

Designing Creative Events with Deconstructivism Approach

Maryam Memarian, Mahmood Naghizadeh

Abstract—Deconstruction is an approach that is entirely incompatible with the traditional prevalent architecture. Considering the fact that this approach attempts to put architecture in sharp contrast with its opposite events and transpires with attending to the neglected and missing aspects of architecture and deconstructing its stable structures. It also recklessly proceeds beyond the existing frameworks and intends to create a different and more efficient prospect for space. The aim of deconstruction architecture is to satisfy both the prospective and retrospective visions as well as takes into account all tastes of the present in order to transcend time. Likewise, it ventures to fragment the facts and symbols of the past and extract new concepts from within their heart, which coincide with today's circumstances. Since this approach is an attempt to surpass the limits of the prevalent architecture, it can be employed to design places in which creative events occur and imagination and ambition flourish. Thought-provoking artistic events can grow and mature in such places and be represented in the best way possible to all people. The concept of event proposed in the plan grows out of the interaction between space and creation. In addition to triggering surprise and high impressions, it is also considered as a bold journey into the suspended realms of the traditional conflicts in architecture such as architecture-landscape, interior-exterior, center-margin, product-process, and stability-instability. In this project, at first, through interpretive-historical research method and examining the inputs and data collection, recognition and organizing takes place. After evaluating the obtained data using deductive reasoning, the data is eventually interpreted. Given the fact that the research topic is in its infancy and there is not a similar case in Iran with limited number of corresponding instances across the world, the selected topic helps to shed lights on the unrevealed and neglected parts in architecture. Similarly, criticizing, investigating and comparing specific and highly prized cases in other countries with the project under study can serve as an introduction into this architecture style.

Keywords—Creativity, deconstruction, event.

I. INTRODUCTION

THIS research is mainly concerned with exploring how to design an architectural edifice with focus on satisfying intellectual and spiritual needs. In this way, on its vacillating course of variations and events, architecture can disengage itself from the past concepts and embark on the unknown areas of the future. But the question here is how we can address the neglected aspects in an architectural plan so as to proceed beyond the boundaries and limitations imposed by time. It is thought that the meticulous analysis of a context can

Maryam Memarian was with the Architecture department, faculty of architecture and urban design, Qazvin, Iran (phone: +989124331702; e-mail: m.memarian2010@yahoo.com).

Mahmood Naghizadeh is lecturer at the Architecture department, faculty of architecture and urban design, Qazvin, Iran (phone: +989121140402; e-mail: naghizadeh@qiau.ac.ir).

help establish the appropriate link between an architectural edifice with its users and exceed the time frameworks and restrictions. This approach intends to establish an architectural thought that can disentangle architecture from the lifeless body of construction materials and get it involved in the context of culture and society. Additionally, it attempts to probe into the essence of art; consequently, it creates a dynamic phenomenon that is beyond the needs and necessities of time and place. This project is an event that that sets out to crystallize a thought that grows out of deconstructing, opening and dredging the cultural, political, economic, and educational structures in architecture. Such a thought goes beyond its own fabric and gets back to it with a modern institution. Such a thought results in creating a place that will trigger deep reflective thinking and setting up a context for flourishing creativity. The approach proposed in this design rests on the thoughts of the prominent philosopher, Jacques Derrida, one of the most well-known twentieth century philosophers in general, and the philosophy of deconstruction, in particular. This approach seeks to dissect the structure by deconstructing it in such a way as to expose its underlying assumptions, contemplate its arrangement, and examine the possibility of other arrangements in architecture so that it helps extricate architecture from its time constraints. Anti-architecture is in methodological contrast with the prevalent architecture. The aesthetic principles that follow a static trend are inclined toward change, flexibility, and compatibility with events. It also recklessly bypasses the past and current rules of architecture that are conventional, not natural. It is a journey into the suspended realms of traditional binary oppositions in architecture such as landscape-architecture, interior-exterior, center-margin, product-process, and stability-instability.

In fact, the purpose of design of a space is an event in which different ideas come together and lead to creating new ideas. Certainly, this space exerts an influence on people's lifestyles, thinking, and attitudes toward the surrounding environment. But how such particularities of space help us achieve this critical objective in design of an edifice will be investigated in the rest of the paper.

II. DEFINITIONS AND CONCEPTS

A. Concept of Event

Event is one of the significant properties of the approach to deconstructing postmodern art and architecture. In an essay about the "Folies of the Parc De La Villette" Jacques Derrida (1930-2004) [1], the founder of deconstruction thinking, expanded on the definition of "Event", calling it "the emergence of disparate multiplicity". He had constantly

