Each summer season, the sun-drenched coasts of Bulgaria and Croatia turn into densely inhabited, intensively exploited tourism industry hot spots. This book traces the various architectural and urban planning strategies that have been pursued there since the mid-1950s—first in order to create, and then to further develop, modern holiday destinations. It portrays (late) modern resorts of remarkable architectural quality and typological diversity that have lasted for decades: as anchors of the socialist states’ “social tourism”, as playground for domestic publics in search of recreation and as a viable product on the international holidays market. Finally, it shows how individual resorts and outstanding buildings have been restructured both economically and physically since the fall of state socialism, and explores the present-day conflicts triggered by coastal development in the name of tourism.
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The Skipper Group, for example, whose 5-star Kempinski Hotel Adriatic in Sveti Roka went to the Hypo Alpe-Adria Bank; Goran Štrok, who had to sell his Adriatic Luxury Hotels in Dubrovnik to the Lukašić Group in 2010; and Neva Karam, who found in 2012 that he could no longer afford his Hilton building site in Split. The Austrian government nationalized the Hypo Alpe-Adria Bank to save it from bankruptcy in 2009 yet alone its total outstanding debts related to tourism projects in Croatia amounted still to one billion Euro in 2012.


Interview with Goran Fabris, ex-manager at Valamar and presently a manager with Maistra, which in terms of its numbers of beds is the third largest hotel management company in Croatia, Poreč, 25 August 2012.

Understandable fear of losing control over the country’s most important economic sector, to obligations ensuing from war-time, from rivalries between Zagreb and local stakeholders to corruption, from on-going legal uncertainty to over-regulation of the market. But whatever role all these may have played, in the opinion of many critical liberal economic experts, the main reason for the delay is the over long period of maladministration—to which Croatia’s EU accession in 2013 will hopefully put an end.

From another angle, however, the delays may be read as a historical happy turn of fate: unlike Spain, Bulgaria and Montenegro, where a fully deregulated property market and a lack of political will to impose planning regulations have left large parts of the coast disastroously disfigured by random sprawl, Croatia’s natural resources and landscape are still largely intact.

By the time construction picked up there again, local architects were proud to draw on what they see as a specifically Croatian modernist tradition, and were ready to reinterpret it in innovative ways. [p. 242]. Croatian managers, for their part, had time enough to convince new owners that it would be well worth their while to respect the special features and traditions of each specific destination: the hotels’ and resorts’ semi-public zones and leisure facilities were originally intended to be open to all and—despite the shifts in ownership—they are used like common property today. The local population thus enjoys unhindered access to them—as well as unhindered access to the sea, which is still a right guaranteed by law.

Building the Affordable Arcadia.
Tourism development on the Croatian Adriatic coast under state socialism

Maroje Mrđuljaš

Development after World War II

Tourism—despite its quite long and respectable tradition in Croatia—was low on the list of social priorities in the immediate post-war period. Not that the issue of leisure and free time was ever neglected. On the contrary, free time was clearly understood to be an essential factor in the overall production cycle, and therefore came to be structured, planned and evaluated, just as work time was. The State provided workers and young people with subsidized vacations, which they were supposed to spend at the various holiday houses that the State, the Army, and major labour and social organizations had been constructing for that purpose along the coast since the mid 1950s. Most of these leisure facilities were quite basic new buildings, or old hotels and larger town houses converted into tourist facilities. Yet one of the most beautiful International Style buildings in Croatia was also built in the post-WWII period, the restaurant pavilion in Umag, designed by Nada Šilović in 1953: a free composition of simple volumes, set among converted hotels, it has a gently curving ramp that interconnects the grounds and the terrace.

The tourist resort typography (odmarališta) that was developed in parallel illustrates the initial architectural and social vision of ‘socialist leisure’. Modest pavilions designed as guest accommodation were clustered loosely around the ‘social condenser’ (Društveni dom), a central building housing a restaurant and other communal facilities, such as a multifunctional hall, a library, and billiard and chess rooms. Antun Ulrich and Dragica Petrak designed a nice example of this in 1949,
in Oteševo, on Lake Prespansko in Macedonia. While the best resorts were subtly laid out and architecturally simple, some other social leisure facilities became quite radically experimental. One of the most exciting architectural artefacts on the Croatian coast is the Children's Health Resort in Kravice, near Makarska, designed by Rikard Marasović in 1961, and financed and run by the Yugoslav People's Army (JNA). The actual health centre was realized as a circular structure, dramatically hovering above a generous plaza, in a pine wood forest close to the sea. The resort is now in the hands of the State and quite derelict.

It was only after 1964/65 that tourist development really exploded, following socio-economic reforms that proclaimed decentralization, workers' self-management and empowerment of the six republics to be the primary goals. In essence, the reforms instigated a semi-regulated free market economy. Industrialization and modernization were progressing at a favourable pace, partly thanks to huge credits from the West, yet the economy was stagnant. Reorientation to new economic sectors was therefore necessary.

With over 6,000 kilometres of picturesque littoral and island coastline, Croatia was ideally suited for the nascent 'industry of tourism' and the ideological imperatives of 'leisure' and 'free time'. Gradual extension of the Adriatic motorway (Jadranska magistrala), construction of which had begun in the mid 1950s, made the Croatian/Yugoslav coast more easily accessible and drove the development of mass tourism. This, in turn, triggered an accelerated spate of construction that produced numerous hotel complexes, generally characterized by well-embellished modernist architecture. Yet here, more keenly than in any other sphere of economic development, it became quickly apparent that the success of tourism relied directly on the preservation of spatial and environmental qualities. The institutionalized practices of urban planning and environmental preservation were therefore developed at this early stage.

