

PAPER • OPEN ACCESS

Search of the Quality of City Public Space. Space Directing – Tool of Improvement

To cite this article: Anna Franta 2019 *IOP Conf. Ser.: Mater. Sci. Eng.* **471** 092029

View the [article online](#) for updates and enhancements.



IOP | ebooks™

Bringing you innovative digital publishing with leading voices to create your essential collection of books in STEM research.

Start exploring the **collection** - download the first chapter of every title for free.

Search of the Quality of City Public Space. Space Directing – Tool of Improvement

Anna Franta¹

¹ Cracow University of Technology, Faculty of Architecture, Institute of Urban Design A-3, Podchorążych 1, Cracow, 30-084, Poland

studio_ut@pk.edu.pl

Abstract. Directing the perceiver by space – influence of the spatial environment on a human being, with simultaneous intensification of anthropogenic aspects in the state of the development of this environment (whose quality is unsatisfactory) entails a necessity for professional space directing. Professional directing, that is defining the qualities of urbanistic and architectural space with the use of knowledge, experience, and intuition, concerning both the object of action (space) and this subject (human being) and consciously affecting the quality of the influence of this space on the user, on its perfecting, which would be favourable for the human being.

The key to the auteur's attitude, space directing, is then the analysis of the "object in the process". Space directing examines the specific object which architecture constitutes in the process of its manifold relations with human being: perception (by), influence (on), exploitation (by). Space directing examines those predicted relations object-human being in the whole process of creation of the object (its designing and accomplishment) and in the process of modification of the object during its long-term exploitation.

Space directing is designing of the relations space – human being in the freely predicted "theatre of everyday life", the dynamic process of exploitation of the architectural and urbanistic space: an object beautiful in intention, durable, understandable.

The intention behind the reflections herein is to demonstrate the usefulness of actions in relation to the urbanistic and architectural space derived from "theatrical laboratory" of the director's procedure - in the director's way of thinking in the process of creation; thinking in terms of predicting the reactions of the users during interaction with space and inspiring them through selection and gradation of media employed out of the whole, simultaneously examined matter available to the space director, so as to make those reactions, stemming from the way of "interpreting" the space come into being; in the director's superiority in the investment process concerning the subject matter of managing the work; this enlargement of the role and competences of the architect, from the role of the author-designer to the role of the author-director of the whole work, during its creation and during its modification all through the time of its exploitation, since consistent creative activity, namely the author-director's intellectual ability to create a synthesis of circumstances, improves the chances for a coherent (i.e. improving, not reducing the quality) accomplishment and possible further evolution of the work.

1. Introduction

Dynamically grasped heritage, comprising the past, our present attitude thereto, and what the present introduces by adding new elements thinking of the contemporary and future times, is the ability to make optimal use of the opportunities offered by the technical civilisation for the benefit of the "culture of the



city” [1] – improvement of the public space, its expressivity, beauty, which is the measure of the culture and aspiration of city inhabitants. We are bound by the servitude towards elementary beauty, which “is created by so few and needed by so many” (Goethe).

“What defaces our landscape? The lack of the continuum thinking. What is failing in us is the sense of order – responsibility for the image of the country” – these important words uttered by Czesław Miłosz at the Congress of Polish Culture in 2001 seem to be not only still valid, but to relate not only to Poland.

The measure of the maturity of the idea of local autonomy is the understanding that the public space of the city is common, and “common” does not mean “no man’s”, but “ours”. Res-publica – what is common – has always been the most important in building cities: beauty that is more powerful, more magnificent, more perfect. Res-privata – what is private – was beautiful, but in a more modest way – subdued, constituting the background. As a society, we design conditions affecting the quality of life as such, as well as the quality of space that surrounds us.

A question should be posed in this context: what state of the anthropogenic space we wish to have, what state we believe is the right one. Is it to be merely a result – a sum of effects of human activity – a free play of economic and social mechanisms, or perhaps a consciously structured spatial framework, optimising conditions for diversified human activity? A framework that fosters improvement of the quality of life, coming into being with the application of economic mechanisms and respect for social conditions, assuming intentional actions against pathological phenomena.

