



ON SİNAN'S WORK, ON LE CORBUSIER, ON THE TEACHING OF ARCHITECTURE

An Interview with the Renown WILLIAM J.R. CURTIS, in Ankara, METU Faculty of Architecture

On the occasion of Le Corbusier's Centennial of the 'Journey to the East', the famous historian, critic, writer and photographer William J.R.Curtis was in İstanbul. He was invited to Ankara by the METU Faculty of Architecture and its Alumni Association OMİM, to give a lecture. The conference on October the 14th, 2011, titled "Light as An Absence of Shadow: Resonances of Le Corbusier's 'Voyage d'Orient' / Gölgenin Yokluğu olarak Işık: Le Corbusier'nin Doğu Yolculuğu'nun Yankıları", was given by W.J.R. Curtis in the Faculty of Architecture, Auditorium. The Editor of the *METU JFA*, took this an opportunity to invite him for an interview, which was held in the Faculty Building, and lasted one hour and a half the very same day. Three faculty members were invited to join, Jale Erzen, Suna Güven and Cana Bilsel, along with the Editor. The Interview published here for the first time, reveals interesting insights regarding the personal attitude and approach of Curtis to not only history and architecture, but also politics and ethics. The Editor would like to thank William Curtis for his willingness and patience; to Erzen, Güven and Bilsel for their constructive contributions; to Suha Özkan for making both events possible, and to Güliz Korkmaz Tirkeş for transcribing the recording. However, the final form of the text is by the Editor.

William J.R. CURTIS: And also [continuing a discussion, regarding Sinan's work] I must say that in the big pillars, the muqarnas, it is a little bit dead in the Ottoman way.

Jale ERZEN: That's a matter of shadows and...

WJRC: Yes I know, but it doesn't act on me enough. It is the original light in the building. It is very hard to judge with these questions, because we are not really looking at what he intended in these buildings: What he has planned for...

Jale ERZEN: I read a recent article in a Swedish journal of aesthetics about light, and the whole idea of light in the present age that we are lighting everything too much, which kills

light... What the author says about Hagia Sophia is true: When you have so much light, you don't see the light.

WJRC: Totally. I think it is worth a letter to the press about this, because I really think this is a disaster that they overlight Hagia Sophia.

JE: You don't see anymore.

WJRC: You don't see anything.

JE: When you have too much light you don't see anymore. Also the same is true of course with Süleymaniye and many of the mosques. On the external parts they have the window panes closed and half closed, not so much open, for heat and cold and so on. It may be a different atmosphere.

WJRC: Well I'm sure there are lots of things you are not seeing the way they were intended. It is hard to judge, but anyway I don't want to make oversimplified remarks about Sinan.

JE: I want to add something about light... You know Tadao Ando, in one of his interviews, he said 'the soul wants the shadow and body wants the light'.

WJRC: Well, that's nice. Actually you know its Japanese... Yes, there is a book from 1933 or something whose name is Ikigawa, or whoever? Whoever, it prays for shadows. It is about how modernization is destroying Japanese expectation for shadows. I'll find the references. It is quite an old theme in Japanese architecture. Because shadows are a very important part for Japanese interior...

Are we recording this? It is quite interesting.

Ali CENGİZKAN: Yes yes, we are already very excited.

WJRC: Would you like to direct this in anyway?

AC: Thank you for coming first. Thank you for accepting this special interview for the *METU JFA*. This is a great opportunity for us to have an interview with you.

The theme you have already started with Jale is quite interesting in terms of the link of Sinan and Corbusier, and your talk this afternoon.

WJRC: Yes.

AC: So why not proceed from there and you have just mentioned pros and cons of Sinan in a way. Can we have them in a clearer way, or can we hear them again?

WJRC: I can try. I mean I have only seen a handful of Sinan's work in Syria, in Turkey... What are the qualities that really impress me about Süleymaniye, I can say. First of all, its presence in a topography of the city; the power of that gesture? First of all, the platform, but also the power of that silhouette obviously conceived



to be seen from a very very distance and of course in juxtaposition to Hagia Sophia as the anchoring point of the Imperium. There is already the immediate power of silhouette of İstanbul and I am obviously the 25000th of people to admire that, be very interested. The watercolor of Corbusier, so wonderful a capture, a long distance relationship. And coming back and looking at these buildings, the other thing which is so powerful is the spatial action of minarets. Not just vertically, but the way they energize a space on the large scale. They indicate a territory, a bounded domain, which is of the mosque. But they do much more than that. They address urban space, they address Islamic space. They have this amazing capacity when they are grouped in 4, (and especially 6, like in the Blue Mosque) to activate space on a very large scale. And so these are the very big gestures, the silhouettes the cupolas, and the platform. The platform is such an important part of architecture. And then, the way that one experiences the platforms in the mosques... I'll come back to Sinan in a minute.

The Blue Mosque even when I saw it as an 18-year-old, I was astonished by the sequence. Then when we went back in 1977, I photographed that sequence very carefully, because there are in fact a lot of ambiguities of perception with depth. You got a frame view of the fountain structure, and you got the cascading things

above: There is a flattening of the space. You don't know how far things are away. So you are being guided up, like a sub-structure... You come through, there is a framing of it. Then there is in fact a release of the whole panorama of the building. I'm speaking of what's happening second by second. You have to negotiate the ablution structure; you are obliged to do so. There is a tremendous sense of floatation, which is partly a condition of how deep the windows are, how much visual weight there is in these things, but it's also the arcade. So the thing is actually floating on shadows. But when you move around, you begin to grasp the whole external volume, but with an anticipation of the spatial volume. I think in his way that's what Corbusier is talking about in the chapter on mosques in *Vers une Architecture*, where he talks about the soap bubble. He says 'these are the buildings which are like something to have an internal space that comes exactly to what it should be and no more'. So I'm repeating the soap bubble, something intentional. Then you come back to the axis, having been forced off it. You are obliged to move off it, and you rediscover it and then of course you find the new place through. So you are actually given an *enplade* which finishes with *mihrap*, and everything else that you know, and that wall of transparency in the Blue Mosque... Which is nonetheless with this important deviation, which gives you the rotation of the spaces, the reading of the cupolas... This is an

absolute masterpiece of orchestration.

Now, coming back to the frustration a little bit with Süleymaniye is, you are not allowed to use the main entrance at the moment, you always come in at the side entrance. So one would love to see what happens exactly with your eyes as you go through. Because, obviously there is the other issue, which is the big gate motif, which I don't know the iconography the way you do, but I imagine it is the throne of Süleyman, this thing with the two pieces, it seems to me it is an appropriation of the Byzantine iconography.... Salomon's throne, which is Süleyman's throne.

