

Секция: Социология

Radionova Liudmyla

*PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy and Political Science
O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv
Kharkiv, Ukraine*

Kudryavtsev Oleksandr

*PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Philosophy and Political Science
O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv
Kharkiv, Ukraine*

Radionova Olga

*PhD, Associate Professor, Department of Tourism and Hospitality
O. M. Beketov National University of Urban Economy in Kharkiv
Kharkiv, Ukraine*

"THIRD PLACE" AS A WAY OF REMOVEING THE SOCIAL IMPLOSION OF THE CITY

In modern society it is very important to provide an opportunity for people to communicate, because through public, informal communication, we hone our skills of conversation, communication, identify problems and find solutions. Now, in the pursuit of privacy, people are isolated and feel a little disconnect from the real everyday life. Individualism and cultural diversity are now the reality of a post-industrial city, as was noted by the Los Angeles School of Sociology. Scientists have focused their attention not so much on the monocentric development of the city, that is, linear, as did the representatives of the Chicago School of Sociology, but on various "spaces" for the development of the city, which may be unrelated [1].

L. Mumford, in the book "The Culture of Cities", believed that the city can not be reduced to a material structure, its social and cultural aspects are more important.

This is its essence, not the shape of the streets or the type of buildings. Sociologists, noting the nature of the city as a social entity, talk about the short duration of human connections in an urbanized space, urban life in large cities leads to depersonalization and further social distancing [2, p. 93-118]. Why is this duration gradually decreasing in the modern city and the quality of social relations is changing?

Richard Sennett, a well-known historian and sociologist, who is considered, today, one of the most radical theorists of urban culture and a critic of modern capitalism, writes with regret that the manners of communication and ritual exchanges between strangers to each other look formal and empty, or fake. "Res publica", as the author writes, means those bonds of community and mutual obligations that exist between citizens who are not bound by family or personal relations. He argues that it is more the bond of the crowd, of the "people," of the state, than the bond of family or friendship. As in Roman times, participation in res publica today is often something that happens by inertia, and the forums of this public life, such as the city, are in a state of decline [3, p. 423].

It is precisely because people are too self-oriented. It leads to the difficulties in understanding the principle of privacy, to clearly explain to themselves and others what their personality really is, to demonstrate to themselves and others their true inner world. As modern urban individualism developed, the individual became more and more silent. Streets, cafes, shops, train stations, buses, and subways have turned out to be places where people mostly exchange glances, not words [4].

Sennet writes that cities are immersed in "intimacy", although they should function as a kind of forum, that is, there should be the possibility of

communication between strangers without the need and rapprochement on a personal level, from the point of view of Sennet, public life has lost its significance in urban spaces and begins to function as something formal, alienated, unspoken, there is a spread of intimacy. Sennet believes that a large role in this was played by the emergence and spread of shopping centers, office skyscrapers in modern megacities, which contributed to the mortification of public spaces, implying the presence of communication between strangers, and led to the reluctance of people to interact, strangers remain strangers, exchanging a maximum of views, they are alien to each other. Public spaces do not function as a kind of forum, people do not open up to each other, but rather beware of each other, maintaining a certain distance.

American researcher Lyn Lofland in her work "The Public Sphere: exploring the essence of urban territory", she tried to analyze and categorize "places" in urban space in terms of their belonging to the public or private spheres. However, Lofland believed that the public sphere is not equal in importance to the public spaces of the city, it "consists of those places where the individuals who meet in most cases are not personally familiar or only categorically familiar with each other." Lofland describes three types of social relations (and, accordingly, spheres) that can exist in urban space: personal (in family, among friends), categorical (that is, people are "strangers" to each other and can only define the other within the framework of their profession or other type of "non-personal identity": seller, buyer, taxi driver, passenger, etc.) and local-local (parochial) relations, that is, relationships of people who are familiar with each other, but not as close and intimate as in the family, but rather functional: this is the relationship of work colleagues, members of interest clubs, neighbors, etc. [5]. Thus, in Lin Lofland's theory, there is still the same tendency to build a binary opposition of urban spaces, making it a little more diverse by pointing to an intermediate type of relationship that combines functionality and proximity.

In our opinion, the concepts of the authors considered have a theoretical insufficiency – the transformations of modern urban space cannot be described only within the framework of the proposed dichotomy. It is obvious that publicity today can and should be understood as multiple, and this understanding, in our opinion, corresponds to the concept of "Third Places" – public spaces where there is no alienation. The "Third Place" functions as a kind of forum where interaction between strangers takes place.

The concept of "Third Places" was first introduced in 1989, in Ray Oldenburg's book "The Great Good Place". The main idea of this work, which was traced throughout the book, was that each person has three different places:

- The first place is the house and the people he lives.
- The second place is the office, work, the place where people spend most of their time.
- The third place is a place that can unite, create an atmosphere of interaction, communication and creativity, it is a place where people meet, get acquainted, exchange their ideas, learn something new.

Institutions that fit into the concept of third places should have an appropriate environment and atmosphere for human communication, as well as for recreation, study or work. These are comfortable spaces for a person outside of home and work. In his book, Ray Oldenburg argues that Third Places are important for civil society, democracy, urban activism, creating a certain "sense of place" [6].

Thus, it is once again confirmed that Third Places are spaces that combine non-overlapping, contradictory, dichotomized spaces. Third Spaces become a new variable that combines the first and second places, real and imaginary, or, public and personal, expanding the understanding of the functioning and use of public urban spaces, making the idea of publicity more complex and capacious.

References

1. Trubina E. Gorod v teorii. M.: Novoe literaturnoe obozrenie, 2011.
2. Wirth L. Urbanism as a way of life. Selected works on sociology / Translated from English by V. G. Nikolaeva. M., 2005. P. 93-118.
3. Sennet R. The fall of a public person. M. Logos, 2002. 423 p.
4. Sennett R. Flesh and Stone: The Body and the City in Western Civilization. New York: W. W. Norton, 1994.
5. Lofland L. The Public Sphere: A Study of urban quintessence. New York, 1998.
6. Oldenburg R. Great Good Location: Cafes, Coffee Shops, Bookstores, Bars, Hairdressers and Other Hangouts in the heart of the Community.