



**Karolina Jaklewicz\***

## *Otherness as a value. Camp and the multicolored architecture of Hundertwasser*

### *Introduction*

Camp does not go out of fashion. Exhibition at the Metropolitan Museum of Art in New York (2019) “Camp. Notes on fashion”, paraphrasing the title of Susan Sontag’s essay *Notes on “Camp”*, which is fundamental to camp, once again placed camp at the centre of cultural events. Camp, which was defined by Sontag as the third (after traditional and avant-garde) sensitivity [1, p. 24], does not become history, but it is a creation that keeps on becoming anew, an identity in a process, an optics that allows us to understand a diversity of the contemporary world. We always react to camp in an ambiguous way – it arouses our admiration and aversion – Sontag writes about camp directly, i.e. “it’s good because it’s awful” [1, p. 33]. Elsewhere, she points out that camp is an art of “too much”. Do not the dilemmas, which are connected with making an aesthetic judgment resulting from these ambivalent feelings, accompany the perception of the works of Austrian artist Friedensreich Hundertwasser? This perception is influenced by both the form of objects (shape) as well as the colour applied, which differ from generally accepted and approved design and aesthetic standards. The aforementioned non-normativity, as well as perceptual ambivalence, predispose Hundertwasser’s work to be analyzed in the context of camp aesthetics and sensitivity. This work may show Hundertwasser in a new light and indicate a new clue in the discussion about his works. The discussion about Camp, which was initiated by Sontag’s memorable publication *Notes on “Camp”* (1964), continues today. Sontag undoubtedly triggered an avalanche. Before her text, camp was unnamed and thanks to *Notes on “Camp”* it became widely available and familiar. Phenomena

which previously eluded aesthetic classifications gained frames. Despite the undoubtedly accurate diagnoses, Sontag received justifiable criticism. Opponents accuse her of publishing the secret code of non-normative cultures and passing it on to the whole society, which resulted in the inclusion of camp in mass culture, and above all in the limitation of camp to a style because as Sontag wrote: *Camp is a vision of the world in terms of style – but a particular kind of style* [1, p. 8]. Moreover, Sontag located camp in an object, whereas the dispute called the retrieving of camp is, first of all, pointing to a camping entity without which – according to many researchers and camp artists – one cannot speak of camp. Retrieving camp is also taking into account its political nature, risk and social impact, and it is after all an attempt at returning to the margins. Many opinions about camp mean an immanent quality of camp itself, its internal dynamics, diversity, and intensity, i.e. features which are close to Hundertwasser’s creative activity. Since, therefore, in the canon of camp art, Sontag included Gaudi’s architecture, and in particular the Sagrada Familia Basilica in Barcelona [1, p. 17], pointing to both the style and the author’s ambition to make a great generational change, the absence of Hundertwasser’s name (and in particular architectural objects) on this list can only be explained by the fact that they were created many years after the publication of *Notes on “Camp”*.

Summarizing various definitions of camp, it can be concluded that today it is a polyphonic category because it combines three main aspects, i.e. special aesthetics (so bad that it is good), self-presentation (no camper, no camp) and sensitivity of a viewer (the eye of the beholder). Not everyone has the ability to take note of camp, perhaps this is the reason why this category has not been a reference point in the analysis of Hundertwasser’s work so far – texts which discuss his projects focus on ecological and philosophical aspects, considering the appearance of a building as

\* ORCID: 0000-0003-4119-0720. Wrocław University of Science and Technology, Poland, e-mail: karolina.jaklewicz@pwr.edu.pl

an artistic expression and ignoring an unambiguous aesthetic classification. In recent years, Hundertwasser's projects have received more texts glorifying his ecological and pro-social solutions, in which attention is drawn to the topicality of the problem of relationships between man and nature. Sanja Domazet and Darko Nadic emphasizes his point of view on human and nature relation, i.e. *He also insisted that man was a guest to nature and that he should learn to behave accordingly. The key to understanding Hundertwasser's view of life and his oeuvre is specifically in this – that man is a guest to nature and that he should adapt to it. Therefore, Hundertwasser propagated living in harmony with nature, and he personally lived accordingly* [2, p. 1023]. Emmanuela Chiavoni gives her opinion in a similar way, namely *His love of the environment created profound, inner respect and a refined ecological conscience; his work as the doctor of architecture was his very personal contribution to the enhancement of the world* [3]. Nir Barak analyzes and interprets Hundertwasser's works as a source of inspiration for environmental ethics [4] and Ove D. Jakobsen and Vivi M.L. Storsletten sees Hundertwasser as an exemplary ecological artist whose concepts can still have an influence on the improvement of the world [5]. Feeling the absence of a deeper reflection on the aesthetics of Hundertwasser's designs, this text will focus on the external form of his works.

