



2023\_11(1)

AGG+ Journal for Architecture, Civil Engineering, Geodesy and Related Scientific Fields  
АГГ+ часопис за архитектуру, грађевинарство, геодезију и сродне научне области

030-043

**Categorisation** | Review scientific paper

**DOI** | 10.61892/AGG20230130

**UDC** | 725.17(497.11):330.341.424

**Paper received** | 02/07/2023

**Paper accepted** | 19/09/2023

**Biljana Mišić**

*Institute for Protection of Cultural, Historical and Natural Heritage of Republic of  
Srpska, Banja Luka, Bosna and Herzegovina, bibimisc@gmail.com*

**PRESIDENTIAL PALACE IN NEW BELGRADE:  
EVALUATION APPROACHES TO POST-WORLD  
WAR II ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE**

Review scientific paper

DOI 10.61892/AGG20230130

UDC 725.17(497.11):330.341.424

Paper received | 02/07/2023

Paper accepted | 19/09/2023

Open access policy by

CC BY-NC-SA

**Biljana Mišić**

*Institute for Protection of Cultural, Historical and Natural Heritage of Republic of Srpska, Banja Luka, Bosnia and Herzegovina, [bibimistic@gmail.com](mailto:bibimistic@gmail.com)*

## PRESIDENTIAL PALACE IN NEW BELGRADE: EVALUATION APPROACHES TO POST-WORLD WAR II ARCHITECTURAL HERITAGE

### **ABSTRACT**

The discipline of preserving cultural monuments faces the challenge of large-scale contemporary and living heritage, which should be adequately documented and evaluated in order to be effectively protected and preserved. The valorization of architectural heritage, especially its most modern part, requires extensive consideration and estimation due to unstable social conditions, frequently changing purposes and temporal devastation. Many reasons can greatly affect our experience of the past as well as the conclusions, judgments and values we attribute to its monuments. This paper explores approaches to evaluating post-World War II architecture using the example of the Presidential Palace in New Belgrade. The research goal is to contribute to the objective valorization of the building based on different perceptions of the built structure and its surroundings through time, as well as specific meanings and emotions it causes for contemporaries.

**Keywords:** *Presidential Palace, New Belgrade, post-WWII architecture, evaluation criteria, meaning changes*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

The question of evaluation criteria and protection principles for post-WWII built heritage has lately become a focus of global professional attention. Nowadays, conservation debates highlight the importance of understanding contemporary architectural heritage as a very useful element in creating a modern visual identity of a place. In Serbia, during the last decades, experts have made the first steps to place this specific heritage under legal protection. In order to give the whole process the strength of social responsibility, the professionals strive to codify the unique and consistent preservation policy system.

The identification of valuable post-WWII architectural monuments is a very complex task that requires discussing social, ideological, political, cultural, economic and other conditions of their origin along with their architectural, urbanistic, technological or technical values. The comprehensive evaluation criteria and conservation principles should contribute to the clarity of judgments, thereby ensuring the objective standpoints and consistency of the perspectives in heritage protection policies. This process should be based on the strong belief that accurate and verified data are essential for creating a more appropriate attitude towards the heritage, regardless of its building types or construction period.

This paper explores one of the most notable buildings of post-WWII Yugoslavia, the Presidential Palace in New Belgrade (called later the Building of the Federal Executive Council), which has been declared a cultural monument thanks to its technical, artistic, cultural, social and historical values [23]. With consideration of the above evaluation criteria, the paper seeks to contribute to a wider understanding of the building significance through the study of the spirit of the place [1], its entirety [2], authenticity and integrity [3, 4], as well as the evolution of its character and social meaning through the past [5].

## 2. BUILDING THE SPIRIT OF THE PLACE: FROM A “NO MAN'S LAND” TO A NEW POLITICAL AND URBAN CENTER

If we had to choose the visual symbol that best represented the so-called “second” Yugoslavia and the experimental nature of its peculiar socialism [6], most of us would opt for the Presidential Palace in New Belgrade, the most representative and the only fully preserved building of post-WWII architecture in Belgrade [7]. However, today, we can hardly get a picture of the once-vacant, sand-covered soil [8] on which the construction of a new government headquarters was planned. The seat of the Federal Government Presidency was the first and most significant of a series of iconic buildings in the future New Belgrade, a modern city imagined between the historic centres of Belgrade and Zemun.

