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Abstract
All the countries in the world are bound by the goals of Agenda 2030, which include ensuring open, secure, resilient and sustainable cities and human settlements. These goals play an important role in promoting social progress. The key characteristic of progressive cities should be their openness to the general public and equal accessibility for everyone regardless of their gender, race, age, or social status, and under the same conditions. Public buildings with their associated public spaces form an integral part of the city. For public buildings to be truly public these should follow the same principles as the open city. And it is architecture that has the power to design such truly public buildings. Unfortunately, Slovenia has not yet recognized that it could constitute itself as a modern state through the architecture of public buildings.

Keywords: state, values of social progress, public building

This article deals with the topical issues of the architecture of public buildings in Slovenia after 1991 viewed through the social values of progress. The introductory presentation of the issues and key terms (state, social values of progress, public building) is followed by an attempt to find the answer to the question which principles of the modern state should public buildings reflect and enforce, using the listed references (the primary reference being an essay by Richard Sennett entitled The Open City). Based on the findings, a critical analysis of selected public buildings (two of them not yet built) is then made. The main focus of the analysis is the issue of openness of public buildings. The working hypothesis is that public buildings today are not really designed as open buildings, which begs the question whether they are truly public.

Public buildings should be designed for people (citizens) who need them as spaces in which they can protect their interests, meet their needs, and feel good. The key characteristic of public buildings should be openness to the general public and accessibility for everyone. In Slovenia, there are only few public buildings that convey the values the state is said to represent (modernity, democracy, openness, integrity). The top-level state bodies reside in buildings from the Austro-Hungarian era, the appearance and inaccessibility of which still makes them awe-inspiring. Apart from a few rare
exceptions Slovenia has not built any prominent public buildings since its declaration of independence. It seems that Slovenia has not yet recognized that it could constitute itself as a modern state through the architecture of public buildings.

In the narrow sense of the word "state" is defined as the organization of public authorities in a given society regardless of its development level or form. Politics is striving for the common welfare and security within an appropriate social organization. If politics is interpreted mainly as directing society towards specific goals, then the state is the most efficient means of achieving that (Boundless, 2016). All countries in the world are bound by the goals of Agenda 2030 (UN, 2015) which puts forward a balanced integration of three dimensions of sustainable development: economic, social and environmental. These goals are of special importance because they promote the values of social progress.

The Social Progress Index (SPI)\(^1\) defines social progress as the capacity of a society to meet the basic human needs of its citizens, establish the building blocks that enable citizens and communities to enhance and sustain the quality of their lives, and create the conditions in which everyone can reach their full potential (Deloitte, 2016).

Slovenia has been a sovereign state for 26 years. According to Jure Gašparič (2016), historians call the period in Slovenian history after 1990 "transition", which means that it is considered a period of change. After 1990 the state with all of its systems and subsystems had to be built, numerous regulations had to be modified, new institutions had to be established, and market economy had to be introduced. Transition implies a great change which is not only an institutional and systemic one, but a social one as well.

Sociologically speaking, a social change is any major and visible change in patterns of social conduct and in relationships among individuals, groups, and societies. This also entails a change in values, norms, social symbols, and other cultural products. From the very beginning of the Modern Era progress has been perceived as a law of nature and as a positive value. The social and political progress reflected in the values of freedom, democracy, and equality is one of the dimensions of progress (others being scientific, technological and material progress) (cf. Mirjam Počkar et al., 2010).

It is not only in Slovenia and other transitional countries that changes are taking place, but also in the so-called developed countries where there is a long tradition of the democratic order and the capitalist economic system. In reference to social changes, this refers to the increased civil society participation as a response to the value crisis over the last 20 years (as a consequence of the growing centralization of power), and at the same time to the economization of the social in the last decades of the 20th century.

According to Boundless (2016), in the classical thought, the state was identified with both political society and civil society as a form of political community. In the modern thought, the nation state as a political society is distinguished from civil society as a form of economic society. Civil society is the arena outside family, the state and market where citizens come together to fulfil their common interests. Civil society is about moving towards the so-called open society, such as the Baukultur "movement" in the field of construction and architecture in Germany.

