

DOI <http://dx.doi.org/10.3846/cpc.2016.244>

A PHILOSOPHICAL TOPOGRAPHY OF PLACE AND NON-PLACE: LITHUANIAN CONTEXT

Odetā ŽUKAUSKIENĖ

Department of Humanities, Faculty of Kaunas, Vilnius Academy of Arts, Muitinės g. 4, LT-44280 Kaunas, Lithuania
E-mail: odeta.zukauskiene@gmail.com

Received 16 June 2016; accepted 17 July 2016

Drawing on French anthropologist Marc Augé and his seminal book *Non-Places* (1995) the author pays attention to the transformation of contemporary urban landscapes. In thinking through the dialectic of *place* and *non-place*, this paper aims to account for the apparent sense of *placelessness* in our cultural landscapes and in increasingly globalised world. If we want to ask fundamental questions about what has happened to our urban landscape and to the spirit of cities during the last decades then the concepts of *place* and *non-place* help us to describe the actual changes. Besides, Augé's work gives us the methodological tools to address philosophical questions about the nature of supermodernity and the relationship between modernity and postmodernity moving toward new conditions of globality. This article will attempt to apply anthropological and philosophical concepts of place and space to the context of Lithuania, comparing the ways of spreading of *non-places* (*non-lieu*) in the Soviet modernity and contemporary global, hyper-visual and liquid cultural landscape.

Keywords: global landscape, Marc Augé, non-place, place, space, Soviet modernity, supermodernity, post-modernity.

Introduction

Place is one of the most important concepts of contemporary cultural and philosophical anthropology. The term of place as a mean to transmit histories and memories was noted by numerous anthropologist, philosophers and cultural theorist. Nevertheless, as a global world becomes increasingly *placeless* new concepts have been introduced. Abstract and virtual space is conquering concrete place. The domination of

space encourages cultural theorist to rethink the existential and lyrical meanings of particular *places*, highlighting the importance of cultural landscapes and its *genius loci*. Not unlike a sense of memory loss encourages the development of memory studies. As eminent French historian Pierre Nora argues, we speak so much of memory because there is so little left of it and “there are *lieux de mémoire*, sites of memory, because there are no longer *milieus de mémoire*, real environments of memory” (see Nora 1989: 7).

Copyright © 2016 The Authors. Published by VGTU Press.

This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the [Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial 4.0](https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/) (CC BY-NC 4.0) license, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited. The material cannot be used for commercial purposes.

The shifts of discourses from place to space and from history to memory are explained by such factors as the increased speed of transportation, growth in migration and diaspora, the proliferation of new media, especially the Internet (see Mazierska 2011: 8). Place, territoriality and historical locality opposes to the notion of space. Place is something that we have inherited and has significant heritage values. Spaces themselves derive from a combination of new technologies, rationalized organizations, and settlement re-composition imposed by economic changes (see Balandier 2001: 63). Postmodernity therefore produce nomadic spaces and we observe the transition from a sedentary to a nomadic world. According to anthropologist Augé, supermodernity produces *non-places* – functional spaces that are transitory and emptied of meaning. Thus the purpose of this work is to address questions about the nature of supermodernity and *non-places*, applying the theoretical concepts of the philosophical anthropology to Lithuanian context, comparing the *non-places* (*non-lieu*) of the Soviet modernity and supermodernity with each other.

The concepts of place and non-place

Augé has coined the definition of *non-place* on the work of French philosopher Michel de Certeau, trying to define temporality and spatiality of the supermodernity (*surmodernité*). Augé relates the concept of *place* to territory and identity. He claims that *place* reveals the relationship between individuals, reminds individuals of the great epochs of history in architecture and arts, embodies their religious practices and lived experiences. *Place* hold people with the same cultural background together, strengthen the sense of belonging to their country, history and culture. That is why any construction of identity, whether national, religious, cultural or ethnic needs to find some spatial clues. To these *places* anthropologist

opposes *non-places* – spaces that create neither identity nor relationships, neither shared cultural symbols nor monuments. In this perspective, *non-places* are formed in relation to certain ends (transport, transit, commerce, leisure). Following Augé's idea, anthropological *places* organically create the social milieu, while *non-places* generate the solitary contractuality of passengers, travelers and consumers. Finally, these *non-places* (globalized spaces) cause changes in the relationship between peoples, places and environments.

