborative methods that would enable a more comprehensive approach to the given task and the achievement of the so-much appraised modernist notion of the synthesis of all arts. In the wake of the political turmoil of 1948, a more liberal understanding of cultural production in Yugoslavia diversified the field, encouraging a new generation of visual artists and architects – well trained in the aforementioned workshops – to experiment with new formal solutions, looking for inspiration during state-sponsored scholarships in the Western European centres and in imported modern art and architecture exhibitions and magazines. Many sculptors and architects began to forge successful early post-war period is rather scarce. Early Yugoslav competitions for monuments included: Monument to Marko Oreskić in Korenica, Croatia (1946), Monument to the Liberators of Skopje, Macedonia (1946), Jajinci Memorial Park, near Belgrade (1947–1948), Memorial Ossuary of the Fallen Partisans of Dalmatia (1948).

236 During the four years of war in the Balkans, some 800,000 Yugoslavs joined the Peoples’ Liberation Struggle; one of the highest proportions of participation in armed anti-fascist resistance in Europe. It ended with some of highest numbers of workers’ struggles and peasant uprisings.

237 Bjažić Klarin, Arhitektonski i urban-istički natječaji.

238 Šišković, Architectural Competition Practice, 184.

239 The competition documentation and information on federal competitions from the Yugoslav cultural space, as an important platform for experiment and innovation. Already at that time, as Grozdana Šišković claims, competitions had the potential to spread new ideas and concepts within the public cultural sphere. In this way, architectural projects not only influenced the trends within a single architectural scene, but their mediative role often proved to be the central facet of architectural competitions.
solo careers, and new public tasks – including competition calls for monuments and memorial complexes – significantly influenced their studio practices, and encouraged them to undertake interdisciplinary collaborative work. Despite sporadic examples of new concepts for monuments that had already been realized in the early 1950s – Edward Ravnikar in Slovenia, Zdenko Kolacio in Croatia, or Bogdan Bogdanović in Serbia – the scope of new tendencies in memorial sculpture became fully visible at federal competitions for monuments organized from the mid-1950s. Encouraged by Yugoslav participation at major international events such as the competition for the Monument to the Unknown Political Prisoner held in 1952–1953,240 and by the critical reaction to the jury’s rejection of Vojin Bakić’s proposal for the Monument to Marx and Engels in Belgrade,241 the younger generation of artists and architects started to perceive competitions as an opportunity to anonymously present new ideas.242 Almost as a rule, winning projects were extensively discussed and often harshly criticized in the media, tensions and polemics became more common, references to Western European practices entered the field of critical discourse, and competitions began to play the central role in generating a new theoretical discourse on war memorials, as well as on public art and the production of space in general (ill. 1). However, change did not only come about as a result of the generational shift among the competitors; the investors and organizing committees realized that no progress would be made unless competition propositions were adapted to the specificities of new tasks, and unless the field of memorial production – as with other fields of artistic and architectural production – were to become more open and inviting towards contemporary art and ever more complex and innovative collaborative practices. Accordingly, competition juries grew in number and became more diversified in terms of their members’ professional orientations. Due to its wide-reaching response from the younger generation, and the widespread critical echo it produced in the media, the competition for the Monument to the Victims of Fascism in Jajinci near Belgrade is particularly worthy of mention. The propositions for this open, anonymous Yugoslav competition seem to have established standards and remained one of the key referential points for decades to come. The Organizing Committee requested competitors to show the “full freedom (…) to think and develop the solution”, by combining artistic, archi-
body, namely, the special Committee for the Marking and Arrangement of Historical Sites of the People’s Liberation Revolution. It was in fact the first case of active opposition from a professional organization – the Union of Architects of Serbia – which argued for the necessary cooperation between professionals and politicians on such organizational tasks. Indeed, most of the plans that this specially formed, highly-ranked political Committee had for Yugoslav monuments failed, mainly due to their political exclusivity and unwillingness to keep up with expected democratic and open principles of public competitions. It confirms the thesis that monument-making in Yugoslavia, even when it came to tasks of utmost political importance, involved complex and dynamic processes based on negotiations and even open conflicts with the political establishment that, during the 1950s, still assumed it was able to fully control such practices. However, many successful competitions for monuments, such as the one for Jajinci Memorial Park, did not result in the creation of monuments. The decisions would be postponed for different reasons, which are often today incredibly difficult to decipher. Another federal competition for the same memorial site was organized in 1980, with a record number of jury members (35), attracting yet another generation of competing teams of artists and architects. Further discussions among some of the most renowned art critics, artists and architects, again filled up newspaper pages, with commentaries spanning from appraisal to harsh criticism, including complaints coming from the former camp inmates’ organization. The final outcome was, however, the same: the winning project was set aside, and the monument, designed as the result of a direct commission from Serbian sculptor Vojin Stojić, was finally unveiled in 1988. After three unsuccessful attempts, the 1980 competition for Jajinci Memorial Park was perceived as one of the symptoms of the “crisis of memorial production”. This ‘crisis’ determined the fate of many ambitious memorial projects completed in the early 1980s, such as the Monument to the Uprising of the People of Kordun and Banija at Petрова Gora, or the nearby “Brotherhood and Unity” memorial complex on Šamarica, both in Croatia. After being selected in a federal competition and constructed in the early 1980s, the latter soon faced the economic reality and the effects of the gradual collapse of the self-managed socialist system. This was manifested in the inability to maintain such memorial complexes, composed of monuments, hotels, museums, and other programs that needed constant management and continuous financial support. After the memorial house at Šamarica changed between several patrons, continually produced debt, and was unsuccessfully offered to all major hotel companies in Croatia, an offer by a private investor was accepted in 1988. This investor decided to take a risk and embark on a family ‘memorial business’; an ambitious plan that was soon interrupted by the war and the collapse of the whole system, including the degradation of the symbolic references and ideological values these monuments and memorial sites embodied. Symptomatically, the ‘memorial crisis’ that arose in the wake of growing economic and political problems in Yugoslavia, seems to have been compensated by presentation of those same monuments at major global art exhibitions, such as the Venice Bienalle, where Yugoslavia was represented by major memorial projects from the 1960s and 1970s.


Although all of the above could have applied to the prevailing attitude in the period and context investigated in this analysis, the views and attitudes on open competitions were far from in unison. The pro and contra
arguments also depended on the structural positions from which those personally involved in the process spoke, as well as on their own material and professional interests. What is more, they depended on the positions of power within the field of artistic and architectural production. Some of the most renowned names of Yugoslav memorial production – each in their own generation – were keen to ignore or undermine the importance of democratic principles of competition and selection. Such attitudes often came from those among them – as the quantitative analysis will clearly show – whose structural position allowed them to skip tiresome and time-consuming competition procedures, and enjoy the privilege of direct commissions for monuments. This kind of structural imbalance produced undemocratic tendencies, cultural elitism, and the promotion of the idea of the “artistic genius”. Paradigmatic examples of such attitudes were Antun Augustinčić and Bogdan Bogdanović. Although they belonged to different generations and fields of practice, their structural positions were in many ways comparable, which seems to have been reflected in their shared negative attitude towards open public competitions.

On several occasions, Bogdanović expressed his scepticism regarding the functionality of public competitions, claiming they were good only for beginners and newcomers: “I think that competitions don’t always give good results since usually, or even regularly, the mediocre projects win.” He confirmed that most of his memorial projects were commissioned directly, and expressed his belief that such tasks should be given to affirmed authors, because “when someone is given the trust and the credit, than it becomes not only an honour, but a responsibility that must be justified”. Journalists’ questions regarding the rumours about the author being “backed by someone” were based on a controversy provoked by the lack of a regular competition procedure for the monument in Jasenovac. An open competition for this monument was never held, although several authors were invited to submit their proposals. As Bogdanović himself claimed, only two projects entered the second round: his and the collaborative project by Zdenko Kalacio and Kosta Angeli Radovani. Such an unregulated and obscured procedure provoked many negative reactions from individuals and professional associations. After his first project for Jasenovac Memorial Area was publicly presented in Zagreb in 1963 (Ill. 2), the Croatian Architects’ Association sent a letter of protest to the headquarters of the Federal Union of Veterans of the Peoples’ Liberation War of Yugoslavia in Belgrade.

By listing positive examples – public federal competitions for monuments in Jajinci near Belgrade and Kamenska in Croatia – they advocated for adherence to more democratic procedures when it came to the selection of the best projects for such important memorial sites. It was yet again proven that non-transparent commissioning procedures could not pass by without public reaction and complaint. In this case, however, the quality of Bogdanović’s project and his professional renomé – despite criticism
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coming from some art historians and architects²⁵⁴ – seems to have established enough authority for the realization of the project. It is possible, however, that this affair expedited the process of the passing of the special legal regulation of monument building in Croatia in 1968, a law by which competitions for significant memorial events and people became obligatory, and by which juries were made to include professionals from the fields of art and architecture.²⁵⁵

The laws regulating this particular matter differed from republic to republic, which produced different standards and practices across Yugoslavia’s various constituent republics. The same year, the Regulation on Competitions in the Field of Architecture and Urban Planning was also adopted.²⁵⁶ Although it was widely applied and called upon in the event of irregularities, the breaching of those rules had no legal consequences. This was likewise the case with the legal instruments that were aimed at protecting authorship. Affairs regarding Dušan Đamolja’s winning project for the Sremski Front monument and Igor Toši’s battle with the Committee for the construction of the monument at Petrova Gora – that will be discussed later in further detail – were perhaps the most notorious among these. Interestingly, Croatian sculptor Antun Augustinčić – 22 years Bogdanović’s senior – had a response strikingly similar to his when asked to comment on the affair surrounding the irregularities in the competition procedure for the Monument to the Peasant Uprising of 1573 in Slovenia and Croatia, in Donja Stubica, Croatia. In this case, the process was reversed: as soon as the results of this highly competitive federal competition – in which authors of younger generation triumphed – were announced, the recommendations of the jury were ignored, and Augustinčić’s work was directly commissioned. The sculptor, who had long enjoyed an almost mythical status (in both pre- and post-war Yugoslavia) and who was strongly backed by the highest political circles, had never had any intention of running for the competition. Due to his previous personal relationships with the commission-ers, he was unpleasantly surprised – and even personally offended – when the public competition had to be announced, due to the aforementioned new law on building monuments. The fact that the monument was being built in his native region almost certainly contributed to his personal motivation to undertake this project. On the other hand, he must have been aware that the status his monuments once had had become seriously threatened by new trends in monumental sculpture which almost completely discarded figuration and narration, relying instead upon hybrid amalgamations of architecture and sculpture. When asked about the reasons for his failure to submit a work to the open call, he replied:

> It is not true that one really needs to run for competitions. There are different kinds of competitions… C’mon, tell Križa, for example, to submit a novel for a competition. You wouldn’t ask that of him. Instead, if you’re interested, you’d commission a novel directly from him. Why? Because it is well known what Križa can do, and how he writes, so if you commission something from him, you are expecting to get something in his style. (...) Finally, I know very well what competitions are. At best, they are an opportunity for the young and unknown authors; first and foremost, even if I did compete, everyone would recognize me. What’s the point of anonymity then? All sculptors with a certain physiognomy can be recognized.²⁵⁷