Spatial planning on the Adriatic Coast

The methodology and ideology of urbanism in Croatia adhered quite strictly to the CIAM doctrines adopted by modernist architects prior to WWII. The Radna Grupa Zagreb (Zagreb Working Group), an association of young architects founded by the CIAM member and former Le Corbusier apprentice Ernest Weissmann, was especially influential. Another prominent artists and architects' association was the Grupa Zemlja (Land Group), which gathered around socially engaged leftist intellectuals led by the prominent architect Drago Ibler.

Modernist doctrines remained fundamental to the urban planning field, also after WWII, for urbanization of the predominantly rural country was a priority issue on the Yugoslav socialist agenda. Planners therefore began to look at how technical efficiency might speed up the rate of modernization.

The central state urban planning organization—the Urban Planning Institute of the Republic of Croatia (Urbanistički institut Hrvatske UHI)—was founded in 1947, and set up branches in the coastal cities of Rijeka and Split. In 1950, the Urban Planning Centre of Dalmatia in Split drew up the master plan for the city. In order to provide 'enough space for the eventual accommodation of tourists', it proposed two small harbours, as well as Friule, Spinut and Meje, the three main green recreational zones. This shows that tourism was an integral part of the urban planning program from the very start.
In order to 'test run' planning methodologies also at the regional level, two pilot studies were launched: in 1960, Dragan Boltar and Miroslav Kollenz, of the Urban Planning Department at the Zagreb Faculty of Architecture, drew up plans for the Makarska and Šibenik regions, in collaboration with the Office for Tourist Catering Services and Construction (Biro za turističku i ugostiteljsku izgradnju).4

The plan for the Makarska Riviera became one of the finest examples of regional planning. A group of young and talented local planners—including Matija Salaj and Julije De Luca—continued with the development of detailed plans for the Brela district, and thereby advocated an integrated approach to architecture and urban planning. From 1962 to 1967, in close collaboration with the architects Drago Moravec and Ante Rožić, they built several medium-sized hotels (redevelopment of Hotel Park; Hotel Riviera; Hotel Mirna; Hotel Marina; Hotel Maestral) [+181], as well as other tourist facilities financed by the Makarska Hotel Company.

Preliminary studies for a master plan for Dubrovnik, carried out in 1960 by the Urban Planning Institute of Croatia, also paid special attention to tourism. Tourist facilities were not concentrated in or close to the city centre, but dispersed over a broader area spanning 55 km of coastline.5 The plan designated several locations for the development of new tourist complexes—but it also included 10,000 beds in private accommodation, whereby it integrated an existing form of private, small-scale economic activity in the overall tourism concept.6

After an initial conference in Zagreb in 1959, the Urban Planning Institute of Croatia carried out several studies of tourism planning methodology and its suitability for Yugoslavia's Adriatic coastal regions. In 1962, the Republic of Croatia commissioned a long-term development and spatial planning programme for the Adriatic coast. In 1964, the working group led by architects Mijo Hečimović and Miro Marasović conducted preliminary field research and collated data, then issued a detailed report on the state of fifty-five tourist facilities. They produced disturbing evidence of a dire lack of coordination and cooperation in tourism developments on the coast. They also considered the economy of the coastal region to be underdeveloped and in urgent need of attention, especially in the south. Tourism was acknowledged to be the most promising source of income and future development. Findings
of the research were published in Čovžek i Prostor (Man and Space), in 1966,7 and later in several other architectural journals.8 Ambitious growth was advocated: 'If we compare existing accommodation capacities of 250,000 to the planned target of 2,500,000, it is obvious what the future holds in store for us (over the next 20 to 30 years, note MM).9

The fundamental feature of all Yugoslav tourism facilities is that the planning for them was underpinned by concepts of spatial development and governance based on 'the common interest'. Tourist complexes were open to all and included public spaces designed to mediate between the collective and individual spheres. The unequivocal decision to restrict tourist construction—nothing could be built within 100 metres of the shoreline—has in turn preserved the coastal area as common land, accessible to all, while complementary investments were made in promenades and parks.

International cooperation

In 1963, research by local experts prompted the government of Yugoslavia to request the United Nations' assistance in defining new development plans for the Adriatic region. Three major regional projects ensued from this cooperation, all of which were implemented between 1967 and 1972, at the peak of construction activity in the tourism sector: the Southern Adriatic Project, the Upper Adriatic Project and the plan for the intermediate area around Split. Both in Yugoslavia and internationally, the projects were acclaimed as milestones in integral regional planning methodology. Yet, somewhat paradoxically, construction of the new tourism facilities progressed considerably before the integral regional plans had even left the drawing board.

The project manager of the Southern Adriatic Project—appointed by the UN—was the distinguished architect Adolf Ciborowski, an expert active previously in many UN projects and organizations, including the reconstruction of Skopje after the earthquake of 1963. The project coordinator was the Yugoslav architect Miro Marasović. The UN also nominated an international consultancy group that included Tekne, from Milan, and Cekop and a freelance expert, Boleslaw Malisz, from Warsaw. All tourism issues were handed over to the Institute

8 Architectura, a journal published by the Zagreb-based Association of Croatian Architects, covered the theme of urban planning in coastal areas and/or tourist architecture e.g. in Architectura, 1969, no. 104, and Architectura, 1971, no. 111/12; Architectura Urbanizam, a journal published by the Association of Yugoslav Architects and the Belgrade-based Urbanist Association of Yugoslavia, presented examples of tourist and leisure architecture in Architectura Urbanizam, 1967, no. 45/46.
for the Economy of Tourism in Zagreb. The project was planned and carried out by a group of experts from the Urban Planning Institutes of Croatia in Zagreb, of Montenegro in Titograd (now Podgorica), and of Bosnia and Herzegovina in Sarajevo. It was led by Franjo Gašparović and based in Dubrovnik. The development of plans was split between the three groups, while international consultants from Shankland Cox & Associates (London), from Vattenbyggnadsbyrå (Stockholm), and from O.T.A.M. Tourconsult and Urban (Rome and Paris) supplied additional expertise. All the plans were completed by mid 1969. The Upper Adriatic Project, launched in 1970, represented a further step in a long-term cooperation between the UN and the Yugoslav government. The Urban Planning Institutes of Croatia and Slovenia implemented the project, again with the support of Shankland Cox Associates and O.T.A.M. Tourconsult.

