

TWO BOOKS OF RELATED SUBJECT MATTER ADDRESSING THE CRITIQUE OF MODERNIST VIEWS ON DESIGN AND ARCHITECTURE

DVE OBSAHOVO PREVIAZANÉ PUBLIKÁCIE VENOVANÉ KRITIKE MODERNISTICKÝCH ÚVAH O DIZAJNE A ARCHITEKTÚRE

Jarmila Bencová

Among the many books and scholarly articles that appeared recently to commemorate the 100th anniversary (1919) of the founding of the Bauhaus, the legendary German modernist school of design and architecture, the two most recent publications of the Norwegian-Czech theorist of design and architecture, Professor Jan Michl, do not provide the expected celebratory note but, in a more sceptical form, offer a critical view of the justifiability of the goals and methods of the *Modern* era. In their subject matter, the two books are mutually connected, and it is necessary to read them in parallel for a full coverage and supplementation of the various aspects of the question. At the forefront stands the author's intent to stimulate reflections on the problems within the theoretical and practical aspects of the designing of architecture and utilitarian objects, yet not in the previously implemented or even preserved intentions. The method of Michl's reflections is unusual not only in its unique traversal of the depths and essences of the theoretical ramifications, but equally in its urgent appeal to what it finds lacking in the objective view of modernity as a phenomenon, to the unwillingness or inability to view realistically the architectonic and design implications of the Modernist era. The conclusions reached in both publications, in turn, could be noted in the advice on the need for a reaction, or the way in which students in the fields of architecture or design should be educated. For these arguments, the author provides many trenchant arguments from a wide range of Western researchers, their views on the functional aspects of modernist architectural and design work are subjected to an analysis that often brings forth a series of new – and genuinely difficult – questions. By necessity, they extend

into cultural and art-historical matters in such broad chronological and spatial reaches that their intellectual postulates clearly cannot be summarised merely within the logic of Central Europe's design and architectural practice. Living in Norway, Michl has, as it were, a bird's eye view of Europe from the north, while confronting this view with years of personal and professional engagement with exceptional figures of Europe's philosophy and history. Above all, these individuals include philosopher Karl Popper (1902 – 1994), art historian and theorist E. H. Gombrich (1909 – 2001) and economist Friedrich von Hayek (1899 – 1992). As the author admits, these were the thinkers who shaped and presented the key points in the problems of cultural and artistic modernity, offering challenges and inspirations for discussion, as well as for his *seductive* ex-critique of modernity and eventually even critical reactions to their own works.¹

Among these aspects are the ranges of stereotypes present in the concepts of the theory and history of art, architecture, and design, creating the immediate topics that in Michl's books emerge in thematically parallel treatments. At the forefront of his writings is a desire to clarify the unstable, misleading, or ungrounded theses of modernity, presented as catchphrases or slogans on how form, in all aspects of the modern work, allegedly must remain subordinate to function – or in its more expressive, oft-repeated mantra, *form follows function*.

In both of Michl's publications, one persistent (if at times irritating) feature is an appeal to re-think the modernist functionalist and aesthetic principles. As a professor of the history and theory of design at the universities of Oslo and Gjøvik, as well as in various



JAN MICHL

FUNKCIONALISMUS, DESIGN,
ŠKOLA, TRH
ČTRNÁCT TEXTŮ O PROBLÉMECH
TEORIE A PRAXE MODERNÍHO
DESIGNU

FUNCTIONALISM, DESIGN, SCHOOL,
MARKET
FOURTEEN TEXTS ON THE
PROBLEMS OF THE THEORY AND
PRACTICE OF MODERN DESIGN

2019, Brno, Books/Pipes Publishing
(2nd edition), 327 pp.

stimulating discussions at conferences around the world, he seeks opinions that could help reveal the longstanding crisis of *unrestrained functionalist pedagogy*. This is the term he uses for the classroom *modernist monopoly*, imposed at the expense of stylistic diversity in the training of designers and architects. In pedagogic conceptions and in the public sphere, he hopes to reinforce the belief that not only in theoretical treatises but even more in the training of architects and designers, it is beneficial to develop an open discussion and eventually reach a more realistic evaluation and objectivization of the tasks and methods of modernity. In this effort, it is not solely about the epoch of their strongest influence in the 1920s and 1930s, but equally the problems spanning modernist approaches from the historic, if chronologically indeterminate, emergence up to today's equally complicated justifications for the acceptance of a "new" modernist, or more accurately neofunctionalist stance. Michl repeatedly proposes starting first with the open critique of historicisms and their past and present reminiscences (among others, his texts on the theme of *redesign*²), in an essential resolution of the anachronisms of ornamentality and decorativeness, and then in the careful investigation of functionalist methods, as practiced in the theory as well as training in our professions. If the first publications primarily addresses themes of creativity and the acceptance of the phrase *form follows function* and the

