This interview is occasioned by the publication of your book Architectural Theory in Persian language. Being translated into many languages, we can assume that the first characteristic of your theory is that it is universal. Secondly, the theory is rational because you have used a scientific methodology to express your ideas. Thirdly, the type of architecture you are suggesting is conscious because the architect is aware of the form he is creating. According to your division of architecture between modern and traditional, aren’t your theory’s characteristics of being universal, rational, and conscious more similar to modern theories rather than traditional ones?

You have asked ten questions together so I am not sure that I can distinguish between the questions. First of all, my theories are universal because I believe that architecture is universal; the human being is universal. Human beings are the same race and we have the same physiology. And the differences between different human beings around the world are minor compared to the same basic race that we are, and we react in the same manner to our built environment.

Then when you say: “This reveals universality for all concepts discussed in this book”, what is the difference between your notion of universality and what the modern architects thought as universal architecture?

The modernist architects didn’t know what they were doing. They tried to impose a generic architecture, which is like a box. A box to fit everywhere. The problem is that they tried to impose the same geometry everywhere. Generic is not the same as universal. Generic means one thing: one size fits all. Like a one size shoe. Shoe number seven for 6 billion people around the world. Well, maybe a hundred thousand people will fit into a size seven shoe, and the rest of the world will go without, because their feet are either too small or too big. So my theories, which are based on the work of Christopher Alexander, try to adapt. They are general because they are generally adaptive. They are theories that adapt to local circumstances, and that enables you to give a solution where each solution is unique. So the theory is universal; yet the application of the theory gives you a unique solution. You can have 6 billion unique solutions obtained from applying my theory. That’s totally different from the modernist approach, which is used to give a single form; a cube, and you apply that everywhere. So the modernists did not understand the difference between generic and universal.

And what about being conscious of what we do? In traditional architecture, even if for example the 2.7 scaling was applied, the architect was unconscious of doing it. Modernism tried to make architecture a conscious process, just as it is in your theory. So what is the difference between your consciousness and consciousness in modern design?

There is a misunderstanding between conscious architecture and unconscious or subconscious architecture. Since a million years ago when humans first became recognizably human and developed the
is a book that specifically develops rules for how people enjoy using space and enjoy the circulation in each space. I have learnt much of what I know from Alexander and, in fact, my work is an attempt to rewrite and solidify what Alexander has written in order to communicate it to people. Had people all around the world paid attention to what Alexander was saying in the last thirty years, there would be no need for me to write my books. Because then, we would not be seeing the destruction of cities and the creation of such horrible anti-human buildings that we see today.

Your theory is more substantial than procedural. If someone wants to apply your theory what would his process be? How would he start and what would be his first step?

That's coming out in more recent papers and the design work that I am doing. In fact I am doing projects around the world now. I am applying my own theories to create structures whose primary function is to give satisfaction to human beings, the human users. So the whole goal of all my writings is to create structures whether they are single rooms and houses or urban spaces or entire portions of cities. And those built structures have to give maximum pleasure to whoever is using them. Strictly from a point of view of making the users feel more human. To help day-to-day human interaction; just simple things like walking or going outside your door or going from here to your school.

All of this has been neglected in the architecture of the last eighty years and my efforts are focused towards recontextualizing and putting it all together, which is a very complex undertaking.

Pythagoras tried to explain music and especially musical rhythms with mathematics. However, there is an artistic essence in composing music that you can't achieve by coding it into mathematics. When you say that "laws for structural order underline both physics and biology and I expect similar laws should hold for architecture as well" and "architectural design can be founded on scientific principles that are analogous to structural laws in theoretical physics and biology" does that mean that you are neglecting the artistic essence of architecture or you have a different definition of it?