As scientists noted, the relationship between the outside and inside has reversed in various areas of politics, social, cultural and even individual life in recent decades. Global economy and technologies accelerated communication to the planetary scale. Change of scale manifests various tensions between global and local. However the problematic of *places* arises not only from the ever-growing spaces of communication and commerce. The techniques of image diffusion also pay an important role: super-visual culture, globalized, media-driven world proliferated by the image create the feeling of a continuous space, which is perpetually reflected in its mirrors. The proliferation of images generates illusional and virtual space and causes the apparent transformation of the world and of our sense of place. Through contemporary digital and virtual technologies, the world of pictures and screens create “virtual world” which becomes an integral part of the contemporary landscape and transform our temporality and space perception. And these landscapes of screens in a certain sense also can be associated with *non-places*. Thus virtual spaces created by means of audiovisual media and the Internet also form increasingly frequent *non-places*.

As a result our attitude and relationship with historical paces is significantly transformed. The shift of consumerism and tourism industry transform historical *places* to *non-places* of consumption, tourist images and photos create the spatial overabundance

and the substitutes of reality (illusions about reality causing disappointment with our-living-reality). Consequently history takes on it full meaning only in relation to global history. And the notion of “the place of memory” created by Nora perfectly describes that our historical monuments, museums and other objects of cultural heritage show us what we enter in a newly emerging *transnational culture*.

Following Augé, supermodernity is characterized by excess of space. Our steps in outer space, as he puts it,

“Reduce our own space to an infinite small point, of which satellite photographs appropriately give us the exact measure. But at the same time the world is becoming open to us. We are in an era characterized by changes of scale – of course in the context of space exploration, but also on earth: rapid means of transport have brought any capital within a few hours’ travel of any other. And in the privacy of our homes, finally, images of all sorts, relayed by satellites and caught by the aerials that bristle on the roofs of our remotes hamlets, can give us an instant, sometimes simultaneous vision of an event taking place on the other side of the planet” (see Augé 1995: 51).

Proliferation of images, information and signs, acceleration of means of transport and other global processes involves considerable physical modifications of urban space that causes concentration, movements of population and the multiplication of *placelessness*. Thus development of *non-places* encourages us to re-examine fluctuating external and internal frontiers of our cultural landscapes.

In fact, *non-places* rises questions that concern not only localized society and territory issues, but also the questions of identity itself, because “identity and relations lie at the heart of all the spatial arrangements” (see Augé 1995: 58). As Augé points out, relations of coexistence matures in *places*. Thus *place* is necessary relational, historical, and concerned with identity.

Every urban area in traditional historic city usually has its mythical dimensions, preserving local legends, stories and experiences. Streets and squares are used for commemoration (usually named after notables of local or national life, or great events of national history). In general terms, anthropological *places* are symbolic constructions of space embracing identity, relations and history.

In the world of supermodernity our cultural landscapes are evidently changing. Some places which were used to live are being occupied by globalised spaces. *Non-places* often (in the case of shopping malls, for example) are made very largely to satisfy the needs of economic exchange. Relationship with history that haunts our landscapes is being aestheticized, and at the same time desocialized and artificialized. Consequently *non-places* cannot be defined as relational, or historical, or concerned with identity. International hotels, leisure institutions, clubs, supermarkets, railway stations, airports, and finally the complex skein of cable and wireless networks, – all the *non-places* create a world surrendered to solitary individuality: “they are like palimpsests on which the scrambled game of identity and relations is ceaselessly rewritten” (see Augé 1995: 79). These *non-places* cannot be localized. They are “the non-symbolized surfaces of the planet” and creates more functional than lyrical space, which lack of characterization. Moreover space is eminently abstract (like light which is the same everywhere).

As Augé rightly notes, the *non-places* of supermodernity are invaded by signs. In these spaces individuals are supposed to interact only with signs, references, codified ideograms or schematic plans. Thus “silent dialogue”, solitude and similitude reigns in our big supermarkets and functional places. Highways, commercial centers and other passing places fabricate the “users” of the road, retail or banking system. And in much the same way we become the passive users of our place and landscape, whereas in *non-place* there is no room for history “unless it has been transformed into an

element of spectacle, usually in allusive texts. What reins there is actuality, the urgency of the present moment”, and “assailed by the images flooding from commercial, transport or retail institutions, the passenger in non-places has the simultaneous experience of a perpetual present and an encounter with the self” (see Augé 1995: 105).