links between this origin and the implementation of the abstract aesthetic into architectonic and design work in the early decades of the 20th century, the second book essentially turns towards the questions polarising the past of architecture and design, with the Bauhaus and its inherited problems in the area of taste, the Purist requirements versus decorativeness. One extensive theme for the author is the justification for the acceptance of the stylistic-expressive and styling-based aspects of creation. Michl in these publications offers a conclusion, yet definitely not a final end to the discussion on the modernist-Bauhaus idiom, nor on the character of its own level of totalitarization in culture and art.

The book **Funkcionalismus, design, škola, trh** [Functionalism, Design, School, Market] comprises fourteen texts, most of which were previously published in journals or delivered as conference presentations. Seven of them were previously included in the volume **Tak nám prý forma sleduje funkci** [So They Tell Us Form Follows Function] from 2003, VŠUP Praha, 237 pp.

The author sets forth the twisted "thread" of modernist doctrines of the functionalist contributions to the theory of design and architecture, emerging from the various (sometimes erroneous) historically emerging semantic levels of the concepts. Understandably, these are concepts integral to the study of art and architecture, transferred to the theory of design, yet equally concepts that are stereotypically invoked in a range of contexts, thus impossible to avoid and continually revived. In Michl's presentation, the first agenda is to reveal them, yet right afterwards to stress their fluctuating usefulness and hidden untruths.

One such instance is visible in the brilliant polemic with the reflections on a small problem in the work of the great British art historian and theorist E. H. Gombrich. The two interlocutors discussed the *adoption*, i.e. acceptance and defence, of the modernist slogan-thesis *form follows function*, in which Michl, in the wider sense, addresses Gombrich's rational, anti-metaphysical approach to the understanding of styles and stylistic change (pp. 129 – 158). Through the method of Gombrich's thought, he uncovers one of the mysteries in his influential reception of history, extendable to the theory of design and architecture. The mutual presentation and confrontation of views, particularly on the wording of the phrase, clashes with Gombrich's personal methods in creating art

history. For Michl, it was his lifelong opposition to metaphysical understanding that, in this instance, led him astray. Here, it is evident that his obsession with the continual explication of the *end that determines the means* is, in essence, only a synonym for the metaphysical diction of *form follows function* (pp. 137 – 140, 154).

When Michl discerns, in the philosophy of modernity, artistic form opposed to the instrumental conception of function, he does not find the key in the form's individual contents, but rather in what this phrase aims to present as a whole, in the sense of a single utterance. His project is to reveal it as the imperative of a new Modern Age, as a slogan that the era nonetheless never admitted to form the central idea of creation – even though it formally employed it, supported it, declared it. Literally, it is a deciphering of the circumstances whether it implied a formality that every creative artist understood as a necessary yet unspoken cliché, or a symptom of all that was new, in other words as a well-presented gesture of the new era that granted it its modernity.

In consequence, Michl is required to present its genesis and map beforehand the “pre-Sullivan”, pre-Modernist epoch with the first indications of the Functionalist idea of *form following function* (pp. 131 – 135). Yet it is necessary all the same to add that architect and theorist Louis Sullivan was not the only one to reflect on the purpose of buildings (at the very least, compare the Chicago School to Sullivan's use of the functionalist reflections of Viollet-le-Duc and others). And even if Sullivan's powerful slogan acted almost as a magic spell, real-life architecture and design thought up their concepts on their own, and gladly independently. Furthermore: without hesitation or fears of dogma, without ideological affinity toward the proclamation. The reasons whether it formed an absence of the capacity to find a stylistic or aesthetic replacement for functionality – after all, it was all in the search for a new style – or if the interest had disappeared in an unburdened view of historicism, still remain for investigation. Perhaps precisely these outcomes of an unended, indeed unending, historicism are the reason why no one ever took a realistic perspective of modernism? Equally, these contradictions could be the driving force for innovation in the creative approaches of architects and designers: deliberately not removed but adapted to the individual stance of each creator or theorist. In following the pre-modernist problems, Michl tries to move