Liberated from any natural and ideological constraints, the location chosen for the building was ideal for expressing the new political, architectural and urban ideas [8]. The preparatory works were related to the fulfilment of the ground between the left bank of the Sava and the right bank of the Danube, two rivers whose streams for centuries marked the border between East and West. The conquest of marshy land with the aim of raising a modern city worthy of the image which the young socialist state wanted to market itself in the world represented a socio-political action of primary strategic importance for the government. In the spirit of the idea that the construction of socialism implies the construction of a new

man and new society, youth labour brigades from all over Yugoslavia took part in the embankment and erection of the first buildings<sup>1</sup>.



Figure 1. Skeleton of the Presidential palace in 1954. Source: [25]

As soon as 1947, the competition for the buildings of the highest state (Federal Government Presidency) and party institution (Central Committee of the Yugoslav Communist Party) in New Belgrade was announced. In order to promote the general spirit of collectivism, the idea of the participation of all Yugoslav citizens, both experts and non-professionals, came to the fore. To the same end, priority has been given to the involvement of large design teams over individual authors. A total of 26 papers have been submitted to the Presidential Building competition, with 89 authors, including 75 experts and 14 non-professionals [10]. In artistic terms, the contest call emphasized its significance as “a turning point in our architectural creativity”. It was specifically indicated that the Presidential building should be “representative” and “monumental and close to the feeling of our people - loved by them” [11].

It is indicative that the first-prize solution of Croatian architects Vladimir Potočnjak, Anton Ulrich, Dragica Perak and Zlatko Neumann, by its general architectural concept and aesthetics, was truly “representative”. The selection committee’s report emphasized the quality of the functional disposition based on the form of the letter H, which consists of two lateral concave wings connected by a slightly curved central tract. In external design, the achievement of “peaceful beauty” was particularly noted with the ascertainment that “the required monumentality was given seriously, really and unpretentiously” [12]. The “required monumentality” is meant to achieve the dignity of the object structure by using

<sup>1</sup> The image of the new Yugoslav man was formed and glorified through the character of builders and participants of youth volunteer brigades. In the construction of New Belgrade, the role of unskilled labour, women and men alike, was dominant. In major volunteer activities in the period 1947-50 about 100.000 young people were employed. [9]

modern language and simple means of architectural expression, but also in the style, material, and extent of interior decoration, as well as the themes of painting and sculpture works. The artists were required to undergo some “ideological preparation” and to collect documentary material for scenes of war and the construction of a new city, which were to be presented on monumental mosaic and mural compositions.

Nevertheless, the initial enthusiasm of the ambitious young state was soon subjected to testing. Political instability in the early 1950s, caused by the crisis in Yugoslavia’s relations with the countries of the Eastern Bloc, showed much deeper consequences than expected. All construction activities in the country were completely suspended. The lonely structure of the palace’s basic volume plunged into the insufficiently stabilized soil of future New Belgrade and stood silently anticipating a period of the upcoming complex political situation and internal crisis [8].

### 3. TOWARD NEW CONCEPTS: RAISING OF THE BUILDING AND THE CITY

The first ideas about the urbanization of the area between the rivers Sava and Danube appeared in the period between the two world wars [8], when Belgrade assumed the function of both the spatial and political centre of the Kingdom of Serb, Croats and Slovenes (later the Kingdom of Yugoslavia). According to the first General Plan of Belgrade (1924), the pioneering building ventures began: the Old Airport (1927-31), the King Alexander Bridge (1934), the Belgrade Fair (1937-39), as well as the banking of wetlands along the Danube River (1937-38). After 1945, one of the new socialist leadership main goals was to rebuild the country both symbolically and physically. This concept fully blended the idea of New Belgrade as a symbol of a new society but also a new functional understanding of the future city space. In opposition to all the ideas of pre-war urban planning, by which the construction of technical and industrial facilities is foreseen, New Belgrade was originally conceived as the administrative and political centre of the state [8: 72].

The main step towards finding a solution to the concept of the future city was made by its inclusion in the competition program for the representative governing and political buildings (1947). The results of the contest, as well as the conclusions of the jury, were the basis for further work on urban planning and conceptualizing of the area [12]. It was the Belgrade Master Plan (1950) that defined the position of New Belgrade as a landmark of the central state administration. However, over the next years, this idea was fundamentally changed and replaced by the project of the largest residential ensemble in the country. The causes of this transformation, on the one hand, can be sought in the decentralization of power and the reorganization of the administrative system, but also in the introduction of common social rights under the slogan “free housing for all citizens”. The new city concept, formed in the interval from 1950 (Belgrade Master Plan) to 1962 (New Belgrade Regulatory Plan), puts the issue of housing as a main function of New Belgrade [8: 122].

