THE POSSIBILITIES OF ARCHITECTURAL RESISTANCE

Levan Asabashvili 1397532
Architecture Thinking/Architecture
Final Thesis
Urban Asymmetries Mexico
05/03/2009

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PERSONAL STATEMENT OF MOTIVATION

During my bachelor studies and after the graduation from the (Republic of Georgia) Tbilisi academy of art's faculty of architecture, I have been critical to many realities that my city was facing willingly or unwillingly. But I was looking on the surface of particular problems without ability to put them in a coherent relation to each other and to the rest of the complex political economic and social processes going on in the region. Moreover, through time I am realizing that we are facing even more problems that previously went unnoticed for me, due to my unawareness of the theoretical tools for analyzes of spatial condition and it's shaping forces.

The following research is the product of more than one year (two semesters) study at the Urban Asymmetries studio, at the Delft School of Design of the Delft University of Technology. During the course of study we have been introduced to the general problematique of the urbanization and architecture. The problematique, which ten students of our group found common to the regions, cities and places we are related to, even though we are from very different parts of the world.

Our studio has been trying to understand, theorize and act on the urban conditions produced by the neo-liberal models of planning and production of space. My research addresses the same subject and tries to search for the possible approaches, through the practical and theoretical knowledge that we acquired together as a group.

INTRODUCTION

"The architect then appears as a cog in the wheel of capitalist urbanization, as much constructed by as constructor of that process. (Was this not as true of Haussmann, Cerda, Ebenezer Howard, Le Corbusier, Oscar Niemeyer, as of everyone else?).Yet the architect can (indeed must) desire, think and dream of difference." (D. Harvey 2000, Spaces of Hope, p.237)

Through the history, architecture, urbanism and production of space in general have always been a reflection of the political economic and socio-cultural processes of the society where they occurred. Therefore architects and planners have been consciously or unconsciously related with dominant modes of production and political powers, by executing spatial programs of their clients. Architecture has rarely taken political initiative itself, except of some points in the history, (beginning of the 20th century) when avant-garde political projects and progressive art and architecture movements worked in a close collaboration to imagine different worlds. Today, in the post political condition, the urgent necessity emerges of rethinking the way space is produced and the role of urbanists, planners and architects in the society.

The main aim of my research is to analyze and grasp the complex interrelated processes that shape the man made environment, starting from the city spaces to the architecture of the specific buildings and any spatial manifestation of the human activity. Understanding the complexity of these processes is very important in order to be aware, what are the external conditions from the actual discipline, determining the work of planners and architects, independent from the theoretical debates within the profession. If looked from this perspective, traditional architecture and urban practices, with their isolated disciplinary debate as a primary determination of their professional action appear

of secondary importance. Their position is lacking the overall understanding of the external processes shaping their activity and products. Under this condition, when outside forces are taking total control on the nature of the profession, when it is stripped from any indication of being an intellectual work dedicated to the common good, there appears an urgency of rethinking the practice and its role in the society.

Based on this argument I formulated the main questions that will guide the research and further argumentation of my thesis.

What are the forces determining spatial practice, organization of space and its aesthetics?

How legitimate is spatial practice to be politically concerned?

What is the role of the politically engaged spatial practice in the sociopolitical economic and cultural life of the society?

In the critical analyzes my thesis follows the thought of several authors which I found relevant for my research. Furthermore I build my argument partly based on the same theoretical work and partly on my personal experience acquired before and after working at the studio. The content of the research is also filled with the notes that I have taken since I joined the Urban Asymmetries group. It is composed from the records from the lectures, seminars and discussion, comments from the juries on our design presentations, notes from the reading material and remarks about the main topics that we were dealing during the course. From this perspective research approach of the theoretical part of my thesis can be considered as critical and speculative, while practical part which consists from the experience of working in the studio is empirical.

In the following text the argument will be opened up by the general account of the theoretical tools for understanding the urbanization process, independent of the specific social, political and economic processes occurring in certain time-space. This will be followed by the short introduction of global neo-liberal policies in parallel with the generic urban processes under this economic model and theoretical positions adopted by the wide range of current architecture and planning practices towards this condition. In the third chapter I will argue about the necessity of redefining or rethinking spatial practices; I will define the urban problematique common for the cities world wide under the capitalist development, that I think is urgent to address, and further I will formulate the theoretical nature of progressive spatial practice, through the possible structure, methods and language. The conclusion will include the main argument of the thesis.

