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Abstract. The transitional process from a socialist into a capitalist societal system, started at the end of the twentieth century in Bosnia and Herzegovina, and the related transformation of the public into private land ownership, with the neglect and lack of adequate development programs and public opinion, produce today the urban-architectural and, in general, identity crisis. Under the guise of overall well-being, but mostly in the service of short-term economic profit, attractive urban spaces are occupied, the existing physical structure is uncontrollably removed and new construction is carried out, almost as a rule, in disregard for the needs and interests of society/citizens. Transformations of urban space, generated by the vibrations of a transitional society, are most evident in the capital, Sarajevo. The building process is basically a multiplication of residential settlements, the construction of which is carried out on a case-by-case basis, with considerable pressure from investors, and with the decisions made within closed, narrow interest circles and (often) without consulting the profession/urban planners and the public/citizens. In such an environment, the public domain loses its primacy over the private, which is manifested in the alienation of people and the loss of their identification with the place. Such residential settlements are deprived of central functions in the field of social infrastructure and in the manner of "tried and tested" repetitive urban-architectural models, which together negatively affect the quality of individual and social life. In other words, residential settlements without an identity are created. Although they have formal names, these settlements are nameless. They are no places. Architecture and building are always deeply connected with the ideological framework of a particular society, which means that the understanding of the function of space and the place of man in it, we have opened a central question, as the main goal of this paper: Is it really true that the construction of Sarajevo's new settlements cannot be adapted to anything other than current urban policy? Or else: Is their fate such that they will be permanently determined by the attribute of a settlement without a name? For the purpose of finding the answer, of possible ways of overcoming the crisis or at least mitigating its effects, we conducted a comparative analysis of housing planning in a socialist societal system with current transition planning. The results of this analysis have shown that the new urban policy is intrinsic and creates new articulations of urban space without spatial identity, essentially a name. We have concluded that a crucial moment has arisen in which it is necessary to stop anarchic decision-making on (sporadic) transformations of the city space and to establish a system of compliance with procedures in designing and adopting programs that allocate new necessary functions within the existing physical structures. As urban decisions are currently being made (mostly) outside the realm of the public/citizens, i.e. in closed circles and with the pressures of private investment, the need to change such practices is evident. This is only possible through dialogue, because when all those interested in the decision-making process are involved in the conversation, change will happen. Only then will we be able to talk about urban politics dedicated to creating an environment in which a person, is placed in the centre of the building process, and where one is given the opportunity to personalize the space one inhabits, to identify with and name it – make it its own, personal and intimate.
1. Introduction
The first half of the 1990s in Bosnia and Herzegovina was marked by the beginning of radical changes in socio-political and economic relations in the country, which together introduced its living space into a new reality. Specifically, the transition of a socialist societal system, oriented towards society and with a dominant role of urban planning, towards a capitalist societal system, oriented to the individual and with a dominant role of self-organization in the management of space, today plays a decisive role in the transformation of cities. In this sense, the development and re-development of the cities of Bosnia and Herzegovina today, is determined by the transitional conflicts between the private and public domains, that is, the conflicting interests of self-organization and planning. These transition conflicts are specially generated by the forces of economic profit of private interest in the processes of privatization, decision-making, management and privatization of public space does not, in most cases, result in quality new built environment. Withdrawal of the state from the field of urban policy (by formal privatization, deregulation and short term profit) has transformed public issues into private issues, thus “excluding them from a democratic negotiation process” [1]. The transfer of traditionally public issues to the private sector “shifted power from the hands of public bureaucracy to the hands of (…) private corporations” [2], further deepening the conflict “between the private and the public, the individual and the institutions, at a time when the public the sector needs support to counteract the increasing market pressures” [3]. Market forces, especially in transitional societies, seek to ignore long-term development plans and processes, as well as the interests of cities, prioritize short-term economic profits and manage land use inefficiently and incompetently [4]. The above points to the fact that the urban policy situation in our cities today is influenced by several factors: conflict between private and public domain, lack or neglect of adequate development plans, "innovative" private investors, adaptive or powerless city/municipal administration, and absence or neglect of specialized public discourses in the sphere of construction.

