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Abstract

This paper proposes spiritual practice as an operative opening toward an alternative to the “monopoly of ‘efficiency–standards’”. This is approached in terms of architectural practice with attention paid to its profession and in terms of educational environments in the widest sense. A description of the salient aspect of the rajayoga and its antecedents can demonstrate practically the essence of architecture in its the materialistic cultures. Rajayoga provides a structure with which to assess the themes of Poetics and Politics of Value, Worlding and ‘U–Topos’ accordingly and to develop the discrimination essential in architectural practice. The conclusion is for developing terms for the values of mind and Being long developed in spiritual practice and its documentation within the Being dwelling. The opportunity is opened to exit the monopoly yet to work productively with exact sciences and social sciences as subordiante to a goal in architecture and in education.
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The Alternative

The “alternative cognitive art of knowledge of creation and invention and ‘making and thinking’” is available, highly developed, yet effectively un–utilized in our epoch of technological materialist Machine Ages¹. Spirituality is a ready opportunity and a valid impulse, all the more so as it is outside the issues of the questioning of this Symposium. Spirituality bids the appropriation of the goals of making in the world but brings terms and approaches that may seem strange and meaningless. This paper engages spirituality in the form of rajayoga and its antecedents in terms of architectural practice.

Dwelling aspires naturally to ‘making’ something that is not ‘yet’ present. Architecture is proposed as superordinate programme that is aspiration in dwelling, not the ‘things’ and not ‘making’. This distinction is essential. This distinction connects us back with the original questioning that formed as spirituality, documented as soon as writing came available. That capacity was already there, original also to language. It connects us across time, not merely across trends and humanity (globalization). It is the mode that recognizes a questioning potential that defines our ‘period’. To discriminate between what is ‘I’ and what is all else is to face the discrimination that dwelling demands. This is spirituality.

This paper questions the ‘making’ of intentional environments if the ‘made’ is considered to ‘be’ architecture. ‘Thinging’ and architecture are not the same. In the Machine Ages ‘making’ expresses this issue as concealment. Heidegger in his The Question Concerning Technology expresses that challenging forth the world in technology of ‘Enframing’ essence, Being’s ‘truth’ comes to presence in ‘oblivion’. He describes ‘oblivion’ as concealment itself concealed, and as ‘danger’ whereby the danger itself is concealed. Being as ‘truth’ coming to presence in ‘oblivion’ then includes architecture. The architect is faces ‘oblivion, not architecture. Architecture when it occurs in practice is brought ‘back’ into revealing through technicist professional practice. Architecture is ‘brought back’ out of its concealing in the object where it is thought to be. Architecture is ‘brought back’ out of building and environment that are generally reduced to urbanism, landscape and the ecology or ‘environmentalism’ — all technological designations. This is not a proposal. This is architecture today. The architect today can not effectively express architecture without (building) technological terms that forms a technological proxy for the architectural profession. The matter of building has all manner of identities and modes that have not made the identity of ‘architecture’ obsolete. What presences architecture in ‘thinking’ and in feeling is ‘content’ beyond the ignorance necessary for ‘knowledge production’. To think it is the object is a reversal that is disjunction for architecture. How then to practice in transcending this disjunction?

An architectural practice is in disjunction when it is thinking architecture as created and invented objects. In this disjunction, discrimination is contradicted. ‘Creativity and making’ are derivative of aspiration. Reversing this challenges technology with its negation. It is clear that technicist materialism, even in extremis, must have its positive evolutionary aspects for dwelling. Being dwelling granting of choice for each of us to make of what we will. What can be made of the freedom-of-choice within Nature in dwelling is infinite. No ‘thing’ can be an ultimate, this is the essential principle of aspiration. Hence, the ancient original questioning thinking that comes out of primeval times originally forming this period: What is ‘I’ and what is all else? Heidegger’s effort’s roots are in discrimination dwelling in aspiration. Architecture is ‘more original’ and nearer Being, inclusive of technology, and all else in dwelling. As is (also) spirituality, for which rajayoga and its antecedents give copious documentation going back millennia. The evolution of spiritual practice can be traced in architecture already presencing early in this period.