In this respect, Augé gives a kind of negative quality to *non-place*, though for Certeau it has not acquired a negative connotation (see Certeau 1994). However, Augé already asserts that *places* and *non-places* coexist and one can be transformed into another: “it is possible to think that the same place can be looked upon as a place by some people and as a non-place by others, on a long-term or a short-term basis” (see Augé 1995: 37). Still Augé’s critical description of the new world order lacks of this self-reflexive moment. Certainly, *non-places* are no longer restricted to the places of transition, travel and consumption. *Placelessness* invades our living environment and its invisible presence is already felt in all other sorts of living spaces. So at the beginning of the 21st century it is more and more difficult to delineate a *non-place*, because of the blurring of real or perceived boundaries between *places* and *non-places*, local and global, real and virtual.

Without developing a deeper critical analysis of Augé’s ideas, it should be recognized that anthropologist is not wrong in most of his theory, and his book reveals an eloquent portrait of contemporary society. There is no doubt the concept of *non-place* can still be used as a theoretical tool to expose the controlled spaces of late capitalism and the loss of autochthonic identity.

Yet in the context of this study it is important to note that already in 1967 French philosopher Michel Foucault gave a lecture entitled “The Other Spaces” (French: *Des espaces autres*, first published in 1980) where he perceived the predominance of space in the conception of modern world (see Foucault 2001: 1571). Philosopher retraced the history of space in

three stages: Middle Ages, Renaissance and Modernity. In his typology the first stage is highly *localized space*. It was replaced by *extended space*, which was typical of the time of Galileo Galilei and the 17th century. Technological improvements in transportation and communication made possible the extension of space. *Space of emplacement* is the third one, where all objects seems to be connected with each of other in a network. In practicing this type of space individual experiences a heterogeneity of city, where *places* and *non-places* interact necessitating some sort of integration. Thus Foucault stressed the growing interdependent configurations between *places* and *non-places* (see Gillet 2006).

Although not directly the work of Foucault remains a major reference in regard to Augé’s work on the *non-lieu*. It shows that *places* are bound up with *non-places* and the transformations of cultural landscape gradually lead to globalized and heterogeneous world. This process has begun much earlier than it seems to us: the proliferation of *non-places* has started with the birth of modern world, but they reached an unpredictable scale in supermodernity.

Non-places and socialist modernism

It should be noted that analyzing “contemporary world” Augé uses the concept of “supermodernity” to describe the logic of excessive space. In his lucid essay he explores the stage of late capitalist society that reflects a deepening or intensification of modernity. The phase of supermodernity (or hypermodernity) is a mode of society, which can be understood and analyzed in relation to pre-modernity, modernity and post-modernity. Though supermodernity differs from modernity, in a sense, it is a deepening or intensification of modernity. In my opinion, this remark is worth closer examination.

But first, we should recall that Augé’s book was published in 1992, just after the collapse of the Soviet Union (SU) and its satellites. In times

of radical political and sociocultural change the author could not evaluate all these transformations and particularly the processes in Central and Eastern Europe. Therefore, at the end of the book Augé writes: “the countries of East Europe retain a measure of exoticism, from the simple reason that they do not yet have all the necessary mean to accede to the worldwide consumption space” (see Augé 1995: 106–107). However, in along these lines author did not take into account that the Soviet modernism also had of a certain dimension of globality.

In his essay on the *Specters of Marx* from 1993 Jacques Derrida provides us with an instructive insight:

“Communism was essentially distinguished from other labor movements by its *international* character. No organized political movement in the history of humanity had yet presented itself as geo-political, thereby inaugurating the space that is now ours and that today is reaching its limits, the limits of the earth and the limits of the political” (see Derrida 1994: 38).

Derrida thus points that the collapse of the SU and of European Communism, however, should not be viewed as self-enclosed. Rather, they should be understood with reference to a more general historical development in the past twenty or thirty years characterized by increasing globalization as well as the growing differentiation of wealth and power (see Postone 1998). This general development is one of several large-scale historical patterns.

