

# IDEOLOGICAL ASSUMPTIONS IN AESTHETIC JUDGMENT OF ARCHITECTURE

Vladimir Stevanović<sup>1</sup>, University of Belgrade, Faculty of Architecture, Belgrade, Serbia

*The aim of this paper is consideration of presence of ideological factor in aesthetic judgment of architecture. The focus is on the aesthetic theories in which ideology is the key component that can produce aesthetic meaning on the basis of which aesthetic evaluation can be performed. With regard to this, the paper provides an insight into the relevant aesthetic approaches, which, by subject matter and methodology, can be determined as ideologically oriented. The theoretical frame established allows implementation of an interpretive and comparative analysis of two texts that through aesthetic judgment discuss Belgrade architecture, immediately before and after World War II. Through recognition of an ideological context in these two texts, this paper will point out how different aesthetic evaluations of certain morphological aspects of architecture (such as folklorism, ornamentalism, eclecticism, classicism, monumentalism and purism) do not come from inherently architectural, i.e. stylistic-formalist aspects, but how they result from ideological connotations attributed to them in a wide variety of ways. In this sense, this paper finds ideological background in established criteria of aesthetic judgment such as authenticity, homogeneity and contemporaneity.*

**Key words:** *aesthetic judgment, ideology, authenticity, homogeneity, contemporaneity.*

## INTRODUCTION

When referring to aesthetics, the first things most architects and architectural theorists think of are the issues concerning the proper, i.e. the beautiful shaping of form or visage of a building. In exposing their authorial intentions and motivations architects frequently explain and justify the use of certain visual elements utilizing aesthetic reasons. In the same manner, architectural theorists tend to use phrases such as aesthetic standard, aesthetic requirement, aesthetic function, etc. Indicative is the identification of the aesthetic property of an architectural work with something pertaining to gestalt, which is visible, external and material. Therefore, mainstream architectural understanding of aesthetics should comprise elements of architectural articulation, such as global definitions of mass and dimension, position in space, order in composition and harmony of spatial elements, relation between lights, textures, materials and colours.

## FORM AND MEANING IN AESTHETICS AND LEVELS OF AESTHETIC RECEPTION

Understanding aesthetics from the focus of architecture would not appear to be groundless, if one recalled concepts of aesthetics dating back to the mid XVIII century. The fact is that the founder of aesthetics, German philosopher Alexander Gottlieb Baumgarten (Gilbert/Kun, 1969; Grlić, 1983), defined this discipline as a science of sensible knowledge of art and beauty, which coincides with the denomination of *aisthesis* (Greek term for sense impression, for what is perceptible). Baumgarten's theory, as a product of a modern, enlightened age, in accordance with wider social, scientific and philosophical changes, overcomes ontologising objectivism and introduces a gnosological subjectivism which is prevalent in contemporary aesthetics. Along with these changes, the ideal of beauty as the bearer of the aesthetic value of art work ceases to be something that exists independently from cognitive experience. Beauty, as an aesthetic value, does not belong to metaphysical and theological properties of objects anymore.

Rather, it has changed its course towards the subjects, becoming the question of their own experience. The emphasis is placed on the modus of understanding the objects and on the satisfaction that appears in the process of reacting to the beauty of an object.

At the turn from of the XIX century, German idealist philosopher Georg Wilhelm Friedrich Hegel, understands aesthetics in a different manner. Through a rationalist principle, Hegel critiques the aesthetics that existed so far, which was based on sensory abilities that produced feelings of satisfaction and enjoyment. For him, feelings are empty forms of subjective affectation, which cannot satisfy spiritual interests. 'What works of art provoke in us today, is not only a direct pleasure, but also our judgment at the same time, since we put in function of our contemplation the content of a work of art' (Hegel, 1971:12). Hegel changes the focus of aesthetic considerations from the form to the meaning of a work of art. Hegel understands a work of art between immediate sensuousness and ideal thought, and accordingly sets foundations for a comprehensive aesthetic analysis.

