Title: Between Architecture and Cultural Studies : reflections on the Constitution and Devaluation of Urban Public Spaces

Author: Andrzej Bełdowski, Tomasz Burzyński

Citation style: Bełdowski Andrzej, Burzyński Tomasz. (2015). Between Architecture and Cultural Studies : reflections on the Constitution and Devaluation of Urban Public Spaces. W: M. Kowalczyk-Piaseczna, M. Mamet-Michalkiewicz (red.), "Urban amazement" (S. 207-222). Katowice : Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.

Andrzej Bełdowski
SILESIAN UNIVERSITY OF TECHNOLOGY
Tomasz Burzyński
UNIVERSITY OF SILESIA

Between Architecture and Cultural Studies: Reflections on the Constitution and Devaluation of Urban Public Spaces

ABSTRACT: This interdisciplinary paper aims to outline the role of architecture in the societal construction and devaluation of civic public spaces from the perspectives of theoretical architecture, cultural studies, and theory of culture. When perceived in the context of the agency/structure duality, urban public spaces could be seen as societal constructs whose character and identity can be traced to the holistic organisation of architectural forms within a given locale. At the same time, the deflation in the quality of public spaces may be explained by making references to mutually reinforcing processes of spatial commodification and symbolic violence which are both exercised by implanting pure, self-explicable architectural forms into well-entrenched urban spaces.

KEYWORDS: agency, structure, city, public space, architectural theory, cultural studies

Introduction

Urbanised spaces are viewed as landmarks of modernity and modernization, beating hearts of industrial civilization, as well as busy amalgamations of architecture, technology, art, and economy. As opposed to pre-industrial, rural communities, which are founded upon the virtue of "dense sociability"[1] stressing the critical importance of close emotional

---

1   Zygmunt Bauman, "Modernity and Ambivalence," in *Global Culture, Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*, ed. Mike Featherstone (London and New York: Sage Publications, 1997), 151.

ties of familiarity and kinship for the survival of the collectivity, modern cities are being constituted as overtly rationalised spaces inhabited by myriads of Others who have very little in common apart from their shared participation in the socio-economic organism of a metropolis.[2] Hence, both the preservation of civic culture and the long-term existence of city communities depend on the construction of common symbolic spheres that would subsume the multiplicity of heterogeneous denizens within the common horizon of a shared civic identity and resultant action patterns. This role could be fulfilled by urban public spaces which, by combining all-inclusive accessibility and communicative egalitarianism, have paved the way for the rise of communitarian virtues, and have been instrumental in the formation of a distinct civic identity.[3]

The paper aims to discuss the role of architecture in the societal construction and devaluation of civic public spaces from the perspectives of theoretical architecture, cultural studies and theory of culture. When perceived in the context of the agency/structure duality, urban public spaces could be seen as societal constructions *in statu nascendi* whose character and identity can be traced to the holistic organisation of architectural forms within a given locale. At the same time, the deflation in the quality of public spaces may be explained by making references to mutually reinforcing processes of spatial commodification and symbolic violence which are both exercised by implanting pure, self-explicable architectural forms into well-entrenched urban spaces.

---

2   The distinction between the emotional integration of a community (*Gemeinshaft*) and the teleological-rational integration of a society (*Gesellshaft*) has been granted an almost axiomatic status within social theories and cultural studies. See Ferdinand Tönnies, *Community and Association* (London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955).

3   Stéphane Tonnelat, "The Sociology of Urban Public Spaces," in *Territorial Evolution and Planning Solution: Experiences form China and France*, ed. Hongyang Wang, Michel Savy and Guofang Zhai (Paris: Atlantis Press, 2010).

Interpreting Urban Spaces: Agency and Structure

Given the formative legacy of structural-functional methodologies and their focus on abstract, ideal-typical qualities of social and cultural systems,[4] it seems relatively easy to forget that space is an essential element of cultural experiences and cultural practices. Likewise, one is naturally predisposed to perceive spatial characteristics in terms of independent variables, objective coefficients to individual and collective actions which constitute the taken-for-granted *milieu* of our day-to-day activities. Such a reductionist conceptualisation, needless to say, gestures towards a fairly commonsensical notion of space conceived as a "container" of social interactions, as well as accompanying processes of signification and communication:

