

# Psychology and Architecture in Cities: Phallic Architecture, Urban Quality of Life, Environmental Psychology and Social Engineering

Ulaş Başar Gezgin<sup>1</sup>

## Abstract

The urban links between psychology and architecture is closer than it looks at first glance: A somehow marginalized literature focuses on the notion of ‘phallic architecture’ which is loosely conceptualized as the urban high rises that were intentionally or unintentionally built to symbolize phallus. While global examples of intentional phallic architecture usually serves as touristic attractions, psychology as a discipline rarely focused on unintentional phallic architecture. Given the scarcity of comprehensive works on this topic, this chapter tries to develop some psychologically-grounded arguments based on a few relevant sources.

Secondly, the chapter reviews discussions about urban quality of life and the notion of ‘skyscraped city’ from a psychological perspective, together with spatial segregation not only on class lines or ethnic lines, but also on the distinction between advantaged vs. disadvantaged urban residents including social capital relations.

Thirdly, the chapter connects the area of environmental psychology with the participatory approaches in the field of urban planning to extend beyond a critique of existing order by detailing a ‘planning for people, by people and with people’ framework. As stated in Gezgin (2011), environmental psychology revolves on research about the following: “*Psychological effects of urban policies; place attachment and place identity; perceptions of city image and urban design; pro-environmental behavior; transportation choices, urban navigation and commuting issues; urban noise, recycling behavior, energy-related behaviors, green identities; and perceptions, attitudes and information on green issues such climate change, global warming, sustainability, conservation, biodiversity, and mitigation measures.*”

---

1 Istanbul Galata University, Faculty of Arts and Social Sciences, Department of Psychology, ulas.gezgin@galata.edu.tr, Orcid: 0000-0002-6075-3501

Finally, as the backdrop to all these topics covered in the chapter, the debates on social engineering are on the spot, since the chapter conceptualizes psychology and architecture as two subareas of social engineering, following a holistic analysis of ‘authority’. The chapter plans to reverse-engineer psychology and architecture in this context.

## 1. Introduction: Phallic Architecture

Although it is a somehow marginalized area, the research on phallic architecture is significant as one of the bridges to connect urban architecture and social psychology of urban life. This significance partially arises from the fact that one of the first researchers who reflected on this topic is Henry Lefebvre who is one of the precursors of right to city movements (Kipfer, 2008; Moloch, 1993; Stanek, 2008). Ambrose’s ‘Visual Dictionary of Architecture’ defines ‘phallic architecture’ as *“tall buildings that consciously or unconsciously provide a symbolic representation of the phallus. Phallic architecture may take the form of phallic symbols, which were historically used to represent fertility, the male sexual organ and the male orgasm”* (s.199). Ambrose pronounces the Obelisk of Theodosius (Dikilitas) at Sultanahmet, Istanbul and the Olympic Stadium of Montreal, Canada as examples of phallic architecture. The former may be unintentional while the latter is intentional. However, Ambrose warns us: *“it would be naive to label all tall buildings as phallic symbols”* (s.199). On the other hand, Lefebvre is in favor of taking ‘phallic architecture’ metaphorically and metonymically (Lefebvre, 1991; Pile, 1996).

Leaving aside the metaphorical understanding, intentional phallic architecture has existed in the history and onwards as well as phallic worship. Priapus is the Greek god of fertility represented by permanent erection. That is why the disorder which corresponds to involuntary non-stop erection is called as ‘priapism’ (Merriam-Webster, 2013). Greek phallic worship survived in Bourani Festival at Tyrnavos of Greece, where phallic objects are used (Spiegel, 2008). Ancient Greeks and Romans are known to wear phallic amulets called ‘Fascinus’ against ‘evil eye’ (Smith, 1865, p.521). Likewise, in modern Thailand, phallic amulets called ‘Palad Khik (ปลัดขิก)’ are worn and exhibited at larger sizes for good luck as a Hindu-originated tradition. Bhutan in which walls are still decorated with phallic images had phallic worship in its pre-Buddhist religion (Pandey, 2005). Japanese phallic processions and worship (Kanamara Matsuri) have provided sensational pictures for travel magazines for so many years. Various phallic or phallus-decorated buildings have survived and are being built all over the world. It is clear that phallic

worship and symbolization were common in ancient history. However, this article limits itself with the modern times for methodological reasons.