insisted that these points called *folies* were points of activities, of programs, of events. Derrida elaborated on this concept, proposing the possibility of an “architecture of the event” that would “eventualize”, or open up that which, in our history or tradition, is understood to be fixed, essential, monumental. He had also suggested earlier that the word “event” shared roots with “invention”, hence the notion of the event, of the action-in-space, of the turning point, the invention [2]. On the other hand, Bernard Tschumi [3] would like to associate it with the notion of shock, a shock that in order to be effective in our mediated culture, in our culture of images, must go beyond Walter Benjamin's definition [4] and combine the idea of function or action with that of image. Indeed, architecture finds itself in a unique situation: it is the only discipline that by definition combines concept and experience, image and use, image and structure. Philosophers can write, mathematicians can develop virtual spaces, but architects are the only ones who are the prisoners of that hybrid art, where the image hardly ever exists without a combined activity [2]. He asserts that the very heterogeneity of the definition of architecture-space, action, and movement-makes it into that event, that place of shock, or that place of the invention of ourselves. The event is the place where the rethinking and reformulation of the different elements of architecture, many of which have resulted in or added to contemporary social inequities, may lead to their solution. By definition, it is the place of the combination of differences. that if such a shock is supposed to be effective in our communication culture and visual culture, it should be far beyond the combination and definition of the idea of function or action. Moreover, architecture finds itself in a unique situation and there is no architecture without events, actions or activity [5]. Architecture has always been as much about the event that takes place in a space as about the space itself. For example, the Columbia University Rotunda (1895) has been a library, it has been used as a banquet hall, it is often the site of university lectures; someday it could fulfill the needs for an athletic facility at the university. Function does not follow form, form does not follow function - or fiction for that matter - however, they certainly interact [5].

If shock can no longer be produced by the succession and juxtaposition of facades and lobbies, maybe it can be produced by the juxtaposition of events that take place behind these facades in these spaces. If architecture is both the concept and the experience, space and use, structure and superficial image - non-hierarchically - then architecture should cease to separate these categories and instead merge them into unprecedented combinations of programs and spaces. Concepts such as “Crossprogramming,” “trans programming,” “disprogramming” suggest the displacement and mutual contamination of terms. There is no architecture without action, without activities, and without function. Architecture was seen as the combination of spaces, events, and movements without any hierarchy or precedence among these concepts [5].

For Michel Foucault [6], an event is not simply a sequence of words (or chapters), but the moment of questioning or

problematizing the very assumptions of the setting in which the problematization takes place and which occasions the possibility of another, different setting [3]. An event embraces the productive potential of the forces from which it developed [7]; a field of new possibilities which causes its readers/participants no longer to think about certain thing in the same manner [8].

B. Creativity

It is quite difficult to present a definition for the concept of creativity. The cultural value placed on creativity in the arts, sciences, technology, and political endeavors is immense. Creative people have received adulation throughout history [9]. Some researchers have argued that creativity constitutes humankind's ultimate resource [10]. Social and technical innovation rely heavily on creative people and processes [11]. Yet, despite creativity's undisputed importance, psychological research regarding creativity remains an academic backwater [12]. However, generally speaking, Creativity is defined as the tendency to generate or recognize ideas, alternatives, or possibilities that may be useful in solving problems, communicating with others, and entertaining ourselves and others [13].

Prentky [14] suggested that “what creativity is, and what it is not, hangs as the mythical albatross around the neck of scientific research on creativity”. As a psychological concept, creativity has resisted unequivocal definition or clear operationalization [15], [11]. Rhodes [16] suggested that definitions relate to four different potential research areas:

- The person who creates;
- The cognitive processes involved in the creation of ideas;
- The environment in which creativity occurs or environmental influences;
- The product that results from creative activity.

C. The Philosophy of Deconstruction

In English dictionaries the word deconstruction means to take apart or examine in order to reveal the basis, parts or composition of often with the intention of exposing biases, flaws, or inconsistencies. Another meaning of deconstruction refers to adapt or separate the elements of for use in an ironic or radically new way [17].

There is still a great deal of ambiguities and questions concerning this term that is frequently used in the area of thought, meaning, arts, and philosophy. Littré French dictionary offers three meanings for the ‘deconstruction’: the first one refers to its grammatical term, that is, “carry out a deconstruction, to deconstruct lines of poetry, suppressing meter so as to make them similar to prose”; the second refers to “disassemble the parts of a whole, deconstruct a machine so as to transport it elsewhere”. But the meaning that receives the most attention is “to deconstruct oneself, to lose one's structure”. ‘Modern erudition attests that, in a region of the ancient Orient, a language that had reached its perfection had deconstructed and deformed itself by the sole law of change, a law natural to the human mind’ [18].

Of all the movements, currents, themes, and figures in French thought of the twentieth century, the bibliographies will one day show that deconstruction was the term that solicited the greatest variety of attempts at description and definition. It also produced the most frustration, as it is increasingly clear that in every case such attempts fail to achieve their goal. The failure is built-in to the extent that, even in French, the very word deconstruction already belongs to more than just one language, thus making impossible any effort at adequately delimiting a clear and univocal meaning. Ceaselessly translating a language of metaphysical tradition into the unruly rhetorical and extra rhetorical strategies of textual practice, deconstruction is a name for what can always disrupt our understanding of every concept and every name, including those that serve to define and relate philosophy to literature, theory to practice, knowledge to act, and consequently, thought to history [19].

