

# A SELF-MADE SCALE OF VALUES FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL CULTURE

F. VÁMOSSY

Institute of History and Theory of Architecture,  
Technical University, H-1521 Budapest

Received February 21, 1985  
Presented by Prof. Dr. J. Bonta

## Summary

An art philosophy approach to categories of architecture and of design is outlined, starting from the theorem "art is of all of us" by William Morris, referred to the environment culture. Culture of architecture may be considered as the scale of progress in this direction. Renewal of the environment has to rely on labour division forms arisen in the scientific-technical revolution, on integration of the profession of architect, on a new, comprehensive approach to, and methods of design — from structure through architecture to urbanology — on a mentality uniting artistic-technical abilities and social sensitivity. An answer is sought to the question, whether this extended set of requirements can be accommodated in the category of arts or not.

## The realm of forms — environmental art

"Art is for all of us"  
John Ruskin

Along the long way of our analyses, architecture has been considered — either said or unsaid — as result of an autotelic, creative, consubstantial activity with intrinsic entity, comprising an inseparable unity of science, craft, art [1]. We have not analyzed, however, the real quality of this activity, where it comes from and how it realizes the unity of the human-social creativity and the social task, how this specific activity reflects us on ever rising levels beginning from the reality of direct social existence, up to arts, the top level unfolding of the mental-social structures. The question was not raised, since there was no doubt about the answer: If art — as Lukács put it — is the "self-consciousness and memory of the human race" and if the human progress and the social development are nothing else but the unfolding of the human character, then can architecture be considered as an art at all, and is it possible to measure the development of human character in the world of architectural forms and built environment? Does the degree of the unfolding of human freedom manifest itself in architecture, can it be gauged by the objective, built environment, by this characteristic feature and result of the process of self-realization of mankind? Or, approaching from another side: can the human

environment become a creation in its totality, realm of created-arranged forms, or is the chaos of subhuman, instinctive existence a necessity in our environment?

Thus, can Ruskin's principle: "...art is for all of us" [2] be realized in the process of social progress, and can it be realized exactly from the renewal of architectural activity and culture, from the advancement of this most ancestral and most general manifestation of human creative power, from this archetype of planning? Is it possible that the Aristotelian "entelecheia", this intrinsic purposefulness, real, definitive endeavour, "sense", can be extended to environment as a whole? May the Aristotelian theorem: "Forma dat esse rei" (form gives existence to things) be true in social-environmental meaning and scale? Thus, if the real existence of things is born through taking shape, may a new architectural culture arise, one that realizes, develops humanity in our race better and completer than ever, on the level and in the manner of a conscious being living its real history rather than its prehistory? Hence, do we pursue real social goals or vain daydreams?

Are the lines in *Doctor Faustus* written in the infernal autumn 1943 truthful, in which the ravaging horror forces the doubt residing in Thomas Mann to question actuality, sense and even possibility of work, creation, opus? Or may we believe in the renewal of possibilities of the point of origin he also believed in? "Creation is the result of work, professional skill, and its goal is to give rise to illusion — now, one may wonder if, at the actual level of our consciousness, and sense of reality, this play is tolerable, if it is mentally possible, and whether it can be taken seriously? And further, whether the work as harmonic, self-contained formation has some legitimate relation to the perfect uncertainty, disorder of our social conditions, or is every illusion, even the most beautiful one, a lie?" [3].

This open itemization of the contradiction between creation and reality lost nothing of its actuality. The feeling of impossibility of creation, the denial of the possibility of progress together with the fear experienced deeply penetrated our hearts. Revolt against a "closed art work" became a peculiarity of this age of ours, and this denial involves the doubt about, and the rejection of perspectives; distress and relaxation have — inevitably — disillusion as concomitant. The danger is factual, and doubt is rightful, progress through arts and science seems often illusory; yet, in this world of ours, renewal is under way.

