

**umjetnič
ka vrtna
kući**

**ca artis
tic garden
hut**

2013

/2014

Program Umjetnička vrtna kućica odvijao se tijekom 2013. godine na nekoliko mjesta u Zagrebu. Pokrenut je s namjerom da stručnjaci, umjetnici, moderatori i publika razgovaraju o onim temama koje bismo voljeli problematizirati u formi časopisa, no za to nemamo prilike. Širenje prostora časopisa u razgovornu formu bilo je popraćeno i s prezentacijama umjetničkih radova, autorskih stavova o pojedinim temama, kao i performansima pojedinih umjetnika. Na taj smo način proširili djelatnost i utjecaje koje časopis Život umjetnosti već desetljećima postiže na domaćoj sceni.

Osim toga, pokrenuli smo blog na kojem objavljujemo najave Umjetničkih vrtних kućica kao i ostala događanja vezana uz časopis, a sadržaje redovito dijelimo i s publikom na društvenim mrežama.

→ zivotumjetnosti.blogspot.com

Program Umjetničke vrtne kućice u sklopu popularizacije znanosti financijski podupire Ministarstvo znanosti, obrazovanja i sporta Republike Hrvatske.

The programme called Artistic Garden Hut took place in 2013, at a number of different localities in Zagreb. It aimed at offering an opportunity to scholars, artists, moderators, and visitors to discuss those issues that we would like to see presented in the form of a journal, but we have no opportunity for that. Extending the journal form to a spoken dialogue included presentations of artworks, artists' opinions on specific topics, and art performances. In this way, we have expanded the activity and impact that Život umjetnosti has had for decades on the local scene.

Besides that, we have launched a blog where we announce our Artistic Garden Huts and other events related to the journal, sharing them regularly on various social networks.

→ zivotumjetnosti.blogspot.com

As a project that popularizes scholarly topics, Artistic Garden Huts have been financially supported by the Croatian Ministry of Science, Education, and Sports.

O DABIR TEME prve Umjetničke vrtne kućice bio je u vezi s izložbom Viktora Popovića. Djelujući istodobno kao profesor, dizajner i umjetnik, Viktor nam je 'otvorio' vrata Splita, grada čija se reprezentacija često (i nepravедno) ponajprije svodi na piciginu na Bačama te distrofiranu i netransparentnu gradsku političku elitu. Upravo stoga pokušali smo ispitati uvjete i mehanizme kulturne produkcije, susresti aktivne i angažirane pojedince i kolektive te ponuditi neku drugu, paralelnu, isto tako vjerodostojnu sliku grada pod Marjanom. Tom smo se prigodom zapitali koliko dobro poznajemo ljude, institucije i trenutna zbivanja koja označavaju umjetnost danas u Splitu.

Umjetnici su se predstavili kroz niz kratkih prezentacija što je potaklo zajedničku raspravu svih sudionika. Budući da su neki od sudionika razgovora profesori UMAS-a (Loren Živković Kuljiš) i Filozofskog fakulteta u Splitu (Dalibor Prančević) te studenti UMAS-a (Lana Stoićević, Dragoslav Dragičević), bilo je riječi i o radu na tim fakultetima te o formiranju mlade splitske umjetničke scene. Saznali smo da Umjetnička akademija u Splitu funkcionira drugačije nego Akademija likovne umjetnosti u Zagrebu. Tome pridonosi i činjenica da je kadar splitske akademije mlađi i pokazuje veći afinitet prema suvremenoj umjetnosti. Studenti su naglasili slobodu izbora medija i načina rada, kao i individualni pristup profesora.

Razgovaralo se o važnosti institucije Galerije umjetnina Split (Božo Majstorović), koja projektom FFWD: Utorkom u Galeriji afirmira mladu splitsku scenu. Osobito je važna suradnja koju u sklopu tog projekta ostvaruju studenati Umjetničke akademije i Odsjeka za povijest umjetnosti Filozofskog fakulteta u Splitu. Govorilo se o zanimljivim izložbenim inicijativama o kojima se izvan Splita relativno malo zna – pojedine su primjeri izvaninstitucionalnih djelatnosti, poput projekata Radni teren (Rt) Jugoplastika iz 2011. te Rt (Radni teren) Dujmovača iz 2012., oba u organizaciji OUR-a (Organizacije udruženog rada – Udruga za kulturu i vizualne umjetnosti). Ukratko se spomenuo rad Udruge za suvremenu umjetnost Kwart, djelovanje Neafirmirane umjetničke scene NUS te važnost anti-institucije Galerije Ghetto koja je svojim interdisciplinarnim pristupom anticipirala budući razvoj splitske scene.