Although neither the German philosopher Martin Heidegger nor the French poet Stéphane Mallarmé ever wrote the word deconstruction as such in their own language, it would not be overly abusive to suggest that the possibility of deconstruction is in some measure the possibility of reading together the traces their writing has left in and beyond the twenties century. A helpful, if complex, starting point is provided by someone who did write the word deconstruction: Jacques Derrida, whose own writings have been hyperbolically attentive to the existence and survival of both Heidegger and Mallarmé [19].

One major concept, the one by which Derrida's thought will often be designated, also appears in the article: that of deconstruction. It is in his "Letter to a Japanese Friend"—a friend who could not find a satisfactory equivalent in his own language—that Derrida gave the clearest explanation for his choice of word [18]:

When I chose this word, or when it imposed itself upon me ... I little thought it would be credited with such a central role in the discourse that interested me at the time. Among other things I wished to translate and adapt to my own ends the Heideggerian words *Destruktion* or *Abbau*. Both words signified in this context an operation bearing on the structure or traditional architecture of the fundamental concepts of ontology or of Western metaphysics. But in French the term "destruction" too obviously implied an annihilation or a negative reduction much closer perhaps to Nietzschean "demolition" than to the Heideggerian interpretation or to the type of reading I was proposing. So I ruled that out. I remember having looked to see if the word *déconstruction* (which came to me it seemed quite spontaneously) was good French. I found it in Littré. The grammatical, linguistic, or rhetorical senses [portées] were, I found, bound up with a "mechanical" sense [portée "machinique"]. This association appeared very fortunate ... [18]

If we are to think at all seriously about deconstruction, Jacques Derrida seems to suggest by first attempting to set it apart from what it is not and what it does not mean, then we will have to become attentive to how exactly it would have to occur in ways that differ from all those things that seem already

familiar to our thought. This would be true even, and especially, if we were not thinking anything at all. Because whatever deconstruction names can happen neither as a theory nor a philosophy, neither as a school nor as method, nor as a discourse, an act, or a practice, it follows that deconstruction will also not be easy for us to think or talk about, to define and therefore translate and recognize, in the terms that have far so long served to organize our thinking about almost everything. It will therefore also have to defer, or postpone for an indeterminate period of time and space, simple recourse to such familiar patterns of thought, speech, and action [19].

D. Deconstruction Architecture

On the 25th anniversary of the exhibition, MoMA curator hosted *Deconstructivism: Retrospective Views and Actuality*, "an informal conversation and reflection on the seminal show" with Eisenman, Tschumi, and Mark Wigley. This recent event prompted *World-Architects* to take a look back at *Deconstructivist Architecture* and trace the subsequent careers of the seven architects to examine the impact of the show and the changes in architecture in the last 25 years. *Deconstructivist Architecture* was displayed in three galleries at MoMA from June 23 to August 30, 1988, five decades after the influential *International Exhibition of Modern Architecture of 1932* [20].

Deconstruction movement can be conceived as a meta-phenomenological and meta-structural trend. Diverse definitions for deconstruction have been provided so far as follows: long-lasting aberrance, skepticism and irrationalism, pseudo-transcendence, polemics of the philosophical tradition of the West, dangerous Neo-Heideggerian. There are some others who recognize deconstruction as a critique of the criticism or as addressing what has been neglected by criticism. That being said, it does not seem plausible to specifically define deconstruction because deconstruction does not inherently lend itself to logic, limitation, and definition. In the realm of arts and architecture, deconstruction can establish any type of solid construct. The construct and cultural, political, economic and educational foundations can also be exposed to such a stratagem. Derrida added that deconstruction can be regarded as an architectural metaphor. It is self-evident that it should not be applied with focus on its literal meaning. He went on to claim that by deconstruction does not allude to the demolition of a building, but it should be considered as a form of questioning the pattern and architectural plan. Likewise, in philosophy, there is an attempt to question the foundation, premises, principles and frameworks. Deconstruction finds architecture the perfect place to demonstrate itself. It seems that Derrida's polemics of the fundamental realities of architecture is as important as his attack on the prime realities of philosophy. Deconstructing a program, form, or construct denotes that there is nothing absolute in architecture. Thus, in architecture, there is no room for existentialism and theology.

Eisenman, the famous deconstruction architect, in his projects endeavored to work within the binary oppositions of traditional architecture like landscape versus architecture,

interior versus exterior, center versus margin, product versus process, and stability versus instability. Buildings, writings, and ideas of Eisenman all have a relentless force and seem to be intertwined with each other to interestingly show the real progress. In fact, a new anti-architecture that to some extent is a text as well as a building and a model [21]. In total, Eisenman's architecture is trying to stimulate imagination, perception and acceptance of exotics to create a new place and bring architecture and philosophy together. His metaphorical architecture has a hermeneutic aspect as well [22].