In principle, modernity in architecture was associated with industrialization, urbanization and the reinforcement of homogeneity. The development of modern capitalism was related to the weakening of state policy and the strengthening of corporate performance and global activity, which took a leading role in shaping not only the economy, but also society and the living environment. In the context of modernity, Soviet system can be considered as a unique and special case of modern society. The

globalization process in the Soviet modernity has led to the development of industrial society, which has been inevitably accompanied by urbanization, bureaucratization, and communication processes. Wherefore the expansion of Soviet modernity has acquired the main aspects of globalizing modernity. Evidently, the globalization of the Soviet period is very conditional, because it covers only the space of former SU and the socialist countries. However, the application of the concept of global modernity to the Soviet area encourages us to look otherwise at the processes that took place in Soviet countries and its cultural landscapes (see Leonavičius, Keturakis 2002: 43–44).

It has been observed that extensity, power control, political and cultural integration as well as other characteristics of modern societies were inherent for the area of SU. Soviet factories were similar to transnational companies and payed little attention to local regional interests, urbanizing, industrializing territories and influencing migration processes. Looking at the cultural globalization during the time, one should admit that displacement and exteriorization were very significant factors. Initially, *placelessness* became an important tool for Soviet ideologues. Speaking of architectural culture, supermarkets, factories, and cultural institutions – all of them were the same across the entire SU. Intensive industrialization mainly reflected the general global tendencies in socialist modernism.

Architectural strategy helped to developed continuous Soviet political, economic and cultural space. This strategy led to the uniformity in architecture (typical commercial, educational, health care buildings, culture centers and etc.), and to the development of monotonous industrial townscape. Equally the policy of displacements of peoples has been closely connected to the process of urbanization and industrialization.

The entire SU took path of intensive industrialization of construction. The formation of mass industrialization-based principles

basically laid the foundations for further process of urban development in Lithuania and other countries until the very end of the Soviet era. Although it should be noted that this period also saw the construction of several modern architecture objects that were somehow continuing interwar tradition in Lithuania and were more harmonized with the natural and urban environment, searching for *genius loci* (see Drémaitė *et al.* 2012: 103).

In general, mass reproduction of architectural forms turned the socialist modernism into a synonym of faceless architecture. The process of urban-industrialization radically transformed both urban areas and surrounding countryside, cultural and living landscapes in the second half of the 20th century. Urban planning (space, architecture and infrastructure) has become a powerful tool of the ideological mobilization of people, organization of the masses, capable of influencing and changing the human behavior. In terms of the development of Soviet modernism, we can see that it also created peculiar versions of *non-places* (factories, department stores, sport complexes, etc.), which are characterized by its absence of cultural references, its denial of *place*.

In the course of 50 years of Soviet occupation in Lithuania unification of building environment had been promoted and thus local culture had been weakened.

“Following the Soviet pattern various schemes of territorial planning were tried on in Lithuania resulting in the complete transformation of landscapes and urban patterns. It might be compared to the Lithuanian philosopher’s Vytautas Kavolis metaphor of the framework of the factory: ‘when social action is oriented to the symbolic framework of the factory, it has an immense capacity of producing specified types or effects [...] but it does so at the cost of destroying the large natural, social, and moral contexts within the desired changes are located’” (see Drémaitė *et al.* 2012: 155).

In nowadays mostly utilitarian buildings, monotonous industrial architecture of Soviet modernity are replaced with faceless international hotel chains, box-like supermarkets, and repetitive commercial buildings. One of the typical examples of Kaunas is textile factory *Drobė* (reconstructed in 1958) which has been recently replaced by large Finnish supermarket *Prisma*. Thus one version of the *non-place* was changed by another.

In short, it must be recognized that strategies of modernity (as well Soviet modernity) and postmodernity are quite different from each other, yet there are also some of the not-so-obvious similarities. However, what they have in common is the architectural synchronization of life. During the Soviet era the architectural synchronization was based on ideology distancing society from the past (developing of uniform environmental hiding our past). Whilst in post-industrial capitalism namely capital and financial leverage determine synchronization and homogenization of our cultural landscapes. Moreover supermodern conceptions privileges the future of our heritage, thus our cultural landscapes intersects with tourism and itself become products generating economic gains.

