AESTHETICISATION IN CONTEMPORARY ARCHITECTURAL DISCOURSE: THE DUALISM OF STAGED AND AUTHENTIC

ABSTRACT

In the global market of aesthetic sensations, good space turns into attractive product design. While aestheticisation attacks the space through digital cognitive stimulation, it is upsetting that day-to-day life is insufficiently treated in architectural design. With the necessity of considering space and life in conjunction, the research question is placed between the aesthetic imaginations of the conceptual and ethical requirements of the everyday. The initial hypothesis is that architectural space is determined by the dualism of different modalities, which affect the spectator’s perception and the dweller’s day-to-day life. That dualism of staged and authentic space manifests an increasingly conflicting relationship, which makes their common element, the concept of space, questionable. The research aim is to show that the architectural duality turns into an antagonistic relationship between two modalities (staged and authentic), caused by an aestheticised context, which glorifies the dominance of the visual and results in the translation of the architectural concept into a manner.
1. INTRODUCTION

The built environment in which we live and write about is a fusion of ideological heterogeneity, capitalist exploitation, sociological disharmony, corrosive policies, environmental problems, lack of cultural emancipation, an aestheticisation of all spheres of life, popularisation of architectural trends, visual contamination etc. This fusion represents an architectural reality trapped in the antagonistic relationship between architectural discourse, architectural practice, and our day-to-day life in the twenty-first century.

The architectural reality, in the ‘epoch of space’, confronts the unstoppable growth of spatial problems, which turns good space into attractive product design on the global market. According to Boris Groys, that process of aestheticisation, identified with seduction and celebration, is a self-criticism of the aestheticised object (or space) as a reaction to its disadvantages. In the whirlwind of aestheticisation that takes over the architectural space as well, it is upsetting that in the architectural approach, day-to-day life and the presence of dwellers in the space are insufficiently treated, so day-to-day life is mainly rejected as a trivial fact. Consequently, the space of day-to-day life in contemporary society resembles a spectacle of political and social turbulences, where commodities are ‘colonising social life’, so architectural and urban space often shows their pathological state.

The day-to-day life is not considered enough, either in architectural discourse or in architectural practice. In a monotonous architectural rhetoric, the words context, concept and event, which form the essence of architecture, in the ‘irreversibly built construction magma’ are becoming almost meaningless words. Ecological sustainability, renewable energy sources, new materials, urgent zero-carbon cities and most ecological and technological terms are at odds with dominant practices. Furthermore, the most frequent phrases, such as capital investment, economic prosperity and economic profitability, which concern the ideological (or political) side of space, are becoming extremely vulgarised. The influences of aestheticisation and the increasing obsession with images turn architecture into the production of fetishised advertising visualisations that offer ideal spaces of happiness, far from the existential interests of dwellers. This research does not reject aesthetics, because it is an important component of spatial visual perception, but it indicates the neglect of spatial problems in prevailing aestheticisation, which often turns space into a spectacle. In such a context, the architectural concept loses its meaning and turns in a manner.
The research subject is the relationship between the architectural concept and space of day-to-day life, in the context of current aestheticisation. The antagonistic relationship and permanent struggle between education and practice, conceptual and day-to-day life, aesthetics and ethics are analysed in order to define the dualism of the architectural space, which consists of the staged and authentic modality.

The research aim is to show that the architectural duality turns into an antagonistic relationship between two modalities (staged and authentic), caused by an aestheticised context, which glorifies the dominance of the visual and results in the translation of the architectural concept into a manner.

2. ETYMOLOGICAL DETERMINATION OF TERMS

At the very beginning, there is the necessity for explaining key terms, where aestheticisation, staged and authentic become architectural terminology for interpreting spatial phenomena and connections between imagined and lived space. The defined terminology (staged and authentic) separates, describes and investigates two modalities of architectural space (conceptual and physical), observed in the current problematic context (aestheticisation).