Architecture presences in every Being that dwells as presencing of ‘what is’ in everyone. Dwelling (which is thinking and feeling) always brings aspiration of what might be done and 'probably' presences architecture for each of us. Awareness is where we dwell in aspiration, architecturally. It is revealing awareness itself in terms of ‘what is’. Considering architectural practice in terms of spirituality, the Goal in spirituality and the Goal in architecture cohere. An aspiration that was begun millennia ago is continued. To presence this is the Goal in architecture. This goal is not the environment, but to serve aspiration — it is superordinate programme.

Architecture is original and inherent of aspiration of striving. Ambition and growth are derivative of personal transformational evolution. To discriminate this is to find the essence of what is ‘I’ within all that is not. Unless this is open, ‘creativity’ and ‘invention’ flounder in what was assumed early in the ‘epoch’ and concealed as objects. The rules of technology and its sciences, the proofs and the resulting ‘efficiency—standards’, is sign of these earlier

---

4 This refers to Heidegger's use of 'epoch' for this stage or technology with Enframing essence based in his The Question Concerning Technology.
assumptions. Presencing architecture is then proposed as distinct from the materialistic, technological and sociocultural aspects. It is here this paper begins and to which it returns as touchstone.

**Three stages of spiritual practice (rajayoga)**

‘Making and thinking’ are an expression of thought of a particular kind. Thought has long been traced in spiritual practice. Rajayoga calls it a condition of ‘modified Mind’ claimed in its antecedent Yogasutra long ago. As the translation implies, it is derivative of Mind. In my dissertation The Goal in Architecture this is developed through rajayoga and its antecedents and it is contextualized with phenomenology.

Rajayoga is differentiated within the wider field of the ‘ashtanga’, or eight limbs of yoga. Three limbs are orientated to the Mind and have exclusively to do with the ‘inner’ condition. These are concentration (dharana), meditation (dhyana) and constant remembrance or blissful awareness (samadhi). Expressed as narrative, a long time ago humanity realized an awareness that allowed the mental creation of ideas to understand the world. Not only what to do and how to do it, which serve as introductory, but to evolve fields of knowledge as a basis for action and thought. The yogic concept is that this is a human-made form of knowledge obstructs knowledge of things as they are. Work to harness this capacity for knowledge to remove its negative attributes turned out to also mean the removal of this ‘modification of Mind’ itself. That is, the capacity to gain and hold knowledge is self–eliminative. The contents of ‘modified Mind’, called vrittis, are mental tendencies; the outward flow of mind as wishes, desires and other stimuli coming up in the mind causing action — the basis of what is called ‘knowledge production’.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>rajayoga</th>
<th>samādhi</th>
<th>constant rememberance or blissful awareness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dhyāna</td>
<td>meditation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>dharāṇa</td>
<td>concentration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pratyāhāra</td>
<td>withdrawal or interiorization of the senses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>prāṇyāma</td>
<td>integration of mind and body by regulation of breath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>āsana</td>
<td>integration of mind and body by physical poses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>niyama</td>
<td>control of emotions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>yama</td>
<td>code of conduct or self restraint</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 1. Rajayoga and hatha yoga within the ashtanga of yoga.

The sequence of the development of spiritual practice that flows from the earliest documentation of shastitantra, with which Buddha attained, Samkhya and yoga and through to rajayoga as discrimination in aspiration that developed in the capacity of though’t is portrayed here simply and orientated to the subject of this paper. The focus of yogic discrimination

---

5 In various translations of Patañjali’s Yogasutra, the term ‘modified Mind’ is used. See Larson. 2008. *Yoga: India’s Philosophy of Meditation.*

6 The term is credited to Vivekananda and his book of the late 19thC. Rajayoga is differentiated from hatha yoga and defines newer impulses.

7 See the story of yoga in Larson. 2008. *Yoga: India's Philosophy of Meditation.*
advances through the past two millennia. Each stage was already proposed before history. Before ±400 CE, and the arrival of the Yogasutra of Patanjali, Samkhya appears and comes into written documentation. Its aim is the end of suffering. Discrimination between what is ‘I’ and all else (purusha and prakriti) in the world are to be realized. When this is realized, interest in the world ceases, hence liberation from lives.

