Space as ritual: contesting the fixed interpretation of space in the African city
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Drawing on Henri Lefebvre’s quotidian theories, space making is explored as an expression of a society’s collective mind. Spatial understanding is a function of culture. Spatial ability is the capacity to interpret knowledge about space and to organise spatial information. An appropriate spatial strategy in the South African context must support spatial ability and transcend Eurocentric models of spatial definition in order to achieve a viable postcolonial model. In the context of this argument, spatial production is viewed as the result of interrelations constituted through the social interactions of the everyday. Space can only sufficiently be understood as a realm of possibility, acknowledging the existence of multiplicity and the co-existence of heterogeneity. Against this background more dynamic models for spatial exploration are proposed.
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In the context of a world that is progressively more interconnected, the concept of place has become totemically important. Its symbolic value is continuously mobilised in political and cultural argument. In this paper it is argued that place resides in the production of architectural and urban space that celebrates the rituals of the everyday, of real and valued practices related to cultural and geographical sources of meaning. Such a dynamic reading of space is necessary in considering strategies of place making in the context of the African city. In exploring this issue the argument is presented as a dialectic critique of the current African urban landscape, its effecting Western influences and alternative approaches to the reading and production of African, and more particularly South African, urban space.

As an introduction to this argument, it is first necessary to consider the word space as used in architectural discourse. According to Colquhoun (1985: 179) the Western concept of architectural space is relatively new and was first formulated in the 1890’s by the German aesthetician and art historian August Schmarsow (1838-1914). Although, in one sense, all he did was to categorise something that always existed, in another he radically changed the way in which architecture is interpreted. Space became a positive entity in which the traditional categories of tectonic form and surface were contained. Architects would now think of space as something pre-existent and unlimited, giving value to concepts of continuity, transparency and indeterminacy. Such a reading of space contains ideological implications.

Space as cultural construct

Proussin (1992: 125) proposes a cultural understanding of spatial quality in reference to the concepts of space and place in an African context, referring to the concept of spatial ability. Spatial ability is defined as the capacity to present knowledge about space and to organise spatial information. The cross-cultural psychologist J. Berry (1992: 124) proposes a measure for
spatial ability using the terms “field dependence” and “field independence”. Field dependence is defined as a reliance on external visual cues resulting in a stronger consciousness of boundary and limitation, and as a cognitive style presents a literal interpretation of space. In comparison, field independence represents a deeper understanding of space beyond physical boundaries. Space is conceptualised from within as a dynamic process rather than a static condition. A highly developed spatial imagination is typical of nomadic cultures while a highly structured urban world suppresses spatial complexity (Lloyd 2003: 109). These two opposites represent a Western/African dualism and are used as a foundation for evaluating the spatiality of the contemporary African city. This duality extends to the interpretation of the concept of spatial “ownership”. In the African context all space is perceived to be public, except that which is defined by ritual as private space. In comparison, the European view commits all space to private ownership except for that which is designated and regulated as public area and defined through legal processes and demarcated by physical boundaries (Lloyd 2003: 107).

Rethinking space: the African city as colonial construct

The Western mindset, through the agency of colonialism, dominates the African urban realm. Not only were Africans alienated from the land but they were also excluded from participation in urban processes. Instead of enriching European city culture through its human emphasis towards the establishment of an inclusive normative urban theory, the African view has remained largely marginalized (Lloyd 2003: 107). As a result the African city is often characterised by a layer of anonymity, its identity weakened by the effects of globalisation and the Western/Modern imposition of norms of urban theory. African cities are struggling to find appropriate solutions that could assist in reclaiming their identities and create a valid African urban expression (Ntuli 2002: 54). It is difficult to define the urban nature of the African city, especially because it often refers to Western and colonial notions of a city, and is dominated by Modern ideologies. These were manipulated to display authority, oppression and control as typified in the Apartheid
city and coincides with Koolhaas’s (2000) concept of a “Generic city”. In their critique of the modern urban condition they describe this type of city as one in which sensations are weak and distended, emotions are limited and its inhabitants are mostly only familiar with its superficial routines. Positive attractions are obscured in the face of its perceived lack of social and ethical standards. Choices and opportunities are limited because notions of necessity instead of social richness dominate the urban fabric. History is almost non-existent in the urban fabric, as concepts of layering and intensification are alien to this city. The city is not improved on; instead, should a new layer be required, it is established elsewhere or replaces the existing. The city is therefore identified by homogeneous spaces that are deficient in providing opportunities for urban experience and, as stated by Borden (2001: 184), allow the domination of the “exchange of decisions and commodities over social relations and uses”. This alienating environment is devoid of spontaneity and dynamism, alternative spatialities are repressed, and the urban experience is reduced to what he calls “organised walking” (2001: 184).