The transitional forms of spatial manifestation of the described current socio-economic processes can be recognized in most cities of Bosnia and Herzegovina. The city of Sarajevo is especially exposed to them. Being at the same time the capital of the Canton, the Federation and the State, the seat of administration and administration of all levels of government, international organizations and institutions, the economic, economic, cultural, educational, health and transport centre of Bosnia and Herzegovina [5] are in Sarajevo, logically, the impacts of these streams are most obvious.

Sarajevo has become the scene of an immoral attempt to cover up social impoverishment and the heightened crisis of local urban and architectural culture. With increasing emphasis on the concept of economic profitability in space formation, residential settlements are multiplying (almost as a rule) in arbitrarily selected urban locations. Their construction is realized on a case-by-case basis, with considerable pressure from investors, and with the decision to build decided in closed, tight circles and (often) without consulting the profession/urban planners and the public/citizens.

In such an environment, the public domain loses its primacy over the private [5], which is most clearly manifested in the alienation of people and the loss of their identification with the place. Residential settlements are deprived of central service functions in the field of social infrastructure and in the manner of "tried and tested" same urban-architectural models, which together negatively affect the quality of individual and social life. In other words, residential settlements without an identity are created. Although they have formal names, these settlements are nameless. They are no places.

In this sense, starting from the thesis that construction is always deeply connected with the ideological commitments of a certain society, which means with the understanding of the function of space and the place of man in it, we do not take a hermetic attitude as dominant in regard to the new articulation of urban spatial units. On the contrary, we respect the needs for growth and development and thus open up the central question, and the search for answers is the main aim of this paper: Is it really true that the construction of Sarajevo's new settlements cannot be adapted to anything other than
current urban policy? Or else: Is their fate such that they will be permanently determined by the attribute of a settlement without a name?

2. Nameless settlements or structuring the problem

The transition of the former socialist into the capitalist societal system in Bosnia and Herzegovina and the associated transformation of the public into private land ownership, with the lack or neglect of adequate development plans and public opinion, produce today a general, but also a specific urban/architectural identity crisis. Under the guise of overall well-being, and most of all in the service of short-term economic profit, attractive urban spaces are occupied, the generated physical structure is uncontrollably removed and new construction is carried out, almost as a rule, in harmony with the needs and interests of society/citizens. The process of “filling the city” [6] is under development, where almost all “underutilized” [6] and potentially public spaces are transformed into construction land. Within a relatively short period of time, but within a wider spatial context, smaller, mutually independent, interventions are being implemented, which, in physical and symbolic terms, exploit "empty spaces/voids" [7] for new construction. This creates a set of anti-contextual, disconnected spatial articulations, away from the real needs of the city and its citizens. Such, they create and portray a new environment that ignores social and economic development, climate and topography, history and heritage, functional schemes, aesthetic and symbolic experience – they ignore the human!

Transformations of urban space, generated by vibrations of a transitional society, are most evident in Sarajevo. One can state that Sarajevo can today be viewed as a dynamic system of "empty" spaces, whose "filling", by the "constant movement between usability and entropy" [8], makes its spatial development fluctuating. The city becomes the sum of fragments of newly built structures, where similar objects and interstices alternate in (more or less) uniform matrix, with similar spatial and aesthetic characteristics. This spontaneous repetition of uniform objects and patterns, the accumulation of separate spatial interventions significantly altered Sarajevo's urban image (Figure 1).

