

Ludwig Fromm
Architecture and Social Sphere

Fundamentals of a criticism of Architecture

Muthesius Academy Kiel

Gestalt
and
DISCOURSE

Volume I
published by the
Muthesius- Academy
Kiel

Editors:

Hubertus von

Amelunxen

Klaus Detjen

Theresa Georgen

Dedicated to Dagmar Nordberg: her research, and the conversations
with her, as well as her patience made this text possible.

isbn 3-00-005768-4

All rights reserved.

© Copyright 2000 by Ludwig Fromm
und Muthesius-Hochschule, Kiel

Design: Ina Vehring, Kiel

Typesetting by Werner Dominke, Werkstätten der Muthesius-Hochschule

Reproduction and Printing by Wolfgang Becker, Werkstätten der Muthesius-
Hochschule

Translation: Miriam Manning

Printed in Germany

Table of Content

Architecture and Social Sphere

Introduktion

Baukultur ...

(The Cultural Domain of Architecture...)

9

Part one

Stages of the Cultural Domain of Architecture

15

Architecture Caught up in Tradition:

Architecture in Prestate Societies

21

Emancipation of Architecture:

The Architecture of the Regional Civilizations

29

Loss of the Centre ("Verlust der Mitte")

The Architecture of Global Civilizations

41

Part two

Baukulturelle Interventions

[Interventions in the Cultural Domain of Architecture]

59

(1)The Atmospheric

66

(2)The Organizational

76

(3)The Means Generating Meaning

86

Conclusion

...Wrapped up in the Architectonic Discourse

93

Bibliographie

96

Remarks as regards the translation:

101

Introduction

| In autumn 1979 a magazine was published for the very first time under the title "Baukultur" ["the cultural domain of architecture"].

|9

This unusual title was a term created by the editor-in-chief Paulgerd Jesberg.

Until then the term Baukultur had not existed.

Although the magazine could not manage to establish itself by way of determining a trend, its title as a linguistic term though has become an actual and lasting part of today`s vocabulary in the debate concerning architecture.

Baukultur is being written about, is discussed and disputed.

Two lectures given by Hermann Hipp during the years 1992 and 1994 (Perspectives of Baukultur) and Manfred Sack (Remarks on Baukultur) were the first attempts at an critique of architecture in the context of a dispute as regards the content of this multifarious, new term.

It has still not until now entered our dictionaries. Thus, even in the new Duden, one may only make out a semicolon amidst building subsidy and architecture and not, as would be appropriate, a definition of the term Baukultur.

As shown by the research of H. Hipp, the term "Baukultur" has been in common use in the architectural and subject specific context already since the outset of the 20 th century.

Colloquially, however, this expression has not been used frequently until the '80s of the century.

In their lectures Hermann Hipp and Manfred Sack assign the term Baukultur to the political sphere.

Sack speaks of "Baukultur is politics" and Hipp, identically, of "Baukultur is a political term".

Both Manfred Sack and Hermann Hipp consider the debate on the "the cultural spheres/domain of architecture" as a communicative, as a societal process.

10 First aspirations in respect to the cultural domains of architecture were found by the historian Hermann Hipp in the "...longing for harmonically unified forms of life, for an ideal world..." at the beginning of the 20th century. (1 /in: Hermann Hipp, *Baukultur und Stadtgestaltung*, Schriftenreihe des BDA Hamburg, No. 7, p. 18) He sees this desire for harmony embedded in the "...movement for reformation of the way of life at the turn of the century, which was infatuated by antimodern, antirational and authoritarian, ethnically national rather than social way of thinking ...". (2 / Hermann Hipp: *ibid*, p. 21). For Hipp the concern for the cultural domain of architecture has obviously, at the beginning of its emergence, conservative if not reactionary connotations.

Thus the roots of the term *Baukultur* may be traced back to the beginning of the 20th century. Still, the debate on *Baukultur* does experience significant consideration only after a long break during the Eighties. In spite of the entirely distinct historic situations at the beginning and at the end of the 20th century, a mutual logic can be perceived: in both eras there are controversial discussions on values, cultural phenomena of dissolution are registered and lamented, politically restoration is propagated, and architecturally/architecturally one looks backward.

In the meantime we have come to accept our modern society's lack of values. Theoretically we were able, with great accuracy, to define the difficulties as a state bereft of content, the "loss of the mental/spiritual centre" ("Verlust der Mitte") as it was still named by Seydmayr within the structures of the media-controlled capitalism of liberal democracies. Problems of meaning and value in our modern societies, we were thus taught by philosophy and sociology, are phenomena inherent in the system. Life has lost its "corset of values" ("Werte-Korsett"), as Norbert Bolz circumscribes it some way offhand in his book *Die Sinngesellschaft*.

This structurally qualified emptiness is not only of an abstract or academic significance to us. We experience it in a very concrete and individual manner as crises of identity, as a societal loss of solidarity, or, culturally, as a problem of complexity in a world ever more estranging itself from us.

As a result this deficiency, on the one hand, produces fears ("Surrogate Apriori", N. Luhmann) and, on the other hand, gloomy fictions of

solutions solving it all: a not altogether harmless starting point for the political debate.

This leads back to the term *Baukultur* and the activities, which these are supposed to aspire to or foster. Hipp and Sack told us something about the activists' motives: According to their conviction, the appearance of the term *Baukultur* may only be explained against the background of assessed losses of values or meaning, which again have their origins in the societal sphere.

In historic times, with the "elders", a hint on culture sufficed. There was no question yet of a specific, distinct culture. Today, each subject field has a culture of its own. Eating has its gastronomic culture, arguing its culture of debate, selling a culture of sale and building associates the cultural domain of architecture. Here too the signs of the increasing complexity of postmodern societies are clearly readable.

Baukultur, charged with content as analyzed by Hipp, also is no typical technical term as e.g. *Baukunst* (the art of architecture). Speaking of *Baukunst*, we refer to it as a term immanently inherent in the field of architecture, relating to the building process itself, the "proper" way of building. Functional, beautiful and stable it ought to be. *Baukultur* though does stand for much more. *Baukultur* as a conceptual term carries the connotation of a connecting meaning, in the sense of seeking contact. By means of the question of relevance, that is to say the question of meaning, the term intellectually connects architecture with society, with societal activities.

The term *Baukultur* does have an ambivalent character. It creates a critical energy when having demonstrated deficiency symptoms and losses of quality, whenever it is necessary to discuss and publicize, and it hopelessly goes downhill in the reactionary, the fundamentalistic, once the image of the supposedly attainable ideal ("heile") world is projected and leads us to believe in. Whenever the decline of the traditional is merely rated as an inattentiveness of history, which is supposed to be revised by a large and joint, at best national effort. "Those who request great achievements in relation to this debate on *Baukultur* are likely to be willing to foster the great men and women of action, the architects – particularly the powerful and energetic clients, particularly in the public sphere, particularly the state...". (3 / Hermann Hipp : *ibid*, p. 21)

After all, the term Baukultur is a term of debate and thus implies aspects of a moral code. The attentive addressing the cultural (as regards architecture) means to wish for the good. "This way architecture visualizes the hope for a harmonic organization of the world and its correlations." (4 / Hermann Hipp: *ibid*, p. 21)

This definition goes far beyond the scope of the merely political, and thinking transcends into ethical, into moral realms.

We are confronted with a dilemma: the – having turned proverbial – "inhospitable feel/inhospitality" ("Unwirtlichkeit") of our cities is increasing rather than decreasing. The visible, tangible chances of exertion of influence do vanish more and more. The central government hands over legal sovereignties to private responsibilities. Soapbox speakers talk about Baukultur, yet what they have in mind is the culture of sales promotion and they tend to deliberately forget pointing this out to their audience.

The structural conditions of our time stand for disintegration, the complexity of the postmodern society seems no longer to be controllable.

In this situation, what help does the theory of architecture offer us? Which professional answers, in an ever faster changing time, does the discipline architecture give us to our questions, – us, the professionals of architecture and our society?

We guess or know: there are not many. So, the escape into ever new -isms is understandable but unproductive. New perspectives and conduct are necessary. A first methodical assistance as regards the search for approaches is given by the cited above Bolz, when he challenges our attentiveness with the following sentence: "... Science must resist the probability of theoretical problems being turned into moral problems." (5 / Norbert Bolz: *Die Sinn gesellschaft*, Düsseldorf, 1997)

To create an academic nature for the reflections unfolded here means to illuminate the reasons behind them, which initiate, foster or even cause the loss of meaning and the supposed cultural decline. This is what the first part of the book is about.

Academic nature is not concerned with the knowledge of the newest trends in the glossy magazine. Neither does academic nature mean to adhere to a once confirmed analysis. Academic nature concerns the search for ways out, the capacity to evaluate what has been discovered,

to come to conclusions, to tread new paths. This is what I discuss in the second part of the book.

In this respect the text on hand is a contribution to the pure research in the context of the theory of architecture. And it is a contribution to the cultural domain of architecture, to Baukultur.

In the first part of the paper the developmental stages of architecture are described. In the course of this, the development of architecture shall be viewed not historically but structurally, in its relation to the societal changes.

For this reason and in order to clarify conceptual dissociations from the known methods of perceiving architectural history the term *baustrukturelle Phasen* (structural stages of architecture) shall be used. Architecture and society are examined in parallel for the sake of being able to demonstrate and systematize mutual dependencies.

In the second part, the fundamental theoretical principles are elaborated, which tie the efforts in the cultural spheres of architecture to the professional subject matter, to the discipline "architecture".

This is understood as a contribution to the objectification of the debate on Baukultur. Suggestions, taken from the analysis of the structural conditions of architecture, are made with regard to interventions in the cultural spheres of architecture (methods deduced from the technical subject field for the improvement of qualities in architecture). These suggestions refer to subject fields, which define the Gestalt (shape/manner/form) and thus the quality of architecture. What is discussed here are the atmospheric effects of architecture, the linguistic expression of space and Gestalt (form/shape) and the *Sinnhaftigkeit* (manifestation of meaning) of architectonic forms.

The interest of this paper applies to two phenomena at the same time: First, the meaningful influence of the societal on the structural development of architecture: a theme, which in this systematic fashion the theory of architecture has, so far, not known. Second, the interest of the creative work is drawn to contents, which still have marginal positions as regards the general, public perception.

Atmospheric and linguistic qualities of architecture may only be treated as peculiar or special themes by an architectural debate – still defined in a superficially aesthetic manner.

This paper proves the fact that the architectural work in modern societies is in need of the different and new instead of traditional ways of setting priorities. Work in the architectural sphere needs adjusting, as regards content and method, to the changed conditions of the structural sphere.

Not only the job outline of architects, that is the manner of organizing the professional frame of our work is changing, but also the contents and methods of our work need to be adjusted to the new situation of (post)modern interrelations caused by structure. The continuation of handed-down methods of working, their ideals, contents, techniques etc. leaves the professional architects to be romanticized warriors tilting at windmills, pitiful figures, honourable idealists who chase the wrong ideals with the wrong means at the wrong time.

Part One

The structural Stages of architecture

The developmental history of architecture may be told in various different ways. The manner of reflection also defines the narrative form. If the main focus is on the development of architectonic forms, other images and correlations are viewed, as if one were looking at variable perceptions of space and Gestalt. The spectacles, the filters always define the results.

For the first part of this paper, a viewpoint was chosen which the theory of architecture has so far not known or did make use of only reluctantly: the structural view.

The German philosopher Wilhelm Schmid systematizes ways of our perception in his book *Philosophie der Lebenskunst* (Philosophy of the Art of Living). (6 / in: Wilhelm Schmid: *Philosophie der Lebenskunst – eine Grundlegung*, Frankfurt a. M., 1998, p. 194 ff.) He differentiates between sensual, media-related, virtual and structural perception. “This kind of perception assigns to what one might call the ‘deeper view’, which tries to encompass, with theoretical effort, abstract correlations, which may sensorially not be captured and yet make up for the actual conditions marking the field of potential choices. Interest directs itself to all that takes place ‘subliminally’, beneath the threshold of sensuous perceivability and is what actually evokes the singular phenomena – a perception of what is not directly perceivable, an effort to see what is not visible. The sensuous perception of the singular and special issues of a situation is contrasted by conditions and structural features, which are to be cognitively deduced...” (7 / Wilhelm Schmid: *ibid.* p. 195)

This is just what the paper on hand is about: the structural characteristics of architecture.

This method of structural perception is supposed to help comprehend the conditions of architecture within time (in the course of time).

Therefore, the following expositions are laid out as comparisons: the structural characteristics of societal and architectural realities are discussed in parallel.

Three different stages of the structural development of architecture shall be outlined. Criteria for the chosen differentiations amidst the stages of the development present themselves in the way of qualitatively differing levels of relations between architecture and society.

Human beings “create” their history, mostly without knowing. Often it is just in retrospect that the historical logic discloses itself to us.

People acting amidst their social surroundings at the same time behave in an active as well as reactive manner, i.e., they initiate activities, active behaviour. Taken as sum total and viewed structurally they may be understood as features of the societal system.

Sociology assesses the effect of the work of so-called integrative forces as a process during which possibilities of human development are realized by and by.

The Brazilian sociologist Darcy Ribeiro – he was at times minister for Ethnic Affairs in Brazil – writes in his book *Der zivilisatorische Prozess* [The process of civilization]: “The sociocultural development takes place for the reason that limited possibilities of response to the same fundamental imperatives are realized amidst similar conditions. This leads to the repetition of parallel cultural forms and to the fact that uniform structures are produced, which allow for being classified inside a universal typology.” (8 / Darcy Ribeiro: *Der Zivilisatorische Prozeß* [The Process of Civilization], Frankfurt a.M., 1983, p. 23)

The knowledge of homogenized tendencies pointing the way during the course of the sociocultural development allows us to suspect that the much praised “free play of powers” is essentially defined by constraints.

In this context the respective literature hints at the effect of so-called “Invariants”. What is meant are entities of a fundamental nature or, at least, unchanging over long periods of time, which react to influences or to the applied transformations in a neutral fashion, i.e. invariant.

If one wishes to comprehend the evolutionary process as a system, the physical environment, – man as an individual and man as a social being – may be understood as communicating partial systems, participating in the developmental process; the special structures of these systems giving

the appearance of distinct constellations priority. Such structures are e.g. the “organisational principles of nature”: “...they direct the structuring of an organism, replace (one possibility) entities of organic life in time (how death functions in nature) and secure the precision of replication, i.e. they secure the probability that the reproduction of a system in its partial aspects can succeed.” (9 / Klaus Eder: *Die Entstehung staatlich organisierter Gesellschaften* [The Development of State-run Societies], Frankfurt a. M., 1980, p. 170)

Ribeiro, cited above, speaks of general conditions as well as three fundamental features of a non-cultural character and a number of factors of a cultural fashion when describing the forces regulating evolution: “The general condition lies in the similarity of shape, the uniformity of nature, amidst which humans act, by which humans are forced to adjust to physic-chemical and biological rules, which can not be influenced by civilization, by culture. The homogenizing effect of this condition mainly finds its expression in technology, which, in its manner of acting alongside nature, necessarily must meet nature’s requirements.

As an answer to these, we find, in all civilizations a minimum of objective knowledge and standardized productions. They exert a determinant influence on the other spheres of the respective culture. One might say that the logic of objects enforces itself on the cultures, the civilizations and challenges them to develop according to the assumption of its principles and by way of adjusting to these.

The fundamental characteristics of a non-cultural nature combine with these general conditions, in order to imprint all civilizations with the same principles. They relate to the so-called “human nature”.

First, it is all about the peculiarities deduced from the biological structure, which differentiate humans from any other genus: intelligence, flexibility, individuality and sociability – results of their biological evolution. This elementary uniformity impresses itself on all cultures and thus, along these lines, renders them essentially similar. It ensures that all cultures develop similar norms as regards adjusting to the environment, in order to win from it the material indispensable for the survival and the reproduction of the human genus (harvesting, hunting, fishing, etc.).

Second, it is due to the characteristics of living in groups, which the human genus requires for its evolution and its maintenance of cultural

models. They foster the social life of man and the interaction of, on the one side the reproduction of the genus (taboo of incest, families, relationship, tribe etc.) and on the other side, the economic production as well (division of labour, social stratification etc.)

Third, the peculiarities of a psychological nature have to be named. Though they are harder to define, yet they are responsible for the essential unity of the neurophysiological and mental structure of human beings; they lead to the fact that humans, confronted with similar challenges do find similar solutions.” (10 / Darcy Ribeiro: *ibid*, p. 23)

A further general condition of a cultural character is added to the enumerated preconditions: “It exists in the specific human ability of symbolic communication and is responsible for societal life amidst a cultural tradition, which, transmitted from one generation to the next, renders all later developments dependent on the previous heritage.” (11 / Darcy Ribeiro: *ibid*, p. 25)

The specific structures of societal systems are based on interactive relations among varying determinations, which decisively define the different spheres of a society. We may thus assume that human cultures as an historically concrete expression of societal structures developed and developed further within the bounds described above of so-called invariants and by way of the accumulation of knowledge.

The structural marking of three societal developmental stages drawn up here is not to be equated with an organization of the evolutionary process in the way of sociocultural formation as presented in the text by Ribeiro.

The organization I propose is less divided into small sections, since I did not want to take into account local, functional, historic peculiarities or those conditioned by evolution.

The defining criterion for tying up concrete historic societies into groups was the character of the codes of interaction by which these groups are distinguished.

This does require some explanations: The sociologist Klaus Eder, who had a critical look at the formation of states and primary class societies, compares societal principles of organization (in the way of structuring of human relations) with the genetic code of organic systems: “Principles of societal organization may be comprehended as symbolic codes, which

can increase the density of interaction in a society. Such symbolic codes enable a society to organize itself in the way of an interactive system...” (12 / Klaus Eder: *Die Entstehung staatlich organisierter Gesellschaften* [The Creation of State-Organized Societies], Frankfurt a. M., 1980, p. 171)

Niklas Luhmann, a social theorist and, besides Jürgen Habermas, the most well-known German sociologist at the end of the 20th century (1927 to 1999) does, in this context, speak of “Codes of generalized symbols” (13 / Niklas Luhmann: *Macht* [Power], Stuttgart 1988), which he comprehends as an institution in addition to language, and the functioning of which he sees in the directing of the communicative transference of the selective performances. “In addition to language, which normally guarantees the intersubjective intelligibility, i.e. the realization of the selection of the respective other as selection, communication media do thus also have a motivating function by way of suggesting the acceptance of different selective performances and assure that these are usually expected.” (14 / Niklas Luhmann: *ibid*, p.7)

This communicative “performance”, fostering the societal organization and its reproducibility, its stabilization and future reusability, is maintained in the evolutionary process by way of institutionalization, which means that distinct selective, limited ways of behaviour are coded in order to make human relations (interactions) calculable and keep them alive: interaction codes are created (Eder).

Codes of interaction having an evolutionary effect are marriage, power and monetary relations (on the basis of money as the interactive medium).

