

The work that I seem to be naturally and increasingly drawing myself into is design of interior spaces.

as an architect, I haven't been trained to think as might be expected from interior designers, whose main core obsession seems to be perhaps to decorate. (and I do not mean this derogatorily.)

the architect on the other hand is consumed, with an exploration of finding a higher experience in the way he trails his spaces.

So, trapped (in a manner of speaking,) I find myself more often than not questioning the very and every realm of the design of interiors.

There is space; built by the architect, and then there is the void of the within, which is then to be used to perform amongst other things, daily functions. This is done with the use of daily objects, hence;

there is space and then its objectification. This objectification essentially requires a meticulous study of function and technology to create products that will perform efficiently. Conventionally these products speak a language that is new, strange and often undecipherable to that of its space. The communication ceases. There is instead an aesthetic din that is rather unsettling underneath the present clutter that we find. These are distractions, clamoring for identity with gaudy apparel and tunes.

Does the notion of interior design subscribe to simply this? a band of sorts?

Does it have to exist in the form it does now? Is it essentially a science of product designing and art installations?

Can these not be simply bought out, or customised at the most, with designers and manufacturers? Would I not need various skill sets of all kinds of crafts?

Perhaps, yes, and yet not fully so.

The role, then I am playing, sits on the threshold of these two realms (architecture and interior design of spaces), which essentially I do like to think are one, and incomplete in the absence of one or the other. (not to override the landscape; but I will limit my discussion here to the above two) paucity of land, and a need for change, to be in sync with changing technology which is a constant phenomenon, has given rise to the need of a hybrid professional which is the interior designer. In the new urbanity, and of late, we are forcing interior space design in spaces that are badly construed, or spaces that seek a new use, or spaces that simply need restoration. The interior designer comes in with a bang! literally. There is enough abuse, by way of demolition, and forced refurbishing of technology and the insertion of the ruthless 'trend'. This activity is brutal. and by all means needs radical questioning. Such meaning of interior design, must be reviewed and arrested.

But then there are architectural endeavors too.

What then, when I begin to design interiors, must I aim and strive to achieve, especially when the space in itself is so complete. Austere and pure. and in my mind the struggle is even more pronounced, as I firmly believe in the celebration of space, without the distractions of its objectification, the architecture, is essentially and most profoundly an intangible experience only for the realm of the mind.

the pursuit of architecture will always remain as an intellectual investigation. all other manifestations that may be derived from ideas more worldly are mere small appendages that may hold aesthetic and spectacle appeal value like ornament on a body.

how then do I bring such value to all the objects within the space? the house?

what is my understanding of the set of objects that I undertake to fill this space with...? what is the intellectual position I will take to stand as tall and handsome as is the architecture within which this will sit?

perhaps, often, the answer lies, within the actual negation of the gallery of materials and the craft that is easily identifiable and quantifiable as measure of design.

I am not suggesting the notion of minimalism.

I am asking, instead, can interior design, too be measured by its idea? by its intellectual position and not by its clever spectacle value?

What would it look like then?

Materiality:

There is a built form, its void within and its skin, the material. (recap)

Can we then in our constant quest to retain an individuality, so that like ourselves, pursue design choices so that every built form maintains an identity, in spirit? or in form? or then in its skin? how urgent is this as a need against a desire which is an outcome of an underlying insecurity?

What then do we define as the spirit of the place . the zeitgeist of an architecture , (here I mean it as a single body and not necessarily as a body of work), is this not in its naked essence , like a fragrance that may be remembered , or a taste that may be favored , but not seen or held ? Should then the spirit be reflected through the experience of the built form .. ? Material , would be like the mud on the earths surface , different in different regions , but all in all , earth ... Materiality, is the earthiness of the project in this sense . Its malleability, remains inadequately explored.

And yet, the notion of sameness is ever so boring. it sits in defiance of our conjured understandings of time and timelessness . Change is imperative, and when we succumb, to it, it is ever more fortified...

Where do we seek change, and how? What then is the premise for evolution and its understanding? What is adaptability?

In the myopic sense of the design discussion, I am referring to semantics.

Do we simply change materials on surfaces or address the higher realms of the spirits outside the tangibles, to evolve new ideas?

Can this mean we retain certain denominators as constants? Such as material and then redefine notions of design. ?

How often, in the history of change, while tools of design have been explored, have the construction techniques found radical change?

The new look of the post modern, whilst has found its birth in the computer aided design, its adaptability in construction with the same ease has still not seen the light of day. Perfection like all other aspects of modern contemporary life is only virtual.

Have newer methods and materials been found to be more congenial to architecture, construction ease and durability, in both the physical and metaphysical terms?

I wonder.

Do I make sense?



Samira Rathod