Both Augustinčić and Bogdanović criticized competitions from their respective, comfortable positions in the system, secured by their long-term involvement in the social network of competition procedures, either as competitors themselves – which for Augustinčić was already the case in the interwar period – or as prominent members of competition juries – as was the case with Bogdanović. The following analysis will, however, reveal some important differences in their structural positions which indicate to various strategies of attaining positions of power. But after all, the regularity of a competition’s procedure primarily depended on the commissioners and investors, whose decision it was as to whether a federal or lower level of competition should be organized and carried out according to the prescribed regulations. Despite the assumption that on the local levels, where competitions were not obligatory, direct commissions were more common, some examples show that it was not exclusively the professional and political circles that guaranteed democratic procedures and highest aesthetic standards. On the contrary: since the decision-makers themselves were not particularly eager to adhere to or support such procedures, no wonder the competitions often failed or were perceived as corrupted. It was the direct stakeholders – local and political communities, veterans, former inmates, and countless individuals who participated in the financing – who were mostly engaged and interested in the process of selection, but were rarely given the chance to participate in the decision-making processes. Some early examples – such as the Monument to the Husino Miner in Tuzla – show how citizens and workers were organized to discuss and collectively decide on the conceptual and formal aspects of monuments.²⁵⁸ Decades later, an article about the competition for the Monument to the Liberators of Majdanpek in Serbia begins with the following statement: “Proof that a competition for a monument can be carried out on the most democratic basis was shown by the citizens of Majdanpek and Donji Milanovac, who themselves voted for the proposals for monuments to revolution in those two towns.”²⁵⁹ The idea was to give everyone who donated money for the monument’s construction the right to vote for a project based on their own preferences. A competition was carried out in collaboration with the Applied Artists and Designers Association of Serbia (ULUPUDS). In late 1979, an exhibition of project proposals was organized, based on which the citizens of Majdanpek could select their favourites. The competition was not anonymous; all authors were present at the exhibition, and available to elaborate their ideas to the interested visitors. Slobodan Javanović, a machine technician employed at the surface


As with every other competitive system, Yugoslav federal competitions for monuments were based on arbitrary decisions at the hands of jury members. Examples of direct-democratic decision making, as with the Majdanpek project, were but rare exceptions. Although a strong consensus prevailed that aesthetic decisions should be in the hands of professionals and experts, one of the persistent problems regarding the decision making was what Milorad Macura described as "evaluating new ideas by old criteria. Then conventional work gains over the progressive. And this obstructs the rhythm and degrades the level in the development of architecture and urbanism."262

The decision-makers were not, however, only professionals – juries were composed of diverse social actors, from highly ranked and local politicians, through representatives of war veterans, to public intellectuals and ordinary, low-skilled workers. It was the inner dynamics that decided on who would have the most influence in the final decision, and the "establishing of value criteria according to which juries selected and recommended architectural concepts was a complex field of dialogue between suggested architectural 'constructed realities', and the representative professional judgments."263

The power relationships were indeed often beneficial for professionals, since the majority of jury members belonged to that group, and cultural workers and intellectuals in general enjoyed a relatively high level of authority and prestige within society. However, in contrast to certain other forms of cultural production in socialism, where decision-making processes were more covert, it is almost impossible to claim that memorial production as such had any kind of autonomy.

Another issue was that of the different types of social relationships that existed among and between actors participating in the process, which necessarily function as obstacles to what would ideally be considered an objective evaluation. This was even openly confirmed by some prominent members of juries, such as university professor and art critic Grgo Gamulin who, in his polemic with Igor Taš over the competition for the monument at Petrova Gora in 1971, wrote:

The fact that all experts are 'blocked by their positions and acquaintances' is a well-known and completely natural thing, and has as little as possible to do with you, whose works have not been known. (…) Do you really think I can't recognize competition entries by Bakić, Đazmonja, Luketić? However, it is the matter of the highest possible objectivity, of the wider pool of affinities and knowledge, and this is why the jury membership is crucial, and it has proven to be so in this case also.264

Although the full reconstruction of 'behind the scenes' scenarios is a demanding and largely unattainable task for historians, quantitative analyses can contribute at least vague outlines of the general physiognomy of the field. Federal competitions largely contributed to the professionalization of the field of memorial production, which led to its gradual saturation. Perhaps most vivid critical view of the problem of specialization in the field of memorial production was given by Croatian sculptor Kosta Angeli Radovani:

I have always expressed my suspicion and lack of confidence towards the 'specialists'. One does not make a monument as they would make a shoe or a pot. Each time, sculptural work brings different solutions, expressing different ideas. But those who work in 'series' never make mistakes nor do they encounter difficulties like other sculptors do. Their works are always fully completed as installed with the greatest pleasure. This is what enables the use of templates for repeating the same tested solution, and, as the author moves in the magic circle of the same idea and expression, his collaborators become all those who want to get an instant monument based on the same, certified sculptural expression.265

Anonymity was often difficult to achieve if we take into account the growing number of specialized authors who regularly submitted their proposals for monuments. Still, the system of coded entries encouraged participants to experiment more freely, or even enabled newcomers or 'underdogs' to overshadow the 'masters of the monuments'.

Competitions were usually organized through one stage. The second stage procedure would be introduced ad hoc, in case none of the awarded projects sufficed the requirements, a practice that does not comply with the generally accepted and prescribed professional rules for architectural competitions.266 The practice of
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EXCEPTIONS, IRREGULARITIES, CORRUPTION

To encourage, to spark, to fire up the creative potential of an architect, and to select the best among the best, this is the point of an architectural competition. The competition is the engine and the prioritizing mechanism that progresses the production of space. A tribune from which new thoughts are heard, a platform with a view into the future, a courtroom in which decisions are made according to, and despite, the laws, judged at the same time both objectively and subjectively.261
organizing limited competitions by invitation was practiced throughout the observed period. One notable example is the closed competition for the monument celebrating the Battle of Sutjeska: the project by Miodrag Živković was selected by the jury as the best among the four competitors: himself, Stanko Mandić, Jovan Kratošvil and Boris Kobe. Since different models of competitions were never coordinated and regulated on the federal level, it gave way to manipulation of the procedure.

Perhaps the most controversial case was the competition for the aforementioned monument at Petrova Gora, Croatia. The competition was announced in 1970 as a standard single-stage, open, anonymous, federal competition. The names of the awarded projects – including the winning project by a young architect, Igor Toš, and collaborators – were publicly announced in press, and presented at an exhibition held in the Museum of the Revolution of the People of Croatia in Zagreb in July 1971. The jury gave their recommendation for the project in the making was even supplemented by a visual identity based on Toš’s design, reproduced in the papers and official communication channels of the committee board. The construction of the monument according to Igor Toš’s project and the physical plan by Ante Marinović-Uzelac, was supposed to begin in 1975, and be finished by July 1976, on the 35th anniversary of the uprising of the people of Croatia. The decision to carry out the second stage of the competition, which came about after a new Committee for the Building of the Monument was constituted in 1973, provoked an open letter from the author, who decided to speak out regarding irregularities in the procedure and copyright infringement issues. This sparked an official reply from the Committee, after which the author protested once again. The controversy over this case has never been fully resolved, and the role of Igor Toš soon went into oblivion. The project itself, however, did not – Toš’s project seems to have served as an inspiration for Bakić’s second proposal. The similarity is especially noticeable if Bakić’s second project is observed in opposition to his first idea for the monument (III. 3). Besides the copyright issue, the second stage of this competition seems to have been problematic in some other aspects as well. Stevan Luketić – who was invited to participate in the second stage of the competition – wrote a letter of protest in which he refused the decision of the jury because, among other things, “it did not evaluate all three projects equally”, and allowed some participants to correct, change or supplement their projects according to jury members’ suggestions and objection after the deadline. Furthermore, although it was an uncommon practice, the jury decided to postpone of the deadline on the request of Vojin Bakić due to the health problem of his son and collaborator at the project. The final decision was made only in 1977 – this time not by the expert jury, but directly by the Committee for the Building of the Monument. As Gamulin claimed, the “signature” of established authorities in the field of memorial production did not only become easily recognizable, but their initial inspiration and their experimental approach in time often resulted with the same sort of repetitive solutions, so strongly criticized regarding Socialist Realist monuments in the early 1950s by the very same authors. In some cases, the same project would be successfully submitted to several competition calls.

The professionalization of the field and the crisis of the institution of open anonymous competition became most evident in the 1980s, when the practice of limited competitions (or competitions by invitation) became more common. It seems to have better suited both the investor, who avoided complex procedures and put less money at risk, and the invited authors, who were financially compensated regardless of the competition outcome. After the republic competition for Dotričina, organized in 1977, did not bring about a satisfactory result, the project for Donja Gradina – among others, proposed by the author of the winning project and the physical plan by Ante Marinović-Uzelac, was supposed to begin in 1978, did not bring about a satisfactory result.

266 A similar example of “branding” memorial projects before the construction even started can be found for the monument at the Syrmian Front near Šid. An icon of Đuzmanija’s winning project at the competition was even drawn on a map of monuments published along with the a guide to Yugoslav monuments in Osijek in 1975. See: Milošen Patković, and Dušan Plećaš (eds.). Spomen-obliježja narodnooslobodilačkog rata Jugoslavije. Vodič uz kartu. Izbor spomen-obliježja narodnooslobodilačkog rata Jugoslavije (Osijek: Glas Slavonije, 1975).

design of the memorial park, the thematic scope of the memorial area grew and required a new concept on which this competition was based. See: spomen područje dotršćina. natječajni radovi (Zagreb: skupština grada Zagreba; komisija za uređenje spomen-područja dotršćina, 1980).

ing result, the jury suggested organizing another, limited, competition with invited authors, "who have so far achieved most significant results in the design of memorial parks/areas."279 The authors selected for the next closed competition, a federal one for the Monument to Tito and Zadar's Fight for Freedom in Zadar (1983), were almost identical.280 The results were unsatisfying as the authors’ ideas were, contrary to the intention of the invited competition, already exhausted.281 They offered predictable, standard solutions, while the younger generation of artists – who were critical or cynical of what they perceived as a privileged field of propaganda art practice – was professionally discouraged, and even personally unmotivated to participate in such projects. This also came about as one of the symptoms of memory politics crisis that resulted from the political crisis in the country during the 1970s, and especially in the 1980s. The economic situation (inflation, economic ‘stabilization’ campaigns, cuts in public financing, etc.), meant less money for costly and often unsuccessful competition procedures, including awards and jury honorariums. All illusions and ideals seem to have vanished, and pragmatism took over: the insistence on the principles of democracy of selection with open, anonymous, federal competitions again – as in the early post-war period – became secondary to the preferred efficiency of the procedure and the quality of the results. The golden age of experimentation was over.

QUANTITATIVE AND NETWORK ANALYSIS

After defining the general framework, offering a glimpse into the practical aspects and issues of competition procedures, with an emphasis on various issues associated with practical implementation of such democratic selection procedures, the second part of the text will focus on the figures derived from a quantitate analysis of all case studies included in the study. Although still a relatively new and epistemologically amorphous filed, Digital Humanities provides researchers with new tools, and encourages the extension of analytical scope to the macro-level, thus broadening our perspective beyond an isolated set of historical episodes. The advancement in digital technology make such endeavours more realizable, offering ever-more complex algorithms for describing and visualizing historical phenomena, and also facilitated the recreation of dynamic interrelations among people, objects and
method that raises new questions about historical events and as a potential mode of historiographic critique. As the foundation for methods such as topic modelling and data mining, the quantitative analysis of art historical data can be both a challenge and a complement to the case-study model of practice.284 Yugoslav federal competitions, functioning as important intersections of various social actors and creative hubs from which new experimental approaches to the memorial genre emerged, do not only offer an insightful methodological angle for the critical historical analysis of memorial production, but can also critically inform art-historical periodization. As such, competitions present a suitable case study for the analysis of a specific, task-oriented, multi-professional social network, based on the idea that the two main entities in the system – competitions as networking events and people with different roles (participant or jury member) – can be (inter)connected in various ways.