The impact of deconstruction theory on Peter Eisenman's works can be clearly traced in the Wexner Center for the Visual Arts at Ohio State University in Columbus. He had spent the better part of his career distilling architectural form down to a theoretical science. It was with tremendous anticipation that this building, the first major public work of Eisenman's career, opened in 1989. For some, it heralded a validation of deconstructivism and theory, while its problems provided ammunition for others who saw theory and practice as complimentary but ultimately divergent pursuits. The building's popular reception has been equally mixed, but its influence and intrigue in the academic community is as pronounced and unmistakable as the design itself. Located on the eastern edge of The Ohio State University's campus, the Wexner Center was built to accommodate a multidisciplinary space for the exploration and exhibition of contemporary art [23].

This project as the first prominent building of deconstruction appears as an outstanding work and reflects deconstructivist ideas in architecture that can be summarized as follows:

1. The controlled chaos view and unpredictable turbulent perspective that attract the attention of visitors to the center as an innovative and fresh movement;
2. Focus on empty, rigid and transparent spaces through form with the help of columns, frameworks, and scaffolding that manifests the architect's willingness to indicate that the project is still unfinished. It also serves as a connection between the past and future;
3. Use of old foundations in the site related to Military College and their physical reading in the form of portal and entrance of the building that represents the attention to the memory of the site as part of the design process-oriented trend and a tendency to constant innovation of life stream with respect to the past;
4. Dichotomy view between two grids and two groups of people, artists and ordinary people by creating a gap between two buildings on the basis of collision of the urban grids of the city of Columbus and of the university;
5. The innovative and fresh design of the interior with building misplaced walls and suspended prisms hanging from the ceiling that suggests a different feeling or emotion in users;
6. The latent strategy in geometry of the building to convert architecture into a unique language that communicates disorders in the modern world, human incapability and knowledge variations.



Fig. 1 Wexner Center for the Arts

Another architect that is deeply influenced by deconstruction is Bernard Tschumi. Based on Bernard Tschumi, it is time to dispose of postmodernist ideas and be superseded by post-humanist architecture ideas. In this type of architecture, the theme is dispersed and loses its concentration. Based on what has been laid down by Tschumi, in these discrete architectural works, there are three common aspects:

1. To discard the idea of integrating and synthesizing the components and to substitute it with the idea of dismantling and analyzing them separately;
2. To reject the idea of the existence of conflicts between performance and the form of architecture and replacing, merging, and juxtaposing these two qualities with it;
3. To stress plans that are developed based on a particular method as well as emphasize that the components should be dismantled, juxtaposed, and combined afresh to weaken the role of disconnections and extend itself to all architectural systems.

When Tschumi first met Jacques Derrida in order to try to convince him to confront Derrida's work with architecture, Derrida asked him, "But how could an architect be interested in deconstruction? After all, deconstruction is anti-form, anti-hierarchy, anti-structure, the opposite of all that architecture stands for." "Precisely for this reason many architects have been fascinated by deconstruction," Tschumi replied [3].

As years went by, the multiple interpretation that multiple architects gave to deconstruction became more multiple than deconstruction's theory of multiple reading could ever have hoped. For one architect it had to do with dissimulation, for another, with fragmentation, for yet another, with displacement. Again to quote Nietzsche (1844–1900) [24]: "There are no facts, only an infinity of interpretation" [3].

The modern deconstructivist mainstream came into being. It disrupts the comprehensiveness and integrity of architecture and from among architecture fundamentals, it opts for forms, that is, abstract forms that are developed in the mind of an architect that avoids established rules and principles and has nothing else to resort to. The impetus for the design of such edifices is neither nature nor functional beauty of the machine, nor pure Euclidean forms, nor the history and the past but any stimulating thing that is capable of shaping an idea.

Although deconstructivists merely consider architecture as an artistic phenomenon, they cast aside factors such as balance, unity, proportions and alike that are artistic criteria of

architecture because they seek out to replace their own criteria with them. For example, deconstructivist architects disturb both the balance of form and artistic balance; indeed, balance in their works grows out of imbalance. Impurities or balance of imbalance enjoys its own dynamism and movement that invigorates architecture. Such vitality and vivacity springs from characteristics of our time and is in accordance with contemporary philosophers' ideas.

In deconstructivist architecture, form is being disturbed on the inside and turn into chaos. Or as its critics exemplified, a kind of parasite eats the form from within and disrupts its order. But killing the parasite does not equate with killing the form because form and parasites create a living thing and a being. The result of such a change or internal deviation, as deconstructivist theorists believe, is that the obtained forms appear natural despite all the irregularities and disruptions. In other words, one can specify disruption, transposition, deviation, and inclination as characteristics of this type of architecture. Qualities such as demolition, detachment, corruption and discontinuity implied by deconstruction should be abstracted from it. This type of architecture transposes the form without tearing it down.

Parc De La Villette, designed by Bernard Tschumi in 1982, one of the biggest parks in the northeastern part of Paris, is sited in a working class, semi-industrial district on the edge of the suburbs, also segmented by two canals. For Tschumi, Parc De La Villette was not meant to be a picturesque park reminiscent of centuries past; it was more of an open expanse that was meant to be explored and discovered by those that visited the site. Tschumi, wanted the park to be a space for activity and interaction that would evoke a sense of freedom within a superimposed organization that would give the visitors points of reference. As part of Tschumi's overall goal to induce exploration, movement, and interaction, he scattered 10 themed gardens throughout the large expansive site that people would stumble upon either quite literally or ambiguously. Each themed garden gives the visitors a chance to relax, meditate, and even play [25].