The question "what is a public building in the context of architecture" has also had different answers over time with the change in social and other circumstances. Terminology was changing as well. According to Leon Battista Alberti (2007) public buildings include: a city wall, a city gate, a road (a river, a canal), a drain, a bridge, a port; in addition to that, spacious squares used for a variety of purposes, as needed, form an essential integral part of cities. Alberti does not consider shrines,

---

\(^1\) The Social Progress Index (SPI) is a framework used to measure social progress in individual countries at the global level, in which indices measuring the social needs of citizens are set alongside economic performance (the GDP growth rate). It turned out that the GDP growth data alone did not provide sufficient data for a comprehensive monitoring of human and social progress in the 21st century at the global level.
temples, courthouses, theatres and other similar buildings as truly public because these are the domain of specific social groups, such as priests and civil servants.

Modern definitions of a public building can be found in English dictionaries, e.g. in *English Oxford Living Dictionaries* (2017): "A building used by the public for any purpose, such as assembly, education, entertainment, or worship." A similar definition can be found in *Collins English Dictionary* (2017) (the only difference is that it also mentions the owner): "A building that belongs to a town or state, and is used by the public." *Intense Energy Efficiency* (2009) on the other hand provides a more detailed definition: "The building is occupied by public authorities or provides public services to a large number of persons. It is frequently visited by members of the general public, e.g. administration buildings, schools, hospitals and buildings for sports. Public funding is used for its maintenance." In dictionaries in other languages, other definitions can be found, while there does not seem to be any definitions of a public building in sources and references in the Slovenian language.

In Slovenian legislation (Construction Act (ZGO-1), Article 2), the terms "building in public use" or "non-residential building intended for public use" correspond to the term "public building". A building in public use is defined as a building which is available for use to everyone under the same conditions, and which in terms of use can be categorized as a public space or a non-residential building intended for public use. In the Decree on the introduction and application of uniform classification of facilities and on the designation of facilities of national importance (CC-SI) buildings are named and classified by purpose; thus public administration buildings, for example, are classified as business and administration buildings, museums and libraries as buildings for education and scientific research, and health care buildings as buildings of general social importance. Despite this different classification, all of the above-mentioned buildings are considered public buildings for the purposes of this article. This is a term widely used in practice both in Slovenia and in other countries.

When analysing public buildings it should not be forgotten that these should be analysed in the context of the city. Public buildings are inseparably connected with the city, as these represent one of its most vital parts. Public buildings (which should each have sufficient associated public space) form the framework of the city - the city can hardly exist and function without them.

**Public buildings and values of social progress**

In the introduction, sustainable goals the international community has committed to have been mentioned. In connection with public buildings (inseparably connected to the city), the topic dealt with in the article, two interconnected goals concerning the development of cities and institutions (based in public buildings) should be pointed out: (1) to ensure open, secure, resilient and sustainable cities and human settlements, and (2) to develop efficient, accountable and transparent institutions at all levels. In the conditions of the traditional state, the building of cities is planned, managed hierarchically from top to bottom, technologically perfected, carried out without the participation of citizens, which Sennett (2013) calls the closed principle, and concludes that currently cities are built in this way, i.e. as closed systems. Already in his critique of capitalism, Sennett (2008) states that "consumers–spectators–citizens" are captives of political marketing performances, and actively take part in their own passivization instead of in progressive politics (where citizens join forces for a common cause), which is the result of two tendencies in the last decades of the 20th century: heightened individualism and the economization of the social.

