Tomasz Stępień*

Spatial turn.
Transcultural and transdisciplinar spaces in the architecture

Preliminaries.
Spatial turn *as a social science paradigm*

Intellectual discourse within the framework of social sciences at the end of the 20th century and at the beginning of the 21st century was dominated by theoretical analyses of a threefold turn which formulated and at the same time determined the reality of the contemporary societies: 1) cultural turn commenced by M. Foucault, continued adequately to the technological development of the contemporary cultures and civilizations based on the interpretation of history by F. Fukuyama and S.P. Huntington[1]; 2) technological turn with analyses of social changes caused by the new media technologies (M. McLuhan) and information technologies (M. Castells); 3) spatial turn, the forerunner of which is H. Lefebvre with a new concept of space in the social dimension.

The very term of *spatial turn* appeared for the first time in the study by the geographer Edward W. Soja entitled *Postmodern geographies* published in 1989[2]. [3, 18] However, in the social dimension, the forerunner of the new meaning, understanding and interpretation of space is Henri Lefebvre. In his study entitled *La production de l'espace* published in 1974 (Production of space) he presented an interdisciplinary concept of space at the same time introducing anew the notion of space as a motif of the intellectual discourse within the framework of social sciences. The paradigm of the term itself is often referred to in the context of the controversies and disputes on modernism and postmodernism. From the postmodernist viewpoint, Fredric Jameson states that the spatial turn paradigm, or even more a whole series of turns as its variations, enables us to unambiguously define differences existing between modernism and postmodernism and at the same time it functions as one of the main motifs of the postmodernist criticism of modernism[3].

According to Jameson, modernism emphasizes the meaning of time and history whereas postmodernism led to *spatialization of the temporal*. The notion of spatialization of the temporal means a simultaneous trend away from the 19th century obsession of history towards a new era of space (M. Foucault). E.W. Soja in his later works such as *Thirdspace* published in 1996 refers to this meaning of *spatial turn* where he defines it as a type of *master turn*, therefore, we arrive at the main paradigm of science of the end of the 20th century – paradigm of transdiscipli-

---

* Wrocław University of Technology, Department of Humanistic Sciences.

[1] Cf. Foucault M., *Von anderen Räumen*, [in:] Dünne, J. / Günzel, S., *Raumtheorie. Grundlagentexte aus Philosophie und Kulturwissenschaften*, p. 317–329, Frankfurt a. M. 2006; Fukuyama, F., *Koniec historii*, Znak, Kraków 2009; Huntington, S.P., *Zderzenie cywilizacji i nowy kształt ładu światowego*, Muza, Warszawa 2003.

[2] Edward W. Soja, *Postmodern Geographies. The Reassertion of Space in Critical Social Theory*, London/NY 1989. In the recent years two comprehensive studies of the whole issue of the spatial turn in the modern science were published: Döring, Jörg/Thielmann, Tristan (Hrsg.), *Spatial turn. Das Raumparadigma in den Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften*, transcript Verlag, Bielefeld 2008; Warf, Barney/Arias, Santa (eds.), *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, Routledge Studies in Human Geography, London 2009.

---

[3] (...) *A certain spatial turn has often seemed to offer one of the more productive ways of distinguishing postmodernism from modernism proper* (...), F. Jameson, *Postmodernism, or, The Cultural Logic of Late Capitalism*, p. 154, Durham 1991; (quoted after:) Döring J., Thielmann T. (Hrsg.), *Spatial turn. Das Raumparadigma in den Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften*, p. 8.

nar character as such[4]. In this way, 'space' becomes the main component of the critical social theory [3].

Nowadays, the emphasis is put on the multidimensionality of the meaning of 'spatial turn', which expresses both its transdisciplinar character, i.e. may refer to every discipline of knowledge or science as such as well as its transcultural character, i.e. may occur and be valid independently of place and time in the impingement sphere of a given culture-civilization. In this context, *spatial turn* is strongly connected with the technological development of the second part of the 20th century. It refers to the new information technologies which are interpreted as an omen, expression and at the same time the main tool of the globalization process. Spatial and technological turns mean a new perception of the human reality, either in form of a global village (M. McLuhan) and a web society (M. Castells), or mobility as the main phenomenon of the modern society (J. Urry). The leading motif of spatial turn itself involves the far-reaching changes brought about by the media and communication technologies.