METHODOLOGICAL PARAMETERS AND LIMITATIONS

The timeframe of this case study (1955–1980) has been elaborated in the previous section: In the mid–1950s, federal competitions for monuments began functioning as platforms for experimentation of a younger generation of artists and architects, and competitions’ outcomes started to induce fervent critical discussions in the media. The beginning of the 1980s, on the other hand, marked the gradual decline of memorial production, with this ‘crisis’ reaching its peak in the second half of the last Yugoslav decade. As, under current circumstances, it would have been highly demanding, if not impossible, to collect data for all federal competitions held in the defined period, a representative sample consisting of 24 case studies has been formed. Three of these competitions lack full documentation regarding participants.285 However, the decision to include them in the representative sample is intentional and methodologically motivated, as it demonstrates the extent to which a shortage of information – as a common and unavoidable issue for most social and humanist researchers – can affect the overall data landscape and visualization of networks. Although this dataset can be expanded through further research, our estimate is that the given sample suffices for the outlining of some general features, and indicates certain conclusions about the social structure and networking models generated by the federal Yugoslav competitions for monuments during the 25-year period studied.

In order to analyse this specific, task-oriented, multi-professional social network, we will look at quantitative data and interrelations between two types of network entities: events (competitions) and people (awarded competitors and members of juries). The data processing and analysis was done with the use of the CAN-IS database developed through the ARTNET project,286 while some data visualizations were complemented with other open source programs (Tableau and Gephi). After all available data was collected from a combination of published and archival sources, it was inserted in the predefined categories, quantified, and/or visualized as networks though specially developed algorithms in which the position, size and colour of nodes and edges reflect a particular relational, categorical or quantitative attribute. My initial hypothesis was that the results could offer some new insights into the phenomenon or that some of its hidden aspects would be highlighted, and that such results would open up new research questions.

QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS #: COMPETITIONS

All competitions taken into consideration in this analysis were open, anonymous and conducted at the federal level, meaning that they were open to all citizens of Yugoslavia, while the entries were coded and evaluated by specially appointed panels of judges. The names of jury members had to be made public, as well as the authors and team members of awarded and purchased works were in most cases publicly announced. For most competitions, it was also possible to reconstruct the total number of submitted proposals by using primary sources in the archives, or newspaper reports and interviews with jury members. The diagram in Fig. 1 is organized as a time-line featuring competitions organized in the period between 1955 and 1980. The size of squares translates as the number of submitted entries. The highest density of competitions is evident in the period 1965–1971 (marked with a yellow square), when a total number of ten competitions were launched...
in six years. In just two years (1969–1970), six competitions were held, with a total number of 232 projects for monuments competing (denoted by an orange square). It should be noted that these figures are far from complete, which offers us a sense of proportion in terms of numbers of actors engaged in the production of monuments and memorial complexes in socialist Yugoslavia. They are equally telling regarding the effects of the aforementioned process of professionalization and saturation of memorial production. In is interesting to note that some competitions were even held simultaneously: those for the Monument to the Peasants’ Uprising in Donja Stubica and for the Monument to the Victims of Fascism in Podhum (both held in 1969–1970 in Croatia), or the competitions for the Monument at Mt Kozara, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and that in Kraljevo, Serbia (both held in 1970).

Two side effects of such overlapping can be detected: On the one hand, the lower number and lesser quality of submitted works produced dissatisfaction from organizers and jury members, and competitions often failed or were postponed. On the other hand, it dissolved the concentration of ‘big names’, giving more space to the ‘outsiders’. In the previously discussed competition for the Monument to the Uprising of the People of Kordun and Banija, both of these side effects were manifested: due to the high popularity and historical significance of the events that took place at Petrova Gora, the total number of 17 entries was considered to be relatively low, while the triumph of the 27-year old architect Igor Toš’s innovative solution definitely came as a big surprise. The outcome of the competition for the monument in Donja Stubica was similar: a number of sculptors belonging to the middle generation won high prizes, among them one female sculptor (Marija Ujević-Galetović). Due to the complex circumstances previously discussed, in both cases, the awards did not guarantee the realization of winning projects. Although, due to the incomplete list of competitions included in the analysis, their spatial distribution (Map 1) cannot bring any definite conclusions in terms of the geo-spatial policy of monument making in Yugoslavia, it is noticeable that a considerable number of competitions were organized for monuments in urban centres, which were mostly dedicated to individuals or meant to represent abstract ideas (Edward Cardelj and Revolution in Ljubljana, Vladimir Nazor in Zagreb, Marx & Engels, Moša Pijade and the Park of Friendship in Belgrade, etc.). On the other hand, the competitions for the most important war memorial sites – located in uninhabited rural areas where historical events took place – attracted more interest and creative energy from the artists and architects, as is visible from the numbers of submitted proposals.

**QUANTITATIVE ANALYSIS #II: AWARDED PARTICIPANTS**

The geo-spatial distribution of the cities and towns from which awarded competitors submitted their proposals, their number indicated by the size of the circles, shows that the production was concentrated in the three big cultural centres of Yugoslavia: Belgrade, Zagreb and Ljubljana (Map 2). The disproportion between the number of projects submitted from the capitals of Slovenia and Bosnia & Herzegovina, for example, confirms the importance of strong architectural and sculptural traditions associated with established art and architectural schools. This further indicates the difference in general artistic and architectural production standards, but it may also suggest the significance of the ability to establish professional and personal connections with decision makers which was more
likely in bigger political and cultural centres. On the other hand, the number of authors from other republics’ or provinces’ capitals (Skopje, Novi Sad, Priština), or towns such as Maribor, Subotica, Čačak or Rovinj, proves that the efforts of cultural decentralization since the mid-1950 did have a certain degree of impact on the quality of production in the peripheral contexts. Although it was difficult to visualize the inter-republic flow of works, the data presented confirms that federal competition continually played an important role in bringing projects from different parts of Yugoslavia to one table, thus contributing to the trans-republic (today international) exchange of ideas. It should be noted, however, that teams mainly consisted of practitioners from the same city/town, although there are several cases of networking among team members from different republics.

Another interesting result of the quantitative analysis is related to the gender of awarded participants. Since this study is primarily concerned with social networks of all participants, and not with their individual roles in project designs, calculations were performed for all contributors in competing teams. Out of a total of 397 names featured in the publicly announced awards and purchases, 322 were male and 75 female. This means that about 19% of awarded contributors at federal competitions were women, mostly architects. This is somewhat surprising if we take into account the overall low percentage of women credited as authors of this type of memorials. As the analysis for monuments in Croatia has shown, only about 3% of sculptors or 10% of architects were women. This brings us to the conclusion that public competitions, which usually required bigger teams and often involved collaborative practice, allowed more women to enter the field. However, while this reveals that female contribution was greater than expected, their contribution – i.e. female artistic/architectural labour – often remained invisible, as they would mostly participate in bigger project teams, with projects usually credited to men. Since most of the awarded competitors were architects by profession, the fact that women in Yugoslavia were often specialized in landscape architecture – a profession that itself was undervalued – also contributed to their higher percentage in this field of production. While this may lead us to the conclusion that public anonymous competitions were beneficial for female authors, in reality their contribution usually remained unrecorded or ignored. These figures do not only confirm the general notion of the gender bias in the fields of fine arts and architecture, but help us to attribute their causes to the structural limitations of the whole system.

Besides offering a general view on the types of professionals engaged in high-level memorial production in Yugoslavia, the quantitative analysis of the professional orientation of awarded participants gives rise to several other important conclusions (Fig. 2). Of the total number of 378 participants whose profession could be identified, 77% were related to architecture, spatial planning and engineering (architects, urban planners, landscape architects, engineers, architectural technicians or students of architecture). Surprisingly, only around 12% were sculptors, or around 18% were from all fine art professions, including professions such as painters and graphic designers.

287 The distinction between authors and collaborators on a particular project was not made for the purpose of this analysis, although it is indicated in the database itself.

These figures would be somewhat different were we to look only at the signed authors of projects. Project documentation for more complex competition tasks, i.e. those that included urban planning, architectural drawings, and various presentation materials (photographs, models), demanded bigger and more heterogeneous working groups, often including architectural studio employees or trainees. This analysis shows that the highest level of memorial production in Yugoslavia was dominated by architects, whose pronounced interest in spatial relations and social functionality contributed to the typological innovations. This was already observed by art historian Matko Meštrović who, in 1961, after seeing the exhibition of the winning projects for Monument to the Victory of the Peoples' Revolution in Kamenska, Croatia, wrote:

"Indeed, soon we may be building schools at the place of future monuments." While Meštrović’s prophecy did indeed come true, and functional monuments became more frequent in the following decades – be it as educational centres or touristic facilities – it was not merely because the architects answered the calls in greater numbers, but because the competition propositions required technical and urban planning skills. At the same time, they encouraged more integrative approaches that required experimentation, cross-disciplinary collaboration and innovation.

A very important positive fact is that architects are more frequently answering to the task of designing and constructing monuments. This derives from a more open, far-sighted, free and daring approach to monuments; from the will to widen its radius, and the inner dimension of its temporal–spatial existence, being and radiance; from the ever more realistic anticipation of its concrete form and lasting purpose. A monument is no mere a head, a gesture, a figure; more and more often, a monument becomes a designed space which penetrates life in a more realistic way. This last competition can show us how far we have gone on that path. If we are not satisfied with its results, we can be satisfied with this.\(^{289}\)

After discussing Branko Ružić’s and Vladimir Ivanović’s innovative project for a monument-school, he finished his inspired, optimistic report with the hopeful prediction: "Indeed, soon we may be building schools at the place of future monuments."\(^{290}\) While Meštrović’s prophecy did indeed come true, and functional monuments became more frequent in the following decades – be it as educational centres or touristic facilities – it was not merely because the architects answered the calls in greater numbers, but because the competition propositions required technical and urban planning skills. At the same time, they encouraged more integrative approaches that required experimentation, cross-disciplinary collaboration and innovation.

