



Solidarity Architecture: Socially Minded Approaches Emerging in the Professional Practice in Architecture

Dayanışma Mimarlığı: Mimarlık Mesleki Uygulamasında Gelişen Toplum Odaklı Yaklaşımlar

Mehmet Gökhan Berk¹ , Muzaffer Tolga Akbulut² 

Öz

Bu makale, mimarlık mesleki uygulaması ile birlikte tasarım, planlama ve genel olarak mekân yapımına ilişkin mesleki faaliyetlerin ifasında dayanışma kavramını bir yaklaşım, yöntem ve iletişim biçimi olarak açık veya örtülü bir şekilde içermek üzere çeşitli şekillerde ortaya çıkan yaklaşımları irdelemektedir. Mesleki tutumların özellikle modernleşmenin tarihsel süreci içindeki gelişimi ve değişimi, değişen toplumsal dinamikler ve toplumsal olaylar dikkate alınarak genel olarak değerlendirilmiş bulunmaktadır. Mesleki anlamda dayanışma yaklaşımını içeren bir tutum alınmasına ilişkin incelenen genel özellikler profesyoneller ve toplum arasındaki ikilik ve ayrışmanın giderek ortadan kalkması, mesleki faaliyetlerin hedeflerinin birey ölçeğinden veya ihtiyaç sahibi olan kesimlerden daha geniş katmanlara, özellikle toplumun çoğunlukla baskı altında bulunan, daha az ayrıcalıklı, yoksun ve dezavantajlı gruplarını içine alır şekilde genişlediği tespit edilmektedir. Bu tanımdan hareketle, Dayanışma Mimarlığı, yapı fiziksel çevrenin oluşmasında etkin olan mesleki faaliyetlerin toplum odaklı bir şekilde, etkileşimde buldukları toplumsal gruplarla beraber yürütülmesini önemseyen bir mimarlık yaklaşımı olarak ele alınabilir.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Dayanışma Mimarlığı, Özgencilik, Katılımcı Mimarlık, İnsani Mimarlık, Pro Bono, Müştereleştirme

ABSTRACT

This article evaluates the various forms of emerging approaches in the professional conduct of the architectural practice and other forms of professional activities related to the design, planning, and space making in general, making explicit or inherent use of the notion of solidarity as an approach, method, and means of communication. A broad review of the evolution of the status of the professional attitude has been made with consideration of the changing social dynamics and social movements, throughout the recent history of modernization. The common characteristics observed with the adoption of the professional solidarity approach, are the dissolving of the duality and distinction between the professional and the community, the shift or enlargement of the target of the professional activity from the individual or people in need to a wider community, most of the time being the oppressed, less privileged, deprived and disadvantaged sections of the society. In line with this description, the concept of Solidarity Architecture can be evaluated to be an understanding in architecture attaching importance to the performance of the professional activities which are determinant in the formation of the built physical environment in a socially minded manner and together with the interacted social groups.

Keywords: Solidarity Architecture, Altruism, Participatory Architecture, Humanitarian Architecture, Pro Bono, Commoning

¹ **Corresponded Author:** Yıldız Technical University Faculty of Architecture Istanbul
mgokhanberk@gmail.com, <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9088-9680>

² Yıldız Technical University Faculty of Architecture Istanbul
mtolga@yildiz.edu.tr, <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3020-0789>



INTRODUCTION:

The name of Wolfgang Amadeus Mozart may sound more familiar to many of us than the name of Hieronymus von Colloredo whereas the latter, the Prince-Archbishop of Salzburg was in fact for a long time the employer of Mozart who worked as the salaried musician of the Salzburg court of the Archbishop since the age of seventeen. Continuous disagreements between Mozart and the prince archbishop led Mozart to break up with Salzburg and his employer in 1781 at the age of twenty-five, to move to Vienna and continue his life as an opera composer, music teacher, and piano virtuoso performing his own compositions. Mozart's moving to Vienna is illustrating the portrait of an artist, a professional choosing liberty and serving the public by renouncing lifetime protection and guaranteed income under the patronage of his employer.

The choice of Mozart was congruent with the spirit of the time when in Europe, the footsteps of secularism, liberty, freedom, revolt, and revolution were growing louder; the French Revolution and the times for radical changes in the structuring of especially the European society in its aftermath were quite close. Mozart did not live long enough to see the collapse of the archbishopric of Salzburg and the escape of Hieronymus von Colloredo to Vienna which happened a couple of years later than the famous musician's early death in 1791 at the age of thirty-five. On the other hand, according to Elias (1993:28-42), Mozart witnessed the transition from craft art to artist art similar to what was happening for the other liberal, intellectual professions towards autonomy over the modes of carrying out work. His moving to and staying in Vienna enabled the achievement of his independence and ability to freely express his artistic, creative, and composition talent and he composed the works leading him to the music Hall of Fame during this period (Bianco, 2011).