In his text, Sennett (2013) discusses modern aspects of building cities (and their character), and explains the difference between the closed and open systems. He presents the open system which belongs to the people as the opposite of the closed system (over-determined, balanced, integrated, linear) which belongs to the masters. In doing so, he references Jane Jacobs (2009) who is an
advocate for a dense, dynamic city, in which the social ties between individuals are formed during encounters in the street. According to Sennett, a well-designed open city has ambiguous edges, an incomplete form, and an unresolved narrative. He supports his claims with examples from natural sciences, visual arts, and literature combining them with his own experience in urban and public building planning. Ambiguous edges (he compares them to a cell membrane, which is at the same time porous and resistant) enable an exchange between communities of different race, ethnicity or class. The exchange is diminishing because modern residential areas are gated communities closed off with impassable walls, fences etc., within which individual communities are getting stronger in isolation without the possibility of mutual occasional commercial, physical contacts. The division of the modern city into functional isolated zones for work, commerce, family, and the public realm, which is adapted to the streams of traffic is also problematic. A number of examples of this can be found also in Slovenia, and among the public buildings as well. Schools, for example, are turning into ghettos in city centres, zones closed off with impassable fences that enclose also the grounds with sports grounds, which could otherwise be accessible to and used by all inhabitants in the afternoons (e.g. Majda Vrhovnik Primary School in the centre of Ljubljana). The impassable part of Koper is a closed off area of the prison, which has been inadequately placed into the commercial area of the city. In the centre of Ljubljana, the capital of Slovenia, the Parliament building (the house of democracy) is virtually inaccessible to the public; it is only very rarely open to the general public and even then in a very limited way. The appearance of the building itself conveys the sense of inaccessibility, unlike the new Scottish Parliament building which is a good example of a modern open public building with its associated public space (both in terms of architecture and in terms of public accessibility). The complex of the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Slovenia in Ljubljana is another example of a functional isolated zone in the city centre.

According to Sennett, the incomplete form is a creative credo. He illustrates it with Wallace's phrase "engineering of the fragment" and Eisenman's term "light architecture", both of which refer to an architecture planned in such a way that it can be added to, and more importantly, modified in the course of time as the needs of users change. In modern buildings, it is almost impossible to implement this principle (this would require enormous investments), especially because they have complex infrastructures, and it is hard to make this infrastructure adapt to new purposes. Despite that, Sennett believes that it is possible to apply this principle in constructing the physical world (although this might not yet seem conceivable at the moment) in the same way as dialogue helps create good social relationships (it enables complex communication transcending clarity, and it is the basic principle of the good conduct of social life in general). The above-mentioned principle seems especially important to him for ensuring sustainability (i.e. making the most out of buildings) since it would facilitate changes in purpose or size of buildings in more ways than one. In this way it would be easier to adapt public buildings (typical examples of which are schools, courthouses, business buildings used by ministries) to changing needs mainly due to reorganization following the introduction of new programmes, changes in legislation etc.

Sennett discusses unresolved narrative in the context of a literary form. Unresolved narrative is the opposite of a linear narrative of the sentimental novel where everything is predictable, including the end. He compares the linear narrative to planning a closed city where every last detail is predetermined (as required by law, e.g. in Britain). He adds that real life is often not a linear narrative, and in the actual processes the compulsive clarity is rarely practical, for this reason the open-city planning should be non-linear; it should be a process of real-time exploration of unforeseen discoveries, a process of discovering and solving problems, in the same way as in novels. Sennett mentions his own experience planning renovations of schools and outpatient clinics together with clients through democratic coordination, and points out that planners should use common sense instead of succumbing to frustration and neurosis. In Slovenia, planners encounter similar problems as those in Britain because plans are required to be very specific and predetermined to the last detail. The result is construction of useless buildings which need modification soon after the users move in, or buildings for which the investment cost increases
significantly during the construction (two examples of such public buildings are the Paediatric Clinic and the Institute of Oncology, both in Ljubljana).

In summary, Sennett states that good modern city planning requires challenging unthinking assumptions made about urban life, assumptions favouring closure, and embrace febrile ideas of living together, those stimulations of differences, visual and social, which produce openness. At the same time it is crucial that processes are managed from bottom up, and that the city belongs to the people, who react directly, express their needs, and are sensitive to the reality they experience up close every day. Kenneth Frampton (1979) also addresses these topics. Frampton proposes a vision sensitive to tectonics, ecology and tactile dimensions which can create sensitivity and physical response, which is more appropriate than the one found today in the centres of hegemonic power. In his vision, human sensitivity in contact with reality is in marked contrast with the dominance of those in the ruling position, who make decisions based on the argument of power and are alienated from the real life. In his treatise on the social characteristics, reasons and consequences of economic activity at the end of the 20th century and at the beginning of the 21st century Sennett (2008) states that “what people need the most is mental and emotional support; they need values with which they can evaluate whether changes in the area of work, privileges and power are worth the effort. In short, they need culture.” So, humans with their needs, mainly the need for mutual trust and cooperation, are at the forefront.