JE: It is a rhythm.

WJRC: Precisely, it built in sublimely, into this experience. Without this whole sequence going into the Süleyman mosque, it's very hard to judge that, because you are obliged to come from the side. So coming back to Süleymaniye I was looking very very carefully at the things that I really feel work for me personally, beautifully, and the things that don't quite work so well. Now one of the problems, you see I see these things as almost 'problem types' in the history of architecture. In the sense that the 'Renaissance *cortile*'; once it begins, one of the problem types is [the question of] how you do the corner.

JE: There you have a problem.

WJRC: It is very difficult how to do it. And then Bramante has one idea, and someone else has an idea, so and so forth. And they go back to Sangallo, they go back to Brunelleschi... In the evolution of the system of architecture which Sinan sets in place, there are almost a series of moves, which I wouldn't say codified, but they are the 'problem types'. And one of them is 'how you make a minaret meet the volume of the building'. And I really salute the way this happens in the Blue Mosque. Because the integrity of the minaret and the power of the volume of the wall are both maintained in great tension. Are you listening, Sinan, sorry excuse me, with all reverence! The way the wall meets the minarets, it eats into them rather a lot in Süleymaniye, it slightly kills

off the base of the minarets. And at the same time it slightly kills off the wall. Now you could say bravo he did it at all, because he is still inventing a system at that point. Now I haven't taken my time to go around and see Sinan's later mosques, I don't know whether he thought about...

JE: In Edirne he solved the problem.

WJRC: OK, then you are telling me, I have never been to Edirne. Then he makes more force out of the minarets.

JE: And of course the problem of the corner in the *cortile* in the courtyard, everybody is aware of that. But we have a way of justifying things...

WJRC: Yes, but be careful with these justifications.

JE: In Muslim architecture, in Muslim art, we always do something, or distort something...

WJRC: I don't buy it!

JE: I don't buy it either.

WJRC: No, no. No, Sinan is a great classicist.

JE: This is why and how we are having things off-centered.

WJRC: Oh, that's another question, that's another discussion. But these I mean, you are asking me, my reaction. What I react with I said today at the lecture, with complete joy... Well of course [it is] the hierarchy, the way he establishes the grammar for the school of ceramics and school and the other lower buildings; all using the same language but diminishing, varying... This is just masterpiece, the *ensemble*, which shows in the Corbusier drawing, using the *cupola* with definite intensity, the silhouettes of the *cupolas* are marvelous, you know these shapes. And I love the low wall with the grilled windows, where you see the light of the street going by; or you are looking out in, this is so beautiful including the cemetery at the side. And then this other side, which is in restoration, I mustn't go; I said, yes I have to go, excuse me... I went, which is where that low wall is, the parapet, and the view, which is immediately

across... This is a response of the site within the site, to the exterior of the site responding to the fabric you saw it as a great monument. Now you experience it as a panorama of the city. The realm! It's all about the realm at that point. It is not just the Bosphorus, it's the realm; this new order.

And so this building, to me touches so many incredible issues. But of course, in itself it refers back to all the time between Hagia Sophia, it competes with Hagia Sophia one would imagine. But if we are looking again at Hagia Sophia and thinking about it, Hagia Sophia is also competing with the Patriarch in Rome, and it's competing with the basilicas, it's a fusion of the basilica type, I suppose, and a more centralized type. Part of the drama of this building is that, the way these two basic ideas are resolved in tension everywhere, between the longitudinal and then this, and then with these ambiguous spaces all around, the Byzantine mysterious spaces, if you like. So the power of Sinan is of course to reactivate that tradition, as a distance of thousand years and this is really something, this is a marvelous thing. But as an individual work, there is a little bit of dryness in the expression here and there, but even the meeting of the side gallery with the main façade, all a hundred percent, but look...

JE: You mean the courtyard?

WJRC: No. On the side entrance, where you go in there is a long gallery space, jammed into the building. It doesn't at all meet..., yes... But you see, it's a building which is such a breakthrough building. You don't expect complete resolution. He is discovering the parts and the system at the same time in that building pretty well. I mean, so it is time to refine those things. Maybe if he was here he'd say, 'I guess Mr. Curtis I agree, but I saw that in Edirne ... so just stop it'...

JE: He is always moving on, he is trying a new structural system, so you see the progression of his work from his earlier work, the Şehzade for example, which is a perfect symmetrical building, and then you have Süleymaniye, which could



have been solved better if he had stuck to the first idea, for example. So he is always moving forward and after 1570s, he is doing really outrageously courageous things with his architecture, because he has to work in very small scale and create monumentality in situations, urban situations, where the site is very cramped. So he is using the wall system again. He goes back to the Byzantine system. But in spite of that, he is like Picasso in a way. He is always trying something new and he takes chances in the appearance of buildings for new structural solutions. So when you look at Sinan, it is I think important to see the very fine details. Because if you want to judge him only on the prime scale of his success with structure and form, then you will have problems because he is really trying new things, he is really innovative each time. You see... And he is pushed to innovate, because the whole urban situation changes in İstanbul in the 16th century, and he worked about 50 years. So your very sensitive perception of the very fine details, I think is very important.

WJRC: He establishes into the sea, within monumentality. This is really something.

JE: Also, on the molding...

WJRC: Yes, the famous moldings that he did.

JE: So classical, because the curvature on each molding moves, the angle moves according to the central You don't have that sensitivity in the Blue Mosque; for example, where these huge pillars like elephant feet. Whereas with Sinan, you always have a delicate, a kind of passage from this [huge mass] to the floor.

WJRC: Blue Mosque, inside, it is hard to imagine the same architect

in the outside. The outside is so sophisticated. Rather crude things happen with pillars as you say. Everything comes down through pillars, the lack of tectonic clarity in a way. No, I understand, I mean I do think, I must say, I wanted to ask someone who would know and you would know, he must have constructed quite large scale models, Sinan and his office.

JE: We don't know exactly, but we think so, because in Sinan's memoirs he says that he presented for Selimiye. He presented a model for Selimiye, but we don't know if the model means drawing, or a real model. But I'm sure they must have had models. Because why, because in one of the festivities, if you know the miniatures, we see the craftsmen carrying a model of Süleymaniye, the architect's studio. So if they can do that for a festivity, I am sure that they were able to do this model for a study. He also says 'I presented a model of Selimiye to Selim II'. The reason why we are not sure, and the great scholar Gülru Necipoğlu from Harvard, she is very well informed on the period. She said we can't be sure how to translate this Ottoman word, whether it is an image of a three dimensional thing, or whether it is a drawing.