Critical thinking and public spaces

In retrospect, we can say that totally commercial postmodern meta-civilization caught Central and Eastern Europe unprepared, and took on even more ominous forms than in Western Europe. In the transition period the efforts were made to return to what was before Soviet era, which often required refreshing the old traditions, but in these conditions of transitional change neoliberalism found fertile soil. The free market policies were embraced by the new political leadership: modernist rationality, functionality and efficiency were effectively accommodated and commercialized by the newly emerging postnational culture. If we try to compare seemingly two so different periods,

the parallels of the logic of Soviet modernity and post-Soviet development are striking.

However, only over the last decade, critical urban theory takes shape in Lithuania, which reveals that we could understand more clearly the postmodern landscapes only in the context of globalization, capitalist development, and neoliberal policies. New economic system promotes new urban spaces and infrastructure, which requires a physical concentration, dense building and tall building development. Thus the needs of the new economy are not always convenient for local residents (see Trilupaitytė 2009: 509).

Among the most widely discussed topics in contemporary urban and critical cultural theory is the commercialization of public spaces. The decline of the agora, which was a dynamic public space, and the growth of privately managed spaces is discussed not only by cultural theorists, but also is the object of artistic investigation. One of the examples could be transdisciplinary project *Pro-test laboratory* initiated in 2005 by Lithuanian artists Nomedas and Gediminas Urbonai. *Pro-test laboratory* was generating and archiving all available forms of protest against the situation of the former cinema *Lietuva* (meaning Lithuania) focusing on the discourse of public space *versus* corporate privatization. The protest was aimed at reclaiming the now privatized space. Cinema *Lietuva* (built in 1965) was chosen specifically because it is a well-known building situated at the historical center of Vilnius, and as well public space. It was the largest and the last privatized cinema in Vilnius, whose case has highlighted a number of conflicts. One of them relates to the ways of treatment of Soviet late modernist architectural heritage in the post-Soviet context.

On the one hand, the architecture of Soviet modernism of the 1960s–1980s became the victim of the ideological hegemony of the neoliberal regime, trying to demonize Soviet period in order to reproduce its own political legitimacy. In this process the modernist artifacts of the Soviet era was erased from the urban

landscapes. In the urban centers, where the accumulation of symbolic capital and spectacle occurs, they are destroyed or “modernized” depending on the context and location. In other cases they are left for decay and neglect.

On the other hand, is it necessary to preserve the examples of Soviet architecture, which itself denied our cultural identity and history? The issues of ideological connotations and identity of this *placeless* architecture are highly significant. Many buildings had not any artistic or aesthetic value. The communist party’s social program delineated the mass production of typical buildings. One of the typical projects is aforementioned cinema building. Though, this building is part of valueless, dull and old-fashioned architecture, but it is still important as a former cultural center, which has become some sort of place.

If we look to the recent history, we can see that many new cinema buildings were constructed in the 1960s. *Lietuva* was one of the largest and most modern cinema houses in Vilnius. Architecture of the building is typical for socialite modernism. Many of the box-like buildings were built all over the SU. However important activities of the cultural life took place in the cinema, including the exhibition of non-commercial films, international film festivals, retrospectives and concerts.

Returning to the aforementioned *Pro-test laboratory*, it should be said that artists drew attention to the fact that contemporary cities are gentrified and former institutional buildings are sold and redeveloped for profit (within the neoliberal capitalist system); so an important type of public space disappears. Actions organized by artist provoked media attention and theater owners (one of Lithuanian supermarket chains) got rid of the *Lietuva* building and sold it for poorly informed investors. Abandoned building (that was planned to be turned into *Paradise Apartments*) still standing, but fortunately there are plans to replace it by the Museum of Modern Art designed by Daniel Libeskind. This privat-initiated project solves long-term conflict

and finally the new building is emerging as cultural site.

In many Central and Eastern European cities the new *placeless* spaces of leisure and consumption are expanding rapidly. The historic towns obey the internal logic of consumer “centers”. “Cities within a city” eventually are replacing all other public spaces. Economic restructuring radically changes urban landscapes. *Non-place* turns from the one to the other mobilizing spectacle as a unifying and controlling tool of the divided society. Those monumental spaces express corporate domination and are reshaped by the playful language of global style.

