

Lecture 14 November 1

Last time I am afraid what I said ~~might~~ was probably a little disjointed ~~so~~  
~~waxwixxxhaxe~~ and the same may be true today so we have a complete session on Friday  
with no lecture ~~wxxx~~ <sup>and</sup> just discussion about these two lectures and try <sup>to</sup> ~~and~~ sort out  
the content.

So today I am going to present the idea of health, the idea of talking about  
a city from the point of view of its health and being able to derive all the state-  
ments of design problems from that concept. Health is extremely difficult to  
define even in the purely biological medical ~~xxxxxx~~ literature there are no very good  
definitions of health for organisms and as for definitions of health for societies  
of cities they are virtually non-existent. So I am going to move into it a little  
slowly. ~~x~~ To begin with in very broad and general terms what one ~~x~~ means by health  
has to do ~~x~~ with the mutual, the successful, mutual adaptation of all the parts and  
processes in a system. That is very nice to say, it doesn't get you anywhere except  
maybe a suggestive. and a little ~~recher~~ idea which you find in the writings of some  
psychologists is concerned with the idea of self-actualization, in other words every-  
thing within the system that wants to happen can happen. This is again a completely  
vague concept. In the architectural world I suppose the closest thing one gets to it  
is Louis Cons idea of making a building what it wants to be, but that also seems highly  
vague. ~~xxx~~

Now, there are one or two general concepts that have been used in design that are kind of  
the idea of  
~~xxxxxx~~ close to/letting things happen ~~the~~ <sup>trying to</sup> the way they are or the way they want to happen  
And I ~~am~~ going to discuss those first before ~~we~~ get to the grips with the concept of  
health itself. These two general concepts are that of activity analysis, which you are  
all probably familiar with and need analysis, which you are also probably familiar with.  
Now they both, ~~they~~ both these kinds of analysis do have the general emphasis of taking  
seriously what is trying to go on in a system and letting it happen appropriately. The  
difficulty is just like the concept of objective, that I described last time, when you  
pursue them to their logical conclusion these concepts just don't hold up and don't give you



are we ~~a~~ making such a big deal about.

~~Now Now~~ Now this is one sort of philosophy, and I think what I just said to some extent answers that. It says, of course, the environment doesn't do anything to people, it just lets things happen.

Now there is a second kind of quibble that keeps coming up and that is at least shouldn't we merely be dealing with the big issue. I mean let's do the macro structure for example. This is a general view of Tungar and ~~SMK~~ Smithson and others. or let's frame the broad policies, in the view of some policy planners, and let's let all the details take care of themselves. I ~~mean~~ mean really, what does it matter whether a house sign is the right shape or not it is ~~completely~~ irrelevant - it ~~isn't~~ doesn't make any difference to life. This is the second kind of view.

Now the whole idea of ~~stress~~ stress and disease has a fairly important answer to this second objection, but the answer is not perfectly worked out. But roughly the idea is this: These - when a stress occurs or ~~as~~ a conflict occurs what happens is is certain tendencies are being ~~driven~~ driven underground. If tendencies are in conflict then one or the other tendencies is going to have to go underground. And as the tendencies go underground they begin to have - to have kind of ripple effects, kind of galloping effects. The next thing that happens is likely to be worse - it leads to a conflict likely to be worse than the first. And so that every minute little stress is capable of triggering chains of reaction leading to larger and larger stresses. And that we cannot take the view that the little stresses are alright - we don't have to worry about them. Infact from the point of view I have just described<sub>x</sub> of this kind of galloping positive feedback, the chances are, we can't be certain of it, of course, I mean any - it is true that any one of these little stresses may infact be irrelevant, but we can't be certain of that and there is the strong ~~likely~~ likelihood that in ~~some~~ some cases the cumulative effect of a small number of little stresses will have a large scale galloping consequences. This again happens in ordinary disease of organisms. It is the reason