"Science may alter the world but cannot alter man" — suggests André Malraux [4], and in critic instants of our age it is easier to believe him than to trust in slow processes of varying circumstances to form man. Amidst depressive abysses of this century, triumph of reason and goodwill can hardly be believed in. Today, more is spent on armament all over the world than on construction; in the alarming possession of arms apt to destroy all the

Earth surface may we still believe in the presence of "Great Age" predicted by Le Corbusier? After the age of Scientific-Technical Revolution borne out of war and driven by the advancement of military engineering, what is there for mankind to expect?

This is both the start and the final point of our arguments. New possibilities of creation are deduced from the omnipotence of destruction. If technical-scientific development of this age is able to produce — by its extreme concentration, organization, and foresight — extreme threat to human life, then, through regrouping goals and means, utilizing revolutionary renewal, new organization of mental and physical potential, why not to master — again overwhelming — building and environmental problems?

There are only two alternatives of the universal tendency of urbanization, the abrupt propagation of industrial-technical civilization, the present world-wide fermentation. Opposing the sinister prediction of "fireball on Earth", the alternative of survival, renewal, and subsistence of mankind should be believed in [5].

#### Renewal of Architectural Culture

"I do not want art for a few, any  
more than education for a few, or  
freedom for a few." [6]  
William Morris

Approaching phenomena of human culture illuminated in a way to produce and to gauge values by social progress, architectural culture is seen to be one of the most important domains and characteristics of progress, of the step in human endeavours to self-realization — self-perfection. Level and degree of evolution of human freedom is not only reflected in architecture but architecture itself is one means and condition of the realization of freedom. Progress itself can only be measured with the proliferation of human values including those of architecture and arts, and characterized by the threshold value of transgression from subhuman to full human life. Technical variation, transformation of living conditions produces no value in itself but it makes the quality of life transformable to a more human one. These possibilities have since long been available — for privileged social layers; historical opportunity and task of this age is to open cultural values for everybody and to make them property of the entire mankind.

Mankind crossing boundaries of this age, no doubt, inherits high-level technical development — no single condition, however, of progress, whatever cumulated. Convergence of creativity and new social tasks, consubstantiality of creativity and creation of man can only be achieved in possession of means beyond material ones that are inaccessible for us as yet.

Disregarding essential structural conditions of society, the primary, overwhelming role of a social-productive system, let us consider now conditions of creating a more human environment, possibilities of progress under given conditions of production. Are not we ready for change, is there a possibility to reformulate the problem of the creation of environment at the level of arts, in possession of a renewed architectural culture?

For instance, is one of the most important factors, perfect knowledge of technical means available? Is there ability to systematize, are there methods to create the expected new unity under these more complex circumstances of accelerated technical progress? Anyhow, may one keep oneself (in a way to purify human condition, to develop and liberate our personality, in spite of the growing detachment from nature) in the process of oppressing technical and social changes? How to make technology a means for the creation of environment and an agent which maintains the relationship between ourselves and Nature? In trying to answer these questions, seeking the most essential solution, change in the long path of the change and development of architecture and arts, problems and shifts in division of labour, this overimportant phenomenon, the progress of social reorganization is to be encountered and its process reconsidered.

Our progress in the process of labour division is a rather typical feature of the history of mankind, and the topmost condition of development, also in respect of science, arts and architecture. Rather than dwelling on this process as a whole, some peculiarities of importance for our subject will be emphasised.

The inherent unity of culture and civilization before the industrial revolution (based on crafts, animal power and manpower, later on mental capacities) necessarily became decomposed with the structural change of conditions. At this new level of development requiring a different organization, the unity of man and artist has to be created through and on the level of a conscious mental activity, in the developed system of labour division of our age, where a new culture of work has to be created. New methods of division of labour, conditions of an efficient interaction of tools, have actually been sought for. This process induces renewal of the approach to architecture of our age revaluating its competency, range, assimilating the comprehensive task of shaping the environment. This is the only way to realize the principle: "art is for all of us", on the ground of architectural culture communicating value to the masses, forming simultaneously man and world while renewing them. Can this new art with the comprehensive demand for shaping the environment still be termed architecture? Probably it can, namely design itself, high-grade representant of the actual level of mental labour division, of an increased apparatus and range (actually, uniform or at least affine creative activities of increased importance, from the design of objects, indus-

trial design, to town planning), consubstantial with architecture, originating from its methods, and revivifying its possibilities [7].