through the history of design and architecture, selecting often striking, even unlikely references and associations within theory, for instance in the mid-18th century with a Franciscan who happened to be an influential architectural theorist, Carlo Lodoli (1690 – 1761) (pp. 95 – 96). This reflection, though, is debatable if the concepts of architecture that exclude ornament, repress décor and implement an ornament-free design and architecture are not, at the same time, predominantly purely functional and moreover are not practiced only after the Baroque but directly within it and before it. Functionality, in various forms, was approached from many different reasons, not only from ones of utility, but even in the early-modern sense of *distribuzione* were not seen only in the sense of function but also as representation – useful to someone or subject to someone, etc. A preparatory state of constructive functionalism emerged definitively at least from the era of Alberti as a developed, Vitruvian *utilitas* (as, for instance, intriguingly discussed in the principles of the origin and activities of things by philosopher Arthur Schopenhauer at the start of the 19th century).

From the statements and work of such figures as Le Corbusier or Mies van der Rohe, we could best interpret this version of the explication of functionalism, and similarly the Bauhaus could not defend its own pedagogic direction without it. Yet the question remains how it was seen, for instance, by one of the Bauhaus's most significant instructors, Paul Klee, considering his personal interpretation of his work *Angelus Novus* from 1920²³ – In the architectonic thought of the avant-garde, however, the question of utility was also granted a moralistic accent. And despite the individual and aesthetically more sensitive stance, we regularly find in the texts the same concept of ‘rational functionalism’ even when purely rational creative methods served as a hindrance to the proponents of Poetism, or conversely conflicted with the idea of a kind of “emotional functionalism”.⁴ Still, one passionately discussed and controversial phenomenon of the interwar years in Europe was, though unfortunately omitted from Michl's books, the intellectual current addressing the spatial aspects of architectural creation and the preference for a theory of space, addressed with no less intensity than that of functionality by the leading protagonists of architectural and design modernism. Here, it was not merely an impulse towards creative methods (p. 67,

135), but also to the shaping of conditions for the functionality of all living processes, for instance in the sense of the influential writings of Karel Honzík and his contemporaries.⁵

It needs to be stated that this situation applies in the case of Czech and Slovak modernists, where several alternatives, several theoretical and creative interpreters, and the shifted time horizons allow the phrase “form follows function” to be deployed essentially as a backdrop to original “figures” of authentic creativity. The Slovak architect and architectural historian Ladislav Foltýn, himself a graduate of the Bauhaus, himself writes of the contradictory trajectories of creative methods in the late 1920s, recalling among many Slovak architects the writings and realisations of Emil Belluš, whose works “express that architecture, even if it is the outcome of relatively precise functional forces, is never the outcome of a tight-lipped utilitarianism”.⁶

Practically throughout the entire 20th century, there appeared between the phenomena of form and function another, genuinely more modern⁷ relationship than can be expressed by the now overused intermediary word *succeeds* or *follows*. Michl does not address this himself, yet all the same just as it is possible to conceive form variably, particularly as an expression of an individual view of its organisation and structure, similarly function need not have an unambiguous meaning within the creative initiatives of modernity. Indeed, this question was a major theme of interwar philosophers and theorists of art and architecture: whether in the spirit of polyfunctionality, or more accurately that of the non- or a-functional, i.e. empty, lost, hopeless forms requiring demolition. One such case might be the Pruitt-Igoe housing project in St. Louis in 1972. Was this demolition merely the destruction of forms because of their function, or the elimination of both, and hence the escape, at long last, from the “form-follows-function” slogan as the gestural declaration of modernity’s end? The proponent of the latter stance, architect and theorist Charles Jencks, here interpreted the modern into endlessly continual levels of new, further developed and thus rehabilitated “moderns”, with all possible variations of radical postmodern eclecticism.⁸ His position is close to the appeals to the importance of following “not only function but also fiction” (Heinrich Klotz), or the stance that form follows almost nothing (Robert Venturi) or conversely form should follow vision et al. Yet Michl does

not pay special attention to these recollections of the impact of *form* – nor does he address the significance of the hermeneutics of the word “follow” or the meaningfully over-exaggerated idea of *function* acquiring a closer, perhaps more human dimension. This lack is to be lamented, because the emergence as well as the retreat of the phenomena of functionality (in the sense of utilitarianism, utility, the aesthetics of the operation of things and buildings, the purpose as the identification of form in built or designed works) as well as form (with its form-creation, understood as the direct form-ulation of form, shape, object, creativity etc.), i.e., as concepts with multiple meanings that allow form to appear, should also be necessary parts of this key phrase! Or is it even possible that the Modern Era did not find its new metaphysics precisely in this own internal (and indeed etymological) sense?