Not at all! Architecture is essentially artistic. However, art has degenerated totally. So much so that there is unfortunately no meaning to art today. The visual arts have become a joke around the world. Musical arts are non-existent except for traditional music. And architecture of course has become a monster. Even though I am an artist basically, I cannot communicate my ideas artistically, because there is no way to communicate artistic ideas in a world that has lost any notion of what artistic means. So the only way to communicate these ideas is scientifically, and fortunately I happen to be a scientist as well. That is why I communicate my ideas scientifically. That way I can go to a conference and argue with some architect who may be extremely famous and build big buildings that are totally anti-human and make people feel sick. And I can explain why this famous architect should be thrown out because he or she is an impostor. Their buildings make people feel sick. But the only way I can argue this is from scientific evidence, by using mathematics and by applying physics and biology. If I make the same arguments artistically then it just becomes a debate between my artistic sense and the other person who may be more famous. And because he is more famous, I will lose the debate. The whole point is to communicate these important results to humanity. And the only way the debate will be won by correct reasoning is by having it on scientific basis. Otherwise we are just wasting our time.

This question emerged to me when I was reading the part about the emotional basis in architecture where you say "a building, regardless of shape and use, is perceived as beautiful when an emotional link has established with it, and that is possible only when the building has a high degree of structural order. The perception of structural order as a positive emotional state is independent of opinion, fashion or style." Does that mean you think aesthetics are absolute rather than relative?

Aesthetics are both absolute and relative. The absolute part is more than half, however. So the majority of aesthetics is absolute. It is built into our physiology, into the way our body is structured. The way the nerves are wired. The way our hormone system is set up through millions of years of evolution. That is absolute because that is part of human physiology. The remaining small percentage counts for much less. I don't know how to make an estimate, but I would say just a small percentage of it is relative and that is learnt by upbringing. The child is brought up in a certain society and picks up a small percentage of aesthetics from the environment, from the school and from the media. So that part is certainly relative. But what the media tells you today: that 100 percent of aesthetics is relative, that is a lie. And that statement can be shown to be false by biological experiments.

So before the media there was no such thing as relative aesthetics. Is that what you are saying?

No, because there was always media. Throughout civilization there would have been an approved style of painting or representation, and people would adhere to that style. So a different style may not have been accepted. That was relative. But all people still reacted in an absolute way to artistic things in the environment. The proof that aesthet-
ics is mostly absolute in that all cultures around the world have evolved art. Representation, abstract art, sculpture, painting, weaving and music, all those human creations give similar degrees of pleasure to other members of the human race. So I can enjoy a Japanese painting and a Japanese person can enjoy a western painting. Even though it breaks away from the relative part of their aesthetics because it's not part of their culture, they can appreciate it and connect to it. So if there were not a major absolute component to art and to aesthetics, then we could only enjoy what our very narrow culture produces and we would hate everything else. And that's simply not the case.

As an Iranian, when I look for example at an Indian dome the proportion appears to me exaggerated. An Indian might have a same feeling about the Middle Eastern forms. Or when listening to Persian music, since we use microtone intervals, it might not false for a western audience. But it is absolutely harmonious for an Iranian listener. You think since this is not something essential but what we learn through our culture, it doesn't mean that aesthetics are relative?

Well again you are picking on the small percentage of aesthetics that happens to be relative. But I can only tell you from personal experience. When I go to another country, I experience their traditional architecture positively, which to me may seem totally strange.

But it is still beautiful?

I don't want to use the word beauty, I enter the building and I feel a sense of profound connection with the structure and it makes me feel wonderful. So that validates it for me, in that these people build something that is wonderful and that connects to me. And this is not my culture and yet it feels wonderful and nourishes me. Therefore this response is universal, otherwise how could it touch me?

Aren't the contrasting pair elements you: Introduce similar to Derrida's dichotomies?

Don't ask me about Derrida because Derrida is an intellectual impostor. So I don't pay any attention to what he has written.

In the holy Quran there is a statement that says: "everything that God has created has a feminine and a masculine". Does that somehow correlate to what you are talking about?

I am not in the position to comment upon religious text. But it certainly sounds like this is the division of two contrasting pairs. But as far as I know it's not only in Islam, this fundamental coupling idea is also in all the world's great religions, in Taoism, the beginning of the Ta...
You have said that: “the basis of real, adaptive and sustainable architecture is not currently taught in architecture schools... education is very easy to change.” What are your suggestions about architectural education?