The phenomenon of spatial turn itself is not explicitly defined – we can say that it refers to the disputes which take place within the particular domains by making reference to space. We can observe a sort of prosperity for 'space' as each discipline (field of study) of broadly understood humanities undertakes a different 'spatial turn' by shifting research emphasis, by change of perspective or by an attempt to define a new phenomenon which appears in a given field of research. Thus, we deal with the particular metaphors of spatial turn. This multitude of metaphors allows us to assume a hypothesis about transdisciplinar character of the contemporary science and its particular disciplines. Apart from the notion of *spatial turn*, we can also distinguish the following expressions: 1) *topological turn*, which refers to mathematical terminology and phenomenology within philosophy; 2) *topographical turn*, in theory of literature and culture, an expression based on discovering space as a text with its roots in cartography, i.e. map and map reading as transforming space into a text and also as an expression of human control over space[5]. – A characteristic form of space rehabilitation is assumed by *spatial turn* in historical sciences – this process was initiated by a German author named Karl Schlögel. The starting point here is the question about possibilities of existing the so called great narrations after their proper end caused by the postmodernism postulate of F. Lyotard. Spatial turn signifies a symbolic return of space to the historical discourse in form of locating and spacing historiographical representations and analyses within the impingement sphere of the particular cultural and social space, and consequently, historical space[6].

---

[4] (...) *Contemporary critical studies have experienced a significant spatial turn. In what may be seen as one of the most important intellectual and political developments in the late twentieth century, scholars have begun to interpret space and the spatiality of human life with the same critical insight and emphasis that has traditionally been given to time and history on the one hand, and to social relations and society on the other* (...), E.W. Soja, *Thirdspace. Journeys to Los Angeles and other Real-and-Imagined Places*, London/NY 1996, (quoted after:) Döring J., Thielmann T. (Hrsg.), *Spatial turn. Das Raumparadigma in den Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften*, p. 9.

[5] Cf. program text of topographical turn, also as a response of European humanities to Anglo-Saxon *cultural studies*: Sigrid Weigel, *Zum topographical turn*, Kultur-Poetik 2002, [in:] Döring J., Thielmann T., *Spatial turn...*, pp. 15–18.

[6] (…) *Erneuerung der geschichtlichen Erzählung selbst* (…) *die Frage nach der Möglichkeit einer großen Erzählung nach dem Ende der Großen Erzählung* (...). History takes place, *deshalb sei jede historiographische Darstellung defizitär, die nicht auch die je historisch-konkrete Ortsverhaftung des zu rekonstruierenden Geschehens mitexpliziere* (...), Döring J., Thielmann T., *Spatial turn...*, pp. 20–22; cf. Karl Schlögel, *Im Raume lesen wir die Zeit. Über Zivilisationsgeschichte und Geopolitik*, München 2003.

Compression of time and space

Compression of time and space (D. Harvey) constitutes a particular background for rediscovering space in the last decade of the 20th century; this term refers to the process of condensing horizons of cognition connected with time and space which at the same time led to an implosion of space. Equally, in McLuhan's global village, in Urry's mobile society as well as in Castells' web society, it is in the space that lines of flows, loops, centres and peripheries are designated. According to the postulated postmodernist theory of media, the process of overcoming time and space, to paraphrase McLuhan, takes place exactly in the space as *medium* and *message* in one. In other words, the postulated deterritorialization of cyberspace is suspended on the coordinates of this space[7] [2, 12, 17, 18].

Therefore, a technologically plausible compression of time and space requires social location and spacing. Deterritorialization refers to the technology, not to man and society. Communication technologies do not liquidate spaces, however, they do change them[8] [3]. This phenomenon is

---

interpretation of changes occurring in the world of media was presented by H.M. McLuhan, cf. his study: *Wybór tekstów*, Zysk i s-ka, Poznań 2001. As for model of information society with the concept of space as a cultural function, cf. Castells, M., *Społeczeństwo sieci*, PWN, Warszawa 2007. The concept of society based on the phenomenon of mobility is presented in the work of J. Urry, *Socjologia mobilności*, PWN, Warszawa 2009. As for issues of new cyber-culture and technological determinants of the modern society, cf. Zawojski, P., *Cyberkultura. Syntopia sztuki, nauki i technologii*, Poltext, Warszawa 2010.