Parc De La Villette is a new urban form in which program, form and ideology are juxtaposed. The entire elements are arranged in a way that the visitor is not already not habituated to. With regard to the design of this park, viewed as one of the conspicuous instances of deconstruction architecture, we can refer to the following points:

1. Lack of stability in design context and openness of park context for transformation that considers time, movement, and historical changes;
2. The presence of striking colors that creates the sense of dynamism and variation in the environment and a turning point for prompting discovery, movement, and interaction among visitors;
3. Space decentralization that creates a different spatial experience and at the same time the multiplicity and diversity of architectural elements. The combination of oppositions between division and unity, madness and wisdom indicate the elements of deconstruction architecture;

4. Using three classifications of points, lines, and surfaces, lines of a set of paths, points created by broken grids and collage surfaces of certain figures as red follies that are complete in their own interior but collide with each other and are joined together. This superposition leads to transformations and collisions that represent the sense of attempt and tension in the place and calls into question the fundamental concepts of architecture such as chronological account of construction, hierarchy and order. It also brings about an unusual order that allows for sense of freedom within superimposed organization;
5. Use of semi-detached and semi-attached units to attend to various functions like music hall, sports place, and workshop auditorium, etc. that helps decentralization of elements and development of any plan in the future without devastating the master plan.



Fig. 2 Parc De La Villette

III. ANALYSIS

The purpose of the current research is to analyze and employ a different approach to creating an artistic edifice along with creativity, which challenges all institutions and social, political, cultural, and artistic structures. With respect to latent and neglected aspects, this approach sets out to formulate a diverse and more efficient future for space, so that it can encourage people to keep visiting a building and attract the attention of visitors to this architectural edifice not as a routine, but in the form of a movement and act that is new and innovative. Therefore, this design seeks out to create a space that is creative, relative and is in the process of becoming. Whether it is in the process of creation or after it has been stabilized in the environment, it is amenable to change and is recyclable in different time periods. In its course full of upheavals and events, it gets disengaged from the absolute past concepts and connects to the unknown realms of the future.

The question here is how to establish an appropriate connection between the architectural edifice and its users to surpass the time frameworks and limits. In this regard, first of all, it is attempted to express sense of place and the user's connection to the cultural edifice.

Sense of place refers to people's perception of environment and their somewhat conscious sensations of the surrounding environment that places a person in an internal connection

with the environment, so that the person's understanding and emotions are intertwined and integrated with semantic background of the environment. Such a sense serves as a factor that turns space into a place with emotional and behavioral characteristics specific to a specific person. It is often used in relation to those characteristics that make a place special or unique, as well as to those that foster a sense of authentic human attachment and belonging. Sense of place not only brings about a sense of relaxation concerning an environment but also supports the cultural concepts, social and cultural relationships in a community in a specific place, refreshes the previous experiences, and helps individuals achieve an identity.

With the advance of human societies and change in people's lifestyles and residence, architects, planners, and designers are increasingly paying attention to the quality of spaces and the constructed environment. In the same vein, the function of design as an instrument to shape the living environment and respond to human expectations and needs has become more important. Many research has been carried out to explore the mutual impact of environment or constructed space on people's mentality and behaviors. The researches indicate that in addition to physical elements, the environment is composed of messages, meanings, and mysteries that people try to decode, understand and evaluate based on their roles, expectations, motives, and so forth. Sense of place serves a significant role in coordinating people with the environment and contributes to better use of the environment, users' satisfaction, and ultimately their sense of belonging to the environment and their incessant presence in that place. Although a variety of meanings have been offered for place and space, the characteristic of place is more specific than space; besides, place is more interwoven with human values. In relation to place, the space distinctive characteristic is its subjectivity and objectivity. Individual and collective values impact upon sense of place; meanwhile, sense of place exerts an influence on values, attitudes, and in particular individual and collective behaviors. People usually take part in social activities with respect to their sense of place. Since sense of place is not a recognized concept, it is not possible to offer an accurate definition of it; rather, it should be assessed and evaluated by using a test measuring the relationship between place and phenomenological bases of geography [26].

Additionally, this research intends to create a creative and public space, because the metropolitan city lacks a flexible and open space. That space should be capable of establishing a deep bond with the background and the surrounding context and capturing the interest of every passer-by.

A public arena is an area shared by a city's dwellers; in other words, it belongs to all people living in a city and everyone has access to it. It has been provided by the central or local government. Therefore, it is not a limited entity; nor is it confined to a specific group of people; people's presence grants meaning to it. Dynamism available in the public arena creates incentives in the participants to explore and revisit that place and perceive its qualities and inherent realities of space and they can grasp the unspoken of space. This process or the

dialectic between the text (architecture body) and the mental world of the reader results in generating meaning in the reader's mind. A visitor to a public place constantly reviews space and discerns tips and hidden features. S/he comes up with the quality of boundless space that is persistently evolving and in the process of becoming. Consequently, frequently reflecting and revisiting space drives architecture out of being product-oriented and directs it toward an endless process. This idea is derived from the notion of Christian Norberg Schulz [27] about spirit of place; it is the confrontation between man and a place that he has to encounter.

