

INTERPRETING WHAT IT MEANS TO LOVE THROUGH THE ARCHITECTURAL OBJECT: A CASE STUDY OF MUSEUM DAERAH KABUPATEN LANGKAT

Muhammad Afif Zain¹, Morida Siagian²

¹Department of Architecture, Faculty of Engineering,

²Lecturer, Department of Architecture, Faculty of Engineering,
Universitas Sumatera Utara, Medan, Indonesia.

Corresponding email: muhammadaafizain@gmail.com

Abstract (English)

This comprehensive research paper presents an exhaustive theoretical exploration of "love" as an ontological and architectural act of total acceptance. By synthesizing advanced architectural theory with profound emotional philosophy, the research investigates the transition of the architectural object from its pristine inception into a state of inevitable decay. This temporal and physical journey is symbolized throughout the paper by the poetic allegory of the "red rose" transforming into the "blue rose." The red rose represents the unblemished youth of an object, past experiences, untarnished memories, and things that are ultimately impossible to hold onto as time progresses. The blue rose, conversely, represents the inevitable decay, the shifting of physical form, atmospheric weathering, and ultimately, our own mortality. Love, within this theoretical framework, is radically redefined not as a nostalgic desire for static preservation or a return to an idealized past, but as the active, unconditional embrace of what a building has become. Through the specific case study of Museum Daerah Kabupaten Langkat, located in Tanjung Pura, North Sumatra, Indonesia, this philosophy is grounded in physical reality. The paper employs Charles Sanders Peirce's triadic model of semiotics (Sign, Object, Interpretant) as its primary methodological framework, mapping the museum's transition from its former glory as the Sultanate's Grand Council to its current, weathered state. The physical scars of the museum its altered dome, its replaced windows, and its aging Tuscan columns are decoded as vital signifiers of its ongoing historical narrative rather than mere structural failures. The resulting thesis postulates that to love an architectural object is to accept its transience. By critiquing the impulse of false restoration, the paper argues that cherishing a building's decayed reality is the ultimate expression of architectural love, a profound acceptance that recognizes our own mortality while simultaneously propelling life and architecture forward into the promise of future red roses.

Article History

Submitted: 15 May 2026

Accepted: 24 May 2026

Published: 25 May 2026

Key Words

Architectural Decay,
Philosophy of Architecture,
Semiotics, Architectural
Preservation, Museum
Daerah Kabupaten Langkat

Abstrak (Indonesia)

Makalah penelitian komprehensif ini menyajikan eksplorasi teoretis yang mendalam tentang "cinta" sebagai tindakan ontologis dan arsitektural dari penerimaan total. Dengan mensintesis teori arsitektur lanjutan dengan filsafat emosional yang mendalam, penelitian ini menyelidiki transisi objek arsitektur dari awal mulanya yang murni ke dalam keadaan pelapukan yang tak terelakkan. Perjalanan temporal dan fisik ini disimbolkan di sepanjang makalah oleh alegori puitis "mawar merah" yang berubah menjadi "mawar biru". Mawar merah mewakili masa muda objek yang tak ternoda, pengalaman masa lalu, kenangan yang tidak tercemar, dan hal-hal yang pada akhirnya mustahil untuk dipertahankan seiring berjalannya waktu. Mawar biru, sebaliknya, mewakili pelapukan yang tak terelakkan, pergeseran bentuk fisik, pelapukan oleh atmosfer, dan pada akhirnya, kefanaan kita sendiri. Cinta, dalam kerangka teoretis ini, didefinisikan ulang secara radikal bukan sebagai keinginan nostalgia untuk pelestarian statis atau kembali ke masa lalu yang ideal, melainkan sebagai penerimaan aktif dan tanpa syarat terhadap apa yang telah terjadi pada sebuah bangunan. Melalui studi kasus spesifik Museum Daerah Kabupaten Langkat, yang berlokasi di Tanjung Pura, Sumatera Utara, Indonesia, filosofi ini didasarkan pada realitas fisik. Makalah ini