that even when you have, lets say a relatively unserious case of flu lets say, you start being a little more careful about the climate and conditions where you are because you know if you go on behaving exactly the same way you normally do your resistance is low and you are more likely to get pneumonia, in which case ~~you~~ you could die / ~~And~~ And this is the way in which these little stresses often work. One case that was written about which has this general quality concerned ~~the~~ the effect of truck noise on childrens wellbeing I can't document this. I read this once in some German source and I haven't been able to find it again roughly the thing was the following: Some people had found a correlation between ~~the~~ the onset of mental disorder in teenagers and the question of whether when they were little children they were living on heavily travelled truck routes. And the explanation was not that the truck noise was having any direct effect on the well being of these kids but that the truck noise - I mean in a very obvious not very serious sense rather ~~undesirable~~ undesirable ~~made~~ made people in families sleep just a little bit less well. And as a result of sleeping just a little bit less ~~well~~ well there would be slightly more chance of bickering and gradual disagreeableness in those families during the daytime and therefore there was slightly more chance that this disagreeableness could lead to serious conflicts and that under those circumstances a child growing up ~~under~~ in that family would be more likely to get into some kind of mental difficulties.

Now ~~these~~ these - it is a crucial underpinning in the whole series that I am presenting that every little stress can and that there is -- you just have to state flatly every ~~little~~ conflict ~~between~~ between tendencies that can be recognized must be ~~dealt~~ dealt with and eliminated/

Now the one other thing, I think I have said it but I just want to reiterate it. All the other ~~theories~~ theories, the activity analysis, the needs analysis, and the theory of objectives and all those things leave you in some slight doubt both about what objectives to take and also about just what can the environment do to meet these objectives

Now what I ~~have~~ have just presented to you deals with both those questions in one fell swoop very very simply the conflicts are observable or detectable and therefore



there is no need. to formulate any kinds of objectives for yourself and that answers that question but more important is that it makes it quite quite clear what role the environment is to play . Every pattern that is to become a reasonable element in the pattern language is a pattern which arranges parts in such a way as to avoid some other configurational arrangement of those parts known to be responsible for a conflict and that is ~~xxxxx~~ really very simple. It is not particularly easy to carry out. but as a way of working - and as a \_ it really lays out quite clearly what has to be done in the creation of patterns.

Now I want to make one point - thats really the end of the lecture. I want to make one point, I want to raise a difficulty in this theory which might be worth - maybe we could all discuss on Friday or it might be what you are trying to write about it . And it is this: In terms of the spectrum of very very basic needs are here and we could equally write very basic objectives . And on the other hand down here the strictly observable things that are happening now - the activities that are observed in activity analysis. Both these modes of analysis are ~~xxxx~~ unsatisfactory . These are unsatisfactory because they are too general and they don't really tell you what to do but you know we can't be like ~~xxx~~ Trobrianders and these are too specific because they don't realize adequately the fact that there ~~ee~~ may be needs that are not being met in the current pattern of activities which may not ~~xxx~~ get to the heart of the issue ~~xxxxxx~~ so in some sence we want to be in here and to some extend the idea of observing conflicts between tendencies does help you locate the appropriate level at which to be operating in here, but it doesn't quite do it - I mean for instance when you find - I am trying to think of an example - just a second - when you recognize there is a conflict between the obvious desire to have some open space around your house which is shared by any families today a conflict between that desire on the one hand and the desire on the other hand to be close to down town centers and there is simply because you feel you can't



have a lot of single family houses near a relatively small downtown center. You can't resolve that conflict by just taking it at face value. ~~So~~ So then you have to ask the question so what are the two ~~xx~~ tendencies ~~xx~~ really underlying these overt tendencies. I mean what is it people are really after when they go and buy these suburban houses. So what are the tendencies that are really driving them there and what is it they are really after when they want to be near ~~downtown~~ downtown centers. And in a way that kind of ~~xx~~ question is familiar to all good designers. You are gradually trying to move up this scale and you are trying to move up it just far enough so that you don't commit that absurdity and so that you do resolve the difficulties that occur here.

Now that problem still comes up sharply when one is trying to resolve conflict between tendencies and I haven't really been able to formulate an adequate answer to the question of ~~xxxx~~ just at - just what level is it reasonable to go to and at exactly at what level should one be attacking these conflicts.

Question<sup>n</sup>

Reply: Well this is - remember last time I said that the idea that conflict was a good thing is an inevitable consequence it is part of the whole syndrome of the objective theory ~~now~~ and I mentioned ~~x~~ it there and it comes out naturally because when you are ~~xxxxxx~~ talking about objectives you have to think that they are warring with each other and struggling and that it is obviously good that they should be ~~settled~~ resolved and that it is also inevitable that there should be conflict.

