CULTURE AND ARCHITECTURE IN DISTRESS – SARAJEVO EXPERIMENT
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Abstract
This paper attempts to discuss the reciprocal connection between culture and architecture as a social product. In doing so, the paper intends to critically engage with the theme of ‘culture’, its impact on residential developments, and its character in the process of recuperation of post-war society in Sarajevo. The development of residential architecture is followed through the four historical periods that had the greatest impact on its formation. Setting the scene to better understand the current built design challenges, post-war, post-socialist culture and architecture are analysed through the lens of T.S. Eliot's (1948) theory on culture. Specifically, the paper refers to the criteria Eliot defined as essential for a culture to survive: Organic Structure, Regional Context and Balance & Unity in Religion. Finally, the paper identifies the main obstacles in the process of cultural transformation of Sarajevo, indicating an urgent need for addressing the issues of cultural and architectural vitality.
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INTRODUCTION

Throughout history Bosnia and Herzegovina (in further text Bosnia) has always been the ‘experimental zone’ where various ideological and political ideas were exchanged and tested, which resulted in a heterogeneous ethnic and cultural environment. Such diverse social and political background sets a complex scene, where historical and cultural progress can be traced in architectural developments. For a city like Sarajevo, which has been marked by turbulent history, understanding the correlation of culture in reference to architecture is of particular importance, as it has greatly determined the existing dense urban and architectural tissue.

Discussing culture within Balkan context is not a straightforward topic. Lory (2013) claims that the ‘multicultural’ character of the Balkan region has become ‘the word on everybody’s lips’. He questions the character of different ‘cultures’, given that the majority of the population speaks the same language, and shares the same history. However, as noted by Djurdjevic in “The Balkans: Past and Present and Cultural Pluralism”, the Balkans are renowned not for the harmonious coexistence of its peoples, but rather for poor management of diversity. Sarajevo has been understood as the incarnation of the multicultural image of the Balkans by its inhabitants and by the world (Lory, 2013). It has been a meeting point of Christianity—the Bosnian Church, Catholicism, Orthodoxy, Islam, and Judaism (Mahmutcehajic, 2003; Torsti, 2004; Kotzen & Garcia, 2014). The unity of its multicultural and religiously diverse population has always been vital for the peace and stability (Mahmutcehajic, 2003).

In this paper, culture is not described as a portrayal solely related to religious or ethnic groups, or as an enactment confined to museums or memorials. It refers to the development of a singular culture specific for Sarajevo, which is based on acceptance of differences, courteous and cordial relations among neighbours, understanding of the Other and respect for their cultural practices (Lory, 2013). Furthermore, it is understood as a product of an intricate socio-political milieu that influences everyday living and ultimately reflects itself in the built environment.

Rapoport (1969) states that in the modern context forces and pressures are much more complex than in traditional settings, and that the links among form, culture, and behaviour are more tenuous. Put into the setting of Sarajevo, visually defined by its strong cultural milieu, the mentioned weak links - or the contemporary global trend of absence of an apparent connection between architecture and symbolic, intangible concepts of culture - profoundly influence the visual image of the city. On global or even regional scale, Sarajevo is not the only city that struggles with such occurrence. In fact, most of the post-socialist cities in the Balkans are experiencing similar situations, exploring their new architectural and social identity (Husukic & Zejnilovic, 2017). However, unlike other Balkan cities, the specific socio-political situation makes contemporary Sarajevo a unique case. The city suffered violent destruction at the threshold of 21st century, and was faced with massive reconstruction and renewal process. Subsequent post-war city development was not an easy task, and was associated with the main geopolitical factors that have determined the territorial and urban situation (Aquilué & Roca, 2016). Some of the issues recognised as the factors influencing current architectural setting in Sarajevo are:

- Urgent post-war interventions - imminent rebuilding and restructuring of institutions, infrastructures and buildings (both public and private) (Hasic, 2004; Garcia & Kotzen, 2014; Aquilue & Roca, 2016).
Specific socio-political circumstances defined by the Dayton Peace Agreement, and the change of economic model from the socialist system to the neoliberal and capitalist system. This resulted in the creation of ‘soft power’ (Fernandez & Aalbers, 2017), allowing the entry of foreign investment which would lead to globalisation. In the case of Sarajevo, foreign investments are frequently connected to Turkish and Arabic capitals (Robinson et al., 2001; Aquilue & Roca, 2016).

The territorial division of Bosnia into two entities (Federation of Bosnia and Republic of Srpska) plus Brcko District, and Sarajevo into two cities (Sarajevo and East Sarajevo) with the consequent displacement of the population from one region to another (Toal & Dahlman, 2011; Aquilué & Roca, 2016).

Absence of implementation of related policies that aim to control housing development. In particular, here it is referred to the exacerbation of an issue that existed even before the 90’s war – the massive illegal construction and urbanisation on the slopes of Sarajevo which was resumed after the Bosnian War (1992–1995) in areas with steep slope gradients (Jordi Martin-Diaza et al., 2017).

Within such complex spatial and socio-political relationships, the contemporary architectural interventions in Sarajevo lack in cultural and contextual sensitivity, which further burden the visual character of the city. The core argument of this research is that the local culture in Sarajevo is currently unable to adjust to the changing values of present-day society, and that the specific socio-political setting is reflected through oversimplified and superficial understanding of context. In developing the framework for this argument, the paper intends to critically engage with the theme of ‘culture’, its impact on residential developments, and its character in the process of recuperation of post-war society.

Residential buildings are used as a sample because as an architectural product they are most susceptible to be changed under cultural influence. Different cultural groups demand different residential typologies, space configuration and visual expression (Zejnilovic, 2015). Subsequently, they become carriers of socio-cultural information encrypted in space configuration, material, form and composition. Importance of shelter for man and human existence is an actively discussed topic (Schoenauer & Seeman, 1962; Norberg-Schulz, 2002). Gaston Bachelard (1994) in “The Poetics of Space” explains the meaning and importance of a house, describing it as ‘one of the strongest integration forces in man’s life’. Let us not forget that in the complex social network, house is also related to power and social status, since we tend to categorise ourselves and others depending on the type and the location of a house we live in. In that context, Hauge (2009) claims that, ‘on an individual level, people may be depressed by the difference between their housing situation and how they would like people to perceive them’. Aside from being seemingly ideal built objects to test various architectural methods and socio-cultural dynamics, housing studies are necessary in order to drive more effective policy development (Stephens, 2017). Furthermore, contemporary theory argues that understanding the state’s role in shaping housing aspirations and housing policy are central to shaping more effective forms of capitalism (MacInnes & Miao, 2017; Fernandez & Aalbers, 2017).