WJRC: So there is a real problem of what the document means, in translation. That is very interesting. Speaking of Gülru, this is very also so much autobiography, excuse me. I taught at Harvard between 1976 and 1982, half years, teaching in the Carpenter Center of the Visual Arts, which is a Corbusier building. It was an undergraduate department and our responsibilities were visual education, I was a historian but some of the courses I gave were things which very general courses on perception, on meaning, and things like this. And I gave one course that was called "Towards an integrated theory of design" which was basic concepts of architecture; not just architecture, but objects, even landscape. Which was thinking about form, about meaning, about types, about this about that... But I would illustrate it with many examples each time. The students would refer to it as "Around the world in 80 ways". You know,

when I came back from another trip, I would change my slides. And they all remembered, I had a distinction between a lecture which was called "experiencing architecture", and another lecture about the "analysis of perception and form". I deliberately kept these two notions apart. And the experience of architecture had several great sequences, and one of them was on Acropolis, moving through the Propylea, the zigzags, this and that. The other was the Blue Mosque sequence, which I just described... Of course I had some modern ones too, not the least the Carpenter center itself. Walk through it and see what you see! What's happening to every ten feet, you must get into that. On the other hand, when you say 'what is the form of the building', this is quite a difficult question, which I still don't have the answer. And you say 'the plan gives you the form', oh yes and no, 'there is a perfect diagram', oh yes and no. The form is something little bit intangible. It's Gestalt; it's presence; it is also what you see, but it is not just what you see. Your perception is other things going on. Anyway, so why am I mentioning this, because I would quite often talk about Süleymaniye Mosque and the Aga Khan Program at Harvard and the MIT, it was just starting. I knew Oleg Grabar who is a friend, someone I first got to know my first year as a student; we had great dialogue over the years, including the contest of Aga Khan Award. Not just that at all; we had many letters I have exchanged with Oleg on methodology, on history, but the true exchange of the craft of historians of two different periods. I must look at all those letters again. It is marvelous dialogue. So I took a great interest in these new things coming along. I travelled every spring from 1977 onwards to different Muslim countries, Morocco, Egypt, Syria, so and so, in fact I wanted to go to Iran, and that revolution took place, and I went to India, instead and that wasn't just Islamic architecture at all, that was all other, well, the treasures that opened up... So just to say that, I wasn't just in that box, not at all. So I heard about the Aga Khan coming to visit at the Graduate School of Design, which would be like a showcase meeting, because several of the graduate students working with Oleg were to present what they were doing.

And one of them was this young Turkish lady; was very correct. She did a very nice job on the thing she was investigating about, the dependencies of the Süleymaniye Complex, the important rituals. She was beginning to talk about all those things. So I went up as a fellow, and said, Hello, I was very interested in your talk, Mr. Curtis, 'Oh, yeah', and I would love to hear more about this from someone like you, who knows about it. It is one of my very inspiring places to be. And then, I told her the story about this drawing, which I showed at the end. I said, Every time Ms Necipoğlu that you go up that ramp, please remember Süleymaniye, because there is his transformation of Süleymaniye. So I saw this lady appear and disappear, as she moved her way up, you could say. I have only read bits of that very big book. I must have read it, because it is obviously an extremely interesting study. Here we come to a point about methodology, and about what historians decide to, discuss, and what they don't discuss.

There was a period there, there was also Howard Burns. He was a former teacher of mine. He was teaching Renaissance. He and Gülru did a thing together, that was partly linking the Renaissance and Sinan. By the way one of my absolute dearest friends is Debra Howard, who wrote that book on Venice. I always had the instinct about Venturi? This has something to do with Sinan. That was really proved I should say... So there was a lot of coming and going between Renaissance architecture... Let me put it in another way: If Sinan is looking back to Hagia Sophia, of course the Renaissance architects are also looking back, they are not just looking back at the Pantheon, they are also looking back at things like San Lorenzo in Milan, which is on the way to the Byzantine system of space, you know, with these complicated things. And this was very important to Palladio. So all these parallels about what people are looking at which are actually deeply related in Byzantine architecture, and Byzantine architecture is a re-reading of antiquity. So anyway... I was very very interested when Howard said 'why didn't you come and sit in one of our seminars', this was in the 80s at

some point. Gülru was very involved in saying 'This is this brave person in the court so they get this kind of kiosk, this is this person, they get this. It was a semiological analysis'. And I said hmmm, OK OK, but not OK. Because, what this is doing, is telling you that buildings are emblematic of rank and all that, it's all true, but there is a kind of almost moving to a determinism from, this is the program, this is the form. What is lacking in this book and in this approach is the whole problem of formal transformation that makes architecture. Are you with me? This is a rather severe criticism of Necipoğlu. She has done a lot of marvelous things in the study of the court system, engineering, the different casts, but the architectural reality of those works is a little bit missing in this approach.

Suna GÜVEN: I think the same thing exists in Debra Howard's work as well. And that is why, she walks very high on the list to get the SAH Book awards that year. And for that reason she did not get it. When that book is very lavishly researched, the documentation is absolutely superb, she can juxtapose the east and the west, and all of that. But what is lacking is that gestation. The experiential perception of architecture as a whole, it is too fragmented. Maybe an architect is necessary to redo that book, because of the splendid book...

WJRC: In all kinds of ways. Well you see, here we are really talking, I don't know if it is of interest, maybe it is of interest, it is a loop coming back. I went to study at the Courtauld Institute of Art as an undergraduate in 1967; so from 1967 to 70. I went in the age 19, after the Adapazarı earthquake, after chapter two of İstanbul? I had two years out of school, I was a bright boy who was too much of a rebel; I worked as a farm laborer, did all kinds of strange jobs. Then I went on my great trip to İstanbul. Then I could have gone into the computer industry strangely enough, I was quite good at this. I could have stayed there. And I was very casual about the way I applied to the university. In England we have the A.K.A. forms, the second choices. First year I just filled in like that, Philosophy and English;

