THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THEORY AND IDEOLOGY IN ARCHITECTURE

Mimarlıkta Teori ve İdeoloji Arasındaki Fark

ALEKSANDAR KADİJEVİĆ

(Prof. Dr.), Belgrade University, Faculty of Philosophy, Department of Art History, Belgrade / Serbia, e-mail: akadijev@f.bg.ac.rs, ORCID: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1875-8093

Atıf/Citation

THE DIFFERENCE BETWEEN THEORY AND IDEOLOGY IN ARCHITECTURE

Mimarlıkta Teori ve İdeoloji Arasındaki Fark

ALEKSANDAR KADİJEVİĆ

Abstract: Apart from a lesser degree of philosophical aesthetics, architects predominantly rely on two fundamental intellectual discourses that are thematically intertwined and conceptually too often identified: theory and ideology. The influence of these discourses on individual opuses and construction schools is best seen from the historical distance. They give to architectural creations deeper thought (theory) and a practical projective dimension (ideology). Moderate, constitutively and constructively oriented ideologies stimulate the attainment of a tolerable, sustainable social reality, while pronounced pragmatism and unilateralism are at the heart of every extreme ideology that seeks to realize as fully as possible. Ideology often stimulates the distorted consciousness, the distorted image of the world and its appearance, arising from the limited interests of the conflicted groups and their partial perception of reality. Hence, she "disseminates", beautifies or degrades the actual status of the quo of socio-cultural reality, in accordance with the specific interests of its agents.

Keywords: Architecture, history, theory, ideology, historiography

Öz: Daha az derecede felsefi estetikten farklı olarak, mimarlar çoğunlukla tematik olarak iç içe geçmiş ve kavramsal olarak çok sık tanımlanan iki temel entelektüel söylemden yararlanır: teori ve ideoloji. Bu söylemlerin bireysel kullanımlara ve inşaat okullarına etkisi en iyi tarihsel mesafeden görülür. Mimari kreasyonlara daha derin düşünce (teori) ve pratik bir yansıtıcı boyut (ideoloji) verir. Ilımlı, yapıcı ve yapıcı odaklı ideolojiler tolere edilebilir, sürdürülebilir bir sosyal gerçekliğin elde edilmesini teşvik ederken, pragmatizm ve tek taraflılık, mümkün olduğu kadar tam anlamıyla gerçekleştirmeyi amaçlayan her aşırı ideolojinin merkezinde yer almaktadır. İdeoloji, çatışan grupların sınırlı ilgi alanlarından ve onların kısmi gerçeklik algısından kaynaklanan çarpık bilinci, dünyanın çarpık imajını ve görünüşünü uyarır. Bu nedenle, temsilcilerinin özel ilgi alanlarına uygun olarak, sosyokültürel gerçeklik kotasının gerçek durumunu "yayar", güzelleştirir ya da azaltır.

Anahtar Kelimeler: Mimarlık, tarih, teori, ideoloji, tarih yazımı

Apart from a lesser degree of philosophical aesthetics, architects predominantly rely on two fundamental intellectual discourses that are thematically intertwined and conceptually too often identified: theory and ideology. The influence of these discourses on individual opuses and construction schools is best seen from the historical distance. They give to architectural creations deeper thought (theory) and a practical projective dimension (ideology).

The theory of architecture, as a way of re-examining the role of architectural creativity in a certain epoch or within a diachronic transepochal continuum, develops primarily in a narrower circle of interested experts in which it achieves a primary effect (thinkers and designers).[1] Unlike critics, influential theorists seek to uncover and explain the universal laws of architecture development. They are communicated in exhaustive treatises or in lesser subject articles. Architectural theory, in addition to the designs that dealt with the thoughtful background of current creativity (Alberti, Palladio, Serlio, Vignola, Ledoux, Boullee, Semper, Sullivan, Wright, Loos, Gropius, Le Corbusier, Rossi, Venturi, Tschumi, Ando, Koolhaas, Ibelings),

---

[1] *Hanno Walter Kruft*, *History of Architectural Theory*, Princeton Architectural Press, Princeton 1997.

