

СЕКЦІЯ 6
ПУБЛІЧНІ ПОСЛУГИ ТА СОЦІАЛЬНИЙ ПРОФІЛЬ
ТЕРИТОРІАЛЬНИХ ГРОМАД

PUBLIC SPACE OF THE PARK IN THE HISTORICAL AND
PHILOSOPHICAL PERSPECTIVE

Vakulenko S.O., applicant for higher education
Scientific adviser:

Radionova L.A., Cand. philos. Sciences, Associate Professor
O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv

Public spaces are an integral part of the “city for people”. A city without public spaces is doomed to remain an "office city". Public spaces are not designed, they become them.

Public spaces are meeting spaces of diverse urban groups who learn about alternative opinions and lifestyles by encountering and engaging in random and unpredictable interactions. The development of urban public spaces is an essential requisition for the formation of the ideology of the city, which would take into account its accessibility to "strangers", tolerance for differences and open to all opportunities for political and economic life [1, p. 42-44].

The park is also a public space. Public spaces of Kharkiv are predominantly formed in the central part of the city. On the periphery, the space is mostly used for building industrial facilities and garages. A place along natural features, such as a body of water, for example, could be a good public space for the residents of the area.

One of the leading postmodern philosophers, Jean Baudrillard, emphasized that three concepts are important for modern urbanism: “concentration”; “desertification” (the reverse process and accompanying concentration) and, in his (Baudrillard's) opinion, of paramount importance, the concept of critical mass. He sees the essence of the critical mass problem in the fact that as the concentration of the population grows, sociality itself is destroyed. Baudrillard compares modern society and the laws of its development with the cosmological discoveries of the laws of the development of the Universe, arguing that when the Universe exceeds a certain threshold of mass, the big bang and expansion turn into compression (implosion) - big crunch.

Baudrillard believes that "explosive population growth, the expansion of networks of control, security agencies, communication and interaction, as well as the spread of non-sociality" lead to the implosion of the real sphere of the social. The epicenter of these processes of modern society, according to Baudrillard, is the modern metropolis. Socially, these processes "generate indifference and confusion in individuals." He compares the model of modern society with a transport interchange: “The paths of movement here never intersect, because everyone has the same direction of movement... Maybe this is the essence of communication? Unilateral coexistence. Behind its facade lies an ever-increasing indifference and rejection of

any social ties. In our opinion, such a public space as a park removes implosion to a certain extent.

The methodological basis for the development of the public space of the park is the aesthetics of the English philosopher F. Bacon, that consisted in his attitude to nature. The constant correlation of various activities with natural processes was the main methodological device of Bacon. Bacon considered the architecture of public spaces as part of the human environment.

Bacon understood architecture as an artificially created ordered part of the natural environment, perceived it as a system of interconnected elements. In a special section on "About gardens," Bacon emphasizes that in the course of time, as civilization and a taste for elegance develop, people will learn to build beautifully rather than plant beautiful gardens; it turns out that gardening is a more subtle concept and requires more perfection. In the description of the model park of the 10th century, paying tribute to the regular gardens of the Renaissance, Bacon retains in his park a central fragment with rectilinear alleys, but he pays main attention to the loving description of the green lawn surrounding the house. The landscape structure is the main dominant of the park.

The theory of symbolic interactionism can help explain the fundamental relationship of architecture with human thoughts, emotions and behavior. The authors of the theory argue that the theory contributes to a better understanding of architecture in three ways: it draws attention to the potential mutual influence that exists between the individual and the material environment designed for him; gives "the opportunity to understand how the artificially created environment embodies our ideas about the world around us"; the material environment is more than just a decoration against which we perform various actions. Man-made objects act as factors directly influencing our thoughts and actions, unequivocally inviting us to self-expression." The theory of symbolic interactionism by I. Hoffmann also considers the relationship between the individual and his material environment, recognizing that various artificially created objects and spaces can be used to "manage the impression", playing various auxiliary roles of the scene of the foreground or background (backstage spaces) or external zones, contributing, among other things, to "hoax", i.e., the creation of "social distances" with the public.

References:

1. Радіонова Л. О. «Трете місце» як сучасний публічний простір міста. Соціально-гуманітарний вісник: зб. наук. пр. Вип. 37. Харків: СГ НТМ «Новий курс», 2021. 74 с.