THE CHOICE of topics for our first Artistic Garden Hut was related to the exhibition of Viktor Popović. Active as a professor, designer, and artist, Viktor has 'opened up' the gates of Split for us, as a city that is often (and unfairly) represented by means of reductive images such as young men playing ball games on the beach of Baće or dystrophic and obscure urban political elite. It is for this reason that we have sought to examine the conditions and mechanisms of Split's cultural production, encounter active and engaged individuals and collectives, and offer another, parallel, and just as credible image of the city under Mount Marjan. On that occasion, we asked ourselves how well we knew the people, institutions, and current events that characterize art in today's Split.

The artists introduced themselves through a series of short presentations, initiating a discussion involving all the participants. Since some of the presenters were professors at UMAS (Loren Živković Kuljiš) and the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Split (Dalibor Prančević) or students at UMAS (Lana Stoićević, Dragoslav Dragičević), one of the topics was the activity of these educational institutions and the formation of the young art scene in Split. We were informed that the Art Academy in Split functioned in a different way than the Academy of Fine Arts in Zagreb. One of the differences is the fact that the Split faculty is younger and shows more affinity for contemporary art. The students emphasized that they were free to choose their media and their techniques, and they also praised the professors' individual approach.

We spoke of the importance of Art Gallery Split (Božo Majstorović), which promotes the young art scene in Split through its project FFWD: Tuesdays at the Gallery. An especially important aspect is the cooperation between the students of Art Academy and the Department of Art History at the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences in Split, enhanced through this project. Another issue was the interesting exhibition initiatives that are barely known outside of Split – examples of extra-institutional activities and projects such as Working Field Jugoplastika (2011) and Working Field Dujmovača (2012), both organized by OURS (Organizations of Collective Work – Associations for Culture and Visual Arts). We also briefly mentioned the work of the Association for Contemporary Art Kwart and the Unaffirmed Art Scene NUS, as well as the importance of the anti-institution Ghetto Gallery, which anticipated the future evolution of the art scene in Split with its interdisciplinary approach.

JE LI ARHITEKTURA NA FILMU organizirana samo na popratnu scenografiju u kojoj se odvija radnja ili pak na tematski okvir dokumentaraca o pojedinim građevinama, gradovima i/ili arhitektima? Kakav je odnos arhitektonskog i filmskog prostora, na koje načine arhitektura može preuzeti određene narativne elemente u filmu? Što kad ona postane 'glavni sporedni lik' u filmu, preuzimajući ulogu znaka koji upućuje na nešto drugo doli na nju samu – na jedno (prošlo) vrijeme, kulturu, pa čak i psihičko stanje glavnog lika? Koje je paralele moguće povući između razvoja kinematografije i moderne arhitekture? Kako je ideja moderniteta (zajedno s modernim gradom kao locusom izvođenja te ideje, primjerice) vizualizirana u filmskim ostvarenjima? Kako arhitektura u filmu poprima ideološko značenje i/ili definira kulturološku tipologiju? To su samo neka od pitanja na koja su pozvani sugovornici nastojali dati svoje odgovore, uz isječke iz nekolicine filmova.

U razgovoru su iskrsnule mnoge teme, potkrijepljene dodatno prikazivanjem isječaka filmova: od tehničkih elemenata stvaranja arhitekture i prostora na filmu, preko mogućnosti interdisciplinarnih 'čitanja' arhitekture kroz film, do odnosa i prikaza prostora grada na filmu. Teoretičar filma Hrvoje Turković govorio je o građenju filmskog prostora i scenografskim, ali i nescenografskim postupcima (dakle, ne samo kroz arhitektonske elemente, već i putem zvuka, specifičnog kadriranja, montažnih postupaka i sl.). O filmu kao mediju koji može proširiti granice razumijevanja same arhitekture uopće i shvaćanja prostora govorio je arhitekt Alan Kostrenčić, koji se također posvetio i konceptu prostor-vrijeme, utemeljenom na teorijskim tekstovima francuskog filozofa Gillesa Deleuzea, te kritičkom potencijalu ova dva medija (kako mogu potaknuti preispitivanje našeg odnosa prema stvarnosti). Kulturna antropologinja Sonja Leboš usmjerila se prema odnosu filma i grada, tj. prikazivanju grada na filmu te ulozu grada kao čimbenika (pokretača) radnje (primjerice, promjene u identitetu i strukturi grada manifestiraju se u samoj naratološkoj strukturi filma). Također je usmjerila pozornost na važnost interdisciplinarnog povezivanja dvaju medija u korist proizvodnje novih znanja, novih zaključaka na području antropoloških studija i studija urbaniteta.



