

NEW GLOBAL ECOURBARCHITECTONIC APPROACH TO PLANNING

UDC 711.1+72.01+502.1/.2(045)

Nikola Cekić

University of Nis, The Faculty of Civil Engineering and Architecture, Serbia
E-mail: *nikola.cekic@gaf.ni.ac.rs*

Abstract. *The paper accentuates questions of a different town planning, architectural, environmental, de facto, an organic approach to planning the rurban agglomerations, where remodeling of existing physical structures is inevitable. The goal is to build adequate, normal communities in urban terms, where people will be active daily, make non-conflicting decisions for a non-deformed urbanization and a more sustainable state of city-building spirit, for a general, well thought-out repair of rurban matrices. It is an effort to create a new, restored urbanity in different social-historical-economic circumstances which excludes the profiteering, immoral, primitive weakness of the planners, selfish investors and builders.*

Key words: *Global ecourbarchitectonic, planning, significant social changes*

*"Architecture must be cave-like, audacious,
wrathful, smooth, angular, brutal, round ..."
("Politika daily", 05.01.2008.)*

The abrupt onset of great investments caused establishment of the foundations and new protectionism views on the planning of rurban agglomerations, of new volumes which did not bring about new, expected waves in terms of architecture, town planning and art, that would enlighten the world. On the contrary. The new "artistic" construction industry, "imported" architecture is barely at a mediocre level, and as a rule, it is full of stereotypes, it is not affirmative, resembling a pre-fabricated solutions, it is empty, stale and in chaos. It raises the key question: who is the one, in the hardship of the economic transition, and with a developed "gray economy", defining the significant social changes and redefining the development policy of the cities, who is this director – a director of urban order who is determining the dynamics of the city coordinates? Who is producing

patterns for a different metabolism of the relation of artifact structures in the spaces, for the ostensibly new technical and instrumental procedures of very quick transition of socialism into capitalism, according to which the future urban life with such socio-economic situation and with significantly changed socio-economic framework and architecture will be more fruitful and more beautiful? With 1000, 2000....8000 euros per a square meter! Regardless of whether it is a residential or office space! This, in the conditions when a majority of the population is nearing the so called "absolute poverty" threshold – one dollar of income per day per capita! And when all the theories about collective, humane building, about the reconstructions of urban agglomeration, influences to increase the awareness of the population, programs about the market planning methods, become ineffective, in an instant.

To acquire urbanity, means to deal with the social-historical-economic continuity, but with the "transitionists", who well understood the transition, profit-making time, and who used it for their own purposes in a most selfish manner, launching terrible lies, which were "accepted" by the people: "speculators, professional petty politicians, opposition arm-chaircrats, nationalistic profiteers, prosecuted and non prosecuted criminal characters, profiteers, and all those who used the transitional weaknesses of large urban agglomerations in a most immoral and primitive way possible".

This gallery of *freelance transitionists* is even more splendid, and it contains the loud protagonists with half-beliefs, those "halfers", half-regime people, half-believers, half-workers, do-nothings etc. that is, all those who have nothing in common with town planning and architecture, let alone planning!

I agree with the opinion of the pronounced Belgrade sociologist, Ph. D. Sreten VujoVIC, who asserted ten years ago that: "the town planning is a mixture of ideology and practice under the patronage of the state and the market." Yes, but when there is no rule of law in the state, and when the economy operates in the gray zone, it is an ideal situation for the operation of "mafia-managers". In addition, the citizens are always at a loss, because of the non-existing owner, and because of the new clients who impose the illicit elements, commit criminal acts in the economy, speculate with the real estates, usurp the public common property and develops new forms of profiteering.

Platitudes about constructing new Europolises, China districts etc. are all deceptions, in Doxiadian terms: pure crimes!

Urbarchitecture nowadays is a commodity which transforms the world at an incredible rate, reality and not a fiction which directly affects a number of innumerable, quickly composed and functionally retailored localities – for instance banks, their offices, insurances, doctor's offices, cafés, fast food outlets etc, but not the structures of art, sport and recreation, stationary traffic, where the public is only the silent observer. Shall I use the example of the city of Nis, where with an honorable exception of the Puppet theatre, since 1945 till nowadays, no building of a cultural purpose was built? This small fact confirms how the development of the city and citizens in our country survived tragic discontinuities. Hermetization. Unfortunately, looking back to the recent history, the citizenry has been too small and impotent to become a factor in significant social changes. Such urbanization was marked by the decisive role of political Party instructions in the organization of relations in space. It is very similar these days: political subjects, public subjects, entrepreneurs owning private companies and market subjects dictate "new transitional urbanization of mixed characters". A question ensues: whose cities are those, where the

town planning chaos, observable in the additions on the existing constructions, "kioskmanias" and similar enterprises establish a new semi-suburban, decelerated change in the planning culture – a poorly readable modernization.