### **Material and method**

Our analysis of Hundertwasser's actions will be made in relation to camp aesthetics which was defined by Sontag in her essay *Notes on "Camp"* as well as in the context of later critical texts referring to Sontag's texts, which were collected in the book entitled *Kamp. Antologia przekładów* [Camp. Translation Anthology] (including Mauriès, Booth, Meyer, Butler, Czapliński) and published in 2012 [6] as well as in the context of the book *Kamp, glamour, vintage. Współczesne kategorie estetyczne* [Camp, glamour, vintage. Contemporary aesthetic categories] by Wioletta Kazimierska-Jerzyk which was published in 2018 [7]. A completely new motif in the analysis of the Austrian architect's implementations is the reference of his works to camp in the eye of the beholder, which encompasses his/her personal aesthetic experience. The colour used by Hundertwasser will also be analysed in the context of the "Hundertwasser-Schiele. Imagine tomorrow" exhibition which took place at the Leopold Museum in Vienna (2020). Experiences resulting from the direct viewing of the exhibition, which showed the specificity of the Hundertwasser colour palette as well as studies of architectural designs allowed us to put forward a research problem, i.e. whether and why the works by the creator of KunstHaus Wien can be classified as the aesthetics of camp.

### **No Colour, no Camp**

Before the problem posed above is solved, it must be proved that if it were not for the colour used in architecture, the following argument would be much less purposeful. Therefore, starting from the experiment and imagine two

illustrations showing the Hundertwasserhaus should be. The first one shows a visualization of the Hundertwasserhaus building painted neutral white, whereas the second illustration is a photograph of the original multi-coloured building. Which one arouses more emotions? Which one arouses ambivalent feelings? The white version evokes echoes of modernism, while irregular rhythms devoid of intense colour are associated with organic architecture and they have the elegance of classical white porcelain. Whiteness has nothing to do with camp exaggeration. In the white version, Hundertwasserhaus is more of an objective model than camp stylization. The object, deprived of colour, does not represent the camp's need for shock or a joke. It certainly cannot be said to be so bad that it is good. The white object gently fits into our memory and discreetly presents its form in an immaculate form. Whiteness represents neutrality and is far from manifesting anything. It is different with the original. The multi-coloured building breaks out of the habits and models of the European downtown architecture. It is a misfit, it provokes and makes it impossible to calmly pass it by. It manifests its presence. It arouses a kind of admiration and rejection in us, we like it, but we are not able to fully accept it. The colours applied are mainly shades of basic colours, i.e. red, blue and yellow, so in this proposal there is a quote from classic modernist solutions, but the combination of spots, their location, size, shape and quantity have nothing to do with modernist discipline. Playing with the past, however, makes it possible to preserve the context without which camp does not exist. For camp has to be more. By playing with known schemes, camp keeps us in a state of instability, i.e. when we see basic colours in modernists' designs, we accept it as if it was supposed to be so. Nevertheless, when similar colours are touched by camp sensitivity, they seem to be out of place, but we cannot look away from them because camp is seductive. Colours in the designs of modernists constitute an emanation of the reasonable use of colours. Colours which are enclosed in rectangular frames lose their internal energy, are subject to rules, and are subordinated to the shapes determined by architecture. Camp colours seem slow, enticing, and audacious. Applied intuitively, without restrictions, without sharp boundaries. In this liberated way, by crossing the boundaries of a suggestive field, the colour was applied by Hundertwasser (Fig. 1). Camp is not only a traditional colour – camp shimmers and glitters, but also sequins and glows. Glazing, ceramic elements, gold and silver coatings, which were used by Hundertwasser, blink from a distance with reflected light (Fig. 2). It is difficult to pass by the shimmering columns indifferently. Colour adds existential fullness to them and emphasizes an individual character of particular forms. Hundertwasser's columns do not resemble light stone columns which are carved with regular fluting and crowned with symmetrical heads, which we know from historic buildings. Colourful, irregular, and unique, they resemble a collection of miscellaneous figures. They are not perfectly even, they are perfectly distinct. They are a group of misfits, their skin is different, their surface is the act of expression of some extraordinary identity (Fig. 3) The colour used on the façades works in a similar way. The surprising arrangement of colourful spots is an external act

Fig. 1. Hundertwasserhaus,  
Vienna – view from  
the 36–38 Kegelgasse Street  
(photo by K. Jaklewicz)

Il. 1. Hundertwasserhaus,  
Wiedeń, widok od strony  
ul. Kegelgasse 36–38  
(fot. K. Jaklewicz)



Fig. 2. Hundertwasserhaus,  
Vienna – fountain at  
36–38 Kegelgasse Street  
(photo by K. Jaklewicz)