The results of the competitions have so far shown that those solutions in which a harmonious composition of the park with buildings and sculptures were the most successful. (...) We are deeply surprised by the fact that the “city of parks” announces a competition for a memorial park that will not be evaluated by any of our landscape specialists because none are sitting upon the jury. (...) We think that the problem of sculpture and its placement in the greenery is another specific issue, for the evaluation of which the selection of a sculptor as one of the jury members would be more appropriate than a painter. To conclude, it would be in the best interest of the quality and correct assessment of the competition entries, for which the city of Sarajevo will give 5 million dinars, to extend the existing jury to include the aforementioned specialist for landscape architecture and sculpture.\(^{291}\)

Although Klaić’s complaint was not taken into account, the competition turned out to be unsuccessful, as none of the projects were awarded the first prize.\(^{292}\)

The overall predominance of the more technical, pragmatic and problem-solving disciplines, such as those of architects and urban planners, is a logical yet rarely affirmed and analysed notion in the existing literature on monuments. This has, on the one hand, produced interdisciplinary collaboration, but it also explains the tensions that were present between architects and sculptors, who felt threatened by architecturally pragmatic approaches and often more effective results. While some sculptors continued the old model of using architects as technical support, keeping a clear distance between the respective contributions of both authors, others – usually the younger, post-war generation – successfully advanced their own practice through fruitful collaboration with architects, urban planners and landscape architects, adopting the gained experience and knowledge, and using it to their own advantage – opening the ways towards new concepts and typologies. A third group, however, developed an antagonism towards architects, claiming that many such architects allow themselves to go on adventures more than to something we could call successful explorations (...) trying to get beyond their bureaucratic, cliché manners, through which they paraphrase and repeat some solutions that had originated in other


\(^{290}\) Ibid, 125.

\(^{291}\) Smiljan Klaić, “Natječaj za arhitekton-
social, ideological, and even financial-economic possibilities and relations.

TOWARDS A NETWORK ANALYSIS

The lists of the twenty most awarded and most connected authors, and most frequent and most connected jury members (Fig. 3) gives an adequate transition to the network analysis. Its main purpose is not only to show the interconnections within the network, thus revealing the structural positions of individual actors, but also to indicate their various and multiple roles in relation to competitions, enabling us to visualize the complexity of this type of task-oriented, multi-professional social network.

From the gender perspective, it is interesting to notice that among twenty most awarded authors there were four women, while no men were equally highly ranked within juries. On the other hand, the structural position of the Serbian female sculptor Olga Jevrić is mainly determined by a relatively high degree of centrality. Some of the most famous authors of monuments were not eager to run for competitions, but those of the person with the highest number of connections with other awarded participants (Aleksandar Krstić; coloured green), the extent to which Bogdanović was structurally embedded within the network is striking.

Before the further discussion, which, based on these results, will focus on the analysis of the structural positions of two statistically dominant (and) historically important figures: Dušan Džamonja and Bogdan Bogdanović — we shall give a brief synopsis of the general features of the network.

GENERAL FEATURES OF FEDERAL COMPETITIONS’ NETWORKS

In this analysis, we looked at two types of actors: awarded participants and the members of the panel of judges. In both cases, we are dealing with a limited number of people that form bipartite networks; either through participation in the same group of architects/artists whose project was awarded at the competition, or through sharing membership of the same panel of judges. The visualizations were generated from the predefined datasets inserted into the relational database. Depending on the parameters used and algorithms employed,

---

we are able to generate different visualizations. Networks can significantly differ as a result of whether we decide to limit the data to awarded participants, their mutual relationships and their relationships with competitions (Fig. 6a), or if only jury members, their mutual connections and their connections with competitions are shown (Fig. 6b). From these visualizations it is clear that in both scenarios all competitions are well connected, most of them having multiple relations with other competitions, both through joint jury memberships and through the fact that the same authors were awarded. The network of participants, shown in Fig. 6a, has a wider diameter and is less dense, which indicates less cohesiveness among network members. The participants' network, due to the nurturing of collaborative and team work, is at the same time characterized by a larger number of smaller, isolated groups of project teams. On the other hand, the network of jury members is denser, yet it features two groups which are conspicuously isolated. Those groups of jury members are linked to the competitions for monuments to Edward Kardelj (Ljubljana, Slovenia), and to the Victims of Podhum (Croatia). The reason for this may be that the organizers chose more local actors, possibly also with the intention of attracting more local contributors. It is interesting that the ‘gatekeeper’ for the Kardelj monument was Slovenian architect Marjan Tepina, who was also a jury member for the monument to the Revolution in Ljubljana, while the gatekeeper for the Podhum competition was Grgo Gamulin, who, around the same time, also evaluated the works in the competition for the Kozara monument, and who wrote extensively and self-reflectively on both of these decision-making experiences. However, for the purpose of generating the whole complex network featuring both datasets, a different software (Gephi) was used, because it offers more sophisticated
Fig. 6a
The network of all awarded participants, mutually linked based on artistic or technical collaboration on project proposals, and individually linked with the competitions at which they participated. Generated with CAN-IS

Fig. 6b
The network of all jury members, mutually linked based on common jury membership, and individually linked with the competitions in which they participated as jury members. Generated with CAN-IS
visualization tools that makes the general reading of the network easier, while certain (set of) elements can be visually empathized and thus become more easily detectable (Fig. 7). In this network, both groups of entities (competitors and jury members) are brought together. Different types of edges are distinguished by different coloured lines (pink – joint work on a competition entry; green – joint jury membership; light blue – participation in a competition as a jury member; yellow – participation in a competition as a participant), while the size of the two types of nodes (architectural competitions and people) are ranked in size based on the degree of centrality. The nodes could not be differentiated by colour because many actors, as we have already shown, played dual roles throughout the period. A comprehensive reading of this visualization therefore requires decent knowledge of the profiles of the most prominent actors.

The network itself is characterized by a high density in the central part, where the green type of edges – joint jury membership – is dominant. A series of smaller groups of teams working on joint competition entries are located along the network periphery, indicating a low degree of centrality of those actors. The degree of centrality of blue nodes signifying competitions is especially interesting. As expected, the first competition for the Jajinci memorial is located at the very centre of the visualization, thus statistically confirming the emphasized importance of this event in terms of establishing standards and anticipating the future trends in federal competitions. The centrality of the node indicates that the very same authors – for many of whom this competition was the first chance to become noticed and be rewarded for their innovative approaches – continued to be active within the field of memorial production in the following decades, either as competitors or jury members. Similar can be said of other larger
blue nodes in the network, signifying the second competition for Jajinci, competitions for monuments in Kamenska, Sremski Front, Petrova Gora and Kozara.

CENTRAL FIGURES IN THE NETWORK – THE CASE OF BOGDANOVIĆ AND DŽAMONJA

The second most central or dominant node in the visualization shown in Fig. 7 is Bogdan Bogdanović. Although Dušan Džamonja, due to the small number of collaborations and lack of jury participations, is characterized by a relatively low degree of betweenness centrality, he was the most prominent participant, taking part in the largest number of competitions. We compared the backgrounds and structural power positions of these two statistically prominent actors. It is, however, well known that both were highly prolific authors in the field of memorial sculpture and architecture, retaining leading positions within the system throughout the period studied. How was it then possible that their structural positions in the network visualization were not more balanced? The answer lies in the fact that they employed different strategies for establishing and maintaining their power positions. Dušan Džamonja (1928-2009) and Bogdan Bogdanović (1922-2010) belonged to the same generation. They both experienced the Second World War: the young Bogdanović participated in it actively on the Partisan side, while Džamonja was a highly receptive witness to the horrors that surrounded him as a child. The creative work of both artists was deeply affected – or even determined – by their wartime experiences. Despite the fact they had different backgrounds – one trained as an architect and the other as a sculptor – both manifested a strong desire to cross the boundaries of their medium. This not only resulted in major differences in their poetic language, but early on brought
them both to the field of memorial sculpture that allowed for such kinds of experimenta-
tion. Although they had already been recog-
nized among most talented authors in the
first half of the 1950s, the competition for Ja-
jinci memorial (1957) was a landmark event
for both of them, and the only occasion in
which they both participated as competitors.
They established themselves professionally
in early 1950s, both as outstanding, leading
artists and architects of their generation. At
this point, however, their careers took differ-
ent paths: Bogdanović became a member
of the Faculty of Architecture in Belgrade in
1953, thus beginning his life-long academic-
career that was crowned by the title of Profes-
or Emeritus in 1987. His institutional
power grew even stronger when he took on
leading roles in professional organizations,
such as the Yugoslav Union of Architects
(1964), and when he became a member of
the Serbian Academy of Sciences and
Arts (1970, resigning in 1981). Džamonja,
on the other hand, took the path of what today
would be classified as a freelance artist.
Interestingly, he managed to do so in a so-
cialist system in which there was no real art
market. In part, presumably, this may have
been possible precisely due to the system
of public competitions in which he would
regularly participate. After gaining enough
experience, skills and confidence at the
Academy of Fine Arts in Zagreb and at Fra-
no Kršinić’s Master Workshop (1951–1953),
he almost completely broke away from the
existing hierarchical structures and prac-
tices of the art academy, and embarked on
an independent career. Besides developing
a successful international career, applying
for numerous public competitions was his
main strategy for developing experimental
practice in open-space large formats, and
maintaining an independent position within
the Yugoslav art system.

Despite different structural positions and
strategies, Bogdanović and Džamonja were
among the most dominant, prolific and well
established names in the field of memorial
production in former Yugoslavia. The ge-
ographic reach of their monuments was
among the widest, but the commissions were
obtained in different ways. While Džamon-
ja continued to enter public competitions
throughout his career, Bogdanović aban-
donned this practice very early on, instead con-
tinuing to work through direct commissions.
This is also clearly visible from their posi-
tions within two respective networks: that
of the participants of the winning projects
– where Bogdanović takes the central posi-
tion – and the network of the jury members,
in which – surrounded by politicians, war
veterans, public intellectuals and several
other prominent architects and sculptors –
Bogdanović looms as the central figure.
His connectedness to the jury members at
different competitions, and his continuous
presence in decision-making processes, his
social esteem as a public intellectual, critic
and theoretician – all of these were crucial
for obtaining direct access to commissions,
thus bypassing the tiresome and often risky
process of running for competitions. Zden-
ko Kolacio’s structural position and strategy
was rather similar – although being one of
the most prolific architects in this field of
practice in Croatia, he also soon gave up
on submitting project entries, and became
a highly prominent figure within juries.
The main difference between these two
strategies of securing position within the
system of memorial production depended
on the material conditions. Džamonja as a
freelance sculptor chose to earn his living
by making art, and was thus forced to use
every opportunity to acquire funding and
honaria. The dynamics of such working
conditions allowed him to spend more time
in his atelier, preparing the extensive and
detailed project documentation. On the
other hand, figures such as Bogdanović
and Kolacio, who enjoyed great renown in

society and were permanently employed at
universities or urban planning offices, were
invited directly. Their position was therefore
privileged compared to those authors –
usually emancipated freelance sculptors –
who were highly dependent on the system
of competitions. This also explains the ways
in which Bogdanović’s structural position
conditioned him to speak against public
competitions. We must keep in mind that
his deep involvement in the decision-mak-
ing processes made him highly aware of all
corruptive, unregulated and problematic
segments of that system.