GENERAL FRAMEWORK FOR UNDERSTANDING THE CITY

Through the history, generations of thinkers have been trying to understand and theorize the city. There have been different theoretical assumptions, radically opposing each other but through the experience of work done in this direction, it became clear that it is impossible to understand the city by the separate analysis of its different constituent parts, such as physical morphology, programmatic constitution or social form. In the following chapter I want to argue that if one wants to grasp the complexity inherent to the city, the formation of some sort of the vision of the totality or in other words metanarrative is necessary. In my following analyzes and argument I am relying on the Marxist theory of urbanization, which provides broad understanding of the processes shaping the social environment.

The rich material provided by this theoretical knowledge is mainly focused on the analyzes of capitalist urbanization, but with the same theoretical tools it is possible to go beyond this level and try to define more general forces and processes for understanding the production of space, characteristic of the human activity in general and urbanization process in particular, independent of the time and space of its occurrence. My aim is to understand the city not as an assemblage of the unrelated things and processes but as a totality with forms and processes interrelated to each other.

So, what are these general forces shaping our environment? If we start from the history, the earliest forms of the human settlements were the direct cause of the production process, which required living on the fixed places related to the fertile lands or places rich with natural resources. The accumulation of surplus from the production or violent appropriation of wealth from other communities helped emergence of the ruling classes which soon took control on the means of production and military power. With the time the process of accumulation of wealth and population multiplied in space. There were also other factors generating the need of collective living such as collective need for defense etc. These processes produced the first cities. The prevailing modes of production and production relations were main determinants of the political, economic and social processes in these early collective forms of living. If we analyze the geographical positions, their relations to the surroundings and the spatial forms of these urban formations we can clearly see the interrelation of aspects described above. Through the history these aspects became more and more complex involving reorganization of modes of production, altering social formations and power relations of societies, driven by the stem of class struggle and advancement of knowledge. These changes involve changes in the spatial forms and organizations of human habitation as well. Based on this analyzes we can argue that the city is the direct manifestation of the social, political and economic processes of the society where it exists.

Here I won't go into the detail formulation of Social, political and economic aspects. I will describe them more lately, through analyzes of urban processes under the condition of late capitalism. But what needs to be specified here is the nature of space. When we are talking about the space, we are touching complex concept that needs to be properly understood and formulated in order to be useful for application for analytical work. Here I will try to describe its nature through the theoretical work of Professor David Harvey, who has written extensively on this problem. In his book *"Spaces of Global Capitalism"*, Harvey names a word *space* as one of the most important key words in our contemporary society: *"Thinking through the different ways in which space and space-time get used as a key word helps define certain condition of possibility for critical engagement. It also opens up*

3

ways to identify conflicting claims and alternative political possibilities. It invites us to consider ways we physically shape our environment and the ways in which we both represent and get to live in it." (D. Harvey 2006, Spaces of Global Capitalism, p. 120) He divides space in three conceptual frameworks: Absolute, relative and relational and explains them as:

1. Absolute is a space of everything physical that can be measured.

2. Relative is the space where the distance in absolute space is relativized. According to the author *"space is relative in the double sense: that there are multiple geometries from which to choose and that spatial frame depends crucially upon what it is that is being relativized and by whom"* (D. Harvey 2006, Spaces of Global Capitalism, p. 122) It is a space of movement where the distance is measured by the energy and time needed for circulation. It is space of all kinds of maps and spatial representations. He adds that despite relativization, calculation and control of relative space is still possible, but depends on the rules to be applied. In relative space, the factor of temporality is very important as it is related to the movement.

3. The relational space is also viewed in connection with time. The author mentions Leibniz's formulation that: *"Processes don't occur in space but define their own spatial frame. The concept of space is embedded in or internal to process."* (D. Harvey 2006, Spaces of Global Capitalism, p. 123) Relational space is a space of memories, feelings and their influences, therefore its measurement and control becomes more and more complicated. The author notes that the concept of relational space is useful for understanding political processes as it is connected to the collective memories and everyday life.

If we see the city as a spatial configuration of the social, political and economic processes entwined in it, which are dynamic and change through time, it is not possible to comprehend it as a static object any more. Rather the necessity emerges to conceptualize it as a process. In this framework the three concepts of understanding the space is crucial for the proper analyzes of the often invisible forces shaping its organization and form. It is necessary to note the statement of the author, that in above mentioned formulation none of the concepts should be considered of having a main importance, rather they are inseparable and without careful examination of all the three against the embedded processes, it won't be possible to grasp and comprehend the complex forces determining and giving form to the city. Here also should be mentioned the concept of temporality as one of the key aspects in any effort of analyzing the process.

To sum up, I want to argue that the city can not be perceived as a static spatial form; rather it should be conceptualized as an interrelation of the socio-political and economic processes with the spatial forms and organizations specific to them. For a proper understanding of urban form, independent of its historical context, including all its scalar variations, from large agglomerations to the districts, neighborhoods and specific buildings, the careful parallel analyzes of these processes and their spatial configurations is necessary. I would go farther and argue that, it is hardly possible to understand the space without the examination of the processes involved in its formation and the other way around, one can not properly grasp the meaning of the processes entwined in the city without careful study of the space maintaining and absorbing them.