Il. 2. Hundertwasserhaus,  
Wiedeń – fontanna przy  
ul. Kegelgasse 36–38  
(fot. K. Jaklewicz)





Fig. 3. KunstHausWien, Untere Weißgerberstraße 13  
(photo by K. Jaklewicz)

Il. 3. KunstHausWien, Untere Weißgerberstraße 13  
(fot. K. Jaklewicz)

of performing an unusual interior. Colour – referring to Hundertwasser’s theory of “The five skins” – can be described as the second skin of a building, which means for architecture what clothing is for a human being [8]. Colour makes the first contact and determines the character of an object. The colour-recipient relationship is intuitive because colour, following Immanuel Kant’s way of thinking, is a qualitative value – it cannot be counted, its perception depends on an individual taste, colour is free from unambiguous judgments and this is also where its camp separateness is revealed. Separateness is not, however, an attempt at a revolution because camp needs the context of a common taste and only against its background can it stand out [9]. Przemysław Czapliński expresses it precisely, i.e. *In order to avoid any ambiguities, it should be said that calling a minority camp reactionary means exactly what it means, namely that it collaborates with the system which it contests. It is not transgressive, but ingressive, that is, instead of crossing or shifting boundaries, it only wants to reveal them. And after unveiling, to problematize. It is thanks to this that it achieves a strong tension [...] [10, pp. 43, 44].* Observing Hundertwasser’s projects, we feel this tension resulting from the distinctiveness of his architecture, but the distinctiveness presented in the very centre of the city and in the majority context. In this situation, it is the colour that is the first distinguishing feature, it is the colour that attracts attention first, it is different, but it wants to remain within the city limits and within the scope of the aesthetic judgment of the majority.

The aforementioned need to be close to tradition, that is, to be close to the accepted, is particularly evident in the painting activity of the Viennese artist and his strong connection with the creative activity of Egon Schiele. This relationship became the subject of a joint exhibition, where the works of both artists were shown and the works of the master and apprentice, which were arranged according to themes, were presented in individual rooms. Hundertwasser became acquainted with Schiele’s work as a 19-year-old young man at the Viennese exhibitions at the Albertina and the Neue Galerie. From that time on, his

interest in the art of Schiele grew and in 1950/1951 he published the poem entitled *I love Schiele* [11, p. 6]. In the poem, the older painter was called the father and his art was the new religion. Researchers of Hundertwasser’s oeuvre agree that thanks to Schiele, Hundertwasser discovered “ensoulment of colours and individual forms” [12, p. 11]. Both artists have a similar biography, i.e. they both lost their fathers and were brought up by their mothers, both abandoned art studies in order to develop independently, both, apart from art, used language – Schiele wrote poems, whereas Hundertwasser manifests and theoretical texts. Despite many similarities, the joint Viennese exhibition reveals significant differences precisely in the sphere of colour. Schiele is the heir to the European school of painting and his melancholic tone fits into the palettes of Italian masters, especially the tone of the Venetian school. Due to colour, Schiele’s paintings can be arranged in a row with the paintings of Titian, Veronese, Giorgione or Tintoretto. The tone of the Venetian school is considered to be sophisticated, in-depth, and romantic. There are no sharp combinations or pure colours as it is dark but warm. It is a mysterious, sometimes dark palette. Egon Schiele’s palette is similar – broken warm colours, dark tones, deep greens, browns, reds, and oranges. We can see that the artist is looking for a colour and mixes paints until a unique-sounding tone is obtained. Schiele’s colours are neither unequivocal nor obvious. Schiele is clearly a colourist, whereas Hundertwasser is not. Hundertwasser’s palette is less sophisticated and more banal as if it has lost touch with the best painting traditions and has been influenced by the contemporary conventionality of colours. The colours of Hundertwasser are sharper and the combinations are less harmonious. While in Schiele’s the colour suggested some psychological depth, eroticism, mystery, in Hundertwasser it lacks a second bottom and from time to time it lacks a sense of combining contrasting spots and colours lack a common denominator. Sometimes we can see how much Schiele is inspired, but when he works more independently, the difference in the tone is even more pronounced. This is especially noticeable when we compare works of similar themes and compositions, which were presented at the exhibition and reproduced in the catalogue, e.g. Schiele’s self-portrait (*Self-Portrait with Raised Bare Shoulder*, 1912) with Hundertwasser’s self-portrait (*Self-portrait*, Marrakesh, 1951), the town view of Schiele (*The small Town III*, 1913) with a painting by Hundertwasser *City Scene, Half Siena, Half Paris* (1950) or the painting of flowers by Schiele (*Sunflowers II*, 1910) with a painting by Hundertwasser *Vase with Flowers* (1951). A colour is an individual property – if an artist is not a copyist – his palette is as unique as fingerprints. Therefore, while there are compositional or thematic similarities in Hundertwasser and Schiele, the colour aura of the works of both artists is different. Consequently, the Schiele palette has no effect on the colour used in the architectural objects of the Viennese designer. Schiele’s paintings will never be described as happy, funny, or colourful. We can think of Hundertwasser’s works in this way because they do not hide a secret, they establish direct open contact and radiate the need to attract attention to themselves. Colours on the façades