The term aestheticisation is defined as ‘a cultural trend associated with postmodernism that involves an increasing personal concern with visual displays and/or a growing role for public spectacle in everyday life’⁵, or ‘a process where a set of values defined by ethics and based on principles and truth is replaced with a set of values defined by aesthetics and based on feelings and appearances’⁶. The dictionary states that the word aestheticisation is a typical pejorative expression and is considered as such in this research, describing all the issues that change the architectural discourse. The terms staged and authentic are antonyms that explain the phenomenon of architectural dualism. The term staged means ‘presented or performed on a stage’ and ‘planned, organised or arranged in advance’⁷. A free translation of the word could refer to something that was previously thought out and then presented with the goal of getting the desired impressions. Contrary, the term authentic has meaning as ‘legally, valid, truthfully, certain, originally, correctly, irretrievably and credible’⁸. These terms do not have specific architectural connotations. The term staged refers to the terminology of performing arts, while the word authenticity is often trivialised in its original meaning in architectural polemics. The phenomenon of aestheticisation also is not treated in contemporary architectural discourse either frequently or visibly.
In this research, the term *staged* indicates the conceptual and imaginary presented space and *authentic* talks about the space of day-to-day life in which we live (refers to the built, physical space, rather than the authentic quality of the architectural work). These two terms describe two states (modalities) of the architectural space (dualism), while the term *aestheticisation* determines the causal context where the modalities of architectural dualism are placed.

### 3. AESTHETICISATION OF EVERYDAY LIFE

We live in an aestheticised world. The embellishment of everything that surrounds us becomes the obsession of contemporary society: from individuals to activities in the public sphere. We find aestheticisation in everything: from individual efforts towards aestheticised bodies and behaviour; through the economy and markets that use aestheticised propaganda to reach goals; to genetic engineering, as a form of genetic beautification. It would be a banal approach to understand aestheticisation exclusively as a process of embellishing things with no aesthetic value, because the consequences of aestheticisation remain deeply rooted in society and culture, beyond the visual. This phenomenon of aestheticisation and its influences on the architectural discourse are the initiators of this research about issues in the space of day-to-day life.

The main hypothesis starts from the assumption that aestheticisation is a problem of our civilisation. Nevertheless, some research refuses that aestheticisation is an exclusively contemporary problem, pointing out that the criticism of democratic culture was always accompanied by criticism of its aestheticisation. Therefore, the influence of aesthetics on ethics and politics can be found in the philosophical criticisms of the ancient period, starting with Plato, who saw the possibility of tyranny ‘in the pretty appearance of democratic culture’. In the twentieth century, Walter Benjamin understood fascism as the cruelllest form of tyranny and defined it as a form of ‘aestheticisation of politics’, explaining that all attempts to aestheticise politics reached their peak in war. Radical socio-political changes after the Second World War made the aestheticisation of all social aspects visible and dominant. This can be linked to the concept of freedom, which still emphasises private interests in search of one’s own pleasures, where aesthetic relations replace social links and the political community is divided into spectacle and audience.

Between the spectacle and the audience echoes the slogan: ‘What appears is good; what is good appears’. Jean Baudrillard explains that most of the things that are available to us and that are shown to us, are based on the strategy of
converting ‘worthlessness into spectacle, into aesthetic, into market value, into a form of complete unconsciousness, the collective syndrome of aestheticisation known as culture’\(^\text{14}\). He believes that today’s aestheticised culture developed from the moment when Marcel Duchamp has transposed the banal object of the urinal into a work of art. Transposing banality by de-aestheticisation in art (which is aesthetic by nature) led to a breaking point of social aspirations that caused the general aestheticisation of everyday life\(^\text{15}\). Thus, aestheticisation was made visible with the Dada movement, which denied aesthetics and the traditional idea of beauty and erased the boundaries between art and day-to-day life through scandal and provocation.\(^\text{16}\)