By means of interactive codes or, so to speak, methods of interaction, the formal societal structures can be described, which embody different highly developed forms of societal organization: the family-organized societies, the hierarchic societies and the multifarious forms of civic middle-class societies.

The interest of architectural theory in structurally defined stages of evolutionary processes of societal systems, i.e. of forms or types of society, is based on the assumption that significantly different conditions for the emergence of architecture appear with these rapid evolutionary developments of society.

The attempt at defining baustrukturelle [structural...] stages of architecture is divided in three respective sections.

In the first step the evolutionary stages are defined.

To achieve this, their structural characteristics are described. The evolutionary stages characterized in an abstract fashion are assigned to historic/concrete societies. (a).

In a second step, for each stage, the so-called "objectifying achievements of realization and the moral forms of consciousness" (Eder), are circumscribed, that is the stage of development of the cognitive structures, of our way of thinking in the respective phase (b).

With the last step (c) the specific, structural relations between architecture and society are demonstrated.

The way architecture is influenced by the societal structure is shown. This facilitates the description of the structural conditions of architecture against the societal background of a stage of structural architecture (baustrukturelle Phase).

Architecture Caught In Tradition: Architectural Construction in Pre-State (Archaic) Societies

(a) The Structural, Societal Presuppositions: The first period of the structural development of architecture may be set on a par with an historic period of architecture. From the perspective of historic architecture we are familiar with several terms relating to this period of the history of architecture. We read headings such as "Tiefkulturen" ("Low Cultures", i.e. societies at a precivilization, preliterate level), "Non-advanced Civilizations", "Primitive Peoples" and in the Anglo-Saxon world, when authors fell back upon ethnological literature, we read of "Primitive Cultures".

A historic categorization leads us to the time after the "Neolithic Revolution", i.e. the period of time from 5000 BC up to round about 100 BC.

The current forms of pre-state architecture, such as in Arctic, sub-Arctic zones, in South America, Africa, Asia, South-East Asia, Oceania, etc., may and must be included in these reflections. The most comprehensive compendium of existing early forms of architecture is mediated in the work *Architektur der Primitiven Kulturen* [Architecture of the Primitive Cultures] by Guidoni. (15 / Enrico Guidoni: *Architektur der Primitiven Kulturen*, Stuttgart-Milano, 1975) This book is part of the "World History of Architecture", a series by the publishing houses Belser and Electa, edited by Pier Luigi Nervi and highly recommendable.

To return to the early historical stages of architecture: the so called Neolithic revolution is triggered off by a developmental impetus in technology.

Techniques of building in stone for example create the means, i.e. the potential for producing effective tools. In parallel, humans learn to not merely chase animals but also to form close bonds with them, to tame, to domesticate them, to gather and make use of plants.

With the progression of this development, the dependency of man upon nature becomes increasingly inconsiderable. Life becomes more determinable, controllable. The changing of the world through the interference of mankind has been initiated.

Technological processes and those in terms of civilisation lead to new sociocultural formations and also to new societal forms of organization. The transition from the practise of mere gathering of food to the diverse ways of food production leads in the course of the historical development to a settled existence, i.e. to territorial fixation. As a result differing forms of societal organizations evolve: the archaic societies.

The societal structure of archaic societies can be characterized by the defining impact of relationships. Parts or elements of these societies are autark (self-sufficient) subsistence kinship groups representing productive units. "The archaic process of production is socially organized within the framework of households. Households are, at the same time, units of production and consumption; they are interlinked by way of obligations relating to kinship, not by way of hierarchical relations or economical dependant relationships. This differentiates the archaic means and ways of production from the other pre-capitalistic means of production. They represent the most primitive form of the socialisation of production." (16 / Klaus Eder: *ibid.*, p. 40)

The lack of hierarchical relations distinguishing archaic societies stands for a restriction of the adjustability of the societies built on the independency of the singular households in conflict situations.

For this reason a distinctive, regulative mechanism evolves inside these societies: the ritual.

Since the independent household fashions the economic foundation of archaic or Neolithic societies, an institutional set of rules, responsible for problem-free interrelations of the production units, can only be organized in a partially hierarchical manner. For this very reason too, the American sociologist M.D. Stahlin (17 / M.D. Stahlin *Stone Age Economics*, Chicago 1972, p. 199) calls the family organized societies "Systems Sans Rule". Out of a systemimmanent weakness the compulsive need accrues for system-integrative, system-stabilizing measures. These are explicit ideologies, which can guarantee a smooth course of development of

the economic processes of production and reproduction, such as is ensured by rituals for example.

As an integral part of the ideology, rituals work as regulative mechanisms. "They steer (direct)... interchanging relations with external, outward nature (technological, organizational rituals) and the integration of the internal, inner nature (therapeutic rituals), as well as the maintenance of social order (rituals of decisions, distribution, judiciary etc.)...One characteristic feature of how ritual systems act is to formalize communicative contents and, in a restrictive manner, to qualify their meaning; the ritual formalization is an adequate mechanism for stabilizing the absence of alternatives in respect to social standardizations." (18 / Klaus Eder: *ibid.*, p. 28) The distinct meaning of these rituals for architecture shall be set out later in full

(b) The Cognitive Preconditions Defining Philosophy (Views of the World), the Conception of the World: The life of Neolithic societies may be characterized by its particular closeness to nature, which also defines their philosophic images. Nature here delivers a model.

Jean Piaget, a Swiss psychologist, a pioneer in the field of modern educational methods, writes on the theme of nature and cognitive structures: "... the point of reference for the shaping of cognitive systems is the image of external nature; this image of external nature changes the conceptions of the world by way of objectifying experience." (19 / Jean Piaget in: Klaus Eder, *The Emergence/Evolution of Governmental Societies Organized around a State*, Frankfurt a. M., 1980, p. 152)

Nature was interpreted as "order of perfection" (20 / Lucien Sebag: *Marxism And Structuralism*, Frankfurt a. M., 1967, p. 12), which was to be copied and achieved. Knowledge and consciousness, practice and morals find their orientation in nature as a model, which was adopted as "divine model".

The transition from the Paleolithic conception of the world is conceived as the transition from animistic to mythological structural patterns of thought. The technological progress in the Neolithicum fundamentally changes the attitudes of man towards nature. The predictability, and thus the controllability of nature increased. Man learnt how to tame wild animals and to breed, how to cultivate plants in the quantities required. These new skills, newly discovered knowledge

and opportunities press for integration into the “view of life”, they claim a place in the imagination of man. The patterns of thought, the cognitive models of hunters and gatherers can no longer “explain” agriculture and farming. An interpretative deficit presses for the restructuring of the explanatory apparatus. “The wild (erratic) way of thinking culminates on a par with the increasing domination of the external nature in a symbolic construction of the world, which, in a new fashion, interprets nature in respect to culture: the evolving “mythological views of the world” thematize the causal connection of the world no longer as an impersonal dynamism of forces but rather as an interactive connection of acting subjective beings.” (21 / Klaus Eder: *ibid.*, p. 52) Godelier names this cosmos of mythological philosophy (view of the world) a “monistic correlation of effective/efficacious activity” (22 / W. Godelier: *Economical Anthropology*, Reinbek, 1973), in which nature and culture respectively culture and nature act analogously.

(c) Structural Conditions of Architecture in Pre-State Societies

In pre-state (pre-governmental) archaic societies architecture is perceived as “right” and “good” only if it takes place in direct correspondence with a divine model, which is part of the actual societal organization and thus part of the societal structure. “Building... is always referred to as a divine model, which is to be faithfully imitated and which is part of the aggregate referential models invented once and for all by the building spirits (or the ancestors).” (23 / Enrico Guidoni: *ibid.*, p. 29)

The structural distinction of architecture caught up in tradition is the identity, the simultaneity of architecture and society. Identity of architecture and society implies that architectural forms are evaluated in one and the same interpretative manner by all members of a group or society.

This identity of architecture and society in pre-state societies does not allow much scope for architecture. All architectural elements are distinctly defined. Production and handling of architecture are regulated by tradition. Architecture has an “ahistoric” impact: In such a way as if it had always been there in its current form. The applied model is regarded as perfect, not in need of change in any way. Changes of architectural forms, the materials, constructions etc., by way of influence of foreign systems of value, hit the existential nerve of a society, or they

express societal developments, which are already installed and mark the end of the societal identity.

One may explain this principle by taking the example of the North-American tipis. We know the tipi from countless, mostly second-rate western films. It is the type of housing of the Prairie Indians such as the Sioux, the Blackfeet, the Crow and other tribes.

The gestalt-shaping component parts of this tent are defined by explicit, exclusively precise descriptions. The shape of a space, of a body and the way of restrictive marking are laid down in a canon. Deviations would endanger the holistic idea. The tent-construction of a tipi is very much like a construction kit.

The singular parts are tree trunks, ropes, stakes, skins or canvas lengths, which are tailor-made in a distinct fashion, strung together and stitched up. Naturally, the tent is produced in different sizes. But, between the outer cover, the size and the proportion of the construction underneath, there is a geometrical connection, meaning that the tent canvas only fits together with a foundation of poles and bars of a quite specific size and shape: The relations between and among the elements of the construction system (construction kit), the tipi, are unambiguous.

Its structure has no capacity for development. Though, in the special case of tipi, it is possible to exchange the traditional material for the cover (boundary/demarcation), the bison skins for the cloths of white merchants, yet, the relationship between the tent’s elements, the construction (cover-foundation) are not affected by this. Not even the interpretative conduct of the users of these “cloth-tents” suffered from this action in any provable way. As ever, the cover, the membrane, symbolize lightweight lightness, the heavens, the universe. (24 / also read: Ludwig Fromm: *Tipi/Ba nag/ Berber Tent, Image*, 1985)

The evolutionary significance of static construction systems in pre-state societies cannot be explained either technologically or economically. The construction systems of the Hopi (pueblos), the Sioux (tipi), the Berbers (black tent), the Massai (kraal), etc., may only be understood against the background of the respective societal situation. After all, not only the manner of the technology of their manufacturing is controlled by rules, but also their usage. The handling of architecture in pre-state societies is a part of the societal aggregate activity. The existence of “house rules”

(25 / Reginald and Gladys Laubin: *The Indian Tipi*, Ballantine Book, 1957), in a tent or a hut, for example, must be judged not merely as regards function, i.e. as a strategy of avoiding conflicts in a psychological or sociological sense. The regulation, the rule, the house rule, is much more than that. It is a fundamentally responsible medium, by means of which a learning and teaching process concerning valid societal systems of values is guaranteed.

Thus, architecture in its most natural, original form is a concrete instrument of social life. Life in a tent, in a hut or similar constructions, with one singular room mutually made use of, in which family life takes place in a spatially unregulated way, presents itself against this background as less of a shortcoming – it would be regarded as “normal”, i.e. our own point of view (namely the northern European one, at the beginning of the 21st century), taken as a norm-predicting view in our modern perspective – but rather as factual chance, maybe even as necessity to maintain and to mediate current, valid systems of organization and orientation.

In this context it is interesting to once again draw attention to the conceptual term Ritual. Because of architecture’s system-stabilizing functions and mechanisms of ritual formalizations, in addition to purely functional tasks, standardizing functions are demanded to be provided for by architecture. These standardizing functions become supportive of concrete contents of meaning, which reach far beyond the linguistic tasks of architecture known today. Singular constructive or functional elements (a tent pole or a doorcloth) were, though produced individually, treated and named (given a name). Yet they received their justification as part of an aggregate entirety, and this as a specific, as a particular part of a specific aggregate entirety (construction kit).

In case of an architectural form linked with a ritual significance, the architectural element turns into a medium of meaning. This means that originally genuinely functional, profane architectural parts, such as e.g. a tent cover, but still “arbitrarily” binding for all members of a specific society, a specific social environment, that these parts are combined with a meaning, a significance. Symbolic interrelations are created and established.

With many authors there is unanimity as regards the fact that the backgrounds of the ritual couplings of meaning here described are, in

essence, defined functionally. For one, in respect to the system-stabilizing tasks of the ritual complex, but also, as we can read in Enrico Guidoni (26 / Enrico Guidoni: *ibid.*, p. 9), in respect to storing knowledge, and as memory aids (hunting grounds, hunting strategies, technologies of cultivation etc.).

Thus the ritual symbolization mechanisms do have diverse target directions, objectives. These may be of a functionally, communicatively and organizationally or a more mnemonistically fashioned character. In any case they have an impact on architecture the way of linguistic processes do: they create, respectively, mediate a meaning.

Systems of pre-state societies are structured horizontally, they are based on family relations (kinship relations). Their elements, production and consumption units, are self-sufficient autarkic households. The organizational principles of pre-state societies, not based on hierarchical relations, are thus, in the sense of the capacities for organizing themselves, to be evaluated as comparatively primitive (“regulated anarchy”). Controlling functions are taken over by “ritually structured systems of action” (Eder), which, against the background of a symbolic construction of the world (cognitive models of archaic societies), as interaction models of mythological balances of power depict the necessity for a fulfillment of divine laws.

Architecture, as (immediate) instrument of social life, becomes integrated directly into this range of tasks. The Architecture Caught up in Tradition, architecture in pre-governmental, pre-state societies, like wise and at the same time, fulfills its instrumental (practical and organizational) functions (creating space and order). It (architecture) is part of the ritual formalization processes and thus part of society itself.

The architecture of archaic societies is, for reason of the depicted identity of architecture and society, structured in the very same manner as the society itself. It functions like a construction kit. The explicit interrelations between the elements of the “construction kit” (singular component parts, constructions, etc.) define their character.

Ritual meanings are ascribed to functions, construction and form. These are, in other words, semantically specified and interpretatively standardized.

Looked at from a very general point of view, the developmental processes may be comprehended as a selection procedure. When deciding, we choose from existing differing possibilities. Here, the influence of the societal, the social structure is regarded as a constraining frame, a limitation of options, against the background of which the selection procedure takes place. By means of societal conditions, a decision structure (conditions of choice) evolves, which is responsible for the fact that formal similarities at specific places, during specific periods of time become established at all.

As already described, the regulations in archaic societies are enormous. A construction kit, as we all know, precisely presupposes component parts and the ways of combining these parts. The system of architectonic means also is limited: The combinations, the relations between singular component parts (construction kit parts) are definite, fixed and explicitly defined.

The semantic function of architecture also is clearly sketched out: Architecture as spatial system takes over organizational tasks amidst the society.

This happens on the basic preconception of the fundamental linguistic capacity of architecture, its ability to mediate and transfer meanings in a linguistic sense. (See also Part 2, The Organizational). One linguistic task of architecture is the demonstration of differentiations, of differences inside the social make-up of archaic societies.

Taking the ritual coupling of architecture and society, a second semantic function of architecture can be deduced. Besides purely organizational tasks, architecture just the same has the task of representing values. The decorative painting of a North-American tipi gives away some kind of message about the owner, for example it may "report" on his hunting successes. By means of their strong symbolic force, the tents present some part of worldview, world-concept; they are themselves part of a narration, a tale, which interprets the world. On top of this, social hierarchies can be conveyed and represented by means of differing sizes and distinctive sites of the tents.

The semantic function of architecture thus unites aspects creating order/structure and representing values the like.

Emancipation of Architecture: The Architecture of Regional Civilizations

(a) The Structural, Societal Presuppositions. The second significant period of the history of the structural development of architecture sketched out here belongs to the era of the evolution and continued existence of the "Regional Civilizations".

It is the period of the cultural prime of the Egyptians (2000 B.C.), the Babylonians (1800 B.C.), Assyrians (1200 B.C.) and Byzantium (1025 B.C.), Islam (651), the period of Carthago (600 B.C.), the period of Greece (450 B.C.), the Roman Empire (27 B.C.), the Ottomans (1460) and, in South-America, the heyday of the Inca-civilization (1400).

Progress in the field of technology and organization made up for the sociocultural presuppositions for archaic societies to develop, to change into new formations in the evolution. In the respective literature they are summarized as regards content under the conceptual term "Urban(e) Revolution". (27 / read V. Gordon Childe: Social Evolution, Frankfurt a. M., 1968)

New technologies in food-production such as irrigation, the introduction of the plough and fertilizing, new techniques of defence and the consignment, shipment of goods (merchandise) (shipping, vans, wagons pulled by domesticated animals) allow for growth, and in "reverse" demand for an adaptation of the organizational structures of these societies developing further in respect to the newly established societal conditions.

The "regulated anarchy" of the family-organized (kinship) societies no longer does justice to the claims for organization of developing, complex societies. The internal organizational principle of archaic societies changes inevitably and makes more and more adjustments to the existence of differing sociological levels (sections) pressing for political

influence. The end of the subsistence economy, a form of production exclusively tailored onto the immediate necessities of making a living, is bound to approach. The new manner of handling the economy, marked by the fundamentals of the division of labor, evolves into affluent production: from just about subsistent to more than required, this is what the development now issues into. Abundant affluent supplies of products create the presuppositions, the conditions for trade, commerce and the socialisations and conventions associated herewith.

30 Normative family-links, kinship interrelations gradually lose their significance, their importance. No longer does affiliation, the sense of belonging to singular families now rule the interrelations among people, but rather does the affiliation with societal sections define societal life and increasingly determines the societal interactions.

“The basic motivational powers of these social differentiations derived from the technical innovations. They required the regulation of the distribution of affluences in the society, enforced the necessity to put pressure on other groups and to install this as power, and, just as well, to organize the societal life of extensive groups of people. This challenge met only relatively few organizational answers. One was the introduction of private property in terms of land and slaves. The other kept the free access for all to joint landholding and combined this with political and religious regulations of societal life, which furthermore were an incentive to increase productivity and to accumulate wealth.” (28 / Darcy Ribeiro: *ibid.*, p. 66)

With both these differing organizational reactions to an evolutionary development, two quite distinctly different processes in terms of civilization were initiated, in the course of which the sociocultural formations of states of (skilled) manual workers, of craftsmen evolved, which were oriented either collectively (City States in Mesopotamia, in Egypt, Memphis, Theben and others, Phoenicians, Cretan Etruscans, Russlanders, the so-called African “Kingdoms” and others) or towards privatization. A third way was presented by the development of the formations of shepherds towards pastoral people leading a nomadic existence (the Hethitians, the Huns, the Berbers, the Mongols, etc.)

Along this pattern, archaic societies developed three ways of life: the rural, the urbane and that of the tribes leading a nomadic existence.

From a factual perspective and with the view on the internal societal structure of the societies, all these formations were of a vertical kind, i.e. put into hierarchical strata.

In the course of the urbane revolution, technological means are developed, which fundamentally reduce the dependencies on the physical environment.

The forms of political organization are structured in such a way that the plus to be expected in the economic activities of a society can be monopolized by a small societal stratum.

For the majority of mankind the Urbane Revolution directly leads into servitude or slavery. The Urbane Revolution initiates the transition from the archaic form of society to the Regional Civilizations.

These entail such different cultures as those of the Egyptians, the Babylonians, the Assyrians, the Greeks, the Romans, the Islamic, the Byzantine Empire, the diverse forms of feudalism and many others.

As we know, none of these social systems issue into new sociocultural formations. They collapse and fail on the grounds of their size.