Thus, this paper follows the formation of residential architecture through the four historical periods:

- Ottoman Empire (1448-1878);
- Austro-Hungarian Occupation (1878-1918);
- Period between WWI and WWII (1918-1941);
- Socialist Period (1941-1992);
And in reference to social and political background, setting the scene to better the current state and challenges of local architecture. Upon drawing out the theoretical perspective, the following section discusses the consequences of the recent series of profound social changes. In particular, the research focuses on the occurrences within the culture, which are the result of the post-war transformation of a collectivistic-socialist order into an individualistic-democratic society, and its connection to ad hoc developed housing solutions in Sarajevo. It ultimately elaborates on the state of local culture and the consequential residential architecture, in reference to the criteria defined by T.S. Elliot (1948) as essential for a culture to survive: Organic Structure, Regional Context and Balance and Unity in Religion. These criteria cover the socio-cultural activities in Sarajevo, as applicability of these criteria in examining Sarajevo city have potential to indicate significant conclusions.

Finally, after analysing the perpetuating, internal transformations of culture and architecture, the paper defines the key socio-cultural arguments that impair the post-socialist, post-war transition of Sarajevo, and weaken the process of residential architecture re-branding as a representation of society.

**HISTORY, CULTURE, AND RESIDENTIAL ARCHITECTURE IN SARAJEVO**

To ask: 'Where are we going?' implies two further questions: 'Where are we now?', and 'Where have we come from?' (Mahmutcehajic, 2003).

Mahmutcehajic (2003) states that the name Bosnia has denoted a country, a history, and a culture for more than a thousand years. Medieval Bosnia was ruled by bans and kings, then it was an administrative region of the Ottoman and Austro-Hungarian Empires; part of Kingdom of Serbs Croats and Slovenians; after WWII one of Yugoslavia's federal republics; finally becoming a sovereign and independent state and a member of the United Nations after the 1992-95 war.

Consequently, Bosnia and Sarajevo in particular, as the capital city, have layered cultural and architectural history. Founded by the Ottomans in 1462, Sarajevo was established by members of three monotheistic religions – Islam, Catholicism, and Orthodoxy. Five decades later, after being banished from Spain, Jews settled in Sarajevo, giving it an attribute of ‘a new Jerusalem’ a city in which temples of all faiths of the Book can be seen in one glance’ (Karahasan, 1994). Described as a theatre of major historical events, the fascination with Sarajevo comes from the fact that ‘Sarajevo tells its history so clearly in its spatial morphology as well as in its spatial details’ (Tonkiss, 2014). It is a city of accretion, with its historical parts unusually well lined up in a chronological array (Badescu, 2014).

Positioned in a valley, its linear configuration has been primarily developed through three regimes - lying side by side, sequentially, along a strong east-west linear spine; the Ottoman core and Habsburg centre, to socialist and post-socialist extensions. The Ottoman coherent urban core with tight urban fabric is organised around the commerce, souk, mosques, medresa and residential mahalas on the surrounding hills. The Austro-Hungarian heritage follows, with its orientalist city hall, its public squares, early gothic style Cathedral, residential blocks, public and cultural buildings. During the forty years of Habsburg rule, the citizens of Sarajevo became ‘Europeans’, as the city absorbed the western influences that mixed and blended with the Ottoman heritage (Donia, 2006). When the Kingdom of Serb, Croats and Slovenians, later named as Kingdom of Yugoslavia, was created after the First World War, Bosnia and Herzegovina disappeared from the administrative divisions (Robinson et al.,
2001). However, being part of the strongest resistance to fascism in Yugoslavia during World War II (Hoare, 1996), it became one of the new Federation’s constituent republics. The post WWII socialist regime was the time of the largest expansion of the city, with massive urbanisation, and industrialisation, significant increase in residential stock, construction of public and administrative buildings, and finally massive infrastructure development within the organisation of the 1984 Olympic Games.

As the political regimes changed so did the city, the demographics, and the culture. Mahmutcehajic (2003) claims that life in Bosnia was not the same throughout history, and that the dynamic relationships of the population under different regimes were not linear, but built and maintained with a great effort. Since Bosnian society was, on the whole, a pluralist one, its freedom was equally a demonstration of trust and confidence within and between its communities (Donia, 2006). This can primarily be recorded in numerical fluctuations of ethnic groups that formed the city population. Thus, the physical survival and city development cannot be separated from the establishment of social cohesion of the dominant cultures in Sarajevo (Donia, 2006).

Table 1. Number of population by religion according to the Turkish official estimates and censuses (Tanovic et al., 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Muslims</th>
<th>Orthodox</th>
<th>Catholics</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1851</td>
<td>328.000</td>
<td>400.000</td>
<td>178.000</td>
<td>10.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1865</td>
<td>419.628</td>
<td>593.548</td>
<td>257.920</td>
<td>7.754</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1871</td>
<td>541.000</td>
<td>340.000</td>
<td>156.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1876</td>
<td>480.000</td>
<td>410.000</td>
<td>160.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2. Number of population by religion according to the Austro-Hungarian censuses (Tanovic et al., 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Muslims</th>
<th>Orthodox</th>
<th>Catholics</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1879</td>
<td>448.749</td>
<td>496.375</td>
<td>210.216</td>
<td>3.426</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1885</td>
<td>492.710</td>
<td>571.250</td>
<td>265.788</td>
<td>5.805</td>
<td>538</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1895</td>
<td>548.632</td>
<td>673.246</td>
<td>334.142</td>
<td>8.213</td>
<td>3.859</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1910</td>
<td>612.137</td>
<td>825.418</td>
<td>442.197</td>
<td>11.868</td>
<td>7.224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Population by religion in lists of the Kingdom of SCS (Tanovic et al., 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Muslims</th>
<th>Orthodox</th>
<th>Catholics</th>
<th>Jews</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1921</td>
<td>588.173</td>
<td>829.360</td>
<td>453.617</td>
<td>12.031</td>
<td>7.259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1931</td>
<td>718.079</td>
<td>1.028.139</td>
<td>547.949</td>
<td>11.267</td>
<td>18.121</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. The ethnic composition of the census from 1948 to 1991 (Tanovic et al., 2014).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Muslims</th>
<th>Orthodox</th>
<th>Catholics</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1948</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>44.3</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1953</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1961</td>
<td>25.7</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>39.6</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>39.5</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>10.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1991</td>
<td>43.5</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Aside from the four main ethnic groups that formed the vivid cultural mosaic of Sarajevo, during the socialist era a group of Sarajevans emerged who did not feel primary loyalty to
neither of the named groups. They declared themselves as Yugoslavs - neither an autochthonous category of belonging nor an ethnic group but a flexible hybrid identity that indexed identification with the socialist state’s ideological goals and/or provided an alternative to forcing a single choice among individuals with mixed ethnic backgrounds (Hodson et al., 1994; Markowitz, 2007). About 5% of population in 1991 census professed to be Yugoslavs, while in Sarajevo and some other cities that number reached up to 10% (Donia, 2016; Markowitz, 2007). This group was mainly constituted of children from mixed marriages and others who found a refuge from predominantly national identities (Donia, 2006).

