

Report About:

Deconstruction Architect

**Prepared by:**

Abdallah Dlashad Shukralla

# Deconstruction Architect



## Table of Contents

Introduction .....	1
Deconstruction .....	1
History of deconstruction.....	2
The effect of deconstruction in the works of architects.....	3
Pattern interpretation.....	3
Philosophy of originality.....	4
Theory of Deconstruction .....	5
Analysis.....	7
Conclusion .....	10
References .....	12

## Introduction

Many events may have taken place in 1988, but in the field of architecture this year is unforgettable due to its "deconstruction" flourishing. For example, it was this year that Andreas Papadakis, the publisher of the Academy Publishing in London, held a conference at the Tate Gallery in the city and published two magazines with him. The Journal of Architectural Design and the Journal of Art and Design, as well as an exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art in New York, entitled Architecture and Constructivism. The exhibition was organized by Philip Johnson and its catalog was the work of Mark Wigley. But why did all this happen?

It was obvious from the flaws in the photos of the exhibition that something strange was going on. In addition, the sharp winning shapes and torn shapes inside the photos themselves indicated that the word "deconstructivism" was quite appropriate. But there also seem to be some problems, while in London the term "deconstructionism" is practically quite appropriate. But there seem to be some problems as well. While in London the word (deconstruction) was actually used, in New York Wigley spoke of the word deconstructivism. In London, most speakers and writers assumed that the French philosopher Jacques Derrida was somehow involved. Indeed, at the Academy meeting, a film was shown of him showing Christopher Norris interviewing the French philosopher (Jacques Derrida). In New York, Wigley and some of the architects who exhibited their work, including Frank Gehry, denied any connection to Derrida. In his view, the attempt to relate architecture, even this kind of architecture to philosophy, which has an esoteric and mental aspect, is not only misleading, but was fundamentally flawed. (Goldman, Amyes, Goryanova, Gerlt, & Richard, 2014)

## Jacques Derrida



## Deconstruction

Rebellion against conventional and conventional beliefs in the field of architecture and before that in the field of philosophy, which we have mentioned, includes a wider field and disciplines, and in this case, most of all doubts in "wisdom" and "knowledge" as determinations. The finalist in all the debates in the world of thought can be seen the emphasis that has existed for a long time, from the era of classical Greek philosophers and with the advent of the Enlightenment and the spread of the ideas of Descartes, Spinoza and Leibniz and other philosophers like him. And until almost recent years has provided the intellectual and philosophical basis of the West and, more importantly - for our discussion - has been one of the main motivations of modernism in the age of architecture. (Guy, Shell, & Esherick, 2006)

And so they have revolted against the "logical" explanations of the past, to the point that Bernard Jommi, one of the architects known as the deconstructivist, has named parts of his work in Delaware Park as Fleece or Madness. Of course, this madness can be imagined as a poetic madness that has a long history, especially in our literature, and is known from interpretations. But logic based on wisdom and knowledge was one of the fundamental factors in the creation of modern architecture - or modernism if we look at it in a broader context. At the same time, we must remember that in architecture, like philosophy, rational thought has a long history and has formed the basis of the work of many architectural manifestations in different periods. (Adebayo & Iweka, 2014)

## History of deconstruction

In architecture, until recently, the logic of the building, the logic of the structure, the logic of the climate and the adaptation of architecture to it, even the logic of beauty, was much talked about and written about. Now, with deconstruction, all these logics are in question. But one thing to note is that questioning a theorem is not negating it. This may confuse me with some deconstruction experts and proponents. The important point, in my opinion, is that the "irrationality" of the work of the world, or in the words of Hafez, should not be seen as an existing fact and taken into account - of course, it is an undesirable reality, but it should not be. He accepted it as a principle. Accepting it as a principle leads to chaos that is only acceptable to anarchists, charlatans, or, as Farley puts it, "death merchants."