Their civilizations are finally suffocated by feudal stagnation. The three-class society begins to unfold. The well-known picture: aristocracy and clergy shoulder on the peasants. The church, the religion here serves as a factor of integration, becomes an institution. “...It alone preserves the conception of an autarky of the occident and the idea of a shared common destiny.” (29 / Jean Becher: *The Evolution of Capitalism, in: Religion and Societal Development, Frankfurt a. M., 1973, p. 137*) The scattered, spatially separated communities picture themselves, in spite of the predominant fragmentation (and the inability to act that goes with it), as a community: as the community of Christianity. At the beginning a merely representative upholder of cultural bonding and minority religion, the Roman-Catholic church acquires, by and by, the right of disposition over economic life and stabilizes the hierarchical structuring of society into classes.

The organizational foundation of the second stage of a structural evolution of human societies as discussed here may be explained by the impact of “power” as the code of interaction.

All formations described, as well as the differing forms of feudalism, if perceived structurally, may be explained in the same way.

Their formal characteristic features are:

differentiation and specialization on the one hand, and centralistic vertical hierarchical structuring tending towards dictatorial regimes on the other hand.

The replacement of the interaction code "marriage" did not, in the course of further developments, lead to a dissolution of the family and its sociological significance, but rather reduced, respectively superseded "the natural equality of kinship and lineage relations" (Eder) in favor of functional differentiations, which, in most cases, were vertically oriented.

The emergence of the class societies is the result of that kind of developments. The so-called "pillared" society – the class society – is a heterogeneous society.

Well-balanced living, side by side, of complex family structures was replaced by a mutually dependent conflict of differentiated and hierarchically-linked social strata. The necessary cohesion of these sectioned societies is guaranteed by principles, which enhance a society's capacity to control itself, which again is achieved via self-regulating mechanisms.

The dominance of societal sub-systems, which take over steering functions, varies according to the organizational foundation of the society. In the kinship-systems, this was the ritual system, in the state-organised societies (organized around a state), this is the system of traditional rule. (30 / Klaus Eder: *ibid.*, p. 180 ff.) The system of traditional rule historically comes to the fore in the form of centralistic control systems.

(b) The Cognitive Presuppositions Defining the Conception of the World (Worldview). Societal reorganization not only includes technical and social areas, spheres of human life, but it also has an impact on the predominant patterns of interpretation, the cognitive structures influencing the way of thinking.

Earlier on I explained the closeness between man and nature in the worldviews, the philosophies of the Neolithic period. The option of intimate closeness, which I described – the analogy between outer and inner/external and internal nature – is abolished by way of technological inventions as described, allowing for interventions, a changing of and,

later, controlling domination of nature. The craftsman no longer lives in direct dependency on the omnipotence of the forces, of nature, of the gods. Increasingly he succeeds in withdrawing a certain part of his reality from the powers of the gods and the mighty predominance of the forces of nature. Space and time are thus rationalized.

Man is enabled to develop theories about nature. A system of explicit knowledge emerges, which reaches far beyond the stock of common knowledge passed on by word of mouth. "Rationalized images of the world set themselves apart from the traditional cosmogonies (myths of the origin and evolution of the world: author's remark) and search for a new, logical reason for the worldly order: cosmologies evolve. Cosmologies reflect the relation between nature and communicative action in the way of a causal relation; the emerging dogmas are grounded in a natural order, yet they are no longer structurally on a par with nature." (31 / Klaus Eder: *ibid.*, p.154)

The High Religions and state-ethics develop in the way of perceptions of nature, society, man, his position in (amidst) the world being unified as/into systems.

Thus presuppositions for free, creative innovations just as well as ethically founded restrictions are established, which serve the development of the complexity of societies just the same as the stabilization of societal order.

(c) The Structural Conditions for Architecture in Hierarchical Societies With hierarchical structures asserting themselves in societal systems, the relation between society and architecture is also newly defined.

Whereas system-integrative, i.e. system-stabilizing factors in archaic societies (ritual mechanisms) provoked a static system of architecture, (in the context of construction, I used the term construction kit), the centralistic forms of power initiate a process of the Emancipation of Architecture.

This new development comprises the end of the static handling of architecture. New architectural elements can develop, old ones may be varied or put into new contexts.

The transition to open-form- or space-systems creates the preconditions for once again adjusting architecture to the developing

societal system, to link it up again, so to speak, and it becomes possible to condition architecture anew as instrument of the societal life. The structural change in types of societies also initiates a structural change in architecture.

With the transition from family-defined (kinship) societies to hierarchically organized societies, the statically defined usage of architectonic/spatial systems is made more dynamic.

The adjustment of architecture to a new societal stage of development does not, even partially, presuppose technical innovations. An important step forward, speeding up evolution, is the process of the removal of taboos as regards architectural elements. Originally precisely defined relations between singular component parts (Element-Relations) are devaluated, and new, or so far avoided options of connecting architectural elements can be tried and tested. In this way architecture withdraws, at least partially, from the decisive influence of the ritual sphere.

The development of new technology now allows for exchanging traditionally used materials with new ones (for example, stone instead of wood for sacral buildings) or promotes the introduction of new construction systems and, naturally, also new design principles. The new, creative handling of architecture leads to until then unknown spatial or creative solutions (as regards design) and multiplies the amount of creative options and thus options of solution.

But, here too is valid: not all variants establish themselves as solutions. The selective power of the hierarchy of societal representatives with the right of disposal successfully counteracts the diversifying tendencies, i.e. the tendencies towards diversity, with restrictive, system-stabilizing actions with a homogenizing impact.

The control function of centralistic systems finds its expression in the segregation (isolation, separation) of – in the sense of central power – functional subsystems. Thus, a kind of division of labor is introduced. Particular spheres (societal partial systems, subsystems, functional systems, in the respective literature one finds differing terms here) adopt over special tasks within the society. Construction (architecture) thus is no more everyone's concern but the task of specialists/professional experts.

Architecture is fitted into the structural organization of the societal system becoming ever more complex and thus also more complicated,

and it (architecture) does so as an integral part of the latter, in the form of a partially independent (functional) system of the society in its own right. The identity of architecture and society, characteristic of family-organized (kinship) societies, is replaced by principles of system-amalgamation.

The overall (aggregate) general societal system forms an associated system, which is organized vertically as system-hierarchy. Architecture presents itself, within the societal system-hierarchy, as a system in its own right, alongside other systems. Thus it complies with the main characteristic feature of dynamic systems: it is integrated into an aggregate system, yet it develops an autonomous (autarkic) logic, its subject specialism, as one could say.

Architecture as an integral part of the societal aggregate system also fulfills, in addition to utilitarian functions (namely to create space for the practical circumstances of people's lives), functions stabilizing the system. In the centralistic societies, architecture fulfills its instrumental task by way of generating systems of signs as so-called "forms with the power to control system quality" (Schapiro).

The conceptual term style imposes itself in this connection. What is meant is not style as an individualistically distinct form of expression of, say, artists or architects, but rather style as a general core phenomenon, as architectural or artistic style.

Style-generating processes can be detected, once forms/shapes, or, more generally, once qualities, for example of architecture, become determinable, following distinct aesthetic forms of perception and presentation, once it becomes likely or standardized that we are confronted with formal structures, once style allows for being explained, ascertained as an aesthetic norm or aesthetic code. Once we are confronted with a building, which, up to then, we had not perceived, neither in reality nor in literature, and we are able, without undertaking research, to fit it into a formal or historical context, are able to name it Gothic or Romance depending on the given situation, then its formal structure refers to a distinctive stylistic concept, in a manner, which we can comprehend.

Such style-generating processes are linked up, connected with historical, cultural and thus, quite generally, with societal

presuppositions. Three such presuppositions are of particular significance in this context:

- The existence of a central power, which has at its disposal means and institutions, which again are able to shape their suitable perspective in a binding manner, spreading it and, for an historically defined period of time, stabilizing it by way of aesthetic/artistic standardization.
- The lack of possibilities (means/ways), in addition to that of architecture, which can express societal elemental facts in a readable fashion with little effort (32 / read in: Martin Warnke: Construction and Superstructure, Frankfurt a. M., 1984) and
- The existence of a formal, aesthetic system of expression with an open structure in architecture.

According to systems theory, “style” can be defined as an indicator of the frequency of probable relations between singular form-defining elements.

This is to say that certain relations and combinations (forms of decorating, organizing, spatial sequences, etc.) appear more often than pure chance would allow for.

Designing in stilistically defined, determined stages is standardized to a certain degree, if we, for example, understand the standardization in the sense of expecting the relation most probable to establish itself. The logic increasingly becomes comprehensive in a concrete manner, if we for once closely scrutinize the self-evidence, which makes us assume that to design in the Renaissance means to work with the architectural canon of forms of the Renaissance. On the grounds of these contexts and their inherent logic, we are capable, as described, of assigning buildings, which we are completely unfamiliar with, to their respective architecturally historical periods. The intermeshing of architectural elements is no longer explicitly determined as it was in pre-state societies (structural principle of the construction kit), but rather has become probable, has become the norm, has been standardized.

Arnold Hauser, an internationally acknowledged art theorist, views “style” as a “Gestalt-term” (33 / Arnold Hauser: Art and Society, Munich, 1973, p. 94) and thereby hints at the phenomenon of structures

remaining uniquely the same albeit with changeable features, a correlation (context), which is also known in Gestalt-psychology. (34 / read in: Wolfgang Köhler: The Tasks of Gestalt-Psychology, Berlin, 1971)

With the help of an example taken from music, Hauser attempts to explain the closeness between style and the term of Gestalt.

He explains: “One also recognizes (...) a melody, if it is played in another key differing from that one heard before. It is the complex make-up, the context, the sequence of intervals, which is very well expressed by means of the tunes, yet not in the tunes, which renders it recognizable in spite of the fact that all that may be heard, all actual sounds changed. This complex, this structure is not less real than the single resounding tunes, even though it is not manifestly obvious; in any case we experience it directly and do not deduce its existence on the grounds of reflections and speculations. As regards artistic style one is confronted with a similar phenomenon.

Just like a complex musical structure, there also is a style of the Renaissance as an objective, collective creation as contained in a work of art by Leonardo or Rafael, with just the same unambiguous reality.” (35 / Arnold Hauser: *ibid.*, p. 94)

In the structural stage of architecture encompassing the Emancipation of Architecture, the spatial, aesthetic and linguistic capacities of architecture broaden, because ritual linkups of meaning and definitions of combining, on which the unity of structures of architectural phenomena in pre-state societies were based, cease to be in force (forcefully obligatory).

Architecture is integrated into the communication process of the newly developing types of society. The structural similarities between architecture and language, known to us today, are evolving further in a continuous fashion.

The removal of taboos initiates the transition to open Gestalt-systems as regards forms. The manifestations of this process are consequential effects of the change of meaning, but also the loss of meaning of architectural forms, shapes, component parts or of entire objects.

In a linguistic sense, architecture has gone through an enormous change from its beginning up to today. The house, in which we live, does not symbolize a cosmic idea/image for us, it is our home, the place we live in: a functional building, which we like or, at times, do not like.

A North-American Tipi embodies the whole universe for its builder, whereas for the white settlers the same tent stood for threatening, menacing savage unruliness and was thus not allowed to be built in reservations. Today a tipi is a distinct type of tent, which perhaps evokes childhood memories, memories of things past, romantic, of nature, adventure. A considerable change in meaning has taken place, but just as much a loss of meaning.

A symbol of understanding, agreement and arrangement, a convention loses its power and its forceful statement, meaningful message, and, yes, even its capacity of stating meaning in the course of the change in the societal and thus also the cultural conditions, against the background of which the meaningfulness had been agreed upon. An image, an iconic sign loses its forceful impact to the very same degree as the original (object) to be epitomized loses its impact and meaning or eludes completely from the awareness, the consciousness of a society.

In the history of architecture four differing processes of transition have led to changes in meaning, respectively the loss of these (meanings). We perceive the following:

- In the course of their development, architectural forms are fashioned by different materials (tree-pillar / stone-pillar, column). The historians speak of material substitution.

- Architectural forms are connected, by means of convention, i.e. agreement, with specific distinct meanings; here the respective conceptual term is symbol creation.

- o Architectural forms and shapes are torn out of their original context and are inserted into a new linguistic context at a later time or simultaneously at another place. Here, art history uses the term reception (the description of the acceptance and ideational adaptation of works of art).

- o Architectural forms “survive” the sociocultural conditions of their time of origin and thus lose their historic ties with and the restriction to a specific cultural context. The forms are assimilated (assimilation) (36/ “Large periods of the history of architecture give evidence... of a continuity of motives, which are integrated into changing contents” in: Norberg-Schulz, *The Logic of the Art of Architecture* (Baukunst), p. 162) in the way of spatial and formal structures by new societies.

This tendency towards the uncoupling of original meanings and their very concrete forms, component parts and pictorial nature, their vividness is of great impact for the development of the semantic function of architecture. Now, the transitions of meaning are no longer merely joined to, connected with the concrete, the conventional well-known imagery. Recognizability can now be created structurally, by means of putting them into relations with each other's shapes and component parts in order to create models. Thus, the linguistic capacity of architecture could be broadened and enhanced.

The option, the chance to reflect architectural processes set apart from the construction kit-thinking of architecture caught up in tradition in a more general manner made it possible to develop formal systems, which allow for setting up semantic structures outside the specified codes.

New manifestations (of a technological, social, cultural or some other nature) came to the fore searching for new forms. Idea and reality met in a new pictorial context. Since (because): “It is only by way of perceiving the form that the contents of the ideas, conceptions, of the typical can be comprehended, since the form itself is a statement of the reality of the ideas (conceptual images) – and vice versa.” According to this sentence, written by the Austrian architect Georg Schöllhammer, the stage of the linguistic perception is broadened by the typological perspective. (37 / Georg Schöllhammer: “Nachgedanken” (Post-Reflections/Afterthoughts), in: *Um Bau 4* (“On Architecture /Construction/Building”), Austrian Society of Architecture, Vienna, May 1981, p. 13 ff.) A lot has been written on the conceptual term of “type”. Yet, clarity has only rarely been achieved. The article mentioned above presents a positive exception. Schöllhammer has succeeded in extrapolating in a comprehensible manner the connection between a collective striving for expression and architecture, between “the semantic system of a distinct collective” and the “multiple formal systems of architecture”. Of particular significance here is the statement that a “type” in a linguistic sense not only refers to a function, but also defines the latter, or “has [it] at its disposal”, as Schöllhammer enunciates it. (38 / Georg Schöllhammer: *ibid.*, p. 14) Forms of an arbitrary nature, the target of which is the mere production of pictures, which, as regards form, wear out and exploit the traditional typologies,

do not give justice to the ambivalence of the architectural form (referring to function and defining it).

This theme will be discussed in much greater depth later on. The Architecture of the Regional Civilizations is the architecture of hierarchically organized state-governed entities (confederational entities). As an autonomous (autarkic) structural stage it follows the "Architecture caught up in Tradition". The structural peculiarities of this stage were circumscribed with the terms emancipation and style.

40 This formal emancipation of architecture is achieved because of (on account of) the fact that the ritual ways of relating meanings come to an end. Function, construction and form are not any longer attached to ritual meanings as they were in the archaic societies. Thus architecture achieves its relative semantic openness.

The hierarchical structure in the respective societies favours and promotes the development of styles. The decision structures (conditions of choice), which define architectural processes, foster open formal systems with a tendency towards stylistic restriction. The relations between single formal elements of one style (parts of jewelry and buildings) are now aesthetically coded.

The semantic function of architecture is directed towards presenting differentiations, the generating of hierarchies and, as well, the presentation of value-systems. Thus architecture takes over a spatial system of organizational tasks, interpretative tasks and value-presenting tasks.

The formal emancipation of architecture just as well as the generating of styles favor a process of speeding up the aesthetic development of architecture.

"The Loss of the Center": The Architecture of Global Civilizations

(a) The Structural, Societal Presuppositions: The conditions for the first two stages of a structural development of architecture are, as described, to be found in the archaic societies and the so-called Regional Civilizations.

A third structural phase of architectural development is linked up with the development of Global Civilizations.

The structural issues, which provoke and initiate the developments into Global Civilizations, are described, in the respective literature, as a "Mercantile Revolution".

Historians name, as the most important cause of the Mercantile Revolution, rapid developments in the field of the productive technologies. Thus, for example, steel production increased with breathtaking speed. Iron foundries emerged, rolling mill techniques were developed. Machines, which today seem naturally self-evident to us, such as the lathe, drills and grinding machines, were constructed and successfully put to use. A further acceleration of development was induced by warfare technology.

Completely new weapon systems were developed: Firearms, heavy artillery, naval artillery. With the help of these new technologies Europe gradually yet finally freed itself from feudal stagnation. The process of establishing the new capitalist economic system in Europe and later on in the New World was a process entailing manifold intermediate stages. The breakthrough of the capitalist means of production can be depicted in the Mercantile-Capitalistic Empires (Ribeiro) in England (around 1650), in Holland (around 1650) and in France (around 1700). These created the presuppositions of far-reaching social re-organizations and the further development connected herewith.

41

The “market”, the a priori symbol of capitalist activities, first developed nationally, later internationally, and was a consequence as well as a precondition of economic efforts, by which skilled trade corporations were changed into manufactories and then, later, manufactories into factories. We speak of the “Industrial Revolution”. The factory owners and thus the owners of the means of production, pay the workers and privatize the profits produced.

Following the feudal regression, together with the establishment of capitalism, a new development is initiated in the cities. (39 /Darcy Ribeiro: *ibid.*, p.132) The number of people living in cities increases and thus the need for food for the city dwellers (inhabitants/population). Many smaller landowners now produce for the emerging urban market. Conflicts with the old “patriarchal clientele”, which claimed large parts of each harvest for themselves, are now geared to becoming unavoidable. The pressure on the farmers to produce more effectively accounts for the constant increase in production. “Old norms disappeared, norms, which still had obstructed the commercialization of the agricultural production. Land turned into private property and was fenced round, communally owned fields and the traditional pasture rights were done away with. In consequence, the community structures defined by subsistence-activities and neighborly help break down, while contracts of employment become asserted more and more as free and legal relations between workers and employers.” (40 / Darcy Ribeiro: *ibid.*, p. 132)

Yet, the wealth produced during this period in time is just partially a result of technological innovations. In large parts, the entrepreneurs` profits are simply based on robbery and exploitation. Gold, silver, diamonds and workforce are squeezed out of the colonies and make up for a steadily increasing potential of available capital for the expansion of the national economy, which managed, even after the “loss” of its colonies, to develop and grow nonetheless. Technological inventions contribute to a gigantic acceleration, increase in work productivity, which by itself again causes a mass production. A radical change of the societal structure became necessary in order to guarantee the sociological and political presuppositions of these new conditions of production. On the one hand, the work force, laborers in sufficient numbers had to be available everywhere, on the other hand the level of consumption had to

correspond with the output of state-of-the-art means of production. To put it simply: all that is produced must be sold.

