

FaR 2021

International Forum “Freedom and responsibility in pivotal times”

**FREEDOM AND RESPONSIBILITY AS SOCIO-
ANTHROPOLOGICAL FACTORS IN THE FORMATION OF
URBAN SPACE**

Tatiana V. Bernyukevich (a)*

*Corresponding author

(a) Moscow State University of Civil Engineering, NRU MGSU, Moscow, Russia, bernyukevich@inbox.ru

Abstract

The relevance of the research presented in the article is associated with the need to determine the socio-anthropological factors of the formation of modern urban space. The aim of the study is to determine the possibilities of using the social activity of people as a manifestation of their freedom and responsibility for the formation of the city’s space. The spatial characteristics of the city include the structure of the city, the types of spaces included in it, the hierarchy of urban spaces and subspaces and their connections. Methods of urban space development are primarily determined by production methods and social relations, a complex system of social ties and the influence of different social groups, the role of government and business. As a result of the study, it can be concluded that the development of social activity of city residents, aimed at the formation of urban space, allows one to effectively implement the ideas of citizens, satisfy their needs and, to a certain extent, produce new meanings of the cultural space of the city. It is important to define social activity within the dialectic of freedom and responsibility, which allows residents to become real participants in the development of urban space. The possibility of free participation in the creation of urban spaces, the development and implementation of modern social technologies for such participation (public hearings, polls, city Internet portals, etc.) contribute to the formation of a sense of belonging and responsibility for the city.

2357-1330 © 2022 Published by European Publisher.

Keywords: Urban space, freedom and responsibility, the right to the city, social activity



1. Introduction

Research of the formation of a city's space usually includes an analysis of the factors of this formation, historical conditions, cultural specifics and economic consequences. In the study of urban space, it focuses on the spatial characteristics of the city as a cultural phenomenon. Exploring the cultural space of a city often involves interdisciplinarity. In the organization of the city's space, the history of the city, its needs, and development strategies are recorded. The unique image of the city, formed by the correlation of its streets, squares, embankments, and its architecture, is, in the words of Lotman (1984) a place of human habitation and cultural space as a special semiotic system. The researchers of urban space are historians, philosophers, anthropologists, sociologists, culturologists (U. Eco, R. Barthes, H. Lefebvre, Y.M. Lotman, V.N. Toporov, V.G. Ilyin, E. Smolenskaya, etc.). A significant contribution to the study of urban space was made by representatives of the sociology of the city, in the framework of which the issues of urban development were associated with social transformations. The emergence of sociology of the city correlates with the period of significant social transformations of the beginning, since "social problems are basically the problems of the city" (Park, 2002, p. 4). The development of urban problems is associated with the ideas of M. Weber, G. Simmel, F. Tönnies, and others. The problem of urban sociology is becoming central for representatives of the Chicago School (R. Park, E. Burgess, L. Wirth) (Strelnikova, 2012).

Focusing on spatial characteristics, researchers identify the structure of the city, the types of spaces included in it, the hierarchy of urban spaces and subspaces and their connections (Bikbov, 2002). Bikbov (2002) notes that "efforts to combine heterogeneous elements in one place, which in their totality are commensurate with the social status of their consumers, materialize the space of styles, that is, tie the distribution of social properties to places in physical space" (p. 147).

The relevance of the topic of the city's cultural space is caused by the need to determine the socio-anthropological factors of the formation of modern urban space. It is important to identify the role of social activity of city residents, their opportunities for free expression of will on the development of the urban environment, analysis of the ability of citizens to take or share responsibility for the formation of the cultural space of the city.

2. Problem Statement

In the presented study, the problem of the role of social activity of city residents in the formation of the city space is posed. It is important to define social activity within the dialectic of freedom and responsibility, which allows residents to become real participants in the development of urban space. This factor can be considered in the context of well-known social concepts such as the "right to the city". It is necessary not only to determine the theoretical and methodological foundations for the development of the city space, but also to identify their potential in the practice of taking into account public opinion to address issues of urban construction and improve the urban environment.