> […] most forms of social theory have failed to take seriously enough *not only the temporality of social conduct but also its spatial attributes*. At first sight, nothing seems more banal and uninstructive than to assert that social activity occurs in time and in space. But neither time nor space have been incorporated into the center of social theory; rather, they are ordinarily treated more as "environments" in which social conduct is enacted.[5]

The incorporation of spatial considerations into social theory and cultural studies paves the way for a critical recognition that space originates as a product of meaningful social actions and, at the same time, becomes a societal entity *in statu nascendi* that recursively determines both human activities and the quality of social life in general.[6] In this sense, as Henri Lefebvre remarks, "space is a product […] the space thus

---

4   Anthony Giddens, *Central Problems in Social Theory. Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1979).

5   Giddens, *Central Problems*, 202, emphasis in the original.

6   See especially: David Harvey, *The Urban Experience* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988); Edward W. Soja, *Postmodern Geographies. The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory* (London: Verso, 1989); Henri Lefebvre, *The Production of Space* (London: Blackwell, 1991).

produced also serves as a tool of thought and of action […] in addition to being a means of production, it is also a means of control, and hence of domination and power."[7] In other words, having been socially produced, spaces retain the capacity to shape their creators, to recursively determine the direction and rationality of social life.

When perceived as an essential premise of social ontology,[8] the duality of agency and structure becomes constitutive of relationships taking place between spaces as well as actions and related cultural practices. The notion, to cut a long story short, puts special emphasis on the dynamic character of socio-cultural realities which are regarded in terms of iterative processes of action and interpretation (agency) that take place in the determining context of man-made realities—social structures, institutions of culture, and economic organizations—which function as factors facilitating or, on the contrary, restraining undertaken actions (structural determinism).[9] This conceptualization, needless to say, is founded upon the notion of ontological continuity relating acting agents to the functioning of socio-cultural systems and structures:

> […] the levels of structure in operation and of agents in actions will be treated neither as analytically separable nor as mutually reducible. Instead a third, intermediate level will be postulated, and it will be claimed that it represents the only true substance of social reality, the specific social fabric. If we think of any empirical event or phenomenon in a society, anything that is actually happening, is it not always, without exception, a fusion

---

7   Lefebvre, *The Production*, 26.

8   Anthony Giddens, *The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1984).

9   See Tomasz Burzyński, "The Surplus of Structure. Towards the Morphogenetic Approach to Cultural Studies," in *The Surplus of Culture. Sense, Common-sense, Non-sense*, ed. Ewa Borkowska and Tomasz Burzyński (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011); Tomasz Burzyński, "Time and Cultural Practice. Some Methodological Remarks on Temporally-Oriented Analyses in Cultural Studies," in *"Hours like bright sweets in a jar": Time and Temporality in Literature and Culture*, ed. Alicja Bemben and Sonia Front (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014).

> of structures and agents, of operation and action? Show me an agent who is not enmeshed in some structure. Show me a structure which exists apart from individuals. Show me an action which does not participate in societal operation. Show me societal operation not resolving into action. There are neither structureless agents nor agentless structures.[10]

When applied to considerations concerning the constructed character of spaces, the aforementioned conceptualisation paves the way for the notion of interplay between human action and its spatial characteristics. On the one hand, social actions produce meaningful spaces, as it is the case of urban districts. This is, of course, not only to say that cities are being delineated, planned or "manufactured" by myriads of architects and construction specialists. Therefore, urban spaces are not only defined by referring to the notion of urban grid; that is, the "pattern of public space linking the buildings of a settlement, regardless of its degree of geometric regularity."[11] More importantly, the social construction of civic spaces is representative of symbolic actions that provide architectural spaces with their own distinct identities, emblematic orientation points, and other meaningful constructs of culture. On the other hand, however, thus produced spaces bind social actions, render sense to supposedly meaningless practices and may generate consequences that go well beyond their original purposes. This tendency is indicative of, to provide a provisionary example, the purposeful demarcation of industrial (modern) city spaces which tend to include clearly defined and precisely delineated working-class districts (e.g., the case of Nikiszowiec in Katowice). Having been founded as elements of industrialised cities, the sheer spatial organisation of working-class districts reproduces mechanisms of social stratification by means of gathering working masses in pre-defined areas where they enjoy few opportunities to interact and socialise with representatives of other social class

---

10 Piotr Sztompka, *Society in Action. The Theory of Social Becoming* (Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991), 91–92.