At these times around the late 18th century, a free labor market was emerging in the cities of Europe. The respective changes had considerable effects on the transformation of the intellectual professions involving artistic production. This is also the time when the term "solidarity" has taken its roots, mainly from the ideology of the French Revolution characterized by the motto of "Liberty, Equality, and Fraternity" and solidarity has become a political keyword in European social and political history since that time as analyzed in depth by Schmale (2017).

Moving forward from the introductory example of Mozart, this article has attempted to explore various forms of professional attitudes incorporating professional autonomy and solidarity that have been seen to emerge most of the time in parallel to the social movements and apparent social changes in world history. It is argued that the professions are evolving toward a more public interest advocating form in parallel with the history of modernization and the case of architecture is evaluated in this paper with examples, the common characteristics of which are conceptualized with the term "solidarity architecture".

1. Transformation of Professions and Professional Altruism

As exemplified in the case of Mozart, intellectual activities including the visual arts were part of the craft occupations in the Middle Ages and the artists and the craftsmen were most of the time carrying out their work under the protection of some wealthy employers. As such, they were rather in the service of political and commercial power to be able to earn their living. On the other hand, different versions of professions began to appear around the 17th and 18th centuries, and subsequently, after the French Revolution, the social, economic, and working order started to witness radical changes. The changes in the working system and the emergence of professional life accelerated during the industrial revolution which began in the late 18th and early 19th centuries in Great Britain, continental Europe, and the United States.

In the aftermath of the French Revolution and consequently, since the industrial revolution, there have been apparent transformations in the occupational and professional structures. The changes in agricultural and industrial sectors reshaped the structure of the labor but also a significant change was seen especially in artistic, professional, managerial, administrative, and technical occupations. These developments have paved the way for the concept of autonomy in the modern understanding of the sociology of professions, as discussed by Fournier (1999), and Troman, (1996) and which is described by Sapiro (2019:5) as the “right and privilege granted by a governmental entity to a class of professionals, and to each of its certified members, to offer services without being subject to control”. In that sense, professional autonomy pertains not only to the exercise of the profession itself but also to the organization of the profession, recruitment and operation rules, internal discipline, and ethics. The changes in professional life and the concept of professional autonomy have also brought the rethinking of the sociological discussion of class and class structure, especially in advanced societies through the identification of professionals as members or potential members of a “new class” or “a new middle class”.

The Marxist approach that traditionally saw the state as an entity collecting power and serving the capitalist interests ranged the professions as the agents for the dominant class skilled to ensure surveillance and control. Barbara and John Ehrenreich (1979) referred to the concept of the “professional-managerial class” which constituted the third class in advanced capitalist society between the classes of labor and capital, thus between bourgeoisie and proletariat. Braverman (1974) argued that the breaking down of the professional tasks was in fact related to the managerial strategies for controlling the labor process under the capitalist system. Several other authors of mainly left positions debated the revolutionary potential of the professionals whose function was seen to reproduce capitalist social relations in line with the dynamics of social change. While adopting a rather different point of view, Foucault (1979) continued this approach by concentrating on specific institutional areas such as prisons and schools to evaluate the scientific progress of professions. He centered his ideas on the concepts of “governmentality” and the “institutionalization of expertise” through which he has seen the state as an ensemble of institutions, knowledge, and procedures established essentially for the purpose of governing.

Gramsci (1971) who has focused on class relations in Marxist literature with a rather different approach, developed a concept around governing and leadership processes by making use of the term “hegemony”. The Italian Marxist argued that ruling classes are making use of a mixture of force and consent to dominate the society. In that process, the consent of the society is achieved by making the legitimacy of the governance appear like common sense. According to Gramsci, the oppressed groups need to challenge this notion of common sense for social change to occur under the leadership of what he calls the “organic” intellectuals who are to emerge from within the own ranks of the oppressed sections of the society. As such, Gramsci’s analysis of the hegemony of the ruling class encapsulated the advocacy for the people to take action to challenge the unequal power relationships with the help of the “organic intellectuals” which may be evaluated to describe a new form of professionalism.

In the sociological analysis domain since the early 20th century, “professionalism” has become a key concept and the emphasis has been given to its being a force capable of contributing to the stability and civility of social systems as brought forward by authors such as Tawney (1921), Carr-Saunders and Wilson (1933), Parsons (1939) and Marshall (1950). The sociological analysis has differentiated professionalism as a means of organizing professional work and the idea of professionalism has often been placed in a position against individualism and towards the threat of “encroaching” forces of the industrial and governmental bureaucracy. Marshall (1950) emphasized professional altruism or the service orientation of professionalism as a concept that might cope with the threats to stable democratic processes.

All such interpretations have characterized professionalism as a positive, collegial, and mutually supportive concept within the organization of society. On the other hand, besides this generally positive perception of “professionalism” among the sociologists up to the 1960s, a different and relatively negative and critical view of professionalism gained traction as well in the 1970s mainly considered to be based on the ontological definition ranging the professionalism as a form of occupational control (Larson, 1977). Proponents of this approach have described professionalism as being “strategies and rhetoric employed by the members of an occupation who are seeking to improve the professional status, financial benefits, and working conditions” (Hoyle, 1975; 315).