The most popular contemporary discussions constantly raise questions about urban development of abandoned industrial spaces, the creation of new urban centers, the relation between high-rise buildings and architecture in old town, consumption spaces and many other issues. However, the popular debates often lack careful analysis of current processes. Critical discussions about the creation of new global postmodern spaces were held in Lithuania while organizing architectural competition for the Vilnius Guggenheim Hermitage Museum project (when in 2008 an international jury named Zaha Hadid the winner of the competition). It is evident that international attention and increased tourist traffic is related to international famous architect projects (not only of museums, but also of sports arenas, opera houses, concert palaces, etc.). Thus city government seeks to implement projects that would attract more tourists and investment. As Manuel Castells aptly notes, “elite creates those exclusive spaces, isolated and remote areas of the city which are just as the urban residential blocks of industrial society” (see Castells 2005: 395).

Yet, some famous architects work is caring of the local context (as Daniel Libeskind), a number of them register their works in a planetary perspective. These works are made to exist mostly in global level than to express the essence of a place. As rightly Augé notes: “while the Eiffel Tower is a symbol of Paris,

the Guggenheim Museum does not symbolize Bilbao” (see Augé 2006: 14). Although a *glokal* (global/local) approach helps to present this spectacular building of the global Solomon R. Guggenheim Museum network as a new urban identity for Bilbao.

These few discussed examples illustrate the changes that take place in our urban landscapes under radical transformation of society from the Soviet reality to a consumer life and from modernity to supermodernity. They also show that uncritical attitude and lack of critical analysis leads to tolerance of inauthenticity and placeless landscapes, destroys the sense of *place* and existence of public areas. The analysis of increasing placelessness indicates that contemporary landscapes become highly heterogeneous, and they are at the interface between local and global, *places* and *non-places*.

Virtual non-places and new trajectories

The notion of non-places becomes even more ambiguous in nowadays society where the generic spaces (like malls, hotels, outlets, airports), the spaces of flows (new communications technology) and images (advertising, cinema, television, the web of multimedia) dominates over place. This process has not yet been considered adequately by Lithuanian researchers. The concept of non-place is explored briefly by Jekaterina Lavrinec as the manifestation of the power and control asserted over its subjects (see Lavrinec 2006). The author claims that the non-places as non-civic sites could be revitalized by establishing creative tactics and artistic experiments, reforming the sociality, human interaction and “emotional scape” in public spaces (see Lavrinec 2011: 70). In this perspective it is possible to experience the non-places as places although for the short time. However, the creative actions, named in her article (flash mobs, hugging campaigns and other specific effects), have been already instrumentalized for a purpose of the creative industries and creative

city polity, which also promotes neoliberal economics, producing “asocial urban fringes” (see Virilio 2000: 7). The problem is more complex. Especially bearing in mind that non-places create “completely other” world, which

“is not the reversal, denial or suspension of the rules that govern quotidianity, [...] but the display of the mode of being which quotidianity either precludes or strives to achieve but in vain – and which few people ever hope to experience in places they daily inhabit” (see Bauman 2000: 99).

Consequently, these non-places have magnetic power of attraction and colonize ever larger chunks of public space.

Besides, places as real city territories and architectural environments counteract not only functional consumption and transitional landscapes that impose its own logic on the former, but also much more powerful technological vision and optical environment, which dislocate and displace our bodies from physical environment, that is to say from our places of belonging (as previously architectural and urban planning did). Places increasingly co-exist with virtualized environment and cyberspace, which constitutes the *optical non-places* representing the “reality” for many of us. Therefore, what Paul Virilio calls the “aesthetics of disappearance” have links with the concept of non-place. As cultural theorist writes,

“To the spatio-temporal distortions of distance and the delays due to the very rapidity of transport, of the physical displacement of people, is now added the fluctuation of these appearances instantaneously transmitted at a distance [...]. Interactive technologies that favor an as yet unperceived event, this *sudden cybernation of geophysical space and its atmospheric volume* – and not merely of the machine or object, as occurred with the invention of the first automatons. This time it means the establishment of a kind of control of the geophysical environment whereby the visual piloting

that is the instantaneous coming together of places would supersede the piloting of vehicles that still move around in those places [...]. A telescoping of the near and the far, the world’s expanse suddenly becoming thin, ‘infra-thin’, thanks to the capacity for *optical magnification* of the appearances of the human environment” (see Virilio 2000: 47).