and I was accepted, and I said no, I don't want to go to the university. Second year I filled it in again, and I thought that's guaranteed, I heard of this place called... I got rejected from University College of London philosophy. I went to their office, it is near where I worked in London. What are you doing, you accepted me last year? 'Young man just because you are accepted last year, it is not an automatic oath, is it?' But on the other hand this Courtauld wrote me a letter, I thought it was like a slap in the face, I had put them on the number six... 'Would you please, if you want to pursue this application, would you write a short essay about why you appreciate such and such work of art, do this and do that?' Very carefully I wrote these things, I sent them in. And six weeks later 'Oh, would you come for an interview?' Day off from work, great you know. I went from work to this very precious place, 18th century house. Long way from computer industry, I'll tell you that. I had this interview Alan Bowness and the lady who wrote became a novelist, Anita Brookner. It went extremely well, they showed the things I reacted in a very personal way and he said well, 'if you come here can you get financing?' I said what are you saying, 'we are offering you a place', I said you are joking. They said 'no'; they said 'no, we find you very fresh', oh OK, thanks a lot. Really I kind of fell into art history by accident. So I went there; but along came in my last year, Howard Burns, he was a young scholar on Renaissance. He brought the perspective of context, the social context, use, function, I was already interested in those questions. I wrote a piece on Renaissance, the older piece on *Madonna della Victoria*, on my second year before Burns arrived talking about the way it was carried about in processions. The teacher who I won't mention who it was, [he would say] 'Oh, I don't understand why we have know all this?', I said the work of art is use, it's not just looking at it. Along came Burns who was already in favor of this. And it went so far the other way, I am coming around now... That this generation of historians were very influenced by Burns, including Debra, including Caroline Milan. Including several others... It was sort of we have discovered the document,

showing the altar... We have the kind of document that shows the property line was here, we have this, we have this, there we have the building. Please, I mean, you are discovering the context but the missing element is translation. I was already struggling with this, I didn't want to do stylistic history, which was more or less what was done at Courtauld. Equally I thought this is OK, but this is not OK. What is going on here? So off I go to Harvard, not knowing really what would be what. With the intention of writing a thesis about the use, not just the use, but the use and symbolism of the villa and the palace in the Renaissance; I came ostensibly to study with James Ackerman, whom I had already known. But he was in a very bad time in his life. You can say, mid-life crisis, Vietnam war, what is the point of studying all this stuff when they are dropping napalm... You know, it was hopeless; there was no communication whatsoever.

I arrived in America and I thought, the way you're studying Renaissance here in the land of Frank Lloyd Wright, and Neutra... Off I went to California, I saw those things. I met Mr. Shindler, I said 'When you are in America, this is what you should be looking at, don't worry about the damn Renaissance. You could do that later you know.' I went to Chicago... Then I met this remarkable person Edward Sackler? I was talking about him in the office this morning, who heard that I was giving this public lecture in age 22 at the Graduate School of Design, I have never done in my life, I took it on. Thankfully it went OK, he came out of the audience. He said 'Come and see me, you already know things I have written, he said, 'There is this interesting material about the Carpenter Center, do you think this could interest you?' Now I'm coming to the point, it is right in the middle of what you are saying. I therefore had a detailed contextual evidence of a kind that no Renaissance history could dream of. Imagine having all that for, you know, I had phone call messages, I went to the Foundation Corbusier that summer spending 10 days day and night looking at all the drawings of the process. In my mind, this was a way of bridging the gap.

SG: Did you ever meet Spiro Kostof; the late Spiro Kostof?

WJRC: Only once at a distance, we met once.

SG: Because I think he was the first person who actually in a popular, accepted but serious western traditional art history juxtaposed Sinan and the west. Many talked about *Ospedale [degli] Innocenti* and Brunelleschi, but that was the first time he actually wrote a chapter in a survey book which puts Edirne and İstanbul together.

WJRC: Yes sure. No no I am certainly aware of that. I would like to come back to that in a moment, what I tried to do in the book on the *Genesis of the Carpenter Center*, was to go all the way from the social program to the conditions that were given to the architect, to the translation into the form and the symbolization through form. So that was my way of trying to solve that problem intellectually, using the kind of way of formulating history that I was trying to formulate, but with fabulous material for a great architect like Corbusier... Of course I am always interested in social context, ideology this and that, but I am very cautious about jumping too quickly from that into the realm of architecture. Once the thing goes to the realm of architecture other things go on. A building is not just a demonstration of ideology, or power, or this and that. It is something related to those realities, it couldn't be there without those realities, but it is not those realities.

SG: May I go back to your lecture at this point, abruptly maybe, but in the lecture, what was very very forceful was especially that Propylean Sequence in relation to Corbusier, when he was 24 years old. Before you got to that point, you said that you can't draw light and yet light is something so important, but when you showed the sequence of Le Corbusier when he went zigzagging. And then you look at the long flank of the Parthenon. You preferred to show your own photograph, which showed the verticals and horizontals and the schemes and the light and form. But for me, the most spectacular

perception of that particular façade is Le Corbusier's drawing.

WJRC: The colored one with the steps?

SG: No, the one which shows the shimmering verticals, because you see the verticals in sequence like marching soldiers. But they are all, because they are seen from diagonals, they are all patching each other...

WJRC: They vibrate.

SG: But because you have the flutes, you have the shimmering effect, that's light. That's juxtaposed against the rude horizontals of the building, and there's nothing more marvelous than that and yet, that's a drawing of light... Is it not? It's not a drawing of mass.

WJRC: No no, I think you are right. It brings in the light... No equivalent to that...

SG: And yet you chose to show your photograph, maybe you wanted to show your own photograph, I don't know. But that I think is the most spectacular drawing of the Parthenon that Le Corbusier, Jeanneret ever has.

WJRC: I understand what you are saying. By the way, on this issue of fluting when you say it like this, it does flatten, densify and then vibrate, I think his elements in his late work in La Tourette has a lot to do with perception of fluting in Greek temples. They move as you move, and so on. I think you are right.

SG: Maybe, would you like to elaborate a bit more on the relationship between drawing and light; or is that the impossible... You said you can't draw light...

WJRC: I think I should correct myself, one of the things that personally interest me a lot about light in architecture, is that every second is a different light. You're capturing some equivalency that's true of course, and then the sun moves around, time of the year. All of these things register. You could say at that point, you can't draw all sorts of things, you can't draw movement. But you can certainly



in a drawing, imply these qualities. I am sure that's what Corbusier is doing. It is a notation. 'Notation' for the experience of light.

SG: But in this example, I don't want to go on and on about this point, but the reason I brought it up is that in those flutings, it is almost as if there is no frozen moment. It's almost kinetic.

WJRC: Maybe that's what he is trying to do. No no, I get your point, that is exactly what he is trying to get across.

SG: You can't draw light, because it is ever for changing, and you can't freeze one moment, but in that particular drawing, it is beyond that frozen moment. It is beyond a photograph, and it is almost beyond what the eye can glimpse at. Drawing makes it continuous, because of that shimmer.