sound similar – they form a message of presence, an emanation of vital energy, they symbolize the joy which comes from the relationship between man and nature. Schiele closes paintings into homogeneous compositions with a heavy burden of the inner mystery by means of a colour, whereas Hundertwasser often thinks fragmentarily – stains tend to be independent of each other creating a set of smaller elements which refer to a mosaic composition. In architecture, this is particularly evident in the colourful design of the Spittelau waste-to-energy facility in Vienna. The mosaic arrangement of stains which fills individual fields creates an open composition using a chequerboard motif and free-floating organic-shaped spots which are divided into smaller mosaic-like structures. There is an element of childish sensitivity in this arrangement, which longs for fanciful worlds. We can hear the echo of pop culture, which intuitively chooses pretty colours, namely optimistic, saturated, free, not paying attention to the discipline of the key colour. The reference to pop art is also emphasized by the use of a black contour which by outlining the shapes of coloured stains evokes a comic book form. There is also a noticeable postmodern freedom to combine different orders, forms, and colours. The colour tone between the contrast of black and white and extremely warm and cool tones – red and yellow, but also pink and turquoise – may result from their functioning in postmodern times and selecting colours characteristic of that period, i.e. the colours that do not match, freely adjacent to each other, are closer to aesthetics of ugliness rather than to the aesthetics of beauty. Hundertwasser emphasizes this freedom and dissociates himself from the use of schemas, i.e. [...] *my painting is completely different because it is a vegetative painting... everything begins so unpretentiously... it grows quite slowly and simply... colours in succession can create the effect of visual music... I consider colour a sacred gift... while I paint I feel I am in a dream. Once the dream is over I do not recall what I dreamt. But the painting remains. The painting is the fruit of the dream* (after: [3]). It is true that Hundertwasser's objects can resemble dream visions, where elements and colours combine freely and where it is difficult to establish the logic of events. Where did the golden domes above the waste-to-energy facility in Vienna come from? Where did the colourful columns at the historic Uelzen railway station, which were renovated according to Hundertwasser's design for Expo 2000, come from? Where, if not in a dream, is it possible to come up with an object such as the observation tower at the Kuchlbauer Brewery in Abensberg with polypores-like balconies? Who else has ever applied so much pink in architecture? Moreover, pink combined with accents of red? The multi-family building in Magdeburg ("Green Citadel") has a façade covered with pastel pink and shimmering mosaic and is crowned with domes with golden spheres typical of Hundertwasser. Additionally, the building is supported by characteristic colourful columns which constitute one of the hallmarks of Hundertwasser, as well as various windows – for many of his buildings the author designed various windows in one building and, what is more, residents can freely decorate the wall around window frames. Die Waldspirale in

Darmstadt, which is divided into horizontal colourful stripes where pink is combined with shades of yellow, as well as Hundertwasser's only project implemented in the United States, i.e. Quixote Winery in the Napa Valley, are both in a camp style. St. Barbara Church in Bärnbach and Market at Altenrhein are also camp-like, as well as the hotel complex in Bad Blumau – also pink, red, and yellow. All objects designed by Hundertwasser are characterized by a fanciful form and colour, which were not present before in the history of European architecture, i.e. colour exceeding the free limits of postmodern taste, colour as honest as any camp action, because it stems from the artist's interior and from his dream of a better world. Colour in Hundertwasser is more performative than mystical, more playful and joyful than symbolic or reflective. Hence, he is closer to camp rather than historical or avant-garde sensitivity. Camp sensitivity makes it difficult for a viewer to reject his colourful creative activity, despite the aesthetic objection.

### *No Sontag, no Camp*

Sontag's theory allows us to make a camp-like revision *a posteriori*. Sontag places camp not only in camp optics, but also in an object, so there are camp films, clothes, pieces of furniture, and buildings [1, p. 5]. Following Sontag's reflection, we will look at Hundertwasser's design oeuvre, taking Hundertwasserhouse and Hundertwasser Village as examples.

