

APARTMENTS OF SPACES AND PLACES

Jadellius, L.

Chalmers University of Technology, School of Architecture, Department of Design Methodology, S-412 96 Göteborg
SWEDEN

The title of my paper might seem somewhat peculiar to many readers. True enough, it is a little devised language-wise, yet it quite concisely points to some fundamental spatial entities I am going to discuss. With the word "apartment" I want to draw attention to a spatial entity which literally only points out that something is apart from something else. An apartment needs walls, or at least a borderline. The concept of "space" on the other hand implies an emptiness which could be related to any conceivable activity. The concept of "place" finally aims mainly at a position of something in relation to a context. With these three concepts the essential characteristics of architecture's spatial design seem to be grasped, if with a certain measure of variation in meaning within different cultures and historical phases.

The paper is based on my dissertation *People, Form and Functionalism. On General/Universal (Allgemeine) and Generic/Communal (Gemeinsame) Aspects in Public Architecture*¹, where primarily early functionalism and its conceptions of society are discussed, but it will also present a criticism of the postmodern theory and its implications on architectural space based on an outline of a social and democratic spatial theory.

The starting point for the thesis was a somewhat vaguely formulated desire to answer the question of how a both social and democratic engagement could be transformed into contemporary architecture. This issue demands an understanding of the claimed connection between socialism, democracy and modern western architecture, the so called functionalism.

Most interpretations of functionalism have not treated this connection directly, but rather dealt with this movement without penetrating the functionalists' attitude towards socialism and democracy. And this despite the functionalists own utterances on this topic. Frequently research on functionalism is neither based on a study of functionalist reasoning as a whole nor on its underlying conceptions. Instead research has often taken the most spectacular functionalist thesis as basis. This is reasonable if one regards functionalism primarily as a theory, which simply is composed of these very thesis. For those however who primarily have based their opinion on studies of functionalist architecture, the discrepancy between the architecture and those thesis has become obvious. Because of a limited perspective both historically and theoretically, these analysts often have been content with the conclusion that functionalism was in fact merely a style, where theory mainly had a propagandizing function.

To progress beyond this I found it necessary to regard functionalism as a wide current with its most important ideas implicit and only recognizable in a concrete context. Such a context however becomes comprehensible only through a relatively thorough understanding of the contemporary social contradictions and the ideological background. Therefore I have chosen to lay out this work in three different levels. As a basis I have studied the Helsingborg Concert Hall, with all the different projects and debates about its purpose 1918 - 32. In this period functionalism broke through in Swedish society. Above that, the project was a culture-political act in itself, which creates the conditions for gaining insight into the architect's view upon the relations of man, culture and architecture in society. At a

general level I have studied the public culture (*Öffentlichkeit*) and the architectural concept of public buildings, which I gradually found to be a central connection between functionalism and socialist ideals. To create a link between this level and the study of an individual piece of architecture, I found it desirable to follow the development of the modern auditorium and relate it to the architecture of free conversation as expressed in taverns, restaurants, assembly halls, etc.

Historical phases in the rise of a democratic architecture

First I will try to clarify the ideological background concerning public buildings and auditoria. Some of the most fundamental prototypes of public architecture of our time were primarily built in Renaissance Florence. Already there the first notions of the public and of the individual "human being as such" facing the public were formed, which would become an important element in a bourgeois democratic ideal. This ideal however have changed in different phases up to our time. I will therefore devote a great deal of the space to characterize these changes on the basis of architectural development, from the European medieval society.

For the further discussion it is necessary to have a clear idea of the distinction between "general/universal" and "generic/communal", where "general/universal" stands for the unbounded, while "generic/communal" stands for the collective, for something defined to a definite community. With such a distinction it becomes possible to understand that striving for freedom of individuals can be turned against the collective's demands, supported by sets of values, which had an elevated and noble character of universality.