3. Research Questions

The spatial structure of the city is associated with its history, a special axis of chronology, and time layers. The researchers note:

The stability of the city in time not only allows you to build its special topography – due to it, the urban environment is formed, that very difficult to describe, but quite tangible mood that is inherent in a particular city, its atmosphere, its character. (Romashko, 2002, p. 97)

3.1. City as a space for creating meanings

Urban topography can be endowed with special metaphysical features, metaphorically defined and associated with the special ontological status of the city. From the point of view of city's metaphysics, a city is a phenomenon “having certain ontological structures and value meanings and occupying a special place in the symbolic space of culture” (Gurin, 2003, par, 1). In this view, the city is both an integral symbol, the result of the formation of archetypal consciousness, and a subject (and not just a place) of “the production of meanings, the creation and functioning of symbols” (Gurin, 2003, par, 5). These meanings and symbols are not chaotically piled up in the city space, but are included in a certain hierarchical structuring, each level of this city structure produces its own system of meanings and symbols. This hierarchy is reflected in the system of urban planning and architecture: “Each large city has three architectural and symbolic levels: heavenly, earthly, underground (dungeons and catacombs) ... A strict vertical is set, the transcendental principle is highlighted and emphasized” (Gurin, 2003, par, 43).

3.2. The concept of “right to the city”

One of the most controversial issues is the question of the factors of creating urban space. A number of fundamental works are devoted to the issues of influence on the formation of urban space; one of the most popular is the concept of “right to the city”. According to the ideas of Henri Lefebvre's book “The Right to the City” (published in 1968), “each of the residents has a “right to the city” and can defend it”, this work has intensified interest in this topic (Vershina, 2018). The well-known theorist of neo-Marxism defines the role of consumption, social relations, functions of business and government, etc. in the organization of urban space. David Harvey, developing the ideas of the concept of the right to the city, in his article “The Right to the City” focuses on the “fragmentation” of modern cities: “We live in divided cities. First of all, the so-called “global” cities are socially split between financial elites and huge masses of low-paid service workers, mingling with the marginalized and the unemployed” (Harvey, 2008, p. 80).

Harvey believes that all city dwellers are “architects of the urban future”, because with the help of everyday practices “we are making political, intellectual and economic efforts, we are building a city”. (Harvey, 2008, p. 82). Within the framework of this general urban planning, it is necessary to find effective ways to fulfil the “right to difference”. By implementing these tasks, the city dwellers simultaneously express their free rights to form the city space they need and become responsible for the fate of their city.

The idea of the production of space is closely related to the concept of the right to the city. Lefebvre's well-known work “The Production of Space” is devoted to this problem (Lefebvre, 2015). Lefebvre views

space as a product of the formation of society, primarily the development of production and social relations. He defines the city as a special type of social space, formed by projecting all aspects, elements and moments of social practice separately “onto the locality” (Lefebvre, 2015). As a result of such projection, the city appears as a special type of social space – it is equipped, decorated space, full of various social activities throughout a certain historical era (Lefebvre, 2015). Currently, the problem of alienation of the subject from the social space of the city is becoming more acute; it should be solved through the implementation of the “right to the city” as a unity of social freedom and responsibility.

4. Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study is to determine the possibilities of using the social activity of people as a manifestation of their freedom and responsibility for the formation of the city’s space.

The space of the city in this case appears as a specific system, including the hierarchy of urban spaces and subspaces included in it. The genesis of urban space is associated with the history of the city, its inclusion in national and world history. Methods of urban space development are primarily determined by production methods and social relations, a complex system of social ties and the influence of different social groups, the role of government and business (Shih-Kung, 2020).

Currently, certain social practices are being developed to influence the formation of the urban environment, the tasks of which are the formation of a comfortable, safe urban space, in accordance with the needs and interests of citizens (McGill, 2020). However, such attempts will not be successful without their methodological substantiation and identification of socio-anthropological parameters for the development of urban space.

5. Research Methods

The tasks of the presented work include the search for theoretical and methodological approaches to the determination of socio-anthropological factors in the development of urban space and the analysis of existing practices of social activity aimed at the formation and development of the urban environment. The implementation of these tasks is possible with the use of an integrated approach. This will allow one, based on consideration of fundamental scientific and philosophical concepts (the right to the city, metaphysics of the city, etc.) and identification of the specifics of modern social technologies for the development of urban space, to determine the most relevant factors of the formation of a modern city.