WJRC: I think that is absolutely fair, and a good observation. In his later works when he deals with light, it is often a diagram. It is like the ray, a line for example. You put darker colors to show the shadows, in the elevation studies of the villas of the 20s, he shows light by showing cast shadows, a *Beaux Arts* method. In his villas, like in *Maison Cook*, lovely presentation drawing where he has that little ledge and the shadow is cast and light on the façade color, blue for windows, so on. He works out "notational system". That's a bit different from what you are describing. What you are describing is an attempt at 'registering experience'. Very rarely does he do that at other points in his things. But all those other quotes the changing things is very very hard to register in drawings.

That gets us into percepts and concepts. Big one, philosophically. And you can say, all seeing is acting.

You frame your experience, someone as well formed and intelligent as Corbusier is, directing as much as he is receiving all the time, even when very young. So he is using the pen to anchor things about architecture, through his inner framework which is looking for certain things. Let's take the example of the drawings of the mosques. He has really absorbed those diagrammatic things of Hagia Sophia, which enables him to conceive spaces of Süleymaniye in his drawings the way he does, like machine-made presentations. So the issue of not just perception, but also different kinds of drawings, and the interiorization by this young person at a very early age of different skills of drawing comes into it. So very very young, he is doing these things very quickly, but he knows how to do it. He can draw in so many different ways, when he is 18-19 years old. Then they turn into abstract things. So there is the question of also all the different things, the modes of representations, elevation, section, plan, perspectives. There is the question of skill, which is very developed in this case; medium, does he use watercolor in this occasion, does he use ink, does he use pencil, does he use sharper things? When he goes up to the Acropolis, I have never reconstructed all the different kinds of drawings, he uses different media to react to different things, in this case perhaps he says, 'I've got to try and get the light today. Yesterday I was talking about that diagonal view, tomorrow about something else'. It is quite possible that he went back, I mean I do this myself, I say so at different buildings, or I am looking at something different through this and through that I draw buildings too.

But let's get to these things you were mentioning about Kostof. This gets into this huge problem of tenure right, a more balanced history of architecture, we always know the problem of 'the western' ... Those are issues that have interested me for a long time, and I can understand I voted with my feet. And maybe it started on the hillside of Thessaloniki. You know, I never got trapped into this thing. Even with Jim Ackerman. Jim is astonished even when 30 years ago I tell him, 'I was in Syria for three weeks looking at this and that', and he

says 'Oh, I have never been to Syria', and I say you got to go.

You know I am just, let's not use this word Islamic architecture, gets me into big trouble, but even you know *Muqarnas* [the Journal]? I'm in *Muqarnas* number one: "Type and Variation: Berber Collected Dwellings of the Northwest Sahara". A study of settlements in Morocco. That was one more adventure. You see, I didn't say my next academic field of investigation, no, no, no.... I went off to Morocco in 1978, with a spirit of great adventure on my own, to explore... Tangier, Fez, I was captivated by Fas, how could you not be? On the bus, I was the only non-Moroccan present. I was sitting between a young man who was, they were both about 24. They were both doing teacher's formation in Fez, going back from the holidays. One was from an Arab background, the other from a Berber background. The axle broke on the bus, the police got on: What was I doing, they were worried about, was I a spy? Then we arrived in the Souk at midnight; it is a coastal town. And this boy said 'Where are you going to stay, this is a very bad place. You can't be beaten by soldiers. No no no, you have to come'. So I went off on a collected taxi, arriving at two in the morning in his oasis... At the moment, when we arrived at his village, they were changing the water channels, all too qualified. The village had no walls, all high buildings. I met the family and then his father... I was received by family, and I lived for a week with these people. We went every day to different parts of the oasis, looking at different periods, ruins this and that.... His brother-in-law was constructing... I was captivated by the experience of these things. Then the questions came, how did this happen, what have people said so far. Of course I plunged into the libraries in Harvard about French interpretations.. I knew more recent things like Hicks, and other authors who have written. I put it together, how would I analyze a vernacular system, it is not so simple. What are the issues, what do they look like, how they arrange, what they experience? And a series of questions, like what did they formulate it in relation to what

problem? There I began to discover the whole thing about the relationship between the sedentary, and then the nomadic systems, you know, and then construction, climate... I published things like that. You can still read that, and I don't normally talk about this but a lot of the things that people are involved with now about 'hybridization of cultures'; it's all in there, excuse me, thank you very much. It is written 30 years ago. And it is done with great caution, it almost points out to the extent that every interpretation is politicized. In other words, in this issue... You know, let's say, you have the Pan-Islamic idea of it, or the Pan-Arabic to be more precise, all it comes from the 'square form'... You have what I call the trans, Pan-African, the Trans-Sahara one, it all comes on the back of camels, from Sudan, Egypt and all these things. Then you have the Roman, Mediterraneanist argument, which is very French of course, it is the 'castrum plan'. It is probably a lot of these things mix together, but be very careful about anchoring in one description! So coming back to beginning, then I go off to India. I spent, you know, in the 80s I went to India totally 12 times. Sometimes three months at a time, and it started with of course with interest in Le Corbusier. I haven't put all of this down anywhere. It is probably beyond my capacity to write a balanced... I think it comes in pieces. It is better like that, more real. I certainly take my hat off to people like Kostof, trying to get out of this terrible Greece, Rome... We know the problems with that.

SG: Following the steps of Kostof right now is Del Apton. He also has travelled extensively to many many different parts of the world. He is very man centered... I mean.

WJRC: Is it a universalist picture of some kind, or?

SG: I mean, he sees the content, evaluates the architectural context, goes and speaks to the villagers, takes his own pictures. He understands the logic, because architecture is all about a sense of wonder, a sense of aesthetic, and a sense of logic. Which does integrate over time. So if you go to the Sahara, the desert, you see a

particular way of building, you begin to understand that logic which you forget in the later ages, because it is *ready made*.

WJRC: You find the primary logic of the building system, which is geographical at some level because it is about adjusting to those primary forces. For example, I can remember, one of the great contradictions of mud-architecture in the sub Sahara is that you need a lot of water to construct it, but water destroys it. So what we talk about is places that ideally water comes with rivers and from underground, but not by rain; because the rain destroys the buildings very quickly. These conditions pertain in these river valleys; very low rain fall but a lot of water. But where does the water come from, the mount tops from the Atlas... You can begin to unravel the geographical forces which are contradictory, out of which the building system also springs. What materials are available, clay, mud, and palm logs, it doesn't give you the building system, it is the beginning of things. I agree, I think that somewhere behind all this, you begin to say 'Are there (I hate the word too strongly, but) archetypes?' In other words, there are at least deep prototypes out of which things spring. This is a very old discussion, but still it is a very interesting question which is how, as you are saying, how these fundamental moves then erupt into a monumental system through mimesis, which is the Egyptian temple form. When I saw the Egyptian temples, I realized they are really mud buildings...