Therefore without analyzing the specific processes inherent to the various cities in the contemporary world, under capitalist or other modes of production, including specific political and social factors, it won't be possible to understand the complexity of contemporary production of space.

THEORETICAL POSITIONS

In the following chapter I will shortly introduce the condition of neo-liberalism. How it is presented to the public and how it works. In this context I will introduce the way architectural profession responds to this condition and what are the main theoretical positions inside the discipline in relation to this issue. Furthermore I will try to put into discussion my second question of **How legitimate is spatial practice to be politically concerned?**

Writing about the global political economy and its spatial patterns may seem to be an outdated task in the state of current economic turmoil. Everyone knows that the world economic structure will change, but towards what remains the question. Crisis is the inherent feature of capitalist system, constantly destroying and revolutionizing itself. It had happened many times through the history of capitalism, but always the system had been modified towards the more and more effective ways of operation. Today I don't see the reason of not reflecting on the condition that actually caused the crises. On the one hand the world leaders reveal the intentions to solve the recession inside the existing framework of the free market, e.g. talks about the threads of protectionism or bailing out banks with public money without claiming property rights etc. and on the other hand there is no sufficient pressure from the side of public to put forward the question of fundamental rethinking of the world economic and political structure. In this process it is obvious that without a strong public demand the meaningful change will not happen.

In the late 1970s near the end of the cold war and after the fall of Keynesian system, in the advanced capitalist countries, the new form of world economic strategy, often called as neo-liberalism has been introduced. The main aim of this economic model is the unregulated global market and trade, which implies a partial transfer of the control of economy from the state to the private hands. It is believed that with unregulated trade and free competition it is possible to maintain the equilibrium between supply and demand ratios on the market, which is the one of the central problems in the economic theory. The function of the government in this economic model is reduced to the policing and securing the free market legislation.

This idealized model of capitalism has another side, which has not been revealed to the public by its initiators. The very logic of free trade directly implies the uneven distribution of wealth among the population. Through this system, the accumulation of wealth in the hands of particular individuals or the groups of individuals is natural as an outcome of free competition. The concentration of capital in the narrow circles of the society on the one hand and the weakening of the political power of the governments, through loosing control on the economy, on the other hand results in the direct pursuing of the interests of the privileged few against the majority of unprivileged population, from the side of the government. This directly contradicts the concept of equality, which free trade defenders use as an argument for their ideas. Furthermore the deregulation of economies of developing countries results in crushing the local productions in favor of exported goods from the global monopolist producers, resulting in a vast unemployment and poverty.

The argument can be extended to the much bigger scale, including various aspects of the conditions produced through this model. But to sum up, through these processes, in the global scene the real power has been concentrated in the hands of multinational corporations, banks and financial institutions using governments as the mere executives of their will. In this condition politics has been reduced to the policing and negotiating between the acceptable conceptual frameworks. Any kind of the voice asking for the difference out of the accepted limits has been declared as radical and violently suppressed and put out of the debate. This condition has also been called Post Political, as Slavoj Zizek states in the afterward of Jacques Rancier's *"The Politics of Aesthetics", " In Post-Politics, the conflict of global ideological visions embodied in different parties who compete for power is replaced by collaboration of enlightened technocrats (economists, public opinion specialists …) and liberal multiculturalists; via the process of negotiation of interests, a compromise is reached in the guise of a more or less universal consensus."* (J. Rancier 2004, The politics of Aesthetics, P. 72)

The market logic, freed from any political assumption has penetrated in every aspect of everyday life and culture from intimate personal desires to the most general domains such as education, value system or social identity of individuals and masses. The quote from the Guy Debord's *"The Society of Spectacle"* describes this condition: *"In societies where modern conditions of production prevail, all of life presents itself as an immense accumulation of spectacles. Everything that was directly lived has moved away into a representation."* (G. Debord, 1967 The Society of the Spectacle, p.1)

This condition finds the direct expression in space, producing as scholars call uneven geographical development. On the one hand there is suburbanization, as a direct result of the real property speculation fostering the consumerist consciousness of upper classes with the desire to the isolated style of living. On the other hand creation of slums as an outcome of deregulated economy generating enormous migrations of rural population towards the cities in search of jobs and better life. Spatial autocracy is one of the inherent features of unregulated property speculation, living aside citizens as participant in creation their living environments, resulting in homogenization and privatization of urban spaces. Spatial centralization is a direct consequence of unregulated capitalism, meaning concentration of production and consumption in space, generating social, political and economic separation of peripheries and centers of the cities. The list of problems is much longer than presented here, in general resulting in the degradation of urbanity - the most important quality of cities. (More argument about this issue will be presented in the next chapter)