Wolfgang Welsch found the roots of the global spread of aestheticisation, before Duchamp’s act, in emphasising the importance of beauty, in traditional aesthetic approaches. He states that previous aesthetic thoughts had supported global aestheticisation, assuming in this the complete happiness of humanity (from the period of Kant, when aesthetics was linked exclusively to art, to the practices of the Deutscher Werkbund and Bauhaus). But it could not assume today’s outcomes and the fact that homogenisation in aesthetics is systematically wrong\(^\text{17}\). Homogenisation is wrong because of mass technical reproduction, which took away the aura from the work of art (which is related to aesthetics), as Benjamin explains\(^\text{18}\). Homogenisation leads to an aesthetic stereotype, trends and fetish, that degrades art. Baudrillard explains that art has not degraded itself in transcendental ideality, but in the aestheticisation of day-to-day life in the circulation of banal images\(^\text{19}\). Boris Groys says that in art, that becomes only a matter of taste, the observer becomes more important than the artist and the work, so art becomes only design viewed through the lens of the market. Thus, the term aesthetics is transferred outside the sphere of art into day-to-day life and becomes connected to all aspects of individual and social activities: from the aesthetics of objects to aesthetic medicine. Today, everything is subject to design and every observation is aesthetic judgment. So, global aestheticisation brings apparent, superficial and short-lived happiness and a series of related problems in all social spheres and also in the aesthetic discipline itself. Aesthetics today exists outside of aesthetics, as Welsh concludes, or in the trans-aesthetic era of banal images, as Baudrillard concludes. Banality is spreading as a form of non-thinking and a precondition for enjoyment, that aims to separate us from reality through the standardisation of expression and behaviour.\(^\text{20}\)

Although we could find its roots earlier, aestheticisation is most often associated with the period of postmodernism, when the differences between art and mass/popular culture are erased\(^\text{21}\). Mass aestheticisation makes everything visible, thereby erasing the difference between reality and image. As Baudrillard...
claims, the aestheticisation of day-to-day life turns reality into an image, so day-
to-day life becomes saturated with images, which proclaim the fetishism of aes-
theticised commodities. The pleasure of consuming things becomes an aesthetic
pleasure. In the book ‘The Anaesthetics of Architecture’ Neil Leach writes that
the sensory stimulation caused by images causes a narcotic effect that diminishes
social and political consciousness. Welsh connects aestheticisation and anaesthesia
in another way. Among the disadvantages of global aestheticisation (as the
production of meaninglessness instead of beauty), he states that aestheticisation
collapses itself with anaesthesia, as aesthetic indifference. This indifference can
be connected with today’s fast fashion phenomenon, short product life, changing
trends, short attention spans and quick viewing of digital content. Nevertheless,
according to Welsh, anaesthesia (as a conscious choice) could ultimately be a
survival strategy as a complete refusal to perceive the beautified environment.

Summarising the above, the development of aestheticisation, from the search for
ethics in beauty, through the influence of the anti-art of the Dadaists, to the re-
alisation of individuals’ desires through the images, leads to aestheticisation out-
comes that give values to the things, not in reality, but in hyperreality. Aesthet-
ics became the ‘new leading currency in the reality trade’. Baudrillard explains
that aestheticised reality can be equated with political economy, which becomes
a kind of empty speculation, and thus aesthetics. Referring to him, David Har-
vey notes that the image, in a certain sense, becomes a commodity. The world
becomes saturated with values and aesthetics, so the aestheticisation of politics,
explained by Benjamin, turns into the aestheticisation of capital, which ‘glorifies
banality (pictures) as a prerequisite for pleasure’.

4. MODALITIES OF ARCHITECTURAL DUALISM

Dualism is the belief that things are divided into two, often very different or
opposing. The phenomenon of dualism is permanently present in the history of human
thought, starting with Plato and the duality of mind (soul) and body, through
philosophical and theological connotations that imply two states of reality: one
is natural, material and physical, and the other is immaterial, supernatural and
metaphysical. All discussions about dualities, whether they are epistemological,
metaphysical or Cartesian, whether they are avant-garde discussions or belong to
modern cognitive neuroscience, have one goal: to examine the relations of two
sides (modalities) of dualism, that can exclusively be complementary or conflict-
ing. That consideration of the relations between modalities is set as the goal of
this research about duality in the context of architecture.
Dualism in architecture can be considered in two ways: as dualities that architecture deals with (we can define it as *dualities in architecture*) or as a duality that defines the nature of architecture (we can define it as *architectural duality*).

