

Why Architecture in Postmodern Times?

Aleš ERJAVEC

The universe is vast
and in it everything
finds its place.

A.W. Schlegel

In many respects romanticism can serve as the beginning of what we call modern art and literature today. "Romanticism implies a conversion of culture, whose center of gravity is displaced from exterior towards interior."¹⁾ This interiorization is simultaneously a historical fact and a psychological phenomenon and finds its many foundations in ideas preceding the French revolution and stemming from it throughout romanticism. The Revolution itself is important also because "writers and artists discovered (. . .) the feasibility (. . .) of altering political action by thea ction of art"²⁾—a fact of utmost importance for romanticism and modernism. This goes hand in hand with another essential change: "The literate of previous periods, whatever their country of origin, met on a neutral terrain. In the Middle Ages (. . .) there was circulation of ideas and people, of teachers and pupils without these being necessitated to leave the Latin land. The renaissance discredited the vulgar medieval Latin and substituted it with the unitary language of the humanists. (. . .) Romanticism breaks this cohesion. (. . .) The path of unity passes (. . .) by the way of diversity, which, far from constituting a regrettable deficiency, must be considered as a richness. Each national culture finds itself in a state of interdependence with all the others, with which it is tied in the past and in the present. The romanticist mutation implies a relativization of aesthetic values, a self-denial of aesthetics of the universal and of the absolute."³⁾

*

It we jump a hundred years ahead, we come to the age of the avant-gardes as the extreme case of modernism. At the same time another sort of art exists: the literature of Franz Kafka and Rainer Maria Rilke, of Virginia Woolf and many others. A similar relativization as in romanticism is going on, only this time it is often linked explicitly to the 'truth'. If the truth of romanticism was mostly the truth of man's interior, based on a sort of Kantian transcendental idealism, it was a truth of his uniqueness, the result of his individualisation. Then perhaps, it could be said that the avant-gardes were obsessed with expressing the truth of 'reality' itself as it could be

shown now in a new and stimulating way on the basis of scientific discoveries and similar marvels from the turn of the century. This can be said of futurism, of constructivism, of Kandinsky and even of surrealism with its links to psychoanalysis. A similar striving to reach the 'truth' and thus also 'reality' has also, of course, been present before: in impressionism, in cubism's search for pure forms, in the attempts of artists to attain truth—that which cannot be discerned from the academic art of the age, for this, in their opinion, presents the 'untruth'.

Scientific discoveries fascinate artists as well as technological developments and inventions. They offer on one hand a new way to 'reality' or 'truth' and they offer a new subject, a new theme to the artists. They also offer a new means that thus far have not been at art's disposal and many of which represent revolutionary breakthroughs, ranging from early abstractions in painting to earlier technological advancements in architecture: Gustave Eiffel's tower for the Paris exhibition of 1889 meant the conquest of such new materials, and was thus not only a triumph for the architect but also for the engineer. Different, although in certain respects similar words could be said of Hector Guimard's entrances of the Paris Métro, which are one of the best examples of the new role of iron in Art Nouveau.

But the same engineering has another side. When Peter Behrens built the AEG turbine factory in Berlin in 1909 he wanted to build the building in such a way that it would have the appearance of a classical edifice, for he was a proponent of new classicism. He thus built the interior support with steel, while the exterior is really just a 'front' serving not constructional but 'aesthetic' purposes only. An opposite case is the case of a building by the Slovene architect Jože Plečnik, who worked in Vienna, Prague and Ljubljana and began as a student of Otto Wagner. In the proletarian surroundings of Ottakring in Vienna he built the Church of the Holy Spirit from 1910 to 1912, which in accordance with its modest environment as well as a conscious attempt to use new materials, was built from reinforced concrete, preserving a neoclassical monumental exterior appearance, but had also an unsupported 'floating' interior contrary to the then accepted logic of architecture, especially sacral. The building provoked such a protest that the archduke Ferdinand, the protector of the Royal Central Commission for Protection of Monuments had the works stopped.

Behrens is considered to be one of the precursors of modernism in architecture, while Plečnik is more tied to symbolist and even Art Nouveau style in his early works and to a sort of classicist or neoclassicist style later on, the latter of which never took hold in modernist architecture of our century, although it pertains the symbolist elements (especially those with sacral connotations). The main difference between the two is that the first aimed at making a factory seem something different from what it was at first sight and that the appearance was more important than the means of attaining it, while the second wanted to symbolize the sacral ambiance in the interior of the Vienna church and at the same time leave an ordinary and unpretentious exterior, thus stressing the spiritual difference between the two.