The issue of reacting on the capitalist hegemony and its political outcome – neo-liberalism has been examined with different approaches among the young artists and architects with political aspirations. There are voices that are to accept this hegemony and to try achieving change within its frames. Others who take more active position are trying to resist the market domination from its interstice, etc. From this ongoing debate one thing is clear that it is no longer legible to claim for autonomy of architecture as announced by the postmodern practitioners. Their position has revealed their critical sterility and conformity to the market forces, which has become the main determinant of their product's nature and forms of expression. *"Unexpectedly, architectural autonomy, instead of providing resistance to consumer society, brought about the commodification of architecture. The novelty of the current situation is the assimilation into the market economy not only of the realized building, but of the architectural idea itself."* (T. Kaminer 2007, arq, Vol. 11, no1, Autonomy and Commerce: The Integration of Architectural Autonomy, p. 64)

If we briefly review the current dominant architecture practice as a whole, from the idea to the final materialization of the space and production relations involved in this process, we will see that the market logic dominates its entire process. Architecture offices have been operating as corporate firms and have fully adopted capitalist modes of production as a way of producing social space and cultural objects.(although today they also suffer from the financial crises as other forms of business organizations) This strategy results in their engagement in the global market economy with the tactics of capital accumulation, which doesn't allow architecture and urbanism to take a critical stance towards the ongoing socio-cultural political or economic processes that are directly connected to them. Accordingly their products as buildings or urban plans are materialized via the same modes of production, following the logic of commodification and speculation. In the end the organization of space and its aesthetic qualities are automatically determined by this logic, becoming its spatial manifestation by spectacular images, individualization, originality and material or formal complexity. The established modes of production within the architecture and urban practices directly influence the nature of space produced by them. The architect and urban planner becomes a tool in the hand of certain class (here capitalist) in executing their spatial strategies. The spatial practice is striped from any political position or theoretical stance towards the reality it operates, as a part of the intellectual work. It is subjected to the logic of market as a mere technical discipline. Instead the debate is conducted inside the isolated discipline about the matters of secondary relevance such as formal expression, abstract conceptual matter etc. Manfredo Tafuri described this problem in his book *"architecture and Utopia"*: *"The crisis of modern architecture begins in a very moment in which its natural consignee – large industrial capital – goes beyond the fundamental ideology, putting aside the suprastructures. From that moment on architecture ideology no longer has any purpose."* (M. Tafuri 1976, Architecture and Utopia: Design and Capitalist Development, p. 135)

It is regarded that Tafuri's radical criticism in "Architecture and Utopia" tends to acknowledge that, *"It is useless to struggle for escape when completely enclosed and confined without an exit."* (M. Tafuri 1976, Architecture and Utopia, p. 160) Meaning that Architecture can not hope to succeed in the struggle against capitalism unless the total revolution happens that will allow it to practice under the ideological superstructure. I want to argue that what he means here is a uselessness of the architecture struggle to achieve a change within its isolated disciplinary framework, relying purely on the design tools or image. Indeed he encourages the alternative architecture stating in the same book that: *"First among the intellectual illusions to be done away with is that which, by means of the image alone, tries to anticipate the conditions of architecture "for a liberated society." Who proposes such a slogan avoids asking himself if, its obvious utopianism aside, this objective is perusable without a revolution of architectural language, methods, and structure which goes far beyond simple subjective will or the simple updating of a syntax"* (M. Tafuri 1976, Architecture and Utopia, p. 181)

In the three aspects of architecture practice: language, methods and structure, mentioned in the above quotes, the last two are often disregarded and neglected by the architects and urban planners, putting more emphasis on the language as their primary objective. In the next chapter I'll try to find the theoretical definition of the practice which considers the three aspects simultaneously important for identifying and reacting on the problematic. From this approach architecture and urbanism as spatial practices enter a challenging political dimension accumulating vital potential for both, right and left.

PROGRESSIVE SPATIAL PRACTICE

Henry Lefebvre in *"Urban Revolution"* stated that: *"The urban problematique is global, but the way we approach it depends on the economic, social and political structure of the country, as well as its ideological superstructures."* (H. Lefebvre 1970, The Urban Revolution, p.138) I would like to add to this argument that theoretically it is possible to problematize the urban condition using the tools defined on the general level, independent of the specific economic, social and political context of the country. Furthermore, if the urban problematique is global there should be the general theoretical position of the possible practice. This theoretical level would stand on the same global scale as the urban problematique, identified by Lefebvre, and guide to the different approaches of action specific to the different places.