STRUCTURAL POSITION OF WOMEN IN THE NETWORK

In addition to conclusions drawn on the basis
of gender-related statistics, the visualization
presented in Fig. 8 is even more telling in
term of female positioning within the whole
system of federal public competitions for
monuments in Yugoslavia. The red nodes
and edges represent the positions and con-
nections of all female actors within the
network. It is clearly evident that the majority
are located along the peripheral edges of
the visualization, where women often com-
posed the majority of project teams. As the
statistics have shown, women were pres-
ent in the field of memorial production to a
greater extent than would be expected, but
since they usually worked as collaborators
upon projects that rarely won first prizes, they
were neither professionally nor financially
motivated to stay in the field of memorial
production or encouraged to compete with
their own proposals. Women with a higher
degree centrality were often spouses of more
successful and famous architects and sculpt-
ors, with whom they worked in teams, like
Mira Wenzler-Halambek, wife of Fedor Wen-
zler, and Mira Jurišić Krković, wife of highly
prolific Serbian sculptor Momčilo Krković.
The working conditions, unpaid labour, and
other professional limitations derived from
such artistic partnerships should be further
investigated, but they certainly contributed
to the structural obstacles women had to
endure in their professional careers. On the
other hand, the high degree of centrality
of the sculptor Olga Jančić and Vera Hor-
vat Pintarić, prove that it was not impossi-
ble for women to become part of the de-
cision-making cliques. Despite the better
social position of women in socialism, it was,
however, much more difficult for women to
meet the criteria and come to such positions:
both Jančić and Horvat Pintarić, each in her
own field of work, were completely devoted
to their careers, achieved the highest pro-
fessional standards, and were internationally
renowned and connected.

CONCLUSIONS

Digital Art History allows researchers to use
new digital tools in order to include more
actors, voices and (hi)stories in an analysis
that has so far been constrained and lim-
ited by selective approaches and biased
perspectives, dictated by the grand narra-
tive schemes of the Western world. Although
the main objectives of digital art history are
usually described in terms of quantitative,
so-o-cultural, spatial analysis, with a ten-
dency toward transnational and transdis-
ciplinary inclusion of all actors included in
the creative process,294 this study has shown
that the same methods can be equally ben-
eficial to the analysis of smaller-scale and
localized phenomena. What is more, it has
shown that, for phenomena such as public
competitions, it is necessary to take into
account not only those actors who crea-

294 Béatrice Joyeux-Prunel, “ARTLS®: A
Spatial and Trans-national Art History
Origins and Positions of a Research
Program,” ARTLS Bulletin, Vol. 1, No. 1
tively participated in the process, but to juxtapose and overlap their collaborative networks with those networks generated in the decision-making sphere. As the first part of the analysis – based on qualitative approach or standard historiographical methods – has shown, jury members were not only crucial for making decisions; their structural position in the system of high-level memorial production significantly influenced the dynamics and division of power positions, constantly challenging – or even threatening – the democratic principles of public competitions. Without paying attention to jury membership, it would not have been possible to detect the division of power positions among certain prominent authors, as we have shown in the examples of Bogdan Bogdanović and Dušan Đamonja. Competitions for monuments nevertheles managed to maintain a relatively high degree of interest and competitiveness throughout the observed period. Although participation at federal competitions was limited exclusively to Yugoslav citizens, from today’s point of view these competitions can be considered as transnational networking vehicles. It is also important to emphasize the importance of quantitative logic in social network analysis to opposing the methodological nationalism still present in most local art historical studies. Federal competitions were indeed the generators of the innovative and experimental development within the field of memorial sculpture and architecture in Yugoslavia, functioning as key organizational platforms that had contributed to the formation of the Yugoslav memorial landscape. The social network generated and analysed for the purposes of this study is but an initial survey of potential further exploration of the possibilities offered by digital tools. It has shown that public competitions are apt for quantitative and network analysis. The existing network could be expanded both in terms of its quantitative scope – which would require further archival research – and in analysing and quantifying the nature and complexity of entities’ interrelations. In more general terms, this study has indicated the analytic potential for using competitions as suitable angles for examining the intersections and overlapping of the fields of art/architecture and politics in the post-war period.

Several clear advantages can be outlined in the results of such an approach to the phenomenon of public competitions for monuments. With substantial knowledge on the historical background of the phenomenon, it enables a rapid shift between micro- and macro-story perspectives. The automatic data calculation and visualization makes all actors, regardless of their symbolic status, equally visible within the network, thus reducing the possibility of biased historiographical approaches. The visualizations can outline collaborative models that lie behind the production of a monuments or memorial complex, making visible the multitude of actors and professions included in this field of production, as well as creative collaborations that have, for various reasons, been forgotten or overlooked. Such an unbiased perspective on the position of individuals within larger social networks contributes to a fuller understanding of the phenomenon, and to the demystification of the role of “artistic genius” in the process of monument making, without undermining the creative potentials of individual artists and architects. Not only does team work become more evident in such representation, but so does the structural position of the “big names” within the network. Their roles in decision-making processes open up yet another critical perspective on the preferred and/or self-declared artistic autonomy of the modernist artist. Among the most rewarding findings of the statistical analyses is the relatively high percentage of women among the awarded participants. However, coupled with their peripheral position within the network structure, these figures contribute to our understanding of the structural invisibility of female contributions to memorial projects. On the other hand, the centrality of some female entities in the networks opens up further questions regarding their role as gatekeepers in the social network. Such assumptions could, however, only be investigated through a more in-depth analysis and adequate qualification of the nature and quality of the interrelations between various entities.

Finally, as the very structure of this paper manifests, quantitative methods in humanities – regardless of advances in the digital technologies that support them – should be preceded by or built upon a substantial body of knowledge on regarding a certain historical phenomenon, not only so that researchers and readers are able to comprehend the level of its social, political and cultural complexity, but to improve awareness of the multiple narratives and the existence of personal voices hiding behind differently sized and coloured nodes and edges, located in abstract diagrams and maps. *

---
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INTRODUCTION

The independent cultural scene is a term used for an artistic and cultural complex, whose occurrence, consolidation, and proliferation in Croatia can be traced back to the very end of the last and beginning of this millennium. Given the recency of the occurrence, it can still be regarded as an unexplored phenomenon, in which discussions regarding its basic outlines and characteristics are mostly held among its main protagonists. According to the researcher and independent scene actor, Dea Vidović, the independent scene can be described as a "new cultural field", comprised mostly of non-governmental organizations, that is "specific in its agency and organization as well as its aesthetic, ideological, and political values and attitudes."296 The author distinguishes between the two directions of independent cultural development: one that originates from the subculture, and is founded on the value principles of anarchism, activism, and DIY culture as well as the heritage from social movements of the 1970s and 80s, and another one that holds the artistic value as its guiding principle, wherein the artistic and professional context could belong to the institutional culture.297 By emphasizing that sometimes it may be difficult to draw a line between the two directions, the author indicates that their connection is shared through the initiatives' use of a bottom-up approach, critique of socio-political context, non-profit logic, simultaneous focus on both local and international cooperation, and interaction throughout artistic, cultural, technological, and political fields.298

Given the diversity of cultural and artistic practices and values that are created within such a widely-defined field, in addition to the various origins of individual actors, the independent scene can be viewed as a dynamic social space comprised of closely knit, though diverse social groups. Even though they are in a constant interrelated process of coming together and breaking apart, they form a network in which common aesthetic, social, and political values are created and shared; a space in which complex personal, social, and spatial-temporal relations are formed. The networking spaces within the independent scene can thus be viewed and interpreted as netdoms299—social spaces that are simultaneously based on social relations that constitute the network, and on definitions, discourses, and themes that occur within network interactions, which serve to maintain its structure.

When taking into account the attitudes and statements of the scene's protagonists—gathered through semi-structured narrative interviews—the aim of this text is to offer an interpretation of the independent scene as a social space in which structure and culture are intertwined. In other words, by using insights from the actors themselves, the aim is to outline the structure, actors, and relations of the still evolving scene through 1990s, and the complex forms of communication and exchange that generated collective 'stories'.

Taking into account the aforementioned diversity of cultural and artistic practices, the


298 Ibid.

focus of this text is more limited and deals with the segment of the independent scene that primarily examines visual arts, i.e., the segment that, according to Dea Vidović, could be described as being close to institutional culture in the artistic and professional sense.\(^{301}\) In other words, the interview analysis was conducted with a further focus on one actor in particular—the curatorial collective WHW (What, How and for Whom).

Aside from the fact that the diversity of cultural and artistic practices and the various origins of individual actors is visible in the independent scene as a whole, it is also visible in the analytically extracted segment relating to institutional culture. Since the approach to the independent scene is from the perspective of its protagonists, this diversity restricts broader generalizations with regard to scene’s development. As such, a comprehensive analysis of the structure, actors, and relations based on the gathered data would go beyond the framework of this text.

METHODOLOGY

Methodologically speaking, this work is based primarily on the application of a qualitative structural analysis (QSA); an innovative methodological approach in which the quantitative network analysis is linked to qualitative approaches.\(^{302}\) The intention of such an approach is to bridge the gap between the qualitative and quantitative, and to develop tools that allow for interpretation of qualitative constructs with the help of concepts developed within traditional network analyses (e.g., structural holes, network centralization, homophily, and strong and weak ties). This type of methodological approach was used to analyze the gathered semi-structured narrative interviews conducted with the protagonists of the Croatian art scene in the 1990s, with the narrative data being processed using ‘themetic coding’\(^{303}\) in order to develop and interpret analytical concepts.\(^{303}\)

According to Herz, Peters and Truschkat, the main idea of a QSA is “to combine the analytical approach of structural analysis with analytical standards from qualitative social research.”\(^{304}\) They argue that a “QSA goes beyond being a ‘mere’ combination of different analytical methods and instead integrates a structural approach within a qualitative approach.”\(^{305}\) As stated by Kadushin, there are two main approaches in the social network analysis: the analysis of whole networks and the analysis of egocentric networks.\(^{306}\) In this article, an egocentric approach was applied, meaning that the main focus was on the analysis of individual relations, networks, and networking strategies of the scene’s protagonists—or more specifically, the study’s respondents. Following a qualitative structural analysis approach,\(^{307}\) a structure-focused, actor-focused, and tie-focused analysis of the interviews was applied. Structure-focused analysis includes observations regarding network density, cohesion, subgraphs (cliques), clusters, equivalence and similar structural properties of networks. An actor-focused analysis examines the positions and roles of individuals in the network; how easy is it for them to connect with other members in the network, what is their centrality like, and does an individual actor have a bridging role in the network or do they bridge structural holes? Finally, a tie-focused analysis studies the quality of relations within a network, digging into specific subgraphs; weak and strong ties between individuals in the network (in terms of emotional closeness, length of time they know each other, or type of relationship); are there multiple relations in the network, or how important is homophily. In other words, concepts that are typical for quantitative network analyses are here used as sensitizing concepts which guide the interview analysis.

While applying qualitative structural analyses, the concentration on the curatorial collective WHW originates from the material itself: WHW is an actor that all of the study’s respondents have named, either by directly describing their work and activity as formative or important for their own practice or for the scene as a whole, or by using them as an example of changes that occurred at the turn of the millennium. In other words, this text does not cover the formation of the curatorial collective WHW as much as it employs their perspective in describing the scene’s dynamic development through the 1990s and into the new millennium: how was the scene organized through the 1990s and in what way did the organizational models change throughout the decade and into the new millennium? In what way do the socio-political and cultural frameworks impact networking within the scene as well as the formation of individual groups? What is the curatorial collective WHW’s position within the scene? Which actors are important for WHW’s formation and further development? What is the relationship between the independent scene and institutional culture? And finally, in what way is the scene’s structure related to its protagonists and their previously mentioned shared values?

The results gained from the qualitative structural analysis of the interviews have been expanded upon with the analysis of WHW’s two collaboration networks in the initial years of their work. Through the generated visualizations, we consider the cooperation of the WHW collective and other organizations within the independent scene and institutional culture as well as cooperation with artists and other cultural workers, realized through the organization of exhibitions and various discursive programs.