Against the background of a structural discussion, as carried out here, the new issues of these capitalist civilizations are to be seen in the fact that they create a system, which defines its economic development by way of a self-motivated fashion, an urging to achieve more. The momentum of the economic system is based on the causal connection between production and market.

An expansion of wealth and political power, a maximization of profits, and the domination of the global market become the most important targets, but are also the existential conditions of the industrial capitalist economies.

“Henceforth, the core feature of the new formations is the compulsory force, the obligation to maintain and continually perform, with no interruption whatsoever, technical progress and accumulation of capital.” (41 / Darcy Ribeiro: *ibid.*, p. 148) As regards content, this core feature defines the specific form of self-organization in industrial capitalist societies. Viewed structurally, the social relations among people in bourgeois capitalist societies are mediated by means of money, or rather by way of the options money allows for. The phrase “You are what you possess” expresses this context in a catchy way. Or to indeed put it another way: The means of interaction, or rather more correctly the medium of interaction in the bourgeois society is money.

The then existing state-organized societies establish goods for sales markets, which are steered and controlled by way of symbolically generalized relations of exchange, i.e. by way of the medium money. Yet, only with the exclusion, the separation of the economy from the state organization does this medium generate a structure-forming impact on the societal system. The sociologist Jürgen Habermas established the fundamentals of a critical social theory in his work *The Theory of Communicative Action* from 1982. (42 / Jürgen Habermas: *The Theory of Communicative Action*, Frankfurt a. M., 1982) In the following, I shall repeatedly refer to this significant work: here, in the context with the characteristics of media-directed (media-steered) societies; later on, by taking into account the separation of system and society as demonstrated by Habermas. This kind of uncoupling or separation has

to be seen as a mechanism, which, emanating from the societal sphere, quite naturally has an impact on architecture as well.

The significance of his contribution to Critical Theory is of such enormous relevance as regards a perception, a viewing of architecture, because Habermas was able to demonstrate which kind of influence administrative and economic systems have on the lifeworlds (translator`s note: this term(“lifeworld” = “Lebenswelt”) has been adopted from the translation of the work of Habermas by McCarthy, and this conceptual term is explicitly defined in Habermas` work) and the fact that people acting rationally are in a situation enabling them to change life-defining norms. A society may have an awareness, a knowledge of itself and may use this position in the interests of its actors. (translator`s note: this term (“actors” = “Handelnde”) is taken from the authorized translation of Habermas) The modern media-directed society lives on the simultaneity of the artifacts economy and administration. With their mutual referring to each other, they create a social structure, which is defined by the medium money in a differentiatingly depicting manner. “...once money turns into an intersystemic exchange medium, it creates structure-forming effects. As a monetary steered subsystem the economy may constitute itself merely inasmuch as it regulates the exchange of its social environments by means of the medium money. The complementary environments emerge for the reason that the production process is converted to labor and the apparatus of state is coupled again, in a reverse process, on the grounds of the revenue from taxation of the employees (laborers), with the production. The apparatus of state becomes dependent on the media-directed subsystem economy; this way it is forced into a reorganization, which leads , amongst other issues, to the fact that political power gets aligned to the structure of a steering medium, that power gets assimilated by money.” (43 / Jürgen Habermas: *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 25) A comparison of the interaction codes described so far with the interaction medium money makes the latter appear as the most abstract medium to promote respectively to maintain communication.

This abstract character of the interaction medium money gradually has in tow the form of “rationality” of communication, the contacts

between, the mixing up and mutual understanding of people in our daily lives, which stands for the cold-heartedness of relations “defined by (so-called) practical constraints”. The practical constraint refers more to the abstract logic of the interaction medium than to the contents of the issue, which stands for negotiation.

As background for this rationality Habermas depicts, in addition to and on top of an increase in the system-complexity of modern societies, a related process of differentiation, which continuously and ever more separates System and Lifeworld. Since this effect does have a great impact on architecture, we should have a closer look here.

The theoretical conception of the society Habermas works with issues from the taken-for-grantedness of the simultaneity of system and lifeworld. Both make up society. The dominance of the one over the other leads to rejections, dismissals, to risks for the society as a whole.

System is the sphere of the interaction media. It is defined by means of the logic of generalized exchange-relations. The interaction medium money steers, in a self-organizing fashion, its own dynamism.

Habermas conceives of Lifeworld, a conceptual term originally coined by the philosopher Husserl, as a “reservoir of taken-for-grantedness, of unshaken convictions” (44 / Jürgen Habermas: *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 189), that participants in communication, the people of a civilization or a society, draw upon in co-operative processes of interpretation. Habermas writes in this context: “The structures of the lifeworld lay down the forms of the intersubjectivity of potential communication. It is to them that participants in communication owe their extramundane positions vis-à-vis the innerworldly items about which they can come to an understanding. The lifeworld is, so to speak, the transcendental site where speaker and hearer meet, where they can reciprocally raise claims that their utterances fit the world (the objective, the social, or the subjective world) , and where they can criticize and confirm those validity claims, settle their disagreements, and arrive at agreements. In a sentence: participants cannot assume in actu the same distance in relation to language and culture as in relation to the totality of facts, norms or experiences concerning which mutual understanding is possible.” (45 / Jürgen Habermas: *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 192)

By his proceeding in the way of looking at system and lifeworld simultaneously, Habermas analyzes the social evolution as regards the aspects of differentiation between system and lifeworld.

He perceives and considers the differing relations, which have evolved between system and lifeworld during the course of the societal development and can thus depict stages or levels of distance, as Habermas calls it, between system and lifeworld.

|46 The practice so far followed up in the text on hand, which was to structure societal developments in stages (archaic, hierarchical, capitalist or media-directed societies), may be found in Habermas in the form of a description of differing distance (i.e.: different levels of distance) between system and lifeworld.

We read in Habermas: "On this plane of analysis, the uncoupling of system and lifeworld is depicted in such a manner that the lifeworld, which is at first co-extensive with a hardly differentiated social system, becomes demoted ever more to one subsystem among others. In the process, the system mechanisms become unhinged further and further from the social structures, by means of which social integration is performed. As we shall see, modern societies attain... a level of system differentiation at which increasingly autonomous organizations are connected with one another via delinguistified media of communication. These systemic mechanisms steer a social intercourse that has been largely disconnected from norms and values, that is to say above all in those subsystems of purposive rational economic and administrative action that, on Weber's diagnosis, have become independent of their moral-political foundations." (46 / Jürgen Habermas: *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 230)

In order not to endanger the maintenance of the social system, the systemic mechanisms though are embedded in, tied up with the lifeworld.

In capitalist societies, this happens by way of institutionalizing the medium money as a bartering medium. Systemic interrelations in societies with a low level of system-differentiation, as with archaic societies, are still tightly connected with mechanisms of social integration. In rather more differentiated, more highly developed forms of societies, the spheres of norm-free, media-directed structures develop continuously: thus, the impact of the systemic grows.

"Media of communication, which do not operate linguistically (Power and Money), develop complex nets of interaction in social systems, which differentiate themselves from linguistic communication by the fact that they have an effect in a norm-free manner, this is to say without claim for consensus formation. Consequentially, lifeworldly contexts and interactive procedures can be uncoupled. Media, such as money and power, encode a purposive-rational attitude toward calculable amounts of value and enable a generalized, strategic exertion of influence on the decisions of other participants in interaction while circumventing linguistic processes of consensus-oriented communication. Inasmuch as they do not merely simplify linguistic communication but replace it with a symbolic generalization of damages and compensations, the lifeworldly context, in which processes of reaching mutual understanding are always embedded, is devalued in favor of media-directed interactions: lifeworld is no longer needed for the co-ordination of action. This again has the consequence that lifeworldly contexts can be uncoupled from interactive procedures." (47 / Jürgen Habermas: *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 273)

|47

To put it rather more simply, this means that there are fewer and fewer situations in our daily lives, in which the linguistic "acting", logical or moral arguing generate the jumping-off position for solving conflicts. Ever more situations are structurally defined by means of money. This is the way we, for example, get hold of the apartment we want, not because of the fact that we need it and would be able to justify this need, for example by reasoning that we are entitled to it in a morally or existentially defined way. We get the apartment we wish for, if we can pay for it. As plain and straightforward, as mundane it is.

The separation of system and lifeworld as mentioned above is understood, in its most simple form, as a differentiation between the co-ordinations of action as described: Actions are either put into balance functionally, or actions are coordinated by means of consent, the mutual agreement of the participants in communication. One peculiarity affecting us all, which can be deduced from the impact of the mediatization of the lifeworld, I would like to mention in this context. Sociology has recognized the problem of the fact that the mediatization of the lifeworld cannot be considered as one of the processes, which "are available thematically amidst the lifeworld" (Habermas). This way

they cannot, subjectively, be perceived at all or are very hard to perceive, and yet they can be deduced from the formal conditions of communicative acting. Habermas writes: “The subjective inconspicuousness of systemic constraints that instrumentalize a communicatively structured lifeworld, takes on the character of deception, of an objectively false consciousness. The effects of the system on the lifeworld, which alter the structure of contexts of actions in socially integrated groups, have to remain hidden. The reproductive constraints (reproduction forces), which instrumentalize a lifeworld without diminishing the ostensible autarky of the lifeworld (without weakening the illusion of its self-sufficiency), must, so to speak, hide in the pores of the communicative action. From this follows the emergence of a structural violence, which, without becoming manifest as such, seizes the form of intersubjectivity of potential mutual understanding. Structural violence is exerted by way of systematic restrictions on communication; it is anchored in the formal conditions of the communicative action in such a manner that the interrelated context of an objective, social and subjective world gets prejudged for participants (the participants in communication) in a typical fashion.” (48 / Jürgen Habermas: *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 278)

But, after all, communication is not merely medially differentiated out. Thank God, the resulting one-sidedness would be abominable. It is not in all situations of daily life that communication takes place in fundamentally “money-regulated” manner, without language and without arguing. A part of the societal life is defined, furthermore and well into the future, in a communicative fashion. This means that, for our daily life, there exist two different “mechanisms of action coordination”, which is the way Habermas puts it. Thus, there are two alternatives to define societal reality, alternatives to make decisions in the societal sphere. Their differences have been clearly demonstrated to us by the sociologist Habermas: By his way of asking, which meaning something said or done may have in a specific situation and declaring that the respective meaning is dependent on the willingness of the other to assume that what is said and done is right. According to Habermas this “willingness to accept” a communicative or action performance depends on the reputation and the influence exerted by the actor. He

considers two quite different conditions for the development of this readiness to accept communicative or action performances, and in doing so, Habermas differentiates between “motivated ties” and “motivated trust”.

Motivated ties develop empirically, for instance, by means of stimuli, by means of deterrence, physical strength or physical attractiveness, cognitive-instrumental capacities (skills) and disposition over property. Motivated trust or confidence develops rationally, by way of justified agreement/consent in the case of interactive soundness of mind: strength of will, credibility, reliability/trustworthiness, that is to say, cognitive, expressive and moral-practical virtues of action (performing) oriented to validity claims (needs for validity, credibility) and the possession of knowledge at one’s disposal. (49 / Jürgen Habermas: *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 277 ff.)

“Media such as money and power attach empirically motivated ties, whereas generalized forms of communication such as, for instance, professional reputation or value-commitment, that is moral-practical leadership, rest on a specific, distinct variety of, in a fundamental sense, rationally motivated trust.” (50 / Jürgen Habermas: *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 272)

(b) The Cognitive, Philosophy (Conception of the World/Worldview) – Oriented Presuppositions. Whereas the rational worldviews were still defined by the manual dealing with and handling of nature – the craftsman made use of nature for his purposes – the technical orientation of modern perspectives is the consequence of the engineer’s method. His aim, his goal is no longer merely the use of the forces of nature, but rather the unconditioned dominance of the latter.

The evolution of conceptions of the world can be perceived as a learning process: infinitely manifold subjective, ever changing perceptions construe an edifice of ideas. Since such processes have roots in all areas of human existence, they are characterized by a complexity hardly to be managed or coped with. Seen as an analysis, a handling of the problems of nature (including human nature), being made use of and interpreted, the process may be described by means of two quite distinctively different conditions:

- on the one hand, it is marked by the continuous, steady increase of our cognitive and practical knowledge and

• on the other hand it is a selection process, since knowledge is made use of.

But: not the aggregate knowledge, rather we choose according to different criteria. At times it is opportune as regards politics, at other times as regards economy, and again at another time it is opportune as regards ethics to do the One and not the Other.

This also is the reason for the fact that philosophical (in the sense of conceiving/viewing the world) systems do not define societal systems of organization in a direct fashion, but they do put forward, as Klaus Eder enunciates it, “new schemes for the construction of a societal communication context.” (51 / Klaus Eder: *ibid.*, p. 156)

“Models”, “role-models” so to speak, are developed, or, put differently, organization propositions are construed, which, if they serve the stabilization, meaning, if they increase a society’s capacity for dealing with conflicts, merge into societal organization principles; and in this case they then fulfill an explicitly clear function, in the sense of system stabilization as mentioned elsewhere, i.e. the preservation of the communality, the polity.

But, this also implies that only one specific answer to a socially relevant formulation of a question is accepted.

A choice is made, knowledge is selected in a sisting and insisting manner, for example it is put to use in order to bring a new technology further, such as genetic engineering, for instance.

The surmounting of the feudal regression by way of the Mercantile Revolution setting in dissolves (eliminates) the corporate order of society. This is followed by a moral re-orientation setting in, which immediately generates issues of social conflict. A divide opens up between individual will and the old state-governed order and its legislative systems, and an irreconcilable, intolerable situation evolves.

“ The problem of a new mass morality turns into an urgent one, it becomes necessary to supplement the legally established minimum of morals by means of a religiously or otherwise morally oriented magnitude.

At the same time, a new formulation of the moral question develops for that part of the upper classes which does not directly participate in the capital production process. By way of the elimination of the class-

doctrine, and the capitalist behavior asserting itself, the binding forces of tradition get lost, the question arises, in which way the individual, having lost all roots, would have to act and react to face the new way of life in the future.” (52 / Franz Borkenau: *The Destruction...in: Syfahrt, Constans, Spondel, Walter: Religion and Societal Development, Frankfurt a. M. , 1973)*

Archaic Societies with their “natural” social systems defined the life of their members completely and absolutely, right up to the most intimate, private spheres. Regional Civilizations, hierarchically organized, still opened ways to sufficient patterns of interpretation and meaning amidst the social system by means of their “nature-oriented co-operative” milieu.

Mercantile Civilizations, particularly during the industrial-capitalist stages, tear people away from these interrelations, these contexts and throw them – if one wants to put it that way – back onto themselves: human beings are depicted as the central core of scientific research.

Thus the cosmologies, but also the High Religions, – in Europe, Catholicism – lose their relevance, their meaningful importance. During the pre-industrial period, this place is taken up by Protestantism. At the beginning of the 20th century, the sociologist Max Weber examined the interrelation between religious teachings and economically motivated action. (cf.: Max Weber: *The Protestant Ethics and the Spirit of Capitalism.*)

There now exist differing essays and assumptions, approaches, relating to this theme. There is a consent in much of the research work as regards the way they describe the reasons for Protestantism taking over during the Reformation period as “structurally” motivated.

Causes must be looked for in controversially defined images/conceptions of God: while Catholicism teaches the immanence of God, Protestantism refuses this concept and substitutes it with the image, the conception of the transcendence of God. The immanent God is the God of the hierarchic, centralistic systems of rule, which are aligned with a unified entity embodying the good (i.e. what is considered as “good”) and aims. With all activities of the ruling authority, the public welfare ranges before particularistic (economic) interests.

The logic of the capitalistic economy is oriented, aligns itself in a fundamentally different way: here it is especially the particularistic

(economic) interests, which define the dynamism of the system. The consent maintaining the ruling authority is replaced by a compromise stimulating the economy. The morals adjusted to the situation must allow for the safeguarding preservation of particularistic interests on a par with the execution of social power. Only Protestantism was able to solve this dilemma. Alongside the doctrine on the rejection of the immanence of God, the teachings of the depravity of human nature and the predestination (theological doctrine saying that all and everything happening in the world is predestined by the will of a personified God) create an inexhaustible reservoir of moral justifications for a behavior not respecting the public welfare: "In the Protestant redemption-economy, faith, which makes divine mercy possible, means fiducia, which means trusting that God shall never inflict the rightful punishment on human beings." (53 / Guy E. Swanson: *The Birth of God*, in: Syfarth al., *Religion and Societal Development*, Frankfurt a.M. , 1973) This problem shall not be more closely examined here. Yet, this excursion into Protestantism – Capitalism discussion illuminates the transition from interpretative patterns of the religious systems onto the scientific-technical conceptions of the world, banishing religion into the subjective sphere of patterns of justification.

The separation of church and state is the institutional expression of this development, which, at that time, de facto had already been completed. "Lucien Fèbvre demonstrates in a marvellous book that a new reasoning for the world order had to be found beforehand, in order to allow for the disbelief to triumph. For this purpose, nature as a conceptual term had to be brought in, which then has been successively stated more precisely, broadened and extended by science. But, atheism has been celebrating its triumph only since the 17th, and most of all since the 18th century...The result of this all-encompassing movement, which Max Weber named the *The Demagicalization of the World/ The Demystification of the World*, is not the complete elimination of all religious issues, but rather a retreat into the private sphere or into fringe groups." (54 / Jean Baecher, in: Syfarth)

"The scientific-technical conception of the world is no longer ontological cosmology, but rather a categorial frame for the symbolic construction of reality: language turns into an object of formal, cognitive

thinking; nature turns into an object of systematic classification (biology) and physical theories (the classical mechanics) ; society turns into an object of a theory of exchange relations. The symbolic construction of a normative order inside the framework of a new scientific-technical conception of the world is governed by the restrictive imperative of the cognitive rationality as achieved in the 19th century; religion, which so far had supplied the patterns of interpretation for the normative orientations of action, of behavior, is pushed back into the sphere of subjectivistic patterns of justification. Actions, behavior are aligned in an immediately, directly practical fashion: the socialistic idea unfolds a role model for a universalistic communality acting in a socially oriented manner; this replaces the idea, traditionally handed down, of a universalistic community of religiously faithful believers." (55 / Klaus Eder : *ibid.*, p. 157)

(c)Structural Conditions of Architecture in Media-directed Societies: The structural peculiarities of architecture in global cultures, so-called media-directed societies, can be deduced in particular from two developmental processes as described here:

- the mediatization of the communication processes in these types of societies and the – as researched by Habermas –
- effects of a continuously progressing separation between system and lifeworld.

For architecture, a mediatization of communication processes affecting the whole of society implies the increase of systemically defined decision-making processes. This is to say that, as a result, one has to start from the assumption of an increase of decision-making, which unfolds according to the pattern of the motivated relating connection already described (see: (a)). Ever more singular decisions during the course of constructional building are handled, for example, according to marketing criteria. Every architect's office knows of the discussions about architectural qualities with the respective clientele, and also of the frustrations, once the persuasive powers fail to work. These discussions are not merely about competing arguments but also about communication structures with and against each other. The clientele, without questioning it, makes use of the motivated connection, whilst

the architects are left with no more than the principle of motivated trust. More and more often building schemes are initiated and realized by means of financial policy strategies, issues which here shall not be discussed further. The interrelations between state-sponsored projects, within the framework of tax and credit politics, and constructing are well known.