philosophers, cultural scientists, urban anthropologists, art historians and sociologists of the city (Heidegger, Adorno, Gideon, Lefebvre, Barthes, Foucault, Eco, Tafuri, Derrida, Giddens and others).[2]

Based on the original guidelines, theoretical considerations determine the directions of the development of architecture in each epoch, re-examining the methods of its creative upgrade. In doing so, the abstractness of the departed starting points is apparent, suitable for the problematization of the laws that connect the past, the present and the future of construction. Unlike ideology (a transitional strategy that designs the practical realization of the set goals), whose forms of manifestation are publicly visible and socially engaged, theory is established as a neutral doctrinal system. Concerned by reasoning and justifying their own thesis, as well as the criticism of others, theorists do not promote their unconditional devotion. They are more interested in a logical confirmation of their sustainability than a consistent and comprehensive application. In this way, unlike the pragmatic of ideology, theory is established as a recommended speculative platform, instead of a consistently binding doctrine. She passes the practical operability to an ideology that is expressed through stories, appeals, manifest-program tours, passwords and slogans.

Bringing architectural trends in relation to the various spiritual aspirations of his time and the scientific disciplines on which he relies partly, the theory establishes a sustainable normative system of design. Hence, it focuses on the baseline principles from which it performs acceptable logical consequences. In addition to the intellectual audience, theoreticians turn to designers, architecture schools and professional associations, as well as contractors and financiers of architectural creativity through practical guidelines.

Despite its abstract explanation, theory always has an implicit design dimension that is expressed in two forms - engaged and passive. Critically engaged theory is established as the basis of the whole practice, while the passive remains isolated in speculative frameworks. It strives more for conceptual upgrading and internal reinterpretation, rather than concentration of power and control of practice.

Some theories problematize the ontological and epistemological aspects of architecture, while others question its aesthetic, social and ethical orientation (to the incarnation of the absolute spirit, the domination of the nation, race, class, restoring religious consciousness, revolutionary social transformation, achieving a more righteous future, democratizing culture, intercultural dialogue). While passive theories underline the spiritual distance of architecture from society and its varied interests, engaged activists encourage its adjustment to major reform goals, emphasizing the critical dimension as the primary one.

In order to popularize their own theoretical starting points, part of the designers regularly propagate them through speeches, discussions and articles, based on which their historical incentives are determined from the distance. But experience shows that there were no strict consistency in the most engaged architectural theorists, but the words (axioms, guidelines and recommendations) and construction achievements often differed in content, which confirms the fact that in art it is not always possible to consistently represent the set goals.

The theoretical or non-disproportionate attitude is not of crucial importance for evaluating architecture at a certain time, because often the most authoritative creators do not explicitly explain them, intuitively representing them in an artistic layered and rhetorical multifaceted form. The same holds true for the ideological plane of architecture that is subject to the most varied pragmatic instrumentalizations. Hence the theoretical incentives and the ideological

---

[2] *Hanno-Walter Kruft, ibidem;*   Miloš Perović, *Antologija teorija arhitekture XX veka*, Građevinska knjiga, Beograd 2008.

Osmanlı Mirası Araştırmaları Dergisi / Journal of Ottoman Legacy Studies
Cilt 6, Sayı 15, Temmuz 2019 / Volume 6, Issue 15, July 2019

364

foundation of the presented attitudes does not guarantee the ability to achieve equally valuable results on the artistic plan, as evidenced by the entire history of architecture.

And within architectural historiography there are different theoretical models focused on specific cognitive priorities. Guided by the theoretical principles that produce practical consequences, they are recognized by the centers from which they have evolved, in accordance with the innovations of emancipatory higher education institutions and professional associations, and sometimes charismatic independent researchers.

