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SUMMARY:

Tito’s Yugoslavia lasted roughly the same as the city Titograd. The city was named after its president which is today the capital of modern Montenegro. Till the age of six, I was a citizen of *Titograd*, and from the age of six up until now, a citizen of *Podgorica*. History and contemporaneity are profoundly intertwined in this city as *simultaneously in the present*.

Still, if times have changed, the question of the ‘communist’ past in the present remains to be continually interrogated. Critical inspiration here comes from Homi Bhabha, Frederic Jameson, Walter Benjamin and the documented memory of people survivors of the World War II: “In contrast, the distracted mass absorbs the work of art. This is most obvious with regard to buildings. Architecture has always represented the prototype of a work of art the reception of which is consummated by a collectivity in a state of distraction. The laws of its reception are most instructive” (Benjamin 2010: 62).

It is, in my contention that memory of Podgorica is a typical Mediterranean ailment. The collective communist memory of Titograd today is an open text, marginal and an identity in constant state of crisis. Podgorica is colonizing its past. It is colonizing Titograd and every culture in Podgorica existing in the present is a colonization one. Let me pose a question which I will strive to answer in the course of this paper: “If, as they say, the past is a foreign country, then what does it mean to encounter a past that is your own country reterritorialized, even terrorized by another?” (Bahba 1994: 198).

It is through the aesthetics of buildings and schools that we perceive the past. The architecture is the reminiscence of the past ideologies. The perfect geometrical spaces of the socialist past are now interrupted with new forms of houses and buildings that are in contrast with the aesthetics of the socialist architecture. Together they form a discontinuity in the city: “Buildings are received twofold: through how they are used and how they are perceived. Or to put it a better way: in a tactile fashion and in an optical fashion.” (Benjamin 2010: 47-48). In this paper I am concerned with this optical that is to say ideological fashion of the buildings.

The one notion that concerns me is that Podgorica in it’s past and present shows traces of more than three centers. Which leads me to a conclusion that post socialist Podgorica in its nature is a kind of fluid kind of settlement. Rather than a closed one which is the argument that Max Weber proposes: “The many definitions of the city have only one element in common: namely that the city consists simply of a collection of one or more separate dwellings but is a relatively closed settlement” (Weber 1962: 65). The history of changes in state of affairs and politics, but more than that in the changes of ruling classes we can trace the dynamic exchange of the margins and the centers of the city. In this paper I will show more than three center towns in the history of Podgorica and try to argue that every ideology had it’s own negative impact on the past of the city and gravitate towards making new centers and marginalizing the past. Moreover, I will focus on the positive side of the after war politics of memory. This process had led to creating an aesthetic in present people conceive as a popular collective work of arts. They do not see it as type of product that was a lifestyle that was in it’s origins.

The last but not the least I want to argue the importance in Facebook pages which are serving as modern museum for remembering and interpreting the past. They have become more visited and liked than the traditional museums. The pandemic is the main reason they are being abandoned by the masses. They were abandoned before the pandemic and rarely visited due to their archaic approach in preserving and retelling the past.