IS ARCHITECTURE ON FILM limited to the stage set in which the action takes place, or to the thematic framework of documentaries in the form of specific buildings, cities, and/or architects? What is the relationship between architectural and cinematic space, and in what ways can architecture carry some particular narrative elements in a film? What happens when it becomes the 'main side character' in a film, or a sign that indicates something else than itself – a (bygone) time, a particular culture, or even the mental state of the main character? What parallels can be drawn between the evolution of cinema and modern architecture? How is the idea of modernity (together with the modern city as the locus of performing that idea, for example) visualized in cinematic art? How does architecture on film acquire ideological significance and/or defines a cultural typology? These are only some of the questions that the participants were invited to answer on the basis of excerpts from various films.

The conversation gave rise to a number of issues, and was accompanied by examples from actual films: from the technical elements of creating architecture and space on film to the possibility of interdisciplinary 'readings' of architecture through cinema, or the relations within and the presentations of urban space on film. Cinema theoretician Hrvoje Turković spoke of the construction of cinematic space by means of scenographic and non-scenographic procedures (that is, not only by means of architectural elements, but also with the help of sound, specific framing, montage, etc.). Architect Alan Kostrenčić spoke of film as a medium that can extend the limits of understanding architecture as such and the understanding of space, discussing, among other things, the concept of space-time, based on the theoretical texts of French philosopher Gilles Deleuze, and the critical potential of the two media (the way in which they can inspire us to question our attitude towards the reality). Cultural anthropologist Sonja Leboš focused on the relationship between cinema and the city, that is, the presentation of the city on film and the role of the city as the main factor (spiritus movens) of the plot (such as changes in the identity and structure of the city, manifested in the very narrative structure of the film). She also emphasized the importance of linking the two media in an interdisciplinary way in order to produce new knowledge and new insights in the field of anthropological studies and studies of urbanity.

PROMOCIJA NOVOGA BROJA časopisa *Života umjetnosti* posvećenoga temi Rub/nost umjetničkih praksi koja implicira danas već prisutnu tvrdnju da je umjetnost nepodložna definiciji, odnosno da je klasifikacija određenog čina ili činjenice kao umjetničke moguća jedino uz pomoć institucionalnog okvira. I časopis *Život umjetnosti* jedna je od čestica toga autoritarnog okvira koji, paradoksalno, egzistira unutar evidentne globalne krize institucija koja ne mimoilazi ni instituciju znanja. Razgovor je bio uvodno koncipiran na način da su pojedine autorice tekstova izložile svoje priloge, a dodatno su gosti (Vlasta Žanić, Boris Bakal, Una Bauer, Marijan Crtalić, Siniša Labrović) komentirali vlastita shvaćanja navedene prakse, i to na tragu slobodarskih inicijativa.

U časopisu je veći dio priloga bio usredotočen na umjetnost performansa, čija je rubnost žanrovski upisana u njegovo određenje; naime, umjetnost performansa oblikovana je na presjecištu drugih umjetnosti – npr. plesa, glazbe, slikarstva, arhitekture i kiparstva. Navedenu rubnost i grafički smo označile naslovnicom koja je zabilježila akciju šestero akademskih radnika/ica, izvedenu 11. ožujka 2013. godine. ‘Prosvjedujući protiv načina izrade i donošenja, te sadržaja novog Pravilnika o uvjetima za izbor u znanstvena zvanja, šestoro je akademskih radnika u ponedjeljak, 11. ožujka 2013, na dan kada Pravilnik stupa na snagu, u Zagrebu, pred zgradom MZOS na Sveticama (gdje svoje urede ima i Nacionalno vijeće za znanost, koje je Pravilnik izradilo i donijelo), spalilo svoje znanstvene radove koji su odredbama novog pravilnika obezvrijeđeni, jer su objavljeni u časopisima i zbornicima koje je Pravilnik proglasio nebitnima, tj. nije ih uvrstio u popis prihvatljivih časopisa i izdavača’ (Akcija šestero akademskih radnika, 2013.). Naime, zamjetno je bilo da se razgovor odvijao u navedenom smjeru nužnoga povezivanja umjetnosti i aktivizma.