On the other hand, ideology as a phenomenon is insufficiently precisely defined in studies on architecture. The breadth of the range and the multiplicity of the meaning of this complex term, technically applicable to the most diverse discourses, in less consistent historiographic platforms has caused its diluted and reckless terminological use.[3] Often used as a collective synonym for a variety of different socio-cultural phenomena, the notion of ideology is already initially postulated as abstract and multifaceted. His phenomenological explanation, elaborated in sociological and philosophical literature, did not crystallize sufficiently in the history of architecture. And expressing the ideologisation of social reality within the post-war bipolar world order, it further disturbed the interested interpreters to initiate critical discourses about this controversial phenomenon, which in the last centuries had significant repercussions on the development of architecture.[4]

With the collapse of the Berlin Wall in 1989, by reducing and eliminating the most diverse totalitarian pressures, by opening long inaccessible collections of historical documents, interest in the ideological foundations of new construction ventures has increased rapidly. The possibility to adequately provide adequate evidence supports the assumptions about the fundamental ideological condition of architectural achievements, accelerated the finding and "reading" of ideological proclamations on the facades of significant buildings. And the gradual methodological maturation of the discourse on this subject brought a shift in the analytical-hermeneutical level.

For a long time, consideration of the ideological premises of the analyzed construction fund has become a priority topic of contemporary historiography for a short time. The greatest attention was paid to the influence of political, governing and social ideologies on the structure of architectural achievements. Nevertheless, despite the increased interest, the interpreters dealt with this issue partially, overlooking the fact that the ideological layer of architecture is not exclusively politically determined. This reduced the importance of the author's personal ideologies as well as the collective ideological models developed in narrowly expert architectural and urbanistic circles.

In recent years, within the framework of innovative studies of this type, there have been some adventures that could be brought under the notion of ideology, whose conclusions must be subject to timely criticism. Ideologism, as a scientific and theoretical position, insists on the ideological-political premise of artistic work and their over-emphasis in historiographical interpretations. It is already recognized in titles of published works, their composition, terminology and criteriology. Starting from the belief that the whole architecture is ideologized and politically instrumental, experts of this orientation persistently emphasize its extra-curricular background, calling, with indisputably reliable, and indirectly unfounded sources, placing arbitrary parallels, superficial analogies and speculations. In their analysis of architectural compositions, they generally favor their generative elements that come out of the professional sphere, neglecting their autonomous artistic postulates.

---

[3] *Karl Mannheim, Ideologie und Utopie,Cohen,* Bonn 1929.
[4] Aleksandar Kadijević, *Uloga ideologije u novijoj arhitekturi i njena shvatanja u istoriografiji*, Nasleđe VIII, Beograd 2007, 225-237.

Osmanlı Mirası Araştırmaları Dergisi / Journal of Ottoman Legacy Studies
Cilt 6, Sayı 15, Temmuz 2019 / Volume 6, Issue 15, July 2019

365

Only in the absence of deeper cognitive mechanisms and readiness to comprehensively examine the subject matter, adapted to its layered historical character, interpreters resort to the emphasis on partial aspects of architectural creativity, such as technique, materialization, aesthetics, semiotics, economic-energy profitability, or political-ideological background. Sometimes they do this from uncritical belief that the other generative elements of architectural works are thoroughly researched and adequately broken (which can never be fully realized). Such a reductionist methodology, which, by inertia, acquires an increasing number of devotees, ignores the multiplicity of phenomenological layers of architecture, which are allottedly unified its functional, structural, morphological and symbolic components. This does not mean that the ideological foundations of construction must be ignored, but should be interpreted more responsibly and precisely, in accordance with their historical role, precisely measurable by the analysis of the available sources.

Unlike most architects, ideologically oriented political ambitions were primarily the orderers of their buildings. This does not mean that the builders who had materialized them, as a rule, represented the same ideological views. Therefore, when analyzing the opus of the architects, it should carefully separate the ideological from the aesthetic level of their work, by determining the ways in which they communicated with the ideas of the contractors within their work, or to what extent aesthetic contents were substituted or supplemented by ideological ones. Program-based ideas could elevate to a sublime and symbolic level, make them timely current, or marginalize them, giving preference to exploring the form and spirit of the city. On the other hand, a considerable number of public buildings built in state control over the last two centuries have no distinct ideological and political features, which makes it possible to conclude that newer architecture does not fully represent the elements of ruling ideologies, political doctrines and practices. Glorification of certain ideologies, as well as the pejorative display of defeated and hostile ones, from the architects were more prone sculptors and painters in the decoration of buildings, which is what informs us of the historiography of these artistic disciplines.