SG: But then you have to know the *rationale* as you say, that is why a Parthenon built in Nashville Tennessee doesn't work.

WJRC: Exactly. Even the one in Greece is so late, very late in the process. In the process of house of representation, the archaic temple, the wooden temples, animism of various kinds before this highly sophisticated, puts that thing up. There are centuries and centuries that happen. In the present world, I don't follow this enough now, because of so much on my own in what I do, but...

It is a pity that Suha [Özkan] is not here, it is too personal because I was invited to their, into their Cloister in a way, that's the right word, first in 1985 January to Geneva... First one was in Geneva, very cosmopolitan group, very interesting people, Mohammad Arkoun, Oleg Grabar, people from many nations. He proved very keen to promote quality in whatever way they could. And some of them knew me since when I was a student. I was already involved in India. Not just India... I have a whole Mexican side to my life. I was very interested in what they were saying, but I was immediately a little bit cautious, about the hidden agenda. First of all I am quite worried about this idea of 'Islamic identity', worn a little bit on the sleeve at that time in discussions. We were talking about this, yesterday: At the second session that I was invited at the house, you have to imagine the setting; all of the chauffeurs, the marble floors and table three time this length, with his Highness at the end. A gold clock from Iran from 18th century, and a little phone where 'Excuse me, gentlemen', he is talking to the King of Morocco. Twenty minutes later, 'Excuse me,' he is talking to the Prince in Jordan; the moderates you know. Polished floor, all these perfect people from Harvard, Oxford, this, that, speaking 6 languages, they are so perfect; the Press, all the newspapers from around the world. Unbelievable... Right in the middle, horses, anyway, that's the reality. Anyway so they invited me. It was like a Court. I began to push the questions too hard already, there was this Abdel Vekil, who was playing the Fathy card from the Saudis, making houses with domes, telling all about my spiritual father... So petrodollars and it was postmodernism, it was in the air very much. And there was a group trying to get the Aga into that. I put my foot down I said, 'No, the issue here is 'a modernism of appropriateness'. Of course it will go down to tradition, but if you get it to ne-traditionalism, the whole thing is finished. You just the picturesque, the non-sense. There was the political image, which was non-declared. I said 'Oleg, you know better than that; you have written the "Formation of Islamic Art", you know all about the regional differentiations'. This

is risky this Pan-Islamic fiction. At the end of the session I said, 'Well, it has been very interesting, thank you for inviting me. Let me make this comment: I had to listen here two or three members of your group, say, 'Only a Muslim can design a mosque'. I said, 'If we are into that, what will we do about the best sacred space in 20th century architecture, which is designed by a non-catholic: His name is Le Corbusier... This is very risky territorialization of knowledge. Stop. I don't think it has a place... I said, 'Look, the risk here is this: You people are very comfortable, you are all living in countries which are rich and there is division between church and state. It is fine in a world seminar, among people from Arabic background; questions like what's happening to Iran; OK. Be very careful: Shah had already gone, but be very careful. You know this can go backward very fast. You're not comfortable, you're living in Washington, you're teaching in Oxford, this and that, I will tell you, if Islamic identity gets into the street, it's flamed. I said it; it is all on the records. I said that in 1985, when it was not popular to say. The only person who came up was Arkoun: He said *merci beaucoup*.... Muhammed Arkoun. What I am trying to say is that, as a historian, and a person engaged with the real world, I have to negotiate very carefully between ideologies. You know the idea of Western civilization in modernization is awful. On the other hand, there are risks of all these different positions...

JE: Taking sides.

WJRC: Taking sides, or getting too caught up in one limited agenda. This is really risky. The new generation who are also brought up with postmodern philosophy, and this and that, maybe graduates...

Cânâ BİLSEL: You are also quite critical *visavis* of postmodernism...

WJRC: Extremely critical, yes.

CB: Already in mid 1980s you wrote about that. You referred to 'folkloric postmodernism'...

WJRC: Here I am returning to architectural postmodernism, let's

say, a superficial replay of motifs. Now what I was talking more about is what has happened in social theory. Especially in the States... Everything is reduced to discourses, everything is reduced to positions, and we get further and further away from objects, from experience, and you know... You can decode every discourse you like, it does not mean it has disappeared, and it is very American. Post-colonial studies are involved in this; it has very over simplified ways, this and that. To me, this is really simple-minded stuff.

CB: It is one to one, literal and direct...

WJRC: As direct representation of power; or domination; or this and that.

JE: Or as just mere interpretation, [as if] there is no real thing there.

WJRC: It is only the interpretation.

JE: This is the postmodern, in aesthetics also, the reality is only material, and all this meaning that you could do, you invent. It is cynical.

WJRC: It is deeply cynical. It is very curious, because there's that very very interesting issue of *Muqarnas*; the Rum in Turkey which was put together by Gülru, and maybe her husband too, Cemal Kafadar, he is a historian after all; with all others. It is about the construction of the nationalist pictures of all kinds in the Kemalist period. You know, at the end what I thought was, if you reduce everything to discourses, there is no magic left in the symbols whatsoever. But in fact there is magic left in the symbols. They are still powerful. I come into this city, and there are the portraits of this man all over the buildings, it's not nothing. It is not just some... Of course it is mythologizing, all politics is mythologizing. You can't just reduce this into a narrative of this country, Turkey, you understand, there is real power in it.

CB: Semiotic studies can also claim...

WJRC: ...that you have neutralized the symbol in some way, but it does not really work. Of course, you have to expose the mechanisms of meaning, I think that is one of our jobs as historians.

JE: But the meaning is inherited, you know Joseph Margolis, the aesthetician. He is saying that when we understand language, this is not because we put words together. The language as a whole has a meaning. It is a human artifact, and it is not something that you can decide to divide in units.

WJRC: There are levels as well, and many levels. Not the least, the poetic use of language.

JE: Exactly, ...

WJRC: ...and when you are in the world of form, whether it is architecture or art, there are other rules that apply. It's not just a spelling exercise.

JE: It is not just things put together.