It is common in philosophy and also in aesthetics to identify romanticism with

revolutionary and leftist ideas and classicism with conservative ones. This distinction appears to be confirmed by developments in art and especially architecture in the 20th century, for have not the official architects of national socialism and Italian fascism, (and also of Stalinism, let us just bring into mind the many buildings of this sort throughout the Soviet Union and certain other socialist countries) used some sort of 'neoclassicism' to practically and symbolically present and materialize their political ideas and their historical basis? This distinction that appears in the writings ranging from Franz Mehring's to those of the leftist authors (mostly of marxist orientation) of the sixties and the seventies is starting to seem somehow outdated and—why not say it—unfashionable. As all other artifacts ideas, too, can become 'automatized' as Victor Shklovski pointed out in 1914 and certainly the distinction between classicism and romanticism in art may turn out today to be thus automatized and uncritically accepted. That which has previously been acceptable inside a certain historically determined 'grand narrative', may be losing ground nowadays. It may turn out that it has prevented us to see that the classicism is really the style in architecture which forms the most substantial building tradition in Western history. Also, we should be aware of the fact that here we may be dealing with another *function* of architecture, i.e. the representative function, for these 'classicist' or neoclassicist buildings were *public* buildings. They were not made for private investors, but for the state and were materialized symbols of political institutions. In this respect, there is not a very great difference between certain buildings ranging from ancient Greece through monuments in Washington D.C. or in imperial Rome to planned and partially built edifices in Berlin before the second World War. The main difference which probably came into being with romanticism was already discerned by Hegel in his *Aesthetics*: when he speaks about architecture of romanticism he writes that the basic form here is an absolutely isolated house and if buildings of the classical architecture extend in width, the romanticist character of Christian churches makes them grow from the earth and reach upwards. What man needs here cannot be given to him by the outside nature, but can be found only in a world which he created by himself and only for himself.⁴⁾

With this in mind we return to our introductory remarks about modern art and its origins in romanticism. What romanticism brought with it was individualisation, the interiorization of human subjectivity, the Kantian Copernican revolution. It is not a coincidence that with the decline of the 'grand narratives' Kant is getting to be much more interesting than Hegel⁵⁾.

**

It is often said of postmodernism that it has rejected the avant-gardist or at least the modernist legacy (which in many respects was romanticist, meaning also revolutionary, connected to different revolutionary ideas of our century) and pushed to the forefront the academic art of the 19th century, the classicist and the neoclassicist art and architecture. In this respect this did not differ much from the precepts of the avant-gardists at the beginning of our century,⁶⁾ who also rejected the preceding art—

in certain cases just the art that is being brought back today by postmodernism and is defended by it. To a large extent this was also the manner of modernism in general, i.e. it used certain old forms, especially in architecture, in new revolutionary ways.

Nevertheless, postmodernism discarded the basic terminology of modernism: it did not want to be 'revolutionary', 'avant-gardist', provocative, intellectual etc., but usually had more modest aims. It was sometimes considered kitschy and not serious enough, also because it did not try to express fundamental truths. It was not tied, as was the practice in the first half of the century, to the great philosophies, the 'grand narratives', including the great social philosophies and ideologies.

What this meant in modernism *in concreto* may well be discerned from Nikolaus Pevsner's statement in his *Sources of Modern Architecture and Design*: "The twentieth century is the century of the masses: mass education, mass entertainment, mass transport, universities with twenty thousand students, comprehensive schools for two thousand children, hospitals with two thousand beds, stadia with a hundred thousand seats. That is one aspect: the other is speed of locomotion, every citizen being an express-train driver on his own, and some pilots travelling faster than sound. Both are only expressions of the technological fanaticism of the age, and technology is only an application of science."⁷ And Pevsner continues: "Architecture and design for the masses must be functional, in the sense that they must be acceptable to all and that their well-functioning is the primary necessity."⁸

Just by reading this not so very old text we are shown the apparent discontinuity between modernism and postmodernism. The "mass" approach is gone, although paradoxically the population has become much larger than it was when these words were written, to say nothing of previous periods, when they perhaps rang true even more so than 20 years ago. Obviously, the structure of the population has changed. This fact—and not its number—has greatly influenced our approach and stance towards the arts, applied or other. The basic modernist approach towards art was defined by the author. The author or the creator of a work of art was the person who basically determined the meaning of the artwork. Perhaps architecture is the best example for this: the architect was the person who 'knew' what the needs of the occupants and inhabitants were supposed to be and his aim—as in many other aspects of the social life—was to bring together large segments of the population ("the masses") and often to form the utopias on a smaller or a larger scale, ranging from apartment houses to whole communities and even cities. The first among such projects was Tony Garnier's plan for Cité Industrielle (1899–1904).