Now in terms of the theory we are talking about ~~there~~. This is not nearly so clear. Its - it is quite true for instance that there must be political debate. I mean - that's in the example that you are talking about. ~~Now~~ Now political debate is not a conflict in the sense that I have been trying to describe the concept this morning it isn't an inherent conflict between ~~xx~~ underlying tendencies. It is a process with a reasonable amount of order to ~~xx~~ it. I mean even for instance even a fight, I don't mean that the only kind - I don't mean that the only kind - I don't mean that everything should be orderly and tame even a fight in one sense of the word it is a conflict ~~situation~~ situation ~~there~~ there is nothing wrong with fighting necessarily. I mean between friends and eight year



old boys it is almost necessary. In the theory I am presenting here there are obviously in every ~~human~~ human organism there are aggressive tendencies and the only issue that comes up in society is whether these tendencies are able to find an outlet that is adequate for them or whether they are forced under ground so that the tendencies become really serious and will explode in some much much worse kind of contrivance. So see this word conflict is very difficult at the naive level a fight between eight year old boys looks like a conflict <sup>but</sup> in the terms ~~x, amx~~ in which I am talking about it this morning it is not. They are definitely aggressive tendencies there is no question about that. I think there are tendencies to disagree in people and ~~perhaps~~ perhaps there are versions of those that are - yeah that is an interesting kind of paradox. I ~~xx~~ yes this is partly a verbal matter but I mean that particular thing that you just mentioned might raise difficulties.

question

reply: Now that's true that would be I mean if there is a substantial number riding a bike or even one person is riding a bike and he ~~xxxxx~~ can't ride it that is very real. Now wait I am saying two things let's try and separate, there are two parts to your question. One of them is, of course you're right that people are still going to have their own personal ~~prejudices~~ prejudices and biases and therefore one person will probably pick slightly different conflicts from those that another person picks. But I mean that doesn't deny the objective reality of the conflicts any more than one person may pick one kind of a flower rather than another if he is picking flowers. And that's just a matter of preference. One scientist will pick one kind of problem to work on another one will pick another. So that the only thing you can hope for there is if ~~x~~ we all have this general understanding that by the time all of us working together ~~we~~ more or less cover the gambit of ~~conflicting~~ conflicts that actually occur. The other thing that you raised about the bike - there is nothing - this goes back to the whole idea of independence remember the crucial condition was number three which was "given a pattern and the problem that is supposed to deal with are there other problems which occur in that



context at odds with the pattern stated. Now ofcourse, if it turns out ~~by~~ that bicycle riding is - well first of all if ~~it~~ something that is really truly doing on and also there are things about that ~~sees~~sleep pattern which actually make it impossible to happen then that thing is a ~~faas~~ false fault. I don't know exactly what the argument is cause not aware of very many people trying to ride bikes in most places any longer. But for a foreign area where a substantial number of people are ~~riding~~ trying to ride them. Then I would take one of two attitudes either you have to demonstrate that that can go on quite perfectly as it wants to within the frame work of that pattern or indeed the pattern is wrong.

question:

reply: No I am not saying that. I am saying that every single stress counts. If one is concerned with an urban system - and we have agreed that ~~it~~ is going to be a matter of preference as to which of the conflicts you are going to choose to work on first. Obviously if you choose a conflict which happens to concern Joe Brown and it is unique to him and at the same time there are ~~pher~~ conflicts which are involving hundreds of thousands of ~~xxx~~ people. Some people would choose the case where the conflicts are involving the hundreds of thousands ~~xxxx~~ some people wouldn't but that I mean - ~~do~~ I don't see any real flaw there. ~~X XXXXXXXXXXXX~~ question Yes~~x~~ there is a kind of ~~philosoph~~ philosophical position which is completely unprovable but I probably ought to bring it out --it is an assumption which is in my mind -- I really have no idea whether it makes sense or not and I know that one or two people share it and I know that ~~xxxx~~ other people don't and this assumption is this: That there is nothing inherently in the world which makes it impossible to have a conflict free system. See some people start with the assumption that you are bound to have conflict I mean irresolvable ones. I am taking the attitude, and I couldn't possible argue for this, that as you try to resolve these conflicts they turn out to be much less interdependent than you might think and one can go on and on and on resolving more and more of them and never running into the kind of situation ~~where~~ you suddenly find you have to throw away one resolution in order to deal with another one. Now that is - in a way it is just a matter of experience but also



by purely personal Prejudice it helps I suppose that article of faith is kind of an under pinning that helps supports the view that I presented this morning. but it is not essential to that. Yeah

question

reply; I am only partly in tune to what you are saying. No doubt it is difficult to be truthful about the conflicts ~~at the distance of the question which~~ Which are in existence because ~~(more question)~~