The Yogasutra derives from Samkhya and other predecessors, along with Buddhism, without negating them. Its aim too is liberation. However, discrimination is within consciousness and awareness (purusha) and what it is aware of (prakriti), its contents. Practice of devotion to god (as ishvara, one purusha beyond time and all attraction and afflictions) facilitates discrimination within consciousness of ‘modified Mind’ and content–filled awareness8. When content-less concentration (pure consciousness) is realized, interest in the world ceases and the necessity of incarnate life is ended, hence liberation. Rajayoga is the discrimination applied to isolating the striving of the individual (purusha) from the process of ‘creation’ or Nature (prakriti). It is not any longer orientated to stages, but to conditions. Rajayoga’s aim is ‘merger’ in ultimate condition of Being. The practice is for discrimination between love and attachment (samskara) and karma to attain surrender to (the) Self (purusha) in balance with being in the world (prakriti). The highest Being is within each individual — ‘ishvara’ (is) moved within. The approach is to infuse the highest condition via a representative purusha who has attained the goal integral to the practice linking the individual to that condition. Thought is no longer the core of the method. In all cases over millennia, availing the content–less awareness reduces thought to its potential so that ‘illusion’ (maya) ends and the ‘Real’ becomes accessible. Spirituality is then a threshold developed in transformative evolution natural to thinking.

The great interiors if the Gothic were an architecture of this work within awareness. It corresponds with the Yogasutra, culminating centuries of developing content awareness. It can be shown that the rise of the Gothic is aspiration to create the glorious interior of awareness, within which the divine (‘God’, Self or _vara) finds its home. The rise of the Renaissance is the transfer of the value from the environment for the collective aspiration toward the object that had become great and valuable. This takes its part in development of materialism and technology. Creating the space of differentiation within, where the Self (divine) may arise as a great collective achievement to be the inner attainment was successful. The power of that turned to value of object. It is difficult to conceive of the Gothic space as realized Self rather than engineering feats, greatness of space and ornament and tremendous capital value.9 The architectural object today is discrimination within awareness of what arises in aspiration (architecture) in such concealment. The technicist Machine Ages environment, as the Renaissance space and object, maintains this ‘reversal’ in today’s disjunct practice.10 We call the objects architecture, ignoring that it is the awareness of the thing, not the thing that gives architecture presence. The Machine Ages and Modern architecture are the culmination of this disjunction.

Architecture is ‘thinged’ but the ‘connection’ to thing is not measurable and not located other than as an aggregation of individual subjective experience. The awareness of architecture as the object is the same as the maintenance of ‘modified Mind’. The need to remove the object is as the need to remove illusion of world in spiritual practice. For this paper what is salient is

---

8 “Sutra IV.24 Every person naturally possesses the desire to know about existence and states of one's own being. This desire ceases if the person becomes able to comprehend the difference between the intellect and purusha. Since in the absence of ignorance purusha cannot be associated with pleasure or pain, it is reasonable to conclude that the aforesaid desire ceases in a person who possesses discriminative knowledge.” From the Yogabhashya in Larson. 2008. Yoga: India's Philosophy of Meditation. p.216.


10 This is developed extensively in my dissertation The Goal in Architecture.
that the ending of this disjunct condition is called for by the questioning of the “monopolization of efficiency–standards”.

![Figure 2. Relationship of the terms from the earliest antecedents to technology](image)

**Changing Mind**

Krishnamurthi and Dr. David Bohm developed a description of what they called ‘inward’ time, or “psychological–time”\(^\text{11}\) that is ‘modified Mind’ in a specific form. The aim is to end conflict by ending thought of thinking that wants time. The major theme is that time is brought into thought based upon experience of the world: If I decide something, how long did it take? They agreed that worldly matters take time as per Nature’s systems, but the mind does not require it. An interval between ‘what is’ or what ‘I’ perceive myself to be, what could or should be made, and process, structures and reasons for this are created. Thought conditions exist simultaneously then. The one ‘should’ become the other while neither is necessarily ‘true’. This is a description of ‘desire’. It is conflict. Process and method to change this always brings back the original issue of time thought within. Krishnamurthi and Dr. David Bohm pose that the issue of existence in such a conundrum is essence of ‘problem’, and show that ‘the other’ valued this way is ground for judgement (and prejudice).

Krishnamurthi calls the development of psychological time a ‘wrong turn’. But that inner temporal structure, with the relationship to distance also implicated, is an *inevitable* wrong turn that everyone who is born faces. The turn from dwelling in aspiration collectively to the value of the object as individual achievement, where the object *is* then the architecture is characteristic of this ‘wrong turn’. Thought as knowledge and creativity is reverted then on the world and made physical (again) as ‘making and creating’.

