

The ph.D Comm. is having some deliberations about the kinds of combination about the kinds of study that you would want to do in the Ph.D. Program. There are different predictions about what these kinds of combinations would be like so we're going to just - if possible - get experimental evidence on it. So anybody ~~want~~ who would do this come down after class.

I'm not going to lecture at all today, I would like to get a discussion started on the contrast between the two views that I presented Monday and Wednesday. How convincing that distinction is. Anything that you have to say about it. I'll let you start the ball rolling.

Question: ...how do you go about letting things happen as they want to if that is the objective

Reply: In the sense that there is one super ordinance objective that is of course true. You could state that a lot of little objectives which are characteristic of the first theory are being - that one major objective - namely the reduction of concepts is being proposed instead. That's what is being stopped. Now, when - let's see how can we get into this - your saying - are you saying how does one actually discover the tendencies that are at work ---

Question:

Reply: Are you saying ~~xxx~~ its to permissive to let things go on as they are now.

Question: No, I don't see how you can say ____

Reply: You can not distinguish between good and bad. Certainly you can. There is an important distinction between just letting things continue the way they are now which is let's say _____ and allowing everything to happen that wants to happen, and that is trying to happen. The whole point of the argument is that under existing circumstances and I suppose under any circumstances there are certain tendencies which are put into conflict ~~mx~~ by the situation current in that system. That seems to me not obscure. Are you in doubt about that? Are you in doubt about being able to identify that statement there.

Question:

Reply: You mean it wasn't clear that there is this overriding decision that health is the limination of conflict and therefore any conflict that you can identify you want to get rid of.

I see what your saying there - it is certainly true that ~~you~~ I don't want to give you the impression that there is a very very negative concept is going to be the only guide line ~~what~~ one ever has in trying to get into a problem. On Monday I'll describe a very large number of patterns all dealt with in terms ~~a~~ between conflicts and tendencies and I think you'll see that these conflicts and tendencies are as concrete as objectives are. In fact there is really no harm once one recognizes the philosophical differences between the two positions in ~~xx~~ calling the various tendencies that are at work objective. As long as you realize ~~this is not the case~~ that the crucial and empirical questions are one that they must truly be present objectively in the situation not just in your head. The demands in other words must really be pertinent ~~xxxxxx~~ and they must be patiently in conflict because of the situation in _____ to identify ~~xx~~ the source of the conflict.

Question: The difference between the two seems to be that the first system of objectives takes itself ~~xx~~ as reality and tries to deal in terms of objectives _____

the limited factors that it is working with and that there's a real world out there

Reply: Yes, that is an important distinction because the health picture says that regardless of - your attempt to state the problem is really a descriptive attempt a predict attempt - your trying to make some prediction about the tendencies that you think will arise in the system and if your predictions~~x~~ are good they it may be healthy. Now, the objective thing doesn't recognize this possibility that its statement of the problem could be wrong because its not an empirical question - a set of objectives can't be wrong there is no sense in ~~what~~ which you can say that theory. Often what happens in the real building when it's built

Question: It's just over a long period that you can evaluate the results of the system, you would get (as caught up?) in ~~the objectives~~ taking your objective as reality and have as good a way to evaluate as any other. It's to the advantage in the long run but not as a working theory.

Reply: Well, let's - you see that's funny because it's true that it sounds like a very philosophical point and yet it does have extremely concrete consequences quite fast. The various discussions about ~~pedestrians~~ and vehicles that we have been having I think are one case in point. Where the health theory leads you to a different conclusion from the objectives theory. Another example, take Sea Ranch. How many people here know what Sea Ranch is. Ok now, they stated as an objective, I mean explicit in that whole construction, preservation of open ~~xxx~~ land, now at the same time one could have reasonable dwellings at very low density and they constructed as you know a small condominium and a number of private houses and the whole thing is still going. If you go up there you find that even on weekends there are a terribly small number of people there - I mean of the tenants. In other words these buildings are almost empty most of the time. I'm not quite sure what is at stake - it would be worth discussing concretely - it does seem clear though that this development satisfies the objectives which have been stated. ~~Reckless~~ the houses are very far apart, there are these swaths(?) of open land between houses. There is this kind of little baby urban condominium in the middle of rolling pastures. These are all congruent with the objectives. But something's wrong there - it isn't working and I'm using the crudest possible measure of working there - apparently the people who own it don't want to be there much. It would seem that ~~the~~ the underlining tendencies at work in those people & according to the ~~way~~ way they live there lives has not been involved by that solution. I'm not going to go into detail about that but you see on the basis of the objectives theory there is really no way of criticizing the Sea Ranch. It does what it set out to do.

Question:

Reply: Within the objectives theory within what basis of the urban criticism.