<sup>1</sup>Bulevar kraljica Aleksandra 73/II, 11 000 Beograd, Serbia  
vladimirstevanovic@gmail.com

If the attitude of the observer towards a work of art and architecture becomes an important topic in contemporary aesthetic theory, the central place in this relation appears to be the notion of aesthetic reception. Reception is the process of receiving, recipience or acceptance of a work of art (Jaus, 1978; Petrović, 1988, 1989; Šuvaković, 1999). Reception begins with the process of perception and results in a level of experience and a level of judgment. The difference between these levels of reception could be analyzed as the difference between direct and indirect reaction. According to aesthetician Sreten Petrović (1989:323), the level of experience should be related to the direct contact between subject and object, while the level of judgment supposes indirect and subsequent forming of intellectual attitude. In aesthetic judgment there is a distinction between the judgment of taste and the critical judgment. The taste can be personally, culturally and historically predisposed, while critical judgment tends to express a true aesthetic value of works of art. The aesthetic judgment based on taste is undoubtedly partial and relative, while critical judgment should be neutral and should implicitly aspire to absolute validity.

### **Ideological meaning**

According to Petrović (1989:326), critical judgment, as well as the aesthetic system as a whole, is profoundly conditioned by time, theoretical-learning possibilities and cultural-historic assumptions and preconceptions. 'While the general aesthetic attitude is conditioned by the nature of philosophical systems, and this system itself by general theoretical-cognitive assumptions, consequently by sociological condition as a general ideological perspective, the taste is conditioned, by cultural-historical factors as well, but more significantly by the individual-psychological factor' (Petrović, *ibid.*). In accordance with this, it is useful to refer to recent papers which consider the problems of the effects that a cultural context has on the aesthetic experience of architecture (Stevanović, 2011), and show how the aesthetic value of an architectural structure could be shaped by various ideological and political concepts (Mako, 2012). In both cases, situations are researched where the domination of cultural, ideological, moral, pragmatic, existential, economical or humanistic meanings in aesthetic reception can appear over pure perceptual qualities of the architectural structure. However, the problematization of possibilities of everyday aesthetic experience or judgment of taste is not of primary importance in this survey. The subject of interest of this paper, in fact, relates

to the analysis of the critical judgment that is established by official critics within official institutions. Further text will offer a presentation of several concrete aesthetic systems, which recognise directed manifestation of ideological meaning as aesthetic value of works of art and architecture. The emphasis will be placed on what Petrović (1972:13) calls the 'influence of extra-theoretical interest in aesthetic thinking'. Although the recent literature which covers the field of relations between aesthetic thinking and ideology is vast (DeMan, 1996; Duncum, 2008; Eagleton, 1990; Levine, 1994), the following overview will focus on to those theories that temporally coincide with the texts which will be subjects of a comparative analysis, and which, through aesthetic judgment, treat Belgrade architecture, immediately before and after the World War II.

### **IDEOLOGICALLY BASED AESTHETICS**

Hegel's concept of meaning remains in the domain of metaphysics and absolute spirit, but the development of his ideas in the evolution of aesthetics leads towards a concept of meaning, which is different from a metaphysical one. In that sense, it is important to distinguish between interior and exterior meanings. Interior meanings are essences that originate in a direct connection between the subject and the Universe. These are the absolute truths, considered valid by the entire humanity. Interior meanings include metaphysical and religious categories of order, number and proportion, and were used, for example, by architectural theorists Marcus Vitruvius Pollio and Leon Battista Alberti when they established their normative aesthetic canons. Exterior meanings do not refer to understanding of invariable essence. Rather, they are a relative product that depends on the factors developed within a socio-cultural system. These understandings further developed in the XIX and XX century, especially during the periods which were ruled by positivist, Darwinist and Marxist influential paradigms in aesthetic theories.

German philosopher Wilhelm Dilthey (Petrović, 1975:39) postulates art as one of the cultural facts and products. Dilthey derives the purpose of art from the category of objective spirit. Nevertheless, he does not do this in light of Hegelian absolute spirit pertaining to rational mental principle; he rather relies on the dimension of social life and the spirit of time. Dilthey's theory, based on the principles of positivism, led to a new, heteronomous approach to aesthetics, which does not regard art and architecture isolated from conditions of