In such an environment, as an (unexpected) consequence of lack of planning, favouring private investment, removing the public from the decision-making process and (unwanted) concentration, the number of new settlements in Sarajevo is rapidly increasing1. They are characterized by a spatial organization based on the same compositional principles that draw their example from visions of economic profit and maximum exploitation of the acquired plot. In the image of the city, these are separate fragments of the urban matrix formed by residential buildings, positioned on a building plot irrespective of the style and concept of the immediate and wider urban context, at just the necessary

---

1 There is a large number of shopping malls being built, as well as high rise business and residential towers that have an ecologically negatively impact, but since they are not the issue argument of this paper, they are no further elaborated.
distances. As the logic of maximum exploitation of the parcel is at the same time the logic of construction of buildings of huge overall dimensions, so their floors are determined in accordance with the wishes of investors, and not in accordance with the needs of the city and citizens. These are skyscrapers with hundreds of residential units\(^2\), of similar uniform materialization and aesthetic-design features. The above describes the thinking and the conclusion that the urban and architectural solutions of Sarajevo's new settlements were taken out of context and, without direct intention, directed towards its negation and destruction (Figure 2).

Figure 2. New residential settlements – separate fragments of spatial articulations

Since the concept of maximizing the exploitation of available land directly implies the development of the concept of a residential settlement that does not jeopardize the short-term economic benefit of investors, there is also a lack of planning and building facilities and public spaces for the accommodation of central functions in the domain of societal infrastructure. In other words, Sarajevo's new settlements are being built without facilities for primary health care, primary education, pre-school childcare, social care, and almost no space for recreation and socialization of residents. Added to this is the fact that the new settlements are connected to the existing municipal infrastructure without expanding existing capacities, resulting in traffic congestion, the use of pedestrian communications and (potential) public spaces for vehicle parking\(^3\), as well as increased environmental pollution. At the same time, the residential floors are equipped with commercial amenities, such as beauty salons, wedding salons, cafes, convenience stores, private doctors' offices and other similar facilities that fill the building floors, again according to the wishes and affinities of the investors, not the residents of the settlement and the environments that gravitate to him. Consequently, so is the urban parterre as (potential) public space is mostly reduced to regulated communications and access to facilities, while no one is thinking about spaces for recreation and socialization of settlement residents and creating their identification with the place. This tells us that the created housing market is slowly leading to the transformation of complex and rich urban life into unnamed, nameless residential areas (Figure 3).

Figure 3. New residential estates without articulated or designated urban parterre

---

2 The disparity between current residential needs and investments is visible in the information that nearly one quarter of all apartment units are unoccupied [9].

3 While most new residential buildings contain an underground garage, the cost of parking is not included in the cost of the apartment, so most new residents find these additional investments unacceptable and use the existing outdoor parking spaces. Because these spaces are under-capacitated, since they were planned earlier and for the needs of a smaller number of users, new residents "solve" the problem of parking vehicles on any vacant surfaces in the immediate surroundings, which often includes pedestrian communications and (potential) public spaces.
The concept of forming new Sarajevo settlements, therefore, lacks overall ideas about space, thought out, planned, especially when it comes to the quality of individual and social life, social interactions and identification of the person with the space one inhabits. Although this broad field of potential environmental action is stimulating for quality solutions, it is still dominated by a state where "architecture outperforms urbanism" and in which "the city fades in front of the building" [10]. In such a new reality, architecture is "(…) seductive; it defines, excludes, limits, separates, but consumes. It exploits and misuses the potentials that can only be generated by (…) the particular imagination of urbanism" [11]. And that's not there. We allowed that by placing the individual above the general interest, creations and imaginations were pulled before the material, and we forgot about the man. We have obtained residential settlements that are constituted by architectural objects of similar or the same design and composition characteristics and in which there are no public spaces, i.e. they are determined not only by their physical appearance but (above all) by social practices – behaviour, rules, memories. By creating architecture for the needs of the market, the needs of the person (individual and group) to identify with the space, to create his place that connects with the identity, feelings of security and belonging have been neglected. In such spaces, when appropriated, one assigns names – his own, personal, intimate. Finally, structuring in this way the problem of the place and identity of man, we understood that Sarajevo's new settlements were out of place and that although they had formal (commercial) names, they were in fact nameless.