Well let me just give an example - I am glad - I ~~just~~ just thought of an example I ment to give during the lecture - a very quick example - from Cumbernalt Cumbernalt Newton in Scotland. BEcause this I think - I don't think it quite answers your question but it does - it illustrates the difference between doing an analysis of objectives and from the point of view I am <sup>talking</sup> ~~talking~~ about here . In Cumbernalt there is a system of roadways which is entirely separtate from the system of pedestran paths. The - this was based on the precept that the pedestran traffic should be ~~separated~~ <sup>hicular</sup> separated from the ~~urban~~ traffic. Is been built and it turns out that pedestrans walk in the streets. Now there are two reasons for this - I suppose even three I don't know. First one is in order to achieve the complete ~~separation~~ separation of the two systems it was necessary to put in underpasses and I mentioned those underpasses and I mentioned those underpasses in one lecture - I mean I mentioned the whole concept of under passes. The fact is that people have a strong tendency not to use udder passes . They tend to be dirty unplesant, dangerous appart from the business of having to change levels. The second thing is that the pedestran parts because they have been so forcably segregated ~~from the~~ from the hicular happen to be much less direct than the hicular paths which really go to ~~wherever~~ wherever it is happening. Not the tendencies at work in that ~~situ~~ situation are really not quite those represented by the people who formulated this overriding objective . It is <sup>true</sup> ~~true~~ that people are scarred of fast moving cars and don't want to have to wheel ~~baby~~ baby carrages across the road where there are such cars, it is not true that people want or have a tendency to



be segregated from the hicular traffic . People are very happy wheeling things and walking along at the edge of the traffic. It is true that there are tendencies, strong tendencies which prompt people to take the most direct path available to them if they are trying to get somewhere . Not all of the time but alot of the time. There are tendencies that will keep people out of under passes;

Now there is a kind of philosophy - I am not sure what it is called. A general attitude to life formulated in Japan which is expressed by the Japanese in an image of the bamboo as being a wonderful object of strength. And the idea is that the bamboo bends in the storm. Where other trees because they are more rigid are hapt to have their branches broken when the strom comes. Now there is a very strong philosophical similarity between that attitude and the one I am trying to convey here. You cannot insist that pedestrians will be segregated from vehicles. The thing that is really happening has to do with these tendencies anyway so you are only going to make a fool of yourself by doing that kind of thing.

Now it is quite difficult to recognize the truth about these things because our preconceptions are often formulated in a kind of ~~formal way~~ <sup>and</sup> objective way. Therefore there are alot of ~~max~~ planners ~~goks~~ going around ~~not~~ now who think that those two things should be segregated and therefore they did that. It is very difficult to recognize the ~~truth~~ truth behind conflicts . In yourself, a book that is extremely revelant to everyting that I have been saying this morning is by Kitigard called "Purity of Heart is to Will One Thing" and the whole discussion of his book is in what manner a man can actually come to grips with various tendencies in himself so as to get them smooth running. It is known that this is very difficult because one's preconceptions always interfere.

On Friday we will just have a discussion on these two lectures.



any serious basis for decision making . To begin with, activity analysis, I am not sure that its philosophy has ever been <sup>explicitly</sup> written down, but broadly you watch what happens in a <sup>place</sup> ~~xxxxx~~ and you design that place in <sup>such a</sup> way that the thing you saw can happen. Well, the most obvious defect with that kind of analysis is that infact the kind of people that propose it dont take it seriously. You could go to the Golden Gate Bridge and make the observation that a certain number of people jump <sup>off the bridge</sup> ~~xxx~~ in a year and that is an activity which is taking place, and I dont think the proponents of activity analysis would take seriously the idea of making a special place on the bridge that would allow that ~~xxx~~ to happen. This same kind of defect is found ~~in~~ in the analysis of trend among planners. You make a statistical appraisal of the trends in housing demands and then you say propose <sup>tha</sup> a housing supply be created that matches the present trends and demands. Now, that shares with activity analysis the defect that it just simply doesn't raise the question as to whether these activities are good or bad. And any planners who propose ~~that~~ kind of analysis have often been held up to ~~xxx~~ ridicule because they are really not taking the problem seriously and I mean they are not taking the problem seriously, it is ~~a~~ purely laise faire kind of approach which in effect says that there are no serious problems and to let things happen the way they are. Now the idea of needs analysis does try to go, to grapple with that issue, It ways look these are activities are all designed to meet certain needs and if we could figure out what those needs are - the business of design is then to meet those needs successfully.