As historically legitimate, often conflicted thought points, simultaneous ideologies represent influential factors in open cultural environments, fighting the arguments for achievement and supremacy. In closed and repressive political systems, instead of ideological pluralism, monism is often monitored, often but not always, in the architecture of public state structures.

Ideologies include a wide range of driving ideas and goals that the architect strives during his artistic work, logically and objectively harmonized. Understood as a form of practical architectural philosophy, the applicable conceptual scheme, ideology represents a principled basis for total professional and social action.

With the ideology of the social group, architectural movements and individuals try to present their understanding of historical processes, thoughts and values to acceptable from the point of view of social conventions, and their own methods of indicative ones. Often form a special image of safety and represent the principles that are diametrically different from those of other authoritative colleagues. It is more difficult to change the situation in the profession and society, redirecting the historical flows in the desired direction. In doing so, they can be guided by personal ambitions, emancipatory enlightenment ideals, as well as extra-ordinary, freely chosen or imposed socio-economic interests.[5] It is indicative that, in confronting opposing attitudes, ideologists never consider themselves to be problematic, but inconsistency, incongruity, and utopianism are always found in other ideologies.[6]

---

[5] Heide Berndt, Alfred Lorewezer, Klaus Horn (eds.), *Architektur als Ideologie,* Edition suhrkamp, Frankfurth am Main 1968.
[6] *Mannheim, ibidem.*

Given the fact that the design process is fundamentally different from the design of ideological proclamations (expressed in political tracts, pamphlets, memoirs, speeches, party programs and various media appearances), its final result, however much controlled by the extra-factorial factors (narrators, duty advisers, censors, state security services), with their independent ontological status and formal-structural uniqueness, essentially opposes the reduction to the subject of an absolute political instrument. In other words, each object in a thematic-symbolic sense is much more than an ideologically similar and politically cost-effective accomplishment that the procuring entity has sought, and in some cases its artistic rhetoric shows the drawbacks of an investor's political doctrine rather than popular as an exemplary and generally acceptable, are confirmed by numerous examples of Nazi, fascist or socrealistic architecture.

The ideology is expressed in various forms in the vocation of architects. In the course of the design process, while respecting the investor's planned program, it as a rule completes, and often directs the personal ambitions of the builder. Previous experiences show that they can have more functions in their career: informative-descriptive, with which the architect occasionally publicly comments on his own creative platform; program-manifest, when its postulate is presented in the form of a reasoned project strategy; apologetic-critical, when it publicly supports or rejects other ideological determinations, and a pragmatic business-profit, aimed at achieving social recognition and measurable material profit. It is primarily shaped as a corpus of conceptual starting points by which the architect supports the conceptions of a certain style and aesthetic principles, adapting to the program definitions of building contractors and leading ideologies in society. In democratically more developed environments and through architecture, a fruitful "dialogue" ideology develops, making their cultural life richer and more dynamic.

Defining the methods with which the goals will be achieved and achieving the proclaimed values is a priority in the formulation of each ideological platform. Unlike the political, military and economic spheres in which ideology is postulated in the form of time-limited, phase-executable doctrines, in architecture it is expressed through less precise, more abstract proclamations. The complex personal ideology of architects, often difficult to interpret, and sometimes totally enigmatic, obviously draws inspiration from the history of architecture and ideas, but also from contemporary social, scientific and artistic aspirations. After a period of crystallization of ideological attitudes, the architects propagate them publicly (in oral or written form), or tacitly represent them through the iconography and semiotics of construction works, whether it be narrowly skilled, culturally or politically oriented ideologies.

Contrary to the theoretical considerations, explained in exhaustive discussions, the architects' ideological conclusions are more concise, more receptive to the wider audience, embedded in professional articles, manifestoes, speeches, lectures, autobiographies, memoirs, autographs, interviews, open letters and statements. Most often, this is a sincere, emotional public address, with the absence of exact evidence layers that feature theoretical approaches. These appearances are mostly socially engaged and critically intoned. Likewise, the architect's password, motto, appeal, password or axiomatic attitude, apart from showing his personal character and pragmatic support for business ambitions (personal "advertising"), also serves for publishing ideological goals.