Of course, construction work is an economic issue, a branch of industry. Architecture shall and must be managed in line with economic criteria. Economical architecture sparing resources has always been the driving force for creativity and the willingness to innovate and promoted further development. But, the smaller the part of the architecture-related decision, which is made in a consensual manner and with professional reputation and value-oriented motives, the smaller is the professional impact, meaning the impact defined by the logic of the discipline of architecture on the architectural process: a state-of-the-art problem with well known, visible effects, consequences, which are common knowledge. In this situation, to appeal to the explicitly informed client may be a noble gesture, but is of no use as a strategic approach.

The second evolutionary process significantly co-determining the development of modern architecture is the depicted and continuing process of separation between system and lifeworld.

The dynamism of industrial systems with their totalitarian tendency has its impact amidst society by means of the universalization of industrial principles. We experience this peculiarity of industrial systems amidst society as a socioeconomic power, which encompasses all spheres of social life, thus also including architecture.

Rationality in terms of business management in industrial production excludes a way of acting, which is not exclusively oriented towards the business management target. "This structural inconsiderate act of the mono-economic profitability calculation is generally valid and effective, and it intensifies the tearing apart, based on the division of labour, of causes (production-decision) and the impact of damages. Foremost, it is enforced by way of competition, in case of the costs of considerations bringing about competitive disadvantages." (56 / Martin Jänicke: Staatsversagen – die Ohnmacht der Politik in der Industriegesellschaft [The Failure of the State – the Impotence of Politics in Industrial Society], Munich, 1986, p. 19)

Viewed from an abstract perspective, the system, the societal structure is oriented towards preservation, maintenance and innovation, newly creating structural elements. The process towards universality of industrial firm principles, when viewed as regards content, carries an obligation merely to the structural conditions and not to their impact.

Since, as a rule, rationality in terms of business management does not appear in a gestalt-productive manner, mediatizing tendencies also act on architectural solutions dynamically (i.e. speeding them up), because they prefer free-of-context ad-hoc solutions, which superficially spring from an economic, most certainly not a gestalt-related logic.

Culturally qualified, traditionally handed-down architectural and conceptually defined ties (as there are forms of typology) or other content-defined characteristic features, be it of a formal or functional fashion, are limiting boundaries, which cannot be accepted by media-directed processes.

Strategically defined action selects the respectively most productive, most sensible solution. This may be embedded in a tradition in a formal or functional fashion;

an example of this is the postmodern era, but not for the sake of tradition, for the sake of preserving tradition, of perpetuating it, but rather in spite of tradition. Because, it is not supposed to embed and keep up tradition – but mediative logic!

Almost in contrast with this, the lifeworld is supposed to guarantee the maintenance of the society by way of being a permanent "background" enabling communication within the society, rendering the latest, current statements sensible and meaningful, because it is able to give them validity or refuses to give them validity.

In some other context, I already described the effects of the separation of system and lifeworld. Their manifestations can be perceived and measured in the changed relations between culture and society, (individual) personality and society, as well as in culture and (individual) personality. In this context, Habermas writes: "In the relation of Culture to Society, structural differentiation is to be found in the gradually increasing uncoupling of the institutional system from worldviews; in the relation of Individual Personality to Society it is evinced in the broadening of the scope of contingency for establishing interpersonal

relationships; and in the relation of culture to individual personality it is manifested in the fact that the renewal of traditions issues an ever stronger dependency upon the readiness to criticize and innovative capacity of the individual persons. The vanishing point of these evolutionary trends are: for culture, a state in which traditions that have become reflective and then set allow undergo continuous revision; for society, a state in which legitimate orders are dependent upon formal procedures of positing and justifying norms; and for personality (the individual personality), a state in which a highly abstract ego-identity is continuously stabilized through self-steering. These trends can establish themselves only insofar as the yes/no decisions that uphold everyday communicative practice no longer go back to an ascribed normative consensus, but issue from the cooperative interpretation processes of participants themselves. Thus, they signal a release of the rationality potential inherent in communicative action.” (57 / Jürgen Habermas, *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 219/220)

Nothing can be taken for granted any more. Each decision must be made, or it is automatically left to the quick stepping of medial logic. The components of the lifeworld, culture/civilization, society and individual are in need of decisive devoted attention. The phenomena is much discussed in architecture in our modern times, such as the great variety of styles in the postmodern era and the arbitrariness associated with and related to this phenomenon: such as the roller coaster of ever increasing stylistic isms; the dissolution or the loss of Gestalt of architecture as of the space as regards urban building development, again the related neglecting of any claim whatsoever for order as regards spatial structures, the loss of tradition, etc. – all these are consequential effects of the dominance of the systemic. The much lamented consequences are the inhospitable nature, the impossibility to make plans, chaos, trivialization (the expenditure of the domain of the profane), commercialization, the loss of the public space in our cities and so on. These too, without exception, can be ascribed to the dominant structural conditions for architecture in media-directed societies.

The lack of regulated – content-wise – cultural, societal presuppositions in respect to the process of design-decisions is intensely aggravated by way of the boundless formal freedom. During the period

of the emancipation of architecture, this process began as a process liberating architecture from ritual constraints. Against the background of media-directed structures, even the last symbolic couplings of meaning are removed from architecture. The history of architecture uses the term secularization in order to describe this situation.

It is said that secularizing effects, during their development, lead to the fact that architectural forms are freed from all symbolic “couplings of meaning”. These changes of meaning as regards architectural forms, which accompany the development of the history of architecture, were naturally not without formal impact. Thus, these processes of transformation have to be regarded as one of the causes for the fact that intentions as regards design, or design methods respectively, were oriented more and more towards aesthetic aspects. The kind of architecture, which, in all its details, was tied to specified roles, was aligned with a distinct socio-cultural context in a direct (and unambiguous) manner, and which, on top of all that, considered itself point-blank in terms of medium transporting traditional/ritual values, this kind of architecture left little scope, perhaps none at all, for artistic, individual modes of expression, for a free aesthetic designing of architectural forms unleashed from constraints.

Once architecture is in an open, dynamic developmental phase, during which, for example, forms and motifs can be borrowed from other cultural spheres, then, taking on a general point of view, the possibility exists to assimilate “Fremdformen” [“unfamiliar forms”] and thus to enlarge the vocabulary of artistic modes of expression. Then, too, it is easier to define architecture in respect of aesthetic criteria, a nexus, which by and large initiates a process of “aestheticizing” architectural forms. In Bandmann we read as regards the theme of secularization: “The spiritual mind dominates the assigned position, the approach of the object; the magic view of the world changes, congeals into a rational one...” (58 / Günter Bandmann: *Iconology of Architecture*, in: Martin Warnke (ed.), *Political Architecture in Europe*, Cologne, 1984, p. 58) and “...it is beyond a doubt that the artistic freedom encroaching upon the processes of design only became possible, once the bonds with the conceptions of meaning had been unleashed.” (59 / Günter Bandmann: *ibid.*, p. 59) Bandmann continues: “Thus, we come to the conclusion that a aesthetic

meaning replaces the symbolic and historical one and is probably the more crucial, significant one in recent times and times to come.” (60 / Günter Bandmann: *ibid.*, p. 60)

This process made way for the structural openness (in the linguistic sense) of architectural design, something we experience today just as a normal state-of-affairs. The formal fund of architectural variations of Gestalt was enlarged, a taboo on singular forms was extinguished more and more, and its “neutralization” in the historical context was accelerated.

By taking this path, architecture, from a stylistic point of view, could unhinge itself, once and for all, and successfully, from all traditional constraints limiting the scope for design. Formally it developed into an open system without tendency towards stylistic bonds. Neither Gestalt-elements are defined nor their potential relations, bonds, relationships.

Architecture achieved a degree of, a scope for, formal freedom which was only to be brought about by means of breaking with all tradition.

This so immensely valuable gain as regards formal modes of expression for the history of architecture, as a counter-tendency, also involves risks: the form as such becoming bereft of content. The aesthetic openness requires it, to put it in modern German, to be dealt with in a formal manner. Here, the closeness of architecture and language becomes obvious. The one with nothing to say, neither does he profit from rhetoric supreme, peak performances. All, which is put forward remains in the premises of the mundane, is inexpressive, speechless.

In consequence, viewed from the structural point of view, the difficulties in modern architecture do have two causes, which are quite different but perfectly, yet awkwardly, as regards the subject matter, complementing each other: On the one hand, the formal openness, the candor of architecture as achievement of the modern age (modernity); on the other hand the definition of architecture by means of the systemic of media-directed societies, as problem of the modern age, together with its implications, such as commercialization, deprived of meaningful content, ethical neutrality, arbitrariness, etc. etc. (Depending on position/perspective and the way things stand as regards discussion, the appropriate fitting word may be chosen and specified.)

Part II

Interventions of structural architecture

“The Modern Age...”, we read in Wilhelm Schmid, “is an era of choice” (61 / Wilhelm Schmid: *ibid.*, p. 188) Schmid describes choice as a structural condition of the modern age: we must choose, whether we want to or not. What makes this choosing so problematic is the increasing openness, are the infinite possibilities of selection on the one hand, and the lack of a method, which gives justice to the possibilities of choice, on the other.

This choice, self-evident and necessary for us, demands criteria, reliable bases of decision, in order to be able to assess the possibilities: these possibilities according to a list of priorities as a choice which, in whatever way, has to be found.

I have already expounded in which structural rapidity the openness, experienced today, has developed. The building-block system of traditional architecture did not allow for much freedom of choice. Perhaps it was the particularly beautiful or perfect solution as regards artisan skill, which motivated variation. Inside the stylistic order the Architecture of the Regional Civilizations left much scope to find the beautiful, creatively defined form. The attraction of breaking the rules in order to find something new, was, within tight boundaries, many times greater than today where everything goes.

The architect or master builder working in the traditional context knew the architectonic codes to be used, knew his architectural language precisely. Spatial qualities were defined, often socially determined. The significance of a building task and the architectural consequences deduced from this task (size of the building, its position or integration in the urban context, scale, choice of material etc.) were known, or allowed for a merely limited amount of choice.

Thus extraordinary performances in the field of architecture and construction work were, consequentially, valued in quite a different

manner than today where we fall back upon arbitrarily multifarious stylistic codes. We view the history of architectural forms as a quarry, which supplies us at random with one or other formal fragment to be made use of. Spatial quality is defined aesthetically by a majority, is subjected to highly elaborate arbitrariness or is sacrificed to manipulative marketing interests.

How does one handle obviously structurally conditioned phenomena, the influence of which on architecture we must judge negatively?

|60

The experiences of the modern age show quite clearly the subjective efforts. Even the most ambitious representatives of the profession of architecture are not able to tackle the fundamental problems inherent in our modern age in spite of journalistic circulation of the best of singular solutions.

This indicates a basic difficulty to be detected also in the profession, the discipline of architecture.

The foundation of our drafts of theory and design is wrongly assessed, has not yet let itself be adjusted to the new ground rules/conditions in a structurally changed world. Though the aesthetic principle as principle of judgement, according to Gernot Böhme (62 / Gernot Böhme: *Atmosphäre*[Atmosphere], Frankfurt a. M., 1995, p.21 ff.), is methodically embedded in the theoretical approach of the modern age, yet, the reference to society, the structural dependency of the architectural on the system of the societal does not achieve a methodical integration beyond facile attempts at feature articles. The structural space still has not found its place in blueprint-methodology. The choice needs new methods.

So, we are dealing with the theoretical orientation of architectural efforts. If one so wishes, it is to do with the theoretical blueprint of the discipline of architecture, which, according to Kuhn, creates a paradigm (63/Thomas S. Kuhn: *Die Struktur wissenschaftlicher Revolution* [The Structure of Scientific Revolution], Frankfurt a. M., 1988) – which, for the modern age, is still architecture tied up with aesthetics (of judgement).

Thus we are faced with the question of which theoretical standard, rather which level of integration ought to be attained by these theoretical blueprints, models or other ways of reconstruction, which shape thinking

in architectural space as operational, fathomable and effective in order to finally comprehend, to explain, to foresee, to make practical use of, to change those facts of reality, which are qualitatively relevant for architecture.

The first approach is already presented. In the first part of the paper the structural conditions of architecture are made visible, which here are chosen as startingpoint for sketching theoretic fields, which develop the resonance between societal structure and architectonic Gestalt [form, shape].

|61

Following the approach of Habermas there is a distinctly specific task in store for the reproduction and the maintenance of the (structural) components of the sphere of life (*Lebenswelt*), culture, society and personality (the individual person). Since system and (*Lebenswelt*) the sphere of life drift apart for structural reasons, thus self-healing powers are structurally not provided for, specific strategies have to be developed in order to be able to guarantee the reproduction of the conditions of (*Lebenswelt*) life in the future. In his work cited above (“*Theorie des Kommunikativen Handelns*”) [“*Theory of Communicative Action*”] Habermas drew up three reproductional processes of components of the sphere of life (*Lebenswelt*): the cultural reproduction of sphere of life, the social integration of sphere of life and the socialisation of the members of the sphere of life. (64 / Jürgen Habermas: *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns* [Theory of Communicative Action], vol. 2, Frankfurt a. M., 1982, p. 212 ff.)

Habermas describes the theoretical interrelations as follows: “The cultural reproduction of the lifeworld ensures that situations newly arising in the semantic dimension are connected with the existing conditions in the world: it secures a continuity of tradition and a coherence of knowledge, which is respectively sufficient for daily practice. Continuity and coherence are measured by the rationality of the knowledge accepted as valid. This can be seen in disturbances of cultural reproduction that manifest themselves in a loss of meaning and lead to corresponding crises of legitimization and orientation. In such cases, the actors` cultural stock of knowledge can no longer cover the need for mutual understanding that arises with new situations. The interpretive schemes accepted as valid fail, and the resource meaning becomes scarce.

The social integration of the lifeworld ensures that newly arising situations in the dimension of the social sphere are connected up with existing conditions in the world: it takes care of coordinating actions by way of legitimately regulated interpersonal relations and stabilizes the identity of groups to an extent sufficient for everyday practice. The coordination of actions and the stabilization of group identities are measured by the solidarity among members. This can be seen in disturbances of social integration, which manifest themselves in anomie and corresponding conflicts. In such cases, actors can no longer cover the need for coordination that arises with new situations from the inventory of legitimate orders. Legitimately regulated social memberships are no longer sufficient, and the resource social solidarity becomes scarce.

Finally, the socialization of the members of a lifeworld ensures that newly arising situations, in the dimension of historical time, are connected with existing situations in the world: it secures for succeeding generations the acquisition of generalized competencies for action and ensures a harmonious balancing of individual life histories and collective forms of life. Interactive capacities and lifestyles are measured by the responsibility, being sound of mind of the respective persons. This can be seen in disturbances of the socialization process, which are manifested in psychopathologies and corresponding phenomena of alienation. In such cases, the abilities, the competencies of the actors do not suffice to maintain the intersubjectivity of commonly defined action situations. The system of individual personalities can preserve its identity merely by means of defensive strategies that are detrimental to participating in social interaction on a realistic basis (fulfilling the conditions of reality/doing justice to reality), in such a way that the resource ego-strength becomes scarce." (65 / Habermas: *ibid*, 1982, vol 2, p. 212/213)

Habermas assigns these reproductional processes tasks and goals.

He calls them contributions of the reproductional processes which maintain the structural components of the sphere of life (*Lebenswelt*), which in turn countereffect the phenomena of crises such as loss of meaning, "Anomie" (lawlessness) and the appearance of psychopathologies.

The process of cultural reproduction, fostering culture, is supposed to establish schemes of interpretation ("valid knowledge") with the capacity for consent, in order to promote the acquisition of cultural knowledge.

Social Integration as a process supporting culture is supposed to put in order the interpersonal relations by means of the coordination of actions through intersubjectively respected claims to validity.

Socialisation as a process of stabilizing personality is supposed to improve the capacity for interaction (the "personal identity").

In the society based on the division of labour, these tasks are known to be professionally taken care of at different places and by different "providers".

Against this background, architecture too has to allow for itself to be questioned as regards its position as the "patron" of an artificial environment in respect to the decision concerning which part of the task given by society, i.e. the reproduction of the components of the sphere of life, it is to look after.

The functional level of the request deducible from this question is easily described the "reproductional functions of architecture" (Habermas speaks of reproductional functions of the communicatively orientated active behaviour) and may be named equally fast:

One may combat losses of meaning by means of significance, differentiation of relevances (the opposite of arbitrariness), anomies; the dissolution of spatial structures may be opposed by progressive, continuous spatial order and losses of identity may be eased by means of physically experientiable, sensually perceivable spatial environments. But, before the reproductional functions of *Lebenswelt*[life] - interrelations may be transferred from the social space into architectural, three-dimensional space, there are some fundamental questions to be answered. First, do spatial structures have the capacity at all to define human behaviour and, second, are specific features of the spatial environment responsible for specific behaviour?

On a very general level, the first question may be briefly answered with: Yes.

Of course we know of the interrelations of effective activity between architecture and human behaviour. The special subject fields, which evaluate the relations of spatial structures with behaviour are such distinct disciplines:

Gestalt psychology, environmental psychology, architectural depth psychology, research as regards perception, linguistics/philology and many others.

The second question may also be answered with yes. This is particularly easy if we assume the experienced negative effects of our environments; if we clearly imagine under which conditions we are without orientation: for example in a spatial structural context, we are aware of a space having complexity or seeming “one-dimensional”, redundant. We may assign different effects to individual features of Gestalt.

A historical city landscape, for example, the old town of Siena evolved over time, has a highly complex architectural/urban-spatial construction. Differing situations and series of space, of region create the soothing sensation of feeling at ease in a pleasant ambience.

To feel comfortable inside a space means to find an atmosphere, which may be sensuously perceived, which enables us to feel our own physical body, to feel our own self inside the space.

To feel comfortable inside a space also means to be able to orientate oneself, to be able to put the momentary location into a relation with other places.

It means having developed an idea of the surrounding spatial system and being able, on the basis of this knowledge, to move freely in this space.

It also means being able to comprehend valuable elements in the urban space, to differentiate between important buildings, important areas and others of less significance.

The lack of one of these Gestalt-qualities alone leads to irritations and inappropriate behaviour amidst interrelations of an architectural and urban spatial nature. In particularly problematic spatial environments all of the listed qualitative features are missing. The often cited “unreality” emerges when the spatial effect, that is when the perceived atmosphere denies sensory, when the Gestalten [forms/figures/features] (bodies of construction and spaces) remain unrecognizable and their social relevance remains undecided. I choose the phrasing “to feel safe and at ease in a space” quite consciously here, as well as thus follow the phrasings of Habermas. He uses this phrasing in his description of the sphere of life-interrelations. In such a way the closeness to life (Lebenswelt) as

named by Habermas becomes clear. This not only applies to the choice of words but even more so to the differentiation of spheres of content: Individual (personality/person), society and culture. Architecture may thus create a feeling of “comfortable security” in the sense of life (Lebenswelt) and may do so in an individual, societal and cultural sphere.