Sejarah Artikel

Submitted: 15 May 2026

Accepted: 24 May 2026

Published: 25 May 2026

Kata Kunci

Pelapukan Arsitektur,
Filsafat Arsitektur,
Semiotika, Pelestarian
Arsitektur, Museum Daerah
Kabupaten Langkat

menggunakan model semiotika triadik Charles Sanders Peirce (Tanda, Objek, Interpretant) sebagai kerangka metodologis utamanya, memetakan transisi museum dari kejayaan masa lalunya sebagai Dewan Agung Kesultanan (Kerapatan Besar) ke keadaannya saat ini yang telah lapuk. Luka-luka fisik museum tersebut kubahnya yang telah berubah, jendelanya yang diganti, dan kolom-kolom Tuscany yang menua diterjemahkan sebagai penanda vital dari narasi sejarahnya yang berkelanjutan, bukan sekadar kegagalan struktural. Tesis yang dihasilkan mendalilkan bahwa mencintai sebuah objek arsitektur berarti menerima ketidakkekalan. Dengan mengkritik dorongan restorasi palsu, makalah ini berpendapat bahwa menghargai realitas bangunan yang telah lapuk adalah ekspresi puncak dari cinta arsitektural, sebuah penerimaan mendalam yang mengakui kefanaan kita sendiri sekaligus mendorong kehidupan dan arsitektur maju menuju janji mawar-mawar merah di masa depan.

Introduction

For you, what does it mean to love?

In the vast expanse of modern moral, philosophical, and theological discourse, human relationships and the concept of love are frequently treated as ultimate, self-evident reference points, yet they remain notoriously difficult to define without falling into rigid, conditional structures (Hardy, 1970). Love is a profoundly subjective phenomenon. In its most raw, initial stages, it emerges as an intuitive, overwhelming integration of the self with the other an "unqualified moment" wherein boundaries vanish, the universe seems to illuminate, and the individual makes absolutely no intentional mental reservations (Hardy, 1970). During this transfiguring state, the lover responds to the beloved with an open, boundless affection that knows no immediate conditions. Yet, the profound tragedy of human experience is that this peak, transfiguring state is inherently transient. As time progresses and the initial rush of emotion cools, unacknowledged personal limitations and contextual circumstances surface, causing the relationship to become inevitably subjected to implicit rules, mutual expectations, and conditional boundaries (Hardy, 1970). We begin to demand that the object of our affection conform to an idealized image, and when they fail, our unqualified love devolves into a formalized arrangement plagued by hidden, intentional reservations (Hardy, 1970).

To understand the poignancy of this transience, one must look to the central allegory of this paper: the transition of the rose. To love is like witnessing a vibrant red rose in full bloom. The red rose is a symbol of youth, of pure, unblemished past experiences, of the halcyon days of our studies, or of a person who enters our life with breathtaking intensity but leaves because permanence was never meant to be. We grasp desperately at the red rose, attempting to freeze its perfection in the amber of our memory. However, the laws of nature and time dictate that the red rose cannot remain static; it must transition into a blue rose. The blue rose represents the impossible and the unnatural; it is an entity that defies organic limits, embodying the inevitable decay, the shifting of physical form, the melancholic reality of change, and ultimately, our own mortality (Anker & Flach, 2024). Because the color blue is an extreme rarity in the natural flora, often requiring complex transgenic modifications to achieve, the blue rose stands as a poignant marker of transformation and artifice, a symbol of our longing to hold onto that which is already slipping through our fingers (Anker & Flach, 2024). It is something impossible to hold anymore in its original state.

Philosophy demands that we must not reject the blue rose simply because it has lost the crimson flush of its youth. We must not allow the limitations of decay to become insurmountable barriers to our affection. Instead, true permanence in love is achieved by committing to overcome these limitations as they arise, integrating the decay and the shifting reality as new occasions for the realization of love (Hardy, 1970). We must cherish these

fleeting events and shifting states, holding them close and continuing to move forward until we ourselves become the blue rose, returning to the earth in death.

