არქიტექტურა როგორც საზოგადოებრივი სინამდვილის კონსტრუქცია და მისი როლი საზოგადოების ტრანსფორმაციის პროცესებში

ბახტაძე ნათია

*არქიტექტურა არის სოციალური მანიფესტი- განაცხადა ლუის ჰენრი სულივანმა 1901 წელს, და მართლაც, როგორც არქიტექტურის თეორეტიკოსი ვიტორიო მანიაგო ლამპუნიანი წერს, არქიტექტურა შეიძლება ავხსნათ როგორც კულტურული მანიფესტი, რომელიც საზოგადოებრივი განვითარებების პროცესიდან გამომდინარეობს და თავის მხრივაც გავლენას ახდენს ამ საზოგადოების ჩამოყალიბებაზე. მხოლოდ ასეთი ხედვიდან გამომდინარეა დღეს შესაძლებელი შედეგიანი ისტორიული დაკვირვება ნაგებობებზე.*

*არქიტექტონული უტოპიების განხორციელებას სოციალურ ცვლილებებზე იმდენად მიაქვს იერიში, რამდენადაც ეს არქიტექ-ტურა აღარ კონცენტრირდება საზოგადოებრივ მასებზე, როგორც ამას XX საუკუნის პირველი ნახევრის არქიტექტურა აკეთებდა, არამედ მისი მიზანი ცივილიზებული "knowledge society" ხდება.*

*თემა სვამს კითხვებს, თუ რისთვის იყებიან არქიტექტურული უტოპიები და რით არის გამოწვეული, რომ ამ ფორმის ნაგებობები ქალაქის პრესტიჟულ ნაგებობებად ეტაბლიერდებიან.*

# Architecture as a Construction of Social Reality and its Role in the Process of Social Transformation

Bakhtadze Natia

Architecture is social manifest. If we want to know why specific subjects are of a peculiar form we should observe the society as our constructions and cities are reflection of our society. With this view critical research of architecture in reality leans towards research of social relations, which are formed that way[1]- stated Louis Henry Sullivan in 1901, and really as Vittorio Magnano Lampugnani, German theorist of architecture reckons, architecture can be determined only as cultural manifest, which proceeds from the process of social development and in its turn puts an impact

on development of this very society.[2] Only from this point of view it is possible to make historical observation over constructions nowadays.

Sociology of architecture, as one of the most actual scientific disciplines of the XXI century, deals with phenomenon of architectural construction and studies conjuncture of architectural space in sociology and cultural science. However on the international scientific arena, as its actual founders Heike Delitz and Bernhard Shepper explain, we should remind, that Morris Halbvak and George Zemel were interested in relations of architectural physiognomy and society. Such personalities as Walter Benjamin, Michelle Phuko, Norbert Ellias and Ernst Bloch have made deeper analysis of architecture, its social relation and revealed interaction between architectural and social issues. In his "Passages" Walter Benjamin reckons that "architecture is the main witness of society's latent mythology",[3] Ernst Bloch depicts architectural fantasy as society's specific utopia[4].

The assertion that architecture gives face to the society is not new. In the beginning of the XX century vanguard architects put up the social issue of architecture, as far as they charged architecture with becoming constructive force and bringing "order" into social life.[5]

As paradoxical it may sound, vanguard architects of the XX century have founded the above-mentioned relation between the architecture and the society, which is called transformation of the society.[6] They have related problem of architectural form and the society.

According to Heike Delitz, the paradox is that classical sociology was systemized, when architecture represented transformation of the society – main problem of sociology. Main objective of architecture of the above-mentioned period was to create apparent artificial layer of life free from any traditions, which was unusual at those times.

Progress of the society, attaching new direction to the way of life and feeling was the uppermost objective of vanguard architects. It is witnessed by Walter Gropius's apodictic statement – construction is formation of ways of living.[7] It was social-technical position of architecture; the objective was to bring order to masses. Vanguard architects have practically created "sensorium", where they studied society, made social diagnosis, analyzed "new masses of the society" that gathered more and more in capital cities, which, according to Delitz, transformed into social inequality.[8] This class struggle became a core reason of creation of compact settlements with repeating houses and corresponding interior.

Really, according to this architecture, architectural side of our modern society has developed; an "international style" has been created, which ousted any traditions and widespread worldwide. Theory of architecture and sociology determines this architecture as beginning of construction in creative position, which is radicalized in deconstruction.

Deconstructive direction, as the leading stylistic direction of our time system-izes new perspectives worldwide and tries with its own forces to bring the modern society into this field and introduce utopia of deconstructive architecture into social reality.[9] Implementation of the above-mentioned architectural utopias has such a great impact on social changes as this architecture is not concentrated on social mass, as it was done by architecture of the first part of the XX century, thus civilized "knowledge society"[10] becomes its objective.

Sociology of architecture puts up questions about purposes of creation of ar-chitectural utopias and about the reason for this type of constructions to be deter-mined as prestigious constructions of the city.

First of all, sociology of architecture relates architectural utopias to mecha-nisms of institutional constructions, first evident of which is to impress.

In parallel to these problems, nowadays reconstruction of corresponding global aesthetic modern "European city" or "Global city" is considered as in South-East Europe also in a wide range of cities outside Europe as an example of educa-tional model. New architectural constructions create new universal worlds, which in their own turn reflect their origin, social and public consciousness.