The role of the local community, as an interactive partner, comprises expression of individual’s and group’s expectations and needs, but also the development of spatial self-awareness: sensitivity, understanding the significance of a valuable public space individually, for an individual and a community. Then it is possible for a positive social pressure to come into being – supporting activities undertaken by architects and urban planners, regarded as trustworthy, professional representatives of the needs of the local community, thanks to their professionalism able to address such needs offering an optimal solution. A solution which owing to its quality has a natural power of convincing that the role of architecture, which particularly creates the public space of the city, is not only satisfying the needs, but stimulating (and subsequently satisfying) them. It is not about pandering to tastes (fashions) or imposing them authoritatively, but about developing them through promoting and introducing good models in compliance with the specificity and identity of the place, and hence of local communities, as well [2].

Let us focus on the main groups of factors conditioning the existence of a positive quality in architecture. The first group refers to the ARCHITECT and his individual qualities. Talent, that is mental predispositions to practice this profession, covering: artistic sensitivity, ability to grasp all premises necessary in the decision-making process, ability to prioritise such premises, creative passion (internal imperative to create, to search for the optimum, ability to create and ambition to do it well), independence, and logical thinking. These qualities can be developed by means of studies and practice, but they cannot be “learned”. Skills – knowledge and experience, the knowledge of the goal of activities and the matter of the field, that is everything one can learn.

Character understood as the stability of the moral and ethical attitude: cooperativeness (efficiency and ethics of cooperation), management and coordination efficiency, with a high sense of responsibility, and the ability to inspire – a positive stimulating effect on the surrounding world.

Basing on these qualities (and the degree thereof), the architect acts: designs on his own or in a team, coordinates the works of specialists from derivative fields. It is a common picture of his activities: as an author, a designer, an artist.

There is, however, one more quality conditioning undertaking the function of professional management of the process of creating a work of art (in the domain of architecture): it is the architect’s attitude: active, creative, leading, flexible, engaged – let us call it “a director’s attitude”. It is not very

common, although it seems it should be, considering the challenges of the contemporary times. It is the state of readiness of the architect to undertaking professional management of the process of coming into being of the object of architecture, which process lasts from the conceptual idea of the object through its functioning in the changing circumstances of the everyday life. This state constitutes a condition which is necessary, although not sufficient for high quality to emerge.

The second group of factors are CONDITIONS OF PRACTISING THE PROFESSION.

Recognition and respect on the part of partners in the process of coming into being of a work of architecture, agreement to divide the roles in compliance with the competences. The general outline of the competences is as follows: the investors defines “what”, the architect determines “how” from the designing perspective, the contractor calculates “how much” and “when”, architectural and urbanistic authorities control “whether in compliance with the conditions”,

Safety and peace in performing the task. It needs to have the funds secured, there must be an appropriate financial reserve, because in the protection of quality it is necessary to admit loyally that there could occur unforeseen circumstances and costs connected with them. The architect recommends himself by means of his achievements, the opinion of high quality he enjoys. It is the investor’s interest to choose an architect with such recommendations. Adherence to the law, including the copyrights – this is an obvious postulate.

Skills and competences relating to them are respected in order to obtain an optimum level of the task execution and to reduce the risk of error to the minimum. Non-knowledge, non-skill, non-competence must lead to wrong decisions. Decisions should be made exclusively by the one who knows and can. The problem is not for the partners in the investment process to act in compliance with this canon of success conditions. This canon is violated too often, and almost by everyone. It is often forgotten that an architect working for the investor (the causative power of the investment) and being a spokesperson of the investor’s interest, at the same time still serves superior goals: spatial order (as the minimum of the purpose of his activities) and the culture of the place and the country, through the quality of the architecture the architect creates (as an author, personally, and not anonymously, catalogue-like). This role of the architect is not his privilege. It does not limit the role of the investor, who has defined the task and expectations and verified his will accepting the design for implementation. Nevertheless, he should not intervene with the process of creation. What the process of materialising the design in the field of architecture needs is a deciding force in the person of the architect, who knows its properties. This materialisation, which sometimes requires modification, needs to result in an object of appropriate quality.