[8] (…) *ganz so als sei die technisch ermöglichte time-space compression nur vermittels einer Standortversicherung* (...) *sozial zu ertragen. Auch in der Netzwerkgesellschaft bleibt Territorialität als eines der organisierenden Prinzipien sozialer Beziehungen elementar von Bedeutung.*

[7] The phenomenon of compression of time and space is analysed by David Harvey in the study *The Condition of Postmodernity. An Enquiry into the Origins of Cultural Change*, Oxford/Cambridge 1989. The first

characteristic of the globalization process in which new varieties of space appear in the context of technological carriers of communication as global, transcultural and transnational ones. Therefore, the postulates of McLuhan to overcome and consequently get rid of spaces in the meantime serve the purpose of locating ourselves, as it is the case with the GPS technology (*Global Positioning System*). At the same time, the development of new communication technologies changed the form of impingement of cultures and civilizations, which not only impinge within their orbits and spaces,

but were also located either in space or in orbit. Media technologies (satellite transmission) represent a given culture in orbit, but not the orbit of a given culture[9]. In this sense, there is a growing tendency for materialization in the current discourse on culture and civilization which are more and more dominated by the technological development. As a consequence, along with spatial and technological turns, we can observe the return of materialistic concepts of culture and its materialistic determinants[10] [4].

(...) *Die Orte der Lebenswelt bleiben, aber sie sind nurmehr als medialisierte zu denken* (...) *diese fachübergreifende spatial-turn-Perspektive als notwendige Korrektur einer postmodernen Raumignoranz*, Döring J., Thielmann T., *Spatial turn...*, p. 15.

---

[9] As an example of technological spacing of cultures and civilizations, cf. Parks, Lisa, *Cultures in Orbit. Sattelites and the Televisual*, Durham, London 2005.

[10] Cf. Eibl, K., *Kultur als Zwischenwelt. Eine evolutionsbiologische Perspektive*, Edition Unseld, Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt a. M. 2009.

Transdisciplinar character of space

We can find a direct example of *spatial turn* at the point of contact of architecture / town-planning and social sciences in form of transdisciplinar sociology of architecture (B. Schäfers) and sociology of space (M. Löw). This change in perspective in social sciences was initiated, *inter alia*, in the works of P. Bourdieu and A. Giddens along with the introduction of dynamic paradigms of change in analyses and interpretations of the social life reality as well as a general process of becoming a society (P. Sztompka)[11][13, 16].

On the other hand, the trandisciplinar approach to this issue dates back to G. Simmel and his space concept in which he emphasized spatial connections and conditions of behaviours and social actions, the expression of which we can find in his sociology of town and space[12] [15]. This concept of spatial conditions of social actions refers to a relational concept of space based on the so called *spacing* whose author is M. Löw. These concepts emphasize a dynamic reality and understanding of space in the social life. They reject the static concept of space as a Euclidian container for the benefit of active production of space as the space of various relations and references, as *spacing*, i.e. creating syntheses in the reality of conflicts and internal tensions of the modern mass society. This formulation emphasizes the ambiguity of space as a social life category which is produced and shaped and at the same time produces and shapes human relations, actions and behaviours in the social dimension[13] [10, 11]. As a consequence, the contemporary concept of society is based on the process of constant fluctuations and configurations[14] [5] on the one hand, however, on the other hand, 'the society' is interpreted as an equally important process of producing space[15] [9].

Therefore, *spatial turn* signifies a new understanding of space not in the sense of a territory, but rather as a social production of space by means of various, sometimes contrasting social processes, actions and aspirations. On the other hand, the expression of a postmodernist turn towards space and a simultaneous turn away from history and time as coordinates of modernism is the multiplication of the so called no-places which are in a state suspension as regards their historical and cultural meanings, which is the main feature of massing the societies, media and consumption. No-places express homogenization and standardization of the global dimension – space becomes as if a massed product[16] [1].