In this chapter I will try to define this general theoretical nature of the practice, on the base of which will be possible to approach the specific problematique in a different manner appropriate to the specific context. As I mentioned in the previous chapter, as a general framework for formulation of my proposition I will use three aspects suggested by Manfredo Tafuri: language, methods, and structure, but hence the different nature of the possible practice, which will be explained later, I will reverse the original order of the concepts. I will start with the structure, followed by methods, and finish with the language, not as a separate part, but as a direct outcome of the first two. With this discussion my aim is to address my last question: **what is the role of the politically engaged spatial practice in the sociopolitical economic and cultural life of the society?**

In the same *"urban Revolution"* Lefebvre identified the problem of division of knowledge and isolation of sciences in understanding the urban complexity of contemporary world. He also argued about the necessity of alternative practice which would try to unify the scattered knowledge and work towards the unitary approach to the urban problematique as a whole or as a totality. I would add that in this kind of activity the spatial knowledge is crucial as the basis for the critical analyzes of the urban world and the social, political and economic processes embedded in it. My proposition of the theoretical character of progressive practice is based on this argument and further extends it. Therefore in the text I use the term spatial practice as the definition of the intellectual activity using spatial knowledge as the basis for its effort of understanding and acting on the urban problematique. In this effort the spatial knowledge is also seen as the platform for uniting different forms of scattered knowledge.

From this definition it is clear that unlike architecture and urbanism, traditionally understood, the angle and scales for the activity of progressive spatial practice are very wide. Therefore I would like to start with the formulation of the project that this kind of practice tries to realize, taking into consideration the general urban problematique that the cities are facing around the world in the condition of global capitalism. I suggest putting the desired conditions in front of problems to make both sides clearly visible. These are:

- Equal distribution vs. centrality

This is a very broad definition and can include: locality and equal share of production, distribution and consumption against the centralized corporative production, distribution and consumption or

local self organization and direct democracy against the political dependence on the centralities. Also in the same definition can be unified the use and production of local culture and knowledge against the use and production of homogenized and alienated culture and knowledge defined by the centralization.

In the Marxist theory of urbanization centralization is seen as a strategy of capital circulation and accumulation. Drawing on this conclusion, there exists radical critique of the city as a result of centralization of capital, suggesting redistribution of urbanity in the country side. But here a theoretical problem arises questioning, what would be the limit to this redistribution, which has not been answered yet.

European modern movement was characterized by its anti urban ideology, relying on the idea of dissolution of the large cities by the certain tools applied by the architects and urbanists of the time in collaboration with governments. The division of functions, elimination of street in favor of garden city ideals and radical rationalization resulted in general abolition of urbanity in such modernist urban plans. *"Improbability, multifunctionality, multiplicity and lack of organic structure – in short, all the contradictory aspects assumed by the modern metropolis – are thus seen to have remained outside the attempts at a rationalization pursued by central European architecture."* (M. Tafuri 1976, Architecture and Utopia, p. 124)

The counter argument to the radical critique of the city would be that through the history the urban space has maintained and absorbed various modes of productions or social, political and economic systems. Therefore it can be assumed that theoretically it is possible to maintain urbanity within the system alternative to capitalism. Furthermore the concept of collectivity is inherent to the nature of urban space. This suggests that the city can be perceived not as an undesirable phenomenon but as an advanced form of collective habitation with the potential of absorbing the alternatives.

- Density of social exchange vs. density of population per area

Mexican architect Teddy Cruz argues that the concept of urban density can not be reduced to the estimation of population per area. Rather it should be extended to the density of social exchange and viewed as one of the essential qualities for urbanity.

- Social friction vs. class isolation

The idea of social friction comes from the social sciences. Its main argument is that isolation of different social classes in space can not be a solution to the class disagreement. Rather it can be a reason of the growing anger and finally eruption of violence between the different social classes. The idea assumes that social friction, in other words more frequent encounter and spatial integration of different social classes can balance the discrepancy between the two, preventing the growth of anger and generation of violence. In the urban conditions, apart from the many spatial aspects defining the level of social encounter, the street can be viewed as one of the main spaces for the social friction.

- Difference vs. uniformity

This idea can include the multifunctionality against the monofunctionality or cultural and social difference against the cultural and social homogenization of urban spaces. The same definition can imply spatial difference against the spatial uniformity.

- Collective living/urbanity vs. isolated living/Suburbia

- Equal right to the space vs. spatial exclusion and domination

- Mixed ownership vs. Land and real estate speculation

- Spatial participation vs. spatial autocracy

- Consumerism vs. Cultural consciousness

- Architecture for everyday life vs. architecture for special occasions

- Use value vs. exchange value

- Environmental consciousness vs. environmental alienation

The above definition of the project that wants to realize the progressive spatial practice can not be closed or dogmatized; rather it should stay open to new findings or propositions. It is also necessary to note that the aims of the practice can not always be absolute but more trying to achieve some levels between the above mentioned polarities.