‘The ending of time’ is the crux of the discussion. To ‘end’ psychological–time, to eliminate the ‘other’ and the problem/solution economy, is sudden. It is something else that is not thought. ‘The turning’ of Heidegger\(^\text{12}\) and ‘the ending of time’ of the discussion between Krishnamurthi

---


and Dr. David Bohm are essentially the same thing. Heidegger calls it 'jäh'. The ending of time' refers to the period, while Heidegger’s work is in specific terms of this ‘epoch’ of technology. Rajayoga and its antecedents form a long arc within the period with exemplary documentation that comprehends this ‘wrong turn’, and ‘Enframing essence of technology’. ‘Knowledge production’ is essentially relevant to spirituality in this way. It is proposed that ‘Transvaluation’ implies this evolution already under way.

This summary of three stages in spirituality is not complete. It notes the location of conflict, perception, phenomenology, technology, architectural practice (including management, economy and finance) and spiritual practice within an evolving spectrum. The educational institution is a centre where finding wisdom would be more available and everything necessary for supporting transformative evolution in principle dwells. This includes the education of architects who prepare environments that ‘probably’ presence architecture.

The issue of utility in academia of knowledge that is ‘not produced’ nor productive is undeniable difficult, for this poses that academic skill is or will be worth less. What appears important, such as income and personal reputation, is everywhere the same. The difficulty of personal attachment to these is the essence of spirituality, rather than thought itself. Will ‘knowledge production’ and building (environment) production end?

**Four themes: Poetics of Value**

Poetics in ‘making’ are decisively obscure in the technicist cultures of the Machine Ages. Poetics in essence is not absent, but its meaning is in its obscurity. Heidegger in his *Questioning Concerning Technology* shows how technology springs out of what may originally have begun as bringing-forth [*Her-vor-bringem*] of *techne*, although it doesn’t begin there.

*Techne is the name not only for the activities and skills of the craftsman, but also for the arts of the mind and fine arts. … It is poetic.*

Technology as it is now is much less than this. Its revealing is narrow. But it is not merely narrowness. It is absence of what can not be known definitively efficiently. It is art only in a sense of a purity of engineering, which is nevertheless within completion of a finitude. It is of thought as thinking reduced to a sense of the inversion of ‘bringing forth’ [*Her-vor-bringem*]. It is disjunction in architectural practice.

Heidegger reflects:

**It is said that modern technology is something incomparably different from all other technology because it is based on modern physics as an exact science.**

Modern technology is specifically different from what had come before. It is an “unreasonable demand” that is put to Nature as a challenging forth [Herausfordern]. Unreasonable can be, for example, that in answering that demand, Nature can not maintain itself. A forest (not trees) dies for giving wood; a stream dammed floods; a mountain mined becomes a hole and beside it, lifeless hills of slag. This is not bringing forth [Her-vor-bringen] in the sense of *poïesis*. It is not even technology. How is architecture as built environment different if it begins like this?

Heidegger shows how technology’s antecedent is *techne* and that what it now expressly

---

13 Lovitt translates ‘jäh’ as "comes to pass suddenly".
14 This summarizes a quorum of factors from my dissertation *The Goal in Architecture*. This paper touches the terms and their interconnectivity for application to the four themes.
excludes poïèsis. The debate on the subject of the “monopolization of efficiency–standards” has to face that the architectural profession defines itself almost exclusively and expressly in terms of technology that excludes poïèsis. Technology as challenging forth [Herausfordern] in setting upon the world for ‘worlding’ thought as proxy for architecture, where qualification of architects for professional practice is defined accordingly, as technological skills and associated knowledge in a system ‘monopolized by ‘efficiency–standards’’.