Table 5. Ethnic Composition of Sarajevo, Pre-War and Post-War (Markowitz, 2007).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Muslims</th>
<th>Serbs</th>
<th>Croats</th>
<th>Yugoslavs</th>
<th>Others</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pre-war</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>259.470</td>
<td>157.143</td>
<td>34.873</td>
<td>56.470</td>
<td>19.093</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>49.2%</td>
<td>29.8%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>10.7%</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post-war</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>319.245</td>
<td>44.865</td>
<td>26.890</td>
<td></td>
<td>10.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>79.6%</td>
<td>11.2%</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

During the siege, the population was cut in half but since the Dayton Agreement, it has nearly returned to the pre-war status. Post-war Sarajevo inherited not only a devastated urban environment, but also a distinct population profile; large numbers of Bosniak refugees arrived in the city during the war, and remained in it as the war concluded (Stefansson, 2007). After the Dayton Agreement, the overall population in the city decreased about 24% (from ~362,000 in 1991 to ~275,000 in 1998). The original city-dwellers made only about 30% of the present inhabitants (Ernst et al., 2017).

Furthermore, from a multicultural, heterogeneous city, Sarajevo became two almost entirely mono-ethnic cities. On one side, Sarajevo, the capital of the Federation of BiH- where more than 87% of over 350,000 inhabitants are Bosniaks and the majority of the rest is a Bosnian Croat minority (Stefansson, 2007). When it comes to East Sarajevo on the other side – part of Republika Srpska - which comprises of pre-war suburbs and houses, there are only 30,000 inhabitants, an overwhelming majority of which are Bosnian Serbs (Stefansson, 2007). The first post-war census was finally undertaken in October 2013. Official figures from this census have shown that the population of Bosnia and Herzegovina is composed of 50.11% Bosniaks, 30.78% Serbs, and 15.43% Croats (Federalni zavod za statistiku).

Aside from the complex ethnic and cultural milieu, contemporary society in Sarajevo and Bosnia in general still struggles with acute social, economic, and environmental problems—all of which obstruct the task of building a nation (Robinson et al., 2001; Sorabji, 2006). Gul & Dee (2015) claim that ‘the city’s administration is cumbersome and inefficient at all levels as a result of the complex political system.’ They continue assuring that inefficient bureaucratic decision-making, which aggravates financial recuperation significantly obstructs and affects both cultural and architectural development. High unemployment and crime charge, massive corruption, bad public area performance and low standards of living are the great troubles affecting the daily lives of Sarajevo’s residents (Cantrell, 2008). Daily, the citizens are affected by country’s political fragility, demanding socio-financial situations, history and the
need to set up a sense of ‘normal’ life in the midst of what seems to be a very hard living setting.

Nevertheless, Sarajevans have always been devoted to survival, sustenance of diversity, constantly making efforts to develop and preserve a culture that affirms unity in variety. In fact, Sarajevans are well known for accepting historical challenges and ethnic heterogeneity as a ‘natural state’, nurturing it through strong neighbouring connections (Lory, 2013; Donia, 2006). When talking about the ethnic character of the city, Sarajevans put an emphasis on ‘living together’; developing a culture of unity, tolerance and acceptance; rather than on the prefix multi, since it presupposes that the city and thus the population was composed of multiple parts (Lory, 2013). Therefore, when speaking of culture in Sarajevo, this paper refers to centuries of long efforts by local population to cohabit in an atmosphere of acceptance of differences, and coexistence amongst people of different ethnic and historical background, religion, and nationality.

**Ottoman rule: single residential unit: the traditional Bosnian town house - Sarajevo**

The foundations of what is now understood as the Bosnian architectural and cultural tradition, in particular when it comes to residential architecture, were laid during the long stretch of time when Bosnia was ruled by the Ottoman Empire. Bosnians idolise the Ottoman period as a time of prosperity and great achievements (Lory, 2013). Perhaps it is so because during that time, Sarajevo formed a specific architectural and housing culture that was the combination of the experiences from the East and the local needs (Finci, 1962). Alternatively, it was perhaps because of the strong sense of democracy reflected in the liberal approach of the Ottomans towards the members of other religions, being that the Turks did not impose their language or culture, and were considered more tolerant to the domicile population than other invaders (Grabrijan & Neidhardt, 1957). Nevertheless, during their rule, the local population started converting to Islam, altering the demographic structure, (Table 1) and with it the customs and ways of living in general (Grabrijan & Neidhardt, 1957; Kulic, 2009).

These political and cultural changes were reflected in architecture in various manners, but the introduction of the ‘Oriental house’ (Grabrijan & Neidhardt, 1957) is considered one of the greatest legacies of the Ottomans and the beginning of local residential culture. (Figure 1) Though ‘imported’, the builders of the time had profound sensitivity to the context, thus subjecting the house to a number of adjustments according to the local environment, needs and customs, understandings and possibilities (Finci, 1962). The product was architecture described as minimalistic and modest, but with its proportion, treatment of surfaces, and solid
– void composition, also orderly and harmonious. The sense of visual balance was further strengthened through the synergy of the natural background of Sarajevo’s sloped topography, where the houses complimented the existing physical context honouring the natural context. How society views the relationship with nature is considered an important cultural parameter.

Rapoport (1969) defined the relationship where the environment is regarded as dominant, with man as less than nature, as Religious and Cosmological. However, the scale of the Ottoman house, space configuration, interior zoning, as well as the treatment of privacy indicate that the human was at the centre of design. This is a reflection of a culture that Rapoport (1969) names Symbiotic, where ‘man and nature are in a state of balance, and man regards himself as responsible to God for nature and the earth and as a steward and custodian of nature’. Rapoport (1969) continues elaborating that such architectural decisions are a reflection of the ‘lack of pretension or desire to impress’ as a direct consequence of the way of living, climate and technology. Thus, the absence or mild visibility of different social classes reflected in residential architecture. In the case of Ottoman Sarajevo, this could also be associated with the culture of modesty that is rooted in Islamic doctrine (Zejnilovic, 2015). It is seen not as worldly but a divine virtue, with religious connotations very strongly imbedded into local tradition, that accentuates humility and a life that promotes spiritual rather than material wealth.

