

Chrisbut the visions, just the coining of the word is already so remote from what actually intended by it, that I can not see any hope of a person actually getting the point. It is so self-conscious and cute and has ~~actually~~ nothing to do with what is actually meant to be.

Leslie Chris, do you remember in the beginning I was using visions very cute when I was describing something; And I began to realize this year that it is nothing so foreign in the way that a lot of designers...., I mean, they have it in a sense, they can connect with it, I think, in some sense.... it isn't so foreign, it is possible to be understood.

Ingrid It is very different, though

Chris It is incredibly different. When you say that, that actually I find almost more disturbing.

Leslie I don't mean they do it, but....I think inside it is...

Chris Take the Hyatt Regency as a vision. I mean this is what in current twentieth century designer jargon that is a vision. Some stupid architect has suddenly conceived this fantastic master piece with a seven story space. All kinds of insane things going on. And actually the whole reason we introduced this idea in the beginning of the work we did here was precisely to get away from this kind of nonsense.

Hermann Actually, you mentioned something, being in touch with your subconscious through the vision. And the times that happens easiest is when you don't do it self-consciously, but you are very relaxed and you don't force something. And that is what the centering process helps to do. I think that when you try to produce a vision is impossible. And That you have to be in a state of mind that it comes to you. I can think of that personally when I am doodling. And yet all of a sudden you see something in it. Then you can draw it easier because you see what you are drawing.

Artemis. I have another question about visions. Do you mean

that visions are always good? I mean they have a kind of niceness, or there are some cases when visions can be really horrible things.

Chris

I think, in the sense that we are talking about it, certainly, what you are calling these horrible things would probably not qualify it, they are not the same kind of things at all.

This is exactly the problem. The word ,I think, brings all these strange things.

What disturbs me about this discussion even is ^{slightly} that, I do think that in the reality of what took place, I think that all of you really did manage to get somewhere near the authentic version of this several times. I am feeling funny about this discussion ... because this discussion sounds that when you actually were doing this I mean

I just want to pursue the thing when Ingrid said , look, it is very very different from so-called visionary architecture, which the twentieth century is full of, ranging from archigramm, which is actually the most absurd type, to a lots of things which are actually being built, like Portman's Hyatt Regency. Now, and you compare that with a simple

I remember for instance in one point there was a place to get some cold drinks, or there is a flower seller somewhere, or something that is not part of this project; if ~~you~~ you suddenly imagine a children's merry-go-round in some place, these could be a real vision. So could be a ship yard for that matter.

These are things ... they essentially have to do with life, they don't have to do with so-called "visionary architecture"; with all kinds of weird forms, or any specific forms necessarily. They have to do with a different thing that is entered your life and you remember it because of the intensity of its life and the way it has entered your life.

I am not even confident that using the word, I suppose in a sense we ~~xxx~~ have to, because it was our vocabulary.

I see immense danger, that even using the word the viewer of the film is going to get ~~totally~~ the wrong idea, unless it ~~is~~ is unbelievably clear

Hajo

But you know, one main thing which is not clear to me is that there is a strong direction ... we always say it comes unconsciously. I am not so sure. ~~if~~. I agreed to that. I like the word per-conscious, which means that all your levels of consciousness are involved; it doesn't matter if it is whatever comes out of your intellectual mind or... it comes out of all.... In my understanding it has to be integrated with all these levels and then I have the feeling of what ~~ix~~ is maybe called a real vision.

But I am not so sure if it has necessarily to come always out of your unconscious.

Hermann

I am not so sure about it either. What I am sure is ~~what~~ it cannot be something you can produce through. You cannot say I am going to have a vision and produce something, which, I think, is what happens to modern architecture a lot of times

Ingrid

Could we say something in the nature of that the centering process consists of trying to take in the whole field of what is going on ... truly understand it, and so on, and then a vision is a response to that, so to the point that you can actually see it what you are doing. You actually see it, you don't conceive it. At least it has some of that in it, I mean it is like a finished picture. Your understanding is total enough, and your response is total enough that you just see it. That is why this term vision is hard to be replaced by some other term. But it is actually very simple phenomenon though, your response is clear enough that you just see it.

Chris

I think you touched on a another important thing, which is ... the sense ^{in which} ~~that~~ it is unconscious is not that it is ~~at~~ whatever level of the human psyche it is operating. The main sense is that it arises ^{totally} out of the given, in other words, the given generates it;

you don't generate it; the given generates it, and you just see it. That's why it is unconscious, if you want to use that, in other words it is not a deliberate twisty created thing.

There is a certain situation, certain buildings, events, streets, people doing certain things, and then somehow there is a vacuum in some part of it, and you look and see what is there, given all these other stuff, and it actually creates an immediate configuration there, which is one of life, not of an object.

And then, as Ingrid said, you see it in all its details
.....

Ingrid I am experiencing with students now, that the people who actually allow themselves to try to see this, to see what they want to have happened here, and ~~just~~ ^{actually} see it, not ~~try~~ just try, but do see it, they experience this as new and dangerous grounds. It's like " Oh! my god, I have never have thought of that. Do I dare to go on like this"

And then again, the few individuals that do, they realize ~~an~~ enormous capacity to follow up on this, I mean, resources all over the place....