From Georgian reality I would like to draw the attention to Avlabari palace and St. Triity Cathedral in Tbilisi city. St. Trinity Cathedral – is massive monument, which in the end of the XX century and in the XXI century remains devoted to forms of Geor-gian orthodox architecture of the XI century; situated besides modern construction of Avlabari palace it represents ideological and constructional variety.  Prominence of these two monuments is preconditioned by their visual omnipresence, privileged location and stylistic "eccentricity". Both constructions were invented as super mon-uments; they denote new reality and strive to give new face to the society. As archi-tectural symbols they completely determine skyline of the location and highlight self presentation.

These two constructions welcome people visiting Tbilisi from far away; early this role was given to Metechi and monument of Vakhtang Gorgasali. If Avlabari palace with its architectural arrangement becomes the city's main image construc-tion, which denotes modernization and globalization, St. Trinity Cathedral represents metropolitan area, which is highly crowded. This character from the very beginning was a part of aesthetic strategy of cathedral's construction;[11] a parallel is drawn be-tween Erich Rehberg's opinion about those symbolic mechanisms, which represent main keys of institutional identity and by means of which institutional self history is generated.[12] At this very time, in the end of 80's, when Georgia, based on its his-torical reality, was given an opportunity to decide its own fate independently from Russian and soviet government, decided that construction of St. Trinity Cathedral was necessary as a symbol of gained independence, beginning of new life, presenta-tion of revival of Georgian church life and reintegration and reunion of the country.[13] The Cathedral was settled as spiritual cathedral, which has been destroyed for two

centuries. On the assumption of this objective, the idea of maintenance of traditions, repeating of architectural forms and ornaments of the XI century, proclamation that the construction should have been "descendant" of Svetistskhoveli serves to self-knowledge. Thus, the church was considered to become a new heart of Tbilisi city. Today, in commotion of theories and academic opinions about maintenance or revival of architecture's national character, conclusion can be made that origin is constitutional for the past and the future of all humans.[14]

Erich Rothaker writes that "Human is plush and axis – tradition". In history of culture architecture has the meaning of essential dimension, as architecture is the form which maintains past social order. Here the main character of architecture – conservation of old and creation of new - is revealed.[15]

## Endnotes

[1] Louis Henry Sullivan in: Lampugnani, Vittorio Magnano: (1980). *Architektur und Staedtebau des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart, S. 7.

[2] Lampugnani, Vittorio Magnano: (1980). *Architektur und Staedtebau des 20. Jahrhunderts*. Stuttgart. S.8ff.

[3] Benjamin, Walter. (1982). *Passagenwerk*. Frankfurt am Main.

[4] Bloch, Ernst. (1959).*Das Prinzip der Hoffnung*. Frankfurt am Main. S. 858ff.

[5] See for comparison. a) Giedeon, Sigfried. (2000). *Raum, Zeit und Architektur*. Basel, Boston, Berlin. 6. Auflage; b) Lampugnani, Vittorio Magnano. (1980). *Architektur und Staedtebau des 20. Jahrhunderts*, Stuttgart; c) Posener, Julius. (1995). *Was Architektur sein kann*. Basel, Berlin, Boston.

[6] Delitz, Heike. (2009). *Architektursoziologie.* Bielefeld. S.5ff.

[7] Wakter Gropius cited in: Delitz, Heike: (2009).*Architektursoziologie*. Bielefeld.

[8] Delitz, Heike. (2009). *Architektursoziologie*. Bielefeld. S. 8ff.

[9] Delitz, Heike. (2009). Die *Architektur der Gesellschaft*. Bielefeld.

[10] Delitz, Heike. (2006). *Die Architektur der Gesellschaft. Architektur und Architekturtheorie im Blick der Soziologie*, in: 'From Outer Space, Architekturtheorie auserhalb der Disziplin', 10.Jg., Heft 1, September.

[11] See: ilia II. *ქალაქ თბილისში მართლმადიდებელი ეკლესიის წმინდა სამების საკათედრო ტაძრის არქიტექტურლ-დაგეგმარებითი გადაწყვეტის ღია კონკურსის შედეგები.* (1989).თბილისი.

[12] Markus Dauss und Dauss und Karl-Siegbert Rehberg. (2009). *Raumsymbolik. Die "Architektur der Gesellschaft" aus der Sicht Institutionenanalyse*, in: Firscher, Ulrich und Delitz, Heilke(Hg.): Die *Architektur der Gesellschaft*. Bielefeld. S. 109-131.

[13] *ჟურნალ არქიტექტურა და დიზაინის ინტერვიუ სრულიად საქართველოს*

კათალიკოს-პატრიარქ ილია II- თან. (1994). ახალი საკათედრო ტაძარი ვაკეში ეიგება. ჟურნალი: *არქიტექტურა და დიზაინი. N1*, თბილისი. გვ. 22.

[14] Heile Delitz. (2009). 'Die *Architektur der Gesellschaft* aus der Sicht der Philosophischen Anthropologie', in: Fischer, Ulrich und Deltz, Heike (Hg): 'Die *Architektur der Gesellschaft.* Bielefeld, S. 175.

[15] Rothaker, Erich. (2009). '*Die Wirkung des Kunstwerkes*', in: Jahrbuch für Ästhetik und allgemeine Kunstwissenschaft, Band 2, 1952-53.S. 13. Zitiert nach Heike Delitz, 'Die "Architktur der Gesellschaft', Bielefeld, S. 175.