Research and preliminary concepts and proposals had to be presented for discussion to the federal regional and local authorities, for Yugoslavia’s commitment to decentralization and self-management assured local stakeholders an increasingly important role in the country’s economic and political affairs. Architecture critic and planner Vladimir Mattioni has noted the contradictions inherent to such cooperation, which ensued largely from the very different backgrounds of the local stakeholders and planning professionals: ‘[the professional experts’] experience of social systems was completely different: the domestic partners were at the threshold of the development of socialist self-management, the Polish consultants came from a country [under] state socialism and the Western Europeans from countries with free markets and established democracies. Just how these experiences came together and how the “know how” was transferred, was, unfortunately, [not] recorded’.50

What the planners did, in essence, was to make a clear inventory and a detailed analysis of all the Adriatic region’s potential and resources—its spaces, people, infrastructure, energy, traffic, industry, agriculture, spatial and natural qualities and cultural heritage, among other things—and then collate this data in comprehensive documents that served as the operative basis for the development of future plans. But ‘the plans were quickly passed, and not realized as intended. The changes were permanent and varying in format, [...] Thus the formula of the “perfection” of the plans and the “imperfection” of reality arose. In practice, integral planning was successful, not due to its results, but due to the methodology, which was awesome.‘51
From industry versus tourism
to the tourism industry

The federal policymakers—although aware of the region’s immense
tourism potential—insisted that economic progress should by no
means rely on tourism alone. They were wary of the dangers of a
mono-functional economy and therefore advocated the simultaneous
development of other production spheres. In fact, tourism was envi-
sioned as a catalyst for integral development, as a trigger that would
spark accelerated growth in other economic spheres. What com-
plicated matters slightly here was that tourism and industry—owing
to a whole range of spatial and geographical factors, such as the
proximity of rivers, the sea and the ports—ended up competing for
the same valuable coastal locations. Interestingly, the policymakers
did not see this as a problem, and actually even entertained the pos-
sibility of tourism and industry existing peacefully and productively,
side by side.

Interest in the economic potential of mass tourism led quickly
to the notion of the ‘industry of tourism’, which is revealing of tourism’s
status as simply another category of economic production. The ultimate
goal was to steadily increase the GDP (gross domestic product),
and the formula to achieve this was strategic growth. Urban planners
were quite uncomfortable with both these ideas—unlimited growth and
tourism’s symbiosis with industry—but proceeded to plan tourism
nevertheless. In the process of exploring maximum tourism capacity,
for instance, they devised an elaborate calculus: the whole coastline
was scrupulously scanned and evaluated; certain areas were design-
ated suitable for tourism usage (mostly beaches and bays with
easy access to the sea—approximately 15 percent of the coastline);
and then the surface area of beach required per tourist was calculated.
Statistical analyses from other countries showed that 100 out of 140
tourists simultaneously consume the beach, at peak periods of the day.
With the data thus collated, planners could begin to calculate the
number of beds required, and the overall capacities and densities of
tourism facilities. The first variant of the calculus was based on the
length of the beach (1.66 m per tourist), then this was corrected in turn,
by the potential simultaneous usage factor (1.4).13 Just to illustrate the
point: the number of beds needed for the whole Adriatic was calculated
in this way to be around 4 million, which was roughly the size of Croatia’s population at the
time. The second variant of the calculation was

12 ‘Regionalni prostorni plan južnog Jadrana’ (Regional spatial plan for the
based on the requisite surface area of beach: from 6 to 8 m² per tourist. On the basis of these data and calculation, the total capacity of Adriatic beaches was estimated to be 2.2 million tourists. This figure was revised to take into account the local population as well as other parameters, such as water and power supply. The final calculation deduced there was sufficient capacity for 1.8 million tourists.\(^{13}\)

And yet, although the planners operated on the basis of maximum capacities and the idea of unimpeded growth, their awareness of tourism's dependence on the preservation of spatial resources prompted them to define certain positive guidelines. They recommended that urbanization of the coast be concentrated at certain selected points, and that intermediate areas be left entirely wild and uninhabited. In allocating functions and uses to different locations, they also took great care to preserve natural and cultural ambiances. It is thanks to these beneficial guidelines, as well as to the long-term absence of pressure from private capital, that the Croatian coast has remained relatively well preserved, at least in the field of tourism infrastructure.

This launch of the 'tourism industry' soon produced considerable results: economic growth was palpable, and Yugoslavia caught up with the traditionally strong tourist destinations. If we look at the data for the year 1970 only, and judge the number of nights per resident booked by foreign and domestic guests, we find Croatia ranked immediately behind Austria and Switzerland, and ahead of Italy and Spain. The target group for socialist Yugoslavia, as a new force on the tourism market, was, besides domestic guests, the Western lower middle-class population, predominantly from Germany, followed by Austria, Italy, England, and the Netherlands; and, until 1971, Czechoslovakian tourists.