Within the framework of an interdisciplinary approach, it is possible to use data from different scientific fields: philosophy, sociology, cultural studies, political science, etc. The presented work is based on the generalization of the results of similar studies on this topic, analysis of legal documents related to the development of urban spaces, etc. Socio-philosophical analysis is necessary to understand the essence of socio-anthropological factors in the development of urban space as a reflection of the dialectic of freedom and responsibility.

6. Findings

Freedom and responsibility of citizens can become an effective socio-anthropological factor in the formation of the city's space, provided that the practices of civil influence on the development of the urban environment are administratively and legislatively consolidated.

The study considers the possibilities of using social activity for the development of urban space in Russia using the example of analyzing the practice of organizing public discussions, public hearings related to construction issues, taking into account the results of surveys, meetings, etc. (Ivanova & Bernyukevich, 2015). The Town Planning Code of the Russian Federation introduces clarifications concerning these issues. For example, the Federal Law of December 29, 2017 N 455-FL "On amendments to the Town Planning Code of the Russian Federation and Certain Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation" introduced the legitimation of a new form of organizing public discussions – "placing a project subject to public discussion, and information materials to it on the official website of the authorized body of local self-government in the information and telecommunications network "Internet" (On Amendments to the Urban Planning Code..., 2017). The procedures for public discussions and public hearings are separated and clarified in the law. It should be noted that there are differences between the procedures for holding public discussions and public hearings. Public discussions involve the mandatory use of information systems and the Internet. In the procedure of public hearings, the stage of holding a meeting or meetings of participants is mandatory, but in the procedure of public discussions it is absent (Pashnina, 2018).

Public discussions and public hearings (including the stage of the meeting) are effective mostly because of a social background and the fact of expression of public opinion in the form of comments and recommendations. For example, voting on issues discussed during public hearings is not provided. The protocol of public discussions or public hearings prepared and drawn up by the organizer of public discussions or public hearings shall include: "all proposals and comments of the participants in public discussions or public hearings, dividing into proposals and comments of citizens who are participants in public discussions or public hearings and permanently residing in the territory, where public discussions or public hearings are held, and proposals and comments of other participants in public discussions or public hearings" (Civil Code of the Russian Federation Article 5.1, 2004). It is usually stated in judicial acts that public hearings are an element of urban planning activities and their results should be taken into account by the competent authority when making a decision. According to the definition of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation, public hearings "are not a form of exercising power by the population. Nevertheless, they provide everyone who may be affected by the proposed decision, the authority to make which belongs to the competent authorities and officials, the opportunity to participate in its discussion..." (On the complaint of citizen..., 2010). Public hearings ensure openness in making managerial decisions.

One of the forms of expression of the city residents social activity are Internet portals and Internet platforms created to get the opinion of citizens on topical issues related to the development of cities. An example of such resources is the "Active Citizen" platform, an electronic survey system launched on the initiative of the Moscow Government on May 21, 2014. Active Citizen's polls are divided into three categories: city-wide, industry-specific, and regional. For active participation in surveys, bonus points are available; they can be exchanged for rewards.

Currently, one of the most discussed issues is the problem of renovation and humanization of public spaces in the city. Researchers point out that this task can be solved only with the synthesis of architectural and urban planning and ergonomic design approaches to improving the formation of public spaces. Taking into account the anthropological factor in the framework of the architectural and urban planning approach provides for “the organic inclusion of public space in the urban environment, the formation of a functional structure of space using architectural volumes, the inclusion, if necessary, of additional objects reflecting their historical development features and the “spirit of the place” (Votinov, 2015).

7. Conclusion

The development of social activity of city residents, aimed at the formation of urban space, makes it possible to effectively implement the ideas of citizens, satisfy their needs and, to a certain extent, produce new meanings of the city’s cultural space. Social practices of the formation of the urban environment make it possible to overcome the existing “alienation” between residents and the city as a product of the activities of government and business. The possibility of free participation in the creation of urban spaces, the development and implementation of modern social technologies for such participation (public hearings, polls, city Internet portals, etc.) contribute to the formation of a sense of belonging and responsibility for the city.