As an antipode of such projects we may take Bernard Tschumi's Parc de la Villette in Paris. Tschumi himself explains his intentions in the following way: "The La Villette project (. . .) attempts to dislocate and de-regulate meaning, rejecting the 'symbolic' repertory of architecture as a refuge of humanist thought. For today the term 'park' (like 'architecture', 'science', or 'literature') has lost its universal meaning: it no longer refers to a fixed absolute, nor to an ideal. Not the *hortus conclusus* and the replica of Nature, La Villette is a term in constant production, in continuous change; its meaning is never fixed but is always deferred, differed, rendered irresolute

by the multiplicity of meanings it inscribes. (. . .) The Parc's architecture refuses to operate as the expression of a pre-existing content, whether subjective, formal or functional. (. . .) The endless combinatory possibilities of (Parc's architecture) gives way to a multiplicity of impressions. Each observer will project his own interpretation, resulting in an account that will again be interpreted (according to psychoanalytic, sociological or other methodologies) and so on. In consequence, there is no absolute 'truth' to the architectural project, for whatever 'meaning' it may have is a function of interpretation: it is not resident in the object, or in the object's materials. (. . .) La Villette looks out on new social and historical circumstances: a dispersed and differentiated reality that marks an end to the utopia of unity."⁹

As Tschumi himself stresses, his project is only one of the possible projects of postmodernism in architecture and pronounces that "it can be allied to a specific vision of Post-Modernity",¹⁰ which is deconstruction and as we know, Jacques Derrida aided him in making the Parc de la Villette. Although, as Tschumi says, deconstruction is just one of the "specific visions" of postmodernity, it should be pointed out that it is at the same time a 'privileged', we might also say 'typical' or even 'essential' vision or facet of postmodernity and postmodernism—in architecture and elsewhere. Before we explain ourselves, it might be useful to at least passingly, define deconstruction. Charles Jencks defining deconstruction, writes: "If there is a 'Neo-Modern' architecture, as many architects and critics have been quick to claim, then it must rest on a new theory and practice of Modernism. The only such development to have emerged in the last 20 years—known as Deconstruction or Post-Structuralism—takes Modernist elitism and abstraction to an extreme and exaggerates already known motifs, which is why I would continue to call it 'Late'. But it also contains enough new aspects which revalue the suppositions of cultural Modernism to warrant the prefix 'Neo', 'New' or 'Late'—it *is* a matter of debate, and of whether the emphasis is on continuity or change: but the fact of a Deconstructionist movement in architecture has to be accepted. Reflecting changes in the literature of the 60s (Roland Barthes' 'death of the author' and, later, 'pleasures of the text') and changes in philosophy (Jacques Derrida's notion of critical 'deconstruction' and 'différance'), the movement has been most comprehensively developed by Peter Eisenman as a theory and practice of negativity ('not-classical', 'de-composition', 'de-centring', 'dis-continuity')."¹¹

The same theme is approached by Hal Foster: "Now, postmodernist art is often termed 'deconstructive', which is to say that it enfold a contradiction: it must use, as methodological tools at least, the very concepts that it calls into question. It may be too much to assert that such complicity is a conspiracy, but a convention, form, tradition, etc. *is* only deconstructed from within. Deconstruction thus becomes re-inscription, for there is no 'outside' (except in positivist sense of 'outside the mediums'—a transgression that reasserts the limit). That is, there is no way *not* to be in a field of cultural terms, for these terms inform us presumptively."¹²

The difference between Pevsner's position or Garnier's project (and many similar projects, based on socialist ideas of different sorts may be found in the next twenty

years) and Tschumi's Parc de la Villette as one example of postmodernist architecture and architectural project marks the difference between modernism and postmodernism. If the former was 'for the masses', whose needs the architect presupposed, 'function' being the main password, then, with late modernism, the modernist phrase "less is more" began changing into "less is a bore". What happened with postmodernism is best illustrated with deconstruction: as Tschumi says, meaning is a function of interpretation, which means that the meaning of architecture is not fixed. Thus architectural space may have different functions, it allows the user to create functions, to invent them and does not predetermine the use more than necessary.