The values of social progress may gain ground in the real life of a city provided the system of the functioning of the city and the relations within it are as open as possible. These values include the freedom of movement and communication between everyone regardless of their race, ethnicity or class, free and equal participation in the city planning and managing processes, sustainable development, and the sustainability of cities (that live, are not dying). In my opinion, the principles of the open city should resemble those of open public buildings (as the vital parts of the city), and consequently those of the open public institutions. Public buildings are materialized institutions, while institutions being the state by extension should see to the promotion of the values of social progress in society in an efficient, responsible and transparent manner. The state should be setting an example when it comes to implementing the values of social progress through modern public buildings and institutions (which should be as open as possible). Both public institutions and public buildings carry a social connotation.

In his speech addressed to the naturalized citizens of the USA, Louis Kahn (1971) talks about the important social role of institutions. He believes that institutions represent a modus operandi arising from the so-called human agreement. People in interaction is that which makes functioning of institutions possible. Kahn also underlines the importance of the feeling of freedom, which gives people the strength and inspiration to engage in the so-called human agreement.

It can be claimed that public buildings being analogous to the open public space if viewed in the context of progressive values of openness and interaction enable people to take part in the public realm, which Hannah Arendt writes about (1996). Arendt defines the public realm as a sphere of political activity, and as a sphere that represents the basis for the reality of the private realm of an individual. The feelings and thoughts of an individual become reality only when these are faced with the public, when these are articulated. It is with the presence of others who understand something in the same way as we do that the world and we ourselves become real. The French Marxist Henri Lefebvre (2013) also discusses the social connotation of space, and his thesis is that the mode of production governs and produces – simultaneously with certain social relationships – its own space.

---

2 These are the consequences of the so-called new capitalism - unlike classical capitalism that provided workers with a relatively dependable employment, and consequently ensured general stability, modern corporations with their diffusion practices are destroying the social capital and mutual trust, and give rise to uncertainty, which is further intensified by the feeling of obsolescence due to the modernization of production.
(and its own time). Due to the fact that space is produced, the focus of reflection should be shifted from the space itself to the social production of space, which in Lefebvre’s view is essential for the reproduction of society and capitalism itself. Lefebvre goes even further when he states that social relationships exist only in space, in other words, that the basis for social relationships is entirely spatial. From the above-mentioned it is safe to postulate that it is politics that creates public space. To this assumption, Frampton (1979) adds that the representative role of architecture should always depend on the political establishment of public space. I agree with this claim and propose that it be used as a starting point for further discussion. It can also serve as an introduction to the analysis presented below, in which the conclusions from the previous section will be verified against a few examples of public buildings.

**Analysis of examples of major investments in public buildings**

In Slovenia, following its declaration of independence, between 1991 and 2016 new public buildings were built the construction of which was financed by the state (entirely or partially funded by the EU), such as the facilities for the Ministry of Education, Science and Sport, the Ministry of Defence, the Grosuplje Administration Centre the Jesenice Administration Centre, the Gornja Radgona Police Station, and the Ljubljana Moste Police Station. According to CC-SI, the above-mentioned public buildings are classified as business and administration buildings. In the category of business and administration buildings, also a few reconstructions and renovations of existing public buildings were carried out, for example of the facilities for the Government, the Ministry of Foreign Affairs, the Ministry of Culture, the Cerknica Administration Centre, the Novo mesto Administration Centre, and the Cerknica District Court. In Ljubljana, a new asylum centre was built, which is classified as a residential building for special social groups according to CC-SI. In the category of buildings of general social importance, new buildings were built, such as the Institute of Oncology, the Paediatric Clinic, the Faculty of Computer and Information Science, the Faculty of Chemistry and Chemical Technology, the Biotechnical Faculty (all of them in Ljubljana), the Faculty of Medicine and the Faculty of Electric Engineering and Computer Science (both in Maribor), the College of Nursing in Celje; and a few reconstructions were carried out, for example of the Opera House in Ljubljana. In the category of other non-residential buildings, new buildings were built, such as the Brdo Congress Centre, the Koper prison, and the Dob prison. During this time preparation activities for two new buildings were carried out over several years: the Courthouse in Ljubljana and the National and University Library (NUK 2). For the latter (NUK 2), the design phase was completed, while for the former (the court), the project documentation phase was finished.