Additionally, the dynamics of the family unit, the understanding of privacy, as well as the position of women in the society, are cultural parameters where architecture of a single residential unit responded directly. In the floor plan, a clear distinction of gender oriented spaces, and public–private zones directed the circulation within the unit. Subsequent solid-void treatment of the elevations, protecting the ground floor from being seen from the outside, and allowing visual communication through the ‘light and transparent’ first floor, was the architectural interpretation of another cultural feature. ‘The right to a view’ which Finci (1962) defines as one of the basic characteristics of the house, is in fact the reflection of close community connections, where the cult of neighbourhood was respected and nurtured. This repetitiveness of visual language in architecture can be interpreted as a reflection of society’s patterns of thoughts and actions, indicating the importance of understanding a culture in its own terms (Benedict, 1961). Therefore, the Oriental house, which was imported, altered and developed over a period of 400 years, rightfully gained the place in local architectural history as the traditional Bosnian town house, specific for Sarajevo. In the history of Bosnian residential architecture, it is considered one of the best examples of symbiosis between culture and architecture, where designers responded to the needs and dynamics of living in a very straightforward manner.

**Austro-Hungarian period – the building block, and Bosnian style**

The occupation by the Austro-Hungarian Empire, after centuries of Ottoman rule, meant the transformation of the city and the society from ‘Oriental’ into ‘European’. This abrupt cultural and architectural cut is still visible in the urban and architectural fabric of the city. The new ‘layer’ was the result of the change in population structure, which occurred through increased migrations to the city, changing the local demographics, and imposing an entirely altered culture of living. Statistical data show the transformation in the number of inhabitants per religious affiliation – decrease in Muslim population from 72.23% in 1851 to 35.57% in 1910, and a rapid increase in the Catholic population from 3.26% in 1879 to 34.51% in 1910 (Krzovic, 2016).
'Contrast' is an appropriate term to describe the meeting of the two cultures, and the development of architecture at the time. The existing residential capacity, both in number and in type, was not appropriate for the demand of the new growing population. Finci (1962) highlights three main characteristics of residential architecture of that period. Specific use of building lots, with tendency to build structures occupying 95% of the parcel, subsequent narrow streets and little or no sun to the high building blocks, as well as visual language typical for Austro-Hungarian cities such as Vienna and Budapest, were some of the newly introduced architectural lawfulness.

The 'Symbiotic' architectural culture of the Ottomans was replaced with 'Exploitative', where 'man is the completer and modifier of nature, then creator, and finally destroyer of the environment' (Rapoport, 1969). The new visual language created two entirely opposing sections of the city. With the intention to soften the transition between the existing and the new, the developers turned to a different strategy - accept the existing, but improve and revolutionise it, ultimately 'modernize the Orient'. Krzovic (2016) states that the Austro-Hungarians tried to present advantages of the building solutions toward the old traditional Bosnian way of building, but that there was great resistance for the new architectural expression by the local Muslim population. Nevertheless, the change was inevitable, and the new local style started appearing with designs made by architects educated in foreign schools of architecture: Josip Vancas, Karl Parzik, and Josip Pospisil. Pasic (2010) singles out Protestant church in Sarajevo, todays Academy of Fine Arts, as the most successful example of combination of Roman, Gothic and Renaissance style. In residential architecture, neo-baroque elements start appearing, best seen in one of the central streets in Sarajevo – Strosmajer's street.

Kurto, (1998) on the other hand, argues that statements implying that the new architectural style was 'forced' or created from 'opportunistic reasons' were incorrect. According to him, architecture of that time was exploring ways of expression that would be appropriate for the spirit of the place. Aspirations for creating national styles were present everywhere, only in places like Sarajevo where the contrast in comparison to the existing built environment is obvious, the beginning of formation of 'pseudomarski slog' – the authentic expression of this region, was more apparent. (Figure 2) For Kurto (1998) the new approach to architecture is the product of the spirit of the place and not the expression of national prestige.

In residential buildings, this style had influenced only the street facades. It was reflected through colour and decorative lace, while the presence of 'doksat' and sometimes even dome was supposed to suggest the local spirit. Red-yellow strips and elements of Moorish
architecture were introduced in the elevation design of both public and residential building. Such understanding of what was assumed to be associated with forward Islamic civilisations, and the somewhat confusing design direction, was not long lasting since within the local context this strategy did not demonstrate cultural vitality. However, the presence of architecture, that in fact was the combination of the ‘old’ and the ‘new’ in its numerosness and approaches, was increasing. Architectural and formal characteristics of traditional Bosnian residential architecture were still being constructed, with Villa of Daniel Salom (Figure 3) being an early exemplary case of the house built during this period. It obtains elements of traditional architecture – bay windows, court behind the house and a front garden.

The house of hadzi Makso Despic (Figure 4) on the other hand is visually determined by the elements of Renaissance and the Baroque, but was equipped and arranged to a great extent in accordance with the old traditional way of life (Krzovic, 2016). Krzovic (2016) argues that even the early appearance of mixed, transitional characteristics in Villa Salom impose questions of stylistic identity and a possible anticipation of the ‘bosanski slog’ or authentic Bosnian architectural style. This style marks the last decade of Austro-Hungarian rule in Bosnia, and was the product of modernism, academicism and old traditional Bosnian housing that were made sensitive by Art Nouvea (Krzovic, 2016). At the same time, it is the final stage of the local architectural development during Austro-Hungarian rule. The repetition of elements of traditional Bosnian house in residential blocks (Finci, 1962), such as the ‘doksat’ – the extruded window on the first floor, arched wooden terraces, determined the visual language of the Bosnian architectural style and reflected the belief that tradition holds the everlasting values (Kurto, 1998).

The Austro-Hungarian rule initiated Sarajevo’s rich cultural and architectural diversity. Though the residential block was imported, and the Oriental house was moulded and transformed, it did not have the time, sensitivity or perhaps the determination to develop, shape, and grow with the society. Subsequently, the residential block and unit did not influence the development of housing architecture in Sarajevo after 1918. Still, it is a vital part of the local architectural legacy and an important step in the evolution of the local culture.
Period between WWI & WWII – the Modern Movement

The end of World War I brought the creation of new state for South Slavs – the Kingdom of Serb, Croats and Slovenians, later named as the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. During that time, Bosnia maintained its territorial integrity and was divided into six provinces. Architectural developments during this period cannot be seen in Sarajevo urban texture as a distinct layer such as Ottoman, Austro-Hungarian and Socialist. The specificity of the time was that many Bosnian and Sarajevan architects, who were educated in Europe, started applying architectural ideas of Modern Movement locally. Tatjana Neidhardt (2014) states that architecture of Sarajevo at the time was dominated by the influences of academicism and eclecticism, as well as elements of neo-Byzantine style brought by the architects Aleksandar Deroko and Milan Zlokovic. Subsequently, we can see building forms that reflect the function as well as design of large windows that allow greater solar exposure, and connection to nature (Finci, 1962).