11 Ben Hiller, "A Theory of City as an Object: or, How Spatial Laws Mediate the Social Construction of Urban Space," *Urban Design*, no. 7 (2002): 153.

and, consequently, are deprived of significant incentives to alter their class status. In this way, urban spaces actively contribute to the reproduction of working-class culture and may be seen as powerful agents of structural reproduction.

Furthermore, the aforementioned processes are also typical of these architectural forms that gesture to the idea of urban public space which is conceived as a socially all-inclusive locale enabling activities of taking part in daily routines of casual interaction, socialization, and vigilant observations of other citizens.[12] When seen from a perspective of agency/structure interplay, the rise of civic urban spaces is rooted in the structural transformations (i.e. socio-historical and economic changes) that gave rise to modern, industrialized metropolitan areas. By and large, modern cities, as opposed to their pre-modern equivalents, are structured by the principles of cultural multiplicity and heterogeneity, which suggests that a modern metropolis is a busy agglomeration of dissimilar, highly stratified individuals representing a range of walks of life. Although diversity is a feature of civic culture that predates processes of massive industrialization and urbanization, industrial urban spaces are perceived as being inhabited by individuals who relate to one another mainly in the context of production processes, social division of labour, and concomitant mass social processes of conflict and negotiation, such as the class struggle, that come to create the social reality of industrial capitalism.[13] Hence, to refer to Neil Postman's notion of technocracy,[14] one may conclude that modern city is a "technocratic urban space" in so far as it is constituted mainly by the ubiquity of technological systems and their socio-cultural extensions.

Psychologically speaking, modern city dwellers constitute the "lonely crowd"[15] of atomised individuals who enjoy very few common strategies

---

12   Tonnelat, "The Sociology."

13   The distinction refers to Émile Durkheim's formative dichotomy of mechanical and organic solidarity. See Émile Durkheim, *The Division of Labor in Society* (New York: The Free Press, 1997).

14   Neil Postman, *Technopoly. The Surrender of Culture to Technology* (New York: Vintage Books, 1993).

15   David Riesman, *The Lonely Crowd. A Study of Changing American Character* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969).

for bonding and bridging on the basis of pre-existent clusters of cultural attributes, such as dialects, one's cultural heritage, customs and folkways. In this sense, the urban and architectural design of civic public spheres is a response to the rise of mass society conceived as an aggregate of disengaged individuals:

> For the masses are in historical time what a crowd is in space: large quantity of people unable to express themselves as human beings because they are related to one another neither as individuals nor as members of communities—indeed, they are not related to each other at all, but only to something distant, abstract, nonhuman: a football game or bargain sale in the case of the crowd, a system of industrial production, a party or a State in the case of the masses. The mass man is a solitary atom, uniform with and undifferentiated from thousands and millions of other atoms who go and make up "the lonely crowd," as David Riesman well calls American society.[16]

In this sense, the very conceptualisation and design of urban public spaces becomes a product of societal engineering which functions to bind "structure-less" individuals and help them to cope with the unnerving features of civic existence; namely, the unparalleled diversity of its social forms, lack of ontological security on behalf of citizenry, and constant proximity of strangers and Others. Yet, when established, civic public spaces retain their own, innate, agential capacity to generate unforeseen consequences by altering social practices that have been previously bound by them. Being rooted in the well-entrenched figure of the *flaneur*, the phenomenology of public spaces—that is, the societal experience of the public sphere as a distinct area of human experience (the *Lebenswelt*)—is firmly rooted in the principle of "civil inattention"[17]

---

16   Dwight Macdonald, "A Theory of Mass Culture," in *Critical Theory and Popular Culture*, ed. John Storey (London: Prentice Hall, 1998), 32.

17   The civic virtue of "civil inattention" boils down to the "surface character of public order […] individuals exert respectful care in regard to the setting and treat others present with civil inattention." Erving Goffman, *Relations in Public* (London: Penguin, 1972), 385.

which refers to the learnt strategy of turning a blind eye on the myriads of Others participating in the busy hum of big city life.