The construction of New Belgrade was reopened at the end of the sixth decade, no longer with the participation of youth labour brigades, but with the involvement of newly established large construction companies. In addition to the practical, the following works had a very important psychological significance of re-rising “from the ashes” not only of the city but of the entire country, marking symbolically the end of a retrograde phase of Yugoslav history and the beginning of the progressive period of its new future. However, construction works on the renamed Federal Executive Council building were restored even

earlier, in 1954, according to the renewing project of Belgrade architect Mihailo Janković and the “Stadion” Design Bureau. This decision was made for two reasons: the author of the first project, architect Potočnjak, had died in the meantime, and the entire social and artistic climate in the country changed, causing the design to adopt new functional and aesthetic requirements [13].

The shift of the discourse of Yugoslav politics implied the proclamation of new aesthetic and stylistic strategies. The issue of modernity in art and architecture became inseparable from the specific political concept of Yugoslavia. Both socially and artistically, it was necessary to make a distance from the paradigms of socialist realism, which was officially propagated after the war. The claim that the period of alliance with the USSR was too short to impose socialist realism as the official artistic style, Vladimir Kulić explains with the fact that many modernists, “thanks to their left-leaning and anti-fascist reputations, enjoyed sufficient amounts of political clout to avoid blindly following Soviet examples” [14: 131]. So, the erasure of all reminders of the ideologically marked past passed without a sharp cut in architecture and urbanism through the creation of a recognizable visual identity of the new state and its capital city.



*Figure 2. Josip Broz Tito (with the hat), architect Janković (the first behind Tito) and others in sightseeing the construction works, 1961. Source: Aleksandar Janković Archive*

#### 4. CHOOSING THE MIDDLE PATH: FORMAL AND AESTHETIC DESIGN CHANGE

After the split in 1948, Yugoslavia was converted from the closest official partner of the Soviet Union to the greatest outcast of the Eastern Block, experiencing horrible political and economic isolation. It sought new opportunities for survival in rethinking international

relations and forging alliances beyond the binary division of the world, while from the domestic political standpoint, it had set out to formulate its own socialist model [15], different from that advocated in the Moscow-influenced countries. It was a unique political and ideological system combining elements of communism and liberal capitalism, in which an individual and his needs were aligned with the general interests of society. Similarly, art was subjected to a search for a middle trajectory [14] by switching from the initial influence of social realism [16] through the acceptance of Western European conceptions to the formulation of its own model of so-called “socialist aestheticism” [17].

The incendiary rhetoric of political speeches about a brighter and better future, especially since the mid-1950s when political circumstances in Yugoslavia stabilized, required a proper aesthetic expression that should be universal in its formal simplicity and globally recognizable in the use of internationally accepted concepts and values. The most effective form of promoting such ideals was representative architecture, which served as a means of conveying ideological views. State-sponsored monumental public architecture, therefore, cannot be seen separately from the politics and ideological framework and their implications for aesthetic and artistic issues [18]. Thus, in a certain way, the role of the state and nation builders was taken over by the architects, urban planners, landscape engineers and artists whose task was to shape, express and convey a particular political vision appropriately.

In order to understand the new concept of Presidential Palace design, it is important to discuss the aesthetic tendencies of new monumentality in post-WWII modern architecture. The concept of “peaceful beauty”, required since the beginning of the contest program in 1947, evolved in the second half of the fifties, embracing criteria distinct from those governing just a few years prior. Architect Janković, therefore, had to accomplish the extremely complex task of adapting the original project of a massive, basically erected building with the new values of modernity and functionality. According to his design [19], a central ceremonial structure, interior layout and arrangement, garages and other building annexes were constructed.

The spatial changes, as well as the new design elements and materialization, can be interpreted as an architectural counterpart to the political-ideological orientation of the state that has emerged in the meantime. Major modifications were made in proportions, which resulted in a much more elegant appearance and stylistic uniformity of the whole. Originally closed and heavy imprint was replaced with lighter and more transparent building style. Instead of facade cladding with massive blocks, a much thinner marble panelling was made (in place of 12-20 mm one, 4 mm cladding was used), while aluminium frames of different sizes and shapes substituted the oak windows and doors. The intervention had a significant impact on the overall impression of the building, given that a total of 3,200 frames were installed on it [19].