The late technologies exile us from relational places shaping a communications society “that no longer communicates anything but *messages*” (see Virilio 2000: 72) similar to the urban non-places that operates through signs and messages rather than human relations.

On the other side, Augé’s ambiguous and contradictory concept of non-place could be metaphorically related with Gilles Deleuze’s notion “any-space-whatever” (*espace quelconque*), which appears in his book *Cinema 1: The Movement Image* (French: *Cinéma 1. L’Image-Mouvement* (1983)). The cinema has completely upset our spatial-temporal references, connecting local to global. It has changed binary opposition of place and non-place into a very complicated structure, which facing the development of telecommunications and virtual devices. In his anthropology of mobility, Augé claims that ‘supermodernity’, co-existing with global capitalism, is subjected to triple acceleration of knowledge, technology and market, allowing the individuals, images and goods to flow freely (Augé 2009: 13–14). The flow of images, cinema and cyberculture changes our spatio-temporal co-ordinates, transforming our perception of geographical and historical milieu, and erasing a clear line between place and non-place, identity (in the social sense) and anonymity (solitude). Thus in global visual culture the place itself loses its homogeneity. Cinematic and virtual “any-space-whatever” (being outside real time and space) and urban non-places (although different in origin), converge our mental (imaginary) and physical (concrete) horizons into the general spaces of flow. To find effective antidotes for these global processes is getting harder and harder.

In this respect, the case of cinema theatre *Lietuva* could be understood not only as a problematic heritage of socialist modernity and as a certain sort of non-place, which became a new kind of place, but also as a seminal metaphor of ever-changing character of both liquid and global supermodernity, revealing growing tensions and contradictions between places and non-places.

Conclusions

A lot of contemporary research studies are focused on local communities and *places*, but they do not result in diminishing our feeling that *place* losing its authenticity and significance. Occupying urban and rural locations *non-places* easily traverse the boundaries of territories. Global change inevitably generates the altered experiences of autochthonic identity, place or territory. Augé's analysis of *non-places* reveals these processes and can be complemented by significant analogous concepts – *any-space-whatever* (Deleuze), *the aesthetic of disappearance* (Virilio), and others that explore the hegemony of transnational cultural forms.

Reworking Augé, who argues that the emergence of *non-places* in the supermodernity radically changes our urban fabric, permanently dehistoricizing landscapes and destroying authentic cultural *places*, we can take another way and say that the analogical processes took place during the Soviet period. The Soviet modernism also had of a certain dimension of globality and *placelessness*. In the transition period (at the end of the 20th century) in Central and Eastern Europe the efforts were made to return to what was before Soviet era, which often required refreshing the old traditions, but in these conditions of transitional change neoliberalism found fertile soil. New economic system changed ideological type of *non-places* to the new kinds of *non-places* symptomatic of the postmodern global order.

The article analysis the situation of the former cinema theatre *Lietuva* focusing on the discourse of public space and liquid supermodernity. It points to some ideas concerned with the importance of critical thinking and the defending of communal sites. A world increasingly dominated by *non-places* face with a new fragmentation of urban space, the disappearance of public areas, the disintegration, segregation of urban community, and as sociologist Zygmunt Bauman underlines – exteriorization of new elite and exclusion of some social groups. On the other hand, it reveals the co-existence of non-places and virtual spaces, extending the process of delocalization, cultural homogenization and sameness.

References

- Augé, M. 2006. La planète comme territoire. Un défi pour les architectes, in Biase, de A.; Rossi, C. (Dir.). *Chez nous: Territoires et identités dans les mondes contemporains*. Paris: Éditions de la Vilette, 7–15.
- Augé, M. 1995. *Non-Places: Introduction to an Anthropology of Supermodernity*. London, New York: Verso.
- Augé, M. 2009. *Pour une anthropologie de la mobilité*. Payot, M. (Ed.). Paris: Éditions Payot & Rivages.
- Balandier, G. 2001. Les lieux se défont, des “espèces d’espaces” se font, in Balandier, G. *Le Grand Système*. Paris: Fayard, 62–76.
- Bauman, Z. 2000. *Liquid Modernity*. Cambridge: Polity Press.
- Castells, M. 2005. *Informacijos amžius: ekonomika, visuomenė ir kultūra*. T. 1: Tinklaveikos visuomenės raida. Kaunas: Poligrafija ir informatika.
- Certeau, de M. 1994. *The Practice of Everyday Life*. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.
- Deleuze, G. 1983. *Cinéma 1. L'Image-Mouvement*. Paris: Les Éditions de Minuit.
- Derrida, J. 1994. *Specters of Marx: The State of the Debt, the Work of Mourning, & the New International*. New York, London: Routledge.