McAdams (1987) criticized the understanding of professionalism which is read simply as an ideology screening the self-interest of privileged practitioners, whereas, in essence, it shall constitute a set of ethically bound, client-centered practices. According to McAdams, it is scarcely surprising that professionals whose work is in human services will often in the interests of their clients as well as their autonomy, be critical of the arbitrariness and authoritarianism of existing arrangements as well as hostile to a market philosophy that makes “money” the measure of all things and treats people as mere factors of production. In his essay named “Professional Problem” McNight (1981:36) refers to the civil rights struggle for social justice that took place during the 1950s and 1960s for Black Americans to gain equal rights under the law in the United States. The Black American people who are declared deficient and in need, achieved to unshackle their labels and lock them on their “White” oppressors with a strategy of revolutionary insight by claiming that there is no “Black” problem but there is a “White” problem stemming from the economic, political and social privileges recognized only for the white people of USA. McNight is making use of this example to illustrate the introductory sentence of his article which quotes;

“Revolutions begin when people who are defined as problems, achieve the power to redefine the problem”.

McKnight translates this revolution or social evolution to the uneasiness of the “client populations” wondering whether they are the problem. The “self-help movement” has been one type of manifestation of this situation. According to McKnight, the populations engaged in the self-help movement are those that are rejecting their clienthood and seeking liberation by defining the problem as those who defined them as the problem and stating that to these ex-clients, the central issue is the “professional problem”. Along with this analysis, he refers to Ivan Illich (1974) who introduced the term “iatrogenesis” in the field of sociology through his article “Medical Nemesis” where in general terms he is alleging the impairment of the quality of life in industrialized societies by the acts and philosophy of the medical professional practice. Illich (1974: 921) describes “iatrogenesis” as follows:

“Iatrogenesis can be direct, when pain, sickness, and death result from medical care; or it can be indirect when health policies reinforce an industrial organization that generates ill-health: it can be structural when medically sponsored behavior and delusion restrict the vital autonomy of people by undermining their competence in growing up, caring, aging; or when it nullifies the personal challenge arising from their pain, disability, and anguish”.

Illich (1974) argued that most of the remedies proposed to reduce “iatrogenesis” are invented and therapeutically designed as remedies to generate second-order iatrogenic ills by creating a new prejudice against the autonomy of the citizen. This approach implies a harsh criticism of the position of the professional to take a position on the side of the economic and political power, the dominant, ruling, and privileged classes.

2. Socially Minded Approaches in Architecture, Social Movements, and Solidarity

2.1. Social Concerns in Architecture

Comments and critics towards the lack of social concerns in professional conduct have been vivid in various areas, especially in the aftermath of the 1968 social movements. The emphasis on citizen autonomy, the need for the empowerment of the deprived portions of the society, and the struggle of the poor and the underclass at that time were also subjects of interest with similar criticisms in the field of architecture and urban planning directed to the attitude of the professionals in the field. In his article “Architecture’s Public” Giancarlo De Carlo (1970:5) states;

“In all epochs, whatever the importance of his role, the architect has been subject to the worldview of those in power. Since money, materials, land, and authority to act were necessary, and since the ruling power was the only force capable of furnishing him with these means, the architect by definition had to identify himself with it, even transforming himself into its operative appendage. With the rise of bourgeois professionalism, architecture was driven into the realm of specialization, where only the problems of “how” are important, as the problems of “why” are considered solved once and for all”.

Commenting on these lines, in their book named “Architecture and Participation”, Jones and Till (2005:3) believe these words reflect a reaction to the effects of the global capitalism which are started to be seen and also carry the spirit of the 1968 student movements charged with the feeling of disappointment for the betrayal of the social ideals of the modernist movement.

According to Olofsson (2014:47), the 1968 protests were very much related with the confrontation between the modern and traditional lifestyles while the conditions of the urban population were about to be reshaped. The main concerns of the protestors consisting of the young generations coming from different social classes, were in general related with the problems of the urban life, quality and conditions of housing, costs of living in the cities, access to public services, and with other consequences of the transformation of the urban space.

All these issues, problems, and changes in the urban context motivated emergence of new interests in the academic literature for urban studies which have been widely analyzed by authors such as David Harvey, Peter Marcuse, Manuel Castells, author of “The Urban Question: A Marxist Approach (1972)” or Henry Lefebvre who introduced the concepts such as the “Social Production of Space (1974)” and “The Right to the City (1968)” and others. Brenner (2009:198) described critical urban theory as the rejection of the technocratic, market-driven, and market-oriented forms of urban knowledge to emphasize the politically and ideologically mediated, socially contested, and therefore malleable character of urban space.