The problem of ‘efficiency–standards’ is a narrow form of the original issue of what is ‘I’ and what is all else. We developed vast power within the tiny human scale this way. The theme of Poetics and Politics of Value is narrow in the same way as what it questions. To approach poetics in this way is imperatively already the Bestand, and in ‘oblivion’. It is ‘unfunctional’ in this setting. Poetics in academia has no economy; excepting very importantly, in a form that is transformative toward the ending of thought–interval, beyond parallelism with Nature, Enframing technology, and evolutionary beyond “poïèsis (producing, making, creating, composing)”. To change, one has to look not only at what is architectural practice and what is its output: What is the goal in architecture? If architecture is building, then the system may be correct. If this is architecture, then the profession, and its educational culture are most certainly inadequate as well as inefficient. There is no return to the bringing forth [Her-vor-bringen] of Aristotle. That was the budding of what is now over–ripe fruit, demanding the role of humanity in Nature that is certainly less passive. This is not ‘after–architecture’ as Rem Koolhaas puts it in his ‘theory of Bigness’. It is after-technology architecture.

The subject of questioning for engaging in a ‘re’– and ‘transvaluing’ evolution is of accepting Enframing essence of technology as self–eliminative. Transvaluation will have to become an explicit effort of turning technology to its inherent self–eliminative ends. The original need remains; the period is not over.

Politics of Value

This thematic ‘lense’ looks at its exit threshold, as the symposium subject implies. The proposal for working with concrete matter as ‘processes for making and transforming matter’ is in contradiction, pointing to process as the grounds for what it intends. (Re)thinking and (re)designing have brought the issue at hand. Can more of it be the answer? Are we not asking, “Enough. What now?” The contextualization of politics of (trans)valuation at a threshold of values of ‘thinking and design’ is a door that can not be opened, it is not there. Transformative evolutionary practice is this threshold. ‘Evolution’ is necessary, for transformation for its own sake is chaos. Politics as such is excescence of self–eliminative technology.

‘Culture shaping activity’ can only be for making available a human context — an intentional genius locus — to do what is most important. ‘What is important’ is difficult to define and difficult to adjust for widely varying levels of self–understanding. It is an

17 Heidegger attempts to find ‘modern’ technology of Enframing essence definitively other to techne, but this can not stand within its period of self–eliminative thought, considering spirituality. It makes little difference to his argument.

18 In reference to the Bestand (‘standing–reserve’) of Heidegger, what is not included is "too unfocussed, too weak, too unrespectable, too defiant, too secret, too subversive, too ‘nothing’ to belong. Only what fits with ‘efficiency–standards’ out of aspiration where architecture begins comes to revealing presence.

"Not all architecture, not all program, not all events will be swallowed by[Bestand]. There are many "needs" too unfocused, too weak, too unrespectable, to defiant, too secret, too subversive, too weak, too "nothing” to be part of the constellations of Bigness.

"Bigness is the last bastion of architecture — a contraction, a hyper-architecture. The containers of Bigness [Bestand] will be landmarks in a post-architectural landscape — a world scraped of architecture in the way Richter's paintings are scraped of paint: inflexible, immutable, definitive, forever there, generated through superhuman effort. Bigness surrenders the field to after-architecture.” Quoted from Rem Koolhaas, Bigness in S.M.L.XL. 1994.
environment that must be created where knowledge is less important than a fertile zone for aspiration 'probably' presencing, linking architecture and spirituality in dwelling. Aspiration is intensities in ascertaining the value of Self — for each individual. Human relationships begin with the condition of the individual. The one is me, and you and you …. aspiring in dwelling. Discrimination rather than evaluation embraces individual subjective valuations. It is developed in discrimination which is disjunct as (re)exteriorized psychological–time (and –interval). Such discrimination escapes standards of measure, so it does not happen.

Hence, the creative processes involved lie beyond sheer knowledge-accumulation, since new or unforeseen artistic forms and designs do not necessarily increase or diminish knowledge, nor do they primarily seek to do so.

“The search for viable alternatives” is borne in the ‘consequences’ of “the (monopolization of) efficiency-standards in the spheres of science and creativity — a tendency reinforced by the Bologna educational system”. This is well expressed by Krishnamurthi and Dr. David Bohm’s where they discuss in a many ways conflicts is basis in the need to discriminate ’modified Mind’ and its intents — it was in a context of rajayoga. Time taken for mental process is the prolongation in life–time of a situation — always placing more moments between now and that change. Designing a proposed future with knowledge of facts, structures and process that it will take ‘this’ long, never reaches because it must exclude the immeasurable. Aspiration and the goal is not revealed in thought–interval expressed in the world (again) as rethinking and redesign and is not served. This is ascertained in spirituality for millennia in personal values and individual personal evolution as practice, as feeling and subjective experiment. Heidegger’s assertion that technological Enframing essence is Being as ‘truth’ coming to presence in ‘oblivion’ is this in terms of technology. Thought is building technology and comes with the assumption that ‘I’ am interval within and then ‘I’ impress that on the world. Discrimination and aspiration are absent. As standards of measure and science and technology become more exact — the infinite and the immeasurable are better concealed. The more precise it becomes, the more the strict rules of impartiality are enhanced, the emptier the results. This outcome is consequence that points to the alternative. The question becomes of what this immeasurable, infinity that appears as nothing(less) in technology and science can be?