The basic structure of the H-shaped plan received an effective entrance motif. Instead of a heavy central annexe laying down on the floor, Janković’s team proposed a much lighter ceremonial space with a large plenary hall (originally called “Yugoslavia”) and six ceremonial salons (named after the former states units: Serbian, Croatian, Slovenian, Bosnian-Herzegovinian, Montenegrin and Macedonian salon) [7]. The main hall’s artistic program includes a 150-square-meter mosaic and two 100-square-meter murals. At the same time, its most striking design element is the composite whole of the sun-like chandelier and the

glass dome above it, with impressive dimensions of 18 meters in diameter [19]. The major part of the decoration of the rest of the space was realised during the 1960s and after [7].

In salons, diversity is reflected not only in the names but also in the designs, encompassing traditional, ethnic, and natural motifs from the former state's federal units. The authors of salon concepts were the leading national architects: Milan Antić (Serbia), Vjenceslav Richter (Hrvatska), Mihailo Šoltez (Slovenia), Zlatko Ugljen (Bosnia and Herzegovina), Vojislav Đokić (Montenegro), and Dragan Bošnjakoski (Macedonia). The decoration incorporated stones sourced from prominent quarries across Yugoslavia, along with the highest quality materials available on the market at the time. [7]. The art program, conceived with the ambition to form a gallery of twentieth-century Yugoslav art, was complemented by works of national artists and craftsmen, as well as objects that reflect material characteristics of a particular local area. This conception highlighted the idea of the uniqueness of each republic. In addition, it conveyed a strong message about the unity of the state and the joint project of creating an egalitarian society for the future. In Kulić's words: "Taken together, these spaces read as an apt metaphor for the Yugoslav socialist state: a modern container for the collection of distinct traditional ethnicities, brought together by their common struggle for liberation from fascism, class oppression, and underdevelopment, an idea succinctly expressed through slogan brotherhood and unity" [20: 27]. Therefore, the design of the ceremonial part reflects the ruling political ideas of the seventh decade that can be understood by simultaneously emphasizing the general values of the Yugoslav cultural and political space and the specific features characteristic of individual federal units and nationalities.



*Figure 3. Presidential Palace in New Belgrade, Yugoslavia Hall. Source: Cultural Heritage Preservation Institute of Belgrade*



## 5. EVOLUTION OF SOCIAL SIGNIFICANCE: HISTORY OF THE STATE IN THE TITLE OF ONE BUILDING

Today, it is possible to find out a lot about the building both in Serbian and international literature. However, this was not always the case. Until two decades ago, archival documents, as well as the building itself, were carefully protected from researchers and the eyes of curious observers. The question that intrigued the entire public the best was the dilemma about the building's title, which was changed several times, just like the country it symbolically and formally represented.

Building history begins under the name of the *Presidency of the Federal Government*, and it continues with the *Federal Executive Council* (the highest governing body since 1953), under which the building was officially opened in 1961 on the occasion of the First Conference of Non-Aligned Countries in Belgrade. During the period of state disintegration in the 1990s, the neutral term of the *Federation Palace* was most often used. The Federal Republic of Yugoslavia, which existed from 1992-2003, was renamed in 2003 to the State Union of Serbia and Montenegro. Since 2006, with the fourth change of the state framework (the Republic of Serbia became an independent country), the building became the responsibility of the Government of the Republic of Serbia, officially named the *Palace "Serbia"* [7].

Each of the Palace's names can be understood as a reflection of the prevailing social and political tendencies of the time and specific ideological and cultural changes which the building inaudibly witnessed. The commencement of construction, coinciding with one of the most tumultuous events of the post-WWII period—Moscow's attempt to bring Yugoslavia under direct control—challenged the enthusiasm of the young state. Unexpectedly, the foreign political isolation and economic crisis that caused the complete stoppage of the palace construction marked the starting point from which the development of the prosperous young state and its culture and art were no longer questionable.