When you buy a location, for example for the mega-market companies: TEMPO, METRO, MERKATOR, IDEA, INTEREX, PRAKTIKER, CORA etc., out of several tens of thousands of square meters, you have bought the right to remodel a part or to change a large part of urban agglomerations, you have acquired a permanent access, a fare for inauguration of a new, moving, creative global urban culture and new Euro-Balkan behavior, right to a new understanding and interpretation of spatial forms, a new dialog among people, but also a new dialog of man with walls in the interior and exterior space! Therefore, not only physical space, but the right to establish new, as a rule, (un)inspired, invisible mental, philosophic-social-ensnaring-multicultural coordinates which change the way of life in future decades, establish a new historicity full of grotesque contrasts, very often opposing, between the old and the new forms, bring the new identity, new offer urbarchitectonic forms of micro and macro localities, a new balance between the natural and artifact volumes.

In urbarchitecture, it is always dangerous to play with identity! Playing and experimenting with the forms of the houses. We build our identities, constantly and wittingly or unwittingly, we build ourselves...

Their (un)desirable and (un)esthetic not understandable awareness of the space where it is necessary to preserve tradition, heritage, scenery. You have destroyed the old, "provincial" forms of understanding of the urban space, which were being carefully established for decades, and instead of their concept of sport-and-recreational or another functional areas, a new banal division of urban territories into business zones, new gravitational zones of residence, work, recreation, and totally new conceptual and building meaning and functional concepts in adjacent, bordering zones etc. The previous urbarchitectonic, environmental philosophy has been comprehensively dimmed, blurred and annihilated, and a new universal pattern of ideas was established, a globalistic mechanism which "designs" new phenomenal-centers with the marks of imported identity and an interruption in the historical and cultural city-building context. In my view, the too fast building smothered the authenticity of micro-localities for the sake of universal, "non-indigenous", limited urbarchitectonic art, and an urban and valuable artistic and scientific thought has been lost, and the wrong relationship towards tradition and inherited values in space was chosen, and a new urbarchitectonic vocabulary has become a pronounced issue, as a new basis of cultural relationship towards the question of architectonic construction in general.

You have bought yet another thing: a right to a color, scent and taste of the city, a right to "suffocate" it, right to the tones of its new destiny, impulses, noise, a right to influence its anatomy! Moreover, a right to indirectly affect its environment. All the mentioned occurred for a very short time, as a consequence of the invested capital, which, as the writer Danilo Kis put it: "is always good at getting the job done".

This dictated "modernism" of the civilized world, pushed forward by the capital is an extremely dynamic, prominent, turbo-investing commercial offensive, and an investment egotistical category of participation which most frequently promotes the new unplanned urbarchitectonic, visual and functional space, and its new "adjusting" scenery, success and social recognition, "revolutionary" iconography of interpolation of houses among houses,

whose dialog becomes a surprising, boring, inhuman, cold and unattractive. I do not agree with such cultural insensitivity in urbarchitecture, with heedlessness and a fraud, because there cannot be an idea of , continuation and establishment of city building continuity, and where "advocating the modern value of the spirit, new boxlike, pronounced profiteering market creativity" has the primacy, which when viewed in a long historical span can rather be considered – destruction. This has come under pressure of "market planning, under the veil of changes in planning culture and an unwholesome politization.

De facto, globalistic dynamized renewed chaos in the space which changes the rate of change, and promotes positions which significantly change the awareness of the people and interpolates the new culture of behavior in space, living force of the city and creates tensions in all the resources, especially energetic, and increases the city maintenance costs, and which smells totally different and has no relation with tradition, customs, culture and habits of people, and which is a provincial mutiny, Euro-fatum, our new clash with totally different world where urban poetics fades away and perishes!

A fundamental question is: which urbarchitectonic directions will help us preserve our heritage and obtain the close future, without consequences? To stop the ever intensifying process of aggression on the environment, to stop the rhythms of degradation and subdue the construction of rurban continuum under restrictive control mechanisms, with integral action plans and with a large scale of interventions.