303 In total, 29 interviews were conducted and transcribed, with a portion of the acquired data being included in the CAN-IS database. Also contributing to the conducted interviews of project ARTNET were Sanja Horvatinčić, Ivana Meštrov and Dalibor Prančević.


305 Ibid., 16-17.


307 Herz, Peters, and Truschkat, “How to Do Qualitative Structural Analysis.”

308 Given that the qualitative research was focused on 1990s and early 2000s, WHW’s collaboration networks take into account the data from 2000 to 2006. This timespan covers the period from their first exhibition up to the time they start implementing larger European collaborative projects.
When talking about the 1990s cultural and art scene in Croatia, it is inevitable to reference the demise of Yugoslavia and the wars that followed. Representing the most visible and radical break between the two socio-political systems, the wars were followed by a rise of nationalism and conservatism as well as stagnation in the realm of cultural production, which led the scene’s actors to often describe this period as “gloomy”, “traumatic” or “ideologically uncomfortable and difficult”. On one hand, the changes in the socio-political system brought a standstill to the activities of many structures/organizations, such as the Alliance of Socialist Youth and other youth organizations that served as places of experimentation and live cultural production in previous decades. Additionally, due to the imminent dangers of war, museum collections were moved to depots and were unavailable for public viewing until late 90s. On the other hand, the lack of new strategic documents regarding cultural policies resulted in the government employing an ad hoc approach to the cultural sector—later described as neo-conservative—in which culture’s only role was to symbolically represent the state. This break in the continuum—labeled by one art critic and curator as a “conservative revolution”—was therefore perceived not only by the disappearance of structures and spaces, but also by the increasing inability to form relations with progressive artistic phenomena that marked the second half of the 20th Century:

The transition from one decade into another was therefore marked with what can be perceived as analogous to the current times—frankly, it was a horrible attempt to neglect the development of both the fluxes and phenomena that have not only birthed, but also defined Croatian contemporary art. In the period from the 1950s to 90s, when art production closely followed the most important international tendencies, there was an attempt to erase it all [...] and could be called, more or less accurately, a conservative revolution. The attempt was to form what some would call a national artistic paradigm [...].

309 Interview 4, interview by Ivana Meštrov and Željka Tonković, November 25, 2015.
310 Interview 11, interview by Ivana Meštrov, December 22, 2015.
312 During that time, the press published art critics and artists’ continuous critique of government’s relentless focus on the past, naïve art, and kitsch, while at the same time pointing out that the contemporary art is an indicator of Croatia belonging to Europe. The exclusion of contemporary art could also be viewed through the continuous postponement of construction of the Museum of Contemporary Art, as well as the temporary closure of several spaces, manifestations, and contemporary art festivals.
313 Interview 21, interview by Sanja Sekelj and Željka Tonković, March 6, 2017.
There are many reasons for referencing the socio-political context and climate of the early 90s when discussing the cultural and art scene. Aside from it serving as a point of critique for many artworks and participatory actions, it also directly influenced the circumstances and means of forming networks among the scene’s actors, as well as the structure itself. With regard to the latter, given that museums had to limit their activities in the early 90s and their collections were stored away in depots, many other spaces and contemporary art festivals were also temporarily put on hold. In visual arts, this was most drastically felt with the temporary closing of PM Gallery, which throughout the 1980s went beyond just an exhibition space, rather it was a gathering space frequented by the protagonists of the Zagreb, Croatian, and Yugoslav scene. This space in particular was referenced by most respondents, and its closure could be regarded as a symbolic marker to the temporary cessation of artistic spaces that served as gathering spaces. Although the respondents mention certain exhibition spaces whose programs they frequented (such as Nova Gallery, Miroslav Kraljević Gallery, Zvonimir Gallery or Gallery/Museum of Contemporary Art), what is essentially left? [after transition, with the disappearance of all former structures] In my opinion, the only thing left were these informal elements of gathering. Along the lines of, two of us get together in a bar and then figure something out. Most of these projects, from Arkzin to Attack, and even WHW, were formed in random bars; Arkzin was formed sometime in autumn on some terrace in Tkaličićeva Street, the first WHW exhibition project was conceived in BP Club, etc.

On one hand, the consequence of exhibition spaces ceasing to serve as gathering spaces was the proliferation of artistic events in alternative exhibition spaces. The respondents of the study point to several crucial events such as the exhibition held at the Flower Square’s abandoned Old Vjesnik printing house, marking Earth Day. Another one took place in a tunnel under Zagreb’s Grič, originally designed as a shelter during Second World War, followed by exhibitions held at the abandoned toy factory complex Biserka as well as many individual art interventions in public space. The other hand, the constant lack of resources defined a whole generation of young artists, art critics, and other cultural workers who, by seizing these spaces as symbolic representatives of their own positions as well as physical spaces for work, defined one of the leitmotifs of the cultural and art scene in the 1990s and early 2000s. Moreover, this lack of gathering spaces was most likely the reason why the cultural and artistic scene in the 1990s was fractured and informally organized around narrow social circles. One of the study’s respondents, a new media artist, explains the interrelation of private contacts and formal networks as follows:

It is one and the same. Private network is the network. Other forms of network simply did not exist in Croatia in the 90s. It was exclusively private networking, which predominantly took place in bars. There are no gathering spaces, no mailing lists, and no networks. Well, there are two functioning networks; as mentioned, one was Soros, and the other was Culturalink, whose international activities were concerned with other issues.

The same artist would later go on to say that true networking only began in Croatia at the turn of the millennium:

There was a turning point in the 2000s with the formation of WHW and their first exhibition. For the first time, the networking expanded to a second group around Mama, as well as a third group around CDU, with Sergej and Frakcija. These three groups really hit it off, and Croats finally understood what networking meant. In the 90s this simply wasn’t the case. […] The conscious networking only came about in the 2000s when these three groups came together and started working on POLICY_FORUM.

At the turn of the millennium, the organizational logic of cultural actors changed—one year after the 2000 elections that brought a change in government, there was a restructuring of laws governing the formation of NGOs, making the registration process easier and providing more opportunities for accessing public financing for the arts. With the proliferation of numerous cultural NGOs, there came a tactical networking effort of local and national actors through the newly formed platforms Clubture and Zagreb – European Cultural...
Their shared purpose was primarily to nurture cooperation through program exchanges and development, and share resources with the aim of further strengthening the scene at large. At the same time, in order to reinforce their position, the platforms furthered their advocacy efforts through closely following cultural policies and actively participating in the changes and implementations. Due to sudden expansion, the rhizomatic spread of organizations, and the need for networking, many of the study’s respondents identified this structural change in the cultural field as the moment that allowed for the development of the scene to run parallel to institutional culture.

For respondents that participated in the activities of the Zagreb – European Cultural Kapital 3000 platform, the formation of the independent scene at the turn of the millennium can be seen through a prism of “self-institutionalization” and “self-organization”—given that the needs of new actors surpass the levels of individual initiatives and actions and create their own organizational forms. Reflecting on the difference in networking and collaborative practices of the 1990s and early 2000s, one of the respondents pointed out that in the 90s, “there was no model”. Rather, the socialization and one-time initiatives were seen more “as a lifestyle”, lacking any “real structural relationships”. In contrast, the logic behind networking in the Cultural Kapital platform was quite different:


We were following a different kind of logic, one of self-organization. (...) In the 2000s, efforts were made to connect all of these cultural NGOs with the aim of strengthening and providing a lasting framework for cultural activities. One of the guiding principles was for networks to serve as a foundation for a new cultural center, a new type of institution for contemporary cultural practices. I believe that is the key difference between the alternative scene of the 80s and the independent scene that originated in the 90s, because the scene that took hold in the 2000s did not accept the label of alternative culture, unlike the one formed in the 80s.322

Still, one of the key issues that persisted in the early 2000s was the lack of working spaces (and sufficient resources for cultural production in general) that would enable organizations to gain greater visibility, thus driving the scene to focus on collective action and cooperation, as demonstrated in the aforementioned platforms. According to one of the members of the Multimedia Institute, solidarity and resource sharing came as the result of a joint effort by these organizations in offering context for critical contemporary art practices, while the idea of ‘gathering’ and collective action was the result of a belief that “the basic cultural infrastructure is not defined by buildings and operational costs, but by cooperation”.323

322 Interview 18, interview by Sanja Sekelj and Željka Tonković, December 6, 2016.

323 Interview 12, interview by Ivana Meštrov, January 13, 2016.
establishment of the WHW curatorial collective, namely, the first exhibition organized by the independent curators Ana Dević, Nataša Ilić, and Sabina Sabolović, who were later joined by Ivet Curlin. The exhibition took place at the Croatian Association of Artists in 2000, under the title What, How, and for Whom? On the Occasion of 152 Years of Communist Manifesto, which would later become the name of the collective and NGO.324 Thanks to the members of the collective, the inspiration for and the execution of the exhibition are well known: the initiative came from the magazine, Arkzin and its editor in chief, Dejan Kršić, with the aim of increasing visibility of Arkzin’s 1998 reissue of the Communist Manifesto, with a foreword by Slavoj Žižek.325 Initially, the planned 1998 exhibition was supposed to include several young Croatian artists, but ended up happening in 2000 with almost 50 artists from across Europe, predominantly ex-Yugoslavia and former Eastern Bloc countries. In conjunction with the exhibition, and organized in collaboration with the Multimedia Institute, there was an extensive program of lectures, discussions, and projections that included curators from Serbia, Slovenia, and Albania, as well as Hito Steyerl, Frederic Jameson, and Richard Barbrook.

According to respondents, the curatorial collective WHW held one of the central roles within the independent scene structure, and their contribution to the tactical organization of the scene was often emphasized. The collective’s curators belong to a younger generation of cultural actors, whose early work critically examined and reflected upon the socio-political and cultural climate that affected them throughout the 1990s. In their words, the project can also be interpreted in the spirit of generational rights in establishing their own attitudes towards the past as well as the need for the restoration of a continuous with regard to the artistic phenomena of the socialist period.326 Alongside the Multimedia Institute, the Centre for Drama Arts, and Platform 9.81, the WHW curatorial collective was also one of the core members of the Zagreb – European Cultural Capital 3000 platform, and one of the first members of the Clubture platform. Aside from participating in collaborative efforts of the scene, this element of collectivity is present in WHW’s work in general. On one hand, WHW is a collective, curatorial identity that jointly signs exhibitions, texts, and other programs, in addition to sharing work obligations. One of the members correlations the subject of collective work with the pragmatism of shared workloads but also with the increased visibility in the public landscape that originates from the collective platform, emphasizing that collective work is

[...] both a necessity and a matter of choice, because choices carry certain consequences—the way you organize your time, your life, and ultimately, how you organize certain choices in life. (…)327

On the other hand, the elements of collectivity in WHW’s work can be recognized in their lasting quest for establishing a symbolic space for dialogue, networking and collaboration of various actors. This was already present in the organizational efforts leading to the Communist Manifesto exhibition, first through WHW’s collaborations with Arkzin, the Multimedia Institute, and the Croatian Association of Artists, and second, with the subsequent integration of artists, curators, and art historians through various participatory and discursive formats. One of WHW’s members goes on to say that in the 1990s “a great isolation and complete lack of communication on any level was a constant with regard to cultural production”, thus making collaboration “a central issue of WHW’s first exhibition, and in fact, of all of our projects moving forward.”328

ACTOR FOCUSED ANALYSIS

When asked about actors whose roles were crucial in the forming of networks in the 1990s scene, the respondents predominantly reference their own project collaborators or artists whose practice was interesting and/or formative for their own work, or whose segments stood out from the bulk of art production at the time. Almost every art historian, curator, and artist who was active in the 90s art scene is listed in the full interview; institutional art protagonists such as Museum of Contemporary Art curators, employees of the Soros Center for Contemporary Art, artists connected to the PM Gallery during the 1980s, and even younger artists who were fresh out of the Zagreb Art Academy.