---

[11] Cf. Schäfers B., *Architektursoziologie. Grundlagen – Epochen – Themen*, Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden 2006; Giddens, A., *Stanowienie społeczeństwa*, p. 154–206, Zysk i S-ka, Poznań 2003; Sztompka, P., *Socjologia. Analiza Społeczeństwa*, pp. 437–553, Znak, Kraków 2009.

[12] Simmel G., *Socjologia przestrzeni* (1903), [in:] *Pisma socjologiczne*, pp. 365–385, Oficyna Naukowa, Warszawa 2008.

---

[13] Cf. Löw M., *Raumsoziologie*, pp. 69–129, Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt am Main 2009; Löw, M., Steets, S., Stoetzer, S., *Einführung in die Stadt- und Raumsoziologie*, pp. 51–92, Budrich/UTB, Opladen & Farmington Hills 2008.

[14] Elias N., *Czym jest socjologia?*, pp. 89–233, Aletheia, Warszawa 2010.

[15] Jałowiecki B., *Społeczne wytwarzanie przestrzeni*, Scholar, Warszawa 2010.

[16] Augé M., *Nie-miejsca. Wprowadzenie do antropologii hipernowoczesności*, PWN, Warszawa 2010.

Spatialization in architecture and town-planning

The contemporary accumulation of technological development has led to a fusion of society and technology on the ground of esthetics, namely new technologies of

communication and visualization. At the same time, the meaning of technologies themselves has been extended as regards their role as special rhetoric tools in the discourse

on culture and architecture. As a result, space and technologies have become an esthetic expression of transformation of the modern society in all of its dimensions[17] [8].

By analogy with the change of space perception in social sciences, also in architecture we can distinguish the two concepts of space which condition each other. On the one hand, it results from the understanding of architecture and its functions in the social reality as a social action and fact, i.e. a special process of 'notching' space in which we encode our culture of actions and behaviours[18] [3]. On the other hand, in the architecture proper we can find esthetic interpretations of philosophical concepts of technology and space and their influence on the society structure and its changes. This results from the fact that architectonic / urban space has two faces as it is at the same time produced and producing and from its significance in culture. Thus, one of the main issues is the definition of the role and meaning of technology in the current dispute on architecture and its spatial impingements upon society and culture. The history of architecture, the very motive of building and residing can be understood in the perspective of technology as special rhetoric tools of discourse on culture, space and architecture.

A good example here is the static architectural formula/paradigm by Le Corbusier based on the Plato idealistic concept of technology defined as a process of producing according to a determined formula/paradigm which is supposed to express an aspiration for perfection and enable existence in the historical dimension. It is contrasted

with the futurism which places emphasis on the dynamism of the technologies proper and is based on Heraclitus and his variabilism where history is rejected for the benefit of a post-historical permanent process of changes. Architecture as a phenomenon which is dynamic, changing, constantly reviving and renewing corresponds to the paradigm of incessant change and movement in Heraclitus philosophy and at the same time rejects the idea of eternal, invariable lasting adequate to the concept of the world by Plato. These two ontological concepts clash and this can be observed in the contemporary interpretations of the phenomenon of technology and in divergent tendencies within the architecture proper. – This contrast is presented against the background of ideological dispute within politics with architecture as a reflection of the state of the modern society[19] [7]. A similar contrast can be seen in the architectural interpretations of place and space in functionalism (pragmatism and statism) and structuralism (variability and openness of space). Along with the discovery of interculturality and transdisciplinarity in the second part of the 20th century, these contrasts led to the so called spatial turn in social sciences, which from then on have been based on the multidimensional concept of space expressed in the dispute of modernism/postmodernism. This dispute, which focused of interpretations of form and space, at the same time, became the axis of the development of the modern architecture[20] [6]. In this way, architecture appears to be reflected in philosophy and technology as an integral element of culture[21] [8].

---

[17] Multidimensionality of esthetic and technological society transformation process along with its transdisciplinar and transcultural character were presented in the study: Heil R., Kaminski A., Stippak M., Unger A., Ziegler M. (eds.), *Tensions and Convergences. Technological and Aesthetic Transformations of Society*, transcript Verlag, Bielefeld 2007.