This deeply emotional and temporal transition finds its most profound mirror in the built environment. Architecture, much like the human soul, is born in a state of pristine intent but is immediately subjected to the weathering forces of the world. It is heavily alienated by modern scientific and mathematical positivism, which seeks to freeze it in abstract, unchanging geometry, thereby denying its existential orientation and its inherent mortality (Perez-Gomez, 2018). To counteract this alienation and to explore the depths of architectural love, this paper introduces Museum Daerah Kabupaten Langkat as the physical reflection of the blue rose allegory. Situated in the historic heart of Tanjung Pura, Langkat, this structure has transitioned from its majestic, unblemished youth the red rose of the Langkat Sultanate into a state of physical degradation, bearing the heavy, visible marks of over a century of existence (Fitri, Hartini, & Lubis, 2025). By interpreting this museum through the theoretical lens of love as an act of absolute acceptance, we can establish a new poetics of architecture that honors the scars of time rather than seeking to erase them.

Method

To rigorously interpret the architectural object's transition from its former, idealized self (the red rose) to its current, decayed reality (the blue rose), this research employs a complex methodology grounded in advanced semiotics and architectural spatial theory. The primary methodological lens utilized to decode the museum's physical and historical transformation is Charles Sanders Peirce's triadic model of semiotics. This model is essential because it fundamentally rejects simplistic Cartesian dualism which separates the mind from the material world in favor of a relational, dynamic understanding of meaning generation (Hoopes & Peirce, 1991).

1 Charles Sanders Peirce's Triadic Model of Semiotics

Peirce's semiotic framework posits that intelligence and meaning cannot be reduced to dyadic, mechanical reactions between material objects; rather, meaning is generated through a triadic relation comprising the Sign, the Object, and the Interpretant (Hoopes & Peirce, 1991). In this model, every thought is an action, and we ourselves, in the moment of observation, appear as signs operating within an endless continuum of interpretation (Hoopes & Peirce, 1991). This methodology will be used to read Museum Daerah Kabupaten Langkat not merely as a pile of aging bricks, but as a living semiotic entity.

First, there is the **Sign**, which Peirce describes as the form that stands for something else, appealing to the mind and possessing a material quality (Hoopes & Peirce, 1991). In this methodological application, the Sign is the physical architecture of the museum in its current, weathered state. It is the tangible reality of the decaying Tuscan columns, the altered dome, the replaced clerestory windows, and the cracked concrete (Fitri, Hartini, & Lubis, 2025). The building is the "blue rose" itself, existing in what Peirce terms the category of *Firstness* the sheer physical quality, feeling, and existence of the structure before it is intellectually processed or historically contextualized (Hoopes & Peirce, 1991).

Second, there is the **Object**, which is what the Sign represents, denotes, or points toward (Hoopes & Peirce, 1991). Here, the Object encompasses the profound historical reality of the building. It is the origin of the structure in 1905, its function as the Grand Council (*Kerapatan Besar*) of the Langkat Sultanate, its endurance through the trauma of the 1943 Japanese occupation, and the localized memory of its former perfection (Fitri, Hartini, & Lubis, 2025). The Object resides in the realm of *Secondness*, representing the brute force of history, the dyadic reactions of time, the harsh tropical climate, and the human interventions that have

impacted the building over the past century (Hoopes & Peirce, 1991). The Object is the ghost of the "red rose" that lingers behind the current physical facade.

Third, and most crucially, is the **Interpretant**. The Interpretant is not merely the individual observer looking at the building; rather, it is the subsequent thought, feeling, or behavioral habit that the Sign creates in the mind of the observer (Hoopes & Peirce, 1991). It is the translation of the Sign. According to Peirce, meaning is established by how a sign affects future conduct or understanding, residing in the category of *Thirdness*, or intelligence and representation (Hoopes & Peirce, 1991). In this study, the Interpretant is the philosophical and emotional act of *Love as Acceptance*. It is the intellectual and empathetic mediation between the decaying physical building (the Sign/the blue rose) and its glorious, lost past (the Object/the red rose). The Interpretant resolves the tension between past perfection and present decay not through rejection, despair, or forced architectural restoration, but through a profound, poetic acceptance of the building's mortality.