Urbanistic and architectural works have their own specificity [3]. They are all objects exhibiting various (high or very high) levels of durability (up to several thousand years), with a long-term and non-alternative degree of effect exerted on the recipient and user, which is usually high, although not entirely conscious. This effect is inevitable and it refers to each recipient and user. It leaves undetectable, but durable traces in human mind – hence its high level of culturegenic or destructive social significance. Each spatial work (or even form) interacts. However, its quality (practical, visual) determines the type of this interaction, determined as positive or negative. Hence a high positive value of the work becomes a value of high social importance. A high artistic quality has special cultural importance. The durability of the work in an obvious way qualifies it as a carrier of cultural values and as the force that transmits them to the generations to come.

At the same time, the incidental or long-term effect of these works, settling in the human memory, also as a reference framework for events and people taking part in them, is a personality shaping factor. This undiscursive effect of architectural and urbanistic works can be dubbed the space directing.

Bringing back the social role and the unavoidable individual and social effects of the interaction of these works is extremely important for considering the decision-related interdependence in the process of materialising of the work. Simultaneously, we remember that this process, based on an approved design, has the ability to maintain the quality of the work according to the properties defined in the design, but at the same time being able to deteriorate and to improve it. It all depends on the competence

and consequences of the decisions made, and therefore on these properties of the decision makers. Regrettably, all too many spatial decisions are dictated by pure accident. Decision makers in such cases are people who have neither foundations nor title to make them. And the one who manages the process of building (materialising) of the architectural or architectural and urbanistic work, decides about the quality of its materialised form and the quality of its interaction directs the space.

Therefore, taking care of the social and cultural priorities, the architect cannot be uncritically subjected to pressure. The Hippocratic Oath “Primum non nocere” and the principles of professional ethics should be an obligation and an effective protection against pressure in this respect.

The terms “directing of space” and “space directing” do not function in the professional awareness and in the public opinion. Let us, therefore, contemplate on why these terms and the use of the term “directing” towards the work of the architect and architect / urban planner is justified, using the theatre as a research laboratory [4].

The essence of directing is conscious and intentional control of the process of coming into being in its three subsequent stages: designing (concept), materialising (implementation), and finally execution (exploitation), the inherent part of which is an interactive reception of the work. The specificity here consists in the simultaneous awareness of, firstly, the concept of the work, motivation, purpose, and addressee of its message, secondly the “matter” of the message, that is the selection of means and their materialisation, and thirdly, and most importantly, the effects of operating the matter – predicting the scope and consequence of the effect of the materialised work onto the recipient (as a message).

Directing constitutes an integral factor of a creative activity, especially in these fields where the materialised work is finally fulfilled only in the contact with its recipient in the very process of interacting with the recipient, which implies also potential modifications of the work. This is characteristic for both fields of creative activities contemplated herein: architecture and theatre.

Theatre is a specific condensation of the processes of life: in time, space, interactions, and emotions. It is a “laboratory of human behaviour”, addressed to conscious demonstration and animation of the processes with the controlled division into “actors” and “observers”, although with a certain changeability of roles depending on the adopted convention and the related arrangement of the space of acting and observing. Therefore, it is a useful laboratory for the theatre of the everyday life” (Goffman) [5] – the course of processes of the social life, during which “demonstration” and “animation” occur spontaneously and with a free exchange of “actors” and “observers”.

Theatre is a laboratory of reactions to space and “speaking” with space. It is a school of “thinking in terms of the relation man-space”, so that there could be a transmission and reception of planned intentions. It allows to analyse relations of architectural and extra-architectural relations in space, in the process of communication.