Today, the most meaningful elements within the slogan *form follows function* appear to be the connotations precisely of the verb “follow”. Or in other words, the concepts for the dynamism of relationships, links, contexts, movements, procedures, preceding (“avant-...”) et al., and perhaps more clearly than the multiple meanings of the stereotypes and all-embracing concepts of “form” and “function”, characterising this New Era. And particularly so with regard to modern science, machinery, or technologies on one side, and on the other the aesthetic thought or the avant-garde approaches to art and architecture in the modernist era. Hence it may prove necessary to pose the question not only what each of the words means, what each represents, but in fact what follows what, what is following and when, and above all why, Why should one follow the other, and not the reverse? The word *follow* or *follows* in a certain verbal context carries within itself a sense of priority, avant-gardism and so forth – yet Michl states several times that he has no desire to investigate linguistic or semiotic considerations. Against what was communicated to architects and designers on the theme of linguistically changeable structures in 1937 by aesthetician and literary scholar Jan Mukařovský, it is symptomatic for our theme that he speaks of the functional view that “... allows us to conceive of things as actions without denying their material reality. It reveals the world, simultaneously, as both a movement and the firm basis for human activity. The idea of function, being the basic working hypothesis of modern culture, develops



JAN MICHL

CO BAUHAUS DAL A CO VZAL. KRITICKÉ ÚVAHY O MODERNISTICKÉM POJETÍ DESIGNU A ARCHITEKTURY
WHAT THE BAUHAUS GAVE AND WHAT IT TOOK
CRITICAL REFLECTIONS ON THE MODERNIST CONCEPTION OF DESIGN AND ARCHITECTURE
2020, Brno, Books/Pipes Publishing, 297 pp.

and differentiates itself within, and thus needs to be kept forever in mind and its signs to be continually reviewed. What are they? If we speak of the function of certain things, what do we hope to express through it?...⁹

The book **Co Bauhaus dal a co vzal** [What the Bauhaus Gave and What It Took] addresses, in seven individual essays and five reviews, the philosophical and aesthetic problems associated with the monopolistic position of the Bauhaus and the stylistic idioms of the Modern Era. The central text provides the book's title and indicates the trajectory of the reflections, focusing on the pedagogic practice of architecture and design training.¹⁰

In this publication, Michl continues with his investigation of the Modernist thesis of *form follows function* as a paradigm that has mystified and invaded the philosophy of architecture and design, even though its real intent and content, or indeed its own adequacy, has never been fully evaluated, let alone systematised. He examines its application and classifies it as unrealistic, misleading, and controversial, as a pervasive and continually maintained myth of stylistic, aesthetic, or indeed historical patterns, yet equally as a metaphysical absurdity assigned timeless validity. He aims, once more, to uncover the reasons behind the influence of this thesis, thus returning to the content of Functionalist doctrines discussed

in the earlier book, and their most influential spreader – the pedagogic figures of the legendary Bauhaus. Their published (and private) discussions on architecture and design, in brief, deliberately avoid the logic of form as bound by function, ignoring the content and the meanings through which the functionalism of modernity has persisted. Each protagonist of the Bauhaus promoted his individual professional doctrines and never discussed Functionalism within them, regarding it as an individual matter. To cite Hannes Meyer, writing from Dessau in 1929: “all things in this world are the product of the formula: function x economy. Hence all these things are in no sense artworks: all art is composition, and thus contradicting utility. All life is functional, and hence non-artistic”.¹¹

Unquestionably, the teachings of the Bauhaus did not bring forth any reliable concept of how to build or how to create useful items. Essentially, the philosophy of the school program and its output essentially never into being, as can be read as early as 1919 in the Manifesto of the Bauhaus, written by its ideological leader Walter Gropius.¹² Michl provocatively opens the question as to why, in the famed Bauhaus environment where modernity emerged and established itself, there was never any attempt then or later toward at what the avant-garde so often attempted – creating a program or a declaration of principles that would identify the concept of the style and its intellectual background. Without such starting points, in short, the slogan *form follows function* would, in his view, never have gained the right to expand into the dimension of the super-real, as a defence or a kind of religion, or even as an empty scandal towards a realistic appeal.