STRUCTURE

For the definition of possible structure for progressive spatial practice I will borrow the different scales of activity of *"insurgent architect"* proposed by David Harvey in the 12th chapter of his book *"Spaces of Hope"*. This proposition can be conceived also as a methodology but it is useful for imagining the possible structural forms of the practice. About the methodology, I will put more in the next part.

Harvey argues that the enormity of the global field where the critical action can be directed and the multitude of the terrains where this action can be conducted are generating the danger of confusion and disempowerment. To avoid this he suggests introducing the spatiotemporal scale at which the processes can operate on different levels. He suggests different scales from political person to the moment of universality.

Starting with the scale of the political person as a social construct where he or she is presented as a part of the society with the personal commitment and political position. He continues with the scale of collectivity, where the author sees the force for *"rule making and rule braking"* (D. Harvey 2000, Spaces of Hope, p. 236) in other words force for revolutionary change. This is followed by the scale of necessity of unifying many local struggles devoted to particular problems, into one action directed to

the main problem. This he calls *"Militant particularizm and political action"*. (D. Harvey 2000, Spaces of Hope, p. 241) The next is the scale of *"Mediating institutions and built environment"* (D. Harvey 2000, Spaces of Hope, p. 243) which implies the necessity of facilitating certain types of social action and creating possibility of different types of political existence institutionally and spatially. This would involve collaboration with the government on different levels, as well as with communities and appropriate social institutions presenting them. There is the next scale where he sees the need *"to translate political aspirations across the incredible variety and heterogeneity of socio-ecological and political economic conditions."* (D. Harvey 2000, Spaces of Hope, p. 405) Here he refers to the necessity to communicate with different social groups in different social political and economic conditions globally, in order to bring the collective action together. Finally, the scale of universality, where he speaks about the essence of adopting universal ideals in the insurgent practice.

It is important to note that in his formulation he doesn't give privilege to one or another scale of action and states that in order to be effective, the insurgent practice or practitioner should try to act on every level equally.

In this scheme Harvey refers to the word - *architect* in a much broader sense than traditionally understood. Theoretically this model can be applied to many practices of different kind but in the end it becomes important to maintain the unitary vision of science: *"acceptance of some sort of 'unity of science' is a necessary condition for the promulgation of universality claims"*. (D. Harvey 2000, Spaces of Hope, p. 248) But how can we achieve this kind of unity?

Henri Lefebvre in the *"Urban evolution"* argued that the unity of knowledge can only be achieved around the coordinated set of problems, rather than around the body of acquired knowledge. Therefore it is important that the progressive spatial practice is problem oriented. This nature of the practice also becomes the determinant of the important parts of its structure: the negation of market oriented strategies.

The above mentioned scalar partition is very important as the background for the structure of the practice. It gives the hint about the possibilities of its political economy, including various legal statuses, economic organization and forms of research and production. Here I won't go into the details of the possible forms as my aim is not specific but general definition. But I would state that the possible structure of the practice should facilitate legally and administratively the different scales of action described above. I suggest the collective form of administration, research and production as a most effective structural formation, as this kind of activity will require multilateral expertise in order to cope with the complexity of urban world. Furthermore the equal distribution of the decision making votes enables the practice to critically analyze and reflect of every step to be made already within its environment.

METHODS

The pro active and politically motivated position and critical orientation on the problematique can become the main defining features for the methodology of action of progressive spatial practice.

It is necessary to mention here that when we speak about the political motivation and critical approach of the practice, the question arises about the form of the critical action and involvement in

the actual processes of the real world. Manfredo Tafuri in *"Architecture and Utopia"* raises this problem comparing two forms of artistic avant-gardes in the European history, which according to him perpetuated up until our time. On the one hand he shows formalism and abstract avant-garde, which regard their practice as pure intellectual work that is not able to serve as a revolutionary movement, focusing on the language of communication. On the other hand he shows the *"committed"* avant-garde which regards its work as a direct political intervention and takes a position of pure ideology. This type of intellectual work tends to *"get out of productive work and stand before it as its critical conscience."* (M. Tafuri 1976, Architecture and Utopia, p. 66) At the same time the author remarks that the first position is autonomous only relatively and depends on the political or economic patron and his position in giving a sense to the effort of the intellectual work. Therefore this type of work can be regarded as more conformed to the existing system, unable to resist market forces or being problem oriented. The second, radical position, as Tafuri shows, is facing the problem of entering the sphere of productive work trying to stay as a mere critic of what is produced.