their origin and application, but rather regards them as an instance of culture. From the standpoint of proponents of autonomous aesthetics, heteronomous aesthetics degrade art to ideology, by its definition of having historic and social function. The general divergence between autonomous and heteronomous aesthetic concepts is the question whether art could be completely reduced to a social-historic milieu or not. According to the principles of autonomous aesthetics, regarding a work of art exclusively as an expression and a result of current historic development runs the risk of reducing a work to a simple reflection of economic, religious and political powers, thereby overlooking what is permanent in the work. Here, the paper will make mention of only a few influential concepts of autonomous aesthetics which were developed by subjective idealists, phenomenologists and social utopians. The well-known concept of disinterested judgement of the artistic form of German philosopher Immanuel Kant (1957) places aesthetics in a domain isolated from context. Phenomenological aesthetics from the beginning of the XX century is also oriented towards the form and rejects every external reality (Ziegenfuss, 1928:55). The radical abstraction of art from social and historical reality is advocated by the German aesthetician Theodor Lipps in his theory of empathy (*Einfühlung*). Lipps (1914) negates every reproduction of reality which is independent of human consciousness. He proposes that the form of an object is the state that is created by the subject by means of his internal activities. In that constellation, art is alienated from social problems, for the essence of art is observed as introducing of thoughts and feelings to the outside world, which itself is constructed as inexplicable. English art critic, Herbert Read, closely ties aesthetic theory to his ideas about the anarchist and pacifist society. According to Read (1945), in contrast to authoritarian society, anarchism free of bureaucracy will cause neither the disintegration of the personality nor the social alienation that would suppress individual spontaneity and freedom of artistic creativity. Read believes that art can contribute to a healthy, peaceful society, and that artistic practice, which integrates free creativity with lived experience, can promote greater self-awareness.

Nevertheless, in the context of established heteronomous aesthetic frames of the XIX century, French critic and historian, Hippolyte Taine, develops an aesthetics based on consideration of art in a socio-historical context. In Darwinist terms, when Taine claims that a work of art should be understood as a

result of a race, environment and moment, he relies on collective psychology and the identity of habits, interests and beliefs, which comprise the system of values and world view of a socio-cultural entity. 'To understand a work of art, an artist, artistic group, one should correctly present oneself with the general state of mind and customs of the time they belonged to' (Taine, 1954:15).

In his sociological-aesthetic analysis, Hungarian-born sociologist, Karl Mannheim (Petrović, 1975:19-35), distinguishes three layers of meaning that exist in art as a creation of culture. These are: 1) objective meaning – the very work as pure visual thing; 2) expressive meaning – what the creator wanted to achieve, in terms of intention or poetics and; 3) documentary meaning – perspective of the world containing ideology as a system of values, which stands in parallel with specifically artistic aspects of works. For Mannheim, specific qualities of artistic creation are not important. Mannheim, like Dilthey and Taine before him, identifies work of art with other cultural objectifications.

In the context of Mannheim's approach one could consider iconography and iconology of German art historian, Erwin Panofsky. In the iconographic part of the analysis, Panofsky (1955) distinguishes between the primary – natural subject matter, and secondary – conventional subject matter, in terms of visual form and its content, i.e. meaning. Natural content comprises directly perceivable elements such as lines and colours, while conventional content connects these artistic motifs with the subject matter or ideas. These layers are without a doubt analogue to Mannheim's objective and expressive meaning. The third layer, denominated by Panofsky internal meaning or context, is the key in consideration of ideologically oriented aesthetics. Within this iconological layer, an aesthetic object is regarded as an unconscious, symbolic expression of the author within the principles that demonstrate a position of one nation, period, class, religion and philosophy.

From his Marxist position, Hungarian aesthetician György Lukács (1979) explicitly rejects the issue of form that he treats only as an artistic transposition of content used to express social and moral interest. Lukács regards art as a lower form of knowledge that should shape a particular ideological vision of the world. Within this vision, the aesthetic system comes down to recognizing the level of compliance between the structure of a work and the optimal ideology. Aesthetic value is

actually a simple reflection of ideological structure, in Lukács's case – the communist structure. In this context, Friedrich Engels's writings on aesthetics are relevant for a better understanding of ideological influences in communism. As a co-founder of the Marxist theory, Engels develops a fundamental methodological postulate proposing that the aesthetic phenomena are to be regarded as cultural activities of *Homo sapiens* in his slow progress to self-realization within the matrix of socio-historical processes. The non-isolate phenomena of the arts, which variously depend on other manifestations of culture, social, political, moral, religious, and scientific, influence in turn these other spheres of activity (Morawski, 1970:303). Engels pleads for a realist art, which signifies rendering of the implicit dialectics of social reality, the trend or tendency spontaneous to history. The idea of art as a legislator and liberator of mankind is regarded as directly related to the communist ideal and movement. The continual dynamic flux and change in aesthetics and the arts derive chiefly from the rise and decline of the always complex ideological outlooks which, in the final analysis, are conditioned by the general contradictions and evolution of class society (ibid.).