If space is thoroughly designed and kept flexible to change whenever needed, such a space can yield a sort of impetus that its users seek for. It can also enhance communications and motivation and reinforce sense of participation. Similarly, it can set up conditions for the proper use of space by allowing users to share space, instruments, and other sources. Hence, design of a space with adherence to behavioral sciences and environmental psychology has a significant impact on the level of creativity and thinking skills. Certain types of space promote special skills in its users; it, in turn, leads to their constant presence in that space. On the other hand, this paper seeks out to examine the prevalent architectural structure and establish basic and absolute principles to express a new concern in architecture so that we can transcend the time boundaries with the help of it. Accordingly, if we seek for a change in the framework of intellectual principles of users of an edifice, we have to change up the form of architecture because architecture as other cultural forms dominate mental processes and reflects disparate thinking patterns [28].

In the recent ten years, with the advent of Derrida's thoughts and post-structuralism and the influence of a few of critics, architecture called its own nature into question. This has led to the emergence of a movement called "deconstructivism". Despite the fact that this movement has had a significant impact on the academic areas of architecture, it was not warmly embraced by architecture theorists. They believe that architecture still has a sort of physical presence that is not consistent with the philosophy inspired by Derrida's discourse. On the other hand, many of artists and art critics maintain that Derrida's idea has had remarkable effects mainly on architecture, music, and visualization arts. Such great effects have made him an admirable person while his method and strenuous philosophy has made him a controversial figure. By criticizing philosophy, he casted doubt on the boundaries between literature and philosophy [29].

Despite their differences, the common characteristics of deconstruction architects like Peter Eisenman, Zaha Hadid, Bernard Tschumi is non-conventional nature of architecture that they were habituated to. That is why deconstruction architecture more than anything else is the suspension of the text of structuralism architecture. Architecture should find out, in today's conditions, the utopia that modernists are looking for in the future and postmodernists in the past [30]. Architecture ought to avoid the rigidity of the structural values of established binary oppositions like structure versus

ornament, abstraction versus figuration, and form versus function. Architecture can explore within these qualities. Therefore, deconstruction brings about a disorder in architecture at the level of implications; to do so, it employs a difference strategy. By using this strategy, a difference in meaning is developed and that meaning distances itself from the expected and standard definition [31]. To provide the conditions mentioned above, the preceding laws of architecture should be disrupted. Since these laws are conventional rather than natural, it is possible to disrupt them. Facts and symbols of the past should be split apart or deconstructed and new concepts need to be elicited from them in accordance with today's conditions. Peter Eisenman does not believe in architecture; nor does he even envisage an aesthetic purpose for it. Rather, he seeks out to display some relationships between forms. Even factors such as construct, beams and columns are a function of the relationships of form. He identifies all relationships of form within a network of beams and columns. In this spatial system, the column might not just bear a weight and has only a share in his signification. In fact, the procedure is to determine the form and the result is "building". Of Eisenman's architectural features, as Jenkins said, is dysfunctionality. As a matter of fact, Peter Eisenman intends to set the construct factors in a state of disequilibrium in his works to explore fresh equilibriums. Like Derrida, he asserts that it is better to throw away binary oppositions (oppositions between structure versus ornament, experientialism versus figuration, and form versus function). If we cast aside these binary oppositions, it does not mean that we will lose all known rules of architecture. Rather, when these rules are explored, meaning is negotiated [32].

In regard with this architecture style, Bernard Tschumi, one of the leading figures of deconstruction architecture, proposed 'break' or 'discrete'. This architecture style disrupts architectural hypotheses about system. This system also avoids composition and the least coherence is obtained through it. Tschumi encourages a type of architecture that involves ideas, forms, elements, etc. of cinematic, literature and other cultural fields. It is worth mentioning here that this architecture style is not functionalist [29].

In Tschumi's opinion, deconstruction involves not only the analysis of concepts in the most critical way but also these analyses per se are used to question what these concepts and their history have concealed. In this regard, Derrida has asserted that one cannot simply put aside values such as housing, function, aesthetics, etc. He added that a new space and figure should be made. In addition, negotiations should be made around creating a new way for the building wherein values are renewed and in this way their precedence or their external dominance is negated [30]. Tschumi is in favor of an architectural text that is potentially unlimited, not as it is the case with traditional systems and types. Rather, an architectural text that is in touch and conflict with their systematic limits [33].

Today's architecture approach is not interested in describing the differences and confrontations existing in the site and form, but at the end of the twentieth century, the

architect would turn again to issues like making correspondence between conflicting and different objectives (postmodernism) and the integrity with a fresh structure (goals of modernism). He added that architecture is not about the conditions of design, but about the design of conditions that will dislocate the most traditional and regressive aspects of our society and simultaneously reorganize these elements in the most liberating way, where our experience becomes the experience of events organized and strategized through architecture.