The period leading up to the building opening ceremony in 1961 holds special significance in comprehending the ideological framework of a societal and cultural shift in Yugoslavia. Serious external and internal crises forged a significant turnover in the political and economic organization. The state leadership focused all its efforts on formulating a more liberal management system, which implied decentralization and a reformation of the social order. This included the introduction of self-government, the conversion of state property into social assets, and the advocacy of broader intellectual freedoms. In foreign policies, the country sought new opportunities in the Non-Aligned Movement, one of the most dominant ideas of global politics of the 1960s that we can still consider crucial to the survival of the world in the future. The inauguration of Yugoslavia as its leader can be seen as the start of a new and prosperous chapter in the state's history [7].

Like other important dates in history, which bear in their name the spatial determinants of political events, the foundation of the Non-Aligned Movement was unbreakably linked with the construction of the Presidential Palace in New Belgrade, which was the physical space of birth of a new world peace policy. The importance of that first meeting (1961) was confirmed by the qualification of "conscience of mankind" received by the world public [7: 134]. Its symbolical embodiment is found in the program of the whole architectural and urban planning project of the Presidential Palace, in particular in the concept of the Park of

Friendship<sup>2</sup>, an open-space museum arranged in honour of the conference in its immediate surroundings. According to the original design, the park was conceived as a presentation of all the world's people and divided into plots where each country exhibited its ethnological and natural treasures [22]. At the very centre of the park, the Alley of Peace was formed from saplings planted by all leaders of participating countries, expressing the idea of “non-engagement” and international solidarity, the possibility of living together within different communities without competition and aspirations for hegemony.

However, buildings of “public interest” like the Presidential Palace possess a sign of “cold beauty” and “monumental seriousness”, followed by the sense of untouchability and mysteriousness hidden behind their solid exterior. Contrary to the declaratively propagated stance of equality and freedom, the Presidential Palace was separated from its citizens from the very beginning by installing clearly visible warnings of prohibition of pedestrians' approach [21]. The opportunity to access the palace closer only arose during the public ceremonies, when the palace was lavishly illuminated. In contrast, a fountain on the spacious access plateau, surrounded by masts with flags rising, created an unexpected arabesque of colourful water play [7]. The enigma surrounding the building was further intensified over the coming years, culminating in the last decade of the past century, when the unlit and half-empty structure became a key reminder of the failure of the ideology under which it was inaugurated. Fortunately, this impression of abandonment has long since been forgotten.



*Figure 4. Presidential Palace in New Belgrade, aero photo. Source: Cultural Heritage Preservation Institute of Belgrade*

In the last two decades, almost all of the palace's primary functions were restored. As the staff of state ministries circulate in the hallways, events of public importance take place in its ceremonial spaces, and its interior, with a certain protocol of visits, is accessible to

<sup>2</sup> According to its natural, urban, historical and symbolic values Park of Friendship has been declared as a cultural property – significant place [24]

citizens. In addition to the exceptionality of the building that fascinates the observer at first sight, an even stronger impression leaves its internal space and the fact that almost nothing has been changed inside, even with the aim of adapting to contemporary building regulations. Only the names of salons have been altered: Instead of national, more neutral terms are used today, derived from the dominant colours of their arrangement (Slovenian is now blue room, Macedonian is brown, etc.) [7]. However, the atmosphere of high modernity of the 1960s is still very vivid: it is evoked by carefully maintained interior elements, from carpets and lighting to furniture and art objects, whose keeping, unlike most other state buildings, was also the subject of deserved attention during periods of crisis and wars. Details like plush armchair seats, uniquely crafted carpets or marble pavement give the impression that no one has ever used them, providing a “time-machine” experience of the atmosphere that has survived intact over the six decades of its existence [21: 26].

## 6. RESULTS

Nowadays, approaches to the valorization of the post-WWII architectural heritage imply its constant identification and comprehensive investigation. Along with standard study methodologies that focus predominantly on basic material values, today, researchers are paying much more attention to intangible values. The meaning that structures acquire over time is of crucial importance for the personal relationship of the individual towards the built environment. This quality is recognized as crucial for the selection of adequate and respectful conservation procedures and the sustainable development of the heritage in the future. In that sense, this paper paid attention to the wider historical, political, social, as well as cultural and artistic context in which the Presidential Palace in New Belgrade was inaugurated. This approach is important to understand the significance the building and space obtain in formulating a unique and distinctive modern city identity, as well as particular meanings and significance for contemporaries.