Although these urban commentators view Modern urbanity from a Western perspective, their critiques apply equally to the contemporary African city, suffering under the same pervasive norms of late Western capitalism. Current urban design aims to satisfy technical and economic efficiencies, allowing, through implicit neglect, diverse cultures to be suppressed into a bland and universal urban society. For African city dwellers there is little direct or referred process of participation in urban design delivery (Lloyd 2003: 107). Despite the urgency, little research is done, scant dialogue is entered into, and low priority is given to engage African urban populations in the specific debate around the culture of cities. No “school” of urban design has emanated from “Africanist” thinkers. The few academically qualified indigenous planners and architects absorb European and international theory with little modification (Lloyd 2003: 108).
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A city of social richness and a city of necessity. (Pallasmaa, 2005: 43)

**Object fixation**

The alienating environments of the Modern urban condition are aggravated by the Postmodern misconception that the spatiality of the city can be enhanced by inserting isolated architectural events. These tend to employ an aesthetic approach and appeal to a media-dominated society where vision is privileged above all the other senses.
According to Pallasmaa (2005: 22), many of the architectural projects of the recent past, celebrated by the architectural profession, express both “narcissism”, an excessive interest in oneself, and “nihilism”, rejecting moral principles, detaching architecture from the body and turning it into something solely for visual satisfaction. Society is developing an increased fixation with the power of the image, and with this ocular bias, contemporary architecture has become “easy”; it has turned into objects of “vulgar utility” and of “shrewd seduction” (Pallasmaa 2005: 17). Architects have created architectural imagery that is used as instant persuasions, with forms that are lifeless and lack “tectonic logic”. Frank Gehry’s Guggenheim Museum (1991-1997) in Bilbao, Spain, is employed by Wark (1999: 37) to clarify this idea of architecture as image, stating that it has been communicated across space. Nearly everyone has seen a picture of it, or heard of it. The Guggenheim exists not for itself, but for the media. Pallasmaa (2005: 30) expands on this idea, suggesting that it is an architecture that has a fixation with appearances and has no sustaining power over time - it is purely an exterior experience ignoring any spatial consequence.

Image-orientated architecture, driven by the aesthetic approach, is described by Harries (1998: 9) as simply adding adornment to architectural objects with the intention to seduce. This is considered to be an inadequate attitude. Architecture created as spectacle takes the place of reality and disregards its surrounding context of constraints, demands and opportunities (Forty 2000: 274). As an aesthetic object, architecture fabricated to be a product complete in itself and which ignores socio-spatial relations, has its roots in ideologies established in Postmodern architecture. The “desire to avoid boredom” and the search for the “interesting”, expressed in Robert Venturi’s (1924-) aphorism “less is a bore”, is a reaction to Mies van der Rohe’s (1886-1969) “less is more” and to the perceived “moral failure” of Modernism. It is, though, an aesthetic reaction as opposed to an ethical one (Harries 1998: 6-9).
This formalist and aesthetic approach transfers itself onto the urban context in an attempt to restore the city. In an effort to address negative existing urban spatialities, form-driven solutions and functionalist principles are employed. According to Pallasmaa (2005: 29), these reflect a sense of order, control and hygiene. Pérez-Gómes (2002: 165) states that the interventions that occur within the contemporary city are objects that are produced in order to introduce form, and are isolated architectural events that are not integrated with the social landscape, are ignorant of their cultural context, their intended programmes, their historical roots, their ethical and social obligations, and the experiencing body. This results in the “city of the eye” where novel forms supported by new technologies identify form-driven solutions. African cities have not escaped the visual bias inspiring these formal interventions. The controversial Walter Sisulu Square of Dedication in Kliptown, Soweto completed by StudioMAS architects in 2005, represents such a local example. This well-intended project dominates its fragile urban setting, overwhelming the discrete scale of the existing urban fabric with its monumental architecture. The lack of physical integration is also reflected in the attitude of locals who have consistently avoided taking ownership of the space and it remains a vacant “white elephant” (Kuljian 2007/8: 87).
Henri Lefebvre (born 1905-), in the comprehensive critique contained in *The production of space* (1991), refers to this impoverished understanding of space and the fetishised abstraction of contemporary spatiality. Conversely, form-driven interventions ought to be replaced by activity-driven solutions where architecture not only accommodates but also celebrates differences within multi-cultural societies, without resorting to symbolic and monumental forms. According to Forty (2000: 170), a “form-less” architecture is not one in which “form” does not exist, but an architecture of “formal restraint”, described by Pallasmaa (2005: 69) as containing a “rare sensuous richness addressing all the senses simultaneously”. Sennett (1990: 31-132) supports this premise, and defines the essence of human development as the capacity to appreciate complex experiences. In this regard he advocates an architecture of weak boundaries wherein spaces can intersect and connect in an exploration of cross-pollination and exchange. What is advocated is an architecture that is capable of (re)producing itself through use and everyday life.