Given the nature and diversity of the interview responses, there are a few people that can be singled out as important or formative for the scene at large, due to either their frequent referencing or emphasis of their role. For example, Slaven Tolj’s significance was emphasized in most of the interviews with regard to both his art practice and event organization at the Art Workshop Lazaret in Dubrovnik, as well as contributions from the mid-generation artists, Miladen Stilinić and Sanja Iveković. Even though the roles of the latter two are also referenced with regard to the relevancy of their artistic practices, younger generation art historians and artists predominantly list them in the context of sourcing and information sharing, an alternative education of sorts that greatly influenced their formation. This role was also highlighted by the members of the WHW collective, who refer to both the more formalized methods of education such as Sanja Iveković’s workshops, executed through her NGO Elektra – Women’s Art Center, and also more informal moments of gathering and information proliferation:

[...] due to a true lack of resources, people were referred to one another. You couldn’t really travel much, and there wasn’t much to see, but there was a nice practice out of which perhaps came this spark of collectivity through WHW. I remember [the two
of us from the collective] exchanging books and catalogues every time somebody would go traveling abroad; the ritual of catalogue exchanges, of unearthing the catalogues together, but I also have to admit that both Stilinović and Sanja were very interested in lending books and giving oral deliberations in order to open up new worlds for those who recently graduated or were still students and simply didn’t have a chance to discover these worlds. 329

Aside from the role of the mid-generation artists, the members of the WHW collective also underscore the relevancy of activist initiatives and practices for their own formative state. After listing numerous young artists whose work she followed, one of the members of the collective concludes:

I was perhaps gravitating more to circles around ATTACK! and Arkzin that were not necessarily connected to the arts. If I were to draw a line, I would say that I mostly followed the activities of ATTACK! and Arkzin. During and shortly after university studies, I also followed Sanja Iveković who worked on several projects through Elektra where she held seminars that involved young students and art historians. 330

Another member of the collective points out how, in the 1990s art field, there was a lack of cooperation and communication as opposed to the 2000s, and interprets the importance of the activist scene in terms of its organization, versatility, and sense of togetherness, while at the same time, she interprets the general need for cooperation as a political act. 331 For a great majority of respondents, the importance of the anti-war, pacifist, and the associated anarchist and feminist initiatives played an important role in cultural and art fields in the 90s and 2000s. Even though the umbrella organization of the peace movement, the Croatian Anti-war Campaign, gets rarely mentioned, 332 the connection between the activism of the 1990s and that of the emerging art scene can be interpreted both through the participation of some artists in the organization’s activities, and through their support for certain art events. For example, the aforementioned relevant art projects, such as the one held at the Old Vjesnik printing house to mark Earth Day in 1994 came together with the help of the Life Quality Improvement Society, one of the NGOs that founded the Anti-war Campaign. They furnished the participants with working spaces and assisted with administrative and organizational tasks. However, the influence of the Anti-war Campaign in forming the independent scene can be primarily observed through their Arkzin magazine, whose first issue came out as a fanzine in 1991, as well as through the influence of ATTACK! – Autonomous Cultural Factory, an NGO founded in 1997. 333
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The awareness of the greater socio-political context and openness to diverse forms of civil initiatives and artistic expressions were characteristic of both the magazine and the NGO. The contents of Arkzin’s editorials ranged from critiques of the state apparatus, to reports of peace initiatives, minority rights, ecological catastrophes and initiatives, macrobiotics, current rave parties, as well as theoretical texts by Slavoj Žižek and Terry Eagleton, among others. The magazine also covered film, concerts, theater and dance performances, fanzines and exhibitions, as well as media events from across Europe and America. Similarly, ATTACK! organized events on topics of ecology, human rights, and political accountability, and provided an organizational framework and means to numerous theater, music, and film groups and alternative art events. According to Vesna Janković, the focus on versatility of artistic expressions, their interconnectivity and a shared perception of art and culture as social and political processes created a “form of bastardy, hybridity [that was] a novelty on the civil scene”. Due to this openness, the respondents simultaneously perceive Arkzin and ATTACK! as being both important actors on the scene and important places of gathering. They emphasized that “at the time, Arkzin served as a recognition mechanism of sorts”, or was called, alongside ATTACK! and the Multimedia Institute, a “spiritual generator” of the scene. One of the members of the WHW collective recognizes ATTACK! as an informal space with a potential for gathering people, while the atmosphere around Arkzin—who initiated the first WHW exhibition—proved crucial in the strengthening of own practice, adding Arkzin [...] was extremely important. It was important to me as a politically thoughtful being, so it was great that our project was an idea born out of Arkzin. [...] I believe Arkzin does incredibly important work. [...] Arkzin was truly a political, pop cultural magazine. I think it was very important also because it provided translations, being a pioneer in some theoretical translations, publishing articles on international art practices that were completely absent from our mainstream. And it wasn’t moving away from theory, but rather insisted on it—trying to dig deeper into more complex and problematic approaches in places of trauma.

Even though Arkzin and ATTACK! served as physical gathering spaces of various actors, the respondents most commonly treat the magazine and NGO, as well as other aforementioned organizations such as WHW or the Multimedia Institute, as scene’s actors. In other words, the change in organizational logic at the turn of the millennium is also reflected in the perception of the key actors who generate the scene. Moreover, they are not individuals but rather NGOs who, from the 2000s onward, not only form the structure, but are also the scene’s most important bridging actors and concentrators. The respondents also relate the founding of the WHW curatorial collective at the turn of the millennium to a point from which the Croatian art scene is organizationally run by curatorial collectives and independent curators. Interestingly, the projects that were identified by the respondents as being important for the 90s art scene were, for the most part, created and organized by artists. The artists and organizers of these alternative events in the 90s would go on to describe their involvement as a need for self-expression, for entering the public sphere and opening up dialogue—a need to simply do, in spite of slim resources. At the same time, they qualify the formation of curatorial collectives at the turn of the millennium as a point in time from which they could concentrate more thoroughly on their own artistic practices, since “it seemed needless for us to do work that is not in fact our job”.

TIE FOCUSED ANALYSIS

In continuation of the aforementioned assertion regarding the lack of a structural approach to collaborative practices in the 90s, the interview analysis identified a few themes according to the type and quality of relations created in the art scene. Given the previously described socio-political context and climate of the 90s, the lack of structures and material resources made collaboration the foundational capital of the emerging scene. One of the WHW members asserts that “people were referred to one another due to lack of resources”; another respondent states that during the 90s, there was no strategy but an “impulse to collaborate”; while a younger generation artist identifies the need for unity throughout the 90s:

I was under the impression that our gatherings were not of any special nature. I mean, there were very few artists that did stuff and so we kept together. There was no room to criticize each other. We were surrounded by things that were threatening our livelihoods [...] and so we simply stuck together during this period.

Overall, the interviews have indicated several different types of connections between actors, which for the most part seem difficult to differentiate, thus pointing to the fact that art scene protagonists nurtured multiple relations. The study’s respondents often point out the importance of comradeship in accomplishing certain projects, with an emphasis on friendships and networks within their own generation. This is, according to one WHW member, “something that has its own rhythm, enthusiasm, and type of fluidity”, while at certain points this element of friendship mixes with the element of “recognition” based on shared aesthetical and ideological values, ultimately making it impossible to differentiate between the two. For example, when speaking about the art project The Order of Bank and Money Worshippers, one new media artist states:
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The friendship element is especially pronounced in the early onset of professional engagements of the new generation artists and art historians. Though, when analyzing the interviews as a whole, it can be concluded that the element of “recognition” tips the scale and is determined by project accomplishments, shared acquaintances, frequenting the same informal gathering spaces, or even participating in the events that become collective spaces of resistance to the dominant socio-political or cultural climate. For instance, one of the WHW members speaks of “scandalously traumatic spaces that generated a certain kind of a scene” in the 90s, such as the devastation of the Flower Square in Zagreb or the installment of a new director at the Museum of Contemporary Art in 1998. Moreover, when talking about networking related to the platform Cultural Kapital, another respondent gives a direct advantage to the relations based on recognition rather than friendship, saying:

Neither I nor any one of us were in some kind of special friendship relations [...] these collaborations were made following the logic of recognition, not only through the work we do but also, in my opinion, through a shared work ethic.

The social circles in the independent scene were therefore founded on mechanisms of status and value-based homophily as well as transitivity. Regarding the former, the actors shared a social status that implied the claiming of spaces outside institutional culture as well as sharing aesthetic and ideological views based on left-leaning political ideas, the critique of the socio-political context, as well as a tendency toward art experimentation. While with respect to transitivity, most of the actors with similar affinities connected rather quickly to one another due to the relatively small size of the scene. Relations established through these mechanisms carried a sense of permanence and often implied long-lasting collaborations in which the professional and friendship relations are intertwined. At the same time, their foundation in value-based homophily created a network that was homogenous in its basic ideological values, while at the same time, heterogeneous in discipline through the inclusion of interdisciplinary groups of artists, activists, and humanities experts. In contrast to the above described spontaneous generation of sociability, the relationships of some actors were also established through more formal channels, such as participation in international art and communication networks, which were a novelty in the arena of European cultural policy of the 90s. The majority of respondents identified Zagreb’s Soros Center for Contemporary Art (SCCA) as the key intermediary for establishing art relations with both the international and domestic actors. In addition to providing financial support for certain artistic and curatorial projects, the Center acted as an information hub for international art happenings and connected domestic artists and curators with colleagues from abroad. Its role was also emphasized by the WHW members, citing the Center’s support for their first international exchanges and residencies. One of the members also highlights meeting her WHW colleague due to a Soros grant, followed by the artist Sanja Iveković with whom the collective established a permanent collaboration. Due to the difficulties in establishing communications in the 90s, the grant also helped in connecting and collaborating with colleagues from Slovenia, Bosnia and Herzegovina, and Serbia, making it an important part of their work even from their first exhibition. Alongside the SCCA, the international connections were also established thanks to a greater presence of new communication technologies. However, even though these kinds of gatherings or interactions imply a sense of ‘anonymity’ among the participants, the conducted study suggests that the participation in large international networks was also personalized, and is perceived by the respondents through forming relations based on similar aesthetic and ideological affinities. In this sense, the establishment of relations among international artists and curators could be interpreted similarly to the domestic art scene processes, resulting in several very strong connections with international curators and artists. From the perspective of the independent scene at large, some relations between domestic and international actors can therefore be described as weak and strong at the same time. They can simultaneously imply a long-lasting and close collaboration with a specific actor, while through short-term contact, the rest of the independent scene receives new information that can, to a greater or lesser extent, influence the further development of individual artists or even the scene as a whole.