In one of his reviews, Michl makes an excellent reference to the problem of the survival of the task and function of ornament and décor, something that in the aesthetic as well as functionalist sense formed an irritant to creating and theorising architects and designers (pp. 243 – 262). He viewed it as “...the thesis that ornament is something that has outlived itself today and no longer belongs to the modern era”. Particularly in this question, he turns to the philosophy of orders and styles in architecture and design, now replaced in contemporary discussions with the word *expression*.¹³ Modernity, to match the spirit of functional principles, was therefore forced to *expel style* from its vocabulary lists and the dictionaries of the avant-garde, shifting it to the level of a strange,

defective *styling* that in architecture and design led to mere stylistic formalism. Similarly, the author addresses the purpose of the avant-garde idea of struggling against abstractionism. On one side, the consequences of the further struggles with functionalism have now become an inherited legacy (though whether by this he means neo-functionalism, or the Czech *strict style*, or any other versions of minimalism, he does not specify). Yet the work of avant-garde artists within modernity managed to create parallel cultural structures: independent journals, small presses and theatres, or equally artistic schools like the Bauhaus. Here, the contribution to culture was, as stated sympathetically with philosopher Květoslav Chvatík, the overcoming of the fixed image of the world and the human subject with a new dynamic and expanded vision, setting in motion an inward, richly differentiated style, reaching out from Le Corbusier to the architects and artists of the Bauhaus, from Picasso to Matisse, from Proust to Joyce.¹⁴

Michl sharpens his critique of the teaching methods of the Bauhaus, often sounding like an instruction or even an appeal that sounds forth even in the titles of his essays, such as “The Time Has Come to Surmount the Bauhaus Barrier”, “A Serious Gap in Teaching Architecture and Design”, or “The Path towards Understanding Stylistic Idioms as an Invention without a Sell-By Date”, etc. At the centre of his reflections, though, are the results of the fact that the modernist Bauhaus, that enormously influential inter-war German artistic school, imposed a completely new abstract idiom onto design and architecture, yet simultaneously refused to regard it as a chosen style. Various shifts in opinion can be discerned, e.g. the words from Dessau in 1931 of one instructor, the Czech stage architect and typographer Zdeněk Rossmann, that ...we are searching for a new unified line, searching for a Bauhausstil. Searching, because the public is loudly demanding it as a secure sign of modernity...¹⁵ Yet no Bauhaus Style was ever found, even though the public and the journalistic discourse continued to use the phrase *Bauhaus style* in common speech. Theorist Frank Whitford has examined the disagreement of Gropius, who continually denied any specific stylistic orientation for his school, emphasising that the aim was not to develop a unified visual identity but instead a certain stance towards creative potential, taking as its goal the achievement of diversity.¹⁶ And Michl has

brought to the discussions of architects and designers a similar thesis about the Modern Age, not marked by any proclaimed unity but by an analogous radical diversity. Yet this does not, in his view, diminish the usefulness of the Bauhaus stylistic idiom, since the Bauhaus did provide a new style while simultaneously revoking the possibility of understanding it as a style – being regarded generally as a kind of label; not a style but an expression, through which the public and the tradespeople guaranteed their profits (pp. 99 – 116). In 1929, the talented Bauhaus theatre instructor Oskar Schlemmer might have added to this that “the Bauhaus style has made its way into the designs of women’s underwear, the Bauhaus style as a ‘modern decoration’, a rejection of yesterday’s styles and the resolution of being ‘completely current’ at all costs – this style can be found anywhere, except for the Bauhaus itself...”¹⁷ And this confusion, despite the fact that during this given period it was only one of many schools developing and implementing these new ideas, has persisted up until today.