[18] „Architektur als überaus beständige, kulturell verbindliche 'Kerbung' des Raumes, durch die Handlungspotentialitäten codiert werden", [in:] Döring J., Thielmann T., *Spatial turn...*, p. 18.

[19] Cf. Habermas J., *Moderne und postmoderne Architektur*, [in:] Welsch W. (ed.), *Wege aus der Moderne*, Acta humaniora, Weinheim 1988, pp. 110–120.

[20] Ghirardo D., *Architektura po modernizmie*, Via, Wrocław 1999,

[21] Cf. Timmermann P., *Architecture in the Mirror of Technology*. [in:] Heil R., Kaminski A., Stippak M., Unger A., Ziegler M. (eds.), *Tensions and Convergences...*, pp. 47–57.

Notching *space – Shin Takamatsu's architecture*

These internal connections of modern architecture, philosophy, social transformations and new technologies within the framework of multidimensional tensions between modernism and postmodernism found their expression in the projects executed by a Japanese architect Shin Takamatsu[22]. His architectural designs understand architecture as an integral element of culture and at the same time they go beyond the general scheme of controversies between modernism and postmodernism. Takamatsu has his own unique way of interpreting space in the context of tradition and history of the Japanese culture. It manifests itself as a radical process of 'notching' this historical and cultural space in form of 'architectonic machines'[23] as its integral

element and a challenge at the same time, for example, in the project *Ark* (Kyoto 1983). Takamatsu's creative work is inspired by metaphors of light and shade which occur in the architecture of East and West with reference to one of the oldest Shinto temples Izumo[24]. His architecture represents an interpretation of this tradition as a radical entry into the

---

[24] As is emphasized by Takamatsu: (…) *In Bezug auf Licht kann ich wohl sagen, daß ich unter dem Einfluß von Izumo stehe. Das izumoische Licht ist eine leuchtende Finsternis, wie ich es gerne nennen möchte. Das heißt, die Finsternis ist hier kein Gegensatz zum Licht, sondern sie ist eine leuchtende Finsternis. Die Finsternis von Izumo bestimmt und definiert das Licht. Jede Existenz tritt in Erscheinung, nicht weil sie im Licht steht, sondern weil sie einen inneren Schein in sich trägt. Dieser Gedanke über Izumo spielt für mich eine wichtige Rolle, wenn ich mich mit Architektur befasse. Meine Vorstellung ist es immer gewesen, alles, wie Orte, Material, Gestalt und Architektur zu kristalisieren, als etwas, das vom eigenen Licht durchtränkt ist* (...), [in:] *Shin Takamatsu, ein Architekt aus Kyoto*, p. 20.

[22] *Shin Takamatsu, ein Architekt aus Kyoto*, mit Beiträgen von F. Guattari, P. Virilio, S. Takamatsu, Merve Verlag, Berlin 1995.

[23] Cf. Guattari F., *Die Architektur-Maschinen von Shin Takamatsu*, [in:] *Shin Takamatsu, ein Architekt aus Kyoto*, Merve, Berlin 1995, pp. 56–83.

space of this place, i.e. in this case the city space of Kyoto – generally modern space of the Japanese culture [14].

The starting point in the analysis of Takamatsu's creative work is the definition of architecture as a tool and at the same time method of expression of the moment in which the architect's initiation occurs in a creative act by virtue of an internal need for expression or an act of shaping the form. In Takamatsu's case this is achieved thanks to the metaphors of light and shade and the permanent process of repeating movement as designing-drawing the form and its search which in architecture means creating and at the same time researching by analogy with capturing space and architecture as produced and producing. In this way, a direct analogy is drawn between designing-drawing and writing as a metaphor of the power of light contained in the tip of the pen / rapidograph (i.e. technical pen) (*Leuchtkraft, die aus der Spitze des schriftstellerischen Stiftes hervorgeht*, ibidem, p. 13).