A similar process, though, of a narrower range, had taken place at the very beginning. Relatively early in historical development — with the arise of architecture, when architecture as an art started — the mental delimiting function already got detached; within the ancestral unity of handicrafts, this series of operations conditioned by communal activity required already at this elementary stage a personality in charge of caring for spatial order, “concept”, realization. Thereby, architecture representing inner scope, “entelechya” of collective activity has become prototype of a higher-order social organization, a hierarchy of labour division.

This gradual separation of architectural activity in the world of handicrafts predicts a subsequent process of labour division, as projection of a higher-order social organization. Thereby, this creative activity became mother of other arts, and the creation itself their supporter. Thus, the truth of “architectura est mater artium” is not consequence of architecture as space art, backbone of environment shaping alone, but on the same right of the social importance, material shaping activity of the active-creative intellect, just as of the spatial realizability of the built work. This peculiar differentiation (and oppositely, integration) process of creative activities recurs at our age, though at a higher niveau. Expansion of the sphere of attendant arts is simply labour divisional adaptation to new possibilities and resulting new social tasks; development of new possibilities of human creation in a wider range of activities, in a new system of labour division [8].

The industrial revolution and the actual scientific-technical revolution are the most important steps of the development of mental and material (technological) tools and work. The former destroyed the surrounding world arisen from traditional labour division, sharpening inner contradictions, the latter, however — creating efficiency and range of mental work undreamed of — bears possibility of a new harmony. Thus, it can be stated: possibility of shaping anew, transforming and humanizing the surrounding world is, in final account, other than a random feature of development, independent of other factors, like the aesthetic requirements of some layers of intellectuals, art patrons, the elite. Its conditions and possibilities reside in the truth of this age, and are affected by contemporary human living conditions, actual processes of labour culture — division of labour, development of mental creation — artistic design, new possibilities of architecture and attendant arts world-wide. It is not only in science, in blast-like expanding scientific activity, that division of labour and specialization produced a process of search for interdisciplinary unity. Through decomposition of new genres and forms, the developmental path of arts has led to the appearance of a new type of artist of universal erudition — in the frames of, and partly, as a failure

of the bourgeois artistic approach that feels but not yet grasps novel tasks. The renewal of the personal readiness of the artist has brought about conditions of a peculiar integration. This fact, and the extension of the tasks of society for integrative environment shaping — almost unthinkable in frames of bourgeois society — started a process of integration of genres, a task requiring higher-level overview within the division of labour. This is the meaning of the development of design, artistic design; presence of the designing artist representing human unity, the world of automated technical tools, the return of the creative man into production, with an efficiency much higher than that of handicraft. In the meanwhile — resulting from an intrinsic process, — the interpretation of work transforms itself, in several genres, the concept of “closed creation” is not valid any more, the new approach does not rely on the recurrency of historical genres. Both in interpretation and in creation a new way of thinking, with a widened horizon, is manifest, a work of art bearing traces of the mental force but not stiff, open in many respects, and remaining so, possessing new values of life, hence beautiful in a different manner, disclosing different regularities. A new formal level of appearance of creation comes to replace the past one. The concept of creation open in its radiating effect, of organic unity (varying in time and by layers) accumulating both natural processes and laws of life develops our Aristotelian theorems of the proportion of part to entity just as life does. Namely, proportions constantly vary in the unity of a living being, also the living unity is relative rather than eternal. Can art produce values other than eternal not even wanting to be such? The dramatic arts, dance, and music always produced such living, never revivable, peculiarly open values that sprung, however, from the essence of the fighting and changeable human life. Assimilation of, and empathy with the work, the “katharsis” or “purification” itself is a unique process stripping the work of art from its untimeliness and adapting it to the present. Our actual concept of the work of art is likely to have approached this process: in spite of the relative invariableness of its spatial structures, architecture — as stated by Mies van der Rohe — “lives, changes and is ever new”, it seems to have approximated this peculiar genre interpreted less strictly than historical, because it is centered on life.