City spaces, as the methodology of the Chicago School of human ecology teaches us, are being socially constructed in the course of societal processes of conflict and negotiation taking place among classes of people who are differentiated by the virtue of having dissimilar perceptions of economic interests. From this essentially sociological perspective, the urban grid is being constructed on the basis of a historically prevailing pattern of social structure that becomes topographically represented as a distribution of settlements and concomitant architectural forms on the basis of inequalities with respect to income, ethnicity, cultural capital, or class status.[18] Being a tangible expression of social structure, the urban space retains its dynamic character as a chronically discordant site of social mobility, a sphere ruled by the Darwinian principle of the survival of the fittest. At the same time, having been created with reference to spontaneous processes of social stratification (processes of structural determination), stratified urban spaces become incentives to construct architectural symbols of class-ridden identity and social prestige. Hence, when the territory is conquered and claimed, it automatically becomes appropriated by stratified individuals who deploy architectural forms to reinforce and symbolise their class statuses.[19]

Civic Public Spaces. Forms and Functions

Despite their profoundly socio-cultural significance, civic urban spaces constitute aesthetic constructs that are designed and created with reference to a set of historically contingent criteria. In this particular sense, the arrangement of municipal spaces functions to render a sense of continuity and identity to the totality of architectural forms that combine to create a given urban district. Architecture, to put it slightly otherwise, may function as an indispensable element giving rise to the unique

---

18   Martin Blumer, *The Chicago School of Sociology: Institutionalization, Diversity and the Rise of Sociological Research* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984).

19   Keith Macdonald, "Building Respectability." *Sociology* 23, no. 1 (1989).

constitution of civic culture that is perceived as a factor reinforcing ties taking place between individuals and their environment.[20]

Architectural attempts to rationalize upon the demarcation of civic public spaces can be traced as far back as to Marcus Vitruvius Pollio's (commonly known as Vitruvius) reflections upon the interplay of the "subject matter" and the "definition" within an architectural work of art. Whereas the first notion refers to technological aspects of a building or a given area, the latter corresponds to intangible and highly connotative characteristics that come together to create the symbolic and aesthetic "aura" of a given building, settlement or a chosen locale.[21] Vitruvius's conceptualisation is generally perceived as a theoretical development paving the way for perhaps the most substantial binary opposition in the history of architecture; namely, the formative interplay between form and function. Determining as it may be, the interplay of form and function was prized mostly by early modern architects who regarded the unity of form and function in terms of their penchant for order and transparency:

> Whether it be the sweeping eagle in his flight, or the open apple-blossom, the toiling work-horse, the blithe swan, the branching oak, the winding stream at its base, the drifting clouds, over all the coursing sun, form ever follows function, and this is the law. Where function does not change, form does not change. The granite rocks, the ever-brooding hills, remain for ages; the lightning lives, comes into shape, and dies, in a twinkling. It is the pervading law of all things organic and inorganic, of all things physical and metaphysical, of all things human and all things superhuman, of all true manifestations of the head, of the heart, of the soul, that the life is recognizable in its expression, that form ever follows function. *This is the law.*[22]

---

20 Steen Eiler Rasmussen, *Odczuwanie architektury* (Kraków: Wydawnictwo Karakter, 2015).

21 Witruwiusz, *O architekturze. Ksiąg X* (Warszawa: Pruszyński i S-ka, 1999).

22 Luis Sullivan, "The Tall Office Building Artistically Considered." *Lippincott's Magazine*, March 1896, 408, emphasis in the original.

Despite its typically modernist connotations, the unity of form and func-
tion—when understood in the most general fashion—constitutes a spe-
cific "architectural discourse," a universal form of narrative that renders
interpretation and understanding of architecture possible. For instance,
architectural harmony, evident in sublime forms of buildings assuming
sacral functions, could be perceived as an associate totality of cultural
determinants (understood as the historical continuity signs, symbols,
norms, and values deployed in the process of design) and civilisational
factors (perceived in terms of linear progress in technology, design, and
economy). In this specific sense, to put it still otherwise, the insepara-
ble character of form and function creates the natural, domesticated
character of sacral architecture. It is, as it were, the shared architectural
modus vivendi that subsumes laypersons' interpretations and an archi-
tect's intention within the shared interpretative horizon of tradition and
its correlates, such as ideologies, religions, cultural heritages.[23]