The first building built in Sarajevo in Modern style was Damić’s apartments (Figure 5) in the centre of Sarajevo, designed in 1927 by graduates of Prague school of architecture, Dušan Smiljanić and Helen Baldasara. It is argued that this residential building represents the first breakthrough of contemporary thought in architecture of Sarajevo. It’s strictly symmetrical front elevation makes it noticeable, together with the simplicity obtained through the absence of ornament, horizontally accentuated openings, cubist elements on the elevation, and the correlation of form with traditional Bosnian doksat.

Significant attention is given to Modern projects designed by the Kadić brothers. (Figure 6) They designed a series of residential and single residential buildings that reflected the ideas of pre-war Modernism, with great sensitivity for the existing context achieving sense of uniqueness and contemporaneity. (Kadic, 2010). These ideas embraced new concepts of functionality and simplicity of forms, but at the same time they had no problem blending into the existing urban continuum. Therefore, although not visible as a distinct layer in the city, this period of modern architecture introduction, and influence of European architecture, is a
significant step towards integrating indigenous design with international trends, while respecting local cultural and architectural context.

**Socialist period – the tower block**

Architecture after WWII in the newly founded socialist state was in general socially and politically directed. The established ideology of socialist Yugoslavia, with its communistic doctrine, created a new collective conduct, which affected all aspects of life. For Bosnia, just as for the other federal republics of socialist Yugoslavia, this was a period of transformation from constitutional monarchy of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia into a communist state, the decline of agricultural population, and strengthening of the new industrial society.

As Mrduljas and Kulic (2012) claim, ‘the rise of urban and industrial society and the empowering of the urban proletariat were considered necessary preconditions for the building of socialism and were conditioned by both ideological and pragmatic objectives’. Antesevic (2012) states that historically, we can identify three periods in which Yugoslav politics and ideology were constituted: the period after WWII, when Yugoslav politics was under dominant Soviet influence, or radical communism. In 1948 Yugoslav politics went through an ideological split with Stalin’s Russia, turning towards economic reforms, decentralisation and liberalisation. Such a political and social model of communism was unique. Alfirević & Simonović (2015) name two reasons for this model: one is the culture of heterogeneous ethnic, economically diverse structure of the population from six constituent republics; and the second is the need for the formation of an authentic national communist philosophy along with political and ideological independence, as a reflection of the estrangement from the Soviet Union. The newly established self-management system had its impact on all aspects of living and therefore on architecture as well. According to historians and scholars, this period after 1948 and the break between Tito and Stalin was a turning point in Yugoslav architecture and art (Babic, 2013). What followed was the transitional phase that lasted until the 1960s when Yugoslavia's unique political identity was based on constant balancing between East and West. Finally, the period of pronounced Yugoslav socialism which was oriented towards its own potentials and economic possibilities (Antesevic, 2012).

In the formation of the needed authentic communist discourse, architecture was used as a political instrument to depict the ideology of the ruling party. As a member of the 'Independent Alliance', the governmental elites that carried out the 'modernisations' (Mrduljaš & Kulić, 2012) opted for visual expression that promoted global architectural trends, which happened to coincide with the socialist doctrine, in particularly referring to minimalistic approach to visual language and absence of symbolic decoration. It combined communist ideology with Western aesthetic and technological influences. The relationship between architecture and ideology was evident in many aspects of the architectural discourse: from the debate on “official” architectural style, suitable for the developing new socialist society; to the attempt to connect traditional national heritage and modern architecture (Mrduljaš and Kulić, 2012). Architecture in socialist Yugoslavia thus operated within a complex framework of shifting political and cultural paradigms whose contrasts highlight the meanings that post-World War II modernism assumed on a global scale.
Nevertheless, some of the most valuable work of 20th century architecture in Sarajevo was done in that period, such as the very Mies-like Museum of Revolution, or the RTV building – a typical representative of Yugoslav Brutalism.

Residential architecture of the time was concerned with managing the needs of the increased migrations to the city, which demanded large-scale urban development, as well as mass production of built environment. The greatest development of Sarajevo in general, and particularly of residential capacity, happened during this period. In general, it is considered that architectural developments in Yugoslavia were flexible in reference to the official ideology, showing ‘strong willingness and inclination towards experimenting with new and different residential patterns’ (Antesevic, 2012). However, even throughout these experimentations, excluding the inevitable presence of privileged social groups, residential architecture was very much a reflection of socialist ideology, for it aimed to represent the society where equality was a pivotal ideological concept. The Yugoslav design in general was therefore developing in two directions, or what Mrduljas and Kulic (2012) defined as ‘between’ architecture: one related to the global modern trends and the other to the inner contrasts that fundamentally marked the architectural and social history of the region. Reduction of differences was the ‘inner’ concept, which was used to conceptualise living and architecture of the socialistic public housing. The notion of the socialist idea of equivalence was embedded within Yugoslav culture, particularly in Bosnia as the most ethnically diverse republic within the Federation, as ‘a set of positive and pragmatic beliefs, values, forms of behaviours, and acting’s’ (Suvakovic, 2014). At this point in history, architecture was predominantly a tool that was to strengthen, impose and secure the political ideology of the system in the culture. Modern architecture in socialist Yugoslavia after the split from the Eastern bloc in 1939 was instrumental in reinforcing Yugoslavia’s new image of reformed communist country (Kulic, 2009).

The grid organisation of two-dimensional treated residential buildings; the absence of colour or embellishment; and a minimalistic, uniform and very strict visual appearance was the ‘face’ of the city. Residential architecture used its aesthetic as a ‘strategy to participate in the organisation of individual and collective human life’ (Suvakovic, 2014). It was ‘the principle of class rather than identity’ that was given the priority, believing that ‘a just social order would resolve any nationalist issues relating to the different ethnic groups’ (Robinson et al., 2001). As a solution for the need of housing the masses and increasing residential unit stock, the modernist tower block was introduced to Sarajevo for the first time. This study will deliberate the development of a tower block as an exemplary case of socialist architecture that started in the 1970s - Alipasino polje, (Figure 8) a neighbourhood located in Sarajevo valley positioned across the industrial zone of the city, between two main transportation lines. It was designed to house the rising middle classes, the working population; with 60,000
inhabitants it was and still is one of Sarajevo’s largest neighbourhoods. Though it provided the solution for housing, Alipasino polje has always been a topic of controversial debates, criticised mainly because of the scale that was not only dehumanising, but also foreign to the local culture at the time. Aside from raising questions of aesthetics and form, the design was blamed for problems of safety and well-being of inhabitants. Such architecture of living was believed to be suggesting the alienation of individuals and the weakening of the community ties.