## **The effect of deconstruction in the works of architects**

Many deconstructive architects, although accepting it in theory, have their own "logic" in practice. Chumi's "madness", for example, is not so "crazy"! In addition, it should be noted that wisdom and knowledge have been among the vital and very important tools that were used by humans and could discover many unknowns and dominate the environment and themselves and nature is hard and relentless - of course in a way. Relative - succeed. But questioning wisdom means this, and it can mean that everything cannot be explained by logical reasons alone. Therefore, wisdom and knowledge must be combined with experience and experimentation and with the senses (which has so far remained unexplained in many cases). So, the acceptable message of deconstruction can be this: what should have been considered "irrational" must now also be considered, and the "rationality" of any proposition, according to past criteria, is not a condition for its acceptance. (Adebayo & Iweka, 2014)

There is no doubt that some of the founders and supporters of deconstruction go to extremes. The denial of reason and wisdom and the general rejection of the rule of reason because reason cannot be the final fatwa and each issue can be - depending on the passage - subject to hundreds of different interpretations, has an absolute acceptance nature that deconstruction claims to deconstruct it. Be. He cannot question the Absolute and choose another Absolute instead. (Brunette & Wills, 1994)

## **Pattern interpretation**

Deconstruction Translated into deconstruction, deconstruction, deconstruction, deconstruction, deconstruction, and deconstruction. Perhaps this multiplicity of names is due to the fact that deconstruction has a multifaceted and multi-meaningful approach to the signified and signified and any type of text, and perhaps it is also because there are still many ambiguities and questions about deconstruction in our country. (Crowther, 2001)

Since the principles of deconstruction are derived directly from the philosophy of deconstruction and in terms of relatively little familiarity of architects with the philosophy of this theory, to deduce the architecture of deconstruction, it is first necessary to explain the philosophy of deconstruction and more importantly, the theoretical background of this theory of thought. (Gill, 1998)

## **Philosophy of originality**

In the first half of the twentieth century, the most important theory that continued modern philosophy was the philosophy of the originality of existence. The French philosopher Jean-Paul Sartre (1905-1980) is the founder of this theory. He based his philosophy on modern rationalism, as proposed and explained by Descartes, Kant, and other modern greats. Sartre believes in the Transcendental Mind. According to him, "the individual shapes his nature and this factor should not be neglected in the path of the individual... Sartre's unconditional freedom is one of the possibilities of the human mind. "In his opinion, a person is free to take whatever he wants, and that is why he should be held responsible for his choices."(Inouye et al., 2014)

From the second half of the last century, modern philosophy and the theory of originality of existence and rationalism have been questioned by a new theory called the theory of structuralism. This theory was first proposed by the Swiss linguist Ferdinand de Saussure and the French anthropologist Levi Strauss.

## **Structuralism**

Structuralism is a reaction against transcendental wisdom and modern mentality. Structuralists believe that there is a more important factor than the mind that is constantly neglected, and that is the structure of language. According to structuralist thinkers, we must study the structures of the human mind, and these structures are very important. The structure of the mind is the basis of language. Man is connected to the outside world through language. Every mentality depends on the structure of language. Levi Strauss stressed the importance of language and its structure in understanding the nature of the human mind and said: To be. "In his view, cultural structures follow linguistic ideas." (Kanters, 2018)

Strauss questioned the nature of man, the mission of man, and the freedom of man that Sartre proposed. For Strauss, Sartre is a Parisian being with Parisian insight. "Jean-Paul Sartre has generalized the mentality and consciousness developed in the university environments of Paris to all of humanity and to all parts of the world and throughout history, ignoring historical designations," says Strauss. ». Strauss traveled to South America to study the mental and linguistic structures of the native tribes of the Amazon. When he returned, he wrote a book called Wild Mind. According to Strauss, the primitive mind has its own logic and is stronger. If, according to Descartes, everything is formed consciously, according to Strauss, the structures of culture, mythology and society are not conscious, they are all formed



in the subconscious and have no author. Strauss questioned the 300-year-old domination of the transcendental mind. If since Descartes, man is a rational being, according to Strauss, man is a cultural being and human nature is formed in the context of culture, so in order to approach human nature, we must study language, culture and ethnicity.(Inouye et al., 2014)

In general, "the method of structuralism is to find and discover the laws of human activity in the context of culture, which begins with action and speech. Behavior is a kind of language. That is why structuralists extract the structures in phenomena," says French psychologist Jean Piaget (1980-1896), who conducted extensive studies on the structures of a child's mind development and personality.