Nakon razgovora umjetnik Ivan Marušić Klif izveo je performans.



ON THIS OCCASION, we presented the new issue of *Život umjetnosti*, dedicated to the topic of The Margin/ality of Art Practices, which evokes the claim, rather prominent today, that art is not subject to definitions, and that classifying an act or a fact as artistic is possible only with the help of an institutional framework. *Život umjetnosti* is one of the particles in that authoritative framework, which paradoxically persists within the manifest present-day global crisis of institutions, which does not spare the institution of knowledge. The panel talk was introduced by means of individual presentations by authors of individual texts, after which our guests (Vlasta Žanić, Boris Bakal, Una Bauer, Marijan Crtalić, and Siniša Labrović) elaborated on their own understanding of this practice along the lines of libertarian initiatives.

Most of the contributions in the issue focused on the art of performance, whose marginality is inscribed in its definition in terms of genre; the art of performance is, namely, situated on the intersection between various forms of art, such as dance, music, painting, architecture, and sculpture. This marginality was also expressed by means of graphic design, with a cover page documenting the action performed by six academicians on March 11, 2013. ‘By protesting against the new Regulation Book on Academic Appointments, the way it has been produced and promulgated, as well as its content, six academicians burned their scholarly papers in Zagreb, in front of the building of the Croatian Ministry of Education and Sports at Svetice (in which the National Science Committee also has its offices) on Monday, March 11, 2013, the day when the Regulation Book was to be legally implemented. These scholarly papers had been devalued by the new Regulation Book simply because they had been published in journals and conference proceedings that were now considered non-distinguished, owing to which they were left out of the list of acceptable journals and publishers’ (Action of Six Academicians, 2013). It was evident that the panel talk aimed at achieving the necessary goal of linking art and activism.

The discussion was followed by an artistic performance of Ivan Marušić Klif.

JAVNA TRIBINA pod nazivom ‘Antifašistički spomenici u Hrvatskoj – valorizacija / zaštita / obnova’ za cilj je imala iznijeti akutne probleme stanja, valorizacije i zaštite memorijalnih objekata posvećenih revolucionarnom radničkom pokretu, Narodnooslobodilačkom ratu i socijalističkoj revoluciji koji su nastali na području Hrvatske u vrijeme socijalizma, a koji se od raspada Jugoslavije najčešće kategoriziraju kao ‘antifašistički spomenici’.

U samom činu i potrebi rušenja spomenika, koje je u Hrvatskoj prisutno od samog početka 1990-ih godina, dr. sc. Snješka Knežević prepoznala je radikalan oblik ideološkog ikonoklazma (od 1990. do 2000. srušeno je preko 3000 spomenika na području Hrvatske). Jedna od značajnijih rasprava koje su uslijedile bila je vezana uz problem nomenklature ovog spomeničkog korpusa, odnosno potrebe jasnijeg semantičkog razlikovanja pojma ‘antifašistički’ od njihova izvorna naziva i ideološkog konteksta njihova podizanja. Taj problem semantičke prirode prerastao je u raspravu o mogućnostima i potrebi održavanja/konzerviranja njihova izvorna simboličkog značenja i funkcije.

Rasprava je bila potkrijepljena konkretnim primjerima rušenja, mogućnostima i problemima pravnog procesuiranja subjekata odgovornih za kulturocid, kao i recentnima inicijativama obnove pojedinih spomenika i spomeničkih kompleksa. Time je razgovor usmjeren na problem stručnih kriterija u evidentiranju, klasifikaciji i valorizaciji spomenika ‘na terenu’, sa zaključkom da institucionalni državni aparat, u tom smislu, već godinama stagnira, ne nudeći strajna rješenja. Svi sudionici razgovora naglasak su stavili na opasnosti estetizacije i de/reideologizacije tog spomeničkog korpusa, koje su u velikoj mjeri već prisutne, dok je dio sudionika naglasio ključnu ulogu nevladinih civilnih udruga koje javnim inicijativama i akcijama doprinose zaštiti i obnovi.

