

The Structural Stratification of Urban Space—A Discussion of De Certeau's and Marx's Theories of Urban Space

Stefenie Lai^{1,a,*}

¹*Sydney School of Architecture, Design and Planning, The University of Sydney, 143 City Road, Darlington, New South Wales, Australia*

^a*slai6207@uni.sydney.edu.au*

^{*}*Corresponding author*

Keywords: Urban Space, Urban Planning, Production of Space, Everyday Life

Abstract: As a result of the industrial, scientific, and technical revolutions as well as the advent of the capitalist mode of production, there has been a gradual influx of people from the countryside into cities, and the former cities have continued to grow, significantly altering the internal structure of the metropolis. Both the distributional and social systems that clearly define this structure's several dimensions. The paper will concentrate on a few insights made by De Certeau and Marx on urban spatial theory, particularly the concept of structural stratification, and it will further discuss the significance and usefulness of this theory on modern living.

1. Introduction

Archaeologists have repeatedly discovered evidence that the desire to settle has been ingrained in human nature since the dawn of time. People would move onto a plot of land, construct homes, and organise the distribution of functional areas and communities in accordance with the conditions of the region. A significant migration of individuals from the countryside to cities has occurred in modern times as a result of the advent of the capitalist mode of production, and both the distribution and population of these cities have grown quickly. Cities have evolved in response to the requirements of these people, and contemporary urban planning has significantly impacted societal production and daily living.

Diverse functional zones, or zones with the same function but at various levels, are becoming more and more prominent in the process of urban planning, and this "structural stratification" is becoming more and more significant as individuals can be dispersed over a larger and more extensive area. Urban development has begun to place a greater emphasis on respecting people's individual rights and private space as a result of modernity. De Certeau pays more attention to this circumstance, and his study of the urban fabric includes the pursuit and maintenance of a balance between public and private space. Marx would have seen the subject from a wider angle, focusing his analysis of urban structural space on the relationships between production and living and underlining, in particular, the logic of capital and the political economy that underlies spatial

production. Due to the fact that this type of stratification of the urban structure is only a superficial differentiation, and that the real differentiation, i.e. the differentiation of social strata or even classes, lurks beneath the surface, the structural space of the city can be further extended to deeper economic and political issues.

The true distinction exists beneath the surface, in the form of social classes or even classes, and it is on this that we must focus our attention and analyse, in order to find more practical solutions to these deep-seated problems from a perspective that is very much in tune with the reality of city life.

2. "Structural stratification" in De Certeau's theory of urban space

De Certeau's analyses and discussions of urban spatial planning focus on the planning and analysis of the modern city, and he is also very passionate about the cultural traditions embedded in the development of the city in modernity.

2.1. Stratification in urban planning

It holds that as a city continues to expand, it should be planned to satisfy both new functions and requirements as well as a return to its more traditional features. In his viewpoint, as cities go through the process of continual development, they should not only aim to satisfy new roles and needs but also go back to their original traits and reveal their unique characteristics. [1] De Certeau's explanations, in this way, always have a romantic tone, a creative attempt to defy the cold ways of production and regulation. "Loyal institutions that have created something exotic within the city have increasingly shielded the remaining neighbourhoods." [1] It is argued that these historic structures, including old stores and buildings, are a city's true "memories." It is possible that over time, they have lost their utility, and in the modern world, it seems preferable to demolish them in order to accommodate the demands of new modern life. Nevertheless, these structures are a city's true "memory," the argument goes. These, however, are the true "memory" of a city.

The "law of the market" is dominant in today's planning. Such planning brings together a specific number of individuals in the same profession, from those who work in restoration, and then, to the middle class and the freelancing professions, and eventually, the socially privileged. Urban planning restoration of this kind is social in nature. It draws the middle class and independent contractors to areas that were dilapidated but have been renovated. These areas had an increase in rent and a change in population. Rehabbed areas became into hangouts for the affluent and idle, and the scraping of real estate manifested the segregation of populations.

This has led to the phenomena of "clustering," or the assembling of a group of individuals from the same class or profession, to some extent emerging in modern urban planning. Modern urban planning typically places functional districts in specific locations, such as residential, business, and recreation districts. We are accustomed to dividing districts based on social class traits in addition to this type of classification based on functional divisions. De Certeau also mentions "action and narrative" as a manifestation deriving from the building of the city in addition to such a structural layering that is shown by this direct regional division.