In the history of architecture, *'architecture parlante'* ('speaking architecture') is a notable type for a discussion of phallic architecture. It refers to forms of buildings resembling their functions. The architects, Claude Nicolas Ledoux, Étienne-Louis Boullée and Jean-Jacques Lequeu are usually associated with *'architecture parlante'*. The most well-known example of it is Ledoux's plan of Chauvigny which was not implemented. In the plan, the brothel (named as 'the Pleasure House') had a phallic form (Singley, 1993).

Although most of the skyscrapers are not intended to be non-metaphorically phallic images, many of the high rises are interpreted as phallic images. Douglas (2004) describes the Empire State Building as follows: "*Above all it possesses a hard, dramatic sense of loftiness; it is phallic, eruptive, dynamic – seemingly unyielding to the elements and the passage of time. And tall, yes, tall.*" (p.107) Likewise, Kinnear (2011) calls the Empire State building as 'phallic' (p.32). A second example of an iconic phallic architecture is Norman Foster's Swiss Re Tower in London (also called as *'the Erotic Gherkin'*) (Sklair, 2008). As another example for 'the phallic reception', the following news could be noted: A British newspaper reports that a beehive sculpture is removed as it is considered to be 'too phallic' (Carr, 2012).

In art and architecture, verticality is usually associated with masculinity, whereas horizontality refers to femininity (Lin, 2010, p.46). Phallic architecture almost always makes the moment of erection permanent (Kartiganer, 1994, p.44). Westernization corresponds to masculinization in non-Western skylines. Horizontal skylines are verticalized (Lin, 2010). It may even be said that Westernization 'penetrates' the non-Western geographies (Lin, 2010, p.43) by a new affluent class and their architectural markers. Economic and social gap and the rise of finance-capital are reflected in the verticality of the skylines.

Moving from Lefebvre's notions of *'phallic verticality, phallic erectility and phallogocracy'*, Lin (2010) discusses Koolhaas' CCTV Tower and states that it is feminine compared to other towers. It might be interesting to note that CCTV Tower is called as *'the Big Pants'* by locals (Glass & Hoare, 2012). The director of CCTV considers it as a symbol of *'shaken hands'* (Lin, 2010).

Lin (2010) also considers the National Grand Theater and the National Stadium buildings as feminine (horizontal) structures. It should be noted that the stadium building is called as 'Bird's Nest' or 'Egg'. Sometimes, circular is contrasted with linear too (e.g. Lin, 2010, p.42), as the latter

appears to be more peaceful. Lin (2010) mentions the duality between the Big Tower building and All-China Women's Federation building in Beijing as an example.

In the most generalized form, metaphorically and metonymically phallic architecture signifies social repression, oppression and discrimination. High-rises dominate over the people, in contrast to the notion of human-scale architecture. To quote from Moloch:

*“Lefebvre illustrates, through historic and hypothetical examples (that vary in their degree of effectiveness), how competition over the production of space operates. A sort of master distinction is between those who produce a space for domination versus those who produce space as an appropriation to serve human need. In domination, space is put to the service of some abstract purpose (hence, Lefebvre’s phrase “abstract space” to describe the result). This can be to facilitate state power (e.g., the Napoleonic version of Paris and other “phallic” displays) or, more pervasively, the reproduction of capital. In the latter instance, space is carved into real estate parcels for exchange in the market, cubes and volumes demarcated and partitioned so as to be interchangeable as commodities” (Moloch, 1993, p.889).*

Lefebvre (1991) also contrasts architectural masculinity and femininity in another dimension:

*“The Phallus is seen. The female genital organ, representing the world, remains hidden. The prestigious Phallus, symbol of power and fecundity, forces its way into view by becoming erect. In the space to come, where the eye would usurp so many privileges, it would fall to the Phallus to receive or produce them” (Lefebvre, 1991, p.262).*

This dimension of visibility and invisibility can be applied to urban economy. The masses who toil for the construction of the city disappear in the skyscraped skylines. Disappeared are labors of all oppressed and repressed as well. The masculine exhibition hides female labor and femininizes all the ones that he has controlled and dominated. Phallic architecture not only signifies but also reflects and reinforces the patterns of social oppression, repression and discrimination. Psychologists need to work on the anecdotal evidence that phallic skylines are associated with alienation, social disintegration and learned helplessness. Phallic architecture and skyline are not only a set of buildings per se, they represent something else. They are monumental. They

act as memory and stamp of the social structure. The symbolizations of oppressed in cities and especially skylines are rare. Gezgin (2011) states that

*“just as Egyptian pyramids represent the ugly feat of slavery from a critical perspective, high rise buildings in Asia are clear signs of inequality and the triumph of inequality in Asian cities”* (Gezgin, 2011, p.15).

If phallic buildings are a matter of spectacle as Lefebvre (1991) states, camera angles need to be discussed. Phallic buildings are built to be seen from outside, not to be entered into. Usually they don't have tall interior roofs to be seen or photographed (that some of the mid-rise shopping malls have this property is notable). Only a minority of the spectators are allowed to enter the buildings. Both spectators and those who are authorized to enter are crushed under the power of the high-rises. Those who are allowed to enter can only be raiders (sperms) for the phallus in his capitalist conquest. In contrast, we define vaginal buildings as the ones that empower and calm down those who entered. Maybe this can be said for home as contrasted to house. However home is not the place where hierarchical structures are liquidated for women and children; instead they are reproduced at home. Thus, for many, home is far from the safe haven of uterus. For the vaginal building, entrance would be significant. Entrance could be in circular forms much like caves. This may transmit the feeling of trust for residents.

In this sense, buildings can be divided into two: Those for which it is important to be in vs. those which are expected to be viewed from outside. In contrast to the phallic buildings; theatres, cinemas, opera houses, stadiums, zoos etc. are in the first category. As in Lin's examples, they are nest-like and/or egg-like structures. It is obvious that some buildings can't be implemented as skyscrapers. Some types of buildings would not bring more benefit if they rise taller. (However, it is likely that in a Metropolis-like dystopia, such buildings could be skyscraped. For instance, stadiums could be built as circular skyscrapers with a hole in the middle. Rather than paying for seats, fans may pay the room rate. But this doesn't look like financially more viable than the tribunes.) Other elements of the urban skyline, such as the factory chimneys, hospital chimneys, crematorium chimneys (in Buddhist countries), TV towers, religious buildings and flagpoles need to be analyzed based on this distinction. The notion of '*architecture terrible*' which is behind the terrible pre-revolutionary façades of French prisons to deter the society from crime might be relevant for this discussion as well (Wiebenson, 1968). This point opens up the consideration of how architectural styles (e.g. post-modern, high-tech, expressionist etc.) differentially contribute to the phallicity of the capitalist architecture.

## 2. Skyscraping Race: Verticalization of Skylines

Following Lin (2010)'s discussion on the verticalization of the non-Western skylines, the analysis and discussion can be furthered. Asian cities consider high-rises as symbols of 'modernity', 'civilization' and wealth (Gezgin, 2011). In that sense, they are signature buildings not only from the eyes of the architecture companies but also from the perspective of the urbanites. Historic heritages (that means past phallic architecture) are left behind. The new high-rises are prestigious. If one builds the same number of units horizontally, it is less valuable. Thus skyscraping is financially rewarding for the companies. However, the same skyscraping decreases the available personal space for those who can afford high-rises and decreases affordability. Thus, psychological processes are involved.