In the first phase in the formation of modern democratic ideals renaissance humanists attempted to express elevation and distance in architecture towards the concrete everyday life and its relations of community and power. The closeness between production and public life, which had developed mainly from the direct exchange of goods between streets and the workshops inside the households in medieval towns, came in conflict with the democratic idea of universality. At first this resulted in an architecture which tried to suppress the fortified confinement, which earlier had been a sign for noblemen's residence and for the town on the whole. Contemporaneous with the bringing-out of the individual visitor's visual confrontation with architecture, one also turned against the local "vulgar" sociability. On one side we now find the individualised social power- and community-relations and on the other side the idea, that these relations would not get any actual importance in public life. Everyone should be regarded as human being without attention to social status and financial power.

To liberate the symbols of power from all noble individuals was in a second phase — in connection with the bourgeois revolution in Europe — a conception of public building developed that was different from both the so called "bourgeois" buildings and from all forms of residential palaces. A thoroughly de-personalized architecture became a pre-eminent feature in the pursuit to find a contrast to "bourgeois" buildings. The sovereign's palace in its residential function was not any longer aimed to serve as a symbol for the common good.² Instead architects looked at the new institutionbuildings as their highest tasks, elevated above the private palace projects. It was for these that the new ideals started to develop, especially towards the end of the eighteenth century.

Different public institutions like theatres, judicial buildings, libraries, museums etc. had been tightly connected to the court, to the monasteries or to the universities. Now especially those who stood in opposition to autocratic rule and the nobility in France looked for a new identity for public buildings apart from the ruling person.³ For this endeavour it was not enough to implement the form-language of the classic antiquity, as the renaissance had done in order to give dignity and social distance to a palace and his owner. Neither was it sufficient to express local culture and its complicated power relationships, as was done in the erection of city halls in the independent cities. Now instead the aura of monumentality in

temples and churches was held to be exemplary also for secular public buildings. Particularly in temples that were not intended for gatherings rather different from older Christian churches, one could find models for the new symbolic language. The monumentality which there was dedicated to godliness could be made use of for the public, elevated and symbolized by science, morality, music, fine arts, the law, etc.

To be able to understand and ideologically handle phenomena, which otherwise could not be enclosed in the ideological framework of exclusive private property, two polarized complexes of notations are built. One of them imagines ideal society as being based on small arranged communities, while the other instead imagines society without any concrete collectivity at all.

These two traditions correspond within the planning and architecture debate on one side with ideals associated with the common sense of the village or small town community and on the other with the liberty of action in metropolis-anonymity. A basic concept was that of a juristic person, i.e. the idea of a corporate actor as subject of rights originating from the idea of the individual. The collective was thereby understood as a corporate body, like a monolith. Such a personification of the common was furthermore coupled to ideas of the community as an abstract society, often tied to universal or cosmopolitan ideals.⁴

On this basis I have drawn up an outline of the development of the auditorium. The exchange of thoughts and experiences develops from being a part of a closed community where everyone takes part, to a public conversation and discourse, where different forms of mass communication gradually become an essential element in the creation of knowledge. The concrete audience, present in the auditorium, is more and more identified with the abstract universal public and vice versa. Thus it becomes possible to see the audience as a mass of individuals and to believe that it is sufficient to build auditoria to establish a place for the public discourse.

In the same time as taverns and coffee houses changed into restaurants for private get-together and gastronomic enjoyment, the auditoria were built as temples of the fine arts. In the first case the conversation was made private at each table, controlled by an anonymous moral code in a new supervisible and disciplining restaurant architecture.⁵ In the second case the public space was developed to give hegemony to the stage and the play. Traditions of social intercourse within the audience were suppressed in favour of the fine arts and culture as such. Instead, a disciplined sociability developed along with the very auditorium, with strong elements of show and non-obligating conversation.⁶

Functionalism and the Helsingborg Concert Hall

The Helsingborg Concert Hall became among other a functionalist model-example for the emerging new in Sweden, both as an architectural style and as a symbol for democratic gathering. By means of an analysis of this project I was able to find out something I found important in the meaning and significance of functionalist architecture. You could call this a third phase in the development of a democratic architecture.⁷

This Concert Hall was built by a joint-stock company formed especially for this purpose in 1916. Principally the local high society subscribed for shares. The strongly dominating shareholder however became Henry Dunker, the owner of the biggest rubber industries in Sweden, who also became both chairman and managing director.