Beside these peculiar changes of labour division, science and arts, of course, also architecture, this specific activity borne out of the unity of both brain halves, all the conditions of human existence, has been transformed [9]. Elastic shaping of the built environment requires not only new interpretation of arts; unity of this environment may only result from a novel-type, versatile artistic form-giving. The architect is not the dimensioning companion of craftsmen any more but a coordinator of design processes applying automated tools, an expert participant in the teamwork of mental hierarchy, coordinator and organizer, decision maker and developer, shouldering many parts and tasks,

and in all of them: aesthetician of the environment, creator of spatial order, indispensable as central concept deviser; one of representants of related professions from industrial designer through garden architect, civil engineer, to town planner. Historically, every one of these related professions (including town planning) are historically inheritants of a part of the one-time duty of the architect, expected to render space sound, full and human [10]. Enhanced labour division did not repress architecture, neither eliminated its scope or stripped it from timeliness; by the time of transformation of the social task of architecture, its metamorphosis, renewal of labour division, architecture continues to be the backbone of human creation of environment, an action aiming at a flexible formation of the environment to attain a conscious unity. The present, endangering human environment can only be bypassed through renewal of architectural culture, of architecture as an activity. It is not the profession of architect that has come to a crisis because of the imperative of the solution of a variety of special problems; on the contrary, the crisis is that of the environment. Human values in town and landscape environment are neglected because of the — centennial — omission of a human way of thinking, of the will to create unity. Opposing possibilities are borne by the development of the social process of high-grade labour division. Promising possibilities, like the undreamed- of efficiency of environmental activities uniting architecture and its marginal sciences, engineering and artistic design are being felt.

The new hierarchy of labour division — duly embossing architectural (artistic-engineering-scientific) design of ripened mental functions, guided by comprehensive goals — is underlying realization of the new quality and value niveau achievable in possession of cumulated new technical means and other facilities. At the same time, it is tool or even condition of the development of a new human environment realized in social dimensions, which, rather than serving just the elite, will serve all mankind, society as a whole, with all its entities multiply reflecting humanity, abilities and consciousness of mankind. On the other hand, the progress of society has development, freedom, self-assertion and evolution of the — creative — personality as one of its main conditions. Social progress as condition, possibility of personality evolution, and emergence of the new value niveau as fruit of the social development of personality — is the historical path of evolution to man, where the station seems to be near where human genius may create a new unity: that of scientific and artistic activities. Arts, — artist — and architecture did not loose anything in this process, only tasks are formulated differently, more comprehensively, and more sensitively. Society is the winner, granted the possibility of solving the social task corresponding to the renewal of arts and architecture, of the actual labour division; of human integrity, human self-evolution, ever increasing freedom within the renewal process of the objective world and environment, of architectural culture. Namely, the matter of freedom is inseparable of education or arts.

### Architecture and creativity

“Among arts, it is architecture the regular order, definite shapes and lines of which it is the most difficult for the designer to harmonize with his, own personality.” This quotation from the preface of Hungarian Architecture by the still young Lajos Fülep published in 1916 cannot be superseded as access to architecture as an art [11]. Half a century later or so, another great — contemporary — aesthetician shifts architecture to the margin of arts to a world beyond aesthetics, a specially established category, that of pleasures, maybe to avoid facing the social task of the imperative of architectural renewal, the facts of pitiful backwardness. Considering the level of primary reflection, György Lukács himself stated: “. . . only architecture is able to directly manifest the general social existence of an era” [12]. The concept by Lukács that “Arts, in their developed form . . . refer to man”; acknowledging that arts have no common genesis but “gradually have come to a relative synthesis” [13], and, deriving value from work, value creation is judged on whether, in the process of socialization and diversification, a thing suits self-recreation of man or not. One may wonder why this approach could not recognize the aesthetic process of value creation in the world of “creative man” (rather exactly interpreted by Nicolai Hartmann) producing object-environment-architecture? Why did he construct an artificial contradiction between arts on one hand, and the present architectural and industrial design activity, on the other? Does it not result from the inner resistance of personality, rather than from the logic order, internal relationships of this system of peculiar value?