The historical legacy that gives rise to the quality of architectural
forms may be understood as a convenient example postulating the de-
pendence of architectural and urban planning upon such intangibles
and imponderables as ideologies or traditions. Consequently, the unity
of form and function may be perceived as a historical construct. Archi-
tecture itself is an activity that is profoundly anchored in an architect's
cultural literacy representing his or her ability to draw from the symbolic
lexicon of intertextual references that come to combine cultural heritage.
At the same time, the statement leads to a conclusion that "architecture
is essentially a political and ideological practice that uses its techno-
aesthetic and techno-artistic strategies to participate in the organisa-
tion of individual and collective human life, as well as representing
the symbolic and imaginary field of visibility of a society for itself and
others."[24] Yet, the same postulate was first expressed by Vitruvius who
claimed that the architect is not only a skilful designer of buildings and

---

23   Vladimir Mako, Mirjana Roter Blagojević, and Marta Vukotić Lazar, eds.
Architecture and Ideology (Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing,
2014).

24   Midorag Suvakovic, "General Theory of Ideology and Architecture," in
Architecture and Ideology, 10.

places. Architects face a necessity to become a versatile men of letters; that is, luminaries endowed with a truly interdisciplinary insight into the nature of their profession.

The Devaluation of Civic Public Spaces

The devaluation of public spaces is undoubtedly endowed with a number of interrelated aesthetic, social, and socio-economic determinants, so that it is difficult to extract one major reason responsible for the deflating quality of civic urban spaces nowadays. Yet, one may tentatively indicate two strongly interconnected factors responsible for the devaluation process; namely, the commodification of urban spaces and the substitution of traditional architectural projects with modern ones whose forms are persistently indifferent to ideas and ideologies.

The commodification of civic urban spaces—which is most evident in attempts to "implant" large shopping malls into the living tissue of urban space[25]—disrupts the societal, all-inclusive character of public space and, concurrently, violate the traditional, taken-for-granted aura of a city centre. In this case, and let the centre of Katowice constitute a neat example of the said process, commodification and architectural disorder are linked together by a cause-and-effect relationship: the construction of the shopping space of a large magnitude simply implies the use of (late) modern technological forms that does not fit the surrounding architecture.

The perfectly logical correlation between functionality of a shopping mall and its design forces us to seek for a new criteria of urban space quality, the ones that would go well beyond the interplay of form and function. This postulate, in turn, leads to a deeply holistic perspective on urban spaces, a point of view that wishes to render an utterly organic approach to its subject matter:

> In designing architectural objects I recommend not focusing primarily on the object. Rather one should view them within

---

25   Tonnelat, "The Sociology."

> their environment and perceive them as elements in a much larger context. […] One should focus on structures, on aspects of density and distribution. A building is not a solitaire or molecule. It works out or fails in a larger context, and we should conceive of it as a modulation of the field in which it will be an element.[26]

Consequently, when taken holistically, the aforementioned taken-for-granted character of public spaces is rooted in the evolutionary processes of historical determinism and is preserved, to use Fernand Braudel's terminology, as the *longue durée* of extra-generational temporality.[27]

By implementing alien (or even hostile) architectural forms, the disruption of public spaces is indicative of an assumption suggesting that the popularity of certain locales situated within the urban grid is directly related to the historically-granted, symbolic quality of a given public space. Macadamed spaces of medieval squares are still more frequently trodden than modern city spaces made of reinforced concrete, tarmac, glass, and steel.[28] Phenomenologically speaking, architectural spaces are more appealing when they convey an unambiguous message, a clear-cut and understandable narrative that makes a perfect sense in its ideological (or ideal) context. For the same reasons, people are unwilling to identify themselves with the "pure," geometrical forms of late modern or postmodern architectural projects. The contemporary *flaneur* seems to remain indifferent to pure architectural forms that, being alienated from any plausible ideological (or cultural) claims, have become ideas in themselves. In this specific sense, architecture is being validated by itself: it has ceased to constitute an element of larger interpretative totalities.

When the aforementioned continuity is lost, civic urban spaces become deprived of its natural, taken-for-granted character. Such spaces cannot be "read" as a sphere of domestication and/or security. This

---

26   Wolfgang Welsch, "Spaces for Humans?," in *What is Architecture? Anthology of Texts*, ed. Adam Budak and Jolanta Brach-Czaina (Kraków: Bunkier Sztuki, 2002), 185.