In the individual sphere, inside the direct person/space-relationship, spatial environments may have the effect of promoting, of fostering identity, something which for example the sociologist assigns with great hope for an increase in the interactive capacity of the individual person, and the psychiatrist to a decreasing risk of psychopathologies.

In the societal sphere, in the society/space-relationship, spatial environments may foster interpersonal relations whenever spatial organizational structures are generally discernible and effective. Habermas speaks of the [“coordination of actions by way of intersubjectively respected claims of validity”]. These intersubjectively respected claims of validity as regards architecture are phrased by the creatively fashioned space mediating order (in the sense of structural organization).

In the cultural sphere, in the time/space-relationship, spatial structures may imply [“interpretative schemes with the capacity for general consent”] (Habermas), which counteract the loss of meaning and perpetuate cultural knowledge. [“Interpretative schemes with the capacity for general consent”] are requested in debates focussing on Baukultur whenever questions of meaning or relevance define the themes.

In the following text I shall name the reproductional functions of interventions as regards the cultural domain of architecture (baukulturelle interventions) and outline its three aspects, the atmospheric (1), the organizing, structuring (2) and the generating of meaning (3).

“How is atmosphere constructed? Atmosphere seems to start precisely where the construction stops. It surrounds a building, clinging to the material object. Indeed, it seems to emanate from the object. The word “atmosphere” was first used to describe the gas that surrounds celestial bodies and was originally thought to come out of the planet, to be part of it.

Likewise, the atmosphere of a building seems to be produced by the physical form. It is some kind of sensuous emission of sound, light, heat, smell, and moisture; a swirling climate of intangible effects generated by a stationary object. To construct a building is to construct such an atmosphere.” (66 / Mark Wigley, Die Architektur der Atmosphäre [The Architecture of Atmosphere], Daidalos 68/1998, p.18)

With atmospheric intervention, which is understood as a specific, targeted interference in the creative processes and the procedure of design, one of the “reproductional functions of architecture” (the contribution of architecture to the generally phrased task of maintaining the structural components of the sphere of life) is included in the calculation of the weighing reflections as regards design. Thus put into words is the effort to commit architecture to tasks, which can be deduced from the analysis of societal circumstances.

The demand of architecture on social effectiveness is thereby renewed.

The adjective “atmospheric” focusses this claim on the design of surroundings, of spatial environments and their sensorially perceivable qualities. Achievements are demanded from the architectonic Gestalt[architectural object] as a social and spatial medium, for which up to now no systematic concept existed. Yet this is not about putting into words fundamentally new tasks for architecture. Rather a paradigmatic replacement of architectural tasks is supposed to lead to a new assessment of the hierarchy of tasks in architecture.

Which significance, which meaning do we attach to singular Gestalt-features? How do we come to a conclusion, to a qualified assessment of architectural qualities? Which criteria do we apply, in a differentiating manner, in this process of evaluation, selection and definition? Thus we are concerned with the priorities of architectural qualities, with a methodology facilitating the discussion of architectural qualities. In the end it is to do with cultural or – to stay true to the theme – efforts in the cultural domain of architecture, as we were informed at the beginning of these expositions. Against the background of the described splittings between system and the sphere of life (Lebenswelt) in media-controlled societies, sociologists, as already explained, define the strengthening of

identity as regards the members of a sphere of life, its individuals (personalities/persons) as one of the three reproductional functions. With the transference of this task into the area of responsibility of architecture, the first of the reproductional tasks described by Habermas is transformed, out of the social sphere, into the three-dimensional architectural sphere. Now the question : What do we know of identity-creating aspects of spatial effects and their perception? The way and the method of perceiving our environment is the subject matter of many, quite distinct disciplines.

In this case, the assumption of a fundamental possibility of influencing the human psyche and body by means of spatial environments is indisputable. Ever since Gestalt psychology realized that the specific character of our environment is not defined by singular stimuli, but rather gains Gestalt by way of interacting stimuli, i.e. by relations, we are enabled to differentiate between the Gestalt-qualities of our area of perception and the perceivable environment. (67 / Read: Wolfgang Köhler, *Die Aufgabe der Gestaltpsychologie* [The Task/The Duty of Gestalt Psychology], Berlin, 1971)

If it is true that strenghtening of identity, boosting of motivation, capacity for identification and other effects stabilizing personality also have aspects caused by the environment (and the experiences of the last decades give us reason to believe this), then it is reasonable to plan spatial environments which foster the development of identity, which have an ego-stimulating effect in the sense of sphere of life-interrelations, or at least make such an effect possible. Thereby, on a first and very general level, the task of atmospheric intervention as a primary reproductional function of architecture is formulated: The creation of identity-fostering environments as a qualitative feature of the person/space-relationship.

Yet the theoretical respect of these reflections still remains unclear. So far there exists no guideline-theory which would be capable of integrating the distinctly different theoretical drafts as regards the topic of effect and perception of space, thus achieving a unified level of quality.

For some years now we have a discussion in architecture in respect to the concept of atmosphere, a discussion which newly revives the person/space-relation by looking at it from the aspect of sensuousness. The theme itself is not at all new subject matter for architecture. In

“premodern” times the designing of atmospherically characterized rooms/spaces was not defamatory and the knowledge of sensuous effects was no secret lore.

Only in the modern age the mad attempt was made to substitute rationality for sensuousness. Functionalistic tendencies, particularly if combined with purisms of a fundamentalistic nature as regards rules, were readily sold , in a moralizing fashion, as hostile to effect and atmosphere.

Architecture was supposed to be free of décor and manipulation (these terms were linked by way of argumentation). How much of a conflicting nature this approach was, we see in Mark Wigley: “When Le Corbusier condemned earlier architects for concentrating on atmosphere, his call for L`esprit nouveau is precisely a call for a new atmosphere. In a familiar irony, the apparent absence of decor quickly became the decor of choice.”

(68 / Mark Wigley: *Die Architektur der Atmosphäre* [The Architecture of Atmosphere], in: *Daidalos* 68, ibid, 1998, p. 25) It goes without saying that the elimination of an atmospheric effect of architecture is impossible. So, the question we have to ask ourselves is how atmospheres may develop which are either wished for, in a conscious and controlled manner, or are, respectively, often unwelcome, in an unconscious and uncontrolled manner. The ambivalent attitude of modern age towards the category of the atmospheric has, in addition to the puristic aspects already mentioned, quite equivocally referring to Loos` speech on “Ornament and Crime”, a methodical markedness, which may be deduced from the aesthetic approach of modern age. “Up to now aesthetics is actually an aesthetics of judgement, meaning that it does care less for experience or even sensuous experience as the expression aesthetics might suggest because of its Greek origin. Rather it is all about judgement, speech, conversation...Ever since (since Kant...) the social function of the theory of aesthetics is to enable the conversation about works of art. It supplies the vocabulary for the history of art and the criticism of art...Thus sensuousness and nature vanished from aesthetics nearly completely.” (69 / Gernot Böhme, ibid, p. 25)

The predominant aesthetic principle is of a self-contained (self-reflective) nature. It is coherent in the sense of a linguistic approach, not in the sense of perception, i.e. it therefore excludes sensuousness. The

aesthetic judgement acknowledges the “correctness” of a design within the framework of the acknowledged aesthetic arrangement of rules, the aesthetic coding. Whether the same design in the sense of a physical, material experience, the presence of the designed matter, is satisfactory, may not be turned into an experience beyond the aesthetic contemplative view.

Real events and intellectual valuation lost their direct connection with each other. This way the aesthetic work achieved a normative orientation: “It was not merely to do with art, but rather with the actual, the true, the great art, with the authentic work of art, the high-class work of art.” (70 / Gernot Böhme, *ibid.*, p. 25) The comparability of the presented situation with trends in architecture is obvious. If we use, in the above Böhme-citation, the term architecture instead of the word art, we increase the correctness of the sentence. If the aesthetic principle by now has become insufficient, as it knows the way leading to art, yet not the path towards determinable atmospheric qualities, then a re-orientation is necessary. Against this background Gernot Böhme demands a new formulation of the theory of aesthetics as a general theory of aesthetic work. “This is interpreted as the production of atmospheres. On the side of the recipient it is comprehended as a theory of perception in its complete meaning. This way perception comprehends the experience of the presence of people, objects and surroundings.” (71 / Gernot Böhme, *ibid.*, p. 25)

The theory of the aesthetic working has not yet been written. But, Gernot Böhme did point a way for the search. In his lectures from 1991 in Wuppertal and Basel and in September 1992 in the context of the congress “The Relevance of the Aesthetic”, he was the first to change the term atmosphere into a fundamental theme of aesthetics.

Aesthetics here is defined as the theory, the teaching of Aisthesis. “Perception is a state of being emotionally stimulated, an *energeia*, a Being – Real...The perceiving subject is actually participating in the presence of things, the object perceived is actually inside the perceiving presence of the subject. What is thus overcome...: is the self-restriction of aesthetics to the judgement and the rational discourse, sensuousness and affective participation being frowned upon, the repression of the body, the restriction of interest in art and the work of art, the dominance

of semiotics and the preponderance of language. What is to be gained is...the reconstruction of a complete concept of perception, the rediscovery of physical presence, the expansion of interest as regards the aesthetic valency of the world in general, the introduction of the term of aesthetic work, this influential part of societal activity, which does not serve production but rather the putting on stage and presentation, and the most minor part of which is the creative (artistic) work.” (72 / Gernot Böhme: Lecture on: *Ästhetische Naturerkenntnis* [Aesthetic Cognition of Nature], Kongress “Die Aktualität des Ästhetischen” [Congress on “The Currentness of the Aesthetic”], 1992)

A theory of aesthetics, in which the perception of sensorial, sensuous sensitivity (“Perception is a state of stimulation”) is at the centre of interest, shall then be productive for architecture if it succeeds in creating a connection between the external and internal “reality”. The psychiatrist C.G. Jung speaks of an overall unconsciousness forming an ever present background for our perceptions: “Moreover our perception of reality does also imply unconscious aspects... an overall unconsciousness is indisputably the common heritage of the whole of mankind.” (73 / Carl Gustav Jung: *Der Mensch und seine Symbole* [Man and his Symbols], Freiburg, 1979, p. 21 ff.)

With the reference to the depth psychology we enter a, for architecture, largely undeveloped territory. The connection thought of here between depth psychology and the “Construction of Atmospheres” is provoked by the cultural magazine *Daidalos* in an interesting fashion. In volume 68 of *Daidalos* from 1998, we find in the section “Construction of Atmospheres” a summary definition of the conceptual term atmosphere by means of a stringing together different contributions. Authors such as the repeatedly cited Gernot Böhme, Mark Wigley, Sylvia Lavin and others attempt to fathom out the architectural (architectonic) dimension of the term atmosphere in a historic respectively aesthetic way. Essays by Gerrit Confurius (“*Atmosphärische Störungen* [Atmospheric Disturbances]: Wilhelm Reich”) and Michael Glasmeister (“*Bildtherapie* [Picture-therapy]. Ilya Kabakov”) contribute to the conception of a relation between method of perception, which is purely aesthetically orientated, and depth psychology. The stringing together of articles alone does not make up for a theoretical concept. Still, the distinct approaches

(as regards the promotion of atmospheres) contribute to the associative overall impression. This relation between aesthetic and depth-psychological worlds, given a little thought, is plausibly expounded in an interview with the architect Peter Zumthor. (74 / Daidalos, Architektur, Kunst, Kultur [Architecture, Art, Culture], 68/1998, p. 90 ff.)

Asked about the methodics of his work, Zumthor refers in his answer to the concept of atmosphere and his special interest in the physical, the material and space, and declares his express wish for creating rooms, spaces, in which one just likes to remain. At the same time he distances himself from a conceptually orientated, purely aesthetic discourse. "... I am not primarily interested in drawings, plans or theoretical ideas being perfect..." Instead, his work focusses on pictures, images: "material images, internal images." Zumthor describes his manner of designing: "... the actual form is not important – in fact, form is really never important. What interests me is the emotional or experiential value of an image and the form is what I then find in the object itself, it develops from the construction of the building." (75 / Peter Zumthor: Daidalos, ibid)

Working with images in architectural design presupposes its readability. It forces one to accept aesthetic and depth psychological roots, it requires knowledge of their being charged with the physical and emotional. "With time we discover that our personal images, conjured from memory, are actually not so special and that we all share them." (Peter Zumthor : ibid)

The most direct, immediate relation a person may establish with his constructed, artificial, architectural environment is excitement, a state of being moved, which an architectural surrounding may give us.

The relation is defined by way of two layers of intrinsic beings in its materiality: the presence of objects and the symbolic powers of these objects.

We also find the conceptual term of the presence of objects reading Gernot Böhme:

He characterizes the objects according to the shape and forms of their presence. "Forms of presence...are ways, by which an object steps out of itself in a characteristic fashion...Of course one may speak also of forms of actualities...in which the things are present for us. Yet since we have come to fathom ourselves as (a form of) nature, and the presence of

objects does not any longer signify its actuality for a subject detached from world and body but intrusion on one`s own physical presence, thus it may be assumed that we read, at the same time, in the forms of actuality the forms in which things present themselves." (76 / Gernot Böhme, ibid, p. 166 ff.) As forms of presence he names: space (three-dimensionality) (the holding of a topos/grasping of a volume), look (Eidos), physiognomy, colour and sound, voice, smell, energetic and material emanations. With Böhme atmospheres may be defined by way of the shapings of the presence of objects.

Here a manner of perception is characterized, which puts the awareness of the other before self-awareness. Perception does happen to us. The response is to be found in one`s own body. Here, access to or the interpretation of the atmospheric by means of the channels of ratio is of secondary importance.

The categories of the symbolic similarly remain obscure. "Rationality cannot grasp the inner (internal) form and entirety of a symbol. Such an attempt, conjured up right out of the centre of thought, of ideas, remains uncompletable, since the total function of the symbolic transcends the space of what may be presented in the rational sphere and thus in a one-sided, unbalanced way of thinking. By asking for the symbolic we reach a sphere, in which the energies of intuition, of interpretation, of creative comprehension and life in a manner of not evaluating but viewing, the contemplation of images and spiritual experience gain a primary importance...This is also why we do not reach solutions but at the most circumscriptions of a character respective of what the symbolic may mean... Thus symbols require a kind of emphatic experience rather more than intellectual interpretation." (77 / Detlef-Ingo Lauf: Symbole [Symbols], Frankfurt, 1976, p. 9 ff.)

In the most recent paper available on the interrelations of architecture and depth psychology (78 / Ba`Ra Heidi Fischer, Symbole der Urerfahrung und ihre Wiederholung im Bauen [Symbols of Primary Experience/Inexperience and Their Repetition in Construction/Architecture], Frankfurt-Bern 1981),

the author has a good look at archetypical phenomena, which, in their symbolic nature, express states of the (collective) unconscious. Ba`Ra Heidi Fischer bases her reflections on the fact that human beings are

capable of perceiving patterns of memory in respect to human developmental stages and that these patterns of memory are also actively made use of in architectural design. She defines stages of the history of the individual and of mankind which we find again as analogies in daily life and in architecture.

In a feature article in the section "Architecture and the Unconscious" in the magazine "The Architect" Klaus Behnke and Konrad Wohlhage state: "If a person comes into contact with a house or enters a room, he adds life to it not only in a physical but also a psychological way. A value is put on it, unconsciously, even before rational reasons are sought for... a room not merely stirs up a memory of images, an individual experience but a general human archetype. Thus there are not only remains of individual memory, which again render a room alive but it always is to do with the fundamentally human which we can put into groups of archetypes." (79 / Der Architekt [The Architect], Magazine of the BDA, 7/July 1999, p.15 ff.)

Here too the authors hold the opinion that architecture may significantly influence the emotional states of people by means of spatial structure.

The effect of architectural atmospheres seems to be based on two quite differently distinct characteristics of spatial structures: their presence (Gernot Böhme) and their patterns of memory (Bara Heidi Fischer). We experience and perceive both Gestalt-features in an immediate way and without interpretative obligation. With their effect they promote sensations of being physically and psychologically secure and comfortable.

On the stage of person/space-relation, architecture is able to affect the fostering of identity and the strengthening of personality if it develops Gestalt-qualities which create positive physical and psychological responses in the sense formulated here.

Thus conditioned, spatial structures can take on tasks concerning the reproduction of the sphere of life with retrospective consequences for the level of personality (the personal level).

"Whether people are fully conscious of this or not, they actually derive countenance and sustenance from the `atmosphere` of the things they live in or with. They are rooted in them just as a plant is in the soil in

which it is planted." (80 / Frank Lloyd Wright in: Mark Wigley, Die Architektur der Atmosphäre [The Architecture of Atmosphere], Daidalos 68/1998, p. 19)

“If a seafarer leaves the native (familiar) Tikopia, then estimating the distance separating him from the island is based on the observation of the island’s visible silhouettes beyond the horizon. There are five main zones. The first one is Rauraro, the low area near the coast. Once this disappears, the man knows that he covered some distance. Once the cliffs, which at some coastal places rise up to 200 and 300 foot high, are no longer visible, a quite different point is reached. (...) Once the Uru asia (...) disappears, the traveller realizes that he went far. And if finally Uru ronorono, the mountain peak itself, falls out of sight, then he expects the moment with worry.” (81 / R. Firth: We, the Tikopia, in: Kevin Lynch, Das Bild der Stadt [The Image of the City], p. 158)

Turning to the second intervention in the cultural domain of architecture

implies a change of theoretical perspective. The following text shall no longer be concerned with the individual sensitivities in respect to personalities (individual persons), but rather with the social situations with integrative functions and orientated towards coordination of action. The sociologically defined issues which may ease the societal effects of the separation of system and Lebenswelt in a media-controlled society (example: declining solidarity), are primarily supposed to promote a social integration of the Lebenswelt on the basis of organized interpersonal relations. (82 / Jürgen Habermas: Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns, vol. 2, ibid, p. 213) The coordination of active behaviour by means of intersubjectively acknowledged claims for validity (generally accepted rules) promotes a positive climate for the development of interpersonal relations: anomic situations weaken the coordinative abilities, whereas basic conditions, clearly defined by rules, increase the coordinative abilities of people acting amidst a social sphere.

This claim for reproduction of interrelations as regards Lebenswelt may also be transferred to the spatial medium, as a second reproductional function of architecture. Thus, architecture may also contribute to the maintenance and strengthening of Lebenswelt-conditions in this sphere with its spatial/visual potentialities. The effective means here is spatial order/organization.

The chosen perspective here is of an interpersonal, societal nature, which may be analyzed as a society/space-relation. In order to define this relation as regards content, the following question must be clearly settled:

What is spatial order, organization? How is it generated? How is it perceived?

Spatial organization is a characteristic feature of architecture. By means of the ability to perceive, in our spatial/visual environment, objects as entities respectively as parts of entities, we are enabled to differentiate and value shapes/forms (Gestalten) by way of deciphering their spatial/visual structures. The differentiation of shapes (Gestalten) and Gestalt-qualities is preconditional for the perception of organizational structures (Gestalt-hierarchies) in our environments.