In Asia, Tokyo and Hong Kong are followed by Shanghai in terms of the number of high-rises. The first two cities could be said to have so many high-rises due to space limitations. In Shanghai, before the advent of Deng Xiaoping policies in 1978, the high-rises of the city were a pagoda, an observatory, a customs house, an hotel, a warehouse and a bank. Shanghai has moved from religious and astronomical high-rise uses to uses as hotels, offices and mixed uses. In the recent years, office uses are replaced with mixed uses. In other words, skyscraping is residentialized. Kuala Lumpur exhibits a similar trend from high-rise hotels and offices to residences and communication towers. Before the verticalization of the city, postcard images of Kuala Lumpur featured the Mughal-style railway building and mosques; but the recent ones show Petronas and KL Towers (Gezgin, 2011).

In Tokyo, which has the third highest number of high-rises in the world, a government building survived as a high-rise. Tokyo rose by hotels and office spaces, but later on, government buildings were added to the equation. It is rare to see government high-rises in other countries of the world. Incineration plants and communications towers go in tandem with those high-rises as well. (Incineration chimneys need to be very high, so that urban air nearby won't be polluted.) Regardless of the homogeneity, it should be stated that a significant number of Tokyo high-rises are residential. It is also interesting to see that some of the high-rises are used for educational (universities) purposes. Some of the Tokyo bridges are considered as high-rise as well. Singapore exhibits heterogeneous uses of high-rises much like Tokyo. Residential high-rises are common. It is interesting to see that Singaporean authorities set construction limits for safety purposes. Skyscrapers are not allowed to rise taller than 280 m. Seoul is another city of residential high-rise boom. A high-rise hospital is visible in Seoul as well.

In contrast, a significant number of high-rises in Bangkok are hotels, which is not surprising if the share of tourism revenues in Thai economy would be considered. The three tallest high-rises are hotels in Bangkok (Gezgin, 2011). These characterizations show that Lefebvre's phallic architecture position needs revision, considering the prevalence of residential high-rises. At the same time, these may be viewed as exceptions.

The high-rises lead to urban heat island effect and micro-climate changes (because of their solid surface and the haze dome, the heat can't be absorbed by soil) and traffic congestion. Since most of the high-rises are private enterprises, they are criticized as they reflect privatization of urban planning which is assumed to serve the public. Another issue is the conflict between high-rises and historical heritage (Gezgin, 2011).

### 3. Urban Planning and Social Psychology: Methodological Issues

The study of phallic architecture necessitates a methodological discussion. Gezgin (2011) provides the following table for this intersection:

**Table 1. Differences Between Urban Pre-Implementation Research vs. Relevant Psychological Research**

Urban Pre-Implementation Research	Relevant Psychological Research
Mainly qualitative	Mostly quantitative
Spatial (involves maps)	Rarely spatial
Data-driven	Theory-driven
Practical	Theoretical
Descriptive and prescriptive	Descriptive
Knowledge is the by-product.	Knowledge is the main product.
Process is important.	Results are important.
Not experimental.	Sometimes experimental.

Source: Gezgin, 2011, p.66.

As can be seen from the table, mainstream psychology dramatically differs from urban research. Psychology mostly studies topics that are quantifiable. An implication of this is that only quantifiable phenomena involving a research topic are considered. Psychological research is rarely spatial; in fact, with its positivistic hidden assumptions, mainstream psychology searches for the so-called 'universal truths' about human beings. Local variations

are not valued. Maps are rarely used. Environmental psychology with its cognitive mapping methodology is spatial, but it is a minority position among psychological circles. Unlike urban research, mainstream psychology is theory-driven. This partially accounts for why mainstream psychology is criticized for being out of touch with social realities. Mainstream psychology always states that it is descriptive; and usually refrains from socially tangible recommendations. Recommendations are sometimes considered as out of the scientific realm. In contrast, urban research is both descriptive and prescriptive. That means urban research is asked and obliged to provide solutions for urban problems, transcending a 'research-only' approach. In mainstream psychology, knowledge is the main product of the research activity; while urban research considers knowledge as the by-product, since the ultimate aim is the implementation of an urban project. Urban research is rarely experimental, but psychology treats experimental studies as the most reliable. Finally, for psychology research, result is important; whereas for urban research, process is more important.