Activity-driven solutions to spatial problems involve exposing urban realities and reactivating the city, enabling the provision of empowering urban spaces. The role of architecture in the African urban condition should be to provide for multiple identities in the creation of a reconsidered urban condition. To address the issue of impoverished urban space, the function of architecture must be reconsidered to allow liberation from the static “aesthetic approach”. Rather than imposing universality it ought to support the liberalising of diversity and the establishment of hybrid cultures.

**Spatial understanding as a function of culture**

The concept of culture from an anthropological viewpoint categorises the beliefs, practices, and systems of meaning of specific groups of people and defines the core values within a community, making life possible and meaningful (Van Staden 1998: 15-17). Culture influences perceptions, which in turn are formed by expectations, beliefs, and emotions, but also by people’s histories and social circumstances. It follows that an objective and universal perception of reality cannot be expected, as different cultures will perceive reality differently (Teffo & Roux 1998: 134). This strongly suggests that those differences, whether inherent or social constructs, need to be acknowledged by means of secured choice where all cultures and communities are granted equal status (Coetzee 1998: 352).

As an example, it is possible to articulate an understanding of the African condition by contrasting African philosophy with Western philosophy. Western thought points to a worldview that is rooted in an individualistic and objective framework defined by notions of division and control. The result is a value system that is governed by material gain, individual growth and power. In contrast, African knowledge systems are characterised by a worldview that encourages solidarity, communitarianism, traditionalism and participation (Teffo & Roux 1998: 148):
African philosophy | Western philosophy
---|---
a. Together | a. Alone
b. Mind | b. Material
c. Whole | c. Pieces
d. Past | d. Future
e. Harmony | e. Control
f. Shame | f. Guilt
g. Share | g. Accumulate

Embedded in African thought, is the idea of *Ubuntu*. This humanist philosophy reveals a fundamental aspect of African society in the importance it attaches to human beings; it is a human-centred society (Ramose 2002: 231). The emphasis placed on humanity branches out into additional non-individualistic aspects essential to African society, suggesting communal spirit, inclusiveness and participation. The essence of African culture is realised as a unique life force vested in each individual, the *Munthu*. The collective is called *Bunthu*, leading to the Xhosa aphorism *Umunthu ngumunthu ngaBanthu*: “I am a person by reason of other people” (Lloyd 2003: 113). It is accepted that *Ubuntu* may only play an important role in sections of the South African population consisting, as it does, of diverse groups that have alternative value systems. But, given that social and human values are universally appropriate as personified in *Ubuntu*, this seems an appropriate point of departure.

A pertinent spatial strategy in the South African context should therefore support spatial ability and transcend Eurocentric models of spatial definition in order to achieve a viable postcolonial model. This implies contesting Modern urban spatialities based on efficiency and individual ownership as well as resisting form and image driven architectural interventions. It is not necessary to resort to overly symbolic or monumental forms to accommodate a multicultural society, but diverse identities should rather be celebrated and acknowledged through open-ended activity-driven solutions supporting the concepts of inclusivity and community.

**A responsive urban expression**

The revival of the African city relies on a symbiosis of existing conditions, philosophies, and thought processes with new inventive strategies, transforming it into an authentic place-specific expression. It is to liberate itself from confining formal principles and to reconsider its desire for global competitiveness. The challenge lies in accepting that African resources are different and therefore require different solutions. An appropriate South African urban expression begins with honouring the significance of the diverse perceptions and viewpoints of its society. The need for a non-prescriptive space exists, where differences may be negotiated and integration between multiple levels of identity, understandings and practices exist. This elastic entity should accommodate the unpredictable. It is a city that thrives on the human dimension (N’Da N’Guessan & Bachir 2000: 112).

**Contesting commodified space**

The city and its urban form should be the result of spatialities adapting to meet society’s changing needs, leading to continuously emerging new urban forms. These forms are extremely sensitive to the socio-cultural energies that operate over time (Van den Burg 2004: 41). However, South African urban forms and systems have developed patterns indicating a struggle to adjust and regulate themselves to meet the needs of a contemporary South African urban culture.
These new patterns contribute to the South African city, which is defined not only by spatial dichotomies, but by social, cultural, political and economic contrasts. Furthermore, these patterns of differences attempt to survive in spatial relationships in which inflexible and strict boundaries draw up impermeable walls between the public and private realms and between formal and informal spaces, allowing the privileged to control the space available to them. With controlled and commodified space comes residual space. This is characterised by abandoned or restricted spaces, where the negative symptoms of the city are played out and the unprivileged are forced to survive by setting up their own informal infrastructural systems. The result is a city perceived to be characterised by chance, crime and consumption (Koolhaas et al 2000: 187).