Besides the elements of the physical structure of the Presidential Palace, such as existing spaces, settings, views, landscapes, art pieces and objects, the intangible factors like memories, narratives, knowledge and documents significantly contribute to a richer and more complete understanding of the spirit of place [1]. A deeper research on the relationship between internal social and spiritual factors and external physical elements reveals special meanings, values and emotions that we can attribute to the place. These sentiments and meanings are produced by various social instruments (political system, life environment, social standards, etc.) and actors (important persons, artists, users, etc.). The goal of the approach is to analyze and understand the ways in which the space and spirit, that is, the tangible and intangible nature of the place, mutually construct one another. This relational model can improve our cognition of the multiple and dynamic character of the place that is changing through time as well as depending on different groups of observers.

Firm interconnection between the Presidential Palace and New Belgrade, as the most important urbanistic project of the second Yugoslavia, is of high importance for recognizing its values as indigenous cultural heritage [2]. The examination of this specific relationship between building and space provides a relevant base for adequate conservation and restoration policies, which responds to the frequently opposed needs for change and continuity. Reinforced concrete building structures always represented present landmarks, according to which all the preliminary and urban plans of the future city were determined. This fact that speaks in favour of unbreakable ties and mutual influences between the

structure and its wider environment is the main reason why the review of the building cannot be separated from the consideration and analysis of ideas about the development of New Belgrade.

The authenticity and integrity of the place [3, 4] are based on the consistency and preservation of the original building concept visible both in its entirety (form, location, settings, use, function) and in details (materials, techniques, artworks, craftworks and other internal and external factors). This quality enables the further elaboration of particular artistic, historical, social, technical and scientific dimensions of the building. Estimation of the Palace's significant time layers and the patina of age, which can be seen in the fact that almost nothing has changed in the structure, function and ambience of the building since the first occupants moved in it, provides the unique impression that allows the observer to form a generic viewpoint of the past. The significance, sense and feelings attributed to the site by different communities and social groups represent subjective and culturally determined concepts that can influence the perception and assessment of authenticity.

Finally, the interpretation of the aesthetic and artistic values of the Presidential Palace is inseparable from the evolution of its social meaning and significance [5]. The strong turnover that the palace's character has experienced through the past seventy years indicates its social significance, that is, the role that society plays in forming the values of the building. Examining how the institution of power is presented and the symbolic significance it holds for contemporaries offers a comprehensive insight into the overall relevance of the monument. It means that the importance of the Presidential Palace lies not only in the values it represents but in the meanings and uses that people attach to it. Such an approach observes the building as a resource of social, economic and cultural city development based on the principles of sustainability and responsibility.

## 7. CONCLUSION

Research of the context in which the idea of construction of the Presidential Palace in New Belgrade was realized, as well as its history through the following six decades, assumed a comprehensive observation of the mutual influence of social, ideological, urban, architectural and artistic conceptions of that time. The changing political and cultural climate that marked the post-WWII period in Yugoslavia had a direct impact on the understanding of the importance of the role that architecture played in promoting values generally accepted by the society. In all design and conceptual qualities, the Presidential Palace represents a reflection of the aesthetic and cultural values of the time in which it was created [7].

In the building's construction period (1947–62), we can trace the change in the main discourse of the modern movement in Yugoslav architecture and urbanism, from the phase of the strong influence of socialist realism in the early post-WWII years to the acceptance of Western models, which ruled the artistic creativity of the sixties. The significance of the historical moment during which the competition for the first buildings in New Belgrade took place, coupled with the involvement of a large number of entrants, gives them the status of a turning point in Yugoslav architectural history. It was the first common contest that included the entire professional staff of the country and showed advanced reflections on architecture seeking its own model of so-called "socialist aestheticism" [17]. The abandonment and request for alteration of the original palace's design that followed soon

was the sign of the final victory of modernist conceptions in the official creative and architectural discourse. By modifying Potočnjak's original project and incorporating elements from the International style into the constructed building complex, the new Janković's project could be viewed as the architectural response to changes that have occurred in the political-ideological sphere in the meantime.

During the dissolution of the state and the ideology for which it was built, the lonely building of the now unnecessarily bulky building of the former gigantic administration became a symbol for the failure of the post-war political and social project. However, nowadays, its values can be viewed from a completely different point of view, free from the dictates of ideological representation. Erected as a visual expression of the political ideas and social principles of a young, prosperous socialist state, this imposing structure of distinct architectural and artistic values is a physical and spiritual reflection of a time of welfare, optimism, economic and population growth. It was a time in which non-material doctrines were proclaimed as the ultimate achievements of human wealth, and the ideas of international solidarity, equality and togetherness were nurtured instead of nationalism. In this way, in the new spatial, social, political and economic conditions, the programmatic framework of the inception of the Palace establishes new significance and associations, and its artistic and aesthetic features acquire the quality of timelessness and universality.