In reverse we produce spatial organization by means of generating relations between parts of shapes (Gestalten), or respectively, shapes, in order to thus define a structural hierarchy (differing levels of significance) forming a basis for a continuity of the spatial/visual organization. The deciphering, recognizing, perceiving of spatial organization is also then a linguistic process if we determine spatially/visually defined meanings beyond the recognition of the shaped object (Gestalt-hafte). In the last instance, the shaped objects (Gestalten) and their structures refer to possibilities of action and interpretation. They are recognizable as spatial/visual structures in a linguistic sense. Against this background, the concept of organizing (order-producing) interventions was devised. By means of organizing, linguistically effective interventions in the design process, the sensitivity for the continuity of a spatial structure (order) – as a qualitative feature of architectural and spatial shapes (Gestalten) – was/is to be promoted.

Only quite recently did the theory of architecture realize linguistic correlations as architecturally relevant topics. In the course of the discussion on the “Architecture Parlante”, held in France in the middle of the 19th century, the category of language was introduced to the theory of architecture for the very first time.

The conceptual term “Architecture Parlante” was originally used as a term to oppose new architectural tendencies. The critics thought that the new architecture (which meant e.g. works by Ledoux) did not express itself by way of its own coherent identity but rather would make use of so-called recognizable structures which were to be deciphered like pictures, images. Language and architecture were regarded as incompatible though traditional architecture quite naturally made use of linguistic means. In his book “Architecture and Language” the architect Günter Fischer gives impressive examples of the linguistic effect

of architecture. (83 / Günter Fischer: *Architektur und Sprache* [Architecture and Language], Stuttgart-Zürich, 1991)

The debate on linguistic problems in architecture leads (unfortunately) quite quickly and mostly quite deeply to rather distinctly different theoretical spheres. These include in no particular order: hermeneutics, iconography, semiotics, Gestalt psychology, linguistic (de Saussure) and philosophical structuralism, linguistics itself, system theory, research into chaos theory, and so forth.

With the emergence of the aesthetics of information during the fifties (particularly caused by Max Bense's papers) the mostly controversial discussion of the relation between architecture and language began. The background, that is the reason why one may at all theorize about language in relation with architecture, is well-founded in the respective disciplines semiotics and linguistics.

Semiotics is the science of signs. Of signs in general, one ought to say, which means (there are) not merely linguistic signs, directly connected with our language of words, but also other signs.

Linguistics is the science of the structure of language (languages). In some debates it is taken for a partial field of semiotics.

The linguist de Saussure differentiated between diverse types of language.

One structural approach was the differentiation between “verbal languages” and “non-verbal languages”. At first sight this does not seem coherent. Yet, the focus as regards the content of this systematization does imply the fact that there are different media for communicative processes. Following this logic, architecture, design and art are linguistically competent media. Not only words, signs or gestures may translate information or have a communicative effect but also non-verbal languages and thus also spatial/visual structures. Architecture too is a linguistic medium, a medium of language.

One reference to the close relations between architecture and the structural system of language is to be found in structural similarities, which are based on the parallel of some architectonic and linguistic phenomena:“...

- the same heterogeneity of linguistic and architectonic production: may it be a newspaper advertisement or a drama, a garage or a complex construction of a museum;

- the existence of styles in literature and styles in architecture;
- the same genesis of language and architectural styles in a slow...process of segmentation;
- the development of wide repertoires (vocabulary, encyclopedia) and connecting rules (grammar) as regards language and architecture (theories of space, construction and forms); ...
- the heterogeneity of linguistic systems...the existence of dialects...in language as well as in literature..." (84 / Günter Fischer: *Architektur und Sprache*[Architecture and Language], Stuttgart-Zürich, 1991, p. 32 ff.) and in architecture, if we think for example of regional varieties of the baroque period or other architectural styles.

There are lots of reasons for the fact that, in spite of many similarities between architectonic and linguistic processes, we are confronted with more confusion than clarity as regards the relations between architecture and language.

One of the causes is embedded in the discipline semiotics and relates to its claim of becoming established as a main connecting theory amidst integrative communication studies. One theoretical aim thereby lies in the wish for interpreting society as a whole from the perspective of communication studies. Thereby, the linguistic approach is expanded in an inflationary manner and is thus at last devaluated: if all and everything is language, differentiations become redundant and thus slip away from us as a tool for the practical and the theoretical dispute as regards for example architecture.

A second cause is to be found in the field of the theory of architecture. Questions referring to the problematic nature of language are nearly exclusively limited to stylistic questions. What interests are styles:

Deconstruction, the postmodern era, the individual mark: how do people as Ungers, Koolhaas, Zumthor design...

Yet these are not questions as regards the linguistic ability of architecture in general. Here too, we bump into the structural limitations of a form of aesthetics as criticized by Gernot Böhme which exclusively comprehends itself as an aesthetics of judgement.

What significant meaning may linguistic ability have for architecture as a whole? Or, to put the question another way: are there areas of language which have an exclusively architectural (architectonic) character

and which generate linguistic ability merely by architectural (architectonic) means?

If there is an authentically architectural or a genuinely architectural language, then it must be the language of space, the language of the medium architecture.

The method of this architectural language, the spatial language, is a spatial notation, meaning the "voices of that space", the conditioning of the space meaning to render space, in the sense of language, significant and naturally, comprehensive.

A sign, as taught by semiotics, always refers to something beyond, outside itself. This is the nature of a sign and probably the most straightforward and also the most indisputable definition of the term sign. In this context, literature is likely to cite the example of the vicious dog. The sign "beware of the dog" is a signal, just as the terrifying barking of a dog is a signal. But the dog itself is a real phenomenon, not a sign, it refers merely to itself.

Only by way of referring to something else, an object is turned into a sign. As little as the dog is a sign for itself, as little are windows or doors signs for windows or doors. Yet, they can be signs whenever they refer to something which we cannot see, for example a room which they expose or open up. Viewed this way, a window may be a sign for a room. The same applies for a door which leads in to an other outer or inner room. Houses tell us which period they date from, which period of architectural history they are to be assigned to. We may identify aesthetic or stylistic codes and we are able to comprehend formal structures. To do so, we merely need a few bits of information (signs) in order to recognize different functions of buildings, to be able to differentiate between residential buildings and schools, factories etc. The fashion of the shape, the design formulates the recognizable difference.

Differently shaped windows refer to different spatial concepts. By means of the nature of the signs, we may speculate on the non-visible spaces, rooms, define differences and hierarchies: there are small and large rooms, bedrooms, livingrooms, other rooms. Differentiations and hierarchies of spatial structures of buildings can be made recognizable by means of the exterior patterns. Windows and doors, openings of a sort and other parts of a building, components serve as signs.

As regards dimensions of city-space, these correlations apply just the same:

(Constructional) objects refer to spatial correlations, to transitions, to the structure of whole spatial systems, to connecting, invisible spaces. Buildings formulate limits between places and streets, pass forward spatial directions; passers-by infer from architectural shapings correlations between shapes of places and connecting streets, road systems, and so forth.

82 Spatial shape, size, proportions etc... of a road, a place, refer, if we analyze them linguistically, to potential ways of learning, ways of acting amidst spaces. They refer to potential events inside the space. Pictures or symbols used (the eagle at the J.F.Kennedy-Airport in N.Y.C. or the ball at the Pantheon in Rome), refer to correlations beyond the architectural, etc.

At a closer look, different layers of information, different linguistic levels are recognizable which architectural signs respectively sign-systems may refer to. Architecture generates linguistic ability in different areas of meaning. The spatial and the formal structures of architecture enable us to decipher in linguistically diverse ways:

- the recognition of a Gestalt [shape] (integral entirety)
- the recognition of a formal structure of Gestalt (style)
- the recognition of a difference or an aim (a residential building, a factory, etc.)
- the recognition of a hierarchy of significant meanings (for example a city hall may be distinguished from a building of less significance as, perhaps, a residential building) and finally
- the recognition of a reference of the buildings to non-architectural contents.

To symbolize does help us to linguistically relate a building – in the case of the Pantheon a sacral building – to any form of content whatsoever (here: the cosmic). The building is not merely viewed in a relation to its concrete environment as regards urban space and social environment but also to its cultural sphere/environment.

Our architecture and our environment as regards urban space may be linguistically interpreted in different ways and this actually on the foundation of sign and sign systems. In reference to the layers of

information listed above (of the distinct levels, on which architecture is linguistically of effect), architecture has at its disposal different languages or linguistic systems.

The second reproductional function of architecture dealt with here, that is making sure of the continuity of spatial organization, is generated by means of a linguistic mechanism which regulates the perception of figurative or spatial shapes (Gestalten), their structure and their relation to other forms/shapes (Gestalten) (objects or spaces).

In the architectural sphere we are concerned with generating the external as well as the internal, plain or composed Gestalt [shape] or spatial form in a comprehensive manner, by way of discernibly creating the formal (related to the form) structures. The perceptibility of the relations between the external and internal form is, seen under the aspect of organization, merely a problem of connecting, of relating to the next respective spatial correlation. So, here it is not about the identity of form and content in the sense of the classic form-content theorem. The linguistically unambiguous wording of an entry situation or an option in the sphere of internal disclosure promotes connection, comprehension, orientation in the sense of continuous organization.

In the sphere of urban space we are concerned with the readability of spaces and the perception of correlations as regards urban spaces:

The reading of the “Raumgestalt” [shaped space] and the perceiving of the manner of its being enclosed in a total or partial system of space are of overriding importance.

The linguistic work with visual means as regards space which causes structure thus has two respective aspects, i.e. one in the architectural sphere and one in the sphere of urban space: a conceptional aspect generating Gestalt and a referential aspect defining connection.

The compelling wish to perceive our world as an interrelated, coherent one surely has a linguistic reason, which again is caused by the nature of the signs themselves. The sign refers to something beyond and outside its own entity.

Each thing, which we perceive as sign, strikes us forcibly with the existence of a further one. Arbitrariness emerges whenever the sign is “misleading”, whenever it refers wrongly, whenever our claim of finding the reference confirmed is disappointed. The spatial/visual signs of our

83

architectural and city-spatial environments are results of an infinite amount of processes of design and architecture. How often they disappoint as regards language is well known. The arbitrary “anything goes” nature, the lack of reference characterizing our buildings and cities is often picked out as a central theme. A linguistically effective intervention orientated towards spatial organization, recommending continuity and spatial organization is supposed to evoke an awareness of the direct, not to be cut off correlation between the Gestalt [shape], its symbolic nature and the linguistic effects to be deduced thereby. The responsibility for spatial organization as a qualitative Gestalt-feature [feature of shape] of our environment can be methodically embedded in the process of design by means of knowledge about linguistic correlations.

Where there is vandalism induced or provoked by architecture, where loss of orientation, the lack of reference defines our experience of space, whenever signs or signposts became necessary, since verbal language had to explain space, the linguistic aspect of architectural design failed. The control and the definition of the linguistic expression of architecture is one of our tasks of primary importance. Whenever we are capable of perceiving a spatial or architectural Gestalt [shape], whenever we may read it, we achieve orientation. Orientation again promotes the feeling at ease in an organizational system, which relieves the coordination of actions inside the space and thus fosters, in a casual manner, interpersonal relationships.

Whenever we are in the situation to perceive spatial and architectural Gestalt [shape], when we may read it, we get a sense of direction, we find orientation. A perceivable, a readable organizational system gives justice to the claim of validity of intersubjectively respected foundations of understanding and comprehension. In case the text read proves true, the trust in what is there to be read increases. In the same manner, a continuously developing spatial organization generates trust if spatial references prove right, if a gate bears reference to, directs to a path or a space, if a path leads to somewhere, something, or a staircase can explain a spatial structure, if perceived spatial references formulate a connecting relation to reality.

The most productive moment of an intervention creating organization is its openness as regards the methodical. Organization, comprehended

as the sum of meaningful references does not presuppose a general concept, a general blueprint (as, for example, it is presented by the baroque Karlsruhe), but rather is based on the abundance of an infinite amount of singular decisions. Organization emerges, if the process of design is seen as consciously being fitted in a linguistically defined correlation. Each Genus Loci has a linguistic aspect. The intervention as regards the cultural domain of architecture, the foundation of structural order together with the claims supported here is about the willingness to relate to the respective other architectural component, to the respective other space, the respective surroundings, the environment of physical body and space, architecture and urban space, and all this in order to evade the anything-goes arbitrariness, the lack of spatial definition.

“But, it has not always been this way, and one ought to keep in mind that the problem of meaning (i.e. sense), seen historically, is a relatively new phenomenon. It appears on three levels:

- . as a problem of shaping objects (reification):
the form no longer follows the function.*
- . as a problem of shaping the self (individual identity):
the crisis of identity.*
- . as a problem of shaping politics:
the great complexity of the society.”*

(85 / Norbert Bolz, Die Sinngesellschaft [The Society of Meaning], Düsseldorf, 1997, p. 11)

The theme of “intervention generating meaning” leads us on to the next level of reflection on the situation: we change from the social, societal sphere into the cultural one.

The ways of influence, impact of the separation of system and lifeworld on the cultural sphere, as analyzed by sociology, are reduced to the abridged concise formula by Habermas: The running short of the resource meaning/sense. (86 / Jürgen Habermas: *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 213)

Habermas defines the conceptual term culture as follows: “...the stock of knowledge out of which the participants in communication provide themselves with interpretations by way of coming to a mutual understanding about something inside the world (aspects of the world).” (87 / Jürgen Habermas; *ibid.*, p. 209)

A weakening of the structural component of the lifeworld of culture/civilization leads to a lack of interpretation and thus to loss of meaning. “Interpretative schemes with the capacity for consent and valid knowledge” (Habermas) contribute to a strengthening of the structural component of the lifeworld culture, to a cultural reproduction.

As in the spheres already described concerning the socialization of individual personalities and social integration, here too an architectural claim for reproduction, in respect to cultural reproduction of the lifeworld, as the third reproductional function of architecture shall be formulated. Here too, the question shall be put as regards a contribution of architecture, which enables architecture, in the medium of spatial/visual relations, to improve respectively stabilize lifeworldly conditions/presuppositions.

The means with which it (architecture) may have an impact on the cultural sphere now can no longer be merely the spatial order. The cultural dimension is defined by way of space/time-relationship, which

confronts space with questions of relevance, with value systems, questions of meaning/sense, which again require a manifestation of meaning in the spatial domain.

The structurally defined conditions/presuppositions of media-directed societies could already be depicted and demonstrated. The interactive co-operation of diverse effects such as the mediatisation of society and the secularization of the formal architectural elements or, too, the dramatic acceleration of the technological development, all these make up for the increase of complexity, which, to us, seems no longer adjustable. The implored, longed for forced change, transition, finally experienced (in life) has become a problem of meaning: The complexity of the media-directed societies at the stage of the Postmodern era develops, so to speak, in an infinite way, leads to increasingly new developments. "The dynamism of changes in the course of time is stronger than the spatial forces of perseverance..." (88 / W. Schmid: *Philosophie der Lebenskunst* [The Philosophy of Experienced Life (Knowing How to Live)], *ibid.*, 1998, p. 101)

Elsewhere, we read in Wilhelm Schmid: "The modern age, modernity, this is the apotheosis of the incessantly new, which hurries on time..." (89 / W. Schmid. *ibid.*, 1998, p. 98) and further: "The Postmodern Age is different from what its prefix makes us believe, in no way a time-related "After" of the Modern Age, but rather its extreme acceleration and excess. By way of the technological innovations coming thick and fast during the second half of the 20th century and because of the excessive inflated culture of the time ("Zeitkultur"), it turns into a culture of crisis..." (90 / W. Schmid: *ibid.*, p. 101)

Schmid wants to contrast this culture of crisis with another, namely that of choice. Here our interests as regards the cultural domain of architecture coincide with those of the philosopher: A culture of choice, as described by Wilhelm Schmid, is the basic motive fundamental to our efforts in the cultural domain of architecture.

Culture/Civilization lives off (thrives on) two effects: The Perpetuation of the familiar and the assimilation of the New. In the theory of evolution, these processes of homogenization and diversification are familiar. In the course of evolution, complexity increases automatically. The respective system diversifies. Whether it is a social, formal, technical or some other

system, perhaps a spatial/visual one, is of secondary significance. The risk of unruly diversification is the disintegrating decline of the system changing, transforming itself. The contrasting process, the process leading towards homogeneity, creates stability by means of adjustment.

"All working with form... is related to a harmonious balancing of 'homogenizing' and 'diversifying' creative powers. If a traditional 'type' of a building task is to the fore (e.g. a theatre), then the New gets committed to uphold the tradition, and culture thus is, by means of repetition, made 'homogeneous' as a meaningful act; in case the change of requirements, needs and wishes, or even merely the form of its generalization are on the fore, such as a Global Institution brought on its way in a self-organized/corporate fashion (perhaps a relief organization for children), which wishes to and must be addressed, then the New comes to define the form, and culture 'diversifies' itself, grows into something more manifold and ample, substantial..." (91 / Gerd Klamandt: *Curriculum for the Subject of Teachings on Space and Buildings*, Muthesius-University, Kiel, 1998. The subject was developed in co-operation of the sociologist Gerd Klamandt.)

Here too we find the reference to language: The creation of formal meaningfulness also has aspects of a linguistic act. As we know from Habermas, the reproduction of the structural component of the lifeworld of culture relies on "interpretative schemes with the capacity for consent" and "valid knowledge". Applied to the architectural context, the request for interpretable clearness (unambiguity) or readability of the spatial/visual environment is put up in this area too. Together with the claim for unambiguity in respect to interpretation or readability and against the background of meaningful issues entailing values, the contemplative viewing of the time-related context is inevitably thematized just the same. The correlation between a formal decision and a specific, distinct culture or a distinct cultural context is indisputable. For example, a deep understanding of the Roman-Catholic church is caught up in the European Christian tradition.

The straightforward plain spatial order already mentioned, without the claim for representing value-systems may be made conceivable, imaginable as an abstract phenomenon. Formal hierarchies can be generated by means of simple structures of opposition: Something is

bigger than..., more colorful than..., more extravagant, more lavish than..., etc. Their readability is at least partially conceivable as transcultural. This is to say that an organizational structure of the Middle Ages may still be comprehended by people in the present, even if it was not established by means of symbolizations, by means of culturally defined specific linguistic usage. Quite different is the shaping of linguistic processes, which aspire to mediate spatial/visual (informative) orientation as regards values. Here the reference to time is decisive. The “In-the - Course-of-Time” (“In-der-Zeit-stehen”) creates the cultural reference. We are “connected” in a cultural sense, if we are able to decipher culturally defined, formal (related to the form) structures, if we do not confuse a church with a town hall, if we are aware of Gestalt-features which have experienced a semantic allocation from the cultural context, if we learnt our words properly and have valid knowledge at our disposal. Such processes of perception, or rather, to put it more precisely, processes of information are an option, once tendencies towards homogenizing were successful, once cultural peculiarities were included in the repertoire of the formal options by repetitive application. As a result (of this) types evolve.