Now follows a presentation of a selection of the above-mentioned construction projects emphasizing the aspects referring to the decision-making process, the state-building component (from the viewpoint of progressive values), and the quality of the architecture. These include three examples of new buildings, one example of a reconstruction, and two examples of buildings not yet built, but with the project documentation prepared and a planning permission obtained. These examples have been selected because of the availability of their documentation and data, and because their characteristics illustrate the main issues as discussed in this article in connection with public buildings.

The Brdo Congress Centre (Photo 1) was built for the Slovenian EU presidency in 2008 on the grounds of the Brdo Estate near Kranj used for the state protocol services. The construction project was managed by JGZ Brdo - State Protocol Services of the Republic of Slovenia. The government adopted a resolution which allowed the best proposal to be selected without a public competition (at the time, a public competition was already stipulated by law). The architect (Bevk-Perovič arhitekti: Matija Bevk, Vasa Perović, Andrej Ukmar) and the contractor were chosen with one single call for public tenders. The whole construction project from the decision to build it to the issuing the planning permission took approximately 2 and a half years (2005-2007). During this time the
architect was changed. From the architectural point of view, the building has a modern design and reflects the state-building values, the values of sustainable development and openness. The quality of decisions made could be put into question, specifically with the regard to the choice of the location and the purpose of the building (the level of usefulness and utilization) after the EU presidency, as well as a relatively short time allocated to the project (and how this affected the quality of the project as a whole).