## 8. REFERENCES

- [1] "QUÉBEC DECLARATION ON THE PRESERVATION OF THE SPIRIT OF PLACE." Available: <https://whc.unesco.org/uploads/activities/documents/activity-646-2.pdf> (accessed on 11 August 2023)
- [2] "ICOMOS New Zealand Charter for the Conservation of Places of Cultural Heritage Value Revised 2010 Preamble." Available: [https://www.icomos.org/images/DOCUMENTS/Charters/ICOMOS\\_NZ\\_Charter\\_2010\\_FINAL\\_11\\_Oct\\_2010.pdf](https://www.icomos.org/images/DOCUMENTS/Charters/ICOMOS_NZ_Charter_2010_FINAL_11_Oct_2010.pdf) (accessed on 11 August 2023)
- [3] ICOMOS, "The NARA document on authenticity (1994) - International Council on Monuments and Sites," *www.icomos.org*, 1994. <https://www.icomos.org/en/charters-and-texts/179-articles-en-francais/ressources/charters-and-standards/386-the-nara-document-on-authenticity-1994> (accessed on 11 August 2023)
- [4] "APPROACHES TO THE CONSERVATION OF TWENTIETH -CENTURY CULTURAL HERITAGE 2017 Madrid -New Delhi Document." Available: [https://isc20c.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/MNDD\\_Full-Document.pdf](https://isc20c.icomos.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/MNDD_Full-Document.pdf) (accessed on 11 August 2023)
- [5] "Council of Europe Framework Convention on the Value of Cultural Heritage for Society, 27 October 2005," *International Journal of Cultural Property*, vol. 14, no. 04, Nov. 2007, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/s0940739107070282> (accessed on 11 August 2023)
- [6] A. Pavkovic, *The Fragmentation of Yugoslavia Nationalism in a Multinational State*. London: Palgrave Macmillan UK, 2006, pp. 47–58.
- [7] B. Mišić, *Palata Saveznog izvršnog veća u Novom Beogradu: istorija građenja: od Predsedništva vlade FNRJ do Palate „Srbija“*. Beograd: Zavod za zaštitu spomenika kulture grada Beograda, 2011.
- [8] Lj. Blagojević, *Novi Beograd, Osporeni modernizam*. Beograd: Zavod za udžbenike, Arhitektonski fakultet Univerziteta, Zavod za zaštitu spomenika kulture grada Beograda, 2008, pp. 18-54.