WJRC: This is the risk of that tendency of post-colonial studies. I personally was extremely interested in this, because of the things I thought about. When the Ottoman Empire collapsed, how did they re-formulate all this? Of course I knew enough about Atatürk, and the museum I haven't seen yet, maybe I will see tomorrow... I am very interested in museography, and how museography is used to create a kind of history. But at the same time, I thought you know, excuse me at least half the people in there all studied in Turkey and went to America. I want to ask this question to all of you, will you please do now the same to the United States? Let's see what we get, very interesting. They are speaking from a very particularly American perspective, actually, if the truth be told, of a certain American academia.

CB: ...generated, but widespread now.

WJRC: But it is deeply anti-historical, as a lot of American influence is, it is deeply anti-historical: 'The part of the problem in the world,' is this myth, that you endow it into another country, and rearrange the scenery, and sort it out. It is one of the reasons that this damn country is in a mess. They keep doing that. Won't understand [the presence] all of these people in Afghanistan which has 5000 years of history!

SG: So maybe, to conclude...

WJRC: If it is possible to conclude such a vast discussion...

SG: The biggest *malaise* that we have, I think, at the moment, in the simplest terms, is some sort of disillusionment. And disillusionment leads to cynicism. So if we go back to the wonderful message in your lecture, what we need to do is 'to catch the sense of wonder'. Catch that sense of wonder, and the object will speak.

WJRC: Coming to students, you can go now into some architecture schools which are the students all are all learning these theoretical moves and you say, 'What do you think of the brickwork of the building by Richardson over the street?' 'Who?' Never looked at it. So I believe one of the ways you liberate people from these limitations is teaching people to see. It is not me telling you how you see, but teaching them to see what they see.

SG: To see to touch...

WJRC: To experience, to see what's happening to you with architecture, and to learn (as I use the term today) to 'map it', drawing, not just drawing, it could be models, even good photomontage or something like that. In the age of the instant telephone, the image and all that, 'Oh, I took a picture of it, so I know it', you know, it's awful. It is very important to get students of architecture, even in teaching history to them, to experience the things as much as one can. Then, I very rarely teach, and when I do teach, I teach all kinds of levels, you know most sophisticated to the most elementary. But from time to time, I collaborate with a program in the SI University of Illinois, has a school there where they send 40 students, third year students. They come for 8 months to Europe, most of them hardly travel at all. It is an amazing experience to them, and they have some very good teachers, French design teachers. It is well run by an Argentinean, who is American, but Spanish speaker, speaks French, so on. And they invite me in, and I do two visits, in the first week I do two lectures in the morning, let's say

Corbusier, his architectural language, and principles,, and then Villa Savoye a close analysis of the design process. Then we have lunch, we go on a bus, we are at the Villa Savoye for three and a half hours. They're drawing it, they are looking at it, filling their notebooks, then we all get together occasionally on the ramp. We then talk, what about this, what about that... I don't know if that's a guarantee of anything, but I think it...

SG: It's getting closer.

WJRC: It is getting a little bit closer. You know we are very lucky around Paris, to have Aalto's Maison Carré, then I give say a lecture on Aalto, and then, I then also a lecture on the curved section? Then they go see this thing. I think that stays with them. One of the problems that some of the ways history has been taught through now, is too much theorization. It is so far away from things.

CB: How do you think the architectural history should be in a school of architecture, because architectural history as a field of study can have its own aims and goals, its own methodologies based on documents, archives and discourses, and so on. How should it be...

WJRC: What should it be I can't say. But I can give you my thoughts about it, which go back quite a long time. I think that surely one of the ambiguous things about architecture when a building study exists, is where you are looking at it now, that morning with a light on it, in İstanbul, in New York city, in Greece, I don't know, we are looking at it, it is there in some manner. Its thereness is not precisely the same as its thereness when it was made. Things have changed, but nonetheless that's what we have, in the present, it's there. On the other hand, the difficulty, that is to say when you are teaching architecture, one of the tools of teaching architecture is to learn to read a building architecturally, its organization, its architectural concepts, what's going on. But at the same time you must reconstruct the past out of which it came. You must do both, its presentness and its pastness, you've got to do both... Even

I think with, you know, the students of architecture. But often what happens in schools of architecture, oh it's history this afternoon, we take notes, we do exams... No no no, it's great inspiration, wonder of architecture comes partly from buildings, and letting to see them and not just from grand buildings, even modest buildings actually, learning to analyze. I used to set an exercise when I taught in Carpenter Center, where my job was to introduce undergraduates who have sometimes have never thought about architecture, or no intention of being architects. When I did the thing 'Around the world in 80 ways', I would give them the concepts, but always in a form, with very demonstrative set of examples. Like architectural experience, involves movement, changing light, shadow, weather, the sense of weight, etc. Or I could elect on the problem of style, what do you understand by style, give an example, etc. This was like a grid, they could kind of react in around. I could give them readings on very basic things, all kinds of text, you know. I did elect on function, you know, some of the readings come from functionalist theory, but some came from a biologist, who continues to write very interesting things about functional niches and nature, things like that. After 7 weeks each student had to choose a building in the Boston area, that they can visit many times. The question was what, why and how. Why is it like that; why did the Art Center was organized that way, rather than this way; why did he choose those kind of columns. If you choose a concrete system...

SG: That's the reverse...

WJRC: This is a great way in demystifying architecture. So then, they learnt in some elementary way to decipher some of the intentions, but also the conflicts, because nearly every building is conflictual actually. It is never totally resolved. Then I say what about the architectural language, what about the moment in time that this architect was working? What about the different ways of handling bricks, you could have put? Why, why, what, how? Looking, looking, and experiencing. In a way that is training at least two things. One is architectural

thinking through observation that is the beginning of historical thinking. Because why and how are historical questions. I would argue that you can do that in first level students you have here. Then you advance the case, towards the problem of surveys. Survey to me, often they have one focal length. And I think you need to have zooms, and you need to have wide angles, to move in and out. Let's say, you are talking about the history of architecture in this region, you take an example like Süleymaniye, you take it apart in all levels, you look at the other things that influence it, you look at the structural system, you look at the influence... It is very good to students to have moments that they hold on to, but not just as you know we have the kinds of classic works. They are instruments like, things in a laboratory, the specimens, you use because they are pretty well inspirational to most people, at the same time you teach people how to take it to class. Then you get more specialized, obviously, in the course on 20th century, Ottoman, this and that. I think it has to work from some low course of teaching to see and analyze, and then gradually more historical. Probably in relation with the studio people, they also do building analysis with models and things I suppose.

CB: I am teaching design.

WJRC: So you are exactly doing this analysis.