These concepts were also adopted by social movements’ leaders, thinkers, and activists to reclaim the city as a socially produced space against the impacts of commodification and capitalism that creates spatial inequalities in the urban context. The developing concerns about promoting social equality and community problems led a considerable number of architects and architectural groups to employ “participatory design” methods in architecture in the 1960s and 1970s to involve the communities in the professional processes through using methods such as convening meetings with users, questionnaires, surveys, face to face interviews, common study workshops, neighborhood offices with an increasing altruistic understanding of the architectural profession.

The socially minded approaches in the architecture and urban planning professions that have been visible around the 1960s and 1970s have not been continued consistently to become an established practice in these fields. On the other hand, similar approaches have come back increasingly to the agenda of the profession in the last one or two decades. As Mirko Zardini (2008) pointed out, as the curator of an event organized by the Canadian Centre for Architecture focused on the planning and creation of the urban public space and projects supporting community interaction, former practices that have made brief appearances in cities of the 1960s and 1970s are now resurfacing, after having fallen into temporary obsolescence. Like an underground river, they continued to flow and re-emerged in new forms and unexpected places.

Several authors, such as Stavrides (2016) established relations between these current emerging forms of socially conscious conduct of architectural professional practice with the new social movements and occupy activism by referring to the purpose of creating or reclaiming the common space. Stavrides (2016:161) also draws attention to the role of social media, mobile technology, and interactive communication and information means which have started to be used extensively by young people during the Occupy movements in order to illustrate the role of mutual aid and solidarity for the commoning practice.

2.2. Social Movements and the Reclaim of the Urban Space

New Social Movements term abbreviated as NSM is introduced to describe the various forms of social opposition movements, manifestations and demonstrations since the mid-20th century such as the women and gender rights, anti-military, anti-nuclear and peace proponents, anti-eviction campaigns, collectives and environmentalist movements. These social movements are considered to have emerged mainly following the student protests of the 1960s and continued to take place at different intervals. It is also a generally recognized fact that such movements, if not caused, have helped various social concerns to come increasingly to the view and opinion of the international public and the agenda of the international summits and UN activities and events as well, since around the second half of the 20th century, basically accepted to be starting with the 1972 Stockholm Conference on Environment and Development. From then on and after, poverty, urbanization, population increase, mass migration, climate change, and environmental problems are starting to be considered issues that threaten the global order, and states, institutions, and professions were in a way called to action.

It is a widely accepted fact that the new social movements including the occupy movements of the last two decades are led by the new middle class (NMC), a concept which has been originally and initially described by Barbara and John Ehrenreich (1979) together with the idea of professionalism. On the other hand, Cleveland (2003) introduced the “young adult nucleus” thesis to argue that the new movements are not led by a class, but by the (organic) intellectuals in the Gramscian sense of the word who try to educate the masses of people about how to successfully fight their oppressors. According to Cleveland (2003:168), these movements are led by two groups which are described as “intellectual radicals” and “advanced detachments”. The advanced detachments come to a particular movement based on their experience of oppression as a member of the group whose exploitation, oppression, or hurt has in fact been the focus of the movement. The other group is the intellectual radicals who are generally coming from a middle class and take up radical politics primarily based on their intellectual and moral process not as pure altruists but by aligning their interests with the success of the movements they join. They are ready to give up privileges they enjoy in the class they currently belong to in the present society to have a better life overall in the future in a new, post-capitalist society.

This approach does not seem to contradict much with the conventional considerations of the forces leading social movements at least in the context of the urban movements. The attitude of the

“intellectual radicals” as described by Cleveland creates a strong form of solidarity between the intellectuals and the members of oppressed groups. A relation can also be established between the solidarity and collectivity inherent in these movements and the principal approach of the anarchist ideologist Peter Kropotkin, who studied the concept of cooperation as a survival mechanism within the society similar to what happens for the other living creatures in general, in his book, *Mutual Aid: A Factor of Evolution* (1902). According to Kropotkin, mutual aid and cooperation have also been important factors in the evolution of social institutions.

2.3. Solidarity Notion and Solidarity as a Professional Attitude

“In the long run, the practice of solidarity proves much more advantageous to the species than the development of individuals endowed with predatory inclinations” (Kropotkin, 1902)

In Kropotkin’s approach, solidarity is an essential concept for what he describes as mutual aid, and the people’s activities to support others are not related to any kind of reward expectation, but it is more attributable to the instinctive feeling of solidarity. In this regard, the relations between the social movements and the new forms of approaches adopted for the rendering of the architectural and urban planning services by especially young and idealist professionals as described in this article points out the accuracy of the term “solidarity architecture” adopted to describe various forms of socially minded architectural professional practices.

The term solidarity entered into political terminology in the aftermath of the French Revolution alongside the term fraternity. Solidarity has been one of the six principles of the Charter of Fundamental Rights of the EU (European Union) together with Dignity, Freedoms, Equality, Citizens’ Rights, and Justice. This part of the Charter concentrates on social rights, and labor relations and refers to the European Social Charters of 1961 and 1996. Article 30 of the European Social Charter related to the right to protection against poverty and exclusion and Article 31 to the right to housing.