2 The Poetics of Architecture and the Role of Eros

To deepen this Peircian reading, the methodology must also integrate Alberto Perez-Gomez's theories on the poetics of architecture. Peirce's Interpretant of "Love" requires a framework that resists the sterile, clinical approaches of modern architectural theory. Perez-Gomez asserts that modern architecture suffers from an obsessive reliance on scientific positivism and mathematical logic, an alienation that began with the 17th-century epistemological revolution (Perez-Gomez, 2018). This modern paradigm treats geometry and numbers as timeless, universal symbols, effectively divorcing architecture from the mortal, unpredictable, and shifting "life world" of human existence (Perez-Gomez, 2018).

To counter this alienation, Perez-Gomez argues that architecture must be approached through the madness of *Eros* (love). Love is posited as a fundamental alternative to rational universalization, a unifying principle that possesses its own profound logic capable of bridging the gap between consciousness and the carnal body, between the visible and the invisible (Perez-Gomez, 2018). *Eros* acts much like light; it is the elusive vessel for visible things, operating by simultaneously showing and concealing truth, a concept Heidegger termed *alitheia* (Perez-Gomez, 2018).

By reading Museum Langkat through the Interpretant of *Eros*, we reject the positivist urge to measure the building strictly by its structural deficiencies or statistical utility. Instead, we embrace the "poetic madness" that recognizes the building's meaning as inextricably linked to its physical, decaying embodiment (Perez-Gomez, 2018). The methodology thus frames the interpretation of the museum not as a scientific diagnosis of ruin, but as a poetic reading of survival, where the madness of love allows us to accept the blue rose in all its tragic, worldly orientation

Research

1 The Unqualified Moment: The Red Rose of the Langkat Sultanate

To understand the magnitude of the building's transition, one must first analyze the historical and contextual background of its pristine inception. Museum Daerah Kabupaten Langkat, strategically located in the heart of Tanjung Pura, North Sumatra, was not originally conceived as a repository for historical artifacts. The structure was commissioned and erected in 1905 by Sultan Abdul Azis Jalil Rachmatsyah, the prominent second Sultan of Langkat (Fitri, Hartini, & Lubis, 2025). During this era, the Langkat Sultanate was the largest and oldest Malay kingdom on the east coast of Sumatra, a region flush with the immense economic glory generated by lucrative tobacco and rubber plantations (Fitri, Hartini, & Lubis, 2025).

In its youth, the building functioned as the Council Office for Customary Affairs and the Sultanate Court, earning the prestigious title of *Kerapatan Besar* or the Grand Council (Fitri, Hartini, & Lubis, 2025). This was the building in its "red rose" state. It was an architecture of absolute conviction, a pristine manifestation of socio-political power and cultural identity. The building featured a robust Renaissance-style architecture, grounded in a distinct octagonal layout and adorned with exquisite classical elements (Fitri, Hartini, & Lubis, 2025). Furthermore, it was brilliantly adapted to the harsh realities of the tropical climate. The design incorporated a surrounding portico that served as a vital transition space between the intense exterior heat and the interior chambers, while the main roof covering seamlessly integrated traditional Malay architectural elements (Fitri, Hartini, & Lubis, 2025). The portico, capped with a concrete flat roof, was supported by classic Tuscan-style Roman columns, projecting an aura of stoic endurance and regal authority (Fitri, Hartini, & Lubis, 2025).

This period of the building's life parallels what Daniel Hardy describes as the "unqualified moment" of love. In such moments, the experience is so overwhelming and transfiguring that it seems to light up the universe, and the response is one of total integration without any intentional mental reservations (Hardy, 1970). In 1905, the *Kerapatan Besar* was the Sultanate's unqualified moment. It was a space produced to command, to organize, and to project an image of absolute permanence against the chaotic backdrop of the natural world. It possessed an unblemished aesthetic purity, a geometric exactitude resulting from the highest abstractions of architectural planning. For the people of Langkat, the building was a blooming red rose, an entity to be cherished in the present, seemingly invincible to the ravages of the future. The interior rooms, which now house the ethnographic artifacts and the relics of Tengku Amir Hamzah, were originally vibrant, living spaces of governance and justice, entirely untouched by the tragic realities of historical collapse that lay ahead (Fitri, Hartini, & Lubis, 2025).