CB: ... wondering how to integrate teaching architectural history in studios, how to benefit from this is a big question...

SG: Even without the studio dimension, I mean the teaching of the art history, and the teaching of the architectural history, need to be thought out. Do you want to give them the most formulated best example and then deconstruct that, so that they can understand why and how it is put together? Or do you gear from the other end and progressively move on to the final product? So they see how it becomes more sophisticated in the end. There at the Wellesley College, for example, you know the famous Art History 101. This is a

course very popular with students from MIT, from PU. Everybody took it, the most famous and well known course, very very crowded in that they had sections. It was chronological, it started from the earlier periods coming to the later periods, but then depending on each capsulated period, the instructors developed some kind of hands-on section. So if they wanted to emphasize the material, and these were not entirely students of architecture, they had to shape something with their hands. If dimensioning was important, they would measure something even in the dormitory, so that they had to plan... So they had this pragmatic approach which went hand-in-hand with grasping the process of all the work...

WJRC: I totally agree. I would give a very general lecture on the structure of architecture, and structure in the world, you know, bodies and baskets and all sorts of things. I mean, these were undergraduates who were by no means, you know, some went on to become architects, or other things but ... One of the most enjoyable, then in part two to carry on with this, I had something which now people would refer to as material culture. I did a series of lectures on the invention of objects. We looked at things like the safety pin, in relation to the antique brooch. Or the umbrella through history...

SG: From the fibula to the...

WJRC: They could not be really precise historical things, but they were what I call sermons or demonstrations. One of them was on the aerophone section; the wing. Without the aerophone, you couldn't have flied, but once that is invented the whole world changes. Or the propeller, propeller is something that, and is driven, etc. So this was a kind of story of types, and it is rather fun doing that. How many of students have really picked up on that, but I had amazing papers. There was one fellow who was not at all visual or anything, he was in biology and engineering and God knows how he found it, I don't know. But he was really inspired by this. He went off and he discovered in Harvard Business School all these paintings, for different inventions.

The battle sub and the torpedo, and he wrote a piece about the invention of the torpedo. In his document, they were studying fish, you know, what they were studying, the tuna fish! So we used to call it 'the tuna sub!' Things like that...

I loved your thing because, even I find the material culture heavy, with the undergraduates they are so alert to everything; you can get them into a discussion about shoelaces or lenses in spectacles, or... I used to do a sort of demonstration section to the students, which became known as 'the needle and the cork'. So I came in with a cork from the wine bottle and a needle and here are these extremely bright Harvard undergraduates, especially the freshmen. Best thing in the world, geniuses, genius high school, etc. I would say 'Oh, right students, so what are these?' A cork and a needle. 'What's a cork?' 'What's a needle?' 'What do you mean saying that it's a needle'. 'How are you defining that?' 'Where does the word come from?' 'What does a cork do?' You put it on top of a wine bottle. 'Yes, but what does it do?' 'What's its relation to the bottle?' 'What is its relation to air, to the liquid?' 'What is its relation to the trees?' 'What is its relation to the culture of wine?' 'Is this the only way?' 'Is it always functioning?' 'Is this?' In this dimension of function, you are pulling it out, every object is part of a system. Every object. And they begin to think. 'Stop! We are on a desert island and the only things we have are 20 corks and 20 needles. What do we do?' We turn one into a fish hook. 'I thought you said to me it was a needle. It now became a fish hook'. 'What are the conditions of a fish hook?' This kind of exercise is fantastically liberating. Eventually these are so superior students. Think about it, because it also shows how words trap objects. And cultures trap objects, and nearly all invention is about slipping out of a niche and discovering another niche. Jumping sideways or confrontation, two or three things. Like the invention of the tank, which is putting a military boat together with the tractor wheels, someone well may observed in a journal of agriculture from the Midwest in a dust ball, there's this thing called the caterpillar track?

That's what we need for mud in trenches. We put a boat on top of that, and we win the war, with what you name as the tank... that's exactly what happened. Now that kind of thing is extremely interesting to me. I think that architecture is partly involved in that, I think it is this coming to jump sideways. I am interested in that kind of liberation of perception, but equally at the other end, a deeper understanding of the culture of architecture. You can imagine I give 12 lectures on Corbusier, no problem. Not to have them all turned into Corbumaniacs. Not at all. That's not the point. The point is, through the understanding of this extraordinary figure, for example, you can grasp the idea of what is an architectural language, as you can see it operating. Then you can say close your books, I don't care if you have never looked at Corbusier, it does not matter. You learned something. I believe in going all the way from cork to Corbusier in teaching. Architecture schools are pretty good places for that, because you don't have the weight of art history departments worrying about the next meeting of college art association or something. Away from the pressure of art history careers...

CB: Corbusier's own formation is similar to that.

WJRC: Collecting things.

CB: Extracting ideas? Fresh eyes...

WJRC: Freshness of Corbusier's scholarship... The way he looks at ships, looks at so many things.

SG: They may have a sensing eye, but you have to show them why. They have the perception, but you have to decipher the perception.

WJRC: I totally agree, and that's where those kinds of discussions, where you are standing in front of a building, and you are saying 'Well, how is this working, if not visually?' Then you say 'What would happen if we change the color here?' 'Supposing we change the columns into granites instead of sandstone, how would it change?' I totally agree, and I think they are registering what they are seeing. You are coming back to them with what's behind it. I always liked the discussion about we had about detail, because in a way, there is no detail in architecture. When there is a detail there, it is responding to all other things. To have a discussion about how you join a minaret to a wall, apart from putting together two things, it's all kinds of things with joints and roughness of stone, or this, or that. Or, in this building, you know. This building is full of lessons

of architecture. Steps, breaking the thing, there is a whole where cutting the bottom of columns, this and that. It's a very articulate building. I think that getting people to see, and then say 'Oh, yes!... I was so lucky with those kids in understanding the Carpenter Center and the Richardson... These buildings were laboratories you are looking at them, also encouraged description; describing what you see, this is very difficult now, because of instant images. How many students would sit down and write a literary description of a building today? It is almost like asking him to do ancient calligraphy. Because they are all on the web all the time. This is a big problem. 'I agree with you, because you are saying I think this is extraordinary, but why is it extraordinary?' 'What makes it extraordinary?' Let's get down to a discipline now for explaining it.

Anyway... After 26,5 interviews, and a lot of irrelevant remarks about historians everywhere, this is the Turkey deconstruction group.

AC: Thank you very much, it was so refreshing. It was great.

WJRC: Great. I really enjoyed it very much. All the best for nothing has been planned.