After some years of probing, an architectural competition was announced in 1925. The young Swedish architect Sven Markelius emerged victorious from this battle after two recompetitions and a fairly fierce local debate, which left interesting material behind. I have particularly tried to analyze the different standpoints represented and I found that Markelius in his work found his solution in a both clas-

sicist and expressionist temple of music, since this solution would impede the social life of the local high society but any anonymous individual.

After the competition was determined, the conditions for this project were changed and nothing happened for some years. Markelius however got the opportunity in 1928 to create a completely new design. You could still see a classicist touch left, but the most evident features of a temple were now gradually eliminated, however. The essential vision of the then built concert hall was the individual's free and equal dedication to culture, his or her "consumption" of art within an abstract society, free from domination. He found something in functionalism that expressed his striving for an auditorium equally accessible for all, more effective than the "temple" concept was able to. In opposition to older concert halls the auditorium here is shaped like a room, which suggests, rather than assumes — that equality rules, both within the audience and between audience and those who have the decision-making power on stage.

Through the "abstractly" shaped room the audience is given a feeling of culture distribution, free from domination, and beyond all class distinctions and power relations, only controlled by the demands of the anonymous audience and the attraction of culture offered there. With this in mind I then point out a social enclosedness towards city streets and the other musical life, which undoubtedly is expressed in Markelius' building design.

The "institutions", for example the orchestra housed in the building are expressed only through a contemporary rational office front with rows of identical windows. The distance to city life is also emphasized by several other factors, e. g. by omission of the suggested windows in the grand concert room and by architectural features, e. g. through an entrance hall that extends from the street as if it were a gangway to an otherwise enclosed craft of the fine arts.

With its white imposing height the concert building creates a vision of a coming society, which gives it the distance of utopia to everyday life, with its problems and contradictions. The Helsingborg Concert Hall thus became a radical and consistent expression for the notations of an abstract unlimited public, but I also found it closed around the institutionalized collectives. The building thus did not make it easier for the anonymous visitor to penetrate and partake in the musical life, it possibly made it easier to visit a concert performance.

Functionalists considered it to be their duty breaking the influence of the old upper-class audience. At the same time as the bourgeois sociability more or less was brushed aside not to be seen from the public arena, all other expressions of social life based on more stable community relations were excluded too.

One could say that the functionalists tried to develop an auditorium for society which beside changing the audience to a united mass also obliterated the auditorium itself as a hall with an intrinsic value. By giving the newly created united auditorium an abstract character, the visitor also had a liberating experience of unlimited space and at the same time the room in reality became closed towards all non-directed impressions. In these auditoria, the distance to city life was often architecturally pronounced as a progression from the street through entrance hall and foyer, which finally led the pouring audience into the ideal space of fine arts. By means of this architecture the functionalists tried to create an audience as an embodiment of mass-communication, and thus the impression of equality of each and every one in the hall was formed.

Markelius and many other functionalists stated that they stood for social and democratic ideals. But the fact is, that they isolated their buildings from the concrete social life in the public. They strived for openness, but turned towards open air and nature, not towards man and the daily community life. For example they allowed the city and city life to be present as a view, but they did not express a concrete reciprocal relation between outside and inside; between building and locality and so forth. Streets and places were reduced in their plans and suggestions to traffic networks between buildings and establishment, which despite their real isolation succeeded in creating a feeling of freedom and openness through views, air

and space. This "antisocial" character was emphasized by functionalist buildings creating an impression of being just designed, not built by people in brick, wood or other traditional building materials to be influenced and developed by the life in and in front of them.

Towards the end of the nineteenth century an intellectual aristocracy had established itself, demanding that they themselves should develop a culture on a high level. In a second step towards an anonymous specialized expert-knowledge, the idea of an elite with a culture jointly created, now was totally rejected.

Out of this crystallized that which distinguished the functionalist conceptions of society from older traditions of bourgeois democratic thinking. In the idea that everyone should be treated alike irrespective of status and power there undoubtedly was a continuity, but earlier this had been connected with notions of a citizenship received by refined culture. With the realization of universal suffrage there was no longer any motive for such a reservation. Instead a harmonious and efficient society would now be created through rational planning with the help of capable and unprejudiced experts. The functionalists, like many within the socialist tradition, looked upon society as an object for planning efforts. The function of knowledge-creation was no longer associated with a distinct intellectual aristocracy but rather placed in society at large, seen as anonymous production-machinery.