Ideology is more flexible than theory, because it is more directly embedded in reality, more easily acquires followers and followers, acquires the institutional and material support of the patroness. The most aggressively publicly publicized, provoked by the turbulent counter-narratives of the unthinkable, provokes opponents and critics. It is always against something and for something, unlike the scientific theory that in the doctrinal form strives to maintain neutrality in relation to the state of social reality. In cases where social or artistic theory seeks to put as full an idea as possible in practice, it often takes on the form and the way of the advent of

ideology. Hence, it can be concluded that historically the most influential ideologies are largely derived from the theory whose postulates were programmatically developed and propagated.

Because of its adaptability and social engagement, ideology is more media-driven, more popular and more current than any theory. Less layered and less abstract, receptive to the broadest audience, ideological discourse is much more effective than theoretical, because it is closer to life and focused on practical realization. Contrary to the impartial and consistent, technical language of the theory, the rhetoric of ideology is often performed by the emotions of passionate visionaries or rational proclamations of determined reformers. Sometimes they are driven by the ambitions of individuals to gain more powerful political functions as carriers of technical intelligence. When deprived of a more emotive or critical charge, the ideological architects' appearances show non-radicalism, apolitism, and social unenlightening, which also testifies to the character of their personal aspirations.

Ideological activism involves belonging to a wider collegial or social circle of minded people, formed to achieve common interests. Architectural careers are permeated and supported by the work of the group, despite differences in author's poetics. The coherence of the circle (which does not always involve frequent personal contacts, firm organization and hierarchy) is permanently maintained by ideologists, charismatic founders of artistic movements and advocates of radical changes.

The history of art shows that most of the architects relied on the "official" middle-class flow of architectural events, neither avant-garde nor retrograde, while the minority of the most empowered people associated with counterfeit ideas and programs. The ideological upgrading of established stylistic codes is fundamentally supported, and those insufficiently accepted profiling and popularizing. The disadvantages of many ideological discourses in architecture are reflected in their fragile theoretical addition, as well as the inauthentic adoption of fundamental guidelines from other areas, primarily from dominant cultural and political ideologies, and sometimes from under-founded scientific theories.

Conclusion

Moderate, constitutively and constructively oriented ideologies stimulate the attainment of a tolerable, sustainable social reality, while pronounced pragmatism and unilateralism are at the heart of every extreme ideology that seeks to realize as fully as possible. Ideology often stimulates the distorted consciousness, the distorted image of the world and its appearance, arising from the limited interests of the conflicted groups and their partial perception of reality. Hence, she "disseminates", beautifies or degrades the actual status of the quo of socio-cultural reality, in accordance with the specific interests of its agents.

It is important to point out that ideology is not always a set of misconceptions, the practice of concealing and forgery of real relationships, but also the expression of objective and impartial demands. In spite of the deep ethical gap between the different types of ideological performance, as well as the increasingly obsolete ideologies on the historical scene, new and different ideologies are emerging that express the aspirations of the overwhelming generations of creators.

Bibliography

Bakos, Jan, *Monuments and Ideologies*, Centropa 2, New York 2001, 101-107.

Berndt, Heide, Lorewezer, Alfred, Horn, Klaus (eds.), *Architektur als Ideologie,* Edition suhrkamp, Frankfurth am Main 1968.

Kadijević, Aleksandar, *Arhitektura i duh vremena*, Građevinska knjiga, Beograd 2010.

Kadijević, Aleksandar, *Uloga ideologije u novijoj arhitekturi i njena shvatanja u istoriografiji*, Nasleđe VIII, Beograd 2007, 225-237.

Knoll, Petar, *Ideologija moderne arhitekture*, Arhitektura 9, Ljubljana 1933, 124-130.

Kruft, Hanno-Walter, History of Architectural Theory, Princeton Architectural Press, Princeton 1997.

Mannheim, Karl, Ideologie und Utopie,Cohen, Bonn 1929.

Perović, Miloš, *Antologija teorija arhitekture XX veka*, Građevinska knjiga, Beograd 2008.