I do not have an answer to such a planning challenge.

In this urban drama, fat rich people occupy the best central locations, and create for themselves an "exclusive" architecture very often suffused with kitsch, opposites of art and with madness, hopeless and neo-utopistic vision of the world, while the desperate poor masses, which does not have a dime in the pocket, and which will double in the next ten years, does not even try to think about any planning. Prof. Vujovic's opinion is that it is a process where a domination of political financial oligarchy will be established, which will have means and reasons to slow down the social transformation contrary to the publicly proclaimed goals – a group which puts up an unseen resistance to any modernization.

In fact, little thought is given to them – which are coming and which will very soon flood the cities and create new multi-million agglomerations. They erect and shore up, overnight, suburbs and slums, they create traumatic urbarchitectonic mock-models out of sheer necessity, and do not think about any city planning, culture of planning, the least of all about the market planning. They are at the bottom of this story, and only trying to put a roof over their heads and convert their habitat into something which could be called humane, and acceptable and bearable to some extent. In the process of urbarchitectonic planning, de facto, they are the basis of the cruel scenario, where construction additions, and similar interventions in space bring about unacceptable, dangerous symbols of our time – new identity of an unstructured living organism, new urbarchitectonic forms (houses) micro and macrolocalities, deformed functions, unremarkable town planning physiognomies, mish-mash of social deformity! I do not believe in the potential to improve significantly such aggravated states, into "new town planning" – brimming with busy city life. It is a slow process directly dependent on the patronage of the state, that is, the market.

Several scores of years were required to create this global chaos, in which we are now. It will take decades to construct the adequate, more normal communities in terms of town planning, where people will be active on a daily basis, and make non-conflicting decisions

about the non-deformed urbanization and different status of an urbane, city-building spirit for a general reconstruction of the urban matrix.

It is a slow but manageable process. A process, for which, it is recommendable to first renew the subject matter of city building planning, where two parallel philosophies one about town planning, the other about traumatic, brutal anti-urbanism cannot coincide any more. We will not be able to, nor must we, in the future, have the same attitude towards the living, urban space, between the constancy of change of ideas and forms – if we intend to improve the status and mend the big deficiencies in the structures of our cities, as prof. Nikola Dobrovic said.

REFERENCES

1. Bogdanović Bogdan, *Grad i smrt*; "Beogradski krug", Beograd, 1994.
2. Doksijadis Konstantinos, *Čovek i grad*; "Nolit", Beograd, 1982.
3. Frempton Kenet, *Moderna arhitektura - Kritička istorija*; "Orion Art", Beograd, 2004.
4. Pušić Ljubinko, *Čitanje grada*; "Prometej", Novi Sad, 1995.
5. Radović Ranko, *Novi vrt i stari kavez*; "Stylos", Novi Sad, 2005.
6. Radović Ranko, *Savremena arhitektura - Između stalnosti i promena ideja i oblika*; Fakultet tehničkih nauka - Novi Sad & "Stylos", Novi Sad, 1998.
7. Vaništa-Lazarević Eva, *Obnova gradova u novom milenijumu*; "Classic map studio", Beograd, 2003.
8. Vujović Sreten, *Grad i društvo*; "Istraživačko-izdavački centar SSO Srbije", Beograd, 1982.

NOVI GLOBALNI EKOURBARHITEKTONSKI PRISTUP U PLANIRANJU

Nikola Cekić

U ovom radu akcentovana su pitanja drugačijeg urbanističkog, arhitektonskog, ekološkog, de facto, organskog pristupa u planiranju rurbanih aglomeracija pri čemu je remodelovanje postojećih fizičkih struktura nezaobilazno. Sve sa ciljem da se izgrade adekvatne, urbanitetno normalnije zajednice u kojima će ljudi svakodnevno biti aktivni, donositi nekonfliktne odluke za nedeformisanu urbanizaciju i održivije stanje gradograditeljskog duha, za generalnu, osmišljeniju popravku rurbanih matrica. U pitanju je zalaganje za stvaranje novog, obnovljenog urbaniteta u drugačijim društveno-istorijskim-privrednim okolnostima koje isključuju profilerske, nemoralne, primitivne slabosti planera, sebičnih investitora i graditelja.

Ključne reči: *globalno ekourbarhitektonsko, planiranje, značajne socijalne promene*