Bayertz (1999:3) explains that the term ‘solidarity’ has its roots in the Roman Law of Obligations where the unlimited liability of each individual member within a family or other community to pay common debts was characterized as ‘obligatio in solidum’. According to the author, since the end of the 18th century, the principle of mutual responsibility between the individual and the society has been generalized beyond the legal context and applied to the field of morality, society, and politics.

The solidarity notion was used in Durkheim’s theory as a means of cohesion, a concept that serves to hold society together, in his seminal work “The Division of Labor in Society” first published in 1893. Durkheim has described two types of social solidarity which he named mechanical solidarity and organic solidarity. Societies with mechanical solidarity relate to pre-modern, less complex communities and consist of people with similar jobs, occupations, and responsibilities, thus indicating a low division of labor. On the other hand, societies characterized by organic solidarity are consisting of members with diverse occupations and specializations, and there is a more complex and higher division of labor. In this type of society, people depend on each other, and social cohesion is ensured through this dependency and the need for specialized tasks carried out by the members of the society. Durkheim also argues that societies are in constant movement from mechanical to organic solidarity through the changes in the division of labor transforming from simple to complex structures. This transformation is also mainly related to urbanization and the increase in the number of people living in cities (Durkheim, 1933).

3. Solidarity Architecture

3.1. The Origins of the Solidarity Architecture Concept

The term “Solidarity Architecture” first appeared as the name of an exposition where recent examples of socially minded and public interest advocating practices in the field of architecture in Turkey have been displayed and presented. The solidarity architecture exposition has been organized by the Turkish Chamber of Architects in January 2017. In the preface of the exposition booklet, Omacan (2017:7) wrote on behalf of the Chamber of Architects, that the term solidarity architecture aims to describe a professional orientation adopted by all the groups taking part in the exposition and this orientation can be summarized as the collective production of the architectural practice instead of famed individualism, researching various forms of public participation to replace the commoditized, sanctified design discourse, promoting the right to the city and space of people instead of admitting real estate market dominance.

Earlier in 2010, MoMA (Museum of Modern Arts) in the USA housed the exhibition named “Small Scale Big Change: New Architectures of Social Engagement” which presented eleven architectural project examples which were aiming to respond to the needs of underserved communities in various places in the world. The projects are described to promote a new sense of commitment in the field of architecture with an understanding of social responsibility and the architects are said to be more interested in radical pragmatism instead of grand manifestos or utopian theories. Works exhibited include a Primary School in Burkina Faso (Diébédo Francis Kéré, 1999-2001), Quinta Monroy Housing in Chile (Elemental, 2003-2005), Transformation of Tour Bois le Pretre in Paris, France (Frédéric Druot, Anne Lacaton and Jean Philippe Vassal, 2006-2011) and others.

The increasing public interest advocating approaches in the field of architecture during recent years has often been highlighted not to find adequate acclaim in the mainstream media of the discipline and the continued promotion of the famous profiles of the profession has been widely criticized by authors such as Murphy (2011) who wrote about the famous architect Zaha Hadid who designed the People’s Conference Hall Building in Tripoli, Libya promoted by Qaddafi, the authoritarian leader who ruled for more than 40 years before he was overthrown in 2011 after the Arab Spring.

Conrad Newel (2011), the author of the popular blog named ‘Notes on Becoming a Famous Architect’ started his humorous critics of the jury and the laureates of the Pritzker Architecture Prize in his blog in 2011 in his essay captioned ‘Predicting the Pritzker Prize Part I’ where he quoted the Pritzker’s self-defined purpose for the awards:

“To honor a living architect whose built work demonstrates a combination of those qualities of talent, vision, and commitment, which has produced consistent and significant contributions to humanity and the built environment through the art of architecture”.

In his post of 29 March 2011, he thoroughly questioned the fulfillment of the purpose of “significant contributions to humanity” for awarding the prize with past examples which have shown, according to Newel, a consistent partiality of the jury in the favor of famous architects (starchitects) mostly from the western world or developed countries or serving them. Consequent to his quite accurate prediction for the 2011 prize, Newel has written another article on the same issue published online in Arch Daily architecture website on 22 January 2015 captioned “Dear Martha: An Open Letter to the Pritzker Prize Committee” addressing Martha Thorne, the Executive Director of the Pritzker Prize. In this article, he has given examples of various architects and architectural groups who were working in the field of humanitarian aid, volunteer activities, or providing pro bono services and reminded the ‘significant contributions to humanity’ purpose of the prize.

Whether or not related to Newel's articles, the Pritzker Architecture Prize has been awarded to Alejandro Aravena in 2016, Anne Lacaton and Jean-Philippe Vassal in 2021, and Diébédo Francis Kéré in 2022, all being architects known for their focus on public interest and social impact whose work mostly target communities of relatively poor regions of the world and less privileged and less wealthy sections of the community such as the urban poor, disaster victims, migrants or displaced and disadvantaged groups within the society.