Question:

Reply: Let's make it a little more accurate - your quite right of course people do construct objectives. I'm certainly willing to discuss the objectives and to criticize them. What I'm saying - I'm saying two things. One is they provide no basis on which to do this within the theory they construct and secondly, when you ~~x~~ do start~~x~~ trying to understand what are they really doing when they criticize objectives you'll find that there really doing when they criticize objectives. You'll find that there ~~xxxxx~~ actually doing the kind of thing I was describing in the second theory but it's past it.

Question:

Reply: Well, no because it doesn't really give you a very very clear indication in other words when I presented the street pattern a tremendous number of people in here thought that the objectives of relieving congestion was - let's put it this way - not as ~~x~~ important as the objective of pedestrian and bicycle's feel being. And therefore the whole thing made no sense in view of that ordering of the objectives. Now my point is, there are of course demands that pedestrians feel but fundamentally you can not get away from the overwhelming tendency toward the use of individual vehicles and there is no point in just trying to legislate it out of existence. It's a reality and in that sense the objectives view does sometimes lead you into very silly things because it does~~x~~ have the view - it does have the idea within it that you can't simply suppress realities in order to obtain other ends. It does~~x~~ have that view in it doesn't it?

Question: I'm not so sure that it doeswhat about the school pattern ... what about the impression of land form ..how does this link them with THE pattern ~~Rxxxx~~ for the urban center

Reply: The crucial claim was the claim of independence which I believe was reasonably well established although each of the ~~xxx~~ things that you just ~~xx~~ mentioned would have to be dealt with specifically. You would have to go through and show that those

are not actually wrecked ~~xxxxxxx~~ by that pattern. Bringing up the argument ~~xxx~~ that such and such pattern doesn't take X into account can always be - there are two ways of meaning that. One of them is to ~~xxx~~ draw attention to the fact like it didn't mention kids going to school. Now obviously the heart of the whole pattern theory is that your abstracting and therefore you are not going to mention every functional problem every time. And the key issue is whether you can demonstrate that one pattern is sufficiently independent of another, so regardless of how that other pattern is solved, it's solution ~~x~~ will ~~xx~~ still be compatible with the first one. That gets you - to the extent that you can do that it gets you away from the need to be juggling and weighing objectives. I want to give an example of that. No, I'll go into that later - the business of weighting objectives because that is - the whole ~~xx~~ idea of weighting things and combining them according to their weight is a crucial part of that first period which makes very little sense, I believe, but we'll do that in

Question: Ultimately what we're saying is that's its impossible to really solve all this conflict

~~xxxxxxx~~ and this is really the basis ~~xxxxxxx~~ behind the ~~xx~~ matter of setting up the objectives..... in practice neither can this theory do any more

because the only way of proving the tendencies is through defense - that is you can only say this pattern.....not because you've shown that it is somehow theoretical

Reply: Now wait a minute - there is definitely no way to prove independence conclusively that's true -

Question: No, I'm saying you can't prove independence conclusively then you have to set up an objective function that solves everything at once but doesn't really solvebecause it's impossible to solve..... what I'm saying is that neither of them are any better than the other

Reply: Do you feel that - let's just discuss solving everything - what did you think about that discussion on the welfare function - do you think it makes reasonable sense in trying to construct a single function and optimize it.

Student: My personal opinion is that the health theory makes a lot of sense ~~x~~ when your ~~xxx~~ talking about a particular thing and problems in it like ~~xxx~~ for instance a tendency like you look at kids after school and there always going out and trying to spend all their time with friends before they go home and they get in groups and run around - ~~x~~ but the question is should that be your objective or is that merelymal-adaptation to home that these kids don't want to go home. So those kind of problems I see but I can't see them be solved out of welfare or any otherthey don't believe that all conflict can be solved.

Chris: I want to just hit you on a particular thing you . Suppose you make that observation that kids are trying to do this after school - and you say you don't know whether one should allow it to happen or not on the grounds that there may be some much deeper. Now, you can be quite certain that every tendency always has deeper roots. Anything that you can name always has deeper roots but the moment you start allowing yourself to go to those deeper roots when you don't have to you can get pushed into the position of totally redesigning the culture. I think that remark of yours is really legitimate. Given that tendency of kids after school and don't know it that's true - it's just an example - unless there are great reasons which makes that into an impossible conflict with something else so that you have to go back a bit there would be no reason whatever for not honoring that.

Question: So you except the contrast of that problem - if there is a problem..

Chris: Right, you see this is really - it's key in a sense that everybody is aware of the fact that the objective that one can state of a system have to be somehow related to the nature of system - so in that sense it's not worth going back Malanowski and Layton and health is a quality which is specific to a system in its

present state in other words it implies minor modifications of the present state of the system but it doesn't _____ with redesigning the system. In a way one has to use the idea of minimum modifications because otherwise the whole thing opens up into an impossible state of affairs.