Figure 8. Socialist Architecture Residential Tower Alipasino Polje (Source: Author).

Emphasis was on order and planning at the expense of understanding and the importance of tradition, individuality and social needs. However, the architects were in fact looking for a way to reconcile the need for an increase in residential stock and global architectural trends with the local customs and ways of living. The 18 floor high-rise buildings were thus positioned along the edges of the lots, facing the main transportation vessels, creating a long stretch of ‘walls’ that surrounded the neighbourhood. However, towards the interior of the site, they opted for a gradual decrease in the height of the buildings, which allowed the feel of human scale. Furthermore, the use of parcel with large span between the buildings, the gradual change in levelling of hard and soft surfaces, aimed to balance out the verticality of the high-rise blocks, and settle the functional and ideological requests with the needed sense of spatial comfort. This provided community spaces allowing the locals to nurture the cult of neighbourhood and maintain the sense of community. At the same time, the exterior view of the residential district were the 18 floor tower blocks, which corresponded with global architectural trends of the time and reflected the state's vision of a successful, progressive society.

With further developments of residential architecture in Sarajevo, the ones on large scale in Sarajevo valley triggered by the winter Olympic Games in 1984, and some bold post-modernist attempts such as the Canary building in the city centre, (Figure 9) it seemed like the process of modernising residential architecture and society was on a progressive track. However, as has happened many times in the history of the region before, the 1990s war created a disruption, which prevented the establishment of continuity and with it the process of modernisation (Mrduljaš & Kulić, 2012).
POST-SOCIALIST SARAJEVO – THE POST-WAR CONTEXT

Although Sarajevo is not the only city in the region that went through the process of decline and transformation of a socialist city and society, its experience at the turn of the millennium was unique and unprecedented. The longest siege in the modern history of humankind, which lasted 1359 days from 1992 to 1996, inevitably altered the society and made a long-term impact on local culture, development and architecture. The former state of Yugoslavia was, in theory, regarded as a pioneer in promoting state policies based on good ethnic relations. Bosnia with the Bosniaks (Muslims), Serbs and Croats, who made up around 44%, 33% and 17% respectively according to the 1991 census (Pupavac, 2006), was the most ethnically diverse republic of Yugoslavia. However, the violent destruction of the country proved that the idea of building social stability on the notion of absolute equality by suppressing some aspects of ethnic and therefore cultural differences, was not a sustainable model of development. McEvoy (2011) states that in cases of ethnic conflict, culture is likely to be a marker of the deep divisions and antagonisms among the contending groups. He further continues claiming that ‘investigations on ethnic conflict that examined the salience of culture have shown that culture can act as a framing device, rather than the cause of deep segmental cleavages’. However, in the case of the Bosnian conflict, culture was a product of ‘the institutionalization of the system of federal categorization under the greater Yugoslav umbrella’ which ‘was insufficient to wipe out the strong forces of ethno-nationalism’, (Kotzen & Garcia, 2014) finally ending with the 1990s war.

What gave this conflict the epithet of ‘culturicide’ is the systematic destruction of all that was associated with Bosnian cultural values, attempting to erase history, and eradicate all sense of identity. Burning down the National Library in Sarajevo became the symbol of cultural destruction, with an estimated 2 million books and 300 manuscripts destroyed. The devastation of mosques, churches, graveyards, bridges and other religious and cultural
monuments, further contributed to the attempt of erasing the evidence of Bosnia's national heritage. Torsti (2004) states that according to (incomplete) data from the Institute for the Protection of the Cultural, Natural and Historical Heritage of Bosnia and Herzegovina, 1454 cultural monuments were destroyed or damaged. Of those, 1284 were Islamic sacred and other objects, 237 Catholic, and 30 Serbian Orthodox.

However, overcoming the aftermath of the ‘culturicide’, even 20 years after the war, is still just as challenging as the conflict itself. The war torn society was initially faced with reconstruction, migration, and post-war trauma on a massive scale. Parallel to that, the state and the liberalised society were expected to transform from a communistic to capitalistic modus operandi. Though it is not the first time in the Bosnian history that society was forced to reinvent itself, the challenge and difference in this transitional period is the complete absence of an ideological factor. After centuries of being a collectivistic society, run by either religious or governmental ideologies, the post-war society is freed of political doctrines and the number of choices that the culture may make in development, presents a problem.

CULTURE AND ARCHITECTURE IN CRISIS – DISCUSSION

The lack of positive political and social initiative in contemporary Bosnian society impairs the process of cultural transformation. In order to investigate the problems local culture faces, and repercussions it has on the residential architecture of Sarajevo, this research will focus its discussion around the three conditions that Elliot (1948) defines in “Notes towards the Definition of Culture” as essential for the survival and growth of culture.

Organic Structure, or the ‘hereditary transmission of culture within a culture’ (Eliot, 1948) is the first suggested criterion, entailing that for a culture to survive there must be a system of relaying on previous traditions down to younger generations (Kenney, 1994). Analysis of memory transmission in post-war culture is very relevant since ‘collective remembrance’, defined by Basalou & Baxter as ‘memorialisation’ (Hamber & Wilson, 2002), is identified as one of the key concepts in the process of recovery from a traumatic past, and ultimately the establishment of a new culture.
It is objectively fair to say that with parallel socio-cultural, economic and political alterations, traumatic memory, as well as the existence of different versions of the ‘truth’ make the process of cultural transmission in the Bosnian framework very challenging. In that context, it may be argued that Sarajevo is undergoing a state of ‘memory crisis’ and the reasons for this are numerous. Kotzen & Garcia (2014) claim that the way in which the territories of both the country and Sarajevo are administrated ‘memorialises and perpetuates the very divisions that initially catalysed the nation toward war in the first place’. This in specific refers to the presence of an invisible border running through Sarajevo’s residential area of Dobrinja, as a constant reminder and obstacle in overcoming the conflicting past (Figure 10). Built during the winter Olympic Games, the residential complex Dobrinja was one of the most severe combat lines. Therefore, that which was once a reminder of a glorious past has now become a symbol of danger and division. Although, as Jensen (2013) observes, there are no actual physical divisions, ‘fences, barriers, ‘welcome’ signs or uniformed officers’, there is an invisible but very present ‘deeply contested polity border’. The buildings have mainly been reconstructed, yet traces of shells are still visible in Dobrinja and the neighbouring residential areas of Saraj polje, Alipasino polje. Twenty years after the war, this has become an accepted element of Sarajevo’s reality, particularly for the new generations who have not witnessed the war and consider this part of their everyday environment. It is these obscure divisions, as well as the ‘not narrated’, ‘not passed on’ reminders, or even those ‘unwelcome ones’ (Sorabji, 2006), that are either spontaneously learned or passed on between generations.