*Notes on "Camp"*, originally published in "Partisan Review" (1964) and then included in "Against Interpretation and Other Essays" (1966), is undoubtedly one of the most important cultural texts of the 20<sup>th</sup> century. In spite of the free form of the notes, that text became a reference point for subsequent generations of camp culture researchers. According to Kazimierska-Jerzyk, Sontag refers her considerations to Kant's philosophy and in particular to his concept of aesthetic judgments, and although the name of the philosopher is not mentioned, there is no doubt that it is the thoughts of the Królewicz philosopher that are the basis for the writer's deliberations [7, pp. 71–78]. Already in *Note 1*, the author wrote: *Camp is a certain mood of aestheticism* [1, p. 4], which means that when speaking about camp, we use the criteria of aesthetic evaluation. In the case of camp, however, this is a special aesthetic because it rejects the bad-good scale which is characteristic of normal judgments and creates an additional set of value criteria [1, p. 22]. Watching Hundertwasserhouse we cannot compare it with any other architecture, so it is difficult to determine whether it is bad or good. It is different. If it were good architecture – good with reference to the canon established by history – it could not be camp – "It's too good to be Camp". Or "too important" [1, p. 7]. It is also difficult to say unequivocally that it is bad because in fact it presents this third sensitivity in which there is more stylization and humour than class and seriousness. Camp dethrones seriousness, although it does not offend it, leaving seriousness with the artist's involvement, not the appearance of the work. Avoiding the seriousness of style, however, camp introduces a new approach to speaking of

things seriously. *One can be serious about frivolous, frivolous about the serious* [1, p. 26].

Hundertwasser spoke about things seriously – about ecology and about the need for a harmonious relationship between man and nature. The artist introduced an innovative solution when he planted a forest on the roof of the Hundertwasserhaus in the early 1980s. Today, it is a common practice but at that time it was an extravagant gesture. It was not a real forest, of course, it was a conventional forest. And here, too, it is not difficult to notice his coincidence with camp because *Camp sees everything in quotation marks. It's not a lamp, but a "lamp"; not a woman, but a "woman"* [1, p. 9]. There is a lot of texture and sensual decoration in camp art [1, p.6] – just like in Hundertwasser's projects whose rich decorativeness is a surplus in relation to the functional design needs. *Camp is art that proposes itself seriously but cannot be taken altogether seriously because it is "too much"* [1, p. 17]. Is not that the case with Hundertwasser? His works include exaggeration which makes it impossible to take them seriously, however, depriving his art of this surplus would not make it serious; without decorations it would become dull and it would lose its character. The crowning of the terrace balustrade at the corner of Kegelgasse and Lowengasse in Vienna do not constitute a necessary element – a golden figure resembling bowling, figures of lions, a sphere – after all, without them the terrace would still be a terrace, but not the same terrace as before. Decorative elements (also the columns mentioned in the previous chapter) give the buildings a camp style. They are unnecessary and necessary at the same time, they express unbridled sensitivity and passion which are always exaggerated. Camp must exceed the limits of normality, Camp cannot be dispassionate [1, p. 18]. Hundertwasser's architectural objects are certainly not dispassionate, on the contrary, they exude creative passion and kind of honesty. His projects are filled with innocent naivety and naivety is another version of camp – *Pure Camp is always naive* [1, p. 13]. There is therefore something in Hundertwasser's objects which does not allow them to be denied, which inspires the kind of acceptance that appears when we deal with naive products. A viewer appreciates willingness and making efforts. An extraordinary effect is often appreciated. Camp – as Sontag further notices – is an attempt at doing something unusual, special or stunning, such as “a curved line or an extravagant gesture” [1, p. 18]. Avoiding straight lines was a designer's challenge as he tried to replicate the fluidity of shapes found in the natural environment. Colourful stains emphasize an irregular character of the building. For Hundertwasser, art was a bridge between man and nature [12, p. 12], so he designed objects as close to nature as possible. Nevertheless, he designed for the city and the city is the natural environment of camp [1, p. 8]. In the city, nature is “out of place” and in general, the city is a space of paradoxes, it is a space which is admired and hated at the same time because it is a space of “surplus”, a city within a city is “too much”. In this exaggerated scenery camp is created and in this scenography we see projects with different sensitivity, projects with a surplus, with a tower, with a forest on the roof, with colourful col-

umns, mosaics, and trinkets. When visiting Hundertwasser House and Village, we can paraphrase The Troggs song *Love is all around* and say one thing – *Camp is all around*.