There are many dualities that architecture considers in research between complementarity or conflict of function and form, light and dark, full and empty, orthogonal and organic, private and public, etc. Le Corbusier, using the metaphors of rulers and compasses, describes the duality of ‘geometry that produces tangible forms’ and ‘geometry that creates brilliant diagrams’\(^2^9\), thus dividing architecture into male (architecture mâle) and female (architecture femelle). Louis Kahn explains the duality of served and servant spaces\(^3^0\). Aldo van Eyck defines the twin phenomenon (unity and diversity, few and many, part and whole, simplicity and complexity, etc.), that have to be complementary, otherwise they are meaningless abstract antonyms\(^3^1\). In the continuous development of architecture, there is an infinite set of dualities, which are partially mentioned in order to make a difference with the duality, which is the research subject. That is the architectural duality that Bernard Tschumi sees as a consequence of the paradoxes that are in the nature of architecture:

> Architectural definitions, in their surgical precision, reinforce and amplify the impossible alternatives: on the one hand, architecture as a thing of the mind, a dematerialised or conceptual discipline with its typological and morphological variations, and on the other, architecture as an empirical event that concentrates on the senses, on the experience of space\(^3^2\).

It is not questioned that the architectural space has two states: conceptual (immaterial) and sensory (material). Back in the Renaissance, Leon Battista Alberti distinguished the idea from construction, and Étienne-Louis Boullée wrote: ‘In order to execute, it is first necessary to conceive’\(^3^3\). At last, Tschumi writes:

> The relation between the abstraction of thought and the substance of space - the Platonic distinction between *theoretical* and *practical* - is constantly recalled: to perceive the architectural space of a building is to perceive something that has been conceived.\(^3^4\)

That logical division of architecture is an axiom with which this research begins. Architectural dualism is an architectural autonomous ontological form. It comes from abstraction and reality, from thought and space. One modality requires perceiving the imagined with the engagement of the mind and the other requires perceiving the real with the involvement of the senses. These internal contradic-
tions divide architecture, so we are talking about two reciprocally exclusive factors: the concept and the experience of space, or the Pyramid and the Labyrinth.\textsuperscript{35}

It is evident that architecture is initially composed of a conceptual idea and then ultimately a material embodiment. However, that duality is complicated; its modalities are not hermetic categories, their connections are complex, and the subjects are different. The subject of the concept of space is the architect, while the subject in the experience of space is the dweller. To understand the concept of space by the dweller and to deliberate the experience of space by the architect seems to be the main problem in the architectural discipline. Concept-experience dualism, which Tschumi sees as a paradox of architecture, must be researched in today’s aestheticised conditions, which requires the spectator as a third subject. The spectator becomes an important factor in the mass popularisation of architectural production in a society where rules the hegemony of vision\textsuperscript{36}. A fetishised photorealistic render, as an instrument of persuasion about the suitability of a concept (that offers an image of future experiences), becomes an architectural advertisement of an architectural product, as a sensation for the eye of the spectator. So duality, the subject of this research, refers to the duality that Guy Debord recognises in the 1970s, as a duality of reality and image.\textsuperscript{37} Today, Neil Leach explains that, in the increasing obsession with the visual, the sensory stimulation caused by images has a narcotic effect, leaving architecture into its aesthetic cocoons remote from the actual concerns of day-to-day life.\textsuperscript{38} It appears that we are facing a growing discrepancy between the ideal space and day-to-day experience or a discrepancy between the two modalities of architectural duality.

In the following chapters, architectural duality will be observed from the perspective of its modalities, placed in the context of aestheticisation as the presumed cause of the architectural crisis. The first modality is the modality of the staged space, which is followed by the second modality of the authentic space. The first refers to architectural discourse and the second to architectural reality. The first is related to architectural theory, defining architecture as a matter of the mind, and the second is related to architectural practice, making architecture an empirical event. The first requires the perception of the imagined with the activation of the ocular, and the second requires the perception of the real with the activation of all senses. One modality is the concept of space and the other is the experience of space; one is a two-dimensional image and the other is a three-dimensional space. The first modality is defined as the staged modality and the second as the authentic modality.
5. THE STAGED MODALITY