Culture relates place to space.

In studies subsequent to my dissertation, I have learnt from the postmodernist theory that understanding modern sense of place is fundamental. But I have also arrived at a conviction that it is important to go further and study the connections between space and culture and relate them to the concepts of borders and interfaces between places. I have found that postmodernism by and large has the same attitude towards society and democracy, for which I have criticized functionalism and the socialistic dreams connected to functionalism. I will in the following try to explain why.

In older cultures, both among independent peasants and in the feudal-dominated areas there existed an ethnically-tied building culture incorporating a type of cultural self-censorship, which created a mold of unity with a harmonious architectural total effect. Within this framework there was a far from negligible space for individuality and uniqueness. Every house or place was unique, but every single unit had the place given to it by society and in accordance with it one should build and dwell. One could hardly by means of one's house or residence give expression to an individual and independent self-understanding.

The radical architects during the twenties and thirties came to view it as one of their primary tasks to annihilate this understanding of space. Under the leadership of the liberal bourgeois the radicals arrived at a conception in which the license of private ownership and the integrity of the individuals were two of the cornerstones. A third cornerstone of no less importance was, however, the public sense. Private ownership had become exclusive, while the public culture and the universalism tended to become more and more abstract since the dependency of place was to be seen as equal, regardless of position within productive life. Architecture and its organisation of space could in such a situation be seen as an expressive act of a particular owner on the one hand, and on the other search for and abstract universality without ties to an individual or a particular social group. The new open concept of space became the architects' response to the demands that had arisen. They tried e. g. to dissolve the sense of spatial boundaries by means of glass and other smooth "immaterial" delimiting surfaces, as well as employing undefined spatial transitions within the realm of ownership.

The postmodernists have in essence taken over the functionalists spatial vision. The postmodern architectural theorist Christian Norberg-Schulz, for example, writes that postmodernism does not represent a break with modern architecture. "Post-modernism' grows out of 'modernism', and is a logical consequence of

the 'new vision'." ⁸ But postmodern criticism points out that functionalism does not offer a language of meaningful forms nor a "place" for man to feel at home in the new world.

On the one hand postmodern architecture is supposed to give originality to a place by interpreting its context, yet on the other hand all modern architecture is to "visualize the freedom of modern spatiality".⁹ Thus postmodernists take note of an essential contradiction of our time, to be sure, yet their way of dealing with it contains at the same time something basically wrong in the postmodern spatial concept. Norberg-Schulz writes, with his theory well anchored in postmodern philosophy but hardly in the study of the social realities his theories are based upon:

The open world of modern times is ever more becoming one large, complex 'melting pot' where contradictions are the order of the day. The traditional concept of 'place' is breaking down, that is the place as an independent universe distinguished by a particular *genius loci*. In the past, thus, the purpose of architecture was to 'make an ethnic domain visible', to quote Susan Langer. The general characteristic of our day, however, is the open, 'global' world, where the 'ethnic domains' loose their definition and we, so to speak, experience a 'simultaneity of places'. Physically we are in one place at a time, but every day the whole world is brought to us by the new media. This is the existential situation behind what pioneers of the Modern Movement called the 'new conception of space'. America is the prototype of this open world. This does not imply, however, that the concept of place is obsolete. A melting pot is also a place and has to be rooted.¹⁰

To handle the contradictions he suggests with Bert Vossanger that "the *plan libre* and the collage-like form of Modern architecture may be combined with figurative elements which *define* and *characterize* places within open space".¹¹ "In such an 'open place' *each thing has to possess quality*, that is a distinct 'thingness', since the things no longer support each other as they did in the past".¹² The weakness in this lies in an individualistic and unstructured concept of place. With the melting pot as an ideal every project or building section is given visual individuality. The particular place's architectural qualities are reduced to their ability in creating a sense of identity or to the possibilities offered for the individual's orientation. In this way a crucial issue vanishes i. e. by whose commission and in whose interest the architect interprets the place and its spatial relationships.