Drémaitė, M.; Petruelis, V.; Tutlytė, J. 2012. *Architektūra sovietinėje Lietuvoje*. Vilnius: Vilniaus dailės akademija.

Foucault, M. 2001. Des espaces autres, in Defert, D. ; Ewald, F. ; Lagrange, J. (Dir). *Dits et écrits*. T. 2: 1976–1988. Paris: Gallimard, 1571–1581.

Gillet, A. 2006. Dérives atopiques, *EspacesTemps.net* [online], [cited 14 January 2013]. Available from Internet: <http://www.espacestemp.net/en/articles/derives-atopiques-en/>

Lavrinec, J. 2006. Baimių gamyba: tranzitinės vietos, *Problemos* (priedas): 100–109.

Lavrinec, J. 2011. Revitalization of Public Space: from Non-Places to Creative Playgrounds, *Coactivity: Philosophy, Communication* 19(2): 70–75.

Leonavičius, V.; Keturakis, S. 2002. Sovietinė globalioji modernybė ir globalumo-lokalumo suvokimas sovietinėje Lietuvoje, *Sociologija: mintis ir veiksmai* 2: 40–49.

Mazierska, E. 2011. *European Cinema and Intertextuality: History, Memory and Politics*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9780230319547>

Nora, P. 1989. Between Memory and History: *Les Lieux de Mémoire, Representations* 26 (Special Issue: Memory and Counter-Memory): 7–24.

Postone, M. 1998. Specters of Marx, *History and Theory* 37(3): 370–387.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/0018-2656.00059>

Trilupaitytė, S. 2009. Manuel Castells „Informacinis miestas“ ir postmodernistinės urbanistinio kultūrinio planavimo strategijos (Guggenheimo muziejaus pavyzdys), iš Andrijauskas, A. (Sud.). *Postmodernizmo fenomeno interpretacijos*. Vilnius: Kultūros, filosofijos ir meno institutas, 503–516.

Virilio, P. 2000. *A Landscape of Events*. Cambridge: The MIT Press.

VIETOS IR BEVIETIŠKUMO FILOSOFINĖ TOPOGRAFIJA: LOKALŪS KONTEKSTAI

Odetta ŽUKAUSKIENĖ

Remdamasi viena pamatinių prancūzų antropologo Marco Augé knyga *Bevietiškumas* (1995), straipsnio autorė nagrinėja transformacijas, kurias patiria šiuolaikinis miestų kraštovaizdis. Apmąstant *vietos* ir *bevietiškumo* dialektiką, darbe siekiama parodyti, kaip bevietiškumas smelkiasi į mūsų kultūrinį kraštovaizdį, įsigalėdamas globaliame pasaulyje. Vietos ir bevietiškumo sąvokos padeda suvokti esminius pokyčius, kurie pastaraisiais dešimtmečiais keitė miesto dviasią bei urbanistinius ir architektūrinius sprendimus. Be to, Augé mokslinės mąstysenos principai ir priemonės suteikia galimybę kelti filosofinius klausimus apie viršmodernybės prigimtį, modernybės ir postmodernybės santykį globalių procesų fone. Straipsnyje antropologinės bei filosofinės vietos ir erdvės sąvokos taikomos lietuviškajam kontekstui tirti, lyginant bevietiškumo sklaidą sovietiniame modernizme bei šiuolaikiniame globaliame hipervizualios ir likvidžios (takios) kultūros kraštovaizdyje.

Reikšminiai žodžiai: globalusis kraštovaizdis, Marcas Augé, bevietiškumas, vieta, erdvė, sovietinis modernizmas, viršmodernybė, postmodernybė.