Postmodernism 'reinvented' architectural approach based on 'practical' values, the foremost among them being to take into consideration the indeterminate needs of the occupants. The aesthetic is not equated with the functional, as at the time of the International Style, and 'pure' forms which were supposed to be functional and aesthetic at the time, originating in the ideas of buildings for the masses, turned out to be impractical. Modernist architecture, and especially the one stemming from the Bauhaus tradition, was an architecture tied to the modernist project in the extreme: the ideological, political and philosophical. As Tom Wolfe humorously showed,¹³⁾ in buildings originally meant to be built for the workers were hardly ever lived in by them, for they could not afford them. The bourgeoisie was the one who could finance them, who lived in them and who brought fame to their architects. In this respect the postmodernist discovery is a sobering one. To quote Charles Jencks, "the great strength of the Post-Avant-Garde is to recognise what its predecessors couldn't admit to themselves; that it is a small part of the powerful middle class which is indefatigably transforming the world in ways that are simultaneously destructive and constructive. (. . .) All the avant-gardes of the past believed that humanity was going somewhere, and it was their joy and duty to discover the new land and see that people arrived there on time; the Post-Avant-Garde believes that humanity is going in several different directions at once, some of them more valid than others, and it is their duty to be guides and critics."¹⁴⁾

Before we continue it might be useful to clarify a point which might turn out to be problematic. When we discuss postmodernism we have two options: either we situate it inside modernism, like Jürgen Habermas did or we consider it as a separate and qualitatively different period defined precisely by its break with modernism in the manner of Jean-François Lyotard. This dilemma is far from being resolved, and as we sometimes see, the term is used very imprecisely and arbitrarily, mainly as a synonym for contemporary 'neoclassicist' or figurative orientations in art and literature. It has gained wider popularity through literature, the visual arts and especially architecture, the latter being in the forefront also due to Jencks' writings. For him postmodernist movements "are, at once, a continuation of Modernism and its transcendence".¹⁵⁾ But postmodernism, at least in architecture, although we could claim similar properties also for other arts as well, is distinguished from modernism, among other things, in one previously mentioned feature: "Art, ornament and symbolism have been essential to architecture because they heighten its meaning, make it clearer,

and give it greater resonance. All cultures, except the Modern one, have valued these essential truths and have taken them for granted."¹⁶

We see that postmodernism is here defined as a sort of paradox: it is at the same time a part of modernism and something else; it is a period of transition into something as yet unknown, which may turn out to be, and this is a realistic possibility, much less important or singular as it was expected and thought of only a decade or two ago, when the ideas of postmodernism sprung up. Nevertheless, it seems to us that postmodernism is a distinctive period and style and that, in architecture, there is an essential difference between 'late modernism' and 'postmodernism', the latter englobing features typical also for other arts—ranging from the visual to literature. Furthermore, the visual arts, ranging from painting and design to architecture, form the core of postmodernism, while literature served as a paradigm of modernism of the twentieth century.

We would not like to press this thesis too far and would not want to claim that literature or verbal expression always formed the central part of modernist art. But it seems that if we take into consideration modernism as situated inside modernity, it was the context of the 'grand narratives' which defined the spiritual and epistemic space of modernism. This assertion may seem a dubious one, for is not, in the whole modern era, vision the master sense?¹⁷ Vision here plays an essential role, for it is also one of the ways in which the subject is formed. Interpretations of the role of vision, in this respect, range from Condillac who ties the role of vision to that of the sense of touch, up to the so-called 'mirror stage' in psychoanalytic theory. On the contrary, we speak here not of vision, but of *visuality*, which plays a central role in postmodernist art and culture. There are a few reasons for this development. The essential reason may certainly be the development and re-evaluation of mass culture from the sixties on, which was certainly based on visual arts and *visuality*, ranging from pop art to musical performances and their visual effects. Another reason was the development of technical means. If at the beginning of our century people were fascinated with the current scientific discoveries, then video, the computer and communication technology, and their accessibility, constitute an important step towards the contemporary art and culture. Thirdly, and philosophically most important, the above mentioned end of 'grand narratives', including great social philosophies, philosophies of history and most political ideologies of the modernist era (with perhaps the exception of liberalism) due to their practical social failure had an enormous impact upon art. What this process meant in architecture is well described by Huyssen: "The modernist utopia embodied in the building programs of the Bauhaus, of Mies, Gropius, and Le Corbusier, was part of a heroic attempt after the Great War and the Russian Revolution to rebuild a war-ravaged Europe in the image of the new, and to make building a vital part of the envisioned renewal of society. A new Enlightenment demanded rational design for a rational society, but the new rationality was overlaid with a utopian fervor which ultimately made it veer back into myth—the myth of modernization. Ruthless denial of the past was as much an essential component of the modern movement as its call for modernization through standardiza-