However, the very act of creation involves an inseparable bond between the subject and the work itself, almost a biological relation, which is emphasized by Takamatsu (*Ich kann sogar sagen, daß meine Architektur mein Körper selbst ist*, ibidem, p. 18). By analogy with this biological relation with the work, Takamatsu presents architecture on the model of mechanism, aggregate which introduces light into our shade, into man's interior where light and shade, similarly to Izumo temple, do not constitute opposites but mutually complement each other[25]. This inspiration with Izumo temple in Kyoto also expresses differences in understanding the metaphor of light between the cultures of East and West. In the western world, the metaphor of light dates back to the Plato interpretation of light as a kind of revelation or completion of a cognition act. On the other hand, the eastern culture, among other things, the Japanese culture is characterized by dimmer light which comes out of shade and it is not explicit because it is burdened with subtle, sophisticated taboo of reticence. This light serves the purpose of expressing and simultaneously refuting taboo. In the context of architecture, this means an aspiration for shaping this internal light hidden in shade – extracting light from the form, material and finally from the existing urban space. According to Takamatsu, the act of creation perceived in this way is something sacral and the architect himself/herself becomes a priest and alchemist[26].

In the case of relation between place and space, this means that place is always defined anew by architecture in the process of producing space. Such redefining of places is an act of spacing (*spacing*, M. Löw). Simultaneously, in the context of place and space on the one hand, and on the other in relation to the triad of history, tradition and culture – we can observe duplicity of architecture. The architect may remain faithful to the so called *genius loci* to which he subordinates an act of creation and architecture in the perspective of historical long lasting (F. Braudel) or he can reject history and horizontality for the benefit of moment, transfer and flow (M. Castells, J. Urry) by introducing a vertical bend in form of moment-place, in which architecture becomes a challenge for the existing place and space. One of the examples of such domination of place in the process of simultaneous producing and bending space is the design by Takamatsu *Kirin Plaza Osaka*. In order to express this dependency between architecture and space, Takamatsu uses the metaphor of ether (*Ether Planning*)[27]. This concept was supposed to enable the definition of fleetingness, change, temporariness in space, which at the same time remains specified. In this sense, the metaphorical character of architecture connects its development starting from the aesthetics of space and glass at the beginning of the 20th century contained in the studies of Mies van der Rohe and the metaphors of light and shade at the end of the 20th century in Takamatsu's projects. Concurrently, Takamatsu's designs express new technologies at the turn of millenniums, for example, *Yokohama Urban Ring* as an attempt to express electronic space.

As emphasized by P. Virilio, Takamatsu treats space as the subject of criticism and also as a peculiar subversive act of abolishing rules. However, it does not occur in the sense of postmodernist deconstruction but it rather means the question of what and when to build. It resulted from the specific transformation of the Japanese society after World War II. Takamatsu's structures explicitly enter space; it is a particular process of notching space as an expression and objectivity of the whole issue of spatial turn exactly by *Zuspitzung* (P. Virilio) – sharpening, overstatement in form, confrontation with the existing principles of the static and widely accepted scheme. This confrontation resulted from the unique situation in the history of Japanese culture and society, which was suspended between the past and tradition as well as progress and future, from the permanent state of tension between ideas and condensing of metropolis space[28].

---

[25] (…) *der das Licht in die Finsternis unseres Inneren dringen läßt. Licht und Dunkel stehen zueinander nicht in Opposition* (...), [in:] *Shin Takamatsu, ein Architekt aus Kyoto*, p. 5.

[26] *Ich glaube auch, daß sich ein Architekt als eine Art Priester der Images darstellt. Er versucht nicht die Kräfte visuell zu rationalisieren. Formen sind schon da. In dem Moment, wenn eine Form hervorgeht, übertrifft sie sich selbst, geladen mit unerhörten Kräften, als eine Existenz. Die Architektur ist eine paradoxe Maschine, wie ich es mir vorstellte, die dieses ursprüngliche Begehren von Formen hervorruft und klärt. Ich habe geglaubt, daß Architektur als ein Filter, als eine Kristallisationsapparatur, denkbar ist,* [in:] *Shin Takamatsu, ein Architekt aus Kyoto*, p. 22.