As can be inferred from this discussion, psychology needs to revamp itself to get an idea about phallic architecture. A qualitative, spatial, data-driven, practical, descriptive and prescriptive, process-oriented and non-experimental psychology is desperately needed to understand the psychological implications of urban life. As stated above, environmental psychology is the best candidate for this call (cf. Göregenli, 2010), but its scope and influence in psychology circles are still limited. Furthermore, the term 'environmental' in the 'environmental psychology' leads to confusion, as it has two distinct meanings: The first implies study of spatial issues from a psychological perspective, while the second involves researching ecological issues (Gezgin, 2011). In addition, the fact that 'phallic architecture' is a term originating from psychodynamic approaches causes difficulty of reception and interpretation among mainstream psychology circles, as psychodynamic approaches are not endorsed by many of the academic psychologists. Finally, as phallic architecture involves metaphors and metonymies as proposed by Lefebvre, linguistic analysis is necessary, which means that conventional boundaries of mainstream psychology are not sufficient to get a holistic view of the phallic architecture. Ditto for anthropological, sociological, ethnological and historical aspects of the topic. Gezgin (2011) mentions a line of research in environmental psychology which is very much relevant to the study of phallic architecture. That is the research on perceptions of architectural structures and elements, e.g. *'the uses and psychological meaning of living room'*, *'the evaluations of house façades on the basis of preference, complexity and impressiveness'*, *'residential satisfaction of students in Nigeria tapping social*

*qualities of the residences*’ etc. (Gezgin, 2011, p.58). As can be seen from the previous sections, although not intentionally built, people perceive some of the high-rises as phallic. That means there is a gap between construction and perception.

From a wider perspective, Gezgin (2011) lists the following as the most common research topics of environmental psychology: *“Place identity and place attachment; environmental attitudes; green attitudes vs. behavior; eco-practices; disaster planning; elderly-friendly cities; child friendly cities; urban crime etc.”* (p.58). Obviously, the notions of urbanophilia, urbanophobia and place identity and attachment are relevant for phallic architecture. A significant element of ‘urban’ that is liked or hated is the skyline. Urban skylines are also influential in urban identity and attachment. Postcard images of the cities could be investigated for historical change (Gezgin, 2011). Scannell & Gifford (2010)’s a framework of place attachment that has 3 dimensions (person-process-place) could be relevant.

#### **4. Phallic Architecture and Social Engineering**

As to social engineering and phallic architecture, it can be stated that:

*“In democratic countries, the voters have the power to appoint the local and/or central governors; but in some cases, they are not asked about what kind of a city they would like to live in. Urban skylines have been totally changed without notice of the public as if skyline is not a public good. Postcard images have changed quite rapidly, but the question is whether the residents are happy about it. Secondly, user participation is problematic in some of the high rise buildings, as future users have not been asked about what kind of a residential unit they would prefer”* (Gezgin, 2011, p.15).

Thus, phallic architecture and authoritarian societies in general are inherently repressive, oppressive and discriminatory. That is why, in a Foucauldian sense, architecture and psychology in particular and social sciences in general are designed and misused for social reproduction and control. If urban planning is not participatory, a country can be democratic only on paper. Nominal democracy is complemented with phallic architecture and social science from a Gramscian perspective. So Lefebvre is correct to state that phallic architecture is not only metaphorical, but also metonymical. Herman and Chomsky (1988)’s notion of manufacturing consent and Scott (1992)’s discussion of resistance could be useful for further elaboration on phallic architecture and social engineering. On the other hand, it is not reasonable to totally do away with social engineering, as it takes place whenever we have organized forces in a society. Society consists of a set of

organized forces, thus social engineering is inevitable. The question is not about whether social engineering is good or bad; but its scope, direction and character. Although social engineering has negative connotations, positive examples are known. For instance, affirmative action is also a form of social engineering (King, 2007). King (2007) contrasts affirmative action with eugenic breeding as positive and negative uses of social engineering and states that the former corresponds to egalitarianism, while the latter matches hierarchy. He proposes that a major difference between the two forms of social engineering is the following:

*“Eugenicists targeted the marginal and the weak in society, determined to excise their reproductive powers in the pursuit of a racially pure and stronger national stock. In contrast, affirmative action measures are designed to enhance the presence and capacity of their target population’s participation in American society and in direct reverse to eugenics, to make their future participation much greater”* (King, 2007, p.113).