The development plans also positively encouraged progressive differentiation of the tourism infrastructure. Hotels were supplemented by other types of facility, such as private accommodation, camping sites, chalet parks and motels, etc., so as to cater for a broad spectrum of potential visitors at prices they could afford. In consequence, the initially uniform style of recreational mass tourism gradually ceded to diverse 'faces of tourism': to different programs, profiles and scenarios — nautical tourism, for instance — for different target groups.

\(^{13}\) Franjo Gatporović, "Prostorno planiranje jadranskog područja i planiranje novčica turizma" (Special planning of the Adriatic area and planning of tourist developments), Arhitektura, 1972, no. 11/12, p. 49.
Cultural theorists, art critics and historians were quick to voice their criticism of tourism’s exponential growth. Grgo Gamulin, one of the most influential art critics of his day, and a powerful member of the Yugoslav Academy of Arts and Sciences in Zagreb, was the first to formulate a harsh, although quite hermetically conceived criticism. What he wanted to see, and found glaringly absent, was not an ‘industry of tourism’ but a ‘culture of tourism’.

More precisely, what he saw emerging was the deep and almost irreparable dichotomy of culture and tourism, the two estranged poles of something that ought actually comprise an integral, complex entity. In direct reference to the Southern Adriatic Project’s spatial planning, Gamulin asked, ‘[Is] it possible to imagine ‘Adriatic orientation’ as anything other than an absolute concentration on the mass tourism that will congest our coast with urbanistic nebulosities?’ The young art critic Željka Čorak asked, ‘In view of tourism as a specific “service industry”—who here is actually serving whom? Is tourism, as a force par excellence of economic productivity, serving the integral (social, cultural and economic) life of the community, or is life itself flattened and put into the service of tourism and sheer economic efficiency?’

Because, as she noted, however elaborate and detailed these complex development plans were, in terms of tourism infrastructure, they said nothing of the underlying social or cultural infrastructures, or of matters in the public domain.

The critics thereby put their finger on an indicative paradox in current social priorities and their actual inversion: those issues that belonged in Western countries to the sphere of the free market (tourism, for instance), here became prime concerns of urban planning; and vice versa: the issues par excellence of public interest and planning under Western welfare states were neglected in the spatial policies of self-managed socialism. It is only today that we can appreciate the unintentional impact of tourism planning, since many tourism complexes and infrastructures have maintained their public and urban character.

Other aspects of their critiques were guided by that innate flaw in the very nature of leisure and tourism, namely the promise of the phenomenon of escape, of oblivion, of displacement, of becoming the other—the other vis-à-vis normal, workaday, everyday existence. Grgo Gamulin, in his critique of mass tourism, refers to the writings

14 Grgo Gamulin, ‘Krug što se zatvara’ (The closing circle), Život umjetnosti (Life of Art), 1972, no. 18, pp. 45-67.
15 Željka Čorak, ‘Stil i karakter suvremenih zaheta u Jadranški prostor’ (Style and features of contemporary interventions in the Adriatic space), Život umjetnosti, 1973, no. 19/20, p. 39.
of the Marxist sociologists and philosophers, Georges Friedmann and Henri Lefebvre. Gamulin defends the need for 'compensation for fragmented labour', but situates the development of tourism 'between optimism and irony'. This—he opined—leads not only to a certain disquieting lack of consciousness, but also provokes specific surrender to passivity in terms of the reception of what is on offer, which is generally little more than simply 'sun, sand and sea'. This in turn—the critics warned—propels the host culture to a corresponding level of passive receptivity, in that it is ultimately required to offer nothing more than just sheer numbers of indifferent places, mere mechanical accretions of apathetic accommodation units. The proliferation of such passive machines for tourist mass consumption would, over time, not only clutter valuable coastal spaces, but also seriously endanger the region's delicate urban heritage and, eventually, lead the culture's specific urban, social and cultural identity to fall into oblivion.

In order to avoid this dire scenario—they suggested—what an active, responsible tourist architecture must do, is to accept its engaged, almost enlightened educating role, and construct spaces, spatial relations, effects and experiences that raise the visitor's and the visited population's consciousness of their specific surroundings and their position in it. This would be accomplished by building on the legacy of the local architectural heritage. Such active tourism architecture would not only fulfil its cultural and educational agenda with regard to its temporary inhabitants and users, but would also continue to build the inherited Adriatic space. And in doing so, tourism architecture would ultimately enrich and ennoble the space and the integral life of the community, and not just menace and parasitically build on it.

A few architects proposed alternative visions of a new type of tourism facility. In 1969, the talented former Le Corbusier apprentice, Sarajevo-based architect Juraj Neidhardt, came up with a proposal for the Hotel Agava: a temporary habitat merged with its natural surroundings and insofar a critique of what Neidhardt dubbed the 'temple-like hotels'. Neidhardt designed an organic building that consisted of generous public spaces and extremely small and functional, yet meticulously, designed rooms. The project was meant to stimulate an experience of landscape: Neidhardt described its shape as a 'concrete plant', seeded in nature. The soft lines of the 'leaves' (wings) of the hotel structure extended into the natural surroundings, establishing intimate contact between the guestrooms and the earth, air and sky. Neidhardt advocated a unique vision of tourism, designed to foster
appreciation of active leisure pursuits. The hotel was accordingly well equipped for hobbies, recreation and socializing. This formally poetic project offered tourism development on the basis of the formula ‘minimal rooms, maximal collective spaces’, with the emphasis on the synergy of social life, architecture and nature.

The architects found themselves caught in between such clearly demarcated positions—a positivist approach to the ‘industry of tourism’ on the one hand, and the cultural elites’ harsh critique on the other. The architects, of course, welcomed the country’s new ‘Adriatic orientation’ as a driving force for investment, and as a platform for the launch of a new wave of experimentation and independent research. During the 1960s and early 1970s, tourism development became so extensive that some of the new generation of architects—Zdravko Bregovac, Julije De Luca and Ante Rožić, for example—were able to devote most of their careers to the design of tourism facilities.