It is in this way that an interest for the public space has come to be handled most frequently by postmodernist architects. They have tried to break up the functionalist idea to work from the inside towards the outside based on the particular building's functions by adding a public interest for an identity-creating outer appearance in a visual interplay with its context. This interest pays attention to space outside, but looks at the building's surface, its façades as scenery on a public arena. Public life will be reduced to theatre. A richly developed and meaningful public culture presuppose an interactive relation between different places, between street and house, between inside and outside etc, i. e. between different places with different accessibility. Relatively autonomouslyruled territories and apartments are the basis for all forms of exchange of human products and experiences worked out independently and responsibly. If one — like the postmodernists — does not pay heed to this, it is hardly possible to deal with the issue of who within architecture possesses the interpretative "right of way", nor to create a social openness.

Quite inspiring from this point of view are the observations of the cultural geographer Robert David Sack, which cast light on the very interrelation between place, dominion and the cultural context, with the concept of territoriality as starting point.

Territoriality for humans is a powerful geographic strategy to control people and things by controlling area. Political territories and private ownership of land may be its most familiar forms but territoriality occurs to varying de-

gress in numerous social contexts. It is used in everyday relationships and in complex organisations. Territoriality is a primary geographical expression of power. It is the means by which space and society are interrelated. Territoriality's changing functions help us to understand the historical relationships between society, space, and time.¹³

Place, then, would in the light of this be seen as an expression of both formal and informal relationships of belonging. By the same token, the relationships between different places should be seen as manifestations of different relationships of belonging. Man's relationship to a place is defined to a high degree by his individual or collective relation to the place's creation, development and its factual legal status. This is not to deny that houses have meaning for our abilities towards orientation and self-identification, but it constitutes a serious limitation to see these abilities merely as psychological or universal human factors. First with an understanding of how spatial relationships interplay and express social realities can it be undertaken to develop a modern understanding of space on a democratic basis.

Places are defined through their relations

Supported by the dissertation's criticism of the individualistic and abstract sociability — which forms the basis of the open-space concept, I suggest that the key for forward development of architecture is to be found in the criticism of the functionalist open-space concept. True enough, all positive and solid openness, must be sought within the framework of social and cultural complexity, mindful of the tensions between freedom and rootedness. Yet in addition to this it is necessary to create openness in historically evolved factual social relationships and conflicts-of-interest. If one does not realize that democracy and freedom demand the sharing of spatial responsibility it is impossible to study the spatial interfaces as both an image for and an expression of social conditions.

Based on Sack's extensive studies of the evolution of human territoriality he points out some typical features of contemporary spatial organisation:

The modern consumer (...) is in position of controlling and transforming virtually every conceivable element from the natural world and using them to create new arrangements and contexts. But underlying this power to create contexts is that of space and the use of territoriality to construct place. The consumer's capacity to create place as context makes territorial segmentation and spatial integration the primary thread from the realm of nature (...).¹⁴

The realm of meaning refers to modes of thought. Modern thought is highly specialized and segmented. (...) Resonant symbols exist at the professional, local, or familial levels, but, by their very nature, these cover segmented and specialized facets of life. Thus, the public realm composed of thinly shared experiences tends to be shallow and in flux, presenting the paradox of an objective yet impermanent world. In contrast, the private personal world with its rich subjective content, which is not widely shared, becomes idiosyncratic. In short, in both the public and private domains, a major modern predicament is the awareness of the freedom and the burden to create meaning and this predicament provides both opportunities and costs.¹⁵

Capitalism's reliance on money, its facility to compartmentalize and specialize tasks, and its fostering of individualism, are all well-known and supposedly interrelated characteristics. In the consumer's world, we find a derivative of this characteristics of capitalism, rather than the categories of capital, labour, rich and poor, to pervade the experience of consumption. This derivative is that we live in a world of strangers. (...) Being in a world of strangers is then one of the most important threads of modern social relations that commodities weave together in producing place as context.¹⁶

But he also writes that "we moderns are many other things than strangers, and these other relationships influence the experience. (...) Ethnicity, kinship, caste, family, worker, owner, and class are all marks of social relations. Some of these categories, such as families, are found in every society, and others, such as castes, are found in only particular ones. The importance of particular relations may change. In many pre-modern societies, kin and family affected most aspects of one's life, but no longer does kin dominate, and family, though still important, has had its influence curtailed."¹⁷

