

CONSTRUCTION MODE AND SYSTEM

Three possibilities for the construction of the moshav:

In the beginning the idea was that the moshav was going to form a builders coop as part of the activities, and they would manage ~~the~~ the building of the moshav and build major parts or undertake complete operations by themselves.

The idea did not materialize. What were the reasons? Maybe it was too much to ask and expect something like this from the moshav. Only one thing is certain: that they could save a lot of money if they could undertake the management and administration of the construction, so that there could be no major contracting company. A lot of problems and difficulties.

The second possibility that the Jewish agency favored was to bid the project and the lowest bid would get the job of building the moshav. The normal way all the moshavs have been built in Israel. Intense objection by CES for this way of construction.

The proposal we made finally was something in-between. No builders coop from the moshav, no One construction company, <sup>through bidding</sup> but try to find the most appropriate contractor or builder to undertake the job, e.g. Minnser, ~~and then~~ who would be the construction manager, and then subcontract the different operations. e.g. one construction company would take all concrete work, another one all walls.....

Each one of these construction modes offers different positive and negative aspects for the building of the moshav.

However, one way to approach the choice of the construction mode is to say which one of them (available or made or structured) will make the settlement to be the best.....

The problem is that the market, as it is structured offers limited possibilities, e.g. big construction companies which are the most effective, they build it one way or another, the way they are used to. However, for the quality we want to achieve in the projects this is not the most appropriate way. Is this true? why? Specifically I want to know the reasons.

I know is the most efficient. In terms of the effort put into the project. In terms of the energy, the human energy put into it. The more human effort is put into the making of something, directly into the making of it, and not on the things that lead to the making but in the making itself, the better the quality of the thing.

I think that the human energy channeled into the building of a house through a medium size contractor is larger than the human energy and effort channeled into the building of a house by a big construction company. Probably the total amount of human effort spent in both cases is the same; however, because of the structure and the available means in a big construction company more effort is put into managing, organizing....the process, than in the making of the things themselves.

Anyway, I think that a building process could be organized in such a way as to identify the specific operations that need direct human effort channeled into them so that the product has the quality we want, and the operations that a machine is better and more efficient in doing. My vision is to see a huge crane lifting a beautiful truss into place. Usually they lift prefabricated ugly elements. But, imagine the advantages of a construction process that cranes are lifting in place beautiful elements. There is only one thing I ~~am~~ am not certain about; if there is something inherently ugly and unpleasant in the using of cranes or machinery of that scale.

Human effort and energy channeled into the making of the building;

it is not enough to say: the more the better. Then we would advocate manual labor at the most, totally, in an age that this cannot pass. Human effort ~~was~~ in the building operations that it is necessary to generate something beautiful.

Can you imagine the difference if there was a machine that could lift the boards of the formwork in Albany. That would save time, money, and would not reduce at all the quality of the building. Put the human brain and hands on the operations that determine the quality of the building the most. Put the operation of the machines in the construction operations that do not effect the quality of the building, but on the contrary make it more efficient.

The cost of construction: higher than the usual moshav houses. built by the Jewish Agency. Cost was ~~an~~ a hot issue of discussion with Gaby Krain. He wanted to eliminate all things that he thought would add to the cost of the construction, like parapets, special windows, different heights..... He did not realize that these were the things the most important to the character of the houses.

Different systems of value.? Different hierarchy?

Anyway, we have to come to a conclusion whether or not the houses were expensive for what they were supposed to be or not. They were more expensive than the houses in Shahania, they argued. But, for sure. That was obvious. But, for what they were they were not very expensive.

A The money to be given to each family for the building of their house by the ministry of housing was not fixed and clear.

~~SIXXX~~ The money for each house given by the Ministry of housing is the same amount; however, the cost of each house is not the same. How do we solve the problem of differential costing for different house designs. At what point do we know it. How do is it handled? In Mexicali the problem was solved on a with different amounts of loan to each family.....