Tafuri expresses the necessity of mediating between these two positions in order for practice to become productive, at the same time not loosing the political commitment and critical approach. Regarding the same problem Henri Lefebvre asks: *"how can we provide them* (politicians) *with projects and programs without abandoning a critical analyzes of their ideologies and realizations?"* (H. Lefebvre 1970, The Urban Revolution, p.143) This is one of the main theoretical problems for the definition of the methodology for the progressive spatial practice in order not to fall on one side into the formal determinism and on the other side into the isolation characteristic to the radical practices. Here it should be noted that when we are talking about defining the methodology for the practice we should remember the risk of becoming another type of avant-garde or a style, as the very moment of launching of the certain style always appears as the beginning of its end. Market forces always tend to immediate adoption and commodification of any new style independent of its radical political position.

In order to avoid the above mentioned methodological problems the strategic thinking is essential. This can imply the strategic thinking for planning of the structure, methodology or language of the practice, in relation to the specific social, political and economic realities of the context of action, as well as for planning of the projects and proposals. Strategic thinking is important as it is problem oriented and relies on temporality, (it is oriented on the planning of future}. If we accept my earlier proposition that the urbanization process can not be understood and acted on without comprehending its temporality this aspect becomes crucial. I won't go into the detailed discussion of strategic thinking, as the theme is very broad and is not a subject of this thesis.

There are three essential modes of thinking that are most important as the backbone or the way towards the strategic thinking or planning, that I want to mention here: the relational thinking, the critical thinking, and the utopian thinking.

Relational thinking is important for connecting the processes, ideas and objects. It is crucial for understanding the urbanization, as often what appears on the static surface is not enough for seeing the full image of the subject to be analyzed. We can refer again to Harvey's three conceptual frameworks presented earlier, where he emphasizes the relational concept of space as crucial for understanding of political processes or issues related to the collective memory etc. relational

thinking helps to think about the relationships between the problems and not about the problems in particular. It helps to think about the origins apart from the result of the problems.

If we assume the relational thinking as the crucial part for understanding, the critical thinking should follow as the reflective judgment about what is understood or seen.

Utopian thinking is essential for envisioning alternatives and pushing the boundaries of imaginable. Tafuri's definition of utopia is helpful for understanding of its relevance in intellectual work: *"Utopia is therefore nothing other than "a structural vision of the totality that is and is becoming", the transcendence of the pure "datum," a system of orientation intent upon "breaking the relationships of the existing order" in order to recover them at a higher and different level."* (M. Tafuri 1976, Architecture and Utopia, p. 53) These three modes of thinking can be regarded as inseparable as understanding is the logical precondition of judgment and imagination is the coherent way of envisioning alternatives of what is understood and analyzed. These three modes of thinking are relevant to define the directions for the strategic thinking.

From the discussed methodological problems and general lines of thinking presented, we can imagine the practice which regards itself primarily, as Mexican architect Teddy Cruz calls the designer of political processes and than the designer of space. This position automatically excludes the practice from the state of passive position, waiting for the commission or initiatives from the other sides. Rather the practice enters a proactive, politically committed and problem oriented stand in the society. For this, as Teddy Cruz mentions, it needs to foster the understanding, so as to see the conflict and urgency in the urban environment in order to intervene in it in a proper way. The tactics of counterproposal by inventing the commission becomes relevant here.

LANGUAGE

When Manfredo Tafuri argued about the necessity of *"revolution of architectural language, methods and structure,"* (M. Tafuri 1976, Architecture and Utopia, p. 181) with *"language"* he was referring to the syntax of visual communication of architecture elaborated in the previous parts of his book *"Architecture and Utopia"*. Here a connection should be made with the aesthetic practice, as a certain language of visual communication implies the certain aesthetic, through which the sensory communication takes place.

I put the discussion about the language of the progressive spatial practice in the end of the text because one can not build an argument about the language of communication without defining the theoretical position adopted as well as structure and methods of work. Jacques Rancier in *"The Politics of Aesthetics"* writes: *"Aesthetic practices are ways of doing and making that intervene in the general distribution of doing and making as well as in the relationships they maintain to modes of being and forms of visibility."* (J. Rancier 2004, The politics of Aesthetics, P. 13) This account shows that language can not be seen as a separate thing from the practice, on the contrary the specific sensory experience raised from the visual communication of the man made object is directly connected to the *"ways of doing and making,"* defined by the structure and methodology applied in its production.

From this definition I want to argue that it is useless to set the aesthetic language of communication of the practice according to determined formal rules or principles, as it occurred within many art or

architecture movements through the history. Rather the aesthetic language should be the natural outcome of the process defined by the structure and methods of production. In other words the modes of production as well as social, political and economic values within the spatial practice will influence the communicative nature of its artifacts without determining any specific syntax. By the communicative nature here I mean the form of communication, expressing the values adopted by the practice. Furthermore with the predefined formal language the practice will face the risk of commercialization of its predefined aesthetics and becoming one more in the sequence of innumerable styles and movements.