Within the urban condition of a dynamic city there exists a rich social and architectural fabric that provides an abundance of building types, social relations, times and spaces. As a result its inhabitants are presented with a wide variety of opportunities and choices. When a city is able to offer to its users this rich urban fabric on all scales, they are enabled to engage directly with the city and its spaces. If the choices and opportunities that a city offers are to be accessible to all its users, not exclusively to those who have the available resources, physical and perceived boundaries should not resist or enclose these opportunities, but instead offer its inhabitants the freedom to insert their own meanings and actions into the city.
It is essential that an urban dweller is able to experience a city by way of its socio-spatial relationships, which are activated by a variety of temporal patterns, rhythms, interruptions, surface conditions, spatialities and textural qualities that appeal to all the senses simultaneously. A large component of this urban experience takes place in the open and connecting spaces outside buildings. Unfortunately, as stated by Borden (2001: 193), the majority of cities are based on Modern town-planning theories and are organised in accordance with capitalistic ideologies, leaving these open spaces to be defined by expansive homogeneous surfaces, fragmented spaces which are deficient in spatial hierarchy and are interrupted by isolated architectural gestures. These spaces need to be redefined and reprogrammed by “confronting the social, spatial and temporal logic of capitalistic space” (Borden 2001: 194), and to accept all socio-cultural energies to become spaces in the city.
Counter-proposal

As an alternative to the formalised and commodified solutions of the Modern urban condition, Borden (2001: 4) draws attention to three points concerning the spatiality of a city, the first being scale: not only of buildings, but scale that encompasses the whole city, a “multi-scalar landscape” that is a product of human activity and interaction. The second is the city’s identity, which cannot be reduced to a collection of “object-buildings” acting only as representation. Lastly, the city is not a product, produced only by architects and planners, but a broad system displaying a great deal of significance in the life of a city. Architecture should be able to identify with these three points in order for it to make an appropriate contribution to the city, and to ensure that it is not reduced to a homogeneous state that alienates its users, paralyses their imagination, and deprives them of sensory engagement. According to Pallasmaa (2005: 40), the contemporary city should rather be one that supplements the human body by encouraging heterogeneity, nearness and participation.

In the Western tradition of architecture, as maintained by Lefebvre (1991: 205), its misapprehension of the body has manifested in transparent and utilitarian architecture with rational motives, where architectural space has become physical space rather than lived space. There is a need to diverge from the notion of buildings as enclosures and physical objects, to find the alternative of an all encompassing space, which Lefebvre refers to as “social space”. Forty (2000: 272) expands on this concept of social space, arguing that it is “perceived” through the social relations of everyday life, “conceived” by thought and “lived” as a “bodily experience”, while it integrates the social actions of individuals. Lefebvre (1991: 33) makes it clear that
social space is not to be understood as merely a frame or a neutral container that behaves purely as a receptor, neither is it complete in itself.

The divergence from the physical to the non-physical in architecture can include two further concepts of Lefebvre, that of “abstract space” and “differential space”. Abstract space is the space of commodity and capitalism that erases social constructs and distinctions (1991: 57). In addition, it appeals to the visual and the optical and because of its formal nature it can be quantified (Lefebvre, 1991: 286). Above all, abstract space isolates itself from the past and the space that it could become in the future by making a tabula rasa of “whatever stands in its way” (Lefebvre, 1991: 57). It is incapable of redefining itself and, as a result, it is a space that is not destined to last. Architects have become the servants of abstract space (Forty, 2000: 275). Lefebvre anticipates and encourages an alternative to “abstract space”, which he terms “differential space”. This type of space is characterised by diversity and heterogeneity, which “accentuates the differences” and restores the unity that has been destroyed by “abstract space” (1991: 52). It is here where socio-spatial differences are valued and emphasised in order to restore the human body and the social condition.

Conclusion

The concept of differential space coincides with that of spatial ability and field independence. These concepts form the basis for an argument in support of the contestation of object-form and finite boundary spatial constructs which have been imposed on the African urban context in service of a Modern/Western commodification of space. Instead, a dynamic approach to making space in the African city is suggested which is informed by the active practices of everyday ritual and event towards the undermining of abstract space and the creation of lived-space. Such a strategy acknowledges and celebrates critical difference in culturally divergent societies and is suggested as a viable model in re-conceptualising space and place in the African city. The potential for space identity, that is place, emerges from an understanding of everyday experience and the relationship between body and built environment. Morojele (2002: 105) defends “sanctioned impermanence” as a strategic approach to the development of spatial identities in the transitional environment of the African city. It requires the promotion of “baggy space”, space that may be experienced as being significant without being prescriptive. Multiple social uses allow for different interpretations while increasing the potential for communal ownership of and identification with new urban spaces, weaving spatial experience into the cultural continuum.
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