The described situation is reason enough to think about a more critical analysis and re-evaluation of pre-transition urban design, where it is possible to have a plethora of positive experiences useful for a better understanding of the identity crisis in residential areas today. In this regard, we will carry out a the comparative analysis of the planning, design and construction of settlements in the socialist societal system and these current, transitional, in order to find ways to overcome the crisis or at least mitigate its effects.

2.1. Planning of residential settlements in the socialist societal system

After World War II, led by President Tito and the Socialist Communist Party, the former Yugoslavia was rapidly developing into a modern socialist society. The state worked on the formation of a new identity and national awareness, and "thanks to the population, favourable economic climate and strategic position, a strong road network was built, good education accessible to all, improved housing conditions, strengthened industry and minimized unemployment" [12].

During this post-war period of general progress, Sarajevo became the administrative centre of the Republic, and the industrialization of Bosnia and Herzegovina, followed by de-agrarization, initiated an intensive process of rural population migration, which caused Sarajevo to experience rapid changes in population growth and economic development. The rapid growth of the population has stimulated further intensive housing construction, and the spatial expansion of the city, the directions of which were decided by the city administration on the basis of the development plans adopted by it [5]. In them, space was treated not only as a resource, a physical basis for expansion and general progress, but as a significant determinant that simultaneously stimulates and rationalizes them. Relying on the results of scientific research in independent institutions, Sarajevo's development planning was thus an integral process in which the social, economic and spatial factors were equally treated and harmonized as determinants of the overall development strategy. In addition, the final decisions on the implementation of adequate development plans were preceded by consideration of comments, suggestions and opinions of scientific and professional institutions and social bodies, introducing citizens to the settings of particular planning solutions, and holding public exhibitions [13].
The Master Plan of the City of Sarajevo (1965-1985)\(^4\), based on postulates of the Athens Charter, provided a realistic program of proper spatial organization of the city. A clear distinction was made between urban areas, based on four types of functions: housing, work, recreation and traffic – zones for housing, industrial-commercial centres, traffic corridors, sports, recreation and entertainment were identified. The future of the city is defined by the purpose of the surfaces, zoning urban space according to predetermined functions, namely: linking new settlements directly to existing ones, designating recreational spaces and determining the corridors of all traffic systems. In addition, the land subdivision was made, which created the preconditions for the prohibition of land traffic \(^{[13]}\), its unplanned exploitation for the purpose of construction.

In Sarajevo at that time, the intensity and manner of using urban land were in line with the growing needs and interests of the city and its citizens. In this respect, housing policy was socially oriented and enabled the decision-making of all working people on the issues of the policy itself, as well as its implementation. On the other hand, planners, designers, investors and contractors, with a coordinated action aimed at achieving a common goal, achieved the results that Sarajevo then ranked among the cities of the former Yugoslavia with the most rational housing construction.

However, it was precisely the rationalization of construction that led to the assessment of some new residential settlements as incompatible, without spatial and visual cohesion. In them, a model of “single high-rise building” urbanism was applied, characterized by an orthogonal spatial composition of objects of similar dimensions and aesthetically-shaped statements and vertical accents – objects of “towers”, but with spacious green areas between them. Though, viewed from the perspective of sociological research, it was an unfavourable concept of construction, since it meant the absence of a street (even) and a square, which, in the later built-up new settlements, gave up the application of this matrix model. Subsequently, planning sought to associate man with housing and leisure, which resulted in the design and construction of a number of settlements in which a successful synthesis of nature and physical structures was achieved. By applying the model of landscape urbanism, i.e. the concept of object positioning, which sought (to the greatest extent) to preserve the ambient values of the present natural environment and to adapt them to the configuration of terrain in the hillside parts of the city, achieved, contrary to the application of the "single high-rise building" urban model, the satisfaction of living in settlements with formed streets and (green) public spaces (Figure 4).