Even though all presented aesthetic systems are race-, nation-, culture- or class-determined, they are interesting from a contemporary point of view. By reading the time and society, which ideologically shaped a work of art and caused its existence, these aesthetic theories offer conclusions on the possibilities of appearance and acceptance of certain artistic and architectural ideas in one particular society.

### **A COMPARATIVE AND INTERPRETIVE ANALYSIS: INTRODUCING THE COMPLEXITY OF CONTEXT**

Once the theoretical frame of ideological aesthetics is established, it is possible to start applying the results obtained, through a comparative and interpretive analysis of the two texts mentioned earlier. These texts were chosen because they contain the elements that can be characterized as aesthetic in a sense of critical judgement. The first text is a short review of architect Dragomir M. Popović, dated 1940, published under the title of "Belgrade Architecture of Today" (*Današnja beogradska arhitektura*). The other text, considerably longer, titled "Belgrade Architecture" (*Arhitektura Beograda*) was published by architect Jovan Krunić in 1954. Both texts

share the same topic: the state of architecture of the City of Belgrade in the period immediately preceding and following the World War II; however, this topic is viewed from different historical positions. The period discussed cannot be treated as an interrupted continuum. Moreover, it is a period which includes significant changes on the political and ideological plane in the Yugoslav society. After the end of World War II, the Yugoslav society underwent a radical change – from a capitalist monarchy to a communist republic. Along with the change in the political system, foreign relations also changed. The new communist authority at first opted for an alliance with the Soviet Union, which lasted only until 1948. Along with this political rupture, came another change in the domains of culture, art and architecture. These changes in the first place meant abandonment of socialist realism – typical Soviet-communist model in the arts (Milašinović-Marić, 2006). In that sense, Krunić's text appears in a specific historical moment for the Federal People's Republic of Yugoslavia, not long after the separation from the leadership and doctrine of the Soviet Union, while Popović's text belongs to the last days of the Kingdom of Yugoslavia. In addition to the specific historical moments in which these texts appeared, the relevance and importance of their authors is of particular interest. The intriguing social status of these two architects is the main motivation for choosing them in this discussion. According to the historian of art, Aleksandar Kadijević (2007:33), Popović was one of the meritorious architects of Yugoslavia between the Wars, towards whom the new single-party government took an ignoring approach, which supposed actions such as brutal physical execution, seizure of property, imprisonment, persecution and encouragement to emigrate. After the change of the political and ideological ambience, Popović was personally disqualified and discredited by revocation of national honour (Kadijević, 2007:33; 2008:79). On the other hand, Krunić was a well-known name in the communist establishment of the fifties.

### **AUTHENTICITY, HOMOGENEITY AND CONTEMPORANEITY AS IDEOLOGICAL CRITERIA OF AESTHETIC JUDGEMENT**

The analysis will intentionally begin in a reverse historical order. The reason for this is that unlike Krunić's aesthetic observations, which show traces of explicit ideological thinking, Popović's ideological aspects could be revealed only in relation to the criteria recognised in Krunić's text.

In spite of the rupture with the leading communist force, Yugoslav culture in 1954 was still unilaterally determined by one-party authoritarian state politics. In this respect, drawing a parallel between the political thought and cultural elements was one of the important requirements and criteria on the basis of which aesthetic judgment was made within totalitarian societies. In terms of ideological aesthetics, this type of reasoning is characteristic of the previously explained Engels's and Lukács's postulates. Following the same logic, Krunić (1954) deems that the entire Yugoslav cultural and artistic life and architecture lags behind the economic development and political thought. From this premise Krunić further develops refusal of certain styles he identified in Belgrade, today known as: 1) Soviet socialist realism; 2) Serbian-Byzantine style and; 3) Belgrade Modern between the Wars. Particular attention shall be paid to these three styles, for they will be used to demonstrate their impregnation with ideological connotations in the texts of both authors.