tion and rationalization. It is well-known how the modernist utopia shipwrecked on its own internal contradictions and, more importantly, on politics and history. Gropius, Mies and others were forced into exile, Albert Speer took their place in Germany. After 1945, modernist architecture was largely deprived of its social vision and became increasingly an architecture of power and representation. Rather than standing as harbingers and promises of the new life, modernist housing projects became symbols of alienation and dehumanization, a fate they shared with the assembly line, that other agent of the new which had been greeted with exuberant enthusiasm in the 1920 by Leninists and Fordists alike.¹⁸⁾

But why should the end of 'grand narratives' and the failure of the modernist projects have as their consequence a change to visuality and the visual arts? We would argue that all these processes happened simultaneously, as a part of a global transformation and what they had in common, among other things, was their consciousness that they should have a strong communication with the public. In contrast to the avant-gardes, which often despised the public, or to the modernist stance where only the author's expression was important—the public having to 'adopt' to it—postmodernism took into consideration the user. It is not a coincidence that Robert Venturi discovered in the commercial architecture of Las Vegas cultural values which led to the postmodernist architectural *dictum*, that it must keep a continuous dialogue with its users. Postmodernist architecture stresses the user's values, as well as various sorts of architectural expression. It takes into account the urban context and regional specifics, all which do not have to be subordinated exclusively to criteria of efficiency, functionalism and expression of technological achievements.

In addition, we should make certain distinctions inside modernism itself in its relationship towards postmodernism. As previously mentioned, Peter Behrens is one of the precursors of modernism in architecture, although probably not of that architecture we consider 'modernist' as opposed to postmodernist. His work, as well as that of Plečnik and many others, did lead to certain projects identified with modernism. But modernism in architecture as we understand it today, especially as opposed to postmodernism, is really the modernist tradition stemming from Le Corbusier and particularly Bauhaus. Thus, it turns out that postmodernist criticism of modernism is actually oriented only towards its extreme form, personified mainly by the International Style, while other orientations, especially those of early 20th century modernism, are sometimes even integrated into postmodernist architecture.

We witness a similar phenomenon in painting, where the avant-garde art of the twenties is 're-made', but re-made not as an art object but as an 'art context': avant-garde works are put in a different setting, are 'copied' and thus lose their former meaning, gaining a new one in which their aesthetic function, not their provocative and artistically or socially revolutionary value and novelty, plays the central role. In this sense, they retain only one of their functions, which enlarges itself and pushes away most of the others.

This aestheticized element is the second important element in postmodernism,

hence the details, the ornaments, the renewed interest in symbolic elements in art and architecture and the integration of Art Nouveau into postmodernism.

A similar case is the relationship of postmodernist art and nature: if modernism behaved as if nature did not exist, with postmodernism and postmodernity, the consciousness of the necessary coexistence with nature returns.

“Modernism has lost any claim it may once have possessed to modernity. It finds itself in the position of an ageing dictator whose power, influence and credibility have already failed, and from whom international support has fallen away. Modernism resembles a teetering oligarch in another way, too. It has always tended to re-interpret the past from its own perspective, even when that has necessitated the most wilful of misrepresentations.”¹⁹⁾

It is obvious that defending the project of modernism today is a task that would fall under the above cited description of modernism. Nevertheless, as it has been said, this holds true only for a part of the modernist project in art and especially in architecture and the arts connected to it. Because in architecture modernism is equated mainly with the period from the thirties on, i.e. with the International Style, quite a lot of developments happening at the turn of the century and later on of more classicist orientation, are not taken into consideration. If they were, then perhaps the picture and criticism of modernism would not have such strong points as it seems to have at the present moment.²⁰⁾