### ***No Camper, no Camp***

Camp theory, however, is not only about Sontag. Modern thinking about camp refers to all that Sontag has overlooked or ignored. While the aesthetic aspect aptly defined in *Notes on "Camp"* remains a fundamental point of reference, subsequent researchers point to a lack of understanding of the non-aesthetic determinants of camp (including Mauriès, Booth, Meyer, Czapliński). The very etymology of the term camp differs among researchers, but most often it is assumed that camp derives from the French language in which it meant excessively stressed actions and gestures. Additionally, as Moe Meyer emphasizes, it is not about the word, but about the behaviour. Meyer wrote that not the word camp itself comes from French, but specific behaviours were imported from France [13, p. 214]. Mark Booth shares a similar opinion as he locates the genesis of camp in the history of France and in particular in the customs of the French court in Versailles. Both authors see camp primarily in behaviour – Booth noticed, that to be camp is to present yourself from the side of your own involvement in marginal issues [14, p. 196]. Camp seen as behaviour, special behaviour, because dissimilar behaviour is in opposition to Sontag's objective thinking. Meyer writes that the function of camp is to produce a different social visibility, therefore a relationship between camp and the misfit's identity can be established. So Meyer defines camp as a complete set of performative practices and strategies used to act out the identity of a misfit, where he understand acting as the production of social visibility [15, p. 531]. Camp otherness was traditionally identified with gender, in particular with the homosexual culture, whose representatives are marginal in each community. Marginality, along with otherness, is another post-Sontag determinant of camp, i.e. *So he [Booth] recognized that camp was a sociological and not purely artistic phenomenon and formulated a definition which associated camp with all margins. The notion of "marginality" seizes in Booth everything which is rejected, condemned, or condescended by the majority of society. On such vast margins all the worse lands, i.e. worse gender, worse sexuality, and worse varieties of aesthetics [...] [10, pp. 20, 21]. We might add – a worse profession: an artist. And just when we look at artists through the prism of otherness, we can also look at their actions through the prism of camp which was defined by Booth as self-presentation [14, p. 196]. The artist and his/her art are unity at the time of creation, so what a provocative, ironic or funny costume is for a campaigning representative of a sexual minority, as well as the act of wearing this costume, this is what art is and acts of presenting it (exhibitions, projects, books, shows, etc.) for an artist. With this assumption, Hundertwasser's artistic acts of self-presentation gain camp sensitivity. In the previous chapters we showed that Hundertwasser architectural objects meet the criteria of camp aesthetics and if Sontag had had an*

opportunity to use the restroom in Kawakawa or the Hundertwasser Village Café, she would have likely placed them on her camp list. Let us therefore consider whether the person of Hundertwasser fits the criteria of camper, as Sontag's successors and critics saw it.

Hundertwasser projects represented camp "involvement in marginal issues" and such were certainly environmental issues during the development of capitalism in the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century. Undoubtedly, Hundertwasser was also a misfit – he was considered to be a visionary and such people are always a minority and are perceived as different. Since the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century, camp no longer expresses secret homosexual codes, the later game of openness or gender transgression, but rather human (not only homosexual) otherness [10, p. 39]. From this contemporary perspective, Hundertwasser's actions represented otherness – a precursor to the ecological lifestyle. Its buildings are the odd ones – they clearly stand out from the rest of the development, just as Hundertwasser stood out from other designers. Buildings are the body of architecture and the body of architecture is the emanation of the architect's soul. There is no camp without corporeality – this literal and this implicit one. Camp takes place inside and outside the body. Camp is an irritating physical presence. It is "on" the architectural body that Hundertwasser's soul crosses the boundaries of convention, and the surface of the architectural body is the field of manifesto and appeal. Judith Butler's reflection on the inside/outside (soul/body) relationship in the context of defining genders may be an interesting point of reference in thinking about architecture and a designer. Butler wrote, that recognizing the body as an indispensable and inviolable frame creates the impression that the inner space is responsible for the entire structure. Then the soul is the meaning of the surface of the body [16, p. 493]. Assuming the architect's consistency with the design (where the architect is the soul, and the building is the body), it can be concluded that the person of Hundertwasser showed camp sensitivity because Hundertwasser's soul was expressed in camp aesthetics of his designs. The buildings, which looked as if they were wearing carnival costumes, emanated with joy and naivety, however, they concealed not the idea of fun, but the bitter truth about breaking the alliance between man and nature and appealed for the harmonious coexistence of both elements, i.e. nature (wildlife) and man (technology). Besides, Hundertwasser did not shy away from styling his image – as Matzner wrote – *Neither Schiele nor Hundertwasser were strangers to self-staging, and both used their clothing, hair style as well as the medium of photography to portray and convey their artistry* [12, p. 24]. Thus, the architect performed his identity not only on the surfaces of buildings, but also on the surface of his own body. Maybe in a less ostentatious way, nevertheless, noticeably.