In spite of Sack's consciousness of social structure he nevertheless misses an important change in modern social relations. In his analysis of the realms of nature and meaning he points out the segmentation, but in the realm of social relations he just stresses the individual estrangement. When the belongings to some relatively few premodern social categories have diminished, perhaps it is easy to forget belonging as something characterizing modern society as well. He does not perceive that a modern type of social segmentation, where one individual mostly belongs to a lot of segments/categories without any mutual relations. The domains as held together, independent and encompassing groups for the individual are dissolved. As a strategy of power territoriality has been complemented by sociability and the capitalist tendency to shape social segmentation between work teams in the private production and both private and public sphere has been a base for alienation. The modernist dream of shaping an open society by not recognizing any form of segmentation, just makes this alienation worse.

During the twentieth century however the separation between the private and the public sphere — which was so central to the bourgeois — has begun to dissolve because of an ever increasing dependence of production upon other sections of itself and of government policy.¹⁸ This has created a situation where private integrity is threatened as well as the public sphere (state and community) is ingressed by strong private interests. Both becomes increasingly difficult: To perceive the public sphere as being generally valid and serving the common good and to claim that an industrial enterprise is a private matter. It is this very trend that paved the way for the breakthrough of postmodernism with its preference for the individualistic and complexity as such. Yet at the same time this development forms the basis for a principle criticism of modernism's effort to create openness by dissolving the sense of spatial boundaries. The way that postmodernism relates itself to place has led to a drowning of power structures in a partially contrived mess of diversity and pluralism. It has not resulted in a situation where the functionalists' abstract society has become more concrete with a clarification of power- and responsibility-structures.

If we want to drive out alienation we must find a way which consciously takes hold of both individual and collective integrity, and which at the same time strengthens social responsibility in the "private" context. Architectural designs should include a conscious democratic interpretation of the place's host/guest relations, of different user groups' relations to the place's variability and appearance, and finally the relations of places to larger contexts.

An understanding of space which corresponds to such underlying views builds up its openness by means of shaped spatiality and emphasized relationships of belonging. It will not pretend that domains and boundaries are abandoned. It is not enough that "*each thing possesses quality*". One can only abolish all these spatial nowhere-lands by questioning modernism's ways to shape spatial freedom and by starting to shape entrances, boundaries, delimiting spaces and the overlapping of places. As a consequence not merely the freedom of movement of strangers is supported, but that it also becomes natural and welcome to cross social boundaries, mindful of the ensuing responsibility.

What exactly is to be understood as parts and what as entireties turns into a central issue understanding of space. Or maybe rather that the architect's efforts towards wholeness change to a question of interpreting mutually related and inter-

twined ambitions towards wholeness. We have to question the totality of a project if we want to clear the way for a historically formed aspiration towards a wholeness. This means to subordinate the design-project to surrounding spaces, street spaces, functional and ownership relations etc. and at the same time allow the project's functional or social complexes to shape their relations to society in a relatively autonomous manner. If one really seizes upon the different social groups/communities which strive for expression and external relations the issue is no longer to willfully design variation or an arranged sense of small-scale but rather to create and organize as far as possible a social wholeness out of very dispersed intentions. This means to allow expression of factual features and peculiarities within the framework of a project and at the same time to participate in a quest for a co-ordinated wholeness on behalf of society at large by means of the separate part's independent social imbeddedness.

These ways can also be studied as connections between the architect's attitude towards the design-process on the one hand and architectural style on the other. Notably in Sweden there exists a generally accepted idea that the public environment should be equally accessible to each and all. To this laudable ambition a hopeful notion was added that this goal could be reached by giving architecture a neutral expression. In this spirit a special architectural style developed with strong ties to "abstract universality" and which has come to be totally identified with the public sphere. This "public environment" is referred to in terms of something that is not only different from the home sphere but also from society's more light-hearted institutions such as amusement complexes and restaurants. Problems with this style arise as soon as one defines accessibility as meaning more than to move about troublefree without anybody caring. If one wants to e. g. take the employees' or users' de facto possessive rights and responsibilities into account, i. e. to give these groups the possibility to influence the environment, one must identify different individuals and groups of people and provide them with special responsibility relations towards a building or particular sections of it. In a variety of ways a sense of unity and belonging has to be established and formed between the constructed and the users who actually utilize the building. This implies that host/guest relations are to be accepted and made possible within public architecture.