This kind of building oriented typologically or morphologically (both these terms are used likewise) works on the basis of context-defined generation of language. Approaches of the sort were brought back into the architectural discussion by the Italians Rossi and Aymonino (Venetian School) during the Seventies. Ten years later the discussion about the (abstract) concepts of the typological was held in Germany as well. Unfortunately, the design outlining and solutions referring to the typological, particularly during the time around the IBA, the International Building Exhibition in Berlin, were rather more defined by collecting, surveying and classifying approaches, which emulated J.N.L. Durand (he collected and published, at the beginning of the 19th century, building designs taken out of their regional and cultural origin) and which combined, without hesitating, rather thoughtlessly architectural forms from all periods of time and all parts of the world.

On this subject the Viennese architect and architectural theorist Schöllhammer wrote, in the magazine of the Austrian Society for Architecture UM BAU in 1981, an essay, which is highly topical even

today on the state-of-the-art development of the typological experience in practice. Schöllhammer constitutes the fact that the typological way of building has developed in a direction which, exclusively, amounts to nothing more than “...the usage, the application of ´elements which cannot be further ´demoted` without hinting on the purely ideological selection of these elements from a complex of potential options: the danger of this newly evolving trend, the deposits of which fill up journals everywhere, obviously exists in the way that it risks deteriorating into a formal idealism and thus getting stuck in a one-dimensional superficial construction. Because of the fact that this practice of handling matters leads to a perception of such elements as transhistorical (something, which would be perfectly justified on a syntagmatic level of the analysis), without marking it as an ideational abstraction – so to speak, as if it has always been there -, it runs the risk to become ahistorical. This is so namely because it overlooks the fact that the semantic dimension always evolves in a contextual way and not automatically, a priori .” (92 / Georg Schöllhammer: Nachgedanken: Ein Appendix zur Typologiediskussion [Afterthoughts: An Appendix on the Debate on Typology, in: UM BAU, 4. May 1981, Austrian Society for Architecture, Vienna, p. 20)

The way of morphological designing as as form of the typological practice, widespread during the Eighties, the kind, which was propagated for example by O.M. Ungers, was an approach, as described above, inherently layed down in an ahistorical and formal fashion. Neither place nor time justified the morphological choice.

In the meantime the typological way of building/ constructing has become history. By now typological argumentations (critical analysis) arise merely as occasional (isolated) phenomena. From the perspective of architectural theory this is a loss. The typological discourse was stopped too early, inter alia for the reason of the profanation, as mentioned briefly, of the typological theory by way of approaches ignoring context. Particularly against the background of the question described here, i.e. the questioning of the meaningfulness of architectural forms, what is necessary are theoretical reflections, which can link the architectonic form, the architectonic idea with cultural interrelationships, contexts (Realities) in a linguistic way. Form and Reality are mutually dependent. The form then can transport an idea, if reality was used

during the shaping process of the form. The basis of this incorporates an objectification of the working with form. The typological building can do this job and do it well. "The practice of a typological kind of building could be of help... in a societal system, which is increasingly complex; of help i.e. to balance out difficulties as regards tradition by way of not merely negating and demoting, deteriorating the Old, the historical deposits, but rather, with this (the Old) as background, to act on a par with it, and thus, the Old as well as the New, appear as the mirror image of the respective other – in the manner that the New entails the Old, and that the Old is interpreted by the New. This interpretation would at the same time be a new kind of structuring. The New would no longer stand in opposition to the Old, but rather would allow itself a discourse, a conversation with the latter. Such an interpretative breaking up of the existing structures would also lead to a new evaluation, assessment of these structures, the contemporary and timeless pattern would unite in a dialectic synthesis. Each New thus changes our memory." (93 / Georg Schöllhammer: *ibid.*, p. 21)

The meaningful intervention presented here attains its goal in a kind of working with form, which is based on the analysis of and the debate on reality and is committed to the intersubjective character of understanding and reason. Hence a particular importance and value is attached to the theme of culture of choice. Culture of choice does not mean limitation of options. But, to choose against the background of a societal, cultural context means to create, to generate awareness in the sense of a counterpole, an antithesis to destructive arbitrariness.

... wrapped up in the architectonic discourse

This essay devotes itself to the decolonialization of deteriorated lifeworlds in media-directed societies. Thus it primarily describes the task of contemporary architecture as regards the cultural domain of building: Protection of lifeworld issues by way of the reproduction of the structural components of the lifeworld, such as the individual, society and culture, and doing so with the help of architectural/architectonic, i.e. spatial/visual ways and means.

The interventions in the cultural domain of architecture, such as are accounted for and substantiated here, are not located as regards academic theory in the system of modern architectural theories. In the pre-modern theory of architecture the protection of issues as regards the lifeworld could not be a subject matter if only because of the fact that system and lifeworld were still identical, on a par with each other, or existed in relative closeness.

Against the background of a continuous, accelerating process of separation between system and lifeworld in modern, media-directed societies, a theoretical and adjoining practical analysis of and debate on this societal phenomenon will turn into a core task of architecture. A functionalistically characterized vocabulary does not enable the theory of architecture to argue as regards content, in the sense of spatial qualities beyond definite, concrete aims (space for proper cooking, proper sleeping, working...). The colonization of issues of the lifeworld also encroaches upon the abstract concepts. Functional practicality is perceived as the most directly, straightforwardly plain, often most economic reaction towards a claim, which is formulated in the systemic. Our conceptual term of functional practicality thus has experienced a system-functional constraint. System-functional decisions exclusively serve the maintenance of the systemic, they are decisions, which

“...stabilize an anonymous interconnection of action procedures, and they do so without any of the participants having to request for or even pay attention to the maintenance of this system. What, in this sense, is system-functional, as regards economy and administration, for instance an increase in condensing of the city center, together with accelerating real estate prices and growing revenues from taxation must in no way prove to be “functional” inside the horizon of the lifeworld of the inhabitants or the residents.” (94 / Jürgen Habermas in: *Die Neue Unübersichtlichkeit* [The New Disorganization], volume 321, 1985, p. 24)

The decolonialization of issues of the lifeworld with the help of architectural means, which is wished for, must be embedded in the abstractly clarifying conceptual terms of the theoretical approach. The conventional, common conceptual term of functionalism has to be questioned as regards its being a potentially systemic subject matter.

For us architects the conceptual term of the functional is part of our way of seeing ourselves professionally. It is a conceptual term, which we interpret either in a very narrow, restricted manner, in the functionalist sense, its functionalist meaning, or in a broader integral sense. In any case, we comprehend the functional as immanent, mirrored, reflected in the logic of our discipline: “Thus, ‘functional’ is the means that are appropriate in respect to an aim, a purpose. This is the sense in which a functionalism understands itself, a functionalism, which pertains to construct the buildings with the provision that the purposes of the users are met”. (95/ Jürgen Habermas: *ibid.*, 1985)

The functional defines itself in respect to the purpose. In the case of practicality envisaged in a broader sense, the aggregate purpose is not to be found solely in the mechanical functioning of a spatial structure. Practicality interpreted in a broader fashion comprises the issues of the lifeworld. The conceptual term “Reproductional Function” was chosen in a very conscious manner, quite deliberately and intentionally. Hence an enlarged, broadened practicality as an architectural category does have two aspects, the one of the purely mechanical functioning and the one corresponding with issues of the lifeworld. F. L. Wright, already quoted as an advocate, a representative of the designing of atmospheres, made use of the slogan “form follows function” as coined by Sullivan frequently,

willingly, and with pleasure. Still, he was not a functionalist. But being an American, he knew of the fact that “follow” has more connotations than “folgen”. “Form accompanying a function or functions”, which would be another translation of “form follows function” quite definitely transcends the meaning of this wording, which has been trivialized by too frequent and incorrect usage into ethic dimensions. (“The proper (good) form.”) In any case it restricts the arbitrariness of the formal by means of concomitants putting forward content-related arguments.

The authors Hermann Hipp and Manfred Sack, quoted at the beginning, characterize Baukultur [the cultural domain of architecture] as a political conceptual term and all efforts as regards the cultural domain of architecture as a societal, communicative task and responsibility. The interventions in the cultural domain of architecture, laid out and analyzed in this text, see and understand themselves against this background as the technical, professional specification put forward in general terms, of a universally formulated responsibility, as the fundamentals of a genuine contribution of architecture as regards the societal efforts described, which are – at least this is how Habermas once phrased it – all about the competition of the communication developing an informed opinion with media power and money.

Bibliographie

|96

- 1 /in: Hermann Hipp, Baukultur und Stadtgestaltung, Schriftenreihe des BDA Hamburg, No. 7, p. 18.
- 2 / Hermann Hipp: *ibid.*, p. 21.
- 3 / Hermann Hipp : *ibid.*, p. 21.
- 4 / Hermann Hipp: *ibid.*, p. 21.
- 5 / Norbert Bolz: Die Sinngesellschaft, Düsseldorf, 1997.
- 6 / in: Wilhelm Schmid: Philosophie der Lebenskunst – eine Grundlegung, Frankfurt a. M., 1998, p. 194 ff.
- 7 / Wilhelm Schmid: *ibid.* p. 195.
- 8 / Darcy Ribeiro: Der Zivilisatorische Prozeß [The Process of Civilization], Frankfurt a.M., 1983, p. 23.
- 9 / Klaus Eder: Die Entstehung staatlich organisierter Gesellschaften [The Development of State-run Societies], Frankfurt a. M., 1980, p. 170.
- 10 / Darcy Ribeiro: *ibid.*, p. 23.
- 11 / Darcy Ribeiro: *ibid.*, p. 25.
- 12 / Klaus Eder: Die Entstehung staatlich organisierter Gesellschaften [The Creation of State-Organized Societies], Frankfurt a. M., 1980, p. 171.
- 13 / Niklas Luhmann: Macht [Power], Stuttgart 1988.
- 14 / Niklas Luhmann: *ibid.*, p.7.
- 15 / Enrico Guidoni: Architektur der Primitiven Kulturen, Stuttgart-Milano,1975.
- 16 / Klaus Eder: *ibid.*, p. 40.
- 17 / M.D. Stahlin Stone Age Economics, Chicago 1972, p. 199.
- 18 / Klaus Eder: *ibid.*, p. 28.
- 19 / Jean Piaget in: Klaus Eder, The Emergence/Evolution of Governmental Societies Organized around a State, Frankfurt a. M.1980, p. 152.

- 20 / Lucien Sebag: Marxism And Structuralism, Frankfurt a. M., 1967, p. 12.
- 21 / Klaus Eder: *ibid.*, p. 52.
- 22 / W. Godelier: Economical Anthropology, Reinbek, 1973.
- 23 / Enrico Guidoni: *ibid.*, p. 29.
- 24 / also read: Ludwig Fromm: Tipi/Ba nag/ Berber Tent, Image, 1985.
- 25 / Reginald and Gladys Laubin: The Indian Tipi, Ballantine Book, 1957.
- 26 / Enrico Guidoni: *ibid.*, p. 9.
- 27 / read V. Gordon Childe: Social Evolution, Frankfurt a. M., 1968.
- 28 / Darcy Ribeiro: *ibid.*, p. 66.
- 29 / Jean Becher: The Evolution of Capitalism, in: Religion and Societal Development, Frankfurt a. M., 1973, p. 137.
- 30 / Klaus Eder: *ibid.*, p. 180 ff.
- 31 / Klaus Eder: *ibid.*, p.154.
- 32 / read in: Martin Warnke: Construction and Superstructure, Frankfurt a. M., 1984.
- 33 / Arnold Hauser: Art and Society, Munich, 1973, p. 94.
- 34 / read in: Wolfgang Köhler: The Tasks of Gestalt-Psychology, Berlin, 1971.
- 35 / Arnold Hauser: *ibid.*, p. 94.
- 36/ “Large periods of the history of architecture give evidence... of a continuity of motives, which are integrated into changing contents” in: Norberg-Schulz, The Logic of the Art of Architecture (Baukunst), p. 162.
- 37 / Georg Schöllhammer: “Nachgedanken” (Post-Reflections/ Afterthoughts), in: Um Bau 4 (“On Architecture/Construction/ Building”), Austrian Society of Architecture, Vienna, May 1981, p. 13 ff.
- 38 / Georg Schöllhammer: *ibid.*, p. 14.
- 39 /Darcy Ribeiro: *ibid.*, p.132.
- 40 / Darcy Ribeiro: *ibid.*, p. 132.
- 41 / Darcy Ribeiro: *ibid.*, p. 148.
- 42 / Jürgen Habermas: The Theory of Communicative Action, Frankfurt a. M., 1982.
- 43 / Jürgen Habermas: *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 25.
- 44 / Jürgen Habermas: *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 189.
- 45 / Jürgen Habermas: *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 192.

|97

- 46 / Jürgen Habermas: *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 230.
 47 / Jürgen Habermas: *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 273.
 48 / Jürgen Habermas: *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 278.
 49 / Jürgen Habermas: *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 277 ff.
 50 / Jürgen Habermas: *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 272.
 51 / Klaus Eder: *ibid.*, p. 156.
 52 / Franz Borkenau: *The Destruction....in: Syfahrt, Constans, Spondel, Walter: Religion and Societal Development, Frankfurt a. M. , 1973.*
 53 / Guy E. Swanson: *The Birth of God, in: Syfahrt al., Religion and Societal Development, Frankfurt a.M. , 1973.*
 54 / Jean Baecher, in: *Syfarth.*
 55 / Klaus Eder : *ibid.*, p. 157.
 56 / Martin Jänicke: *Staatsversagen – die Ohnmacht der Politik in der Industriegesellschaft [The Failure of the State – the Impotence of Politics in Industrial Society], Munich, 1986, p. 19.*
 57 / Jürgen Habermas, *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 219/220.
 58 / Günter Bandmann: *Iconology of Architecture, in: Martin Warnke (ed.), Political Architecture in Europe, Cologne, 1984, p. 58.*
 59 / Günter Bandmann: *ibid.*, p. 59.
 60 / Günter Bandmann: *ibid.*, p. 60.
 61 / Wilhelm Schmid: *ibid.*, p. 188.
 62 / Gernot Böhme: *Atmosphäre[Atmosphere], Frankfurt a. M., 1995, p.21 ff.*
 63 / Thomas S. Kuhn: *Die Struktur wissenschaftlicher Revolution [The Structure of Scientific Revolution], Frankfurt a. M., 1988.*
 64 / Jürgen Habermas: *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns [Theory of Communicative Action], vol. 2, Frankfurt a. M., 1982, p. 212 ff.*
 65 / Habermas: *ibid.*, 1982, vol 2, p. 212/213.
 66 / Mark Wigley, *Die Architektur der Atmosphäre [The Architecture of Atmosphere], Daidalos 68/1998, p.18.*
 67 / Read: Wolfgang Köhler, *Die Aufgabe der Gestaltpsychologie [The Task/The Duty of Gestalt Psychology], Berlin, 1971.*
 68 / Mark Wigley: *Die Architektur der Atmosphäre[The Architecture*

- of Atmosphere], in: Daidalos 68, ibid, 1998, p. 25.*
 69 / Gernot Böhme, *ibid.*, p. 25.
 70 / Gernot Böhme, *ibid.*, p. 25.
 71 / Gernot Böhme, *ibid.*, p. 25.
 72 / Gernot Böhme: *Lecture on: Ästhetische Naturerkenntnis [Aesthetic Cognition of Nature], Kongress “Die Aktualität des Ästhetischen” [Congress on “The Currentness of the Aesthetic”], 1992.*
 73 / Carl Gustav Jung: *Der Mensch und seine Symbole [Man and his Symbols], Freiburg, 1979, p. 21 ff.*
 74 / Daidalos, *Architektur, Kunst, Kultur [Architecture, Art, Culture], 68/1998, p. 90 ff.*
 75 / Peter Zumthor: *Daidalos, ibid.*
 76 / Gernot Böhme, *ibid.*, p. 166 ff.
 77 / Detlef-Ingo Lauf: *Symbole [Symbols], Frankfurt, 1976, p. 9 ff.*
 78 / Ba `Ra Heidi Fischer, *Symbole der Urerfahrung und ihre Wiederholung im Bauen [Symbols of Primary Experience/Inexperience and Their Repetition in Construction/Architecture], Frankfurt-Bern 1981.*
 79 / *Der Architekt [The Architect], Magazine of the BDA, 7/July 1999, p.15 ff.*
 80 / Frank Lloyd Wright in: Mark Wigley, *Die Architektur der Atmosphäre [The Architecture of Atmosphere], Daidalos 68/1998, p. 19.*
 81 / R. Firth: *We, the Tikopia, in: Kevin Lynch, Das Bild der Stadt [The Image of the City], p. 158.*
 82 / Jürgen Habermas: *Theorie des kommunikativen Handelns, vol. 2, ibid, p. 213.*
 83 / Günter Fischer: *Architektur und Sprache [Architecture and Language], Stuttgart-Zürich, 1991.*
 84 / Günter Fischer: *Architektur und Sprache[Architecture and Language], Stuttgart-Zürich, 1991, p. 32 ff.*
 85 / Norbert Bolz, *Die Sinngesellschaft [The Society of Meaning], Düsseldorf, 1997, p. 11.*
 86 / Jürgen Habermas: *ibid.*, vol. 2, p. 213.
 87 / Jürgen Habermas; *ibid.*, p. 209.

88 / W. Schmid: Philosophie der Lebenskunst [The Philosophy of Experienced Life (Knowing How to Live)], ibid., 1998, p. 101.

90 / W. Schmid: ibid., p. 101.

91 / Gerd Klamandt: Curriculum for the Subject of Teachings on Space and Buildings, Muthesius-University, Kiel, 1998. The subject was developed in co-operation of the sociologist Gerd Klamandt.

92 / Georg Schöllhammer: Nachgedanken: Ein Appendix zur Typologiediskussion [Afterthoughts: An Appendix on the Debate on Typology, in: UM BAU, 4. May 1981, Austrian Society for Architecture, Vienna, p. 20.

93 / Georg Schöllhammer: ibid., p. 21.

94 / Jürgen Habermas in: Die Neue Unübersichtlichkeit [The New Disorganization], volume 321, 1985, p. 24.

95 / Jürgen Habermas: ibid., 1985.

Remarks as regards the translation:

The decision was made to translate in a manner that stays not only true to the original text but achieves an utmost closeness.

This decision unfortunately has a probably unwelcome consequence, i.e. a not altogether too “elegant” English – because of the very distinct academic German (e.g. the predominantly nominal language/linguistic peculiarities deriving not only from the subject matter but due to the very complex, incapsulated language used by the so-called “Frankfurt School” of philosophers and sociologists, which is interwoven into the text and rather characterizes the text as a whole).

Still, attempts were made to ease comprehension, e.g. by way of, at times, offering two or three English terms in order to achieve the respective connotations of the term in question in both languages.

Where there are complex terms requiring contextual definition, the English text often differs severely, particularly as regards semantics, from the original German version for the sake of clearness of meaning, of comprehensibility.