Ramifications of these contrasts can also be considered for phallic architecture, if what is removed to build the high-rises would be analyzed, with a revealed preference approach.

## 5. Notes for Future Studies

Based on what has been discussed so far, some short notes are listed below to guide future studies:

1. In most of the cities, sport and art buildings are horizontal. However, they are vertical compared to low-rise buildings. That means verticality and horizontality are relative. Then we can infer that a city can be vertical relative to its skyline; but compared to other cities, it could be viewed as horizontal.
2. “Who has the power to erect his phallus over the city?” is the most important question. A distinction could be made between corporate phallus vs. governmental phallus vs. religious phallus (vs. historical phallus?). Community phallus could be another category, although it is rare. This can be connected with the depictions of Asian cities above.
3. From an anthropological point of view, the existence of power differentials before the agricultural society needs further analyses. Phallus precedes agriculture. On the other hand, the construction of phallic buildings necessitates settlement which is not guaranteed by

hunter-gatherer way of life. Phallic buildings necessitate agriculture, burial of death and city-states at the same time. City-state subjects mark their territory by tombstones first and then city walls. Metaphorically, nomads are without phallus.

4. Hierarchy is represented by being physically and psychologically higher. This can be connected with Lakoff's metaphor research (Lakoff & Johnson, 2008).
5. Phallic architecture can be investigated with regard to 9/11 attacks. This is not only the case because they were appalling, but they also effected the next generation of phallic architecture as can be inferred from Gezgin (2011): "*Shanghai World Financial Center was redesigned to minimize the human and physical damages in the case of a plane crash after September 11th*".
6. A case study can be conducted for a particular city about how urbanites perceive the high-rise buildings (c.f. Glass & Hoare, 2012; Wainwright, 2013).
7. A case study can be implemented for the monuments of a big city. Nude or near-nude female monuments (which are rare) can be contrasted with phallic monuments and those depicting males. It is interesting to see that implicitly phallic images are not considered to be obscene, while female body is considered to be so. This may be related with the patriarchal society.
8. An inventory of forms of buildings (e.g. tower, bridge etc.) can be checked and analyzed in terms of phallicity.

## 6. Questions for Future Studies

Definitely far from being conclusive, this article concludes with questions for future studies:

1. What would be the architecture of matriarchal societies? (This question is relevant theoretically and not necessarily historically (cf. the myth of prehistoric matriarchy in Eller, 2006)). Kennedy (1981)'s discussion of feminine principles of architecture and planning is a valuable endeavor in this vein. For this question, the notion of 'patriarchal architecture' in terms of design principles should be studied further.
2. In what ways could the distinction between inside and outside be connected with the social identity theory? It is true that phallic

landmarks forge an identity for the city and urbanites, but could they provide identities at other social levels?