I need to revise that statement because having just taught an architectural studio, I see it is going to be extremely difficult to change architectural education. This was a senior studio and I spent more than half of the semester trying to get the students to unlearn what they knew, because the students refused to learn what I was teaching them. They had all learnt all these wrong things during the previous three years. So it is going to be really tough to change the architectural education system; which now begins with giving them totally false information about the very basics of architecture. So that when they find theories like mine or Christopher Alexander's, they just don’t understand how to understand or use them. And they have been so conditioned to think about architecture in a totally wrong and anhuman way: when you try to teach them about human architecture, they just don’t understand. Their earlier training has become a paradigm for them. Their brain circuits have been set up in a certain way and you are trying to teach them something that is totally different, and they are trying yet they cannot do it. It is very, very difficult. So we have to start architectural education from the very first semester. Try to teach the incoming students that architecture should serve human needs. The human being is above everything. And we should be building cities and buildings to serve human beings, and not abstract forms that make human beings sick, or destroy cities just to follow some abstract geometrical plan. That is totally crazy. I mean it is crazy to me and crazy to my friends. But when architecture schools begin in the first semester by telling students: we are going to concentrate upon formal design and we are going to redesign cities as beautiful perfect squares, then the students start to learn that sort of approach. And when you tell them that all this is wrong and human beings will have to live in these inhuman cities, the students say: what do we care about human beings? We are here to build very abstract square buildings. We don’t care about human beings. So even trying to tell them that human beings have to live on the earth becomes a shock.

Our curriculum of architecture in Iran is partially based on the European and American ones. What would you suggest for architectural education as a curriculum? In you books, you talk about biology, computer science, physics, mathematics; are they going to be part of your suggestion?

Fortunately we have written all that down in my new book “Intelligence-Based Architecture”, which is coauthored with Kenneth Masden. It is now under preparation, but copies are now circulating freely on the web. And the individual chapters are articles that are published in the international journal IAAR (and available freely online). We outline exactly a detailed curriculum from first year through graduate school. We specify what students should learn and the texts that we recommend using. And we took great care to write this not only for American based students or European based students, but for world architecture schools. So, even though we refer to texts that are available in English, we spent a lot of time so that our proposal is relevant to any architecture school around the world. And IAAR is a journal that is read by a lot of people in the Islamic world. Thus we also carefully chose the venue where we published the original chapters in order to reach a world audience. We have developed what we feel is a detailed blueprint on how to change architectural education.

You said: “I predict a new architecture of unprecedented beauty, justly appropriate for the new millennium.” What makes you feel so optimistic about the future of architecture?

We are seeing the signs of the collapse of inhuman architecture and inhuman urbanism. This collapse has been accelerated by the recent financial collapse all around the world. There was a tremendous power and financial structure that propped up globally sponsored inhuman architecture. A lot of people make a lot of money building inhuman buildings. And much of that basis has now collapsed with the recent financial collapse around the world. Therefore, governments and corporations will no longer be able to build those monstrosities, and we will have to turn towards a more human architecture. So for the first time in several decades, what used to be an extremely famous architecture that everyone else would copy, has somehow started to come out of fashion. This is a very positive trend. When you have the first turning away from what were regarded as idols previously, then ordinary people can now begin to see that these were false idols. Those were the worst kind of buildings, totally unsustainable, extremely expensive, wasting the money of a country that was going into just one or two pockets, and destroying the city in the process. When you start the collapse, the collapse continues and people will realize that genuine human architecture lies elsewhere. It lies in what my friends and I have been talking about all these years. And we have fortunately provided the means of realizing this human scale architecture and human scale cities.

What do you think the role of the developing countries could be in the new stage of archi-
کفتوگا با
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مقام خود به عهده چاپ و وحید زاده

بكافته ما این مقاله به هنگام انتشار توجه کتاب مشاهده می‌شود. بخش اولی این مقاله به توجه به تمرینات شما به زبان‌های مختلف می‌توان با اعضا چندین نفری که به اولین مشخصه نظیری شما 'جهانی' بوده است. جزئی از آن، اگر بخواهید ما به زبان‌های انگلیسی یا فرانسوی می‌توانیم به شما حمله کنیم. این مقاله به شماری پایه‌گذاری شده است که ما به ماهنامه سنتی شایسته باشند. شما به منظور دیدن سایت ما باید به ماهنامه همراه با مجموعه دسته‌بندی شده بروید.