3.2. Evaluation of Principal Categories in Socially Minded Architecture

Above mentioned conduct of the Pritzker Committee is an example illustrating the increasing interest in socially minded approaches in architecture. On the other hand, there seems to be a growing need for enhanced analysis, elaboration, and categorization of socially committed architecture both in the academic and practical fields. It is attempted here-below to describe a general categorization in that sense by providing the main three distinct dispositions although these can be decomposed into several more main or sub-categories. Mainly evaluated approaches are humanitarian architecture which is described as architectural responses to humanitarian issues, pro bono movement encouraging professionals to render free of charge services to people in need, and the commoning practices which are evaluated to increasingly become a contemporary form of participatory architecture as a much more socially inclusive practice in space making.

3.2.1. Humanitarian Architecture

According to Rozaku (2020), Durkheim's conceptualization of solidarity is helpful to explain in fact the historical development of the concept of humanitarianism as a feeling of connectedness on the basis of the common and shared identities of the society. This understanding describes humanitarianism as a moral imperative that was rather enabled throughout human history in the form of a common category and solidarity has been the underlying force of this modern humanitarian sensibility and cosmopolitan humanitarianism.

The belief in perceiving the architectural professional practice as a tool and mechanism for social change had become apparent in the field of socially committed approaches classified as 'humanitarian architecture' where many architectural NGOs addressed the global issues of lack of adequate shelter, disaster relief, access to resources, and community development through collective work with other humanitarian organizations. The nonprofit architecture group 'Architecture for Humanity (AFH)' was co-founded by Kate Stohr and Cameron Sinclair in 1999 when they were moved to take action to create temporary housing for refugees in war-torn Kosovo. The initiative continued to provide humanitarian architecture solutions around the world, from houses to health clinics to community centers and schools. Other most known professional organizations in the field of humanitarian architecture are ASF [Architectes Sans Frontières], Design Corps (Brian Bell), IOM [International Organization for Migration], BRAC [Building Resources Across Communities], and VAN [Voluntary Architects Network] led by architect Shigeru Ban.

Currently, the humanitarian architecture groups have a fundamental role and are engaged to find solutions to the needs of disadvantaged communities globally. The activities range from the implementation of temporary disaster relief shelters to long-term projects aiming to overcome the problems in the adequate shelter, education, employment, and sanitation of especially the low-income populations. As such the concept is far beyond building and becomes a mechanism to achieve a change in the community to improve people's lives and stimulate children's education, economic development, and the health of the entire community.

3.2.2. Pro Bono Movement in Architecture

Another form of socially-minded architectural practice has appeared with the pro bono movement in architecture during the last couple of decades. The term 'pro bono' is the short version of the Latin phrase 'pro bono publico' which means 'for the public good'. According to some sources, the use of the term in the professional area is generally rooted in the provision of legal counsel for those who cannot afford to retain an attorney and dates back to 15th-century English law.

The run-up of the pro bono movement in architectural professional practice is seen to start around the beginning of the 2000s, mostly considered to be consequent to the 1% (or 1+) initiative of the "Public Architecture" which is an organization established to address the public interest through the rendering of the architectural services and solve problems of human interaction within the built environment. The non-profit organization which has been founded by John Cary in 2002 in the USA, launched the 1% program to encourage architects and firms for donating 1% of their time to working on projects of public interest all around the world (Vinnitskaya, 2013).

McKnight (2016) records that since the launch of the program nearly 1.500 firms have signed on, collectively pledging more than 55 million USD worth of services each year. The firms involved in the program are citing a wide range of benefits including boosting staff morale and better connecting architects to their communities.

The American Institute of Architects (AIA, 2020) has encouraged pro bono work in its Code of Ethics and Professional Conduct offering also resources such as contract documents for pro bono work and guidelines for pro bono project management. In fact, there has been a long tradition of referring to the public awareness of the ethical codes of the professional associations in the architecture discipline. The first of the four main principles of the UIA (Union Internationale des Architectes) is General Obligations and the 2nd is Obligations in the Public Interest. This second principle requires the architects to protect the health, safety, and welfare of the public and take account of the social and environmental impact of their professional activities in the implementation of such work and services (UIA, 2011). Architects' Council of Europe (ACE, 2016) issued the European Deontological Code for providers of architectural services in 2016 in which the obligations in the public interest have been specified as one of the main principles. The Council has also issued several publications on the social role of the architectural discipline such as 'The Role of the Architectural Profession in Delivering Responsible Design' (ACE, 2014).

3.2.3. Commoning Practices

Although the practices of humanitarian architecture and the pro bono movement in architecture have been remarkable schemes of the socially committed practice of the architectural profession that gained traction, the so described commoning practice represents more direct ways for the citizens to take action in the shaping of the urban space and the physical environment against or independent of the state-led policies and profit-driven mechanisms of the market. With the commoning practice, the role of the architect is equalized with the role of community members with the shared goal of creating the common space as a result of the relation between the social group and their efforts to define a common physical environment. According to Stavrides (2016), the common space is differentiated from both the public and the private space. The common space and the commoning practice shall be understood as a process for the communities and collectivities to plan the common space, to make them happen by shaping uses and rules of use in the process of inhabiting them. During the occupied city squares movement including the Arab Spring uprisings and the Occupy movements worldwide, "space commoning" has been a process of reinventing the space as "commons" through collective action.