3. If we relate horizontality with femininity and verticality with masculinity, in what ways can we link architecture with Hofstede's model of cultural differences focusing on dualities between competition and solidarity and power distance?
4. In discussions of phallic architecture, the motto is "*if it is not phallic, it is feminine*". What might be the critique of this otherization from a dialectical (possibility of the third option) and queer perspective? Transvestisms of shamans which are believed to gather the power of both males and females could be considered.
5. How could the notion of phallic architecture be connected with Jungian duality of anima and animus, as well as the Chinese notion of yin and yang?
6. What might be Karen Horney's contribution to phallic architecture discussion, keeping in mind that she counterbalanced the Freudian penis envy with vagina envy? It might be strange to see that feminism appears as an ally for psychoanalysis in this discussion of phallic architecture.
7. How are obelisks, monuments, steles and tombstones related from the phallic architecture point of view?
8. How could Lacan's "the signification of the phallus" could be linked with phallic architecture?
9. In what ways Freudian notion of phallic personality would be relevant for the discussion of phallic architecture?
10. Should we consider groundscapes which are skyscrapers that extend to the ground (Carmona & Freeman, 2005; Cheek, 2011) as feminine buildings, remembering Lefebvre's lines on invisibility? How could they be connected with the symbols of other forms of social oppression, repression and discrimination?
11. Phallic design principles need further discussion. Which design elements make a building more phallic? Soft lines or hard lines? Is the phallic perception also a function of length and/or the ratio of length and width? Does the appearance of ball-like supplements make the building more phallic? It is stated that domes represent female breast and tower represents phallus. When they are together

(as in mosques and in some of the churches and synagogues), can they be interpreted as the unity of male and female or male with balls? Are the gun and shield analogous to tower and dome in that sense? Considering the power of organized religion, is it possible that not the tower alone, but the religious building as a whole be phallic? The distinction between phallic buildings as symbols of patriarchy vs. oppression in general would be relevant here.

12. How could system justification and social dominance theories be associated with phallic architecture?
13. Could the existence of tombstone and mound in a cemetery be interpreted as the reconciliation of female and male elements?
14. How would evolutionary psychology interpret phallic architecture?
15. How would Jungian archetypes be applied to phallic architecture? Can there be a set of archetypes to classify architecture? Is it because of the archetypes in the 'collective unconscious' that people perceive phallicity in some high-rises?
16. How could heliports and metro lines of phallic buildings be interpreted?
17. In what ways could the hierarchical power of people ascending a minaret vs. the church bells could be analyzed? How are they related to the belief that taller structures are closer to celestial beings?
18. How could phallic architecture as landmarks be connected to the notion of 'the image of the city'?
19. What are the other body metaphors that are used or could be used to depict the city and its components (e.g. the lung of the city)?

## **7. Conclusion**

The abstract of this chapter set out a wide perspective that was too ambitious. Due to time and space limitations and methodological problems, the chapter could not deliver what the abstract promised. However, it can be comfortably stated that with its exploratory nature, it has the potential to contribute to research on high-rise buildings. The interdisciplinary character of the chapter and the questions posed are original contributions that need to be extended in future studies.

## References

- Ambrose, G. (2008). *Visual dictionary of architecture*. Lausanne: AVA Publishing SA.
- Carmona, & Freeman, (2005). The groundscraper: Exploring the contemporary reinterpretation, *Journal of Urban Design*, 10(3), 309-330.
- Carr, S. (2012). Beehive sculpture in Hyde park is taken down for being 'too phallic'. *Greater Manchester News*. Retrieved September 30, 2013, from <http://www.manchestereveningnews.co.uk/news/greater-manchester-news/beehive-sculpture-in-hyde-park-is-taken-685486>
- Check, L.W. (2011). Architects find their dream client, in China. *New York Times*. Retrieved September 30, 2013, from <http://www.nytimes.com/2011/01/16/business/16build.html?pagewanted=1&adxnlnl=1&ref=general&src=me&adxnlnl=1380485002-StXst/zAPoXvljTHx5na0Q>
- Douglas, G.H. (2004). *Skyscrapers: A social history of the very tall building in America*. North Carolina: McFarland & Company, Inc., Publishers.
- Eller, C. (2006). Sons of the mother: Victorian anthropologists and the myth of matriarchal prehistory. *Gender & History*, 18(2), 285-310.
- Gezgin, U.B. (2011). *Economics, environment & society: Planning cities at the center of mass/mess of the sustainability triangle*. Germany: Lambert Publishing.
- Glass, N. & Hoare, R. (2012). Koolhaas rewrites script with blockbuster buildings. *CNN*. Retrieved September 30, 2013, from <http://edition.cnn.com/2012/10/02/world/asia/koolhaas-big-pants-cctv/index.html>
- Göregenli, Melek (2010). *Çevre psikolojisi: İnsan mekân ilişkileri*. İstanbul: İstanbul Bilgi Üniversitesi Yayınları.
- Herman, E.S. & Chomsky, N. (1988). *Manufacturing consent: The political economy of the mass media*. New York: Pantheon Books.
- Kartiganer, D.M. (1994). *Faulkner and psychology*. Mississippi: University Press of Mississippi.
- Kennedy, M.I. (1981). Toward a rediscovery of 'feminine' principles in architecture and planning. *Women's Studies International Quarterly*, 4(1), 75-81.
- Kinney, S. (2011). New York's leading lady: The statue of liberty on film. In S.J.Harris (ed.). *World film locations: New York*. Bristol, UK: Intellect Books. (pp.24-41).
- King, D. (2007). The American state and social engineering: Policy instruments in affirmative action. *Governance: An International Journal of Policy, Administration, and Institutions*, 20(1), 109-126.