In the first place Krunić reproaches the non-existence of an authentic local architectural style. 'While the process of artistic transposition of our reality in other arts is in rapid rise and approaches the range of political thought, in architecture we are still living in the shadow of architectural achievements of other nations. Incomprehensible is the paradox that one independent country with already developed industry, which in social and conceptual aspect represents a paragon, in the field of architecture is an epigone, an imitator of achievements of other people' (Krunić, 1954). Accordingly, Krunić insists that the independence of a country should be particularly manifested through the specificity of its own national architectural expression. It is clear that the „other people“ of whom Krunić speaks, directly refer to the Soviet Union, towards which, in a specific historic moment, adequate position was to be taken. This is why he targets the then dominant Soviet architectural style – socialist realism. Krunić (1954) treats the Soviet architecture as a pseudo-classical reflection of the bureaucratic regime and identifies it with Hitler's monumental architecture. The building to which special reference was made is the House of Trade Unions, designed by architect Branko Petričić, located in then called Square of Marx and Engels in Belgrade. Krunić (1954) views the eclectic and classical architectural elements on this building in a sense of a non-modern spirit that even after the liberation managed to impose itself as inertia and trace of influence of Soviet views. Krunić further speaks of Socialist realism as of something which, in Taine's

terms, simply does not belong to the general state of Yugoslav mind.

In addition to authenticity, another important aesthetic criterion, which one could read from Krunić's aesthetic judgment of Belgrade architecture, is homogeneity (compactness or uniformity). The tendency towards homogeneity can be recognised in the criticism of the Serbian-Byzantine style. This style is formed on the basis of Serbian medieval church architecture, and the most representative building of it is the Post Office Building 2 (Fig.1), designed by architect Momir Korunović and built in 1928. According to Krunić (1954), this building represents a slip-off-the-way in Belgrade architecture between the Wars, in which classical forms were replaced by national ones, in an

interpretation that was brought to absurd. Architect Pavle Krat (1948:26), the author of the Post Office reconstruction project, finished in 1948 in purist style (Fig.2), gave a similar review: 'architecture of the old Post Office Building was a typical example of an unsuccessful utilization of our national heritage overloaded by stylistic elements.' The review of the architecture of Serbian-Byzantine style could be read as a clearly expressed abandonment of pre-war Serbian individual hyper-national tendencies. Placing this in a framework of Panofsky's national aspects of his internal meaning or context, one could find the collision within ideological instrumentalisation on the concern of what is actually national. National authenticity in 1954 was supposed to be not Serbian but Yugoslav. Purist and neutral



Figure 1. Momir Korunović, Post Office Building 2, 1928. (scanned postcard, personal archive)



Figure 2. Pavle Krat, reconstruction of Post Office Building 2, 1948.

homogeneity, as a characteristic of a style that is the antipode of the individual, here represents a way for undisturbed striving towards a new Yugoslav national unity. Except the Serbian national hegemonism, in Serbian-Byzantine style, as the style of the royal dynasty of Karađorđević, also recognised was the symbol of monarchist class exploitation.

On the basis of the very same criterion of homogeneity, Krunić evaluates the eclecticism of Belgrade Modern between the Wars. Belgrade "Modern" (which Krunić intentionally puts under quotation marks) manifests itself through residential architecture, which was built by the wealthy class of the society for leasing purposes. Formative characteristics of the Belgrade Modern include a number of decorative elements such as various forms of putting frames around the window apertures, accentuation of corners by semicircular terraces, shallow rounded balconies, corner formations adapting to street radii, circular windows, formation by recessing facade planes, flag pole holders etc. Krunić ascribes this heterogeneous nature of Belgrade Modern to provincial understandings of profiteering building owners, who, exerting all efforts of their primitivistic vulgarism, yearn for colourful facade profiles and paints. In a time of profiteering and commercial construction, facade decor represented the embodiment of provincial understanding. Since the relations after the liberation and socialist organization eliminated the market economy, Krunić (1954) concludes contently that the anarchism in the evolution of Belgrade between the Wars, the soul of which was the profit, is now replaced by planned regularities of humanistic tendencies. 'Instead of the nature of a sum of petty bourgeois vanities of individual facades of its [Belgrade] streets, nowadays it [Belgrade] tends to assume the property of unity and homogeneity, uniformity' (Krunić, 1954). Since the homogeneity of architecture was not present in pre-war times, Krunić, as opposed to the styles critiqued, promotes purism. Affirming purism, he argues: 'The entire decor today is reduced to its real elements, reflected in the disposition of masses, surfaces, maintaining the rhythm of full and empty and greenery garnishing' (Krunić, 1954). In this sense, he singles out a residential building, designed by the architect Momčilo Belobrk, as an example of rare purist facades of Belgrade between the Wars. The critique of individuality in Belgrade's eclectic Modern at this point can be interpreted as an instrument of a general public tendency, in Mannheim's terms - the view of the world or a system of values, moving towards egalitarianism, collectivism and the reduction of class differences in