Navarinou Park in Athens, Greece is one of the examples highlighted by Stavrides for the commoning practices. The park has become a self-managed space after a collective neighborhood action through which communities have first occupied and reclaimed the space and then turn it into a place of gathering, gardening, recreation, and social interaction area since the year 2009. The land of Navarinou Park was destined to become a car parking area, the lease procedures were implemented and the construction works were started when a large number of people including community groups and individuals occupied the space and demanded its transformation into a neighborhood park and recreation area. As a result of the resistance and self-organization of the communities, the park became an urban common, a space of play, communication, creativity, exchange, and activism for all people regardless of age, origin, education, and social status.

In Paris, France a group of architects named AAA (Atelier d'Architecture Autogérée), formed a collective platform to carry out explorations, actions, and research concerning urban mutations and cultural, social, and political practices in the city in collaboration with artists, students, researchers, activists, citizens, and users. The projects of AAA are based on the principle of claiming the urban space from diverse social, cultural, collective, and democratic transformations. In this respect, they carry out experiments with the temporary reuse of the leftover urban space by setting up an enabling infrastructure that is taken over in time by the local residents to transform these areas into self-managed spaces accessible by all people.

In Turkey, as one of the examples introduced during the aforementioned Solidarity Architecture exposition, Düzce Umut Evleri (Hope Homes) Cooperative has been one of the remarkable cases illustrating the socially-minded approaches in architecture. Considered as well as one of the commoning-based initiatives, the housing project is completed after around 15 years of rights-based struggle in Adapazarı, Turkey with the efforts of the people who lost their homes in the Marmara Earthquake in 1999. After the earthquake, people who were destined to live in prefabricated emergency shelters set up a cooperative for their right to housing and reclaimed land to rebuild their homes and to continue the existence of their neighborhood community with the support of volunteers consisting of university students, academicians, artists, activists, and many others during the whole process. Düzce Solidarity Housing Cooperative for Homeless and Tenant Earthquake Victims organized a series of mass demonstrations involving hundreds of people in collective protest on the streets demanding subsidized loans and serviced land. The struggle of the cooperative members included protests in Düzce, encampments in the parks of Ankara, street demonstrations extending to police arrests of demonstrators, legal actions, lobbying, and discussions with the officials. The land was achieved in 2012 and with the help of a team of volunteer professionals consisting of architects, engineers, urban planners, and sociologists forming a collaborative design studio in Istanbul the housing scheme was developed. The houses are completed around 2018 and families have moved to their homes after an equally collaborative construction stage.

CONCLUSION

Homelessness, street dwellers, and people living in informal and squatter neighborhoods are not unusual to be seen in most large cities of the world. Despite the decline over the last 25-30 years, the number of people living in extreme poverty remains considerably high globally. Global wealth and income inequalities remain to be a major concern. Mass migrations triggered by wars, political conflicts, ethnic, and religious discrimination, poverty, and natural disasters remain to be the major problems for both developed and underdeveloped countries. Natural disasters with increasing frequency and intensity due to the effects of global warming and climate change are generally hitting the poorest parts of the world which have not been able to develop resilient settlements.

Moving forward from the introductory example of Mozart, this article aimed to explore various forms of professional attitudes in parallel to the social movements and social change discussed to evolve towards a more public interest advocating form. Professional autonomy is seen as a concept to facilitate and support altruism in professional life stemming from moral and intellectual reasons and the concept of altruism can be defined to be the acts for increasing the welfare of the less privileged sections of society. The young professionals of our age are less restricted if they want to perform their jobs in favor of the relatively poor, less privileged, and disadvantaged sections of the community and the world population.

With this understanding, this paper has provided a brief review of the evolution of a socially-minded approach in the conduct of professions by emphasizing professional autonomy and altruism illustrated with the cases and approaches in architecture. Accordingly, it seems obvious that the current conditions provide numerous opportunities for the members of the architectural profession to work independently of the economic and political power groups, the notions of urban and global commons challenge the land and real estate dependency in space-making activities, the current and developing state of the information and communication technology means and the social media extremely facilitates and supports the notion of solidarity by bridging the gap between the professional and the communities. This is why the solidarity architecture movement can be a great opportunity for the progress of the profession, the professional, and the whole public.

Compliance with Ethical Standard

Conflict of Interests: The authors declare that for this article they have no actual, potential or perceived conflict of interests.

Ethics Committee Approval: Ethics committee approval is not required for this study.

Funding Disclosure: No financial support has been received for this article.