[27] *Äther ist für mich eine Metapher für einen Raum: Ein veränderlicher, ätherischer Raum durch die ungleichmäßige Dichte der Luft, in dem jedes Teilchen sich frei bewegt und die Entstehung der neuen Raumstruktur beeinflußt. Ein Raum, in dem die Inkohärenz der Kohärenz und die Kohärenz der Inkohärenz ein flexibles, dichtes, dynamisches Feld darstellen. (...) Ich kam zu der Überzeugung, daß die Räume, die demnächst in Betracht kommen sollen, gekennzeichnet sind durch diese unbestimmte Bestimmtheit*, [in:] *Shin Takamatsu, ein Architekt aus Kyoto*, p. 37.

[28] In this context P. Virilio emphasizes: *Das heutige Nippon, das zwischen Vergangenheit und Zukunft, zwischen Gedächtnis und Erfindung vereinsamt ist, kommt auf den Augenblick zurück, auf die kurze Zeitspanne einer photographischen Momentaufnahme. (...) Shin Takamatsu Werk entspringt aus Spannungen, die hier, in Tokio, in Kyoto und anderswo wirksam sind, aus Spannungen, die der Dichte des Verkehrs und der Überdichte der städtischen Bevölkerung geschuldet sind: Es erscheint wie das Bild einer unvermeidlichen Zusammenballung von rückwärtsgewandten und vorausblickenden Ideen, als Sinnbehälter, als Panzerschrank von architekturalen Werten, die dabei sind, zu verschwinden,* P. Virilio, *Zuspitzung am Beispiel von Shin Takamatsu*, [in:] *Shin Takamatsu, ein Architekt aus Kyoto*, pp. 50–51.

Takamatsu refers to the concept of open, dynamic space of structuralism by Kenzo Tange as a reaction to the functionalism which was dominant in international architecture. At the same time, the modern Japanese architecture (trend of the so called metabolism) intends to adapt buildings to the requirements of contemporary man. F. Guattari defines this trend as processualism, i.e. not surrendering to the formulas and schemes accepted in the schools and trends of architecture so far[29] [14]. First of all, it is a form of provoking and challenging the existing space which also results from the tradition of form. In the context of space, Guattari distinguishes two contrasting concepts: 1) Le Corbusier with his postulate to maintain the integrated relation between form and space, 2) Mies van der Rohe with his postulate of separating the work, i.e. a structure and its form from the environment. The dilemma between those two concepts means the choice between maintaining and rejecting the context in relation to the surroundings. According to Guattari, Takamatsu's architecture is the third option – an aesthetic structure in a way perfect in its form is at the same time open to the spatial context[30]. Some of the expressions of this third option are, among other things, the aforementioned no-places (M. Augé) which become individualized in an act of creation according to Takamatsu's idea. These three options determine the place of architecture in the modern culture and space [14].

[29] *Wenn man jede systematische Etikettierung dieser Architekten ablehnt, kann man bei ihnen Prozesse evolutiven Werdens ausmachen, die ganz natürlich darauf abzielen, ihre Werke aus den funktionalen Rahmenbedingungen, aus den Erfordernissen des Kontextes, ja sogar aus jedem kulturellen Bezug humanistischer Art heraustreten zu lassen*, F. Guattari, *Die Architektur-Maschinen von Shin Takamatsu*, [in:] *Shin Takamatsu, ein Architekt aus Kyoto*, pp. 57–58.

[30] *Vielleicht genügt aber auch der Hinweis, daß wir jeden Tag solche Objekte aufsuchen, die intrinsisch strukturiert sind und zugleich mit der äußeren Umwelt arbeiten: Diese Objekte sind die unterschiedlichen und vielfältigen Maschinen, durch die unsere moderne Existenz von allen Seiten her versorgt wird. Ein Merkmal dieser Objekte ist, daß sie sich im Lauf der Zeit entwickeln und sich gegenseitig in einer Phylogenese ersetzen, die an die der Lebewesen erinnert*, F. Guattari, *Die Architektur-Maschinen von Shin Takamatsu*, [in:] *Shin Takamatsu, ein Architekt aus Kyoto*, pp. 62–63.

References

[1] Augé M., *Nie-miejsca. Wprowadzenie do antropologii hipernowoczesności*, PWN, Warszawa 2010.

[2] Castells M., *Społeczeństwo sieci*, PWN, Warszawa 2007.