Therefore, theatre is a controlled observation of the relation man-space, which the director himself and in its “second persona” of a scenographer (and this is the Author’s personal and ongoing experience), more spatially sensitive, tests on himself, as the first spectator. The most critical spectator, investigating all imperfections and difficulties, due to his professional hyperconsciousness. The director knows the objective properties of the designed space of the stage (how it has been built) and knows its dramaturgical role (how he wants the spectator to receive it), and consequently he looks for its best image in reception: what to do to make it affect the spectator so effectively. The director controls whether it does not deform to the extent it is undesirable (investigating the extent of the admissible deformation) and analyses the consequences in the reception of the whole, tests the effect from many possible perspectives, observes reactions, being a part of the audience. This test verifying the effectiveness of the director’s decisions allows corrections, if needed, and in this respect the

“competence-related presence” of the director gets extended onto the “exploitation” of the work created by him. The essence of the director’s work is the innovation of his approach to the content of the task (of the play, the work of literature), extraction of new meanings and searching for new expressiveness with the goal to create “a thing” and its effective reception, i.e. evoking desired sequences of impressions, emotional and intellectual experiences, and related reactions when being in contact with it.

Directing is an art of effective composition of meanings. It is also a difficult art of moderation, where nothing is accidental, although there is room for coincidence and improvisation. It is the art of responsibility for communicated meanings and evoked reactions (emotions).

Directing relating to the theatre, which is a certain condensation of life, assumes and controls a repetitive scenario (changeable in certain elements within the adopted flexibility margin) in determined spatial conditions, unchangeable and directed as such. By analogy, “the directing of space” relating to the “theatre of the everyday life” assumes and stimulates a changeable scenario of life (repetitive in certain elements) in defined spatial conditions, permanent or slowly changing towards the processes of life, but with an adopted flexibility margin.

The above presentation of qualities of the director’s activity in the theatre motivates the legitimacy of the use of the word “directing” towards the subject matter of the architect’s activities – architectural and urbanistic space. To a certain extent this space “rules” everyone who enters into contact with it; it conditions, facilitates (in functional terms) and affects (emotionally and intellectually) – it directs.

Architects, professionals and authors within the meaning of the copyright, where the term “author” is used [6], direct the space, determining its shape and itself. The quality of its effect on the recipient is directly dependent on the responsibility and quality of our effect on it. “The directing of space” seems legitimate also because of the fact that it is the process of directing, coordinating a multifaceted system man-process-space, which later on operates (communicates) without the participation of the author – director. Furthermore, it is about predicting the reception: the recipient “utilises”, “reacts”, “feels”, led by the architect’s intention, encoded by means of the signs of the language of space.

What is important in this respect is the paradox of the directing of space. It can be formulated in the following way: the “dictatorship” of accidentally, chaos, lack of order is surprisingly easily accepted as the right of unconstrained development and market mechanisms, or the principle of no principles, feeling no constraint imposed by particular interests forcing on us their accidental, sometimes bad, tastes and limitations, which is a kind of directing, as well, but more of the nature of usurpation, resulting from the position of power, or from pure accident. We find it much more difficult to accept professional directing, or long-term actions, aware of the consequences, undertaken in compliance with the desired coordination principles, making use of mechanisms of the market and democracy for the sake of improvement of the quality of space as a common good. Accidental unprofessional directing controls the whole, assigning roles to each of individual parts in the manner that is the most beneficial for the whole as well as for the parts, consciously optimising their individual and combined effects.

It is important to extract the meaning of the duality of the term “directing” in relation to the anthropogenic spatial environment, which refers to:

- on one hand, man (recipient- user), directed by the space – by the specificity of its form, cooperating in this respect, or sometimes even determining movements, actions, moods, behaviour,
- on the other hand, man directing the space – shaping it, providing it with this specificity of form.

Directed materialised space “directs” the audience throughout its entire duration. The quality of space decides about the value of its directing function and has an essential effect on the quality of life of man who occupies it. Particularly in the public space of the city, the “communication space”, understood as interactive and integrational space, where order, grasped as a synergic composition of many elements, conditions the level of the quality in the orientation in space and fosters social communication. The duality of this communication needs to be emphasised.

The first aspect: the author's intention, communicated by means of materialised urbanistic and architectural space to the recipient, which means a simultaneous interaction architecture-man and man-man through architecture.

The first aspect: the agreement user-user thanks to the favourable set of architectural messages, or the interaction man-man, stimulated by the space.