Does in fact architecture escape the world of arts, is it an activity of a character and a validity insufficient to represent “self-consciousness and memory of mankind”? How can architecture be an art, how can it be interpreted as such if the greatest thinkers approximate it opposingly like this? Is it justified, necessary at all to consider architecture an art and to interpret it as such? We ourselves stated that architecture is a more comprehensive, wider activity than many of the arts domains. What is artistic in architecture, what are the features imposing on us the humble approximation to arts, what is architecture, this specific creativity in our age? As for the past it seems that even György Lukács did not doubt architecture to be an art (or, the existence of an art of architecture); it is in respect to the present age, on the ground of “confined work of art”, with reference to the bounds of aesthetic visualization, that he denies acceptability as an art. A “world of his own” produced from nature would be manifestation of a non-artistic, inferior activity of mankind? Were the oppressive-elevating grandeur of Karnak temples, the calm of the Pont du Gard evoking Roman culture, the intimate space facing the light of the Ronchamps chapel bearing other than artistic values? Or



Ronchamps does, whereas modern architecture does not? Maybe, when Lukács developed his system, when architecture was devoid of sensational, by the time of constricting needs, it was difficult to feel empathy with the creed of Attila József — perception of the meaning of “every human work” — with the imperative of environment renewal?

“The poet — though stuttering his word — is engineer of all spells of this world, he foresees the times to come, composes his inner harmony, awaiting you to do it for many” [14].

Might Attila József, in mental affinity to Thomas Mann, believe in a different, timeless harmony, inconceivable for us? Mann himself — in the quoted passage — doubted the possibility of a work of art in the “visible”. In final account, are we looking for harmony (in the vernacular of ancient art) in the world, or something still more than it, something with a human tint conceivable to any?

Let us remind of “illusion” mentioned by Mann, of the world of forms, and of those stated on architectural activity. It should be said simply: architecture synthesises an abstract world (rooting deeper in the society and its consciousness, science, and bearing its purports) and the world of phenomena; most typical example of creative activities of both cerebral hemispheres, with marks of the arts; it is a result of “illusionism”, formal order, and peculiar artistic creation.

But architecture is more than “illusion”; architectural form is a framework of the living space, a creator and bearer of the way of living, and even in lack of an evocative effect, it points beyond itself as a phenomenon; it is a peculiar, permanent manifestation of the unity between existence and consciousness, as referred to by the quoted idea of Lukács. It may be useless to recall every, inequitable element or feature of the architectural genre to have a closer look at some of its features as an aesthetic phenomenon, a creation.

Proportion; rhythm, pulsation, variegatedness; constructed order; closeness, openness, interpenetration of spatial strata; interaction of forms, surfaces, sections, lines, sharply outlined, sketched details; light and shadow effects, colour diaphaneity, reflection, piercing, artificial light and graphic elements; character, type; lightness, large scale, monumentality; harmony and equilibrium, decay of motion, dynamics and stress, constant change of purport and inherent goal, unity between continuity and discontinuity; mental existence, recognizance and pleasure, evolution of material and mental systems; integer brain work — experience of humanity, the power over nature and ourselves, of human freedom; all these factors are given in the world of architectural forms, thus, there are peculiarities, potentialities of artistic form, “illusion”; “aere perennius” value sources of human life.

If art is an activity creating value, bearing and keeping value, then so is architecture. The value creational process of the spatial-objective intrinsic

world has to be considered an art. Namely, values explored in architectural creation are highly socialized life values of mankind; in the spatial time and formal order, in its laws, in features of stress, "openness", human abilities of space perception are manifest, and so are social role, self-development, significance of a materialized second signal system, a spatial-pictorial language.

This inherent relation system of architecture, a shaped world seems to be bearer of "autonomous" — internal, genre-like, intrinsic — regularities as concerns both sensual binocular vision peculiar to the right cerebral hemisphere and abstractions, purport-social features of the left cerebral hemisphere, just as other art forms such as literature, fine arts, music, dance, or younger sisters of the Muses. Architecture is autotelic, a human-social phenomenon on his own right. Autonomy of its regularities is not disturbed by the fact that architecture is at the same time bearer-creator of direct life values, and that for its genre, science, engineering, and thus teamwork are determinant. It creates a completer world than other arts do, its social totality intensively prevails in single works — maybe oppositely to genre peculiarities of other arts, by "intensity of totality". It may raise tensioned human consciousness and social feeling to life; in final account, architecture may be an artistic expression or even more.