The decision to build a new paediatric clinic in Ljubljana (Photo 2) was made because the existing building was no longer adequate (in terms of the functionality and size of the building, as well as in terms of the condition of the equipment, elements and parts of the building). The construction project was managed first by the Institution for New Paediatric Clinic, and during the final four years by the Ministry of Health of the Republic of Slovenia. The architect (Biro 71: Jurij Princes) was selected in a public, anonymous architecture and spatial competition. The first activities began in 1994, the public competition and the laying of the cornerstone were carried out in 1998, and the opening took place in 2009. It is questionable whether the design of the building is modern enough in terms of openness, transparency and sufficient associated public space. The quality of decision-making, the long duration of the project and how this affected the quality of the project are also in question.
The new prison in Koper (Photo 3) was built because the existing buildings had been denationalized. The construction project was managed by the Administration for the Enforcement of Penal Sanctions (a body affiliated to the Ministry of Justice of the Republic of Slovenia). The architect (PROJEKT MR inženiring: Petar Vekić, Miha Milič) was selected with a call for public tenders (a public competition was not yet stipulated by law). The whole construction project from the decision to build it to obtaining the usage permit took approximately 6 years (1998-2004). The project parameters were changing during planning. The problematic aspect of the prison complex is mainly its spatial placement because the prison is a closed area, an impassable barrier in the city, and yet it has been erected directly in front of the city commercial centre. The architecture of the building itself does not reflect the values of progress in terms of openness and sustainability either, which, at first sight, might be in contradiction with its purpose; however, examples from other countries prove (e.g. the Loeben prison in Austria) that it is possible to build prisons following the same modern principles as with other public buildings, as long as the special security requirements are taken into account.
The two buildings in the Mladika Complex renovated in 2000 was a construction project managed by the Ministry of Foreign Affairs of the Republic of Slovenia. The Mladika building (Photo 4), which was originally a girls' lyceum (today the Ministry of Foreign Affairs is based there), was designed by the architect Maks Fabiani in 1906. For Fabiani, the project was both a challenge and an opportunity to shine since the land allocated to the building was situated along the streets for which he had foreseen the construction of representative city buildings in his urban plan. The building marks the phase in the development of Fabiani's architecture in which he moved away from the Vienna Secession styles and started relying on the local Ljubljana traditions. The boarding house designed by the architect Ciril Metod Koch was built right at the edge of the Tivoli Park. This renovation project presented a dilemma between expressing the modern state through architecture and making compromises to provide facilities using the available building stock. As already mentioned, the problem is that the Mladika Complex is a closed off functional zone in the city centre. On the other hand, the renovation which preserves quality building heritage and tradition is definitely an added value.
The beginning of the NUK 2 project (Photo 5) goes back to before 1990, before Slovenia declared its independence. Its location has stayed the same all this time, that is why the year the project activities started on the provided land is considered the first year of the project. In the public competition in 1989, the proposal of the architect Marko Mušič was selected as the best one. Based on his proposal, the plan was then made and the planning permission obtained. The Building of the University Library in Ljubljana Act (Official Gazette of the Republic of Slovenia, No. 70/94) that was passed in 1994 is still in force, but it is no longer relevant because the prescribed deadline (1998) for the completion of the project is already past due. For some time the building site was turned into an archaeological dig. In 2008, a contract was signed for an amendment to the prepared project documentation; the contract was later cancelled. In 2012, a new project proposal (Bekk-Perovič arhitekti) was selected in an international competition. Due to a lack of funding, the construction project is currently stopped (the project is managed by the Ministry of Education, Science and Sport). This example gives rise mainly to questions in connection with making decisions and taking responsibility for them (including choosing the location where there are important archaeological finds). Otherwise this is a promising project, and from the point of view of architecture, a project of quality (the values of social progress have been incorporated).
The not-yet-built project of the New Courthouse in Ljubljana has had a similar fate (Photo 6). It has been going on for over 20 years and has undergone numerous changes in location, plans and schedule. The first few years were spent searching for and deciding on a possible location. The latest major revival of the project took place between 2006 and 2010. The land on a new location was acquired, and a project proposal (by Matjaž Bolčina, Vojteh Ravnikar, Uroš Rustja, Robert Potokar) was selected in a public competition. In 2008, the Committee for Monitoring the Construction of the New Courthouse in Ljubljana was founded. Later on the project documentation was prepared and a planning permission obtained, but then the activities faded out again. The problem with this construction project is that the programme in the building is not fully specified, and also, its location does not meet the modern architectural criteria, or as Tadej Glažar (2008) put it: "We cannot speak in more detail about the programme, which the participants should accommodate into strictly determined volumes, because during the competition the conditions were altered by adding guidelines allowing a part of the public programme to be situated in the basement floor. Unfortunately, no thought was given to open space, the significance of such a building for the city, the state, and above all, for its users. The alternative proposal offers a solution to the issue of the lack of open public space needed by the courthouse."
None of the three analysed new buildings fully meets the criteria set out in the article; none of them has an appropriate location or spatial placement (in the city), and none of them is connected with the public space or open towards it. The same can be said about the renovation of the Mladika Secession building. In addition, this project does not meet the criteria of the values of progress in terms of openness. NUK 2 is the only not-yet-built building of the two dealt with in this article that meets the criteria of modernity, openness, and sufficient associated public space; however, its completion is uncertain because its location is situated on an important archaeological site. One of the analysed new buildings, i.e. the Koper prison, cannot be considered a typical public building - which should be as open to the public as possible - due to its purpose and special security requirements; however, this example offers the opportunity to think about whether it is reasonable to place such buildings or complexes in the city centres.
In the period after its declaration of independence, Slovenia has also completed a few construction projects that resulted in quality public buildings (buildings that reflect the values of modernity and progress), such as the international award-winning addition to the building of the Faculty of Mathematics and Physics in Ljubljana (Photo 7) built in 2006 and planned by Bevk-Perovič arhitekti; but this is just an exception that proves the rule.

**Conclusion**

The analysis shows that the hypothesis from the beginning of the article can be confirmed. Slovenia has not yet recognized that it could constitute itself as a modern state through the architecture of public buildings. Finding reasons why Slovenia has not been capable of building prominent public buildings was not the purpose of this article. Perhaps one of the reasons might be that architecture is not recognized as having an important role in the decision-making process.

The focus of the article was the social aspects of the modern state, especially those values of social progress that public buildings should reflect, in particular the value of openness, so that the citizens could freely fulfill their interests, meet their needs, and exchange their ideas, opinions, and experience, regardless of their gender, race, age, or social status, and under the same conditions.

The key conclusion is that public buildings, which should each have sufficient associated public space, are an integral part of the city, and should as such follow the same principles that apply to the open (democratic) city. It could also be claimed that the same principles that apply to modern society in general should apply to modern public buildings, with the addition that buildings are visible, materialized by means of architecture. It is architecture that has the power to design such truly public buildings.
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