Although the theory of structuralism questioned modern philosophy and worldview, it itself was questioned and criticized by postmodern philosophers, especially poststructuralists. As Michel Foucault, who himself emerged from the heart of structuralists, says of the above theory: "The generalization of structures neglects the objective issues of culture and society. "Their logic is a land logic and does not allow us to pay attention to identities in different eras." Therefore, the theory of structuralism can be considered as a theory between modern and postmodern theories.(Loscialpo, 2011)

## **Theory of Deconstruction**

The theory of deconstruction, which is one of the most important branches of postmodern philosophy, is a critique of structuralism as well as modern thought. The theory of deconstruction is also a subset of poststructuralism. Because most of the thinkers of this theory are brought up in the period of structuralism. Poststructuralists question structural extremist rationalism and structuralist extremism about structure. Poststructuralists believe that "the importance and dynamism of language should be sought in the flow and instability of meanings."(Lupton & Miller, 1994)

"Saussure claimed that the signifier and the signified were so connected as if they were two coins." But Roland Barthes, the French poststructuralist philosopher of the signifier and the signified, argues that "the signifier is not the exact signified counterpart."(Patin, 1993)

The theory of deconstruction was founded by Jacques Derrida (1930), a contemporary French philosopher. Derrida opposes structuralists and believes that when we look for structures, we ignore the variables, ethnic culture and practices



change every moment, so the structuralist approach cannot be correct. Derrida since 1967, when the three His book was published and discussed in the intellectual and philosophical circles of the West. This is a book: *Speech and Phenomenon*, *Writing and Other Being* and *Writing*. In these books, Derrida's main goal was to attack Strauss's structuralism and Husserl phenomenology. According to Derrida, Western philosophy is in a state of bankruptcy and has now lost its dynamism.(Salingaros, 2005)

According to Derrida, a text never reveals its true meaning, because the author of that text is not present, and each reader or whoever reads it can have a different perception of the author's intent. "Writing is like a child separated from the womb of the mother (author). "Every singer can have his own impression."

For Derrida, writing is not a good tool for conveying concepts, and a text never has exactly the same meanings as it expresses. The text is a creator instead of a transmitter of meaning. That is why in the vision of deconstruction, we live in a multi-meaningful world. Everyone reads different meanings and inferences from the phenomena around them.(Van der Straeten, Masschelein, & Narrative, 2003)

Dual confrontations are another issue that Derrida has criticized. Dual contrasts such as day and night, man and woman, mind and object, speech and writing, beautiful and ugly and good and bad have always been discussed in Western philosophy. Since the time of Plato, one has always been superior to the other. But in Derrida, there is no preference. He rejects this black-and-white logic and issue or this or that.

For example, in Western philosophy, speech has always taken precedence over writing because of the presence of the speaker. But according to Derrida, the meaning of the text is not determined by the speaker. Rather, it is the listener or reader of the text who, according to his mentality and experience, determines the meaning that can be different from the intention and purpose of the speaker or author, so speech is not necessarily preferable to writing.

It should be noted that there is no precise definition of deconstruction, because any definition of deconstruction can be interpreted differently from deconstruction itself. But here are a few examples of the issues raised about deconstruction.(Wigley, 1995)

Hossein Ali Nozari, a contemporary writer and theorist, writes: "The deconstruction, deconstruction, method or method of postmodern analysis is aimed

at opening or opening all structures or foundations. "The theory of deconstruction divides the text into its various parts or fragments and separates them from each other and tears its various and constituent elements, thus revealing its contradictions and assumptions."

Dr. Mohammad Zimran, author of *Derrida and the Metaphysics of Presence*, writes: ».

"Dr. Zimran writes in this regard: It is the foundation of the intellect that awakens man from the certain Cartesian dream and deprives him of imaginary trust and confidence and creates a new concern."

"Deconstructing a text means extracting logics and inferences that are contrary to the text itself," says Derrida. "It's really about expanding virtual understanding."

## Analysis

In general, deconstruction is a kind of examination of a text and extraction of overt and covert interpretations from the heart of the text. These interpretations can be contradictory and different from each other and even with each other and even with the purpose and opinion of the author of the text. Therefore, in the view of deconstruction, what the reader inferred and perceives is important and there are different interpretations and inferences according to the number of readers. The reader determines the meaning of the text, not the author. There is no fixed structure in the text or a single interpretation of it. The relationship between signifier and signified and the relationship between text and interpretation is floating and slippery.