- Kipfer, S. (2008). How Lefebvre urbanized Gramsci: hegemony, everyday life, and difference. In K. Goonewardena, S. Kipfer, R. Milgrom & C. Schmid (Eds.). *Space, difference, everyday life: Reading Henri Lefebvre*. New York and London: Routledge (pp.193-211).
- Lakoff, G. & Johnson, M. (2008). *Metaphors we live by*. Chicago: The University of Chicago Press.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The production of space*. Maiden, MA: Routledge.
- Lin, X. (2010). *Children of Marx and Coca-Cola : Chinese avant-garde art and independent cinema*. Honolulu : University of Hawai'i Press.
- Merriam-Webster (2013). Merriam-Webster Dictionary. Retrieved September 30, 2013, from <http://www.merriam-webster.com/dictionary/priapism?show=0&t=1380463268>
- Pandey, G. (2005). Bhutan's phalluses warn off evil. BBC. Retrieved September 30, 2013, from [http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south\\_asia/4381893.stm](http://news.bbc.co.uk/2/hi/south_asia/4381893.stm)
- Pile, S. (1996). *The body of the city: Psychoanalysis, space and subjectivity*. New York: Routledge.
- Scannell, L. & Gifford, R. (2010). Defining place attachment: A tripartite organizing framework. *Journal of Environmental Psychology*, 30(1), 1-10.
- Scott, J.C. (1992). *Domination and the arts of resistance: Hidden transcripts*. Yale: Yale University Press.
- Singley, P. (1993). The Anamorphic phallus within Ledoux's dismembered plan of Chaux. *Journal of Architectural Education*, 46(3), 176-188.
- Sklair, (2008). Iconic architecture and capitalist globalization. In P. Herrle & E. Wegerhoff (eds.). *Architecture and identity* (pp.207-220). Berlin: Lit Verlag.
- Smith, W. (1865). *Dictionary of Greek and Roman antiquities*. Boston: Little.
- Stanek, L. (2008). Space as concrete abstraction: Hegel, Marx, and modern urbanism in Henri Lefebvre. In K. Goonewardena, S. Kipfer, R. Milgrom & C. Schmid (Eds.). *Space, difference, everyday life: Reading Henri Lefebvre*. New York and London: Routledge (pp.62-79).
- Spiegel (2008). Members only: The annual Phallus Festival in Greece. Spiegel. Retrieved September 30, 2013, from <http://www.spiegel.de/international/europe/members-only-the-annual-phallus-festival-in-greece-a-553070.html>
- Wainwright, O. (2013). Does Beijing's new People's Daily building remind you of anything? *The Guardian*. Retrieved September 30, 2013, from <http://>

[www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/architecture-design-blog/2013/may/10/beijing-peoples-daily-giant-penis](http://www.theguardian.com/artanddesign/architecture-design-blog/2013/may/10/beijing-peoples-daily-giant-penis)

Wiebenson, D. (1968). "L'Architecture Terrible" and the "Jardin Anglo-Chinois".  
*Journal of the Society of Architectural Historians*, 27(2), 136-139.