\[\text{Figure 4. Matrix systems of residential neighbourhoods on planned locations}^{[13]}\]

\(^4\) The urban development of Sarajevo in the socialist societal system is accompanied and guided by development plans: 1. General Regulatory Plan (1948), 2. General Urban Plan of the City of Sarajevo (1965-1985), 3. Proposal of the Program of Construction and Spatial Development of the City of Sarajevo (1971-1985), 4. Program project: Sarajevo – City centre system (1975-1985), 5. Elements of the long-term strategy of the socio-economic and spatial development of the city of Sarajevo (1986-2000/2015), 6. The urban plan of the city of Sarajevo 1986-2000/2015 and 7. Spatial Plan of the Sarajevo Canton (2003-2023) – belongs to the current transition period \(^{[5]}\). From the aspect of the research topic in this paper, the General Urban Plan of the City of Sarajevo (1965-1985) is particularly important, to which we give a brief review, while we will not elaborate other development plans.
A common feature of all new residential settlements was that they were planned as places for meeting the different needs of their inhabitants, that is, with facilities and facilities that provided the spatial conditions for accommodation of central functions in the domain of social infrastructure. In this way, in addition to housing, the new settlements also met the needs of residents for culture, facilitated and encouraged leisure activities, social communication and integration, as well as the optimal distribution of primary health care functions, primary education, pre-school childcare, social protection and trade and services [14]. They were created according to the modernist ideal, with a lot of light and air [12], free from transit traffic (and thus from sources of all kinds of pollution), with easy access to amenities at the level of meeting the daily needs and with (green) public areas whose the construction was financed by the investors themselves [13].

The whole story of Sarajevo residential settlements from the period of socialist societal order is actually a story of real and symbolic elements of identity construction that are feelings of security and belonging to a certain part of the city. For each individual, the content that “domesticated” his or her neighbourhood was the space of creating a place, a personalized substance of the accumulated experience of growing up and the flow of life. Although these parts of the city in physical terms may have been similar in psychological, symbolic and especially identifying character, they were different and specific, as they were enhanced by similar human habits, social practices and customs in the continuity of the passage of time. That is, in the perception of the individual and the group, the way of "living on the street" [6] clearly defined, named and separated one settlement from another, each recognizable by "like people" [6] in thinking and behaviour, gave a sense of security. The formal names of these settlements were not only toponyms, but the names of symbolic constructions embedded in the consciousness of each individual as his unique and inimitable experience of life in the part of the city he could call his place. Even today they are deemed as such.

3. Results and discussions
A comparative analysis of the planning, design and implementation of Sarajevo residential settlements in the socialist societal system and these current, transitional, shows that the present concept of their spatial organization is the result of spontaneous actions, went astray (and still do), ignoring valid and long-established urban and architectural principles.

While Bosnia and Herzegovina was part of the former Yugoslavia, the situation in Sarajevo was diametrically opposed to today. Urbanism was part of the state apparatus and played a constitutive role in planning the development of the modern socialist society, a key role in aligning the social, economic and spatial determinants of the overall development strategy, and the citizens had confidence in scientific and professional institutions and city governing bodies. Subsequently, as a result of socio-political and economic changes – the crisis and the collapse of socialism, urban and architectural creativity fell into a crisis from which, almost 30 years later, it has not recovered. Thus, today, the spatial development strategy of Sarajevo, reduced to a mere sum of separate articulations outside the context of the immediate and wider environment and the identified needs of the city and its citizens, is based on planning documents that are drafted, adopted and enacted in accordance with the wishes of new development entities – private investors and short-term economic profit of all actors involved in this process. Namely, it turned out that investors decide in accordance with their interests, not the profession – urban planners and architects, as well as the public – citizens, and that politicians ultimately implement these interests in reality/construction. The result is dispersion, a condition that describes the locations of new residential developments in Sarajevo, a manifestation of the force of self-organization in space management, and is created in response to only one set criterion – an increase in economic profits. At the same time, the participation of citizens in public discourse has been rendered meaningless in deciding what, when, where and how it will be built. The reason is that the basic democratic tool, guaranteed by law – the comments made during the public debate, which must be considered by the planners and
planners, are (almost) completely ignored and not responded to. As a result, citizens have lost confidence in scientific and professional institutions and city governing bodies.