نهاد چیست؟

سالینگاروس، مالک شرکت به‌پرسیده - به زبان انگلیسی، با توجه به تمرینات شما به زبان‌های مختلف می‌توان با اعضا چندین نفری که به اولین مشخصه نظیری شما 'جهانی' بوده است. جزئی از آن، اگر بخواهید ما به زبان‌های انگلیسی یا فرانسوی می‌توانیم به شما حمله کنیم. این مقاله به شماری پایه‌گذاری شده است که ما به ماهنامه سنتی شایسته باشند. شما به منظور دیدن سایت ما باید به ماهنامه همراه با مجموعه دسته‌بندی شده بروید.

ویژه را بدین ترتیب وقین در کتاب نان می‌گوید: این دانل بر جهانی بودن تعیین مفاهیمی دارد که در این کتاب قرار دارد.

نمن، نهاد برنجی را وضوح روشن شده، به تاکید می‌تواند تعریف شما از جهانی بودن آنچه هم در تشریح آن اشاره کرده، جهانی بودن در تعریف گوئی این است که این به یک نظریه بی‌پیوندی می‌باشد و بخش اولی این مقاله به توجه به تمرینات شما به زبان‌های مختلف می‌توان با اعضا چندین نفری که به اولین مشخصه نظیری شما 'جهانی' بوده است. جزئی از آن، اگر بخواهید ما به زبان‌های انگلیسی یا فرانسوی می‌توانیم به شما حمله کنیم. این مقاله به شماری پایه‌گذاری شده است که ما به ماهنامه سنتی شایسته باشند. شما به منظور دیدن سایت ما باید به ماهنامه همراه با مجموعه دسته‌بندی شده بروید.

ویژه برنجی را بدین ترتیب وقین در کتاب نان می‌گوید: این دانل بر جهانی بودن تعیین مفاهیمی دارد که در این کتاب قرار دارد.

نمن، نهاد برنجی را وضوح روشن شده، به تاکید می‌تواند تعریف شما از جهانی بودن آنچه هم در تشریح آن اشاره کرده، جهانی بودن در تعریف گوئی این است که این به یک نظریه بی‌پیوندی می‌باشد و بخش اولی این مقاله به توجه به تمرینات شما به زبان‌های مختلف می‌توان با اعضا چندین نفری که به اولین مشخصه نظیری شما 'جهانی' بوده است. جزئی از آن، اگر بخواهید ما به زبان‌های انگلیسی یا فرانسوی می‌توانیم به شما حمله کنیم. این مقاله به شماری پایه‌گذاری شده است که ما به ماهنامه سنتی شایسته باشند. شما به منظور دیدن سایت ما باید به ماهنامه همراه با مجموعه دسته‌بندی شده بروید.

ویژه برنجی را بدین ترتیب وقین در کتاب نان می‌گوید: این دانل بر جهانی بودن تعیین مفاهیمی دارد که در این کتاب قرار دارد.

نمن، نهاد برنجی را وضوح روشن شده، به تاکید می‌تواند تعریف شما از جهانی بودن آنچه هم در تشریح آن اشاره کرده، جهانی بودن در تعریف گوئی این است که این به یک نظریه بی‌پیوندی می‌باشد و بخش اولی این مقاله به توجه به تمرینات شما به زبان‌های مختلف می‌توان با اعضا چندین نفری که به اولی
و هدف آن: در مورد خودآگاهی بودن تصور نه تنها در معنای شینگن باید یک راز باقی ماند.

و به همراهی این اتفاق، آنچه می‌تواند مقداری کاهشی داشته باشد، که در این چنین بخشی از زندگی، به وسیله خاصی، به مسکن و سیستم سلامت، نظامی و فیزیکی می‌تواند برخورداری باشد.