Consequently, possibilities of interpreting architecture as an art are manifold, and over- and underlying strata become manifest in our age, at the actual stage of labour division and social development, communal labour division of developed personalities, thanks to the increased efficiency of mental work, in possession of new humanistic and social possibilities. Also the genesis of arts seems to have achieved a higher degree of synthesis, maybe responsible for the impossibility to understand and judge environmental activities: architecture, industrial design or settlement planning, from the horizon of surveying hitherto arts, integer vision of arts of the past.

Here — even taking the risk of simplifications — only a sketch of these layers and interpretation attempts will be given in order to explore what is and what may be art in architecture, sources of aesthetic effects in architecture, artistic essentials of architecture, as viewed at an increasing depth and complexity. The realm of architectural forms as an aesthetic phenomenon, architecture as an art, seems to be accessible from several levels:

Interpreted as a result of direct human activity, at the level of artistic work by "homo faber", at the level of perceiving elements, proportions, rhythms, from the side of aesthetic-psychological effects, formal peculiarities. Means ranging from the psychology of perception, analysis of space sensation, space effect to proxemics (relations of space structures to the physiological-psychological-social make-up) trace a picture of architecture more insightful than before, permitting to build up a peculiar exact and objective branch

of space analysis based on personality factors, a peculiar aesthetic space theory [15].

Another approach relying on mental features rather than on "exact analysis" interprets arts as a way of expression, and on the traditional concept of arts, considering architecture as the product of "homo ludens", the self-expressing, self-perfecting man striving to mental existence. This approach gave rise to work of arts, which are excellent examples of human culture, and historical architecture assumed almost entirely this peculiar interpretation of the work of art. Its representatives focused on the beauty of the art work, closed unity of creation, world concept of mental creation valid for millennia. Still it is rightful to consider architecture as an artistic means of expression, self-expression or social expression; architecture is an art even in this meaning, exhibiting regularities of artistic form, and deeper layers of human personality and social purport. This approach may be observable at a different level in trends of this age. Involving all the endeavours to find renewal in biological-natural analogies, considering architecture as a result of "gesture", it enhances marks of personality and individuality in the "concept", the forming idea, maybe considering the object as a symbol in itself, for itself, expected to open a new, deeper dimension to this mental attitude [16].

This level cannot be exceeded by the approach, consubstantial with the former one, that — renewing the actual concept of symbol, image, or sign — "interprets" architecture in the plane of semiotics as bearer of a "message", or considers the settlement, the space and mass structure as a "context", a text, and looks after the root of architecture as an art in the plane of pictorial language recognizing its existence, resulting environmental possibilities and social commitment. In the architectural reality, this aspect has often a peculiar misunderstanding of the social purport of avantgarde architectural ideas as concomitant due to some misconception and failing to survey social goals, somewhat biased discoloration of hues of social effects. The false pathos of most "post-modern" endeavours has little to do with the real purport of social interpretation if not possibilities of formal renewal. Accidentalness of "events" lent from other arts, revival of emptied historical forms, hope of renewal by relying on a vernacular, or deep empathy (though misunderstanding) of the value of real folklore, ancestral traditions — are equally characteristic of our age. Declaring architecture to be (also) a form of communication leads to little else than obtrusive renewal of forms or — elsewhere — return to the wealth of historical-traditional forms. Nevertheless, these approaches gave birth to a new interpretation of form, the idea of the "open work"; ever new endeavour arisen from the development, even as denial, of bourgeois arts could not get farther than the rejection of conventional approaches, ancient interpretations and concepts of art, or at most, to the archetype of a new synthesis [17].