Another challenge in the process of memory transition in Sarajevo is the initiative to ‘erase’ the immediate history and its cultural products - the ‘elimination of symbols’, (Czepczyns, 2008) which is a common architectural and social occurrence of post-socialistic societies. Czepczynsk claims that ‘changing and eliminating unwanted features or residua of the political landscapes were among the most demanded and sometimes risky tasks decision-makers and managers’.

In the case of Sarajevo, the elimination of socialist symbols was the outcome of the conflict, but in the process of reconstruction, the renewal of former socialist public housing areas happened, altering the uniform and monotonous visual language of socialist residential buildings. The rehabilitation of those old neighbourhoods was used to introduce a positive atmosphere to the city, through applications of vivid colours or images on the building
This approach to visual language led to the establishment of new landmarks within the city, but also aimed to contribute to the elimination of the traces of past ideologies that ultimately resulted in an ethnic war.

Such eradication presupposes the introduction of a new architectural visual expression, which in post-war, post-socialist Sarajevo has resulted in new residential developments that are unable to find the appropriate response to the present socio-cultural matrix. Large residential zones built in Sarajevo valley became ‘island states’ within the city (Figure 12). Some of the core problems highlighted by the local architects are the neglect of the existing context, both natural and built, which in combination with the disregard of construction regulations, arbitrary visual language, and absence of infrastructure to support the new inhabitants, creates haphazard residential nodes that burden the visual image and disturb the patterns of living within the city. It may be argued that such an approach to residential architecture, and visual language in particular, one that is not symbolic nor representative, one that does not associate with the place but attempts to homogenise architecture under the umbrella of globalisation, is an indicator of a continuous tendency of Bosnian society towards ‘Europeanization’. Still, with undeveloped mechanisms of dealing with the post-war, post-socialist memory, the local culture and architecture is unable to re-brand and move on.

![Figure 12: New apartment buildings in west Sarajevo (Source: Left- John Dee; Right – WWW).](image)

![Figure 13. Bosmal, (Source: Author).](image)

According to Elliot (1948), the second condition defined as essential for the survival of culture is the study of Regional Context in order to ‘understand the neighbouring cultures as they may have influenced the particular society’ (Kenny, 1994). The fate of the regional societies has been shared throughout the centuries. Herzfeld claims that the specific cultural and political climate in the region is the result of colonialism and foreign intervention in the
Balkans’ (Markowitz, 2010). At the crossroads of civilisations, the regional countries have struggled for centuries to create ethnic and cultural balance, which culminated in the establishment of one common Yugoslav identity at the beginning of the 20th century. However, even during that time ‘there were also competing ethno nationalist ideologies supporting separate statehood for Slovenia, Croatia and Serbia’ (Robinson et al., 2001). Bosnian Muslims were considered even then, as well as during the 1990s conflict, to be part of the colonial Ottoman Empire, and not a distinct identity within Yugoslavia. This conception to become a constituent part of the state, and project to establish a single unified country has been a constant struggle for Bosnian society and that has paved the way for the late-twentieth-century conflict (Kotzen & Garcia, 2014). Post-conflict, most of the countries of Western Balkans are facing similar difficulties and are developing within the specificities of their societies, continuing the processes of ‘Europeanization’, as well as what Mrduljas & Kulic (2012) define as ‘unfinished modernisation’ and ‘Balkanization’.

Another common regional occurrence that challenges the development of culture and architecture is the presence and influence of ‘satellite cultures’. Post-war countries present fertile ground for alterations and infiltrations of new values to the cultures. Elliot (1948) describes ‘satellite cultures’ as the smaller subcultures constantly influencing the dominant culture, without becoming completely absorbed into the larger system. The process of ‘borrowing the values’ is identified as the process of cultural ‘diffusion’ (Kenney, 1994), and is considered a natural cultural phenomenon. In this case however we are talking about cultures that are completely foreign to the local context and are triggered by the foreign economic and construction investments. They suggest new patterns of living and aggressively propose a lifestyle that cannot be sustainable under the local conditions.

The 118m high business and residential towers ‘Bosmal’ (Figure 13) built in Sarajevo in 2004 as an investment from Malaysia, promoted at the time as architecture that offers ‘luxury’ living, is an example of one such failed attempt. For the scale of Sarajevo, the giant towers violently contrast the fine grain of the neighbouring single residential units, as well as human scale residential blocks constructed during the socialist period. The multifunctional space that is to provide various leisure and living services within a tower, implies a concept of living that the locals are not accustomed to, promoting individualism and the weakening of community ties. The empty apartments of the towers are considered one of the largest unsuccessful investments in the country, a high priced fiasco that failed to intrigue the locals and impose a new life style. The lack of interest by Sarajevans confirms that though the post-war society is still ‘unstable’, and the local economy as well as architectural experiments may test the boundaries of living, the values that represent the primary aspect in organising the cultural system are not easily altered.

Finally, Balance of Unity and Diversity in Religion is the final criterion considered vital for the analysis and development of culture and architecture. Rapoport (1969) addresses the spiritual aspects of religion and the symbolism involved in the development of traditional dwellings. However, he approaches it with a certain dose of suspicion as to how religion, as an integral part of culture, may directly influence architectural form. In this paper, the multivariable nature of religion is not addressed. Considering the context of Sarajevo, this paper is focused on the fact that religion may dictate a certain conduct of behaviour, which could subsequently have impact on the society and typology of residential development. Pupovac (2006) states that the link between ethnic and religious identity, in secularised pre-war Bosnia as well as post-war circumstances, did not significantly alter the way of living within the three ethnic groups. However, for the locals, Bosnian cities are not the same as they were before the war. In Sarajevo, massive migrations have taken place with the ‘arrival
of two new categories of residents’, first being ‘the in-migrated Bosniak displaced persons from ethnically cleansed’ villages’ (Sorabji, 2006). Stefansson (2007) states that at least 90,000 persons have been internally displaced from other parts of Bosnia-Herzegovina, commenting that in combination with the exodus of an estimated 240,000 pre-war inhabitants, the population structure of Sarajevo has been irreversibly altered. This has been a major trigger for illegal urban development on the slopes of Sarajevo. (Figure 14) According to some theoreticians, this was interpreted as a consequence of the impossibility or unwillingness of those internally displaced, sheltered in Sarajevo during the conflict, to return to pre-war homes (Jordi Martin-Diaz et al., 2017). He further states that, according to UNHCR data, these displacements transformed the ethno-religious structure of Sarajevo, with an increase in the number of Bosniak local population from about 50% prior to the war to 87% in 1997, while the majority of Bosnian Serbs and ‘Yugoslavs’ left town. Partially, this is a consequence of the fact that different cultural identities or ethnic groups within Bosnia historically tend to strive to other states: the Croats leaning towards Zagreb; the Serbs towards Belgrade; while the Bosniaks lean towards Sarajevo (Kotzen & Garcia, 2014; Pupavac, 2006) and identify themselves with the city as their ‘natural’, historical, and cultural core.