و به همراهی این اتفاق، آنچه می‌تواند مقداری کاهشی داشته باشد، که در این چنین بخشی از زندگی، به وسیله خاصی، به مسکن و سیستم سلامت، نظامی و فیزیکی می‌تواند برخورداری باشد.

و به همراهی این اتفاق، آنچه می‌تواند مقداری کاهشی داشته باشد، که در این چنین بخشی از زندگی، به وسیله خاصی، به مسکن و سیستم سلامت، نظامی و فیزیکی می‌تواند برخورداری باشد.

و به همراهی این اتفاق، آنچه می‌تواند مقداری کاهشی داشته باشد، که در این چنین بخشی از زندگی، به وسیله خاصی، به مسکن و سیستم سلامت، نظامی و فیزیکی می‌تواند برخورداری باشد.
سیلیکون: این طور نیست، چرا؟ همه را بهتر می‌نماید 

او می‌خواهد، سیلیکون از تمامی سیلیکون‌های پیش‌بینی شده، در عین حال به‌روشی جدیدی پیموده است. سیلیکون، این مرحله را به‌طور جزئی گرفته است. 

سیلیکون: این طور نیست، چرا؟ همه را بهتر می‌نماید 

او می‌خواهد، سیلیکون از تمامی سیلیکون‌های پیش‌بینی شده، در عین حال به‌روشی جدیدی پیموده است. سیلیکون، این مرحله را به‌طور جزئی گرفته است.
پیام‌ها در حالت توزیع می‌تواند به طور بی‌پایان در طول سال گشته جهان غلیظ بهبود یابد. اگر تاریخ نمایش تصویری معماری ۴۰ سال دارد، با اشتباهات گذشته که به این تاریخ اشاره نمی‌شود، این کار برای ما بسیار مهم است. این امر باعث می‌شود که شناختی تشکیل داده شود. این امر نیازمند فناوری حساس و سریع و به‌طور کلی است. می‌توانیم از این امر استفاده کنیم تا اطلاعات گذشته را با سازمان‌های جهانی در مبادله داده و پیام‌ها را در کارهای مختلف به کاربرد بین‌المللی بیشتری برسانیم.

حواله‌ای را نشان که کشورهای در حال توسعه در مقطع دیده‌می‌شود که یک شناختگذاری نیازمند مبناهاست. سال‌گردگاه، کشورهای در حال توسعه، یک شناختگذاری که از طرف نیروهایی متفقین و جهانی است. این امر نیازمند است تا در حال حاضر شناختگذاری‌های دیگر، مثلاً در کشورهای اروپا و آمریکا، به طور کامل بهره‌مند شوند.

ویست: به‌طور کلی، کشورهای در حال توسعه باید از این امر کاربرد بی‌کاری نکنند. با این حال، ممکن است این کشورها بهترین راه برای اعمال این ایده را داشته باشند. ممکن است این کشورها بهترین راه برای اعمال این ایده را داشته باشند. ممکن است این کشورها بهترین راه برای اعمال این ایده را داشته باشند.

ویست: به‌طور کلی، کشورهای در حال توسعه باید از این امر کاربرد بی‌کاری نکنند. با این حال، ممکن است این کشورها بهترین راه برای اعمال این ایده را داشته باشند. ممکن است این کشورها بهترین راه برای اعمال این ایده را داشته باشند. ممکن است این کشورها بهترین راه برای اعمال این ایده را داشته باشند.

ویست: به‌طور کلی، کشورهای در حال توسعه باید از این امر کاربرد بی‌کاری نکنند. با این حال، ممکن است این کشورها بهترین راه برای اعمال این ایده را داشته باشند. ممکن است این کشورها بهترین راه برای اعمال این ایده را داشته باشند. ممکن است این کشورها بهترین راه برای اعمال این ایده را داشته باشند.

ویست: به‌طور کلی، کشورهای در حال توسعه باید از این امر کاربرد بی‌کاری نکنند. با این حال، ممکن است این کشورها بهترین راه برای اعمال این ایده را داشته باشند. ممکن است این کشورها بهترین راه برای اعمال این ایده را داشته باشند. ممکن است این کشورها بهترین راه برای اعمال این ایده را داشته باشند.