Nakon razgovora uslijedila je projekcija radnog materijala najnovijeg video rada suvremenog umjetnika Igora Grubića na temu antifašističkih spomenika, u trajanju od 20 minuta.



A PUBLIC PANEL talk discuss the current problems related to the condition, evaluation, and protection of memorial objects dedicated to the revolutionary workers’ movement, Popular Liberation War, and the socialist revolution on the territory of present-day Croatia during the socialist period, objects that have since the fall of Yugoslavia mostly been described as ‘antifascist monuments.’

The very act of demolishing the monuments and the desire to do so, which was in Croatia manifested from the very beginning of the 1990s, have been identified by Snješka Knežević as a radical form of ideological iconoclasm (in the period from 1990–2000, more than 3000 monuments were demolished in Croatia). A significant discussion that followed was linked to the issue of nomenclature related to this corpus of monuments, that is, the need of differentiating semantically more clearly between the term ‘antifascist’ and their original names or the ideological context of their production. This semantic problem then evolved into a discussion on the possibilities and need of maintaining/preserving the original symbolic meaning and function of these objects.

The debate included topics such as the specific cases of demolition, the options of legally prosecuting persons or groups responsible for this culturecide, and the recent initiatives aimed at restoring some of the monuments or monument complexes. Thus, the conversation focused, among other things, on the issue of professional criteria that should be established for documenting, classifying, and evaluating the monuments ‘in situ’, with the conclusion that the institutional state apparatus has, in this case, been stagnating for many years, failing to offer any permanent solution. All participants of the debate emphasized the danger of aestheticizing and de-/re-ideologizing this corpus of monuments, which can already be observed, while a number of participants also mentioned the key role of non-governmental and civil organizations, which have been using public initiatives and actions to contribute to their protection and restoration.

The debate was followed by a screening of the working material for the most recent video by contemporary artist Igor Grubić on the topic of antifascist monuments (duration: 20 minutes).



KVARTOVI su mjesta gdje se spaja privatno i javno, njeguje osjećaj pripadnosti i participacije. Promatrajući inicijative koje u posljednje vrijeme pratimo na polju arhitektonsko-urbanističkih i umjetničkih aktivnosti, naslućujemo da interes za kvart raste proporcionalno iščekivanju društvenosti iz fizičkog prostora, ili barem, povlačenju iz fizičkog u virtualno, iz javnog u zasebno. Stoga pokušaje osmišljavanja života u kvartu shvaćamo kao poticaj osjećaju zajedništva, uzimajući u obzir brojne okolnosti koje mu se suprotstavljaju, primjerice, činjenicu da većina ljudi ne radi u istom kvartu u kojem živi, i da je vrijeme neradnih aktivnosti bitno smanjeno. Ugroženost kvartovskog suživota podržana je gomilanjem (i strahom od neispunjenja) dnevnih obaveza, pa je tema socijalno-ekonomski i demografski pokazatelj opće organizacije života. Pitajući se tko su ljudi koji uspijevaju saživjeti s kvartom, susrećemo se s mikro (lokalnim) situacijama u kojima primjećujemo jače ili slabije prisutna stanja udomaćenosti, povjerenja i neformalne regulacije odnosa, nadilazeći jednokratnost i neredovitost komunikacije uličnih sretanja.

Ovom prigodom pozvani su akteri – pojedinci, a najčešće kolektivi koji promiču dobrosusjedske odnose, zalažući se za komunikacijsku prokrvljenost gradskog tkiva: MUZEJ ulične umjetnosti na relaciji centar-periferija u zagrebačkom urbanom miljeu, Muzej kvarta u novozagrebačkim četvrtima, Muzej moderne i suvremene umjetnosti u Rijeci te Muzej sodobne umjetnosti Metelkova (+MSUM) na području užeg muzejskog susjedstva, Akupunktura grada (DAZ) u nepropusnim zonama urbanih cjelina te Institut za etnologiju i folkloristiku koji tematizira kvart u studijama iz područja urbane i kulturne antropologije.