A visibly stronger Islamic religious identification in post-conflict Sarajevo is additionally boosted by what Sorabji defines as the second category of residence - the migration of ‘a new wave of religious believers’ who have adopted and practice a different version of Islam which is closer to orthodox aspects of some Arab cultures (Sorabji, 2006). Therefore, it is not a rare occurrence that residents of Sarajevo interpret this manifestation of Islam as radical, since the Islam that has been practised amongst Bosniaks for centuries is very moderate. For some locals, their presence is an invasion on the local life and customs, and it is understood as ‘an attack on Bosniak national identity, familiar values and practices’ (Sorabji, 2006) and they feel that it is generally eroding the cultural standards of life in the city. These too, could be interpreted in the framework as ‘satellite cultures’ that contribute to the religious misbalance within the multicultural Bosnian society, and may be seen as obstacles to the integration of Bosnians into European society.

Though the alteration within the Islamic religious identity is more obvious in the developments of post-war sacral buildings, residential architecture responded with the
development of a new residential typology - the construction of gated housing communities on the outskirts of Sarajevo. The tourist-residential complex in Sarajevo suburb area Osenik, (Figure 15) promoted in the media as 'the luxurious Arab village in Bosnia' is organised around the exaggerated understanding of privacy, and the concept of gender oriented spaces. Though this construction is built for touristic purposes, this is a permanent structure and it is aimed for catering solely Middle Eastern guests, creating 'satellite culture hub' in Sarajevo. On the other hand, the construction of these residential communities does potentially suggest the presence of the need for such developments, implying that the cultural change has already occurred to a certain extent.

Aside from this, what polarises the city and deepens the religious and ethnic misbalance even more severely is the previously mentioned division of the city to the predominantly Bosniak populated Canton Sarajevo and East Sarajevo, inhabited by Orthodox Serbs. Though in such constellation both groups are 'belonging to the 'ethnic self' (Armakolas, 2007) this has greatly changed the urban, cultural and religious identity of the city. East Sarajevo is under large residential construction, developing its own spatial identity, which cannot be relevantly commented on from a religious aspect, and has the same visual problems as the contemporary constructions in Sarajevo. The very division between the ethnic groups within the city presupposes the development of predominantly homogenous religious environments, which highlight ethnic and cultural differences. These transformations have become Sarajevo’s reality, and are yet another manifestation of cultural turmoil during the difficult post-war transitional process.

CONCLUSION

Architecture understood as a social product is addressed in this research through the mutual connection of built environment and the complex, ever changing, live phenomenon of culture. The analysis shows that the organisation of space and form, be it on a micro or macro scale, puts architecture in the centre of social processes. As per Rapoport (1969) enquiry into 'the content of spaces, their size and correlation, the level of understanding and connection between the built and the natural environment, private vs. public space organization, view of appropriate distance etc., directly influence architecture both in form and type.' The paper confirms that Sarajevo is an excellent 'laboratory' for such investigations, given the unique circumstances resulting from extreme social and political transformations that happened
throughout its history. The timeline of respective architectural developments can easily be traced throughout the city, but it is the ‘invisible’ messages engraved into architectural language that tell the true story about the constant efforts of the society to overcome the aftermaths of power struggles and conflicts.

For this reason, the research puts culture in the forefront of transformational processes, particularly in establishing post-conflict reconciliation, which demands a widespread social change for the establishment of a completely new set of ideas and beliefs. An endeavour of that scale, particularly considering the diverse ethnic structure of Sarajevo and its problematic past, asks for massive coordination. This brings us to the fundamental difficulty when talking about the socio-cultural state of post-war Sarajevo – the complete absence of strategy that would lead the transitional process. The state, society, and culture currently have no common agenda, and therefore architecture as a cultural product is unable to communicate shared values. It is then quite indicative that the local residential architecture is on an exploratory mission, which results in ‘form making’ constantly trying to find the new expression of contemporary local identity.

Furthermore, the presence of previously mentioned ‘satellite cultures’ that suggest inappropriate models of living, the misbalance of religion, and confusion in the ‘memorialization of the past’ imply that more than 20 years after the war, local society is still in the process of reconciliation. Burdened by the aftermath of the war, but also unfinished modernisation, and never fully executed ‘Europeanization’, it is difficult for architecture to have positive momentum. An additional aggravating factor is the on-going process of transformation from a post-socialist, centralised, collectivist, and hierarchical society, into a modern, individualistic, democratic, capitalist system. Despite existing regulation plans, the ambiguous housing stock that exceeds the actual demand of living units, illegal residential construction on a massive scale, experimentation with housing typologies, and uninformative visual language of residential architecture, largely damage the living environment of Sarajevo.

Is there an opportunity to make a positive turnover under these circumstances? The answer is certainly not more planning, or establishing regulations that simply never are executed. Though Elliot (1948) claims that the development of culture must be organic, and not consciously guided, this research indicates that in the case of Sarajevo, the needed turnover calls for the establishment of comprehensive overreaching mechanisms that would initiate the formation of a new system of cultural values. Coyne (2007) argues that such an endeavour would involve ‘coordinating individuals around a new set of beliefs, ideas and conjectures’ and that the key in overcoming problems of coordination is ‘common knowledge’. Architecture as a public visual discipline has a responsibility as a strategic instrument in establishing, communicating, and affirming information to the public. The appropriate strategy should use architecture intentionally to cater to the vision of the culture, ultimately contributing to the creation of ‘common knowledge’. This would not only generate a general vision of architectural development, but it would also call for re-examination of design approach in the existing post-war residential construction.

However, is a cultural transformation that will enable the community and architecture to move forward collectively a realistic possibility at the moment? Bearing in mind the present socio-political settings, as well as the fact that cultures are extremely resistant to change and demand substantial amount of time for alterations (Rapoport, 1969), the answer to the question would not be optimistic. Although the research recognises that cultural transformation is a process, at the same time it identifies the urgent need for positive socio-
spatial progression, the recreation of a multicultural community, and the instalment of a culture of acceptance of differences. This fundamentally means that, before any meaningful plan on urban and architectural development in Sarajevo can be made, initiation of cultural vitality must begin with an application of suitable strategy for the greatly polarised society, gradually creating a new culture appropriate for the post-war demographic structure of former adversaries, and new post-war residents of the city of Sarajevo.
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