The staged modality = architectural discourse + architectural theory + architecture as a matter of mind + concept of space + perception of the imagined (engagement of the ocular) + ideal space

The first modality results from the architectural discourse, from the thinking of architecture as a conjunction between the human being and its existence in space. Nevertheless, a dominant side of the architectural discourse aspires to be autonomous, through a subversive approach, refusing to see the crisis. With such ambitions, which lean towards self-reference, the position of the dweller for whom architecture exists, is often ignored. In such a reductive focus, Juhani Pallasmaa sees an increase of ‘architectural autism, an internalised and autonomous discourse that is not grounded in our shared existential reality’39. This is the first obstacle in achieving a complementary relationship in the duality of staged and authentic. The cause of this obstacle can be found in a superficial understanding of architectural theory, which is ultimately considered only as ‘a practical tool for the construction of architectural objects’40 or ‘theory as a means to arrive at, or justify architectural form or practice’41. Whether traditional or critical, architectural theory as a medium for consciously facing architectural problems seems to be neglected entirely in the architectural forms of mainstream culture today.

Regardless of whether it treats the theory or ignores it, the first modality defines architecture as a matter of the mind because words and plans are mental constructs, separated from real life and sensuality42. It is a conceptual space (according to Philippe Boudon) or pyramid (according to Tschumi). That phase of ‘dematerialisation of architecture in its ontological form’43 implies diverse and obsessive architectural aspirations towards the production of singularity and correctness in a multitude of heterogeneous approaches. The architectural concept, thus, represents the ‘product of creative activity’44, which contains ‘thought, thinking and “multiplicity” that always surpasses its realisation or objectivation’45. Intuitiveness and subjectivity in the creation of the first modality often set all the potential of the architectural concept (to create authentic spaces of sensory receptions) on the margins of its success. Bringing the concept to the level of triviality, through understatement of its meaning and reduction of the diagram into a seductive graphic design, directs the concept towards the production of an aestheticised form. Therefore, what we call a concept is usually just a manner.

It is useful to recall Budon, for whom the conceptualisation phase deals with a specific architectural problem - the question of the measure and scale, which are not interpreted in a quantitative meaning but as a link between concept and reality, as a ‘transition from mental to real space’46. Aldo van Eyck calls it right-size,
which is related to the dual phenomenon and the in-between zone, in which the
quantitative nature of individual polarities is replaced by the qualitative nature
of a dual mutual phenomenon, so the real measure becomes reciprocity. The
architectural proportions necessarily involve body and context and refer to the
‘unconscious measuring of the object or the building with one’s body, and of
projecting one’s body scheme into the space in question’. Peter Zumthor sees it
as a matter of proximity and distance, and defines the measure as ‘level of inti-
macy’. Vitruvius also wrote about the human body as the centre of architecture
and Svetlana Kana Radević explained that in projects and buildings ‘there is a
geometric point of intersection, intended for the position of man, from where he
sees, perceives and accepts the entire space’. In neglecting the dweller’s physi-
cal presence and the manneristic perception of the first modality potential, there
is another obstacle to a complementary duality.

Today, measure and scale are especially manipulated in presentations of con-
ceptual space. The pleasure of creation is subordinated to the viewing pleasure.
‘The grammar and syntax of the architectures sign become pretexts for sophisti-
cated and pleasurable manipulation’, which translated into a two-dimensional
medium of ‘digitally synthesised images’, detached from reality, equally leans
towards ‘frozen pleasure of the mind’ and eye. That is what Leach calls the
narcotic effect of architectural anaesthesia. In today’s culture of images, also our
‘gaze itself flattens into a picture and loses its plasticity’. Images of ideal spaces
of decontextualised hyperreality become simulacrum that offer us a distorted
reality or, as Leach explains, offer the world:

That has lost touch with its referents in the real world, and where,
paradoxically, the term “real” has been hijacked by the multina-
tional conglomerates and turned into an empty advertising slogan,
claiming its authenticity against its very absence of authenticity,
such that “authenticity” becomes a suspect, counterfeit currency
in the hypermarket of hyperreality.