Figure 3. Dimitrije Leko, Belgrade Stock Exchange Building, 1937.  
Source: <http://www.skyscrapercity.com/showthread.php?t=406398&page=176>



Figure 4. View over the pre-war eclectic Modern towards the post-war purism - "real" Modern

society. Krunić believes purism is the real Modern architecture, as opposed to the eclectic Modern between the Wars, even though in morphological terms this difference is not emphasized to that extent. Accordingly, it is possible to compare the Belgrade Stock Exchange Building from 1937 (Fig.3), designed by architect Dimitrije Leko, with the adjacent, previously mentioned reconstructed Post Office Building 2. Figure 4. suggests the division of modern architecture to pre-war eclecticism and post-war purism was implemented violently and exclusively ideologically. It seems that the purism of the Post Office Building is more acceptable than the arc facade with the round window on the

Belgrade Stock Exchange Building, although both buildings belong to the same family of modern volumetry.

The three styles presented are recognised as inappropriate in terms of what Krunić calls 'contemporaneous understanding in architecture'. However, contemporaneity, set as the ultimate and unifying aesthetic criterion on the basis of which Krunić makes his critical judgment, is actually in function of ideological argument. This is a clear instance of an appropriation of the concept of contemporaneity which is promoted as rejection of everything that preceded the current ideological setting of the new Yugoslav society. Therefore, Krunić's aesthetic analysis

does not in fact consider styles that are aesthetically unacceptable due to their morphological characteristics (objective meaning and iconological-natural content in terms of Mannheim and Panofsky, respectively). He actually speaks about styles in relation to the ideology and the spirit of those times. Particularly, the year 1954 is the moment in which one should reject not only the Modern between the wars that already bore the epithet of a pro-Western bourgeois decadence, and Serbian-Byzantine style as a symbol of Serbian nationalism, monarchist dictatorship, and class exploitation, but also the leading architectural style of the until-then ally – Soviet socialist realism. Purism was preferred, because it was the only style cleared from all undesired historic connotations, and as such, it represented the analogy to striving towards contemporaneity.

Interpretation of Krunić's aesthetic analysis allowed connection of certain formal aspects of architecture with their corresponding, i.e. attached ideological connotations. However, in order to completely clarify the importance of ideological assumptions in aesthetic judgement, it is time to introduce a comparison with Popović's text, written 14 years earlier. Analyzing the pace of Belgrade construction between the two world wars, Popović places himself in the framework of ideological aesthetics, in the same manner as the aestheticians mentioned in this paper propose. This is recognisable because Popović (1940:278) asserts that Belgrade architecture is an expression of the entire social, economic, cultural and moral life. Unlike Krunić, Popović (*ibid.*) concludes with a conciliatory tone that 'our building tradition, except for church architecture, was not sufficient for us to rely on it; rather, we must learn from the abroad, transplant and filter the new endeavours and, through our own understanding, adapt them to our needs'. Here Popović, in contrast to Krunić's open ideologization, represents a concealed ideological aesthetic thinking, which can be discovered only in comparison to Krunić's text. If the exclusivity of Krunić in terms of authentic style was related to pretensions towards autonomous national identity, which were implemented by the state government, then Popović's assimilation of foreign influences was directly related to the aspirations of monarchy, in which independence and liberty were valued in a different ideological manner. Another significant difference is Popović's affirmative position towards Serbian church architecture, as an authentic expression of our building tradition. In that sense, he does not mind the