A cultural manifestation tied to action, distillation, and widespread penetration is narrative. This "narrative" is a culture that develops in response to the daily actions we take as a result of local influences. The use of narrative as a persuasive technique to persuade individuals to act in a certain way in a certain setting or during a particular event is a summary of culture. In politics and urban planning, De Certeau notes that this technique that has been condensed and applied again can have its own unpredictable and potent effect, persuading people of these beliefs. In the case of urban agglomeration, for instance, individuals frequently encounter propaganda asserting that certain locations are suited for certain types of residents and that there are various benefits or incentives for

particular groups of people to be drawn to a location and form agglomerations. In order to draw people from a certain group of people here and create an agglomeration, propaganda frequently claims that specific regions are appropriate for a particular population to dwell in, delivering benefits or favourable conditions for that group of individuals.

3. Marx's theory of urban space

This section presents Marx's theories on urban spatial theory that are found in his investigation of the capitalist mode of production and the production process. In contrast to de Certeau, Marx avoided delving too deeply into the issues surrounding urban spatial planning instead analysing the spatial fragmentation brought about by capital from the standpoint of the capitalist mode of production, pointing out that capital has brought about spatial fragmentation by displacing individuals with their traditional ties to the land. Marx devoted particular focus to the urban question's relevance to everyday life of individuals, as well as to all aspects of world history and capitalist development." [2] He exposed the principles of economic and political power that underlie the spatial modes of capitalist production. [2] Marx exposed the mechanisms of capital and the fundamentals of political authority that underlie the spatial modes of capitalist production. This part will examine the inspiration provided by Marx's theory of urban space, moving from the surface-level "spatial composition of the city" to its underlying hidden logic of capital and political power.

3.1. Composition of cities

Capitalism continued to advance by drawing additional labour from the rural to the metropolis, which furthered the growth of metropolitan areas and capitalist relations of production. Capitalism has grown as a result of the movement of more labour from the countryside to the cities, which has accelerated the growth of metropolitan areas and capitalist production relations. The bourgeoisie and proletariat were clearly distinguished as society developed, and the capitalist connection permeated society, enslaving the proletariat. "The process of spatial production in the capitalist city is characterized by a combination of the 'concrete' and the 'abstract', i.e., concrete places are linked to power-conferred control, and its spaces are thus divided into dominant and subordinate spaces. Each mode of production is a realistic representation of its own distinctive space." [3]

Spatial fragmentation has been brought about by the area's growing urbanisation and capitalisation. The proletariat is compelled to leave their ancestral lands, give up their enormous spaces of production and habitation, and enclosed into a small area in the city due to the imbalanced spatial geography created by capitalism. Capitalists in urban production make every effort to reduce the amount of space allotted to each worker so that these fixed areas can hold as many people as possible in order to increase productivity. This oppression aims to wring every last drop of worth from the workers through a combination of physical suffering and mental restraint. The bourgeoisie and the proletariat therefore live quite different lives and are in very distinct social positions. Capitalism's spatial divisions further diminish the spatial interests of the weaker groups and allow the stronger groups to have more interests, putting some groups in a difficult spatial situation while encouraging spatial materialism in others. [4]

The resources of space are under the hands of capitalists through capitalist private ownership, who utilise them for further production. However, without enough regard for the interests of the general public, such production is solely in the interests of the bourgeoisie itself. As a result, there will be an uneven distribution of space resources, which is bad for the growth of social collectives, and conflicts between different groups and classes are more likely to become worse.

Marx also criticised the division and segregation of space. Space production is chaotic as a result of capitalism as a form of production. The majority of groups and individuals do not truly gain from

spatial production because it only exists for the benefit of a tiny number of people whose power over social resources it is. The differences between the two are reinforced by the spatial separation.

4. Comparing and contrasting De Certeau's and Marx's theories of urban space

As previously indicated, the piece offers a preliminary study of De Certeau's and Marx's theories of urban space and discusses the reasoning behind and distinguishing features of each of their positions. [5] They both analyse the phenomena of and causes for this geographical split as they come to realise the significance of metropolitan space in modern social production.

Inevitably, the two approaches of "stratification" of urban space distinct in viewpoints and focuses.

4.1. Convergences among hypotheses

The two analyse urban space development in their discussions in distinctly different ways, albeit they do share some findings. They each begin with a distinct method of analysis when examining how urban space has evolved, yet their research reveals some patterns.

First of all, they both attest to the reality of the structural stratification of urban space during the modernisation process and the fact that this stratification has gotten harder to ignore as it has become more pronounced. The formation of many functional zones in the modern city and the more obvious differences between them are also mentioned. Stratification by class is another type of differentiation from functional differentiation. They both agreed that individuals of the same class are typically clustered together in modern spatial allocation, and that functional zoning to meet the same demands is designed differently in the construction process due to the various target groups. For various types of individuals, new differences are thus formed between these zones.