Hye Myoung You can not force your vision, but I don't think it is similar to doodling, I think it is totally different, your state of mind is totally different. You can not just relaxe and what comes up in your mind ...

Chris Yes ..

Ramzi I would take what Ingrid said one step further, that there were other things which were being told to us in a sense.....and the rules of the game, they didn't mean anything until finally we could pin down that this is a game where there is nothing to be won really, which led us to say that you have to be in a state of mind, where your ego is not involved, you are not trying to put the biggest building in the games, and that was felt to us as part of the information

Hajo I ~~think~~ think, in these terms of visions being parts of life, you used ^{quite} often to say "~~it~~ ^{it} is the

most natural thing to do next" That explained it for me very much. And then I see for example the area, the south-east corner of the main square where we struggled so hard, and we had, we thought so many authentic and real visions, and then we wanted to do something ~~th~~ there, something which was really...and then Leslie came up with this bandstand. In the beginning I thought, "what is this now", and then, afterwards, this given created for me exactly the way I could do this ~~rest~~ restaurant and the long building. I found it incredible that it opened up this possibility for me, ~~thaxtix~~ ~~xxxxixd~~ because I tried hard to get around this corner and do something with this corner, it didn't work ~~s~~ simply, it was something.... This thing, in the beginning, I thought, well, obviously not understanding that ~~x~~ this was a real vision. But then it created something which I found after all incredibly much better than what I could ever come up without it, without your bandstand. So, it has a real follow up

Chris That is really a very interesting point, I think, these real visions, the experience one has in encountering them, is both that they are very far-out and also that they are extremely relaxing, because it is very natural ~~xxxxxxx~~ something than to add on something and conceive something else. So they have both of these features, which is rather odd.

Ingrid One interesting aspect of visions is that they tend to have great spacial content. They deal with space in just amazing ways compared to conceived architecture.

Chris Can you give an example of that?

Ingrid Actually the example that was said, in terms of this project, I think, is like that. The bandstand and H Hajo's two buildings somehow,...these angles... They had subtleties of space associated with it... It can't be thought

Chris It is very very simple but it ~~generates~~ does generate an incredible subtle complexity

Ingrid And it has a very three dimensional quality

Hajo I have a question that I can't answer for myself because very often, when you start doing something like urban design, you think very much in terms of functions. We had as well functions, and investigations ~~for~~ ^{about} distribution of functions, and things like these, and at some point ^{in my life} I thought functions are very important, functions have to relate to each other ~~and~~ but they haven't exactly what we call this spaciousness and I have a hard time to make clear connections with those two. But, as far as I understood you are saying that they go into each other anyway

Chris I think there is an interesting point about this. I don't know, if this is relevant exactly but ^{in which} the way [↑] modern architecture works with these sort of programs, where you have a list of square footage which you are supposed to incorporate in a building. If you compare a traditional process, which is much more clearly visionary, in the sense we are talking about, when a building is laid out - if you take a simple house, it can be a farmhouse, - and it is laid out as a product of these kinds of visions; you find all kinds of weird things happening; for instance you might have an unusually large kitchen in one corner, ^{or} you might have somebody's bed squeezed into what appears to be a remnant, and now in a tourist book, it would look like a charming alcove. But actually, there was nothing comparable to the present days program of square feet, governing function with such dead authoritarian hand. Actually, these visions were free to come, and of course, the house works perfectly because everybody's common sense is ~~in there~~ also in there; so people ~~don't~~ don't do crazy things. So, I think ^{actually} ~~isn't~~, not only the question of function, but the whole idea of programs is really challenged by this visionary approach. We somehow get ~~on~~ ^{much} a deeper level of the same thing. You never contradict function, ~~isn't~~ because it would be too crazy to do it. Everything is functional, everything is working, but

that is not, somehow, the thing that is ~~forcing down~~
going to force down everybody's throat,

RamziThe other thing was that we all were
responding to each other

Chris That's very important

In that way, in which Ramzi was talking about, how
actually each person inspires somebody else, the
way in which it is collectively happening, ... I think
it is really important.

If I think of an example; At some point, when Hye M
Myoung saw this pavilion on the small pier. So. you
have this pavilion now, sticking out on the water,
and then looking at that, Hubert sees this ~~gxxx~~ garden
there, and then looking at the garden, then Hermann
sees this very simple library, which has quite a
beautiful simplicity in it, and it is inspired by the
garden, and then on the other side of the garden, ~~y~~
you have the furniture factory.....They are very
simple, but actually, I think, the way in which each
person is moved by what somebody else has done is a
very fascinating aspect of this whole thing.

And ^{then} the furniture factory ^{in itself,} creates that wonderful ~~thing~~
interaction of the trucks and the promenading pedestrians
That spontaneous aspect is beautiful, I think

Leslie In fact, it was hard to build on your one world.