From this segment of comparative analysis, it can be seen that the spatial development planning of Sarajevo in the socialist societal system was characterized by established planning procedures and their adherence, which today is, in a transitional society, an (almost) forgotten category. Recognizing the positive experiences of the previous period in the area of making key decisions on managing the entire urban space and considering the current situation, we realized that the crucial moment occurred in the City of Sarajevo, in which (if it is not too late) it is necessary to return to compliance with previously established relevant procedures and positioning entities in the hierarchy of those who decide on city transformations. This means returning to the appreciation of the needs of the city and its citizens, not just the particular investor appetites that began to manifest after the disappearance of the "general social interest". Also, today there is a lack of a complete theoretical (scientific and professional) as well as practical (that of urban space users) reflection of development problems. While it is clear that barely public discourse can hardly come up with practically viable solutions, even in a pragmatic way, public debate on key urban development issues is indeed meaningful, in fact necessary. Also, the process of returning it is not easy, because it enters into fundamental power relations where deciding on priorities in the sphere of construction (especially of new residential settlements) is interestingly motivated and as a rule opposed, and it can also open new questions. However, the essence of public discourse lies in legitimizing problematic priorities, which is decisive for resolving them or at least reducing complexity, as well as finding ways to overcome the crisis. Because when everyone interested in the process of deciding on the city's transformations is involved in the conversation, then the changes will be for the better.

Viewed from the aspect of urban matrix compositions and overall design characteristics of Sarajevo residential settlements, comparative analysis showed that, in both observed periods, they were distinguished by the creation of separate fragments of spatial articulations, by repeating the same or similar matrix pattern, by stacking objects of almost the same aesthetic statements. However, once recognized, the deficiencies of one solution used to serve as a corrective for the next one, that is, the logic was that mistakes made in an already built housing estate were not repeated in the one planned for construction, i.e. to look for a solution that will bring satisfaction to the lives of both the individual and the community as a whole. Today's housing estates are separate microcosms, embedded in the fate of neglected planning, favouring private investment and the absence of the public from the decision-making process of construction. Mistakes are not thought of, questions of contextuality are not raised, the consequences of the manner of "filling" "empty" spaces on the city and on the human are not considered. Therefore, in order to overcome the current situation, it is necessary to raise awareness of the positive implications of previous experiences in the field of spatial and spatial composition of settlements and, knowing that the gaps have already been made, should proclaim changes and abandonment of bad current practice and urban policy, and for the benefit of everyone.

Unlike those in socialist societal order, residential settlements today are conceived as a simplified function whereby the original contents of housing are placed in buildings, and man is reduced to only a few elementary acts: eat, sleep, reproduce. In doing so, it is forgotten that housing is a concrete, multifunctional and trans-functional practice in which one must relate simultaneously to one's environment and one's own nature. In this sense, the secured spatial conditions for the placement of central functions in the domain of social infrastructure, settlements from the socialist period, in addition to material ones, satisfied the spiritual needs of its inhabitants. Today, ad hoc content planning and spatial design stems from a non-studied program of settlement needs and produces a non-living environment. Insufficient (and inappropriately) used parterres of facilities with inadequate micro locations of certain functions, lack of an urban parterre, the unattractiveness of settlements to stay in and beyond the time of satisfying (mere) existential needs, confirm that program design must have its real
role and should no longer be a side job designers and investors, but the focus of interest of the profession – urban planners and architects, which will eliminate these problems. Unfortunately, this is only feasible for new settlements to be built in the future. At this point, in the already generated physical structure of the new Sarajevo residential settlements, it is possible to reprogram the building parterres and adapt them to social infrastructure content (with or instead of the only commercial content currently represented), as well as to open up an urban parterre by removing parked vehicles in it, envisaged premises (by adjusting the cost of their possession to the economic opportunities of the residents of the settlement). This requires the cooperation of city services, the profession, investors and the public, which is hard to expect. However, changing the minds of all actors involved in the process can make it possible to recognize the general public interest in private initiatives.

