

remarkable for that — the Research Triangle was put together to produce a space for the (not so new) knowledge-based corporations of the second half of the twentieth and the twenty-first centuries. If bourgeois democracy was the perfect shell for the capitalist city of the nineteenth century, public–private partnerships framed in the language of economic boosterism look to be the contemporary equivalent.

Allan Cochrane, The Open University

Lukasz Stanek 2011: *Henri Lefebvre on Space: Architecture, Urban Research, and the Production of Theory*. Minneapolis and London: University of Minnesota Press.

Most of the recent books on Henri Lefebvre follow the idea of drawing an overall reading of his oeuvre and of understanding his work against the background of its founding philosophical ideas. Without neglecting the latter, Lukasz Stanek's *Henri Lefebvre on Space* puts centre-stage the empirical grounding of Lefebvre's thinking, delving deeply into concrete project-based encounters of sociology, architecture, urbanism and philosophy. The focus is on the 1960s and 1970s, when Lefebvre not only headed numerous interdisciplinary research projects as professor in Strasbourg (1961–65) and Nanterre (1965–73) and as director of the Institut de Sociologie Urbaine (ISU) (1962–73), but was also intensely engaged with public discussions on French architectural culture and postwar functionalist urbanism. Stanek identifies three major 'voices' in Lefebvre's writings of this time and makes them the organizational structure of the book: research, critique and project. He argues that these 'voices' allude to three main theoretical decisions that formed Lefebvre's understanding of space: 'the shift of the research focus from space to processes of its production; the embrace of the multiplicity of social practices that produce space and make it socially productive; and the focus on the contradictory, conflictual, and, ultimately, political character of the processes of production of space' (p. ix).

The book is organized into four chapters plus a short afterword. It starts with an account of the specific historical context in which Lefebvre formulated his theory of space. Stanek points out three essential conditions: the crisis of Marxism, the critique of state socialism in Central and Eastern Europe and (what he calls) the 'institutionalization of critique' (the latter in particular poses questions regarding the relationship between theory and practice which remain very relevant to this day). The book then moves on to the three major 'voices'. In chapter 2 ('Research'), readers learn about the research projects on the practices of dwelling conducted under Lefebvre's directorship at the ISU. These focused on two spatial forms considered symptomatic of French postwar urbanization: the *pavilion* (the suburban house) and the *grands ensembles* (the collective housing estates). Stanek argues that these projects were direct sources for Lefebvre's understanding of space as perceived, conceived and lived, and as produced by material practices, the practices of representation and by everyday (bodily) practices of appropriation. In chapter 3 ('Critique'), Stanek illustrates how Lefebvre's philosophical reflections (mainly his readings of Hegel and Marx) conjoin with his historical and empirical perspective on practices producing space. The author builds the chapter around Lefebvre's main philosophical argument in his theory of space, namely that space is a 'concrete abstraction', that is, a general form of social practice in capitalist societies characterized by distinctive features, such as its simultaneous homogenization and fragmentation. As Stanek shows, for Lefebvre the urban is as much an instrument of capitalist production and reproduction as it is a social resource for a 'differential' (and therefore critical) space. Chapter 4 ('Project') provides an overview of several (utopian) architectural designs from the 1960s to the 1980s, and confronts them with Lefebvre's writings on centrality, dwelling, difference and scale. In drawing an analogy between architecture as a producer of objects and philosophy as a producer of concepts, Stanek

reflects upon the emancipatory possibilities of both building and thinking. The closing afterword is only a few pages long and can be understood as a preview of Stanek's forthcoming work. It discusses an unpublished (but to be edited) 225-page manuscript (*Vers une Architecture de la Jouissance*) found by Stanek in the archives. Lefebvre wrote it in 1973, a year before the publication of *The Production of Space*. According to Stanek, the manuscript reads as an initiation to research on architecture by means of Lefebvre's theory, which makes it likely to be an important addition to what we know so far of Lefebvre's work in this field.

Stanek himself suggests that one could consider his book as an extended commentary on Lefebvre's *The Production of Space*. Given the rich material it presents (including numerous letters, photographs, maps, etc.) and the proficient navigation it provides, one can only agree. However, the book is not only useful for all those dealing with space theoretically, but also for practitioners seeking to gain a broader understanding of the social aspects of building culture.

To sum up, Stanek's book is an impressive account of the empirical research projects as well as the philosophical foundations that inspired Lefebvre's idea that space is a social product. Inversely, one can only hope that it will itself inspire future research projects on concerns basic to Lefebvre, such as the importance of everyday (bodily) practices in the appropriation and consumption of space, the necessity to contextualize research in architecture within a broad transdisciplinary study of social space, and the searching for emancipatory elements in contemporary spatial formations. Without any doubt, Stanek's book forms a profound starting point for such undertakings.

**Silke Steets**, Darmstadt University of Technology

Daniel Silver and Carl Grodach (eds.) 2013: *The Politics of Urban Cultural Policy. Global Perspectives*. London and New York: Routledge.

For more than two decades there has been a growing political awareness of culture's importance for urban redevelopment and economic vitality in post-industrial transformation processes. Culture has been mobilized and instrumentalized to achieve various objectives such as competitiveness, growth, quality of life and social cohesion in cities. Many cities introduced specifically urban cultural policies that differ substantively from national cultural policy agendas. Yet we know little about the politics, governance and processes of cultural policy in cities.

However, several scholars have started examining the relationship of cities, cultural policy and governance, and explaining the need for comparative urban cultural policy studies. This edited volume by Carl Grodach and Daniel Silver is a timely contribution to this emerging research field, assembling well-known authors from urban cultural economy studies together with younger scholars. Its 18 chapters covering in-depth individual cases are organized around four main issues in contemporary urban cultural policy: (1) urban cultural policy as an object of governance; (2) rewriting the creative city script; (3) implications of urban cultural policy agendas for creative production; (4) coalition networks, alliances and identity framing.

The first part of the volume explores shifting governance arrangements in and through cultural policy's evolving role. Kate Oakley (chapter 1) discusses London's cultural policy turn from cultural production towards consumption, the strong connection of party agendas with cultural policy objectives and the fusion of social and economic ends in urban cultural policies. Terry Nichols Clark and Daniel Silver (chapter 2) depict how Chicago's mayors introduced cultural policy to provide 'more public goods, more managed growth, and more amenities' (p. 39). In chapter 3, Eleonora Pasotti describes how direct mayoral elections and constitutional reform in Columbia led to the emergence of new independent political leaders and innovative mayors who promoted civiness