Architecture faces a deeper problem than mere visual dominance and becoming
‘an art of the printed image fixed by the hurried eye of the camera’. As a result,
the primary and ultimate role of architecture is forgotten – that ‘architecture is
exposed to life’. Staging a false reality is the third and biggest obstacle to the
complementarity of the two modalities.
6. THE AUTHENTIC MODALITY

The authentic modality = architectural reality + architectural practice + architecture as an empirical event + experience of space + perception of the real (engagement of the senses) + space of day-to-day life

Without going deeper into the problem of reality, but reducing it to day-to-day life with objective and subjective dimensions, architectural reality can be defined as a space-time continuum in which the production of architectural discourse confronts materiality and day-to-day life. That confrontation point initiates the verification of architectural concepts as subjective interpretations of reality. Through a fragmentary selection of issues and avoidance of a holistic approach in the phase of conceptualisation and presentation, architectural reality is confronted with a number of problems in everyday space.

Reality means authentic and true, so architectural reality is compressed in the context (spatial, social, cultural, economic, etc.), which is, in the presentation of the concept, just a frozen image poeticised through imaginations beyond reality as subjectively designed imaginary contexts. We must know that ‘we don’t live in a world of fixed presentations’, but in spaces that carry meanings created through contextual interactions of body, mind and world. The context gives meaning to the architectural object, as Robert Venturi wrote. On the contrary, architectural practice permanently changes contexts of reality, where authenticity is ‘the ability to master local needs through concepts that have universal values’ remains on the margins. The ignored context in architectural practice is the first sign of the non-complementary of staged and authentic space.

The architectural space, faced with the reality that brings the dweller, changes from the staged to an authentic modality - to an empirical event and metaphorical labyrinth. There, space is real because it affects the senses rather than the mind, and the materiality of the body coexists and fights with the materiality of space at the same time. The empirical experience of architectural reality is not an abstract object of consciousness, but an immediate and concrete human activity, which includes subjectivity. Our thoughts are shaped through bodily interactions with the world, so empirical experience refers to our body resonance in space, thus generating spatial experience in which ‘we unconsciously mimic its (spatial) configuration with our bones and muscle’. Space is a mediator between our experience of the world and sensory perceptions. ‘I lend my emotions and associations to the space and the space lends me its aura, which entices and emancipates my perceptions and thoughts’, explains Pallasmaa, adding that the resonances of the body make bodily sensations, pleasure and protection. Tschumi warns, however, that violence also exists in the experience of space, not only pleasure.
Violence in architecture, as a metaphor for the intensity of the body-space relations, is mutual. As Tschumi explains, there is the violence of space over the body and the violence of the body over space. By entering the architectural space, the body makes an event and, by movement, activates the space, thus disrupting the order and balance of the controlled architectural geometry. Under the continual architectural ambition to create new iconic structures through volumetric transformations, we will agree that: ‘No wonder, the human body has always been suspect in architecture: it has always set limits to the most extreme architectural ambitions’\(^6\). Ignoring the body because of the fear of violence over space, which ultimately causes violence against the body, is a second sign of the non–complementary dualism.

The activation of the senses begins in the encounter of body and space, in tactile contact with the world of events. This is where the spatial experience is built, which Zumthor defines as the atmosphere of the space, which is experienced through emotional sensibility, a form of perception we need to survive.\(^7\) From the perspective of fascination with techno-culture, many influences have made the visual system dominant over the other senses. That has led to radical sensory distancing: ‘Vision and hearing are now the privileged sociable senses, whereas the other three are considered as archaic sensory remnants with a merely private function, and they are usually suppressed by the code of culture’\(^8\). Since ancient architecture, the sense of sight has been an essential stimulus for perception and reception in the creation and experience of space. Zumthor himself, starting a polemic on the question ‘What is architectural quality?’ , primarily points out his fascination with the photograph of the hall of the railway station (Broad Street Station, John Russell Pope, 1919) and says that every time he sees it, he is enchanted by the beauty of the space (which he has not visited)\(^9\).