[3] Döring J., Thielmann T. (Hrsg.), *Spatial turn. Das Raumparadigma in den Kultur- und Sozialwissenschaften*, transcript Verlag, Bielefeld 2008.

[4] Eibl K., *Kultur als Zwischenwelt. Eine evolutionsbiologische Perspektive*, Edition Unseld, Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt a. M. 2009.

[5] Elias N., *Czym jest socjologia?*, Aletheia, Warszawa 2010, pp. 89–233.

[6] Ghirardo D., *Architektura po modernizmie*, Via, Wrocław 1999.

[7] Habermas J., *Moderne und postmoderne Architektur*, [in:] Welsch W. (eds.), *Wege aus der Moderne*, Acta humaniora, Weinheim 1988, pp. 110–120.

[8] Heil R., Kaminski A., Stippak M., Unger A., Ziegler M. (eds.), *Tensions and Convergences. Technological and Aesthetic Transformations of Society*, transcript Verlag, Bielefeld 2007.

[9] Jałowiecki B., *Społeczne wytwarzanie przestrzeni*, Scholar, Warszawa 2010.

[10] Löw M., *Raumsoziologie*, Suhrkamp Verlag, Frankfurt am Main 2009, p. 69–129.

[11] Löw M., Steets S., Stoetzer S., *Einführung in die Stadt- und Raumsoziologie*, Budrich/UTB, Opladen & Farmington Hills 2008, pp. 51–92.

[12] McLuhan H.M., *Wybór tekstów*, Zysk i S-ka, Poznań 2001.

[13] Schäfers B., *Architektursoziologie. Grundlagen – Epochen – Themen*, Verlag für Sozialwissenschaften, Wiesbaden 2006.

[14] *Shin Takamatsu, ein Architekt aus Kyoto*, mit Beiträgen von F. Guattari, P. Virilio, S. Takamatsu, Merve Verlag, Berlin 1995.

[15] Simmel G., *Socjologia przestrzeni* (1903), [in:] *Pisma socjologiczne*, Oficyna Naukowa, Warszawa 2008, pp. 365–385.

[16] Sztompka P., *Socjologia. Analiza Społeczeństwa*, Znak, Kraków 2009, pp. 437–553.

[17] Urry J., *Socjologia mobilności*, PWN, Warszawa 2009.

[18] Warf B., Arias S. (eds.), *The Spatial Turn: Interdisciplinary Perspectives*, Routledge Studies in Human Geography, London 2009.

[19] Zawojski P., *Cyberkultura. Syntopia sztuki, nauki i technologii*, Poltext, Warszawa 2010.

Spatial turn. *Przestrzenie międzykulturowe i transdyscyplinarne w architekturze*

Współczesna akumulacja rozwoju technologii doprowadziła do fuzji społeczeństwa i technologii na fundamencie estetyki, dokładnie nowych technologii wizualizacji. Jednocześnie poszerzyło się znaczenie samych technologii jako swoistych retorycznych narzędzi dyskursu toczonego wokół kultury oraz architektury. Jako przykład może tutaj posłużyć statyczny wzór/paradygmat architektoniczny Le Corbusiera oparty na platońskiej idealistycznej koncepcji technologii (wytwarzania). Jego przeciwieństwem jest futuryzm z podkreśleniem dynamizmu samych technologii, a oparty na heraklitejskim wariabilizmie. Podobne przeciwieństwo odnajdujemy w architektonicznych interpretacjach miejsca i przestrzeni funkcjonalizmu (pragmatyzm i statyzm) oraz strukturalizmu (zmienność i otwarcie przestrzeni). Wraz z odkryciem międzykulturowości i transdyscyplinarności w drugiej połowie 20. wieku przeciwieństwa te doprowadziły do tzw. zwrotu przestrzennego w naukach społecznych, opartych od tego momentu na wielowymiarowej koncepcji przestrzeni i wyrażonej w sporze modernizm/postmodernizm. Spór ten stał się jednocześnie osią rozwoju współczesnej architektury, czego wyrazem są projekty Shin Takamatsu. W ten sposób architektura ukazuje się w zwierciadle filozofii i technologii jako integralny element kultury.

Key words: spatial turn, space in architecture

Słowa kluczowe: spatial turn, przestrzeń w architekturze