

# Maria Lubelska

---

## Bieda jako tabu w architekturze : Do kogo należy przestrzeń publiczna?

---

Kultura Popularna nr 4 (34), 224

---

2012

Artykuł został zdigitalizowany i opracowany do udostępnienia w internecie przez Muzeum Historii Polski w ramach prac podejmowanych na rzecz zapewnienia otwartego, powszechnego i trwałego dostępu do polskiego dorobku naukowego i kulturalnego. Artykuł jest umieszczony w kolekcji cyfrowej [bazhum.muzhp.pl](http://bazhum.muzhp.pl), gromadzącej zawartość polskich czasopism humanistycznych i społecznych.

Tekst jest udostępniony do wykorzystania w ramach dozwolonego użytku.

## ***Maria Lubelska*** ***Poverty as a Taboo*** ***in Architecture***

## ***Magda Szczęśniak*** ***Conflicts over Space***

ture have to be involved into this organic form of commerce. Moreover should the traditional outdoor markets appear in the new semi – public spaces in the commercial centers? The answer is opened.

In architectonic aspect, poverty is both obsolete and innovative new taboo.

Throughout the history of architecture, erecting of structures for the rich has been observed. The poor haven't been users of structures designed by architects. Moreover, structures for the poor have usually been hidden in the countryside. Nowadays this taboo is abolished due to provocative architectonic forms in public space. The article presents selected projects and their concepts.

The article deals with the social conflict, which developed around the infamous cross in front of the Presidential Palace in Warsaw. On April 15th 2010, eleven days after the Polish Presidential plane crashed in Smoleńsk, members of the Polish Scout Association placed an approx. ten feet tall wooden cross in front of the Presidential Palace. Initially a place of mourning, soon enough the site became became a space of a political and cultural conflict revolving around the issues of religion and its visibility in public spaces. The dispute about whether the cross should remain outside the Presidential Palace or whether it should be removed, engaged many different types of "publics" and undermined the popular belief in the possibility of a consensus. Drawing on Chantal Mouffe's and Ernesto Laclau's theory of radical democracy, the author analyzes the multiple interventions in the "representative" public space in front of the Presidential Palace – of the scouts, who installed the cross; of the so called "defenders of the cross," who occupied the area around it, once the Presidential Office decided to remove it; of the counter-demonstrators, who supported the decision to move the cross to a nearby church. Seen as examples of democracy in practice, these interventions also help us to deconstruct such seemingly neutral concepts as the "public sphere," "public space," and "common good."