Reaching a high-quality directing space depends directly on conditions of its coming into being and its further modification, on who and how directs it. A skilful creator, architect – urban planner, intentionally designing specific interrelations in the space, assuming the directing function for the long time of creation, and then utilisation of the object, has one fundamental strength available to him only. It is the advantage of consistent (conscious of consequences) activities in forming (design), adding (implementation and necessary corrections within the scheme of the author's supervision) and reshaping (changes resulting from utilisation). Only consistent conduct protects the object against deformation, as “inconsistency with the general guideline of the form may cause its mutilation” (Żórawski) [7]. If it is controlled by the author, it may allow “perfection in the process” thanks to the capability of optimal use of the designed internal flexibility.

The same creator-director, conscious of the effects of his interaction, through his professionalism (education and experience), good will, character (resistance to pressures, including corruption), constantly acts for the good of man (it is his professional obligation), who subjects himself to the director's effect on the space, quite unconsciously and due to a natural need. It fosters man's biological comfort (health), functional comfort (efficiency, appropriate standard, convenience), and mental comfort (satisfaction, stimulation, familiarity, beauty). These three types of comfort possible to obtain can be offered to man by good space, properly directed by the architect, containing and clearly communicating the reception possibilities embedded in it. The forth type of comfort, social comfort, “I in relation to others”, may be offered to man only by the social environment. But space plays an essential role here, too – it can become a stage that fosters or hinders interactions.

Therefore, for the directing of space the creative relation between two environments: the human one (process-related, social) and the spatial one (subjective) in the “living” architecture of public space is the true essence. This relation and the relevant feedback, where space is directed by those who influence its form in the broadest sense (as an audio-visual, active whole), the recipient is directed by its influence (and he can modify it under the influence of this effect), brings about a need of high quality, of competent and long-term directing activities. Therefore, the essence in this respect are the conditions of effecting the directing of space, where the decisive meaning resides in the following simultaneous elements:

- awareness of possibilities and consequences of interrelations,
- awareness of available elements making up the “material” in the hands of the director of space,
- possibility of, making, and implementation of director's decisions and their consequence.

Hence the directing approach grasped as a process emphasises the superior (albeit not exclusive) role of the architect-author in the investment process as:

- a person managing the work professionally, from the need of its coming into being until putting it into use in a long (sometimes several-year-long) process of its programming, designing, author's supervision, controlling changes whose need arises during the implementation process,
- a person taking care of the integrity of the content and form of the work during its utilisation, through professional management of necessary changes (modernisations, reconstructions, extensions).

These rights of the architect-author to create one consistent thought on the specific space, broader than the functions of designing and author's supervision, are functions of directing in the investment process. This is what the copyrights defend for architects, architects and urban planners, and urban planners. It is relatively easy in architectural works, possible, albeit more difficult in architectural-urbanistic works, and it is definitely the most difficult in urbanistic works. Although what we call here

directing functions is protected by copyrights, it is often (too often) wrongly understood by the investor, the contractor, sometimes even by architectural/urbanistic/constructional authorities, and even by the professional circles, perhaps not clearly or consistently enough. In the latter case due to the pressure caused by fighting for commissions the interpretation is different when the investor offers us a job that intervenes with somebody else's copyrights (violating them), and when somebody accepts a job which violates our rights. Explicitness is necessary in this respect: we always respect and protect one's copyrights, because it also stands for the protection of our rights as the ethical and solidary trade of architects, it is the only interpretation of our professional ethics.

The intention to define in detail the decision-making function of the author of the work through postulative assignment of the directing function towards his work is connected with the resultant benefits for the quality of the space and the quality of its effect on man.

The directing approach grasped as a process extends the awareness of the possibilities and responsibility of the architect in forming (in a creative process) of architecture as a message, posing and answering the following questions:

- Who for? – it refers to potential addressees of the message and the selection of its legible, culturally accepted convention.
- What for? – it refers to the content and the interaction of the message.
- How – it refers to the method of building the message, or the types of means of interactions properly selected and coordinated.
- In what way? – it refers to the selection of the means of materialisation (technical, organisational).
- Why this way? – it refers to the role of the new message in the already existing system (including its assumed flexibility towards the potential dynamics of the entire system).