Now, this is a reasonable and intelligent approach but again when you try to sharpen it you find in this case there are three major defects with the whole ~~idea~~ idea

First of all it turns out it is virtually impossable to define a need. On the one hand you could try to define it according to what somebody says they want, but this is obviously unsatisfactory Since in the most, even in the very simple minded cases the way we use the word need is purely different from that. We say that somebody needs something even though they may not be aware that they need it. If you try to give an



operational definition it turns out that every definition you construct falls down in one way or another. You ask is somebody prepared to pay for this thing that they say they need or do you wait until they come hammering on the door demanding it. It is very unsatisfactory. More serious are the following two difficulties:

First of all people who have been interested in needs analysis have tried to pursue very much in the same generally ~~that~~ way that people who are interested in objective have tried to pursue the needs they observed back to very basic needs. Malinowski is one person who ~~tried~~ tried to do that. He defined I think 7, at one time 7 at another time 11 basic needs of a very obvious and elementary sort; hunger, thirst, sexual satisfaction, security. A more subtle version of the same thing was done by Alexander Layton who defined what he called ten essential strivings of all men. And they are slightly similar ~~but~~ physical security, sexual satisfaction ~~and~~ the expression of hostility, the expression of love, securing of love, securing of ~~recognition~~ recognition expression of spontaneity, ~~orientation~~ orientation in terms of one's place in society, security in maintaining membership in a certain ~~group~~ group, a sense of belonging to a moral order and being right in what one does. Now these - it is correct I think that if you examine a culture you can relate most of what is going on in that culture back to these basic needs. But both these needs and Malinowski's are completely useless in the sense that if you set them up and say this is what a city has to do on the basis of those needs you could say look we should all be ~~living~~ living like the Trobriand Islanders. I mean there is absolutely no - in other words there is no basis for trying to get at the special kind of health that is peculiar to our society given all the present organization that exists in it because if you push everything back to these very basic needs you can claim that a tremendous number of different needs and there is nothing particular to choose between them. So this - the fact that needs analysis tends quickly to take you back to needs that are too large in a sense makes it rather useless as a practical tool. ~~Now the third kind of difficulty~~

Now the third kind of difficulty is much the more serious. This is a real functional deficiency in the whole concept. The idea of needs analysis says broadly



Define what the needs are of the people, who are going to be accommodated in the building or any sort of design project and then meet those needs. Now let's just take that seriously for a minute and push it to the conclusion - the logical conclusion. You can say that a man who is sitting down at home needs - suppose he is reading a book - needs a certain level of illumination, he will need food from time to time he will need as you all probably know - when you are in a chair you have to keep shifting position in order to change the pressure on your behind and so he will need a variety of pressure on his feet. Now, <sup>let's</sup> just construct and ~~xxx~~ environment that meets those ~~xxx~~ needs. This would be an environment which is - which has sensors implanted in ~~this~~ body. It detects the moment at which he is becoming hungry and produces food it is constantly analyzing the level of illumination in the room and making the light level change - as the daylight ~~xxxx~~ grows dim the lights would come on gradually, and it is constantly bumping his buttocks so as to provide a variety of pressure on his feet. Now, this is a pretty absurd picture and the reason it is absurd is that it makes a completely passive view of the human individual, But that is actually what the logic and the philosophy of meeting needs says. If you take seriously the idea that you are going to meet needs you will reach inevitably <sup>this</sup> conclusion. I think it is intuitively clear that ? being absurd that is not a definition of health. A situation <sup>which</sup> ~~xxx~~ is constructed like that. Now, ~~xxx~~ we will come back to that because the active part which an individual must play in his life and in his environment in order to be ~~healthy~~ ~~heh healthy~~ healthy. It is quite crucial to the concept that I am going to define ~~at~~ this morning. So activities and needs are not very promising as a basis from which to construct an idea of health. The third approach - I ~~said~~ said that in some sense health seems to deal with the mutual adaptation of processes and systems within a large system and one might hope to deal with health in terms of all the adaptations and mal adaptations that can occur within that system. Now that is <sup>tried</sup> what I ~~try~~ to do in my book on the synthesis of ~~xxx~~ form, and those of you that have