The same principles offer a different pattern for judgment, if extended on the level of evaluation of such artifacts. Currently dominant form of aesthetic judgment of space regards its form, geometry, materiality etc. as a main focus. This can be reevaluated by the aesthetic judgment of the communicative nature of methods, structures as well as socio-political and economic positions involved in the process of production of space, taking into consideration the same parameters, such as its organization, form, materiality and many other aspects.

This type of relational aesthetic judgment leads us, to the perception of *"aesthetic acts as configurations of experience that create new modes of sense perception and induce novel forms of political subjectivity."* (J. Rancier 2004, The politics of Aesthetics, P. 9)

CONCLUSION

In conclusion I want to argue that for the architecture and planning practices it is necessary not only to foster the understanding of the processes shaping their production, but take a full responsibility of the social, political and economic consequences of their work. From this perspective the autonomous and conformist position adopted widely in the profession seems to become of a secondary importance. In contrast to that, taking active role in the sociopolitical and economic life of the society becomes coherent and legible. Only through this kind of shift it will be possible to direct the disintegrated effort of the practice to the alternative objectives. Only through this shift it will be possible to regain to the spatial practices the status of intellectual work for benefit of public. I will finish my argument with David Harvey's words from his book *"Spaces of Hope"*:

"The great individual (the architect/philosopher) who becomes detached from the masses and from daily life becomes either an irrelevant joke or an oppressive and domineering figure on the local if not on the world stage. (D. Harvey 2000, Spaces of Hope p. 253)

<center>DEFINITION OF TERMS</center>

Neo-liberalism: A political ideology supporting unregulated free market and trade. Its primary idea is to transfer part of the control of the economy from state to the private sector.

Everyday life: A concept used by French philosopher Henry Lefebvre. He argued that everyday life is a primary subject for the action for revolutionary change. He defined this term as: "whatever remains after one has eliminated all specialized activities"

Spatial practice: With this term I refer to architecture, urbanism, urban design, landscape design and any unclassified practice, considering theorizing and planning of space as its main objective for professional activity.

Spatial practitioner: person involved in a spatial practice.

Mode of Production: A specific relationship of productive forces – human labor power and means of production (things that are necessary for production: technology, land, natural resources etc). These two together comprise modes of production, which according to Marx are different in different societies. He argued that mode of production; characteristic to the certain society is the main determinant of its social order and cause of its change. He also defined a whole economic sphere to be shaped by the mode of production that it embraces involving the modes of distribution, the modes of circulation and the modes of consumption. He described modes of production as an "Organic Totality" capable of constantly recreating itself and be sustained in a more or less stable way.

Means of production: All things used by the laborer in the process of production on the subject of labor in order to transform it. For example tools, infrastructure, equipment, machines etc.

Production relations: The social structures that regulate relations between humans in the production and reproduction of material life.

Labor power: The physical or mental capabilities of humans, which are exercised in the process of production of use value of any type

Everyday life: The concept of everyday life was elaborated by the French philosopher of Marxist tradition, Henri Lefebvre. He argued that everyday life of the individual is the stage for the revolutionary action, in other words he believed that the revolutionary change should start in the everyday life of the individuals. Also he saw everyday life as the platform for the critical analyzes of lived experience.

Social friction: The idea of social friction comes from the social sciences. Its main argument is that isolation of different social classes in space can not be a solution to the class disagreement. Rather it can be a reason of the growing anger and finally eruption of violence between the different social classes. The idea assumes that social friction, in other words more frequent encounter and spatial unification of different social classes can balance the discrepancy between the two, preventing the growth of anger and generation of violence.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Harvey, D. (1990) 'The Condition of Postmodernity'. Cambridge Mass.
Harvey, D. (2000) 'Spaces of Hope'. Los Angeles
Harvey, D. (2005) 'A Brief History of Neoliberalism'. Oxford
Harvey, D. (2006) 'Spaces of Global Capitalism: A Theory of Uneven Geographical Development'
Lefebvre, H. (2003) 'The Urban Revolution'. London
Graafland, A. (2000) 'The Socius of Architecture'. Rotterdam
Graafland, A. Haan, J. (1996) 'The Critical Landscape'. Rotterdam
Marx, K. (2000) 'Das Kapital'. Washington
Taffuri, M. (1976) 'Architecture and Utopia'. Cambridge, Mass
Debord, G. (2006) 'The Society of The Spectacle'. Rebel Press
Ranciere, J. (2006) 'The Politics of Aesthetics: The Distribution of Sensible'
Sennett, R. (1992) 'The Fall of Public man'. W.W. Norton