2 Historical Trauma and Physical Decay: The Emergence of the Blue Rose

However, the agonizing truth of human existence and architectural materiality is that transience guarantees no red rose can bloom forever. The transition of the *Kerapatan Besar* into its current iteration as Museum Langkat was marked by severe historical ruptures. The most devastating of these was the Japanese occupation in 1943, an event that violently stripped the building of its original context, dethroned its primary function, and initiated its long, arduous encounter with historical trauma (Fitri, Hartini, & Lubis, 2025).

Today, the building has irrefutably become the "blue rose." In the realm of natural flora, the color blue is a distinct anomaly. Less than ten percent of flowering plants produce blue flowers, making the true blue rose a biological impossibility in nature that requires advanced transgenic modifications to achieve (Anker & Flach, 2024). It is a marker of profound transformation, an artificial or altered state that highlights the extreme limits of natural preservation and serves as a powerful cultural symbol of longing for the unattainable (Anker & Flach, 2024). The museum, similarly, has been fundamentally altered by the chemistry of time, geopolitical shifts, and human intervention. It can no longer be what it was; it is an altered state.

The current physical reality of the museum is characterized by visible decay and significant aesthetic mutation. A comprehensive analysis of the building's interior and exterior architecture reveals the severe limitations the structure now embodies:

Strengths (The Lingering Red Rose)	Weaknesses & Decay (The Emerging Blue Rose)

Robust core structure despite being over 100 years old.	Pronounced weathering, physical degradation, and decay due to continuous aging.
Renaissance-style architecture with an octagonal layout and classic Tuscan columns.	Altered dome design that significantly reduces the building's original architectural authenticity.
Adapted to the tropical climate with surrounding verandas acting as transition spaces.	Reduced natural ventilation due to original clerestory windows being replaced.
Diverse functional spaces supporting the potential for a rich visitor experience.	Inadequate modern facilities; permanent exhibition layout relying on harsh, conventional white incandescent lamps.
Strong historical and symbolic value as the former Sultan's Council Hall.	Limited space for collection displays; main rotunda forced into dual use for socialization events, requiring the moving of vitrines.

Table 1: Structural and spatial analysis of Museum Langkat, highlighting the tension between its historic origins and contemporary decay (Fitri, Hartini, & Lubis, 2025).

The museum is deeply scarred. The altered dome design sits atop the structure as a highly visible mutation, severing the building from the strict architectural authenticity of its 1905 blueprint (Fitri, Hartini, & Lubis, 2025). The original clerestory windows, which were once vital respiratory organs allowing the building to breathe in the sweltering tropical heat, have been unceremoniously replaced, choking off the natural ventilation and fundamentally altering the atmospheric lived space within (Fitri, Hartini, & Lubis, 2025). Intense weathering has eaten into the exterior facade, eroding the sharp edges of the Tuscan columns. Inside, the lighting is stark and unforgiving, relying on conventional white incandescent lamps that cast harsh shadows over the museum's collections, which themselves are mostly mere duplicates of artifacts from the Langkat Sultan Palace (Fitri, Hartini, & Lubis, 2025). Furthermore, the spatial constraints are severe; the central rotunda must double as a space for scientific discussions and socialization events, forcing the awkward rearrangement of chairs and collection vitrines (Fitri, Hartini, & Lubis, 2025).

In the context of human relationships, these physical degradations and spatial compromises are akin to the "limitations" and "conditions" that inevitably arise after the initial infatuation of a new relationship fades. Hardy posits that people naturally harbor intentional reservations when the object of their affection no longer conforms to an idealized, perfect standard (Hardy, 1970). Observers of the museum, whether they be locals, tourists, or government officials, might look upon its altered dome, its poor ventilation, and its aging

columns, and feel a deep sense of betrayal or disappointment. The temptation is to demand that the building be "fixed," to establish a new set of rules requiring it to prove its worth by returning to the pristine state of its youth.