Changing human relations depends on the individual and the individual’s responsibiltiy to themselves as a participant in the collective. Each life strives for a maximum benefit within a collective unity. Architecture support each life to aspire properly to its maximum availability to its maximum value through the collective. This can not have its grounds in thinking and design. Architecture as superordinate programme in dwelling is programme and purpose of ’education’. This questioning demands architectural practice discriminate its role.

Worlding

“Engaging ‘reality’ through the material” is Being dwelling aspiration. That is architecture. Its meaning comes of ‘worlding’ of Self. Architecture has to do with building and making (and the gamut of what needs to be done physically to construct), in the sense that architecture is necessary. Architecture exists with its own meaning that is not the other things, in the same way the ‘I’ is not all else. Similarly, its goal is not that knowledge which must be ‘stretched’ like building a span longer. Knowledge has been ‘stretching’ this way for hundreds of years. This is facing, not the end of that, but the end of that as truth in aspiration. To ‘enrich’ the concept of knowledge is to recognize its evolutionary transformative purpose. ‘Architecture’ is aspiration in dwelling, not knowledge bound by ignorance. Infinity can not be stretched.

U–Topos

U–Topos is a definition of what must be made. It will result if architecture is revealed from
concealment within technology and the architectural technicist proxy if technology is recognized as the ‘worlding’ of essentially self-eliminative thought of ‘modified Mind’, which no one is exempt from at the start. Education is superordinate to this thinking, as is architecture. Academia has to give up the means as ends. Knowledge is not the ends of education. Intentional environment is not its ends. The ends of building is architecture, but the building is not architecture. The U–Topos would be a space of differentiation where what is ‘I’ is differentiated from what is all else. It is a place where dwelling is rooted in awareness, not in the environments we use. Awareness is then known to be what is found in dwelling. The awareness is refined in U–Topos. The relationship with Reality is the Goal of materiality. What is that which is related to Reality?

**Conclusion: The revealing of an alternative in the consequences of ‘efficiency-standards’**

By facing that its proxy is self-eliminative, practice can transform. Disjunction in practice will transform in an undoing through appropriate steps taken by individuals in collective preparation of environments that support Being aspiration dwelling. Remembering that we all presence architecture, some of us will accept duty for the intentional environment, the ‘not-doing’ of working to serve it must be developed.

Alternatives can be conceptualized. Spiritual practice offers a beginning when it is accepted as aspiration in ‘oblivion’. Architecture is definitive of spirituality according to the original discriminating questioning in dwelling as its superordinate programme that is in evidence everywhere. Structuring with hard sciences and social sciences may be developed within individuals and in projects. But work to standardize and make efficient such a thing, in fact any alternative in this context, would be hypocritical to the posed subject this paper responds to. The question derives from the need to reveal the true significance of the need. This is to exit technicist materialism in architecture and in the institutions of education. Approaching this with objective scientific method is of no benefit then. A science of practice so that individuals regain the discipline and sensitivity to practice the art of discrimination is essential.

Transvaluation as transformative valuation can not circumvent or counter the monopoly of ‘efficiency-standards’ while retaining its values in practice. It is clear that one can change one’s view (evaluation) more easily than what one is viewing (architectural and educational environments). Aspiration presences before both of these, according to the preparations in dwelling where a path of awareness, intent and making are integrated. ‘Thinking’ the object to be what ‘I’ thought it, makes aspiration powerful exactly there where much punditry of architects places its complaints. This is similar in education.

University would be a place for dwelling in the infinity of aspiration that supports each individual to attain the knowledge beyond the economy of mining ‘ignorance’ for ‘knowledge production’ to attain the highest condition. The highest condition is an ignorance which gave up knowledge production. This is wisdom, where knowledge, and so human being as spiritual well being, is no longer a commodity.
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