- [9] Lj. Radojković, "Omladinske radne brigade na izgradnji Beograda 1947-50," *Godišnjak grada Beograda*, vol. 5, pp. 363-420, 1958.
- [10] "Konkursi za Dom Centralnog komiteta KPJ i zgradu Predsedništva vlade FNRJ," *Tehnika*, vol. 6, pp. 141-148, 1947.
- [11] "Uslovi konkursa za zgradu Centralnog komiteta Komunističke partije Jugoslavije i za zgradu Pretsedništva vlade Federativne narodne republike Jugoslavije," *Tehnika*, vol. 11-12, pp. 339-342, 1946.
- [12] "Rezultati natječaja za zgrade CK KPJ, Pretsjedništvo vlade FNRJ i reprezentativnog hotela u Beogradu," *Arhitektura*, vol. 1-2, p. 60, 1947.
- [13] Building permit no. 05-10730/3.10.1956, Municipality of Belgrade Technical Documentation, Belgrade Historical Archive.
- [14] V. Kulić, "'East? West? Or Both?' Foreign perceptions of architecture in Socialist Yugoslavia," *The Journal of Architecture*, vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 129-147, Feb. 2009, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13602360802705106>.
- [15] J. Perović, "The Tito-Stalin Split: A Reassessment in Light of New Evidence," *Journal of Cold War Studies*, vol. 9, no. 2, pp. 32-63, Apr. 2007, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1162/jcws.2007.9.2.32>.
- [16] A. Kadijević, "O socrealizmu u beogradskoj arhitekturi i njegovim oprečnim tumačenjima," *Nasleđe*, no. 9, pp. 75-88, 2008, Accessed: Feb. 19, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://scindeks.ceon.rs/article.aspx?artid=1450-605X0809075K>.
- [17] M. Popadić, "Novi ulepšani svet: socijalistički estetizam i arhitektura," *Zbornik Matice srpske za likovne umetnosti*, vol. 38, pp. 247-260, 2010.
- [18] A. Kadijević, "Uloga ideologije u novijoj arhitekturi I njena shvatanja u istoriografiji," *Nasleđe*, no. 8, pp. 225-237, 2007, Accessed: Feb. 19, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://scindeks.ceon.rs/article.aspx?artid=1450-605X0708225K>.
- [19] M. Janković, "Kako je projektovana palata SIV-a," *Politika*, p. 20, Aug. 09, 1975.
- [20] V. Kulić, "Building Brotherhood and Unity: Architecture and Federalism in Socialist Yugoslavia," in *Toward a concrete utopia: architecture in Yugoslavia 1948-1980*, M. Stierli and V. Kulić, Eds., New York: The Museum of Modern Art, 2018, pp. 26-39.
- [21] M. Prodanović, "Time Capsule," in *SIV: Palace of Federal Executive Council, Photography Monograph*, Beograd: D. Đorđević, Altanova, 2014.
- [22] I. Vesković, "Park Prijateljstva u Novom Beogradu," *Nasleđe*, no. 12, pp. 203-216, 2011, Accessed: Feb. 19, 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://scindeks.ceon.rs/article.aspx?artid=1450-605X1112203V>.
- [23] *Official Gazette of Republic of Serbia* 72/2013, Aug. 14, 2013.
- [24] *Official Gazette of Republic of Serbia* 8/2014, Jan. 29, 2014.
- [25] Direkcija za izgradnju Novog Beograda, *Beograd; Novi Beograd*. Belgrade: Export-press, 1967.

## AUTHORS' BIOGRAPHIES

**Biljana Mišić**

Biljana Mišić lives and works in Banja Luka. She graduated from the Art History Department of the Faculty of Philosophy in Belgrade (2003) and obtained a PhD degree at the same institution (2019). From 2003 to 2017, she worked as an art historian/conservator at the Cultural Heritage Preservation Institute of Belgrade. Now, she is employed at the Institute for Protection of Cultural, Historical and Natural Heritage of the Republic of Srpska in Banja Luka as a Senior Associate for cultural and historical heritage. She has published several conference announcements and presentations, monographic catalogues about cultural monuments in Belgrade, as well as the monographs *SIV Palace in New Belgrade* (2011) and *Central Europe and Belgrade: Architectural influences 1919-1941* (2022). In addition to anthologies and conservation publications, she also published papers in the scientific journals *Nasleđe*, *Kultura*, *Zbornik Narodnog Muzeja u Beogradu*, *Glasnik DKS* and the professional newsletter *DaNS*.

---

**ПАЛАТА ПРЕДСЈЕДНИШТВА ВЛАДЕ У НОВОМ БЕОГРАДУ: ПРИСТУПИ ПРОЦЈЕНИ ГРАДИТЕЉСКОГ НАСЉЕЂА ИЗ ПЕРИОДА ПОСЛИЈЕ ДРУГОГ СВЈЕТСКОГ РАТА**

**Сажетак:** Очување споменика културе се као дисциплина у знатној мјери суочава са изазовом модерног и савременог наслеђа, које треба бити адекватно документовано и вредновано како би се ефикасно заштитило и сачувало. Валоризација градитељске баштине, посебно њеног најрецентнијег дијела, захтева опсежно разматрање и процјену услед нестабилних друштвених услова, честих промјена намјена и пропадања током времена. Многи разлози могу значајно утицати на наше доживљаје прошлости, као и на закључке, судове и вриједности које придајемо њеним споменицима. Истраживање у овом раду се бави приступима процјени архитектуре послје Другог свјетског рата на примјеру Палате Предсједништва владе у Новом Београду. Циљ истраживања је допринос објективном вредновању на основу различитих перцепција објекта и његовог окружења кроз вријеме, као и специфичних значења и емоција које они изазивају код савременика.

**Кључне ријечи:** Предсједничка палата, Нови Београд, архитектура послје Другог свјетског рата, критеријуми процјене, промјене значења