They both also make the important distinction between classes and strata in modern society, which is a result of such structural stratification. According to De Certeau, the gradual realisation of this interior agglomeration and external structural stratification occurs in a manner similar to how buildings are being modernised. Some of the earlier structures required modernisation so that workers and members of the middle class could occupy them. During this modernisation process, the structures changed into various living arrangements for members of the working class, middle class, and upper class, respectively. In this approach, class structure and spatial stratification are tightly intertwined. On the other hand, Marx also emphasised how closely class and stratification are tied to this division of urban area. He separated them into the bourgeoisie and the proletariat, as in his earlier theories, and noted that the bourgeoisie and the proletariat significantly differed in the allocation of residential regions. The bourgeoisie regularly makes use of its advantages to create a cosy living space for itself while oppressing the living conditions of the proletariat, hence expanding the gap between their living spaces.

4.2. Differences among hypotheses

Analysing the causes of the stratification of the urban fabric involves a distinction. De Certeau ascribes this modern planning to the process of transition from traditional to modern, in which the market's laws require that the same plot of land may show a concentration of development, and the builder chooses one of them to build in order to conform to the market's laws as much as possible, creating a separation of the various zones. Marx, on the other hand, attributed this development of modernity to the capitalist mode of production and system of ownership, which fundamentally produce the opposition between the bourgeoisie and the proletariat. The bourgeoisie is eager to make use of all the means at its disposal in order to produce this spatial oppression and antagonism.

Secondly, De Certeau focused more on portraying the effects of this geographical stratification on people's lives while discussing the stratification of urban space. He attempted to show that this stratification would, in some way, have an impact on people's lives by romanticising the museums, cafes, and art galleries that existed within it. Marx, on the other hand, has a more explicit manner evaluating this type of spatial stratification, highlighting the logic of production that underlies it and how it affects people's productive lives. It is emphasized time and again that this kind of spatial stratification is unjust, and that it is essentially the division of space under the capitalist system for the purpose of maximizing surplus production, and that its ultimate goal is production rather than the development of the human being, which is why it is the object of our critique.

5. Contemporary relevance of the two theories

There was also a wave of relocation and demolition at the start of the new century, with ancient structures being torn down to create room for brand-new businesses and structures. Many historic, antique structures vanished during this demolition procedure. Today's urban development has led to a number of locations beginning to increase their awareness of preservation, giving valuable historic structures the necessary maintenance and protection, and even converting them into museums and making them accessible to the public to further the public's understanding of the history and characteristics of the areas they live in. In terms of urban planning, the practise of constructing in accordance with functional zones is probably going to persist in the near future. According to this construction model, it is important to coordinate the development of functional zones in order to, on the one hand, make reasonable locational planning for their distribution and, on the other hand, strengthen the connections between the various zones and assist the various zones in actually establishing reasonable connections to make life for individuals simple. On the other hand, it is vital to improve regional linkages and assist them in establishing suitable links in order to make life for individuals easier.

To truly meet the needs of production and development, individuals should and must have access to a particular quantity of production space. Second, all planning should be focused on output rather than making it the final and only purpose of the city's overall development. Instead, the focus of urban planning should be on the free and complete development of people, with people coming first. This makes it crucial to consider how these factories won't negatively impact people's lives or the environment while planning production.

Finally, urban spatial theory is a theory that is capable of being put into practise. As it succeeds in directing planning and development towards people rather than objects, it will be able to better assist individuals in achieving the objective of inclusive and unrestricted development.

References

- [1] Michel De Certeau, Luce Giard, and Pierre Mayol. 1998. *The Practice of Everyday Life. Volume 2, Living and Cooking*. Minneapolis, Minn. University Of Minnesota Press.
- [2] Ruben, David-Hillel. 1979. *Marxism and Materialism: A Study in Marxist Theory of Knowledge*. Brighton: Harvester.
- [3] Gottdiener, M. 1993. "A Marx for Our Time: Henri Lefebvre and the Production of Space." *Sociological Theory* 11 (1): 129–34. <https://doi.org/10.2307/201984>.
- [4] Marx, Karl, Friedrich Engels, Jack Cohen, and Et Al. 1979. *Collected Works*. [Vol. 11], [Marx and Engels, 1851-53]. London: Lawrence and Wishart.
- [5] Harvey, David. 2003. *The New Imperialism*. Oxford; New York: Oxford University Press.