The person who introduced these philosophical issues to the field of architecture is Peter Eisenman, a contemporary American architect. Eisenman made the philosophy of deconstruction one of the main topics during the 1980s, not only with his articles and lectures, but also with the numerous spaces, bodies, and landscapes he created.

Eisenman criticized both modern philosophy and modern architecture in an article entitled *The Middle Boundary*. According to him, modern architecture is based on nineteenth century science and philosophy. According to Eisenman, Hegel's discussion of the value of thesis, antithesis, and synthesis is no longer relevant in today's world. Postmodern philosophers such as Nietzsche, Freud, Heidegger, and Derrida have changed our relationship with the universe.

Nineteenth-century science and the scientific certainty of that period have lost their validity. New laws of physics, such as Albert Einstein's law of relativity and Werner Heisenberg's uncertainty, have changed our perception of the world around us. Therefore, if architecture is a science, it must be based on today's science and philosophy and our current perception of ourselves and the environment. Our architecture today must move beyond nineteenth-century science and philosophy and adapt to new conditions. Just as meanings, concepts, and symbols have changed in science and philosophy, so must they in architecture.

Eisenman believes that modernists claim that the utopia should be sought in the future. Postmodernists are also looking for this utopia in the past, but today's architecture must find this utopia in today's conditions. In this case, he uses the word "Presentness" to mean "present" and believes that architecture should be present at any time and place. Belong to the present time and place.

To achieve the above conditions, the previous laws of architecture must be broken, and since these laws are conventional and not natural, it is possible to break them. Facts and symbols of the past must be unraveled And extract new concepts from their hearts in accordance with today's conditions.

Peter Eisenman believes that in our lives today, there are dichotomies such as clarity and ambiguity, stability and instability, ugliness and beauty, usefulness and uselessness, honesty and deception, stability and hesitation, frankness and ambiguity. One cannot be used to camouflage the other, but these contrasts and dichotomies should be displayed in the field of architecture as a manifestation of our living conditions today.

In the past, as well as in modern and postmodern architecture, what has been present has been symmetry, proportionality, clarity, stability, usefulness and usefulness. In these dual confrontations, one has always taken precedence over the other. But what has been neglected and absent is asymmetry, ambiguity, ambiguity, instability, deception, ugliness and uselessness. Our architecture today should reflect our mental and biological conditions today, and what has been neglected in our architecture today is part of our lives today.

In deconstruction architecture, an attempt is made to carefully study the program and design specifications. The site itself and its physical and historical conditions, as well as the social and cultural environment in which the site is located, are also

scrutinized. In the next step, different interpretations of this collection will be presented. Finally, the architectural body is designed in such a way that while satisfying the functional demands of the project, contradictions and contrasts between the issues mentioned above and various interpretations of it are presented. Therefore, the physical form is presented as a set of polysemy, ambiguous, contradictory and shaky, which prepares the context for further interpretation.

Eisenman uses the word "catachresis" in his article "The Middle Boundary", which means ambiguity. The two sides are the middle border. There is no preference on either side or ambiguity. Both this and that - neither this nor that. "The two sides split the truth and allow us to see what the truth has suppressed," Eisenman writes in the article.

One of the first and most prominent deconstruction-style buildings is the Kessner Center for the Visual Arts (1989-1982) in Columbus, USA. Famous architects such as Michael Graves, Cesar Poly, Arthur Erickson and Peter Eisenman took part in the 1982 design competition for the building.

The building site is located at the main entrance of Ohio State University on the east side of the university. The function of the building is to display the works of artists and university students. Each of these architects placed their building between the entrance gate and the buildings on the site. Surprisingly, the building was designed by Eisenman in such a way that it split the narrow space between the two buildings on the site and was located between them, and even more surprisingly, his design was announced as the first winner. Since then, a style in architecture called deconstruction style has been introduced and considered in international architectural forums.