### Discussion

Hundertwasser's urban projects arouse controversy. Usually, due to the ideas which constituted the foundation of projects, critical texts discuss the ecological character

of the facilities or their impact on the well-being of users [17]. If the form of buildings is criticized, designs are placed on the verge of kitsch [18]. While it is difficult to disagree with the approval of Hundertwasser's visionary ecological proposals, to call the Viennese artist's implementations kitsch seems to be wrong. In discussions about camp, we often encounter an erroneous use of the terms "camp" and "kitsch", which are used interchangeably. Camp is not the same as kitsch – this is the obvious that should be presented as the main principle as Patrick Mauriès argues in *Second manifeste camp* [19, p. 323]. And he is right. Kitsch is a concept which appeared in the 2<sup>nd</sup> half of the 19<sup>th</sup> century in Munich. Initially, it meant bad art, a cheap product and with time it became a synonym of mass shoddy production, the opposite of art [7, p. 61]. However, kitsch items are used by campers because kitsch is one of the favourite camp fad which means that camp uses kitsch as an element of self-presentation, but the two concepts cannot be confused [14, p. 199]. Kitsch may become camp by means of camper's actions, but camp will never be kitsch. Hundertwasser's implementations are therefore not kitschy, but they arouse aesthetic dissonance among viewers who are accustomed to established canon – either to the historical beauty of harmony or to the dramatic beauty (or ugliness) of the avant-garde – precisely because they are camp.

### Conclusions

Taking into account Sontag's text, it seems that architectural objects of Hundertwasser can be included in the canon of camp art. When analyzing the aesthetic aspect of his projects, we can find many common points with Sontag's reflection. First of all, ambivalent feelings accompanying the perception of objects – delight and rejection, decorative, exaggeration, stylization.

Hundertwasser's implementations, similarly to other manifestations of camp, break out of the traditional good-bad valuation scale, offering sensitivity that is "so bad that it is good". Taking into consideration also the definition of camp used by other authors and focusing on the camping entity, we can indicate the camp character of Hundertwasser's actions – social visibility and otherness constitute the features of his works and life. At the same time, it is worth emphasizing and pointing to the importance of dissimilar attitudes for the whole of society. Only by caring for misfits and ensuring their safety can we benefit from their visionary concepts. Hundertwasser, although he did not count himself as belonging to camp subculture, he exhibited camp nature and from a historical perspective, can be perceived as a camper, especially when we see his whole life as a performative process of self-presentation in a particular aesthetic edition, the indispensable element of which is the sensitivity of the beholder. Referring to Philip Core – camp is in the eye of the beholder and that is why – speaking perversely (so camp-like!) – camp is a lie which tells the truth [20, p. 393].

## References

- [1] Sontag S., *Notes on "Camp"*, Penguin Random House, UK, 2018.
- [2] Domazet S.S., Nadić D.P., *Sustainability and ecology in the architecture of Friedensreich Hundertwasser*, "Sociološki Pregled" 2022, Vol. 56, br. 3, 1017–1031, doi: 10.5937/socpreg56-39245.
- [3] Chiavoni E., *Architecture, Colour and Images. Ideas and Designs by Friedensreich Hundertwasser*, "Proceedings" 2017, 1(9), 953, doi: 10.3390/proceedings1090953.
- [4] Barak N., *Hundertwasser – Inspiration for Environmental Ethics: Reformulating the Ecological-Self*, "Environmental Values" 2017, Vol. 26, Iss. 3, 317–342.
- [5] Jakobsen O.D., Storsletten V.M.L., *Friedensreich Hundertwasser – The Five Skins of the Ecological Man*, [in:] L. Bouckaert, K. Ims, P. Rona (eds.), *Art, Spirituality and Economics. Virtues and Economics*, Springer, [Cham 2018], doi: 10.1007/978-3-319-75064-4\_6.
- [6] *Kamp. Antologia przekładów*, P. Czapliński, A. Mizerka (red.), Universitas, Kraków 2012.
- [7] Kazimierska-Jerzyk W., *Kamp, glamour, vintage. Współczesne kategorie estetyczne*, Wydawnictwa UŁ, Łódź 2018.
- [8] Restany P., *Sila sztuki. Hundertwasser. Malarz-król o pięciu skórach*, Taschen, Kolonia 2003.
- [9] Kaškiewicz K., Żelazny M., *Dwoisty sens Kantowskiego pojmowania wartości estetycznych*, "Studia z Historii Filozofii" 2018, t. 9, nr 4, 165–182, doi: 10.12775/szhf.2018.056.
- [10] Czapliński P., *Kamp – gry antropologiczne*, [in:] P. Czapliński, A. Mizerka (red.), *Kamp. Antologia przekładów*, Universitas, Kraków 2012, 7–48.
- [11] Wipplinger H.-P., *Prologue*, [in:] H.-P. Wipplinger (ed.), *Hundertwasser-Schiele. Imagine tomorrow*, Verlag der Buchhandlung Walther Konig, Vienna 2020, 5–9.
- [12] Matzner A., *I love Schiele – the Schiele myth and its reception by Hundertwasser*, [in:] H.-P. Wipplinger (ed.), *Hundertwasser-Schiele. Imagine tomorrow*, Verlag der Buchhandlung Walther Konig, Vienna 2020, 11–28.
- [13] Meyer M., *Pod znakiem Wilde'a. Archeologia poznania*, [in:] P. Czapliński, A. Mizerka (red.), *Kamp. Antologia przekładów*, Universitas, Kraków 2012, 213–254.
- [14] Booth M., *Campe-toi! O genezie i definicjach kampu*, [in:] P. Czapliński, A. Mizerka (red.), *Kamp. Antologia przekładów*, Universitas, Kraków 2012, 192–212.
- [15] Meyer M., *Dyskurs Kampu. Rewindykacja*, [in:] P. Czapliński, A. Mizerka (red.), *Kamp. Antologia przekładów*, Universitas, Kraków 2012, 525–550.
- [16] Bulter J., *Od "wnętrza" do performatywnej płci*, [in:] P. Czapliński, A. Mizerka (red.), *Kamp. Antologia przekładów*, Universitas, Kraków 2012, 491–502.
- [17] Andritsch E., Stöger H., Bauernhofer T. et al., *The ethics of space, design and color in an oncology ward*, "Palliative and Supportive Care" 2013, Vol. 11, Iss. 3, 215–221, doi: 10.1017/S1478951512000077.
- [18] Bednarz M., *Architektura Hundertwassera – sztuka na krawędzi kiczu?*, "PUA – Przestrzeń/Urbanistyka/Architektura" 2017, Vol. 2, 248–259, doi: 10.4467/00000000PUA.17.035.7216.
- [19] Mauriès P., *Drugi manifest kampu*, [in:] P. Czapliński, A. Mizerka (red.), *Kamp. Antologia przekładów*, Universitas, Kraków 2012, 317–327.
- [19] Core P., *Kampowe reguły*, [in:] P. Czapliński, A. Mizerka (red.), *Kamp. Antologia przekładów*, Universitas, Kraków 2012, 392–404.