Chris That's interesting

Leslie Because, you felt, first of all, that you are urban
planning, and that you are taking advantage of the
piecemeal process, but also it would be too forced.
It was more spontaneous to come up with somebody else's
~~ideas~~ ideas

Hajo Without the rules and the centering process and the
visions knowing, I think, many of us could have ..
tried to build something next to the building, they
have already done.

Leslie That has to do with insecurities. You want to protect
what you first did

Hajo It has to do with trust with the next person

Hermann Actually, I remember ~~when~~ after the library had come there ~~youkxkxlongxkxixkixingxforkmedxaxkexkxkx~~, you proposed the long building; it formed a courtyard with a tree in it. I remember, we became very involved with that one courtyard. It was one of the most interactive things. It became of much ~~xx~~ richer quality

Ramzi When somebody produced something which was a real vision, ... the first reaction ^{would be} ~~youkxkxkxwxxkx~~ to go and say "this is so nice that I have to keep ... ~~xx~~ not let it ~~xxxxxxxixdixkxkxkx~~ loose its quality ~~kxxxxxxkxkx~~ ~~xxxxkixkixkxixkx~~ by making something else good but not in a sense for your sake but also for the sake ... I mean, this person has all this beauty in this thing, you don't want to destroy it by something mediocre

Leslie A lot of times, when a person did a building, it was not only the building, but ~~xxx~~ you always did it clear in your statement, a sort of bubble that needed to be protected.
I remember, in the educational building, I tried to make clear on the statement that it had to have this connection to the garden; it should be clear that the next building, which ended up to be Mahn's apartments, should allow an opening to the garden.
These were like codes or verbal agreements.
In the bandstand also, that it should be free space around it. It was important for the quality of the bandstand that it should be free standing
I think that there are other cases, too. In the ~~xxx~~ statement of your vision, it was not only the object but also the field around it, that it needed to be related. This was clearly stated.

Hajo I think, in the best cases, one tried to really explain the forces which the new increment created

Chris I am not really comfortable with this force word

Ingrid What, ten years ago

Chris But not in this context, I don't think.

I tell why I don't. What psychologically experiences as a field of force, they^a are not forces in the real

functional sense, like traffic is coming or the wind is blowing or there is a need for parking .

And the word could confuse a person who is trying to understand this.

One experiences a field some sort of a field is set into existence by each act, put together with all previous stuff. You can say, I experience that as a field of force, because it seems to impel me in a certain way, but is not a field of forces.

It is really a field which somehow directs you, but they are not forces in a normal sense, as someone speaks about them in functional architectural

Hye

In physics, the magnetic field. It is more like that.

Myoung

Chris

This whole thing about a field, it is probably true in some psychological sense, but it is more of an analogy; we are not going to attempt to plot it out. Because the whole reason, why we are going into visions you have a vision which is generated by that whole field or ~~the~~ even, the whole centering process, which actually attempts to show how as a product of what is there ~~you~~ you can feel what is the necessary thing to do

I think, it is clear to all of us that it is a deeply intuitive act. I don't mean by that that it is vague. I was never conscious of any attempt to try to diagram this field in any way, which could ^{really} produce positive results. I think the instinctive reaction to what you have to do can be relied ^{on} much more, than some attempt to try to ~~analyze~~ analyze the field and state what it is.

I don't think that one should create the impression that it is uniquely determined. It has to be separated; the feeling that is uniquely determined is actually one of the things that helps to produce it. But whether it is literally uniquely determined in some mathematical sense is very doubtful; because it is extremely personal matter what you come up with.

I don't know how to reconcile these two facts.

I mean ~~the fact~~ , there is the fact that it is uniquely determined in the sense that you succeed to the extent that you loose yourself and you receive it. But, if somebody was to attempt to say, well, it is defined in some mathematical sense by what is there, I think that it should be ~~gibberish~~ gibberish. I would~~not~~ not believe it, at all.

Hajo

I always had that notion of equilibrium, and perhaps from there this notion of forces came.

I think, I am a little bit stuck with this. It quite still explains things for me

I have the notion of equilibrium. In order to get equilibrium, there must, first of all be different forces which work in such a way, that you can create the equilibrium. That is my image of the thing.

And that's why this notion of field forces which by certain actions ~~can~~ create an equilibrium; that's the way I think about it

Chris

I don't believe that

This really takes us into the centering process.

What I believe about that process is that given a particular spacial field~~you~~ you can address yourself to the question "how do I heal that thing, how do I make it more whole, how do I add to it in such a way that I am increasing wholes at large scales, medium scales, small scales, all simultaneously"

And if you simply pay attention to that, it will show itself to you, that certain~~acts~~ acts will heal very much, will strongly create new wholes at a variety of different levels. That has to do in my mind with the configuration, no with forces.

As far as I am concerned, forces is a metaphor. The real thing is that the configuration is the thing that needs to be healed, and in the act of centering what you do is that you create certain new centers which generate wholes that actually heal that configuration by creating more wholeness in it.

That's my view about that.....

That actually I think that is more than my view about it. That's what it is.