◆ Yet, as Perez-Gomez eloquently argues, reducing architecture to an abstract, pristine state of geometrical perfection severely alienates it from the human condition. Architecture must remain intimately connected to the mortal, carnal body a body that inherently wrinkles, ages, and dies (Perez-Gomez, 2018). The weathering of Museum Langkat is not merely a failure of maintenance or a breach of an architectural contract; it is the physical manifestation of *alitheia* (truth). The building's current state is an eloquent, poetic testament to its miraculous survival through a century of geopolitical upheaval, colonial occupation, and relentless climatic endurance. It has fully transitioned into the blue rose, an entity impossible to hold in the past, existing now in a delicate, melancholic beauty that requires a radical shift in how we perceive and interact with it.

Result

If we are to view architecture not merely as a functional arrangement of materials but through the lens of deep, emotional philosophy, we must recognize that the physical envelope of a building is intimately bound to the tragic and beautiful reality of the human condition. A building is not a static object frozen in the vacuum of a planner's abstract geometry; it is a mortal entity. It is born from human ambition, it breathes the atmosphere of its environment, it bears the immense weight of the historical events that unfold within its walls, and eventually, inevitably, it decays. The architectural translation of the blue rose allegory reveals a profound, ontological thesis regarding our relationship with the built environment: in architecture, "to Love is to Accept it."

When we confront the current, weathered state of Museum Daerah Kabupaten Langkat, we are immediately forced to grapple with the heavy melancholia of loss. The red rose of its 1905 inception the unblemished *Kerapatan Besar* with its perfectly proportioned dome, its flawless clerestory windows, and its aura of invincibility is gone. It represents the fleeting experience of youth and the ghosts of past events that are impossible to hold onto anymore. The natural human reflex, born of a deep-seated nostalgia and an inherent, terrifying fear of our own mortality, is to reject this loss. We wish to turn back the clock. In architectural practice, this rejection of mortality often manifests in the deeply flawed pursuit of false restoration.

False restoration is a fundamental refusal to love the object as it actually is. It is the exact equivalent of imposing a strict, unyielding condition upon a human relationship, demanding that a partner permanently maintain the aesthetic and emotional state of their youth, refusing to acknowledge the wrinkles and experiences that come with aging. By forcibly stripping away the weathering, dismantling the altered dome, and artificially recreating the 1905 facade with modern materials, we engage in a violent act of historical erasure. We attempt, through artifice and denial, to paint the blue rose red. In doing so, we strip the building of its lived experience. We inadvertently tell the architecture that its survival through the Japanese occupation, its stoic endurance against the relentless tropical rains, and its long, slow evolution into a museum of collective memory are inherently ugly and unworthy of preservation. We reduce the building to a mere image, an empty, sanitized signifier devoid of the rich, tragic, and profoundly beautiful narrative of its actual survival.

To truly love the architectural object is to completely invert this paradigm. To Love is to Accept it. Acceptance, in this theoretical context, is the ultimate Peircian Interpretant. It is the conscious, intelligent, and deeply empathetic decision to look at the physical sign of the decaying building, acknowledge the historical object of its long, arduous journey, and generate a new meaning grounded in unconditional embrace. It is the choice to overcome the limitations

and reservations that arise when faced with decay, integrating those very flaws into our understanding of the building's worth.

Embracing the museum as the blue rose means accepting its physical scars as an inextricable part of its ongoing, living narrative. The altered dome is no longer viewed simply as a structural weakness or a reduction of authenticity, but as a genuine, beautiful scar of transition. It is a testament to the changing hands of power and the evolving needs of the Langkat community over decades of turmoil and peace. The weathered Tuscan columns, chipped and stained by a century of humidity, and the stifled ventilation from the replaced windows are recognized not as failures to be despised, but as the wrinkles and gray hairs of a venerable elder who has stood stoically through the storms of a century. Love demands that we do not look at the building and wish for a ghost; rather, we look at the building and cherish the survivor standing before us.

