

## DOCTORAL THESES

**AUTHOR:** TIBOR KECSKÉS

**TITLE OF DOCTORAL DISSERTATION:** THEORETICAL APPROACH OF THE SPONTANEOUS FORM-GENESIS

**TITLE OF MASTERPIECE:** ANALYSIS OF SPONTANEOUS ARCHITECTURE EXAMPLES

**SUPERVISOR:** JÁNOS MÓNUS

**INSTITUTE:** MOHOLY-NAGY UNIVERSITY OF ART AND DESIGN

**DATE:** JULY, 2011

1. In my approach the structure-design concept doesn't belong to the classical duality of Descartes, but these two components are consubstantial alternatives of the reality of creation. The base is represented by the imperceptible background structure and the perceptible forms are the current projections of this base. The basic structure starts to behave as a form due to observing it, and this appeared form pretends as a representation of the basic structure. It's very important to notice that this behavior is false because instead of representing the form only refers to the structure. Within the quantum mechanics metaphore the integrating model of spontaneous architecture is the following: the spontaneous forms are the derivatives of the mixed wave function at its accidental points. Each derivative acts as a tangent of the function at the current point. By the use of an enough large number of derivatives these tangents practically defines the shape of the function even it was originally imperceptible. This shape represents the spontaneous behavior as a whole.

2. In my main interpretation, form is a piece that gets isolated from the structure. The genesis and also the naming of the form is connected of this separation. From

the perspective of the basic structure, the separated segment is inactivated that helps us to detect the new piece as a whole. Within the new contour the structure-fragment is reactivated and serves this contour as an inner framework. This framework is invisible for the form-perception. In the secondary interpretation form is the addition of the elementary new born forms within a new integrating contour.

3. We don't understand the structures. For the typically linear and additive character of our approach the behavior of the multidimensioned networks is confusing. We can reach and handle the structure only in indirect ways, via the expert use of forms those refers to it. See the mathematical and acoustical examples in my dissertation.

4. Spontaneous architecture has a basically linear and additive character. Although it applies the linear subtraction as the component of transformation works, the frequency of it drops behind the use of additive approaches, like enlarging and additional building. To create proportional relation between the elements doesn't fit to spontaneous behavior. It uses neither the method of multiplication (the base for networks) nor the method of division (the base for all compositions). Having no professional patterns it can not handle the structures.

5. Dynamic-pragmatic patterns those leave the *mixed narrative* of spontaneous architecture for the *great narrative* of professional architecture soon become static-semantic forms. All the forms of the classical styles of architecture, the modern, postmodern and even the deconstructivist architecture serve as good examples. Forms getting isolated from their alive structure get into the group of autonomous-classical closed creations. This

category was created by Lajos Németh and defines a group of creations those are closed forward the reality and have closed interpretation. This is the reason why it isn't worth importing spontaneous forms into official design.

6. Contemporary observer can detect only small segments from the large process of spontaneous evolution and from this point of view the originally small and frequent mutational steps suddenly enlarge and get very rare. The expert chooses among these hectic mutations by his/her cognitive patterns, those compress the experiences of the long past and of many examples. The absence of the time component is compensated by this integrated evolution.

7. As a default, spontaneous architecture and kitsch doesn't disturb each other. Due to irony, kitsch is sidelined from the *mixed narrative*. Kitsch exists only in the territory of the *great narrative*. The existence of the *great narrative* is a kitsch itself, and it is also a kitsch that despite of its eternal inconsistency – as a complementing example of Gödel's theorem – it gives very concrete answers to all kind of questions. The *great narrative* always denies its being a kitsch therefore it can be defined only from the perspective of the *mixed narrative*, but ironically the vocabulary of the *great narrative* must be used for that. The same thing is just happening when composing this certain thesis.

8. There's a great benefit of objects and buildings those were created by spontaneous forces: they have mixed frequency instead of having any certain, exact one. As a consequence no any unpleasant dissonance appears when meeting other objects and buildings, regardless of they have certain or mixed frequency. This attribute surrounds the spontaneous object as a "sfumato" helping the coexistence of many different kind of structures. We can

detect the same "sfumato" when the processes of spontaneous erosion are streamlining the hurtful edges of individual shapes.

9. The vernacular, spontaneous builder owns the narrow path of his/her vernacular linguistic pragmatics as a mother tongue. The educated architect becomes acquainted with the general pragmatics of architecture only as an adult, that leads to a strange deficit in the field of the mother tongue structure. As a consequence the official designer at most of the cases uses the architectural pragmatics with much less confidence than the amateur creator does it in his/her limited territory.

10. There is a special contradiction between the basic character of spontaneous architecture and the motivations of its creator. Since the world of the amateur builder is a typically *small narrative* it always want to become a *great* one. In his/her own creations the amateur creator appreciates always the forms those tend forward the *great narrative*. Inconsistently the *great narrative* represents just the opposition of spontaneity. Amateurism resolves this contradiction in two different ways. On the one hand due to the dilettante use of forms the semantic elements gets an ironic interpretation, on the other hand the *general spontaneity* – that is responsible for general aesthetics – can leak trough the cracks of badly organised structures.

11. The relation of architecture and form design is critical, when form design – that has got a separate evolutionary development – tries to find its place within the architectural creation without any structural considerations. In case architectural form is not the organic consequence of the basic structure, structural dissonances appear. Since spontaneous architecture has a mixed frequency, it can help

to avoid these structural dissonances, of course only within the competence of spontaneous creation. In case this buffer-function doesn't work properly, the "built in" irony surely helps to counteract the dangers originate from the described impact.

12. Semantic form is always hectic in case of not being regulated. As an opposition, pragmatic form is hectic only in case of being provoked. The originally hectic behavior of semantic forms are mostly balanced by the stylistic norms. The originally balanced behavior of spontaneous systems are provoked by the mentioned semantic forms and also by the other types of spontaneous pragmatics those are too strange for understanding.

13. Mimesis is a very important ability for spontaneous architecture in its evolution of forms, because this ability makes it possible to create the chain of inheritance. The malfunction of this useful ability is the reason of copying distant shapes of distant structures instead of the nearby mutational examples. One main source for this mimetic malfunction is the shape collection of the soap operas, those represents the special folk poetry of the modern globalism. The other important source is the set of forms created by professional architects. The spontaneous creator simply steals the architect's private forms from his/her table and begins to use them. Since these special shapes are mostly valid only within the borders of the current individual creation, getting out of them they become meaningless forms and they begin to wander aimlessly in the nameless space of vernacularity. This childish kind of mimetic character is just like natural laws, so we can get to the bitter conclusion: the one who should take most of the responsibility for this misuse of forms is the architect, who is the caretaker of them.