At the same time, a number of problems associated with the implementation of such urban practices can be identified. Firstly, it is insufficient coverage of the population with the above-mentioned technologies of active participation in the improvement of the urban environment. Secondly, the issues of legitimacy and taking into account the results of surveys, public discussions and public hearings in real decision-making on the development of the city (for example, the construction of certain objects). Thirdly, the possibility of taking into account the opinions of citizens does not at all exclude lobbying for the interests of certain groups of the population, hidden corruption, etc.

However, the analysis of such practices of active participation of city residents allows us to conclude that within their framework, both specific issues of the development of the urban environment can be resolved, and directions for the future improvement of the socio-cultural space of the city can be identified.

References

- Bikbov, A. (2002). Moscow / Paris: spatial structures and bodily schemes. *Logos: Journal of Philosophy and Pragmatics of Culture*, 3-4(34), 145–168.
- Civil Code of the Russian Federation Article 5.1. “Urban Planning Code of the Russian Federation”. Dated 29 December 2004, no. 190-FZ. (as amended on 31 July 2020). http://www.consultant.ru/document/cons_doc_LAW_51040/fc77c7117187684ab0cb02c7ee53952df0de55be/ Date of treatment 10/20/2020
- Gurin, S. P. (2003). *The image of the city in culture: metaphysical and mystical aspects*. http://www.comk.ru/HTML/gurin_doc.htm
- Harvey, D. (2008). The right to the city. *Logos*, 3(66), 80–94.
- Ivanova, Z. I., & Bernyukevich, T. V. (2015). Urban planning policy and public hearings in the Russian Federation. *Bulletin of the Trans-Baikal State University*, 25-9, 52–60.
- Lefebvre, H. (2015). *Production of space*. Streike Press.

- Lotman, Yu. M. (1984). Symbols of St. Petersburg and the problems of city semiotics. In: Semiotics of the city and urban culture. Petersburg. Transactions on Sign Systems, XVIII. *Scientific notes of Tartu State University*, 664, 30–45.
- McGill, R. (2020). Urban resilience – An urban management perspective. *Journal of Urban Management*, 9(3), 372–381.
- On Amendments to the Urban Planning Code of the Russian Federation and Certain Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation. Federal Law of 29 December 2017, no. 455-FZ. (2017). <http://base.garant.ru/71848734/1cafb24d049dcd1e7707a22d98e9858f>
- On the complaint of citizen Olga Olegovna Andronova for violation of her constitutional legal provisions of Articles 39 and 40 of the Town Planning Code of the Russian Federation, Article 13 of the Law of St. Petersburg “On urban planning activities in St. Petersburg”, Articles 7 and 8 of the Law of St. Petersburg. Determination of the Constitutional Court of the Russian Federation of 15 July 2010 N 931-O-O. (2010). <https://www.garant.ru/products/ipo/prime/doc/1695953/> Date of treatment 10/20/2020
- Park, R. (2002). City as a social laboratory. *Sociological Review*, 2(3), 3–12.
- Pashnina, V. (2018). *On some features of the application of the Federal Law of December 29, 2017, no. 455-FZ “On Amendments to the Urban Planning Code of the Russian Federation and Certain Legislative Acts of the Russian Federation”*. 21.08.2018. (2018). <https://itpgrad.ru/node/2807> Date of treatment 10/20/2020
- Romashko, S. (2002). Monument - souvenir - evidence: the time axis of the metropolis. *Logos: Journal of Philosophy and Pragmatics of Culture*, 3-4(34), 97–108.
- Shih-Kung, L. (2020). Evidence of urban spatial self-organization. *Journal of Urban Management*, 24. <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S2226585620303241>
- Strelnikova, A. V. (2012). *Sociology of the City: Spatial Practices and Life Trajectories*. Trovant.
- Vershinina, I. A. (2018). Henri Lefebvre: From “The Right to the City” to the “Urban Revolution”. *Bulletin Moscow University. Ser. 18. Sociology and Political Science*, 24-2, 48–60.
- Votinov, M. A. (2015). *Renovation and humanization of spaces in the urban environment*. Monograph. KhNUGH them. A.N. Beketova.