Mass tourism architecture—typological exploration

The very first commercial facilities commissioned by the People’s Committees in the municipalities (Narodni odbori općina) were as simple as those for social tourism. Camping resorts were introduced as cheap alternatives to ‘expensive hotels’. Most of them also offered simple accommodation in clusters of prefabricated bungalows composed—as in the designs of Vladimir Zaharović (1957) or Neven Klarica (1959)—of a ‘living unit’ and a canopy for the car. In 1960, Branko Petrović and Branko Vasiljević (of the urbanist architectural office, AR 59), proposed a morphology of a small, mixed-type tourist resort on the Povile peninsula, near Novi Vinodolski, for which they coined the term ‘natel’: a hotel devised as a settlement, whereby careful consideration was given to interrelating buildings and the landscape. This was quite a departure from the usual mass tourism concept, and displayed a more ‘domesticated’ or cozy approach to leisure architecture. Jugomont, then the leading Croatian manufacturer of prefab elements for the construction industry, developed various system-built series of prefabricated bungalows, for use by tourists or as private weekend retreats. The first tourism settlements were completed between 1961 and 1963, on the Northern Adriatic: in Crikvenica, Povile, Selce, Krk, Omišalj, Baška, Mali Lošinj and Poreč. Gradually, resorts grew bigger and launched more diversified architectural programs. The Zlatne Stjene tourist resort near Pula, completed in 1961, was composed of larger pavilions, while

its restaurant was dramatically situated on the rocky headland. The construction of the Adriatic Highway also prompted the development of drive-in motels and restaurants: in 1959, Stjepan Kralj designed a striking rotunda-belvedere motel, on a promontory near Plomin. Ivan Vitić, one of the most prominent Croatian architects designed the semi-prefabricated 'Sijeme' series of motor-way motels, four of which were completed in 1964/65, in Umag, Preluka (near Rijeka), Trogir and Biograd.

Although several other types of accommodation continued to play a role in coastal tourism in Yugoslavia, architects were increasingly required to develop large-scale hotels and resorts. These enabled the management to rationalize costs for construction, administration, services and marketing, while simultaneously meeting the growing demands of domestic and international tourists. In response to the rise in demand for mass accommodation, architects developed a whole range of new types within quite a brief period, from the mid 1960s to mid 1970s.

The know-how gained while developing large housing complexes in the late 1950s and early 1960s provided a solid foundation for a more progressive approach to the specific topic of tourism's 'temporary habitat'. Accordingly, all the structuralist concepts—large scale buildings on the verge of becoming mega structures, variations in volume articulation, the gradation of public and private spaces—were first explored in (or parallel to) the tourist architecture developed in the second half of the 1960s and the early 1970s, only then to be applied again, later, to the mass housing sector.

The first phase of the tourist development boom of the 1960s relied on a simple and 'purified' modernist language. Two basic approaches were explored: in one, an iconic and simple 'pure' volume is set upon a horizontal base plinth that accommodates the public facilities; in another, low pavilions are clustered in smaller agglomerations of different construction density. The 'pure' volumes are imagined as an 'other' in relationship to their context and are situated either immediately next to the historical city core (Lovro Perković: Hotel Marjan, Split, 1963; Neven Segvić: Hotel Excelsior, Dubrovnik, 1965; Zdravko Bregovac: Hotel Ambassador, Opatija, 1966) [± 178, 223], or at an exceptionally attractive and prominent spot on the landscape, such as a cliff or promontory (David Finci: Hotel Pelegrin, Kupari, 1963). [± 187, 227]

The 'pure volumes' of such hotels remain to this day the most visible modernist landmarks on the cityscapes of Dubrovnik, Split and Opatija. Whether in urban or suburban contexts, these 'iconic volumes' are situated always alone and at an elevated point, as a singular,
dominant element within a broader context—in order both to enhance their expressiveness and to preclude invasive clusters of dominant architectural forms. Hence their persuasive or exciting appeal owes much to the contrast and tension between them and their setting.19

Unlike the vertical and/or cube-like constructions, the pavilion-like agglomerations strive for a more intense interaction between architecture and nature. These urban planning schemes include terraces, promenades, public infrastructure and landscaping, in order to take full advantage of the local vegetation. In more dense compositions, such ensembles form grids of a density comparable with historical town cores (Matija Salaj: Hotel Rivijera, Makarska, 1966). From its earliest days, the pavilion morphology explored such issues as how to configure public space yet maintain a careful equilibrium and sensitivity to environmental scale.

In the late 1960s, there was a rapid acceleration in exploration of diverse typological patterns based primarily on the structuralist principle of fragmenting volume into more ‘individualized’ dwelling unit-cells, and of using these in turn as the primary construction components for architectural and town planning complexes (Ante Rožić: Hotel Berulia, Brela, 1971; Zdravko Bregovac, Ivan Filipčić: Hotel Barbara, Borik-Zadar, 1970). [→1, 3] There were several reasons for this: conceptually and aesthetically speaking, what was felt at the time was the influence of various international movements and attempts to move urban structures, and especially dwelling structures, towards more diversified configurations. Pragmatically speaking, Structuralism was an efficient response to the increasing demand for accommodation capacity, without getting into structures that were excessively large. Owing to topographical variations, different approaches were developed for the horizontal sites of the northern Adriatic and the steep cliffs of the south. The hotels in Istria were articulated as clearly differentiated ‘objects’, whose wings extended into the landscape (Ivan Bartolić, Miroslav Begović: Hotel Eden, Rovinj, 1969–72; Julije De Luca: Hotel Kristal, Poreč, 1967–70). [→157, 242] Large, urbanized tourist territories were created by constructing strings of hotels interspersed with open spaces for various social activities. The hotels in central and southern Dalmatia make particularly successful use of the topography, in that they relate organically to the landscape through large-scale terraced formations. In certain instances, this was achieved by combining a number of parallel ribbons of nature and landscape (Lovro Perković:

---

19 The influential art critic and historian Milan Prelog wrote in 1972 about the Hotel Neptun near Dubrovnik: 'This high building situated at an exposed part of the peninsula imposed itself on the spacious landscape. Its presence is justified only by commercial demands. This example of misuse of the landscape as a sort of “raw material” for the tourist industry unfortunately quickly found its followers', in Milan Prelog. Prostor —vrjeme, Zagreb: Grafički zavod Hrvatske, 1991.
Hotel Marina Lučica, Primošten, 1972). [→ 190] Setting the units in an extremely dense configuration created porous structures—often penetrated by deep atria—and resulted in extremely compact tourism towns (Petr Kus: Hotel Plat, Mlini, 1971). In these projects, the idea of the 'composed object' was abandoned and the hotels became non-hierarchical structures. These explorations thus dismissed the idea of simply perching the hotel on the landscape as an independent construction, in favour of embedding it in such a way that it became an artificial topographical feature, following the contour lines and creating good conditions for landscaping (Andrija Ćičin-Šain, Žarko Vincic: Hotel Libertas, Dubrovnik, 1974). [→ 12, 230] In its most successful instances, the structuralist trend closely pursued the local Mediterranean tradition, emphasizing density, rich fragmentation, porosity and the relationship to topography. Territorially well-defined hotel towns constituted a specific model, in which architectural details, typological solutions and urban planning schemes were designed within a consistent concept. A more 'abstract' approach relied on the multiplication, mutation and interrelation of units (Boris Maša: Hotel Complex Solaris, Šibenik, 1967/68), while parallel experiments used the postmodernist principle of collage to blend different types and morphologies (Boris Maša: Haludovo, Malinska, 1971/72). [→ 4, 246]

The variations on this approach were numerous, and topographic potential was exploited in experiments with the distribution of vast public programs. Especially interesting results were attained in those terraced hotels whose entrance was placed at the highest point on the site, while the primary communal programs—developed as attractive superstructures to be used and experienced as autonomous elements—were located directly above the accommodation units contained in the base (Andrija Ćičin-Šain: Hotel Palace, Dubrovnik, 1969–72). In more complex projects, public facilities were distributed throughout all sections of the hotel (Branko Žnidarec: Hotel Adriatic II, Opatija, 1971) [→ 166], and endeavours to make them part of public space, and as accessible as possible, generally had a positive impact on their use outside the tourism sphere per se. In some especially developed examples, passages through hotels became promenades with diverse programs (Bogoljub Kurjel: Hotel Astarea, Mlini, 1970). [→ 6]

Some features are common to more or less all of the types. The general trend is to partition huge building volumes and subsequently recompose the parts in free permutation, thereby creating new arrangements whose respective configuration follows the topographical features of the original natural setting. All of the types frequently
deploy the same materials too, mostly exposed concrete. This rough material blends in well with the natural stone of the shore, just as these huge built accretions, with their fragmented forms, blend with the overall landscape and, in fact, themselves become entirely new, artificial landscapes.

These imposing mega-structures, although built on local topography, ultimately created their own peculiar contexts: their own physical contexts, which in turn produced the specific Yugo-Mediterranean social context for the international middle-class population. And the special features of Croatian tourism architecture did ultimately succeed in creating quite genuine settings for the collective tourist Arcadia.

Tourism prompted investigation of architecture's fundamental spatial aspects, as well as corresponding research into questions of style. It began with a purist modernist idiom and—as it confronted various contextual qualities—began progressively to differentiate its formal palette. We therefore encounter instances that explore specific regional characteristics, either through their very form or in the use of traditional local materials; or in the skilful use of local Mediterranean vegetation, or by deploying traditional spatial frameworks, such as narrow streets, little piazzas and empty niches, which foster all kinds of communal activity and social interaction.

This affirmation of regional elements may sometimes go so far as to culminate in almost direct replicas of picturesque fishermen's villages, enclaves of the Adriatic lifestyle. But this has only rarely been the case. More frequently, regional traditions inspire experiments based on a very few vernacular features, which results in more sculptural, figuative forms. Certainly, tourism itself, as a specific domain that allows or even demands a measure of picturesqueness, may be credited with
having provoked such creative responses, which in turn opened the door to a whole new repertoire of postmodern formal influences.

The idea of simulating or re-creating the traditional environment emerged in the mid 1960s, as a counterpoint to the development of modernist mega-structures. To some extent, it echoed postmodern tendencies, but it was rooted also in a longer-term investigation of how local vernacular architecture and Modernism might be merged, the first results of which transpired in the 1930s (Lavoslav Horvat: House Čulić, Split, 1931; Drago Ibler: Villa Robić, Uč-Korčula, 1933; Drago Galić: House Jakšić, Lapad near Dubrovnik, 1936). The earlier examples, built at the same time as the mega-structure hotels, were interwoven with these larger-scale developments in order to evoke the ambience of a Mediterranean city (Igor Emili: Hotel Uvala Scott, Kraljevica, 1967). Some developments created a more cozy and picturesque, village-like ambience (Andrija Čičin-Šain: Polari/Villas Rubin, Rovinj, 1969–79). Starting in the late 1970s, the concept of the planned tourist settlement comprised of weekend houses was promoted as a real estate development (Juraj Matijević, Dinko Milas: Mareda, near Novigrad, 1981–84).