Summing up, the intention of these deliberations is emphasising the usefulness of the directing process in activities relating to the urbanistic and architectural space, stemming from the “theatre laboratory”:

- In the director's thinking, in the process of creating the work,
- In the director's superiority in the investment process in terms of professional management of the work.

Issues of the director's superiority in the investment process as relating to the field of law and organisation, concern the purposefulness and effectiveness of the “agreement for the distribution of roles” (as a condition of a synergic, rational action).

The procedure of directing in the creative process, the director's way of thinking, concerns the architect's awareness and skills. It is a type of thinking in the categories of predicting reactions, selecting and grading means of expression so as to stimulate this reaction(s) as effectively as possible.

The foundation of the directing decision, of intended consequences of specific actions, is the awareness of the scopes and limits of prediction, including “predicting the unpredictable”. The director's thinking in this respect can be defined as an adjustment factor encoded in the system. Creative awareness is directed here towards taking into account the system's reactions to potential unpredictable modifications, so that they are not a destructive factor, but could enrich the message. It is a skill of embedding a mechanism of elastic interactivity in the system, creatively reacting when coming into contact with the process – life. It is a useful skill, as “the architect must predict the variability of events around his own works for an unknown period of time [...]. While searching for a code for architecture beyond architecture, he should be able to shape his forms – markers in such a way so that they could stay in the light of other codes of reception [...]. Wishing to build, he must still be somebody else than he really is. He needs to become a sociologist, politician, psychologist, anthropologist, semiologist. Due to the very essence of his work, he is sentenced to being perhaps the only and the last humanist in the contemporary society. He needs to think about the whole. Architecture is a service. It is so not because it is expected to offer something, but because architecture, in order to give what is expected of it,

investigates systems of potential expectations, their plausibility, their comprehensibility, and the possibility of their acceptance” [8].

The directing of space, drawing from the procedures of theatre directing, can be defined as the “rules of the game” in handling a complex material forming the public space of the city. It regards this space as a specific performance, “a time and space play”, with its own dynamics and dynamically perceived, grasped sequentially rather than once in its entirety. In the understanding of the directing of space, the point of emphasis in the search of the optimal solution is shifted from the object itself onto the way this object operates in the process of its use by man, in the broadest sense possible. This is not equivalent with the reduction of the formal quality of the object itself, but rather with reaching it in the context of the quality of its interaction with man, the quality conditioned by values represented by architecture.

The director’s attitude, besides defining the “tangible” material, even at the conceptual stage takes into account and assigns roles to “intangible” elements (sound, smell, light). It controls the conceptually dynamic character of the reception of the public space of the city; it considers possible ways along which its recipient can move, the speed of movement, the order of sequences and their clusters, which in consequence offers a certain scope of interrelations, or more precise or explicit interrelations (assuming that all the possible ways should guarantee a high quality of reception, with its simultaneous natural diversification). It appreciates the significance of simultaneousness, equally characteristic for public spaces, understood as building the reaction of the background and its dynamic “weight”, causing the changeability of meanings from the foreground under the influence of the context, of what is going on in some other ground.

It is connected with the multifaceted understanding of the context in the public space of the city. The first aspect is the relation form-background in its spatial context and in the context of processes happening around the form (including the ones implied by the form itself). The second aspect, when the context is a mutual relation of subsequent, diversified sequences of public spaces, understood as economics in operating the means of expression and their intentional arrangement in the whole: a string of linked sequences. And, finally, the context- everything that exists as the foundation of uniqueness and further on of identity – used in its strengths (maintenance, emphasis), as well as in its weaknesses, by granting the latter a semiotic role to be played in a specific sequence.

The success of effectiveness is brought about by directing which is not visible; not aggressive, “demiurgic”, but rather spontaneously absorbed; not imposing, but rather suggestive and convincing. Inspiring the recipient to active reactions: motion, action, cognition, discovery, valuation and establishing an emotional relation with the interacting space.