IV. CONCLUSION

From Derrida's and other metaphysics deconstructivists' perspective, presence is the same belief in the presence of content and meaning behind each sign, a text, or an utterance, or an art work. Derrida is not concerned with reading between the lines or appreciating the connotations of a text; rather, he believes, "There is nothing outside the text". Any text is being deconstructed in the process of reading, that is, its essence and "utterance-oriented" and metaphysical realm is being dissected. The process of searching for meaning does not amount to the presence of meaning at all. In the course of reading a text, numerous meanings are being created, that in turn denies the existence of the univocal meaning. Deconstruction is not a concept, but an action. Of the most important achievements of critical approach of deconstruction to philosophy and western metaphysics is to unveil and challenge the dominance of established presuppositions, binary hierarchical oppositions, and logo centrism of ideas and their history. They have also been a central issue of concern to deconstructivists while dealing with western architecture and painting. Therefore, deconstruction architects in their new works do not attempt to denote complexity with unity and opposition, but intermingle complexity and diversity in a soft and flexible manner. This would not eliminate the differences; nor does it create a homogeneous and integrated phenomenon. Rather, these factors and forces are interwoven in a soft and flexible manner and the private identity of each of these factors is eventually preserved. This is the case with internal layers of the earth that are transformed under the external pressure; meanwhile, they conserve their own properties. Deconstruction theory perceives the world as a milieu of differences and shape these contradictions in architecture. This contradictory logic is beginning to soften to exploit more fully the particularities of urban and cultural contexts. They display incoordination within a project in the building and site and this is the onset of their project. But now they do not illustrate these differences in opposition; rather, they intermingle them in a flexible fashion and follow a fluid and relevant logic. If in the past the complexity and contradiction came from the heart of a project, currently the particularities of the place, materials and programs are being imbricated over each other flexibly while the unique identity is preserved. At present, these architects attempt to represent their assumptions, human knowledge of themselves and their surrounding environment in bodily form. They maintain that such knowledge is acquired only through science, technology, and philosophy. That is why

if architects are inclined to fulfill their role in human civilization, they should be fully familiar with updated science, technology and philosophy so that they can use them to display the built environment in a creative and artistic manner. In addition, the latest developments in fundamental particle physics, astronomy, mathematics, evolutionary mathematics, genetics, space and time in recent years serve as the theme of a new school of architecture. Based on new assumptions in mathematics and physics, the world of Newtonian mechanics cannot elaborate today's world conditions. Based on these views, our world is composed of infinite space-time frames, depending on a specific observer. As a result, any observer and frame is located not only in a different time but in a different place. At present and in the modern world, it seems that defamiliarization mainstream in architecture which began at the outset of the twentieth century with disrupting the classical image of the eighteenth century is increasingly receiving attention. Moreover, technological tools to create and represent innovative and incongruous architectural spaces are highly effective in accelerating this process. Meanwhile, raising the awareness of the audience can play a determining role in appreciation of architecture and exploration of its hidden aspects.

Following discussions in the first half of the 20th century, the mechanical world of the 19th century has turned into an organic world. In this organic world, space, time and objects are in an ever-changing, fluid, active state. They are engaged with each other and have a non-linear relationship. Design and creation is carried out in the same way that is happening on a larger scale in the universe. Today's world is characterized not as a methodical system but a synthesis of order and disorder. Architecture in the new world, like the world itself, is creative, self-regulatory, self-modifying, unpredictable.

Most of the deconstruction architects of the mid-1980's predicated their theoretical foundations on the issues recently discussed. Architects such as Peter Eisenman, Frank Gehry and Daniel Libeskind have implemented the trend of emergence, transformation, and evolution in their architectural designs. In their buildings, the process of design and emergence is done in the same way that transpires on a larger scale in the universe.