read it know that I defined the concept ~~of~~ which is called a misfit which is <sup>really</sup> exactly the same as a maladaptation. In general intent I supposed that that was sort of right or had some right direction in it, But again as a tool or analysis it was really useless because just by naming the <sup>thing a</sup> misfit or a maladaptation that doesn't help to come to grips with what things are actually a maladaptations. It does have a certain kind ~~of rightness~~ of rightness about it because it draws attention to ~~that~~ the fact that mal adaptations are the things that we become quickly aware of. So that if you are trying to open a door and something sticks and you can't open it that is a moment that you become quickly aware that something is wrong there and being aware of these little wrongnesses or maladaptations is very easy and inevitably right. But it also becomes possible within that frame work to make up quite fantastic things and claim that they are also misfits or maladaptations. Infact, you can go all the way from the entire gammit of your personal prejudices. So that somebody could claim that not having concrete walls is a misfit and I experiences infact in trying - in working with people who were tempting to use that method and seeing the work that was done by people who were trying to use it that this type of thing does happen very often and that ~~the~~ the various things that are written down as misfits some of them have absolutely ~~no basis~~ - there is absolutely no basis for writting them down. You are no better off than you are with needs analysis or the analysis of objectives because the items on the list can still be entirely arbitrary and it is not clear on what basis one is to construct these items. ~~Now~~

Now I do think that the general idea of a mal adaptation is important in - if we are going to try a defined health it is necessary to define it in terms of ill health or disease that idea I still think is correct. It is much ~~easier~~ easier to come to grips with the idea of something being wrong than the whole thing being right. And to be slightly general for a minute bad health - we say that a system is in bad health when in some sense it is at war with itself, There are processes within the system which spreading the seeds of the destruction of that system. Now this is true in a



very general variety of cases. I mean intuitively true - this is roughly what non-health means. For instance in ecology - classic kind of example of erosion taking place after a forest has been denuded. Then the tree roots no longer hold enough water to bind the ground the wind ~~ex~~ comes in and starts blowing away the dirt and the trees get into a progressively less healthy condition and ~~and~~ some of them start to die and after not too long a period such an area could turn into a desert. Now this is an ~~example~~ - still intuitively a fairly clear ~~example~~ of ill health and we have a series of processes set in motion there - unleashed and capable of causing the destruction of that system.

Now, in the same general idea occurs obviously in health - in an individual organism. A disease is the <sup>inception</sup> ~~inception~~ of a process which is ~~likely~~ ~~likely~~ liable to destroy the whole and in this very general way that I formulated it one can say that there are processes at work which are at war with one another within the system.

In psychiatry the idea of processes being at war with one another is the fundament of all mental illness. It is fairly classic - fairly well agreed upon ~~of all the different disciplines~~ I think of all the different disciplines this idea has been most clearly formulated there. that when someone has something wrong with him mentally it means that he has conflict that there are tendencies or demands or desires which are being born within that individual that are not resolved and that are constantly pushing him one way and ~~them~~ another way. and they cannot coexist peacefully within that system.

Now, in so far as people have been trying to define the concept of stress they have also come to more or less similar conclusions, You might want to look up a report by Carson and Driver a summary of the whole stress concept, I think you will find it in the library here. The most significant ~~view~~ view of stress is again just like health and illhealth, It is badly defined at the moment. People are struggling with



In the case of the street pattern the same thing is true. On the one hand we have the phenomenon that people want to own cars, and they - there is an overwhelming tendency for people to get individual vehicles for themselves and to use them. At the same time they obviously want to be able to cross a city at a reasonable speed as fast as they can, faster than they are able to do at the moment. Now without taking either of those phenomena as good or bad I just assert ~~these~~ two things as fact. Then there is a conflict between them under the circumstances provided by the present kind of treatment ~~we have~~ work.