Visual perception, especially peripheral vision, is vital in the empirical experience of space. Pallasmaa explains: ‘Unconscious peripheral perception transforms retinal gestalt into spatial and bodily experiences. Peripheral vision integrates us with space, while focused vision pushes us out of the space, making us mere spectators’\(^10\). A problem is when focused vision becomes a priority while the other senses are neglected. The dominance of images in an oculocentric society finds negative influences in architecture. Advertising architectural ideas through staged images of focused gestalt becomes the dominant dogma directed towards the visual and formal.

In the authentic modality, architecture should achieve a physical connection with life, where the space is a ‘sensitive container for the rhythm of footsteps on the floor, for the concentration of work, for the silence of sleep’\(^11\), as Zumthor wrote.
Then the space becomes our day-to-day life, through ritual and repetitive actions in body-spatial communication. Authentic modality refers to the space of day-to-day life, to the physical and real framework of everyday interaction.

7. THE STAGED-AUTHENTIC RELATION

Architectural dualism sets modalities, at the same time, in an interdependent and self-sufficient position. Tschumi sees it as the inevitable nature of architecture, as an expression of a lack, a shortcoming, a non-completion: ‘It always misses something, either reality or concept’\textsuperscript{75}. In the staged modality, reality is occupied by the creative potential of the concept, while it is trapped between the author’s subjective preoccupations and rigid economic factors. In an authentic space, the concept turns into the potential of events, which supports day-to-day habits and the dweller’s subjective experiences. Different space-time determinants and subjects of the two modalities are the reason for the impossible simultaneous understanding of the concept and experience of space.

The issue of concept in architecture and its metamorphosis into authentic experiences is the core of architectural epistemology\textsuperscript{76}. The complementarity of staged and authentic space is contained in the power of concept to support the modifications of day-to-day life. Pallasmaa adds that the mental value of architecture is hidden in ‘embodied metaphors and ineffable unconscious interactions - it can only be experienced and encountered’\textsuperscript{77}. In a complementary duality, the concept becomes an experience of architecture without thinking about it\textsuperscript{78}, an experience of embodied memory of space, a kind of self-identity, like ‘the image offered us by reading the poem becomes really our own’\textsuperscript{79}.

Aldo van Eyck explains that the dual phenomenon cannot be divided into incompatible polarities because the division undermines what the phenomena stand for\textsuperscript{80}. The modalities relations are increasingly brought into conflict through mannerisms, staged delusions and visual manipulations. The privilege of aesthetic sensibility on rendered images, as a kind of architectural fetish, forms an imaginary space for celebrating aestheticisation, which degrades architecture. The existence of globally present architectural trends, popularised through social networks, changes the design process into the production of mannerist models of popular presentation. The space and the dweller remain neglected, reduced only to the abstraction of virtual expression.
8. CONCLUSION

The negative consequences of aestheticisation in the architectural discourse are located in the antagonistic relationship between modalities of architectural duality.

The discrepancy between the visually attractive image and the sensory space experience causes the degradation of ubiquitous architecture’s phenomenological, visual and usable qualities in the everyday environment. Although the issue of day-to-day life was introduced into theoretical research almost a century ago, the current urgent urban problems show that the neglect of the individual and society is dominant in the discourse about space. Individual efforts to create a more humane living environment fail to overcome the mass production of aestheticised images of heterotopian life, in which the architectural concept has become a manner.

The research between the modalities of architectural dualism, where are located the paradoxical relations between aesthetic and ethical, concept and life, virtual and real, staged and authentic, leads to the following conclusions:

- We are constantly faced with spatial problems which are not compatible with activities in day-to-day life. We often adapt to space instead of the opposite.

- Equally, those who create the idea, and those who live in space, are strongly influenced by the culture of images. The obsession with images distances all subjects from the sensory aspects of space. Architecture is reduced to a two-dimensional image, which becomes its own goal.

- The architectural concept suffers from the superficiality of image consumption and becomes a manner.