At present, a new mode of interpretation of the artistic approach to architecture, more comprehensive than the former ones, involving them, but enhancing their contradictions, seems to be developing: a reviving approach to architecture interpreted as a manifold social creation. It is a concept considering architecture as an art not only as a form of expression; considering the creation of form not as a one-sided process but one enhancing the renewal of purport, future form possibilities, simultaneously perceiving problems of the development and progress of problems of "homo sapiens", such as possibilities to develop into a "creative man", a foresighted "designing man" its actual restrictions, the imperative of recapitulating the hitherto experience, ways of approach, motivations of developing creative methods, of the psychological exploration, knowledge of the creative process and personality, of the involvement of computers and users into design, conditions of increasing the efficiency of design; and last but not least, outlines of solving the social problem [18]. This interpretation recognizes the problems of artistic systems approach to be environment shaping as a whole: in the sphere of higher social necessities and phenomena, at the level of a higher "correspondence", creative realization, as possibility of a new attitude, inner recreation, developing human factors of self-consciousness and reminiscence; perceiving the art of building as a possibility of freedom and human evolution. It is according to this approach that art becomes true as evolution of the wordly power of man; real self-consciousness and memory of mankind [19].

This new way of looking at things, with the development of social conditions, on the ground of social progress, after the period of Faustian, upstriving, suffering and exploring man creating arts and architecture, may give rise to the progress of arts, thereby to the conditions for the creation of a new environmental culture. This progress can only arise on the ground of our society, of a scale of values to be established by ourselves, imperative for our society to be developed, imposed by the recognizance and empathy of historical ontology of social existence, so that one might rightfully claim:

"After priests, soldiers, citizens, It is us who became finally true listeners to law . . ." [20].

### Notes and References

1. The first draft of this paper was conceived in the summer of 1978, intended as an insert to the second edition of my book "Architecture Today" (Korunk építészete), Budapest, 1974 though remained incomplete. The rightful criticism by Lajos Németh — stating that my book doesn't reach the abstraction level of theoretical generalization where modern architecture could be interpreted from the aspect of art philosophy (Művészet, No. 10, 1975, 9.43) incited me to reconsider the effect of categories of architecture, design and arts from the aspect of environmental culture. This train of thought was not published. Although abridgement of a partial chapter was published in the manifolded proceedings of the scientific conference "Human Character of the Built Environment and its Protection" organized by the Faculty of Architecture, TUB, as manuscript, the greatest part remained a draft.

Neither here could the actual concept and theory of values of environmental culture be finalized. This sketch gives only outlines. It attempts only, in final account, nothing but conclusion or else, origin, of my studies on criticism theory attempting to survey the mental factors of architecture.