The public environment would be changed considerably if special groups of users, like staff, local population or regular guests received aesthetic leeway to participate in the shaping of the building. This as an expression of an independent interpretation of common social tasks. Change would also result if architects through their design tried to inspire users to develop the public environment along the lines of their desires and dreams about public culture. I wonder if such an environment would not be at least as welcoming even for a stranger as a strictly neutral and anonymous public environment.

Notes

1. Jadelius, L. (1987A)
2. See Pérouse de Montclos, J-M (1974), p 26 f
3. Comp. with Braunfels, W (1968), p 68 f
4. See, Coleman (1974), p 23 ff
5. Thorne (1980), p 233 ff
6. Rask, E (1972), p 9, p 40
7. For pictures see Jadelius, L (1987B)
8. Norberg-Schulz, C (1982), p 57
9. Aa, p 56
10. Norberg-Schulz, C (1982) p 20 f
11. Aa, p 20
12. Aa, p 21
13. Sack, R D, 1986 p 5
14. Sack, R.D, (1988) p 650

15. Aa, p 652
16. Aa, p 650 f
17. Aa p 650
18. See Habermas, J (1962)

References

- Asplund, J. (1983) *Tid, rum, individ och kollektiv*. Stockholm
- Braunfels, W (1968) *Institutions and their corresponding Ideals. An Essay on Architectonic Form and Social Institutions. The fitness of Man's Environment*. Smithsonian Annual, II, Washington
- Burke, P (1984) *Popular Culture between History and Ethnology*. Ethnologia Europaea, Volume XIV,
- Coleman, J.S (1974) *Power and Structure of Society*. New York
- Cornell, E (1977) *Bygge av stad och land*. Lund
- Elias, N (1982) *The Civilizing Process. State Formation and Civilization*. Oxford
- Girouard, M (1980) *Life in the English Country House. A Social and Architectural History*. Harmondsworth
- Habermas, J (1962) *Strukturwandel der Öffentlichkeit*. Hermann Luchterland Verlag
- Hauser, K (1953) *Socialgeschichte der Kunst und Literatur*. München
- Jadelius, L (1987A) *Folk, form och funktionalism*. Göteborg
- Jadelius, L (1987B) *Enrumstanken och det abstrakta rummet*. (The One Space Concept and the Abstract Space. English summary, p 61) *Arkitektur*, No 4
- Kaufmann, E. (1933) *Von Ledoux bis le Corbusier. Ursprung und Entwicklung der autonomen Architektur*. Wien, Leipzig
- Norberg-Schulz, C (1980) *Genius Loci. Towards a Phenomenology of Architecture*. New York
- Norberg-Schulz, C (1982) *The "New Tradition" today*. International Laboratory of Architecture and Urban Design, Yearbook.
- Norberg-Schulz, C (1986) *The demand for a contemporary language of architecture*. *Art & Design*, Dec
- Pérouse de Montclos, J-M, *Etiennene-Louis Boullée 1728 - 1799. Theoretician of Revolutionary Architecture*. London 1974
- Plumb, J.H (1982) *The Commercialisation of Leisure in the 18th century England. The Birth of a Consumer Society*. London
- Rask, E (1972) *Det kritiske parterre. Det kongelige teater og dets publikum omkring år 1800*. København
- Sack, R.D (1986) *Human Territoriality. Its Theory and History*. Cambridge
- Sack, R.D (1988) *The Consumer's World: Place as Context*. *Annals of the Association of American Geographers*, 78 (4)
- Sennet, R (1974) *The Fall of the Public Man*. New York
- Thorne, R (1980) *Places of Refresment in the Nineteenth-century City. Buildings and Society*. London, Boston
- Zeitler, R (1983) *Zur Geschichte der Fassade. The Façade - A Historical Outline*. Daidalos. Berlin *Architectural Journal*, 15 Dec