REFERENCES

- ACE Architects' Council of Europe (2014) The role of the architectural profession in delivering responsible design.
- ACE Architects' Council of Europe (2016) European Deontological Code for providers of architectural services.
- Bayertz, K. (1999) Solidarity. Dordrecht, Kluwer Academic Publishers.
- Bianco, A. (2011) Self-employment as a Social Figuration, The Mozart Case, *Cambio 1 (II)*: 113-119.
- Braverman, H. (1974). Labor and monopoly capital: the degradation of work in the twentieth century. New York: Monthly Review Press.
- Brenner, N. (2009). What is Critical Urban Theory? *City*, 13 (2),198 – 207.
- Carr-Saunders, A.M. and Wilson, P.A. (1933). The professions. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Cleveland, J. W. (2003) Does the New Middle-Class Lead Today's Social Movements? *Critical Sociology*, 29 (2), 163-188.
- De Carlo, G. (2013) Architecture's Public, in Jones, P. B., Petrescu, D., Till, J. (eds) *Architecture and Participation*, Routledge, New York (3-22).

- Durkheim, E. (1933) *The Division of Labor in Society*, Macmillan, New York.
- Ehrenreich, B. and Ehrenreich, J. (1979). *The professional-managerial class*. In P. Walker (Ed.) *Between capital and labor* (pp. 5-45). Brighton: Harvester Press.
- Elias N. (1991). *Mozart: portrait of a genius*, Schröter M. ed., Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993.
- Foucault, M. (1979). *Discipline and punish: the birth of the prison*. Harmondsworth: Penguin.
- Fournier, V. (1999). *The Appeal to 'Professionalism' as a Disciplinary Mechanism*. *Social Review*, 47(2), 280–307.
- Hoyle, E. (1975). *Professionalism, Professionalism, and Control in Teaching*. In V. Houghton et al. (Eds.), *Management in Education: the Management of Organisations and Individuals*, London, Open University Press.
- Illich, I. (1974) *Limits to Medicine: Medical Nemesis: The Expropriation of Health* Marion Boyar Publishers Ltd, London.
- Jones, P. B., Petrescu, D., Till, J. (2005) *Architecture and Participation*, Routledge, New York
- Larson, M. S. (2013). *The rise of professionalism. Monopolies of competence and sheltered markets* (2nd ed.). New Brunswick: Transaction Publishers.
- McAdams, J. (1987) 'Testing the theory of the New Class', *Sociological Quarterly*, 28(1): 23-49.
- McKnight, J. (1981) *The professional problem*. *The Grantsmanship Center News*, 9(1),36-43.
- McKnight, J. M. (2016). *The Pro Bono Payoff*. Retrieved from https://www.architectmagazine.com/aia-architect/aiafeature/the-pro-bono-payoff_o
- Marshall, T.H. (1950). *Citizenship and Social Class and Other Essays*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Murhpy, M. (2011, April 15) *The poverty of Starchitecture*. Retrieved from <https://designobserver.com/feature/the-poverty-of-starchitecture/26358>
- Newel, C. (2011, March 29). 75. *Predicting the Pritzker Prize Part I*. Retrieved from http://famousarchitect.blogspot.com/2011/03/75-predicting-pritzker.html?utm_medium=website&utm_source=archdaily.com
- Newel, C (2015, January 22) *Dear Martha: An Open Letter to the Pritzker Prize Committee*. Retrieved from <https://www.archdaily.com/590620/dear-martha-an-open-letter-to-the-pritzker-prize-committee>.
- Olofsson G (2009) *The coming of the proto-professions - a third stage of professionalization?* Paper presented at ESA Conference, Lisbon, RN19.
- Omacan, S. (2017) *Preface, Solidarity Architecture*, Turkish Chamber of Architects Istanbul Branch, Istanbul (p. 7-14).
- Parsons, T. (1939). *The Professions and Social Structure*, *Social Forces*, 17(4), 457–467.

- Schmale, W. (2017). European Solidarity: A Semantic History European Review of History: Revue européenne d'histoire, 24(6) 854-873.
- Stavrvides, S. (2016). Occupied squares, societies in movement." Common Space: The City as Commons. London.
- Tawney, R.H. (1921). The Acquisitive Society. New York: Harcourt Bruce
- Troman, G. (1996). The Rise of the New Professionals? The Restructuring of Primary Teachers' Work and Professionalism. British Journal of Sociology of Education, 17(4), 473–487.
- UIA (2011) Guidelines for the UIA Accord on recommended international standards of professionalism in architectural practice policy on ethics and conduct.
- Vinnitskaya, I (2013, January 22) Public Architecture's 1% Program Provides Projects for Habitat for Humanity. Retrieved from: <https://www.archdaily.com/tag/public-architecture#:~:text=Public%20Architecture%20is%20an%20organization,interaction%20with%20the%20built%20environment>.
- Zardini, M. (2008) A New Urban Takeover in G. Borasi and M. Zardini (eds.) Actions: What you can do with the City, CCA (Canadian Centre for Architecture), Montreal.