The director’s attitude as the way of thinking presented herein develops the issues of “why” and “what” to direct, limiting the question “how” to some general remarks. A detailed answer to the question how to direct a specific performance, how to apply the directing procedure towards the undertaken task, depends on the individual skills of each architect. It is the architect-director professionalism that dictates his choice of method for the analysis of the existing state out of many well-known, described, and applied conventions, or rules of communicating with a potential recipient in compliance with the cultural code available to him and the means of interaction most appropriate for a specific task. All this assuming the director’s optics of the goal.

Each architect whose designs are implemented acts as a director of space, doing it more or less consciously. It seems that emphasising this role and attempting to clarify it through the analogy of theatre – theatre of everyday life, may influence the effectiveness of the architect’s creative activities, the goal of which should be building the space favourable for man. In the case of the urban-architectural

space, everybody who enters the area of its reaction is always directed, although the space does not have to be well directed itself.

Professional directing, monitoring and influencing the reality in the public space of the city, opens up possibilities for this space to become qualitatively better – well (better) directed and therefore directing the audience in the way that is more favourable for the audience. In the theatre there is a director – there is always such a person, although not always thinking in the categories of directing. Let us reiterate: “director” and “directing” are not mere names, but a specific type of thinking about and influencing the matter the director has. There was always a director in the theatre, although not named. At a certain stage of the development of theatre (complication of the matter) the function of the director was invented. “We speak of the director. Perhaps, again, about a certain ideal, about an ideal director. He is the person in the theatre responsible – over the entire working process – not only for artistic issues, but also for the type of interpersonal relations during work. Therefore, it is artistic and moral responsibility. And any other type of responsibility, too. The director’s contribution, as a keystone, catalyst, and manager of work of an entire group of people, allows to raise temperature, to inspire greater emotions, to give the performance an incomparably greater power. Therefore, the director simply had to appear in the theatre. He just had to”, [9].

In the case of architecture, the anthropogenic environment, the architect sometimes is a conscious director. Sometimes he is a subconscious director, but it also happens that due to the lack of awareness he is simply a bad director. It can also happen that the role of the director is fulfilled by “somebody” – a collective and accidental entity. Considering the threat for the space, the densification of the anthropogenic, the description, manifestation of the director– “We speak of the director. Perhaps, again, about a certain ideal, about an ideal director” – and of directing in architecture, the processor of the theatre of the everyday life, seems to be justified. Hence the following conclusion for the profession of an architect seems to be legitimate.

The awareness of directing is very useful in the profession of an architect. Perhaps it is even necessary. The directing role of the architect-author should be strongly embedded in the very practice of this profession. Beforehand, however, it needs to appear in our professional awareness. We need to become convinced about its importance. And this is the goal of this paper.

References

- [1] R. Rogers “The Culture of Cities”, [in:] Richard Rogers Partnership Works and Projects, Monacelli Press, New York 1996
- [2] A. Franta, Z. Paszkowski, E. Kuryłowicz, „Panel urbanistyczno-architektoniczny nt. Architektoniczne klucze badania przestrzeni miasta”, [in:] Kształtowanie współczesnej przestrzeni miejskiej, University of Warsaw, Warsaw 2014, pp. 461-479.
- [3] T. Barucki, Zielone Konie / Green Horses, Salix Alba, Warsaw 2015
- [4] A. Franta, Reżyseria przestrzeni. O doskonaleniu przestrzeni publicznej miasta, Cracow University of Technology, Cracow, 2004.
- [5] I. Goffman, Człowiek w teatrze życia codziennego, PIW, Warsaw 1981
- [6] Law on Copyrights, Official Journal No. 80 item 904 dated 26 September 2000.
- [7] J. Żórawski. O budowie formy architektonicznej, Arkady, Warsaw 1973
- [8] U. Eco, Pejzaż semiotyczny, PIW, Warsaw 1972, pp. 331-355
- [9] K. Braun, T. Różewicz, Języki teatru, Wydawnictwo Dolnośląskie, Wrocław 1989, p. 200.