Serbian-Byzantine style which is inspired by this type of architecture, while Krunić discredits the same style as national and hegemonic. After examining the attitudes taken towards authenticity and foreign influences in these texts, it is also possible to compare the ideological substrate in relation to homogeneity and heterogeneity of architectural expression. Popović does not mind the eclecticism of Belgrade's Modern, nor does he mind that this is the style of lucrative house owners, as understood by Krunić. Moreover, Popović (1940:279), once again, concludes in a conciliatory tone that wealthy people simply wish for their buildings to be beautiful. Accordingly, their taste is not petty-bourgeois but evolved and refined. Popović (1940:282) believes that house owners do not find charm and nobility in purist Modern, but they seek something from the good old days. Here one could easily notice his opinion of the then not-yet-established relation between purism and contemporaneity. In general, Popović (1940:282) perceives certain disorder in the outlook of Belgrade as a faithful picture of our mentality and the state of the spirit, i.e. collective psychology in Taine's terms. Popović's interpretation of the fact that not a single style managed to establish itself in Belgrade suggests there is no orchestrated architecture. Quite to the contrary, in his opinion, the architects enjoyed great liberty in their conceptions and tendencies. For Petrović, plurality of styles obviously does not have a negative connotation that can be found in Krunić's observations. Connecting the plurality of styles, national mentality and liberty into a triangle, Popović tendentiously points to the supposed democracy of the monarchy and the respect of all participants in the society.

## CONCLUSIONS

The concept of ideology in this paper is examined as a concrete form of aesthetic determinism in a sense of race, environment and moment, collective psychology, identity of habits, interests and beliefs, the general state of mind, a position of one nation, period, class, religion and philosophy, and social and moral interest. In a broader sense, ideology is defined as a system of values and views of the world of a socio-cultural entity, while in a concrete analysis special emphasis is placed on ideological context of internal and foreign politics, as well as class and national questions.

Comparative analysis of Krunić's and Popović's texts has shown that the inherent architectural elements such as folklorism, ornamentalism, eclecticism, classicism, monumentalism and purism, bear a specific

ideological meaning in the context of pre-war and post-war Yugoslav society. Likewise, the then established aesthetic criteria such as authenticity, homogeneity and contemporaneity were used in the sense of broader ideological implications. Authenticity is a criterion of aesthetic judgement through which Krunić and Popović solve significant questions of foreign politics and national identity, while the homogeneity relates to internal national and class questions. With the critique of the lack of authenticity of socialist realism, Krunić emphasizes foreign political relations with the Soviet Union. Discarding the need for authenticity, Popović alludes that the Yugoslav Monarchy is ready to cooperate with other countries. The criterion of homogeneity, on the basis of which Krunić makes judgement of the Belgrade Modern, targets internal politics with the emphasis on class issues. The critique of heterogeneity of Serbian-Byzantine style is once again the argument for internal politics, only this time the focus is more on the national, rather than on the question of class. Popović ignores the need for homogeneity and affirms plurality, i.e. heterogeneity as an affirmative exponent of the then existent state of Yugoslav mind and spirit. In 1940 heterogeneity should have been an indication of a high level of freedom, which would use architecture to convey the message of state organization based on freedom of choice. The very same criterion in 1954 represented an obstacle in achieving the uniformity of style used by the Communists to establish a deceptive equality. In the post-war period, under the banner of contemporaneity and the style that was in conformity with the spirit of time, there was in fact a search for an architecture that would correspond to the period in which it was possible to establish a neutral position in relation to the previous state-economic governing models. These were the pre-war capitalist-oriented monarchy and the directly rejected post-war pro-Soviet communist organization. The purpose of this kind of a neutral position was the prominence of national and class compactness of the new Yugoslav socialist society. That is why purism was established as the style of the then reigning ideology, as the only style that had no traces of history, i.e. no connection with the regimes stigmatized as hostile and unsuitable.

Previous conclusions summed up the results of the analysis of aesthetic judgement on concrete examples of chosen works in the Yugoslav contexts before and after the World War II. However, the topic of this paper was neither just the history of Belgrade architecture, nor a retrospective critical review

of Belgrade architecture, but a consideration of ideological assumptions in aesthetic judgment. Once again there is a need to emphasize that in a broader sense the paper shows how particular ideological aspirations of society establish the aesthetic values by which one critic should judge architecture. Ideology appears to be above all other assumptions in aesthetic judgment. In this setting, a layman's position is not different from the position of an expert (architect, critic or aesthetician) if they both enter the limits of their own ideological interpretations. Consequently, a personal institutional competence does not seem to be a factor that exempts from susceptibility to assumptions in aesthetic judgment.