## Abstract

### *Otherness as a value. Camp and the multicolored architecture of Hundertwasser*

Due to the lack of an unambiguous aesthetic classification of Friedensreich Hundertwasser's architectural designs, in this text his multicoloured creative activity will be analyzed through the prism of camp aesthetics. The aim of the article is to present Hundertwasser's design creativeness in a new context, taking into account the criteria of camp sensitivity and aesthetics. Our analysis will be made with reference to theoretical texts and direct experience. The reflection on the works of Hundertwasser will consider both the criteria included in Susan Sontag's text "Notes on Camp", which is fundamental to camp aesthetics, as well as the later considerations of Camp researchers who pay attention not so much to the object as to the person who camps (Czapliński, Booth, Meyer, Mauriès). "The eye of the beholder", i.e. sensitivity of the recipient, will also be important for camp. The key issue will be colour without which it would be difficult to write about the Austrian artist's objects in the context of camp aesthetics. The following text is an attempt at a new perspective on Hundertwasser and perhaps it will serve the acceptance of "misfits" as well as their "otherness" and will broaden the fields of mutual acceptance.

**Key words:** architecture, color, Hundertwasser, camp

## Streszczenie

### *Odmienność jako wartość. Kamp a wielobarwna architektura Hundertwassera*

W związku z brakiem jednoznacznej estetycznej klasyfikacji projektów architektonicznych Friedensreicha Hundertwassera w niniejszym tekście jego wielobarwna twórczość zostanie przeanalizowana przez pryzmat estetyki kampu. Celem artykułu jest ukazanie projektowej twórczości Hundertwassera w nowym kontekście, uwzględniającym kryteria kempowej wrażliwości i estetyki. Analiza zostanie przeprowadzona w odniesieniu do tekstów teoretycznych i bezpośredniego doświadczenia. W refleksji nad dziełami Hundertwassera uwzględnione zostaną zarówno kryteria zawarte w fundamentalnym dla kempowej estetyki tekście Susan Sontag *Notes on Camp*, jak i późniejsze rozważania badaczy kampu, zwracających uwagę nie tyle na przedmiot, ile na osobę kampu (Czapliński, Booth, Meyer, Mauriès). Nie bez znaczenia będzie też ważne dla kampu „oko patrzącego”, czyli wrażliwość odbiorcy. Kwestią kluczową będzie kolor, bez którego trudno byłoby pisać o obiektach austriackiego twórcy w kontekście kempowej estetyki. Prezentowany tekst jest próbą nowego spojrzenia na Hundertwassera, być może przysłuży się akceptacji „odmienców” i ich „odmienności” i poszerzy pola wzajemnej akceptacji.

**Słowa kluczowe:** architektura, kolor, Hundertwasser, kamp