27   Fernand Braudel, *On History* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980).

28   Cf. Leon Krier, *Architektura—wybór czy przeznaczenie?* (Warszawa: Arkady, 2001).

is, in the main, the reason for a long-term failure of late-modernist or postmodern architectural projects that, to refer to Frederic Jameson, "have been a mutation of in the object, unaccompanied as yet by any equivalent mutation in the subject."[29] Consequently, the devaluation of public spaces may be related to their overly and overtly intertextual character, signalling the cacophonic explosion of divergent architectural forms that is commonly preached as "postmodernism."

Conclusions. Architecture, Space, and Cultural Reproduction

Given the role of architecture in the formation of civic identity, one may observe that urban public spaces may function as vehicles and media of collective memory that provide the socially differentiated city dwellers with a sense of continuity and distinctiveness. Contemporary cultural theories postulate that culture is set of constructs which are being constantly reproduced by actions and concomitant acts of interpretation.[30] For instance, the perfect, systemic unity of *langue* would be, at the end of the day, unthinkable without the daily exercise of deploying language in actual acts of symbolic communication (*parole*). Needless to say, the two aspects are totally inseparable: the system of language renders language use possible and, at the same time, is recursively reproduced in the course of communication.

Similar conclusions could be drawn with reference to the role of architecture in preserving civic identities. On the one hand, the formation of civic identity is necessitated by the establishment of bonds that relate citizenry to urban spaces. Yet, concurrently, the bond becomes reinforced by the formal continuity of architectural forms constituting public spheres. It is necessitated by the formation of the seamless urban spaces which become agentially interpreted as domesticated, taken-for-granted, and, consequently, reliable in terms of their bonding function.

---

29   Frederic Jameson, *The Cultural Turn. Selected Writings on the Postmodern, 1983–1998* (London and New York: Verso, 1999), 11.

30   Chris Jenks, ed. "The Analytic Bases of Cultural Reproduction Theory," in *Cultural Reproduction*, (London and New York: Routledge, 1993).

Bibliography

Bauman, Zygmunt. "Modernity and Ambivalence." In *Global Culture, Nationalism, Globalization and Modernity*, edited by Mike Featherstone, 143–170. London and New York: Sage Publications, 1997.

Blumer, Martin. *The Chicago School of Sociology: Institutionalization, Diversity and the Rise of Sociological Research*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1984.

Braudel, Fernand. *On History*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1980.

Burzyński, Tomasz. "The Surplus of Structure. Towards the Morphogenetic Approach to Cultural Studies." In *The Surplus of Culture. Sense, Commonsense, Non-sense*, edited by Ewa Borkowska and Tomasz Burzyński, 223–234. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2011.

Burzyński, Tomasz. "Time and Cultural Practice. Some Methodological Remarks on Temporally-Oriented Analyses in Cultural Studies." In *"Hours like bright sweets in a jar": Time and Temporality in Literature and Culture*, edited by Alicja Bemben and Sonia Front, 3–22. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014.

Durkheim, Émile. *The Division of Labor in Society*. New York: The Free Press, 1997.

Giddens, Anthony. *Central Problems in Social Theory. Action, Structure and Contradiction in Social Analysis*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1979.

Giddens, Anthony. *The Constitution of Society. Outline of the Theory of Structuration*. Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press, 1984.

Goffman, Erving. *Relations in Public*. London: Penguin, 1972.

Harvey, David. *The Urban Experience*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1988.

Hiller, Ben. "A Theory of City as an Object: or, How Spatial Laws Mediate the Social Construction of Urban Space." *Urban Design*, no. 7 (2002): 153–179.

Jameson, Frederic. *The Cultural Turn. Selected Writings on the Postmodern, 1983–1998*. London and New York: Verso, 1999.

Jenks, Chris. "The Analytic Bases of Cultural Reproduction Theory." In *Cultural Reproduction*, edited by Chris Jenks, 1–16. London and New York: Routledge, 1993.

Krier, Leon. *Architektura—wybór czy przeznaczenie?* Warszawa: Arkady, 2001.

Lefebvre, Henri. *The Production of Space*. London: Blackwell, 1991.

Macdonald, Dwight. "A Theory of Mass Culture." In *Critical Theory and Popular Culture*, edited by John Storey. London: Prentice Hall, 1998.

Macdonald, Keith. "Building Respectability." *Sociology* 23, no. 1 (1989): 55–80.

Mako, Validimir, Mirjana Roter Blagojević, and Marta Vukotić Lazar, eds. *Architecture and Ideology*. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014.