Romanticism had, on one hand, established the interiorization (after which the author could take himself as the basic point of reference and judge the external reality only insofar as it was a simulacrum of himself), and, on the other hand, established the right (and sometimes the curse) of the author to ‘change the world’, i.e. to be politically or ideologically active through art. Romanticism is important in literature and music, less in painting and even less in architecture. In developed modernism, the discursive or theoretical foundation of art is of utmost importance. In short, we witness the reign of an idea. With postmodernism, the idea (‘the grand narrative’) disappears and the visual arts gain the upper hand. In this respect—taking into account design, various visual communications as well as painting and installations—architecture, in the sense of our ‘living space’ and our environment (for we are increasingly urban creatures) gains in importance. We would, therefore dare to put forth the thesis that, in postmodern times, architecture in its different forms shall become the most universal if not the major art. It shall be an everyday art, an art to be lived in, to be lived on, under and amongst. In this respect, architecture is becoming the foremost *public* art.

Notes

- 1) G. Gusdorf, *Fondements du savoir romantique*, Paris, Payot, 1982, p. 65.
- 2) R. Paulson, *Representations of Revolution (1789–1820)*, New Haven and London, Yale University Press, 1983, p. 3.
- 3) G. Gusdorf, *op. cit.*, p. 305–6.
- 4) Cf. G.W.F. Hegel, *Vorlesungen über die Ästhetik II* (Werke 14), Frankfurt/Main, Suhrkamp, 1970, p. 332.
- 5) It would bring us too far to enter into the question why with the renaissance of Kant, the concept of the 'sublime' was reintegrated into discussions about artworks. We may only suggest that, due to the identification occurring already in Schelling, Hölderlin (whom we paraphrased in the title of this article) and Hegel between the beautiful and the sublime this term was driven from aesthetics discussions until its reactualization in the past years. It should also be mentioned that although it is today usually traced only to Kant or it is considered in the context of discussions on him, the treatise on the sublime by Edmund Burke (*A Philosophical Enquiry into the Origin of our Ideas of the Sublime and the Beautiful*, 1757) is more relevant than Kant's, who in his *Beobachtungen über das Gefühl des Schönen und Erhabenen*, is not very consistent. But then this might also be the reason why his observations on the sublime offer a more stimulative basis for today's discussions.
- 6) The literary aspect of such processes was analysed in the many works of Russian formalists.
- 7) N. Pevsner, *Sources of Modern Architecture*, 2nd ed., London, Thames and Hudson, 1986, p. 7. (1st edition published in 1968.)
- 8) *Ibid.*, p. 9.
- 9) B. Tschumi, "Parc de la Villette, Paris," in *Architectural Design (Deconstruction in Architecture)*, (Profile 72), London, Academy Editions, 1988, p. 39.
- 10) *Ibid.*, p. 38.
- 11) C. Jencks, "Deconstruction: The Pleasures of Absence," *Architectural Design (Deconstruction in Architecture)*, p. 17.
- 12) H. Foster, "Re: Post," in *Art After Modernism (Rethinking Representation)*, ed. Brian Wallis, New York and Boston, The New Museum of Contemporary Art and David R. Godine, 1986, p. 197.
- 13) T. Wolfe, *From Bauhaus to our House*, New York, Pocket Books, 1982.
- 14) C. Wolfe, "The Post-Avant-Garde," *Art and Design (The Post-Avant-Garde)*, (Profile 4), London, Academy Editions, 1987, p. 20.
- 15) C. Jencks, *The Language of Post-Modern Architecture*, 5th ed., London, Academy Editions, 1987, p. 5.
- 16) *Ibid.*, p. 7.
- 17) Cf. for example *Vision and Visuality*, ed. Hal Foster, Seattle, Bay Press, 1988, especially M. Jay, "Scopic Regimes of Modernity," pp. 3–23.
- 18) A. Huyssen, *After the Great Divide*, Bloomington and Indianapolis, Indiana University Press, 1980, p. 186.
- 19) P. Fuller, "The Search for a Postmodern Aesthetic," in *Design After Modernism*, ed. John Thackara, London, Thames and Hudson, 1988, p. 117.
- 20) It is typical for this situation that a few sketches by Antonio Sant'Elia (who in real life built only a few tombs and cemeteries) are taken as one of the starting-points of the modernist architecture.

Center of Scientific Research of the Slovene Academy of Sciences and Arts, Ljubljana