REFERENCES

- [1] J. Derrida, "Point de folie – Maintenant l'architecture: Essays accompanying the portfolio Bernard Tschumi, La Case Vide: La Villette 1985", Architectural Association, London, 1986.
- [2] A. Read, "Architecturally Speaking: Practices of Art, Architecture and the Everyday", Routledge, London, PP.175-176, 2002.
- [3] B. Tschumi, "Architecture and Disjunction: Collected Essays 1975-1990", MIT Press, London, 1994.
- [4] W. Benjamin, "The Work of Art in the Age of Mechanical Reproduction", 1936.
- [5] B. Tschumi, "Six Concepts: Excerpt from Architecture and Disjunction", Retrieved from <http://workgroups.clemson.edu/>, PP.5-6, 2015.
- [6] M. Foucault, "The Archaeology of Knowledge", Routledge, 2002.
- [7] G. Deleuze, "Expressionism in Philosophy: Spinoza", MIT Press, 1990.
- [8] J. Hillier, P. Healey, "The Ashgate Research Companion to Planning Theory: Conceptual Challenges for Spatial Planning", Ashgate Publishing, Ltd., p.24, 2010.
- [9] D. Nettle, "Strong Imagination: Madness, Creativity, and Human Nature", Oxford University Press, Oxford, England, 2001.
- [10] A. Toynbee, "Is America Neglecting her Creativity Minority? In C.W.Taylor (Ed.), Widening Horizons in Creativity: The Proceeding of the Fifth Utah Creativity Research Conference", Wiley, New York, pp.3-9, 1964.
- [11] M.A. Runco, "Creativity", Annual Review of Psychology, Vol.55, PP.657-687, 2004.
- [12] M. Batey, A. Furnham, "Creativity, Intelligence, and Personality: A Critical Review of the Scattered Literature", Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs, 2006.
- [13] R. E. Franken, "Human Motivation", 3rd Edition, P.396, 1994.
- [14] R.A. Prentky, "Mental Illness and Roots of Genius", Creativity Research Journal, Vol.13, P.97, 2001.
- [15] H.B. Parkhurst, "Confusion, Lack of Consensus, and the Definition of Creativity as a Construct", Journal of Creative Behavior, Vol.33. PP.1-21, 1999.
- [16] M. Rhodes, "An Analysis of Creativity. In S. G. Isaksen (Ed.)", Frontiers of Creativity Research: Beyond the Basics, Buffalo, NY: Bearly, PP.216-222, 1987. (Original work published 1961)
- [17] M. Webster, "Merriam-Webster's Collegiate Dictionary: Eleventh Edition", P.323, 2004.
- [18] B. Peeters, "Derrida: A Biography", John Wiley & Sons Publisher, 2013.
- [19] L.D. Kritzman, B. J. Reilly, M. B. DeBevoise, "The Columbia History of Twentieth-century French Thought", Columbia University Press, 2007.
- [20] J. Hill, "Deconstructivist Architecture, 25 Years Later", Retrieved from <http://www.world-architects.com/pages/insight/deconstructivist-architecture-25>, 2013.
- [21] A. Bani Masoud, "Postmodernism and Architecture", Tehran: Khak Publications, 1999.
- [22] M. Dehghani, "Peter Eisenman and Philosophical Architecture", Retrieved from Etoood Website, 2012.
- [23] D. Longdon, "Wexner Center for the Arts / Peter Eisenman", Retrieved from <http://www.archdaily.com/557986/ad-classics-wexner-center-for-the-arts-peter-eisenman>, 2014.
- [24] F. Nietzsche, "Notebook", Summer 1886-Fall 1887.
- [25] E. Souza, "Parc De La Villette / Bernard Tschumi", Retrieved from <http://www.archdaily.com/92321/ad-classics-parc-de-la-villette-bernard-tschumi>, 2011.
- [26] M. Falahat, "The Concept of Sense of Place and the Factors Shaping it", Fine Arts Journal, 2006.
- [27] C. Norberg Schulz, "Genius loci: towards a phenomenology of architecture", Academy Editions, 1980.
- [28] Y. Shariatzadeh, "Balance Between Tradition and Innovation", Abadi Magazine, Fifth Year, Vol.19, pp. 64-67, 1995.
- [29] J. Collins, "Derrida for Beginners", Icon Books Publications, 1996.
- [30] V. Ghobadian, "Principles and Concepts of Contemporary West Architecture", Sixth Edition, Tehran: Cultural Research Bureau, p.144, 2007.
- [31] R. Eghbali, "Origins of Deconstructivism in Philosophy, Art and Architecture", Fine Arts Journal, Vol.30, p.66, 2007.
- [32] B. Ahmadi, "Reality and Beauty", 14th Edition, Tehran: Markaze Nashr, p.27, 2007.
- [33] K. Nesbitt, "Theorizing New Agenda for Architecture: An Anthology of Architectural Theory 1965 – 1995", Princeton Architectural Press, 1996.

Maryam Memarian was born in Tehran, Iran in 1989. For her bachelor and master degree of Architecture, she went to faculty of Architecture and Urban Design in Qazvin Islamic Azad University in Qazvin, Iran. (2007-2014)

Over the period 2011 to present, she has done some design projects such as: cultural center, Parjak factory and different apartments in Tehran. Her interests include subjects that are related to philosophy of Architecture, Landscape Architecture and photography. She can speak Farsi and English fluently and Arabic basically.

Mahmood Naghizadeh was born in Tehran, Iran in 1967. For his bachelor and master degree of Architecture, he went to faculty of art in Tehran University in Tehran, Iran (1984-1993). Now he is lecturer at the Architecture Department (1997-present), and Head of the Architecture Department (2004-2015), faculty of Architecture and Urban Design, Qazvin Azad University, Iran.

He has been advisor for 30 theses of Architecture Undergraduates, and 20 theses of Architecture Graduate students in Qazvin azad University, faculty of Architecture and Urban Design. In 2008 his book entitled "From Mesgarabad to Khavaran" (Tehran: Nashr-e-af-tab, 2008) was published. Over the period 1992 to present, he has done some design projects such as: cultural center, sport and commercial complex, two 20-storey high-rise building and more than 50 apartments in Tehran and another city in Iran. His interests include subjects that are related to theoretical principles of architecture and relationship among humans, nature and architecture. He can speak Farsi and Turkish (natively) and English fluently and Arabic basically.