Postman, Neil. *Technopoly. The Surrender of Culture to Technology*. New York: Vintage Books, 1993.

Rasmussen, Steen Eiler. *Odczuwanie architektury*. Translated by Barbara Gadomska. Kraków: Wydawnictwo Karakter, 2015.

Riesman, David. *The Lonely Crowd. A Study of Changing American Character*. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1969.

Soja, Edward W. *Postmodern Geographies. The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*. London: Verso, 1989.

Sullivan, Luis. "The Tall Office Building Artistically Considered." *Lippincott's Magazine* (March 1896): 403–417.

Suvakovic, Midorag. "General Theory of Ideology and Architecture." In *Architecture and Ideology*, edited by Vladimir Mako, Mirjana Roter Blagojević, and Marta Vukotić Lazar. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing, 2014.

Sztompka, Piotr. *Society in Action. The Theory of Social Becoming*. Cambridge: Polity Press, 1991.

Tonnelat, Stéphane. "The Sociology of Urban Public Spaces." In *Territorial Evolution and Planning Solution: Experiences form China and France*, edited by Hongyang Wang, Michel Savy, and Guofang Zhai, pp. 1–10. Paris: Atlantis Press, 2010.

Tönnies, Ferdinand. *Community and Association*. London: Routledge and Kegan Paul, 1955.

Welsch, Wolfgang. "Spaces for Humans?" In *What Is Architecture? Anthology of Texts*, edited by Adam Budak, Jolanta Brach-Czaina. Kraków: Bunkier Sztuki, 2002.

Witruwiusz. *O architekturze. Ksiąg X*. Translated by Kazimierz Kumaniecki. Warszawa: Pruszyński i S-ka, 1999.

Andrzej Bełdowski, Tomasz Burzyński

Między architekturą a studiami kulturowymi: refleksje nad kształtowaniem się i dewaluacją miejskich przestrzeni publicznych

STRESZCZENIE

Artykuł stanowi próbę interdyscyplinarnego spojrzenia, łączącego w sobie element teorii architektury oraz badań kulturowych (*cultural studies*), na problematykę kształtowania się i dewaluacji przestrzeni publicznych typowych dla miast współczesnego świata. W tekście przyjęto założenie, że przestrzeń miejska jest takim wytworem procesów konstruowania społecznego, który cechuje zdolność wywierania zwrotnego wpływu na praktyki społeczne i znaczeniotwórcze zachodzące w jej obrębie. Przyjmując założenie o wpływie estetycznie zintegrowanej przestrzeni publicznej miasta na ukształtowanie się tożsamości miejskiej i więzi mieszkańca z miejscem zamieszkania, tekst stanowi przyczynek do zrozumienia dewaluacji przestrzeni publicznej miasta w kategoriach komodyfikacji przestrzeni oraz naruszania równowagi symbolicznej miasta poprzez wprowadzanie bezideowych form architektonicznych, które są pozbawione łączności z estetyką i tradycją kulturową miejsca.

Andrzej Bełdowski, Tomasz Burzyński

Zwischen der Architektur und den Kulturstudien: Reflexionen über Gestaltung und Devaluation der öffentlichen Stadträume

ZUSAMMENFASSUNG

In ihrem Artikel bemühen sich die Verfasser, aus interdisziplinärer Sicht (Theorie der Architektur und Kulturstudien (*cultural studies*)) das Phänomen der Gestaltung und der Devaluation von den für die Städte der heutigen Welt typischen öffentlichen Räumen zu betrachten. Sie haben angenommen, dass der Stadtraum ein solches Gebilde von gesellschaftlichen Prozessen ist, das zum Rückfluss, der in seinem Bereich stattfindenden sozialen und bedeutungsbildenden Praktiken fähig ist. In der Annahme, dass ein ästhetisch integrierter öffentlicher Stadtraum die Formung der urbanen Identität und der Bindung der Einwohner an ihren Wohnort beeinflusst, ist der vorliegende Text ein Beitrag dazu, die Devaluation des öffentlichen Stadtraumes hinsichtlich der Raumtransformationen und der Zuwiderhandlungen gegen symbolisches Gleichgewicht der Stadt wegen der Einführung von ideologiefreien, geschmackslosen und die Kulturtradition des Ortes missachtenden architektonischen Formen, zu verstehen.