Interior design

Interestingly, being required to work within a limited budget (except when designing the most luxurious hotels), the architects did not rely on expensive solutions to achieve the excellence they aspired to, but instead explored architecture's intrinsic spatial qualities—and thus developed a new generation of its essential, elemental forms. Despite funding constraints, the mega-structures also offered modernist 'total design' interiors.

Such interiors represent the continuation of a modernist tradition, namely that synthesis of plastic arts and architecture so vigorously advocated and explored in Croatia from the mid 1950s onwards, initially through the activities of EXAT-51, a neo-avant-garde art group active in Zagreb. Hotel interiors were designed in collaboration with Croatia's leading modernist artists, in a socialist Gesamtkunstwerk style, and displayed surprising similarities with the representative interiors of political headquarters and other institutional buildings. Thus, whether intentionally or not, ambitious interior design and product design in these contrasting contexts became a means of showcasing Yugoslav 'socialist' culture and architectural design to a wide audience from both East and West. Hotels even became museums of modern art, in a sense, with collections that included diverse artistic genres and
media—paintings, murals, tapestries, reliefs, mosaics, and custom-designed furniture and textiles—and so disseminated and promoted modern culture among both foreign and domestic tourists. Special attention was given to the communal public areas, the show-case spaces, while the design of actual accommodation units was generally quite simple. This was in keeping with the categorized standards and tourism industry concepts of the time. Yet it also showed that ‘the collective’ was more of a priority than ‘the individual’.

Many examples evince premium quality interior design and stylistic diversity. The 1960s was a period of flourishing high-Modernism. Architect Bernardo Bernardi worked on the interior of the Hotel Maestral, in close collaboration with the hotel’s designers (1965). Igor Emili designed the reconstruction of the Hotel Jadrain in Rijeka, in collaboration with the sculptor Dušan Džamonja and the painter Edo Murtić (1964). The impressive team of artists, architects and designers gathered to design the interiors of the luxury Hotel Ambassador in Opatija, built by Zdravko Bregovac (1964–66) [17, 10, 13], included the finest modernist artists in Croatia at the time: Zlatko Bourek, Boris Dogan, Dušan Džamonja, Ivo Kalina, Zvonko Lončarić, Edo Murtić, Šime Perić, Ivan Picelić and Ivan Srnec. Ironically, those artists worked within quite diverse aesthetic frameworks and belonged to the very groups that had vigorously debated the synthesis of the plastic arts. Graphic design was assigned to Milan Vulpe, while uniforms and working clothes were designed by Inge Kostincer-Bregovac and Diana Kosec. Even a ‘visual arts supervisor’ was commissioned, namely Boris Vižintin, then director of the prestigious Gallery of Modern Art in Rijeka. After completion, Bregovac lived for a while in the hotel, examining the effects of design in everyday use. Commissioning an extensive team certainly showed that interior design was to be taken seriously, but it led at times to a loss of coherence. Yet even if the final result was little more than a compilation of individual works by the big names in Croatian art, it nonetheless lent a distinct identity and mood to individual spaces within the complex hotel program.

More ‘trendy’ or ‘fashionable’ interior iconography, which broke away from purist modernist aesthetics, began to appear in the early 1970s: in the Hotel Argentina in Dubrovnik, for example, for which Boris Krstulović designed the interior and some futuristic furniture. This new decorative style became a very popular choice for the many
nightclubs, bars and discos introduced and quickly integrated in the ‘tourist product’ at that time. Unfortunately, most of these interiors and artworks, custom-designed furnishings and other elements no longer exist: generic contemporary design has taken their place.

Camping, nautical tourism and entertainment

Camping resorts were an important part of the coastal tourism program. Many of the present-day large resorts began life as camping resorts then were extended in subsequent phases. Voja Karlarakis designed the very first phase of Plava Laguna, near Poreč. The complex included a pavilion restaurant and 250 prefabricated bungalows, built in only three months, and an area for tents. This development was a joint venture with the French company, Club Polynésie. The tourist resort Valata, near Rovinj, designed by Julije Golik and completed in 1969, consisted of 300 prefabricated bungalows for 600 tourists, camping areas for 200 and public facilities. It was one of the first big nudist complexes and its ten hectares of cultivated landscape were classified as ‘exclusive’.

Nautical tourism was, of course, also explored as an integral part of the tourism industry. The ‘Program for long-term development and spatial plan for the Adriatic coast’ of 1967 envisioned five large marinas and twenty-one tourist ports. Between 1969 and 1971, Architekt—the Split-based atelier for urbanism and architecture, led by Vuko Bombardelli—devised a project called ‘Blue Highway’, 21 which encompassed minimum and maximum programs, and spatial and technical standards for marinas. The project documented approximately 100 locations that seemed adequate for use as nautical centres, marinas or small tourist ports. It proposed a hierarchical network of ports: top-class nautical stations in Rijeka, Zadar, Split and Dubrovnik, each with capacity for 1,000 yachts; a network of second-class nautical centres, set some 20–50 km apart, and with capacity for 300 ships; and a network of third-class nautical centres, set some 20–50 km apart, and with capacity for 100 ships. 22 In 1967, in parallel to planning nautical tourism, architect Vojteh Delfin designed an experimental hydromobile tourism system comprised of circular, prefabricated floating hotels that would facilitate the ‘unlimited construction of tourism capacities that opens an entirely new perspective onto an absolutely preserved nature’. 23


22 Ibid., Tamara Indik: ‘Plava Magistrala — Organizirani sistem nautičkih objekata’ (Blue Highway—An organized system of nautical buildings), Covjak i prostor, 1971, no. 219, pp. 21/22.