This philosophy of total acceptance does not, however, equate to neglect, apathy, or abandonment. Accepting the decay does not mean we simply step back and allow the building to collapse into ruin; rather, it dictates the ethical framework of *how* we care for it. Care becomes an act of gentle, poetic stewardship, akin to tending a fragile blue rose in a harsh climate. Interventions, such as the localization of a hybrid museum model, the careful introduction of digital archives, or the sensitive reorganization of the Amir Hamzah and ethnographic rooms are undertaken not to erase the passage of time, but to support the building in its current, vulnerable state. Modern lighting and contemporary infrastructure are added not to mimic the lost past, but to illuminate the beautiful, tragic reality of the present. The building is allowed to exist honestly, proudly displaying the marks of its survival without shame.

Furthermore, this radical acceptance of the blue rose unlocks a profound existential freedom for the observer. By stopping our futile, agonizing struggle to hold onto the past, we liberate ourselves from the paralyzing grip of nostalgia. When we finally accept that the museum has changed, that the youth of 1905 is dead and gone, we align ourselves with the true, unstoppable nature of time. We acknowledge our own mortality, seeing our own brief, fleeting existence reflected in the weathered concrete and aged timber.

It is exactly through this embrace of the inevitable that we find enduring hope. By accepting the blue rose and letting go of the impossible desire to reverse time, we allow our vision to clear. We realize that the end of one state is merely the foundation for the beginning of another. The museum, in its accepted, hybrid, weathered state, becomes a new, fertile ground for memory and community gathering. And in this realization, we understand that life and architecture are not stories of simple, linear decline, but magnificent cycles of continuous becoming. Because we have found the courage to love and accept the blue rose in all its decayed glory, we are suddenly able to see that there are still countless red roses waiting for us in the future for a new architectural interventions, new memories to be forged, and new unqualified moments of love waiting to bloom amidst the ruins.

Conclusion

To love an architectural object in the flawless, unblemished brilliance of its inception is an easy, almost effortless act. It requires no emotional sacrifice to admire the pristine geometry of a newly constructed facade, just as it requires no courage to love the perfection of a blooming red rose. The true, agonizing trial of love, however, lies in confronting transience. As powerfully demonstrated through the historical trauma and physical evolution of Museum Daerah Kabupaten Langkat, buildings, much like human beings, are subjected to the relentless, weathering forces of time and history. The structure's altered dome, its degraded ventilation, and its aging Tuscan columns represent the inevitable transition into the blue rose, a state of decay, alteration, and mortality that is impossible to reverse.

The central argument of this research is that the hard part of love is accepting this reality without reservation. To demand that the museum revert to its 1905 state through the artifice of false restoration is to impose an impossible condition upon it, cruelly denying the building its lived history, its trauma, and its beautiful scars. True architectural poetics requires us to utilize the concept of the Interpretant to generate a profound meaning grounded in absolute acceptance. We must cherish the building for exactly what it has become, embracing its decay not as a failure, but as a vital, poetic narrative of survival in a harsh world.

Life and architecture must continuously move forward. By accepting the blue rose, we cease our futile battle against time. We open ourselves to the future, realizing that within the walls of the accepted, weathered structure, there are still new red roses with new experiences, new hybrid spaces, and new memories, waiting to be discovered. To love is to accept the inevitable, to honor the scars of the past, and to boldly face the horizon. So let me ask you that question again, for you what does it mean to love?

References

- Anker, S., & Flach, S. (2024). *The Cultures of Entanglement: On Nonhuman Life Forms in Contemporary Art*. transcript publishing.
- Aureli, P. V. (2023). *Architecture and Abstraction*. The MIT Press.
- Fitri, I., Hartini, S., & Lubis, A. S. (2025). Reimagining the Langkat Museum: Developing a Hybrid Museum and Cultural Heritage Center in Tanjung Pura, Langkat. *Journal of Environmental and Development Studies*, 6(1), 43-62.
- Hardy, D. W. (1970). What Does it Mean to Love? *Theology*, 73(600), 257-264.
- Hoopes, J., & Peirce, C. S. (1991). *Peirce on Signs: Writings on Semiotic by Charles Sanders Peirce*. University of North Carolina Press.
- Lefebvre, H. (1991). *The Production of Space* (D. Nicholson-Smith, Trans.). Basil Blackwell.
- Perez-Gomez, A. (2018). Study on Principles of Love in Architecture. *Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research*, 284 (ICASSEE 2018), 422-426. Atlantis Press.