## References

- De Man, P. (1996) *Aesthetic Ideology*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Duncum, P. (2008) Holding Aesthetics and Ideology in Tension, *A Journal of Issues and Research* No 49(2), pp. 122-135.
- Eagleton, T. (1990) *The Ideology of the Aesthetics*, Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Gilbert, K. E. and Kun, H. (1969) *Istorija estetike*, Beograd: Kultura, pp. 242-247.
- Grić, D. (1983) *Estetika II – epoha estetike*, Zagreb: Naprijed, pp. 151-174.
- Hegel, G.V.H. (1971) *Estetika 1*, Beograd: Kultura.
- Jaus, H.R. (1978) *Estetika recepcije*, Beograd: Nolit.
- Kadijević, A. (2007) The role of ideology in recent architecture and its interpretation in historiography, *Nasleđe*, No 8, pp. 225-237.
- Kadijević, A. (2008) On soc-realism in Belgrade architecture and its conflicting interpretations, *Nasleđe*, No 9, pp. 75-88.
- Kant, I. (1957) *Kritika rasudne snage*, Zagreb: Kultura.
- Krat, P. (1948) Rekonstrukcija zgrade Pošte 2 u Beogradu, *Arhitektura* No7, pp. 26-28.
- Krunić, J. (1954) *Arhitektura Beograda*, Beograd: Naučna Knjiga (unpaginated).
- Levine, G. (1994) *Aesthetics and Ideology*, New Brunswick: Rutgers University Press.
- Lipps, T. (1914) *Ästhetik: Psychologie des Schönen und der Kunst, 2 unveränderte Auflage*, Leipzig und Hamburg: Verlag von Leopold Voss.
- Lukač Đ. (1979) *Estetičke ideje – marksizam*, Beograd: Bigz.
- Mako, V. (2012) Ideology and architecture: aesthetic rationalism and its cultural respond, in Mako et al. (eds.) *International Conference Architecture and Ideology CD Proceedings, September 28 - 29, 2012, Belgrade, Serbia*, pp. 29-38.
- Milašinović-Marić, D. (2006) Social realism critique from the contemporary viewpoint of the architect Milorad Macura, *Arhitektura i urbanizam*, No 18-19, pp. 134-139.
- Morawski, S. (1970) The aesthetic views of Marx and Engels, *Journal of Aesthetics and Art Criticism*, No 28 (3), pp. 301-314.
- Panofsky, E. (1955) *Meaning in Visual Arts*, NewYork: DoubleDay Anchor Books.
- Petrović, S. (1972) *Estetika i ideologija: uvod u metaestetiku*, Beograd: Zodijsak.
- Petrović, S. (1975) *Estetika i sociologija: uvod u savremenu sociologiju umetnosti*, Beograd: Ideje.
- Petrović, S. (1988) Socio-psihološka uslovljenost recepcije likovnog dela, *Istra*, No 5-6, Pula: Naučna biblioteka, str. 110-123.
- Petrović, S. (1989) Estetika recepcije, in *Estetika i sociologija: četvrto prerađeno i dopunjeno izdanje*, Beograd: Naučna Knjiga, pp. 323-376.
- Popović, D. (1940) Današnja beogradska arhitektura, *Umetnički pregled*, No. 9, pp. 278-282.
- Read, H. (1945) *Art and society*, London: Faber and Faber.
- Stevanović, V. (2011) Cultural based preconceptions in aesthetic experience of architecture, *SPATIUM International Review*, No 26, pp. 20-25.
- Šuvaković, M. (1999) Recepcija, in *Pojmovnik moderne i postmoderne likovne umetnosti i teorije posle 1950*, Beograd i Novi Sad: Srpska akademija nauka i umetnosti i Prometej, p. 291.
- Ten, I. (1954) *Filozofija umetnosti*, Beograd: Srpska književna zadruga.
- Ziegenfuss, W. (1928) *Die Phaenomenologische Aesthetik*, Berlin: A. Collignon.