The first exhibition of the WHW curatorial collective included a large number of international artists precisely due to the earlier established international networks. Their participation brought new values, context, and perspectives to the local scene, and in turn, domestic art production was given a broader context and greater international visibility. Given the ambitiousness of WHW’s initial projects and other curatorial collectives of the time, such as Kontejner and BLOK, their high levels of organization and efforts to connect domestic artists with international curators and collaborators, the respondents draw a distinction between institutional and independent culture. Namely, pointing to openness and flexibility of the independent scene versus institutional sluggishness, and defining the turn of millennium as the moment when the independent curatorial initiatives took over the production and promotion of contemporary art. In other words, according to one mid-generation curator, after the year 2000, “when WHW emerged, that whole generation carried the independent scene […] contemporary art was carried by the independent scene.”
However, the relations between the independent scene and institutional culture cannot be viewed through a simple dichotomy, and are rather much more complex. And although the majority of respondents assessed the relations between these two sectors as virtually non-existent or existing in a “state of mutual indifference”, several respondents have recognized the efforts of a few institutional workers in bridging the gap between the two sectors by supporting the realization of art and curatorial projects produced by the younger generation.

One of the important mediators in the case of WHW’s founding was Nevena Tudor, the director of Croatian Association of Artists (HDLU) in the early 2000s. She was identified, not only by WHW members, but also by many younger generation respondents as the key enabler in the realization of their ambitious projects by providing them exhibition spaces and ensuring greater visibility through HDLU’s program. The WHW members highlight her openness toward the younger generation of artists and curators fresh out of university, and also provide a specific view of the relations between the independent scene and institutional culture at large: by mediating between the two sectors, some institutional workers enabled the “reclaiming of traditional institutions”, or at least “opened new possibilities for participation and dialogue”. Additionally, by providing greater visibility for independent projects, which delivered a more potent socio-political critique to the curatorial concept, WHW members also saw these individuals as crucial to the development of the art scene at large:

When we first started working, we didn’t want to create a project that would stay at the same level as Arkzin and remain outside of institutional culture. Our initial intention was to find ways of infiltrating the institutional space with our socio-political critique, and that was an important project goal.

In that sense, the problems were deep-rooted, and it was impossible to expect institutions to offer a more complex insight into social realities. Yet, precisely because of that, it was important that the projects such as Communist Manifesto take place within an institution, as was the case with Broadcasting. The institutions are crucial, but not as entities, rather as people within the institutions.

ANALYSIS AND VISUALIZATION OF COLLABORATIVE NETWORKS OF THE WHW CURATORIAL COLLECTIVE

Given the aforementioned assertions that collaboration is the main capital of the emerging scene, and that after 2000, the role of key actors in the network is inhabited by newly formed NGOs, the collaboration...
network of the WHW collective with other organizations (2000 to 2006) offers a glimpse into their initial strategic partnerships (Fig. 1). The relations between actors/organizations in this one-mode network represent the organizational collaboration of art exhibitions and discursive events, with consideration of both complex forms of collaboration through program production, as well as smaller contributions through the lending of spaces or including authored projects in the yearly programs of other organizations.

The visualization primarily offers an insight into the intensive network growth of WHW, realized within only six years of their work. In the first two years, they established collaborations with cultural institutions in Croatia (HDLU, Technical Museum) and Slovenia (ŠKUC Gallery, Mestna Gallery), as well as with NGOs (Multimedia Institute, Arzklin, primarily seen through collaborations with designer Dejan Kršić (sometimes listed as the 5th member of the collective), most of the collaborations leading up to 2006 were established with NGOs. Local collaborative efforts were realized through the platform, Zagreb – European Cultural Kapital 3000 (Multimedia Institute, Platform 9.81, BLOK, Shadow Casters, Community Art, Centre for Drama Arts), and included productions of thematic programs that dealt with issues of group and collective work, relations of independent scene and institutional culture, public accessibility and democratization of culture, or even critical analysis of the wider social context of ‘normalization’ that enabled the growth of the independent scene. In other words, the programs dealt with specific issues that were the focus of Cultural Kapital platform’s advocacy activities.
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Lazareti in Dubrovnik and Drugo More in Rijeka was of great importance, which brought discursive program exchanges with lectures by visiting international artists, art groups, and curators across multiple locations in the country (e.g., Charles Esche, Barbara Vanderlinden, Gregory Schole). It is interesting to note that the programs realized through these two platforms enabled WHW to further develop their international collaborative efforts; namely with the Center for Contemporary Art Rooseum in Malmö, led by Charles Esche, Platform Garanti from Istanbul, led by Vasif Kortun, as well as the New Media Center_kuda.org from Novi Sad, a collaboration that continues beyond 2006 with the project, Political Practices in Post-Yugoslavian Art, in an effort to strengthen ties with NGOs in Serbia.

The situation becomes much more complex with the inclusion of all realized programs in WHW’s collaborative network. Alongside institutions and NGOs, the constructed total collaborative network (Fig. 2) also includes all exhibitions and discursive programs that were either organized or co-organized by the WHW curatorial collective, as well as all individuals and art groups that participated in the programs as either organizers or participants. The result is a complex, multimodal network with a central position made of four members of the WHW curatorial collective, who, from 2000 to 2006, organized 56 exhibitions and 51 discursive events, and established relations with 400 individuals and 50 art groups.

Larger international exhibition projects are clearly visible at the edges of the visualization and include exhibitions realized through WHW’s curatorial concepts or exhibitions of visiting curators in Nova Gallery, where WHW members acted as event organizers and coordinators. At the center of the visualization are smaller exhibitions and discursive programs which mostly took place at the Nova Gallery. One visually distinctive event was the exhibition series START SOLO that took place in 2003 and 2004. The exhibitions were a continuation of the 2002 exhibition Start, with the aim of introducing and presenting the work of young Croatian contemporary artists, in addition to stimulating productions of new work. The visualization also offers an insight into WHW’s programs’ dynamics, which can be observed through the participation of artists, curators, and theoreticians in the secondary events surrounding the early exhibitions (colored differently than the direct participation in the exhibit). From 2003, this can be observed through a growing number of smaller exhibitions and discursive formats that mark a shift from the more conventional exhibition-focused programs toward creating a gallery that serves as a public space for communication and discussion.

Although the majority of participants in larger exhibition events only made a single relation within the program, the visualization also demonstrates that a number of program participants realized multiple relations. This was predominantly the case with local actors who, alongside WHW members, stand out in the number of established relations; specifically, Mladen Stilinović and Sanja Ivecović with 11 and 9 relations respectively, followed by Andreja Kulunić and Vlado Martek with 6 relations.

359 Alongside WHW, the project partners were Prelom Collective from Belgrade, kuda.org from Novi Sad, and pro.ba/SCCA from Sarajevo, and it lasted from 2006 until 2010.
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Tomislav Gotovac, Ana Hušman, and David Maljković with 5 relations, as well as Igor Grubić, Goran Trbuljak, Stephen Wright, Marko Tadić, and Aleksandar Battista Ilić with 4 established relations.

Given that only the formal types of interaction and collaboration through the realization of programs were taken into account when generating the visualization, the assumed existence of strong ties within the network can only be distilled from the frequency of collaborations, while the qualitative research results, together with the research on the WHW program after 2006, mostly confirms the above listed actors as having strong ties with the collective. These ties presuppose the existence of long-term collaborations and an intertwining of professional and personal relations, but also express the aesthetical and ideological affinities of WHW members that are congenerous to the practices of certain artists (establishing the continuity of critical art practices from the socialist era, focusing on art practice as a social practice, contemplating new technologies as well as new forms of expression).

The visualization also confirms earlier claims that after 2000, the roles of the most central actors in the independent scene were no longer occupied by individuals, but rather by NGOs. For example, while the Multimedia Institute realizes 19 relations in the network, or Art Workshop Lazareti 16 relations, the important actors within these institutions who presumably participated in the program organization, such as Slaven Tolj, Tomislav Medak, or Marcell Mars, do not take central stage in the visualization. Such a representation is reflective of collective work within NGOs; the sharing of obligations and merits, and devising program concepts through joint participation and discussion. Consequently, the visualization allows for the synchronous assessment of all established collaborative relations in the first six years of WHW existence. Given that a large number of diverse programs took place in this period, it is important to note that the collaborative network of WHW never actually resembled Fig. 1 and Fig. 2, but was rather in a constant state of flux: some actors were recurring, some performed multiple roles, many were part of the network only at one point, while others were establishing different kinds of relations with the members of the collective outside of their official program. However, when talking about successful collaborations between individual actors and the WHW collective, it can be assumed that, if the need arises, these individual relations can be reactivated with WHW serving as a link among the actors within its existing network.

CONCLUSION

The structure of the Croatian cultural and art scene in 1990s can thus be described as a fragmented field of activities informally organized around smaller social circles. Such structural characteristics can be seen as a direct consequence of a transitional socio-political context and the unfavorable position of the cultural field at large. Consequently, it is not surprising that the end of 1990s through to the early 2000s was marked by an absence of central actors that would serve as network ‘concentrators’, even though there were prior instances of actors paving the way for the structural formation of the independent scene. Additionally, given the interview analysis, it can be concluded that despite fragmentation, the scene’s structure was marked by a fair-
ly high density of relations among actors. Therefore, the structural holes—or what Pachucki and Breiger describe as cultural holes—are not considered a primary characteristic of the structure of the independent and cultural scene of the 1990s. Conversely, the existence of such holes is evident when considering the relations between the dominant cultural matrix on one hand, and independent and progressive initiatives on the other.

Due to an absence of systemic institutional support for progressive art currents that existed in past decades, as well as hindered institutional inclusion of the younger generations, the 1990s can be viewed as a period of searching and regrouping, wherein the support of mid-generation protagonists played an important role. This resulted in the post-2000 formation of an almost para-institutional structure of the independent scene. In this structure, the newly-formed NGOs and platforms acted as both the structure and the main actors of the scene. The socio-political and cultural context was also echoed in the processes of forming relations within the network. These relations were primarily formed on the basis of shared ideological and aesthetical affinities of the actors—built on mechanisms of status and value-based homophily and transitivity, resulting in the proliferation of strong ties and a high density of the network. Even though the formation of relations between institutions and independent initiatives was challenging, they did in fact exist, and, unlike the independent scene, the activities of the institutions were perceived through the actions of individual institutional workers.

After 2000, the curatorial collective WHW serves as an example of a typical network concentrator in the independent scene, acting simultaneously as a collective identity and a NGO. According to the conducted qualitative study, WHW is one of the key actors on the scene, whose practice is perceived through the critique of socio-political and cultural climate of the 90s—viewing contemporary art practices as a part of wider social processes. Through the organization of various types of activities, WHW acts as a mediator between various NGOs on the local and national level, and various types of actors on the national and trans-national level, as well as between the older, mid, and younger generations of artists (contributing to the re-establishment of continuity with progressive art currents from the socialist era).

In conclusion, the independent scene’s structure, the formation of its key actors, and the means of establishing relations within the network, were significantly defined by the socio-political and cultural context of the 1990s. It was precisely this context—perceived through the collapse of the socialist state, the growth of conservatism and nationalism, and a lack of infrastructure for contemporary art practices—that caused the efforts to create conditions for contemporary art production to be perceived as a form of collective resistance to the dominant social and cultural climate, or the struggle for context and self-positioning within the social and cultural field. In other words, it was precisely this struggle for structure that influenced the grouping of actors with similar ideological and aesthetical affinities, helping them form their communal story.

---
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