NEIGHBOURHOODS are places that merge public and private, and cultivate the feeling of belonging and participation. When considering various initiatives in the field of recent architecture, urban planning, and art, it can be observed that there is a growing interest in the notion of 'neighbourhood', proportional to the disappearance of sociality from physical space, or at least its withdrawal from the physical sphere into the virtual one, from public to private. Therefore we understand such attempts to enrich the life of the neighbourhood as encouraging for the feeling of community, especially taking into account a number of circumstances that work against it, such as the fact that most people do not work in the same district in which they live, or that they have less and less spare time available for activities not related to work. This threat to the neighbourhood coexistence has been enhanced by the accumulation of one's daily tasks (and the corresponding fear of not being able to fulfil them) and therefore our topic can also be seen as a socio-economic and demographic indicator of the overall organization of life. Having raised the question of who these people are that manage to identify with their neighbourhood, we have encountered a number of micro (local) situations in which we have observed the more or less strong presence of assimilation, trust, and informal type of relations, which overcomes the isolated and sporadic communication of street encounters.

On this occasion, we invited various subjects – individuals and collectives who promote good neighbourly relations, thus enhancing communicational circulation system in the urban texture: MUUSEUM of Street Art, active on the centre-periphery line in the urban milieu of Zagreb, Museum of the Neighbourhood in the districts of New Zagreb, Museum of Modern and Contemporary Art Rijeka, and the Museum of Contemporary Art Metelkova (+MSUM), active in the museum's close neighbourhood, Acupuncture of the City (DAZ), dedicated to hermetic urban zones, and the Institute of Ethnology and Folklore, which deals with the notion of neighbourhood in the field of urban and cultural anthropology.

2014.

UMJETNIČKA VRTNA KUĆICA
NAJAVLJUJEMO

- OŽUJAK *S Goranom Trbuljakom u Dvorištu*
MODERATORICA Ivana Hanaček
- TRAVANJ *Francuski paviljon. Vidim budućnost...*
MODERATORICA Marta Kiš
- SVIBANJ *Suvremeni život povijesnih parkova*
(gostujemo u Splitu)
MODERATORICA Ana Šverko
- SRPANJ *Umjetničke prakse post-socijalizma*
MODERATORICA Sanja Horvatinčić
- LISTOPAD *Revizija 'drugih' i 'trećih' pozicija – od etnografskog*
do muzeja svjetskih kultura
MODERIRAJU Sandra Križić Roban, Suzana Marjanić
i Jelena Pašić

2014

ARTISTIC GARDEN HUT
FUTURE EVENTS

- MARCH *With Goran Trbuljak in Dvorište*
MODERATOR Ivana Hanaček
- APRIL *French Pavilion. I can see the future...*
MODERATOR Marta Kiš
- MAY *Modern life of historical parks*
(visiting Split)
MODERATOR Ana Šverko
- JULY *Art practices in post-socialism*
MODERATOR Sanja Horvatinčić
- OCTOBER *Revision of the 'second' and 'third' positions – from an*
ethnographical museum to a museum of world cultures
MODERATORS Sandra Križić Roban, Suzana Marjanić,
and Jelena Pašić



INSTITUT ZA POVIJEST UMJETNOSTI

Institut za povijest umjetnosti
Ulica grada Vukovara 68 / III
10 000 Zagreb, Hrvatska
www.ipu.hr

IZDAVAČ
PUBLISHER

ZA IZDAVAČA
/ FOR THE PUBLISHER

Milan Pelc

PROGRAM OSMIŠLJAVAJU
I VODE
/ PROGRAM DEVELOPED
AND LEAD BY

Sandra Križić Roban
Leonida Kovač
Suzana Marjanić
Sanja Horvatinčić
Jelena Pašić
Irena Šimić
Vanja Žanko

PRIJEVOD / TRANSLATION

Marina Miladinov

DIZAJN / DESIGN
NAKLADA / PRINT RUN
TISAK / PRINT

Dominik Markušić
300 kom
Tiskara Zelina

IMPRESSUM
IMPRINT

MINISTARSTVO
ZNANOSTI
OBRAZOVANJA
I SPORTA



Republika
Hrvatska
Ministarstvo
kulture
Republic
of Croatia
Ministry
of Culture



ERSTE Stiftung



TEHNIČKI MUZEJ
ZAGREB · HRVATSKA

ŽIVOT UMJETNOSTI

PODRŽAVAJU
SUPPORTED BY