2. The world of ideas of John Ruskin as recapitulated by Aladár Körösfői Kriesch by the turn of the century: Aladár Kriesch: *On Ruskin and the English PreRaphaelites*. Four lectures in the Circle of Art Patrons. Franklin Társulat, Budapest, 1904. As stated in the chapter "Ruskin's Artistic Creed": "everybody needs, and has the right to, art in some form, just as to air or daily bread. And every human era or society is happy or unhappy in the proportion as it shares the arts with its members. In short, art is for all of us".
3. Thomas Mann: *Doktor Faustus*. Aufbau Verlag Berlin—Weimar, 1975. p. 246.
4. André Malraux. *Lazare*. (Rope and Mice.) Chapter VI. Magvető Kiadó, Budapest, 1979. Hungarian translation by Péter Ádám. p. 186.
5. The recent publication of Nostradamus' "prophesies" in France had been reported in the Hungarian press (see the weekly *Magyarország*); the obscure text puts destruction of Paris to 1983, or, according to a different interpretation, to 1999.
6. *Three Works* by William Morris. Introduction by A. L. Morton. Seven Seas Publishers, Berlin, 1973. p. 14.
7. Instead of detailing design problems, let us refer to "Design. An Art of Form."\* Edited, and Epilogue by Hedvig Dvorszky. Képzőművészeti Alap K. V. Budapest, 1979. A special study would be needed to illustrate the unity of approach to design, whit all its inherent problems.
8. Several studies by the author were meant to outline this process and its consequences, the arisal of novel needs.  
Ferenc Vámosy "New Problems of Interaction between Architecture and Fine Arts": Proceedings of the Hung-Soviet. Conference on Mural Arts. December 5—7, 1977. Manifoldd, Federation of Hungarian Fine Artists and Designers. Or else, F. V.: *New Synthesis of Architecture and Attendant Arts in Socialist Town Planning*.\* *Építés-Építészettudomány*, Nos 1—2, Vol. XI, 1979. pp. 173—179.
9. Roger Sperry was granted the Nobel prize in 1981 for research in brain physiology, cerebral hemisphere activity. His experiments have been described by György Ádám: *Perception, Consciousness, Memory*.\* *Gondolat*, 1976. 2nd edition, pp. 160—162.
10. This unity between architecture and town planning is pointed out by Ferenc Vidor in a paper in the journal "Valóság", and in "Possibilities and Limits of Creativity in Town Planning". *Építés-Építészettudomány*, Nos 1—2. Vol. VI. (1974) pp. 27—37.
11. Lajos Fülep: *From the Revolution in Arts to the Great Revolution*.\* *Papers, studies*, Vol. I. Magvető, 1974. p. 275.
12. György Lukács: *The Specificity of Aesthetics*.\* *Akadémiai K.* Budapest, 1965. Vol. II. p. 409. (Chapter II, Architecture).
13. György Lukács: *Existence and Consciousness*. A declaration. (In: *Gespräche mit Georg Lukács*, Rohwolt, 1967.)
14. Attila József: *A város peremén*. Poem.
15. Regularities of the spatial-objective realm of forms of architecture have been studied by Dr. Gyula Hajnóczy in his Doctor Techn. Sci. Theses: *Prolegomena on the Objective Evaluation of Architectural Creation*. Analytic Theory of the Architectural Space.\* Budapest, 1977. Its introduction was published as: *Interpretation of the Architectural Space from Giedion to Norberg-Schulz*.\* *Építés-Építészettudomány*, Vol. IX. (1977) No. 4. pp. 331—350.  
Further, still untackled psychological problems of aesthetics of architecture have been pointed out by Dr. Gyula Hajnóczy in one of his studies.
16. Outstanding architects with the quoted approach to creation range from Alvar Aalto, through Jörn Utzon, Louis Kahn, to Otto Frei; detailed analysis of their works and theoretical manifestos and of subsequent ways of approach have been described in F. V.: *Architecture of Our Age* (see Ref. 1) and in a complementary university notebook: *Architecture Today*. *The Future of Architecture*.\* Tankönyvkiadó, 1983.
17. Survey of historical variations of the work see in: Lajos Németh: *The Owl of Minerva*.\* (Work and History. I. Historical Models of Work.) A kind of interpretation in "spatial arts" is given by István Janáky in: "The fourth Type of Work.\* *Művészet*, No. 8, 1977.

\* In Hungarian.

18. Out of this manifold process, let me refer only to the instructions of art psychology approach, within it, to the instruction from the analysis of creativity levels; inherent characteristic features and abilities of the creative personality determining the level of artistic creation. Irrespective of works from merely reproductive, routine activities, creativity levels described by I. A. Taylor as expressive, productive, inventive, innovative and emergentive i.e. producing something radically new characterize not only the inner developmental processes, but also the produced works of art. In the interval between the purely reproductive level and any other quoted level, works may differ by value not only perceptible for architectural criticism but — in a form — maybe the most important basis of criticizing-valuating the work as a creation. Thereby the psychical-constitutional personality becomes the source of social value, condition of a higher-order social correspondence in itself; a fact, obliging, at a social level, to appreciate not only the creations, the produced values but also creative personalities. See Irving A. Taylor: "The Nature of the Creative Process" In: Ed. L. Halász. *Psychology of Art.*\* Gondolat, 1973. pp. 230—280.
19. Lukács's idea has been reinterpreted according to his real theory in: Georg Lukács: *Ontology of Social Existence*. Vols I—III.\* Magvető Kiadó, 1976.
20. See Ref. 14.

Dr. Ferenc VÁMOSSY H-1521 Budapest

\* In Hungarian.