

 TAYLOR'S UNIVERSITY Wisdom · Integrity · Excellence		BACHELOR OF SCIENCE (HONOURS) IN ARCHITECTURE THEORIES OF ARCHITECTURE AND URBANISM (ARC61303/ARC2224) SYNOPSIS: REACTION PAPER (AUGUST 2016) [10 MARKS]	
NAME: Ong Ker Sin		ID: 0321719	
LECTURER: Mr. Lam Shen Fei		TUTORIAL TIME: 2-4pm	
SYNOPSIS NO: 2	READER TITLE: Architecture Where Desire Can Live		
	AUTHOR: Jacques Derrida interviewed by Eva Meyer		
<p>Derrida brings up a question about the deconstruction and observes that it “resembles an architectural metaphor”. However, he emphasizes that this is not simply on the techniques of reversed construction, but it is also a “probing” which “touches upon the technique itself, upon the authority of the architectural metaphor and thereby constitutes its own architectural rhetoric”. In my opinion, although deconstruction tears the previous techniques, but its links with architecture are clearly on metaphorical. As we can see, it has distinct application and also acts as a strong conceptual tool in the world of architecture. For example Frank Ghery who is best known for his curvy, metallic wave-form Guggenheim Museum in Bilbao, but it all started with strange application of his concepts to his own traditional house in the late 1970s. He started using different materials and techniques which are few applied in architecture projects whereas the traditional design symbols of the house were reinterpreted as he took a step beyond the playful reworking of postmodern architecture. So, through these ideas of deconstruction, I agree that it “frees oneself from the oppositions imposed by the history”, provides chances and platforms that allow the architects to use the diversity of possibilities of the new technologies without restricting thinking. Hence, the idea of creating a new architectural rhetoric from deconstruction is true whereas the buildings itself will be having their own identity and differ them with the others.</p> <p>Besides, Derrida also calls for a new architecture inventive faculty of “architectural difference”. In my opinion, the techniques applied in deconstruction architecture would create projects that have their own identity which on the other word “self-explanatory”. In this case, the architects are not limited to achieve uniformity or to fit the old circumstances. Instead they would bring out a new type of diversity of designs using different concepts, techniques or materials. This somehow response to Derrida’s statement of “impossibility of absolute objectivation”. I strongly agree with this as we should not only focus on only one point of view and take it as the only and absolute. Especially when we are designing a building, it should be self-representing and gives what is intrinsic in itself. So, we should look at the thing from a diversity of possible points of view in order to design a building with its own identity and originality. As what Derrida mentions in the interview, “the originality of a building is not contained in the sensitive body but in something else”, in a way it’s the own identity of the building that contains the originality itself that makes it different. Hence, architecture must produces “places where desire can recognize itself, where it can live”.</p>			

WORD COUNT	444
Key points (2.5)	
Appropriateness of Terminologies (2.5)	
Clarity in Opinions and Reactions (2.5)	
Logical Progression (2.5)	
DATE:	TOTAL MARK & GRADE
ASSESSSED BY:	

		SYNOPSIS DESCRIPTION	ASSESSMENT RUBRIC		
Grades	Marks	Key points (2.5)	Appropriateness of Terminologies (2.5)	Clarity in Opinions and Reactions (2.5)	Logical Progression (2.5)
A	1.8 2.5	- Evidence of outstanding understanding of Key points through clear explanation	Appropriate use of Terminologies In discussing the Issues/ Concepts/Theories	Outstanding Clarity in opinions and reactions - Supported with strong Logical explanation	Outstanding Articulation of logical expressions ending with well-developed paragraphs
B	1.5 1.79	- Evidence of understanding of Key points through reasonable explanation	Reasonable use of Terminologies In discussing the Issues/ Concepts/Theories with Minor unfamiliarity	Reasonable clarity in opinions and reactions - Supported with Logical explanation	Reasonable Articulation of logical expressions ending with well-developed paragraphs
C	1.25 1.49	- Evidence of Some Understanding of Key points through acceptable explanation	Acceptable use of Terminologies In discussing the Issues/ Concepts/Theories with Noticeable unfamiliarity	Acceptable Clarity in opinions and reactions - Supported with satisfactory explanation	Acceptable Articulation of logical expressions ending with some ambiguous statements
D	1 1.24	- Evidence of Some Understanding of Key points through not quite acceptable explanation	Evidence of Terminologies however poorly communicated in discussing The Issues/ Concepts/Theories With	Weak Clarity in opinions and reactions - Supported with Lengthy explanation	Poor Articulation of logical expressions ending with noticeable ambiguous statements
F	0 0.99	- Insufficient Evidence of Understanding of Key points through weak explanation	Insufficient Evidence of Terminologies in discussing the Issues/ Concepts/Theories With	Improper opinions and reactions. Not Matching the Issues/ Concepts/ Theories - Inadequate Reasons	Unable to Articulate / illogical expressions. Poorly written synopsis.