Now there are two things important about this: The first one is the observation that I just made at the end there. It is possible to discern the presence of conflict without taking any kind of ~~biased~~ biased evaluative position about the phenomena in question. It is irrelevant whether you happen to like cars or like pedestrians, one more than the other. The facts which I have just described make it clear that there are tendencies in conflict, under the present circumstances. If you take the attitude that I do you say at that point that problem has an objective reality and needs something done about it, simply because there is a conflict and in that sense ~~a~~ the beginnings of an insipient bit of illhealth in the system as a whole and that must be dealt with entirely without reference to your personal values.

Now the general ~~=~~ the philosophy which is being put forward in this kind of conflict. First of all let's just go back to that absurd thing about meeting needs I mentioned - the ~~main~~ man in the chair - it is quite clear that this view of things does not have that kind of defect. It simply says look in a social system and a city all kinds of things are trying to happen. Most of these things are pretty complicated there are all sorts of tendencies being generated. These tendencies are specific to the system in its present state - that is ~~we~~ overcome that thing about going too far back to basics like Layton and Malinsky. The tendencies that are at work in Oakland and San Francisco now are there.

To 26 minutes



In the case of the street pattern the same thing is true. On the one hand we have the phenomenon that people want to own cars, and they - there is an overwhelming tendency for people to get individual vehicles for themselves and to use them. At the same time they obviously want to be able to cross a city at a reasonable speed as fast as they can, faster than they are able to do at the moment. Now without taking either of those phenomena as good or bad I just assert ~~these~~ two things as fact. Then there is a conflict between them under the circumstances provided by the present kind of treatment ~~waxaxax~~ work.

Now there are two things important about this: The first one is the observation that I just made at the end there. It is possible to discern the presence of conflict without taking any kind of ~~biased~~ biased evaluative position about the phenomena in question. It is irrelevant whether you happen to like cars or like pedestrians, one more than the other. The facts which I have just described make it clear that there are tendencies in conflict, under the present circumstances. If you take the attitude that I do you say at that point that problem has an objective reality and needs something done about it, simply because there is a conflict and in that sense ~~a~~ the beginnings of an insipient bit of illhealth in the system as a whole and that must be dealt with entirely without reference to your personal values.

Now the general ~~=~~ the philosophy which is being put forward in this kind of conflict. First of all, let's just go back to that absurd thing about meeting needs I mentioned - the ~~main~~ man in the chair - it is quite clear that this view of things does not have that kind of defect. It simply says look in a social system and a city all kinds of things are trying to happen. Most of these things are pretty complicated there are all sorts of tendencies being generated. These tendencies are specific to the system in its present state - that is ~~we~~ overcome that thing about going too far back to basics like Layton and Malinsky. The tendencies that are at work in Oakland and San Francisco now are there.

To 26 minutes



Some of them are of course there are underlying dynamics of considerable complexity. I don't mean they are all visible on the surface but these tendencies are there. And what we want to do is to create a city in which these tendencies are capable of operating freely and are not at war with each other.

Now this has a very strong implication of just what an environment can actually do for a society ~~and~~ or an individual. Both the examples that I gave had the property not that the pattern that I propose is capable of doing anything positive. It doesn't do anything to people and it doesn't do anything to them that is good for them. What it does is it lets the dynamics happen the way they want to happen. And in that sense one might say metaphorically that a perfect environment should vanish. Not literally of course, because if there were a void here then all kind of ~~too many~~ tendencies that too many people have would be in conflict with each other. So that would be a very bad environment, I only mean that metaphorically

I think this is a really crucial point it means that there is no sense in looking for an environment that is going to do good things for people. The question which arose - if you remember last time I pointed out that one of the questions that comes out of the objective's philosophy is since we must have certain objectives and we want to satisfy these objectives. We would then ask what can the environment do to people. In terms of the view I have just presented that becomes a meaningless question. It becomes clear why the various experiments in planning and architecture that have attempted to demonstrate effects of environment on people lead to nothing because the environment doesn't have any effect on people. The only ~~issue~~ issue is: does it allow tendencies at work to have ~~take~~ their own free play.

Now I want to make one ~~more~~ further point. Because a second kind - there are two kinds of skepticism that I think are creeping in very much among designers today. One of them is the kind of question I just dealt with, does it really matter. In view of the fact that the environment doesn't have any effect on people why bother with it. Does it matter what the environment is ~~like~~ like - why ~~don't~~ don't we forget the whole thing. What