Until the late 1960s, most of the entertainment and nightlife programs were integrated in hotel facilities. But there then emerged new and architecturally ambitious types: independent or semi-independent entertainment facilities, within the bigger tourist systems or camping resorts. Most hotel facilities were underpinned by architectural idioms, such as the International Style, Brutalism or the regional vernacular; but the architecture of entertainment facilities was not so much purist as eclectic and unconventional.

An especially pronounced expression of this 'new aesthetic' is the Internacional-klub in Porec, which was designed by the architect Božo Lazar and the painter Bruno Maccarelli, in 1969. It is a quite peculiar concept, envisaged as a hedonistic theme park offering a range of entertainment, detailed in the names of its various spaces: the Art Club, Disco Club, Club La Belle Epoque, Jolly Club, Eros Club and (with 900 seats!), the open-air Laguna Club. [+] 203 Architecture critic Darko Venturini wrote an extensive and surprisingly exuberant review of the facility claiming that 'meticulous analyses reveals a series of smaller or more significant mistakes, designers' incoherencies...' but that it would be unjust to dwell on that, for the project is 'an instrument of joy and life, singular, consistent, complete, indivisible, elusive'.

More emphatically, Venturini declares that, 'We have to step out onto light and open spaces of [the] imagination, without fear... because these fears drove us to the dead-end street, to the big general [failure] of CIAM spirit'. This is one of the first open critiques of CIAM discourse in Croatia, following decades during which high-Modernism had held sway in every sphere of the visual arts. The eccentric and hedonistic Internacional-klub not only diverged from the standard functionalist architectural language of tourism facilities—the counter in its Eros Bar was 60 metres long—but also from the modernist tradition in Croatian architecture in general. Its program, spatial configuration and not least the venues' names gave more than a passing nod to the Western model of 'consumerist culture'. And, although primarily aimed at a foreign clientele, it spoke also to a local yearning for hedonistic lifestyles and alternatives to the limited spectrum of entertainment available under socialism.

Speaking of high-end hedonism, the Hotel Haludovo complex in Malinska, on the island of Krk, is an especially interesting case. [+] 246 In 1972, following completion of the complex (and the nearby Rijeka Airport), the London-based Penthouse Adriatic Company—a subsidiary of Penthouse magazine, the US 'international magazine for men'—merged nominally with the Croat Brodomerc Corporation in Rijeka, in order to be able come in

---

on the Haludovo venture, wherein the casino was the major source of revenue. Officially, Brodokomerc owned and operated the Haludovo complex—or the Penthouse Adriatic as it came to be known internationally—but Bob Guccione, then editor and publisher of Penthouse, invested millions of USD in the project and promoted it widely as ‘an antidote to Cold War misunderstanding’.

Guccione invested a further 500,000 USD in advertising, supplied some US-style operational know-how—including approximately 70 American employees, mostly female ‘Penthouse Pets’—and also funded the launch. He announced: ‘In order to defeat ignorance it is necessary to develop communication between people. In this connection, tourism is certainly one of the most powerful forms of communication. Through the realization of this project we have the opportunity to start a big process of re-education: we have become partners in removing doubts and ignorance’.25 The complex was a commercial success and soon gained cult status that remained undiminished even after Guccione withdrew from the business in the mid 1970s.

Tourism’s modernizing effect

Developing tourist environments did not surmount the problems of mono-functional programming, but it certainly boosted modernization throughout socialist Yugoslavia. The physical articulation of tourism areas, in all its forms—from the controlled regional distribution of tourism capacities, the rational design of urbanized ensembles, the quality of architectural articulation, the distribution of programs within architectural complexes, to the implementation of public infrastructure—generated active, interesting and accessible environments. Practically all the projects created gradations of space, ranging from public to semi-public to private (intimate) spaces; and—unlike today’s exclusionary resorts and gated communities—they were not fenced in, and were therefore unlikely to be erased from or lost to the collective imagination of public space. Tourism environments and complexes also maintained the continuity of public space, between the everyday and the temporary habitat, simply because they were added on to the existing road network, as plug-ins quasi. They were spontaneously connected to the dynamics of local life, and introduced to the latter a new aesthetic as well as novel, modern ideas about the environment.

The modernizing effect was evident also in the shift toward more individual and consumerist lifestyles in former Yugoslavia, which paralleled the rise of mass tourism. Tourism developments gradually became non-planned social condensers—all that was not planned and built in the domain of public buildings and infrastructure for the local community (communal halls, restaurants and other entertainment programs, and sports, recreation and outdoor facilities) was built in the tourism domain. This was neither a systematic development nor an ideal solution to the lack of public programs, but it nonetheless gained its own momentum and created a tradition that has lasted to this day, for the promenades, parks and other public infrastructure created for tourists still constitute an important network of designed public spaces along the coast. Environments that were meant primarily to generate profit, and that were planned in the context of instrumental modernization, thus unexpectedly became a contributory factor in the public domain. Once planned as a town’s other—or as a simulation of an urban environment—the tourism environment has since revealed its capacity to absorb the public sphere over time. Urban regulations based on the historically proven interdependency and mutual benefits of the tourist industry and local communities might arguably be introduced, in order to preserve or even enhance the public performance of tourism environments. The fundamental premise for such a scenario is the preservation of physical and programmatic continuity, between planned tourism environments and littoral settlements, as a means to update the legacy of ‘integral planning’. Yet, however strong the arguments in favour of further developing and promoting the spatial ideology behind these environments, carrying it out cannot be left solely to planners, architects and other experts. A fair amount of political will from local authorities will certainly also be required.