Summarizing the results obtained here leads us to finally grasp and understand the implications of urban policies on patterns of social practices, rules and customs observed in "socialist" and "transitional" residential settlements. In both cases, we begin by emphasizing the need to recognize the local framework of spatial expressiveness as a reference place that an individual experiences and calls his or her own. The place is created by the inhabitants of individual settlements who, by living practices visible in the physical space of life, manifest specific \textit{genus loci}, manufactured and shaped symbolism of living in a particular public space. This leads to the conceptualisation of the city as a whole of symbolic character, composed of territorialized (more or less clearly differentiated) parts, specialized according to their social profile. Their diversity is reflected in the individual experience of each individual, their attachment to place, memories and idealizations, in names. In this sense, the basic assumption is that urban morphology, i.e. materialized structure, organized spatial form, is the primary construct of a place and can stimulate and discourage the emergence and development of the urban public in its active and symbolic context. Thus, Sarajevo's "socialist" residential settlements, with their spatial-design features and urban policies guided by the well-being of all, influenced the possibility of creating a personalized substance of the individual's flow of life experience within the local community, and their names are still synonymous with specific symbolic constructions of the place. These places possess identity and character, each for themselves, and are the sum of special characteristics that are deposited and structured over time. They are sensitive to change and characterized by the stability and permanence of real and mental images. Their social role is great, as they help regular users create contextual mental maps, and occasionally identify with the space as a whole or in particular with some detail. On the other hand, Sarajevo's "transitional" residential settlements are produced by the forces of design imposed by contemporary urban policy, developed by private capital and with the attributes of elitist landless power. With the high degree of their spatial-shape similarities and (almost) no formed public spaces, real life in these settlements is transformed into a micro-world that the individual draws into his personal space and there simulates the public that suits him. The result is the disappearance of spontaneity and authenticity in the ever-present direct social interactions. These settlements are out of place. They are characterized by generalized non-specificity, isolation from the context of the immediate and wider urban environment, the rigidity of aesthetic statements. Non-places or standardized spaces are deeply different from places or reflective spaces that direct us to think, give impetus, and in which we find meaning. As they demolish the notion of place, these settlements are nameless settlements. And they will remain so until we explain them again.

4. Conclusions
Starting from the thesis that construction is always deeply connected with the ideological commitments of a certain society, which means with the understanding of the function of space and the place of man in it, the aim of this paper was to seek the answer to the question: Is it really true that the construction of Sarajevo's new settlements cannot be adapted to anything other than current urban policy? Or else: Is their fate such that they will be permanently determined by the attribute of a settlement without a name? To this end, we conducted a comparative analysis of the planning, design and construction of settlements in the socialist societal system and these current, transitional, and concluded that the answer need not
be yes, but that this requires some renunciation of today's construction practices. Namely, accepting and suggesting the use of positive experiences of pre-transition urban-architectural creativity today, we concluded that adherence to the relevant procedures in deciding on urban space management, determining positions in the hierarchy of subjects involved in this process, revitalizing public discourse, raising awareness of the logic of non-repetition of spatial errors and creating a general public interest in private investment together paves the way to the idea that Sarajevo's new settlements can be re-explained.
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