Explaining his plan, Eisenman said that this point is a meeting point for two relatively different groups. One is the university students and artists who present their works in this building, and the other is the citizens and the general public of the city who come to see these works. Therefore, two codes or symbols were selected for each of these two groups. One is the axis of the University's grid and the other is the axis of the Columbus City grid. The two networks are 17 degrees apart. Therefore, both networks have intersected with each other at the site as a sign of each of these two groups. These dualities are displayed in the architecture of the building in such a way that neither of them is superior to the other, and these two axes are split like two scissor blades between the two buildings and have been replaced in them.

After opening and splitting the space between the two buildings on the site, Eisenman noticed the foundations of an old building that belonged to the military academy. The building was demolished in the 1950s, but some of its foundations were still buried underground at the site. Although the building no longer existed, Eisenman noticed it by carefully inspecting the site, reading it as part of the existing text, which is the project site, and displaying the reading in person. Therefore, in Eisenman's plan, parts of the military academy building, which resembled a military castle, were represented and reconstructed at the entrance of the Kessner Center for the Visual Arts.

In designing this art center, Eisenman, unlike others, turned his attention to what did not seem at first glance and first reading. He scrutinized and exposed issues such as contradictions, dichotomies, and marginal issues and interpretations. For what reason? Because architecture must be the physical manifestation of the mentality and vision of its time - in this case deconstruction -.

## **Conclusion**

Deconstruction architecture as an all-encompassing and universal style had a relatively short life and did not exceed more than a decade, but had a tremendous and fundamental impact on the design method and the type of representation of meaning and interpretation in the field of architecture. This style was the forerunner of subsequent approaches such as folding architecture and cosmic origin architecture.

Other architects of this style include Frank Gehry, Zaha Hadid, Rem Koolhaas and Bernard Choumi.

In the field of architecture, various forms and designs of deconstruction have been presented in architecture theorys in Iran for more than a decade. Several examples of buildings of this style have been implemented in Tehran, but it is not clear to the author what the design of these buildings sought to answer.



Zaha Hadid

**Rem Koolhaas**



**Frank Gehry**





## References

- [1] Adebayo, A., & Iweka, A. (2014). Optimizing the sustainability of tourism infrastructure in Nigeria through design for deconstruction framework.
- [2] Brunette, P., & Wills, D. (1994). *Deconstruction and the visual arts: art, media, architecture*: Cambridge University Press Cambridge.
- [3] Crowther, P. (2001). *Developing an inclusive model for design for deconstruction*. Paper presented at the Proceedings of the CIB Task Group 39-Deconstruction Meeting.
- [4] Gill, A. J. F. T. (1998). Deconstruction fashion: The making of unfinished, decomposing and re-assembled clothes. 2(1), 25-49.
- [5] Goldman, L. M., Amyes, T. L., Goryanova, B., Gerlt, J. A., & Richard, J. P. J. J. o. t. A. C. S. (2014). Enzyme architecture: deconstruction of the enzyme-activating phosphodianion interactions of orotidine 5'-monophosphate decarboxylase. 136(28), 10156-10165.
- [6] Guy, B., Shell, S., & Esherick, H. J. P. o. t. C. T. G. (2006). Design for deconstruction and materials reuse. 39(4), 189-209.
- [7] Inouye, H., Zhang, Y., Yang, L., Venugopalan, N., Fischetti, R. F., Gleber, S. C., . . . Tucker, M. J. S. r. (2014). Multiscale deconstruction of molecular architecture in corn stover. 4(1), 1-7.
- [8] Kanters, J. J. B. (2018). Design for deconstruction in the design process: State of the art. 8(11), 150.
- [9] Loscialpo, F. (2011). Fashion and philosophical deconstruction: a fashion in-deconstruction. In *Fashion Forward* (pp. 13-27): Brill.
- [10] Lupton, E., & Miller, J. A. J. V. l. (1994). Deconstruction and graphic design: history meets theory. 28(4), 345-365.
- [11] Patin, T. J. J. o. A. E. (1993). From deep structure to an architecture in suspense: Peter Eisenman, structuralism, and deconstruction. 47(2), 88-100.
- [12] Salingaros, N. A. (2005). *Anti-architecture et deconstruction*: Umbau-Verlag Harald Püschel.
- [13] Van der Straeten, B., Masschelein, A. J. I., & Narrative. (2003). The uncanny and the architecture of deconstruction. 5.
- [14] Wigley, M. (1995). *The architecture of deconstruction: Derrida's haunt*: Mit Press.