- 1** These specific personalities are repeatedly cited by the author in his texts and their views confronted with his own. One of the key texts of *Funkcionalizmus, design, škola, trh*, questioning and critiquing the views of E. H. Gombrich ("Gombrichova neúspěšná adopce hesla forma sleduje funkci. Okolnosti a problémy" – Gombrich's Unsuccessful Adoption of the Slogan Form Follows Function – Circumstances and Problems) was published earlier in: MIKŠ, František and KESNER, Ladislav (eds.), 2009/2010. *Gombrich. Porozumět umění a jeho dějinám. Ke stému výročí narození E. H. Gombricha*. Brno: Barrister-Principal, MU FF, pp. 209 – 231. on internet: Barrister & Principal, FF MU
- 2** The theme of redesign is prominent in several of Michl's publications. The text entitled "Vidět design jako redesign. Úvaha o jedné přehlížené stránce chápání a vyučování designu." [To See Design as Redesign. Reflections on an Overlooked Chapter of Understanding and Teaching Design] also appeared in: FILIPOVÁ, Marta and RAMPLEY, Matthew (eds.), 2007. *Možnosti vizuálních studií. Obrazy – texty – interpretace*. Brno: Barrister & Principal MU FF, pp. 63 – 91, as well as MICHL, Jan, 2003. *Tak nám přij forma sleduje funkci*. Praha: VŠUP, pp. 157 – 210.
- 3** Compare the interpretation of Klee's painting in the text "Theses on the Interpretation of History". In: BENJAMIN, Walter, 1969. *Illuminations. Essays*, tr. Harry Zohn. New York: Schocken, p. 234.
- 4** Compare "function" as one of the central concepts of the Czech avant-garde in the 1920s up until the 194-s, respectively the references to Le Corbusier's lecture "Technology as the Foundation for Lyricism" from 1928. Also note WUTSSDORFOVÁ, Irina, 2011. Estetická funkce a funkcionalizmus. In: Vojvodík, J. and Wiendl, J. (eds.). *Heslář české avantgardy. Estetické koncepty a proměny uměleckých postupů v letech 1908 – 1958*. Praha: FF UK, pp. 123 – 134.
- 5** The lecture "Physio-Plastics. Reflections on Form and Function in the Architecture of Buildings and Machines" was delivered in 1937 but formed a part of Honzík's influential reflections on social functionality in architecture and the applied arts. The character of architecture, for him, was of creation on the basis of functionalist theory, as "physio-plastics" serving both psychic and physical biosocial goals. Viz. inter alia his texts in the journal *Stavba* from the 1930s or the essay "Funkcionálna architektúra" from 1932. HUBATOVÁ-VACKOVÁ, Lada and PACHMANOVÁ, Pavla (eds.), 2014. *Věci a slova. Umělecký průmysl, užité umění a design v české teorii a kritice 1870 – 1970*. Praha: UMPRUM, pp. 322 – 324.
- 6** FOLTÝN, Ladislav, 1993. *Slovenská architektúra a česká avantgarda 1918 – 1939*. Bratislava: SAS, p. 101. On the question of the implementation of modernism and its teaching, also note: MOJŽIŠOVÁ, Iva, 2013. *Škola moderného videnia. Bratislavská ŠUR 1928 – 1939*. Bratislava: Artforum, Slovenské centrum dizajnu.
- 7** Reflections on the unpopularity of the new art are given in the essay "The Dehumanisation of Art" from 1925. GASSET, José Ortega y, 1994: *Eseje o umění*. Bratislava: Archa. op. cit.
- 8** Similarly, on form and function with bizarre results viz. JENCKS, Charles, 1979. *Bizarre Architecture*. New York: Rizzoli.
- 9** MUKAŘOVSKÝ, Jan. K problému funkcí v architektuře. *Stavba*, 19, 1937 – 1938, pp. 5 – 12, reprinted in *Studie z estetiky*. Praha: Odeon, 1971, pp. 196 – 203.
- 10** Michl's study "Co Bauhaus dal a co vzal" was previously published in journal form in *Designum*. (3), 2019, pp. 68 – 73 as well as in *Kontexty*. (3), 2020, pp. 50 – 59.
- 11** TEIGE, Karel, 1929. Mezinárodní soudobá architektura. *Sborník MSA 1*. Praha: Odeon, 1929, p. 80.
- 12** DROSTEOVÁ, Magdalena, 2007. *Bauhaus 1919 – 1933. Reforma a avantgarda*. Taschen Slovart, pp. 14 – 15.
- 13** The review entitled "Je ornament anachronizmem?" is of the publication HUBATOVÁ VACKOVÁ, Lada, 2011. *Tichá revoluce uvnitř ornamentu. Studie z dějin uměleckého průmyslu a dekorativního umění v letech 1880 – 1930*. Praha: VŠUP, 287 pp.
- 14** CHVATÍK, Květoslav, 2004. *Od avantgardy k druhé moderně. Cestami filozofie a literatury*. Praha: Torst, pp. 124 – 125.
- 15** KUDĚLA, Jiří and SVOBODOVÁ, Markéta (eds.) and ZELINSKÝ, Miroslav., 2019. *Fenomén Bauhaus. Příběh jedné školy*. Praha: Grada Publishing, p. 96.
- 16** WHITFORD, Frank, 2015. *Bauhaus*. Praha: Rubato, pp. 203 – 204.
- 17** Whitford, F., 2015, p. 204.