In spatial experiences, the potential of all the senses remains deprived through the virtual manipulation and increase of numbers of passive spectators and day-to-day life becomes faced with the fact that: ‘instead of experiencing our being in the world, we behold it from outside as spectators of images projected on the surface of the retina’⁸¹. Insufficient treatment of the dweller’s needs in the existential reality of space results in the neglected context of reality in the space of day-to-day life. Taking care of the dweller in the space means developing the idea of the space as an ‘open work’⁸² that will be completed by the recipient ac-
According to its affinities. That means giving the dweller the opportunity to achieve psychological and physical spatial communication. Hertzberger explains: ‘What we have to search for, instead of prototypes that are collective interpretations of individual models of living, are prototypes that enable individual interpretations of collective models’83. The inclusion of human behaviour, actions and needs in the design process becomes an unpredictable zone of new discoveries, perceptions and assumptions, because the issues of the future dweller do not have measurable units to explain them. It is a field of open actions and the greatest architectural possibilities because otherwise, without them, we can reduce the space to the level of pure utilitarianism of a machine or the level of mannerist goods that are reproduced, advertised and sold. In that case, we should replace architecture with another name.

N.B.

This paper is a result of research within the doctoral dissertation which is currently being written under the mentorship of professor Jelena Atanacković Jeličić and professor Milan Rapaić at the Department of Architecture and Urban Planning at the Faculty of Technical Sciences in Novi Sad.
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TRANSGRESIJA MATERIJE
Ophelia Mantz
Nakon pandemije, Francuska promoviše nove načine naseljavanja domaćeg prostora učeći od COVID-a. Međutim, određeni modeli su nastali iz sporije transformacije. Ispitujemo kako rad po principu "uradi sam" (do it yourself - DIY) može ukazivati na promene paradigme u francuskom društvu. Ovaj esej opisuje karakteristike i promene principa "uradi sam" tokom vremena u francuskoj na osnovu zamaha koji su stvorile društvene nauke 1970-ih. Objašnjava kako "uradi sam" princip može da generiše promene u ponašanju ljudi i nudi moguće nove modele za ekonomiju i proizvodnju. Međutim, da bi se odigrala uloga i u stanovanju u dvadeset prvom veku i u savremenom gradu, akcija preduzeta po tom pitanju mora biti prostorno legitimisana. Stoga se govori o historijskoj ulozi homo fabera i njegove radionice u izgradnji la cite. Radionice dozvoljavaju transgresiju trenutne materijalne kulture vođene idejama obilja i akumulacije. Stoga se na "uradi sam" gleda kao na način postojanja u svetu koji omogućava izgradnju novih ekonomskih i produktivnih modela tokom ere ekološke tranzicije.
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ESTETIZACIJA U SAVREMEMO ARHITEKTONSKOM DISKURSU: DUALITET PRIREDENOG I AUTENTIČNOG
Marija Ćačić
Arhitektonska stvarnost, koja se suočava sa nezaustavljivim rastom prostorne problematike, „dobar prostor” svodi na dobar proizvodni dizajn na globalnom tržištu estetskih senzacija. U vrtlogu estetizacije, koja posredstvom digitalnih kognitivnih stimulacija zahvata i arhitektonski prostor, dodatno zabrinjava što se u projektantskoj metodologiji nedovoljno tretira svakodnevni život korisnika u prostoru. S obzirom na nužnost sagledavanja arhitektonskog prostora i ljudskog života u sprezi, problemsko pitanje se pozicionira između estetičkih imaginacija konceptualnog i etičkih zahtjeva svakodnevog prostora. Inicijalna pretpostavka je da arhitektonski prostor determiniše dualizam - dvojstvo različitih stanja prostora, koji imaju i različite uticaje na percepciju posmatrača, odnosno na svakodnevni život korisnika. Taj dualizam priredenog (renderovanog) i autentičnog (svakodnevog) prostora ispoljava sve učestalije konfliktan odnos, što dovodi u pitanje poziciju njihovog zajedničkog činioca - koncepta prostora. Cilj istraživanja je da se pokaže da dualitet arhitektonskog prostora prelazi u antagonistički odnos dva modaliteta (priredenog i autentičnog), pod uticajem estetizovanog konteksta, koji glorifikuje dominaciju vizuelnog, što za ishod prevodi arhitektonski koncept u manir.
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