This is related to the kind of piecemeal engineering argument of Popper and other people and I think that's a very very sound humanitarian basis. The argument was made there ~~xx~~ if you want to start taking unnecessary steps back instead of trying to find higher and higher objectives - you're likely to get into totalitarian position and I ~~x~~ feel strongly that there is an association between the objective view of things and the totalitarian position.

Question:

Reply: ~~x~~ Let's take an example - this issue about being able to get agreements about patterns I haven't exercised much and your drawing attention back to it. But let's take a caserecently. Multi-Service centers - these are properly(?) programmed centers where people come in for legal aid - job counselling, things like that and ~~xx~~ there is a current pattern most offices whether their welfare offices or legal offices ~~x~~ or any other kind of offices where you have a chair behind the desk and then you have let's say a small chair which is pulled up to the desk from the public side or occasionally from the side of the desk. Now, it seems to be the case, an unspoken fact here not _____ that when people who have not been into many lawyers' offices before and most of the clients for this kind of legal aid have ~~xxxxxx~~ literally never been inside an office of this kind before are confronted with a large fat desk like that and a guy sitting behind it - there are very intimidated and not willing to speak openly about their personal lives. Now if you try and deal with this - that means that inevitably with this situation as it exists today it represents a conflict in the sense that the intention supposedly of ~~x~~ both parties

is to get this person to talk freely about his life so that whatever legal aspect
or can be brought out and on the other hand the tendency ~~ix~~ to clam
up in the face of authority represented by this situation. Now that's a pretty
clear kind of a conflict. From the value point of view we are left in the situation
of saying look - this ~~xxxx~~ depends entirely upon how you feel about it - and I've
run into people who feel both ways - they'll say look, if you feel permissive, no --
I should draw an alternative pattern there ~~are~~ are a number of different ones - we
were experimenting with either having the chairs side by side like that or better
having chairs like that ~~wixx~~ (something about a table there). The person is coming
in for help and the attorney or who ever else it is

Now, you can take the attitude look - this is a permissive point of view ~~xxxxx~~
this saying that authority is bad and that people should all be equal and from that
stand point this is talking the view that ~~higher~~~~xxxxxx~~ heirarchical organizations
in society is important ~~x~~ and this is merely one situation where it is important
and this is merely one situation where it is important and it has to be preserved
It is true that ~~w~~ you will find people who do incline to both those values and for
one kind of person supports this and one kind of person supports this. On that
basis we can not get any kind of agreement in among designers as to which of these
patterns actually is the one to adopt~~x~~. What I'm trying to point of is if you take
the conflict view you can assert that there is a conflict in this situation which
needs to be gotten rid of and that statement - that kind of objectivity which
doesn't really involve in the question of what you happen to like or what you happen
like or whether you happen to be inclined toward permissiveness or totalitarian
this is the point of the whole thing.

Q Student: This is a point which wasn't made very clearly in your speech on permissivityassumption of values and consider a person having to design a dormitory for 100 boys. He can assume that each student would like to study alone and hence should get one room each. In this case our objective is design 100 rooms so that

they can live in them or else you can say

after doing studies like this we could come up with where 100 students could live and study and do all sorts of things. In this case after doing studies like this could ~~xxx~~ come up a _____ that maybe 40% of the students like double-sleepers - two guys to a room in that case the need - not the objective ~~xx~~ - is to only provide 60 rooms. 40 for the double _____ and 20 for people who are staying alone and I think this makes it a lot clearer than what you did last time.

Chris: That's good. Let's try and get it out further - it's still not as clear as it ought to be.

Student: & Just as an example, you said ~~xxx~~ you should concern yourself primarily with the spatial aspects and sort of play down the ideas of say the economic point of view. You run into these problems. There is a great conflict. Like with Sea Ranch for example. I feel that primarily people who would like to live there can't afford it and people who can afford to ~~xx~~ live there - well seriously, economically there are ~~xxx~~ people who buy it just for a weekend place, so not taking the ~~xx~~ economic point of view into consideration

Chris: Wait a minute, when I said that they were not ~~xxx~~ occupied I didn't mean that ~~xxxxx~~ they were not occupied during the week~~xxx~~ - I meant the weekend - the time that there suppose to be occupied. Let's just go back to that spatial thing for a minute. All ~~o~~ was saying there was - things become obvious from many of the examples that I have been giving that one can get quite deeply into various social problems. The only thing is what are you uniquely competent to make a statement about. And all I was claiming is that in order to tighten our belts and get a sense of what we're hoping to be competent ~~xx~~ about - the thing that we are competent to do as designers - point ~~x~~ out that this spatial arrangement ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ causes the conflict that I've just stated and that one of these two begins to solve it. That's all I said. I think I tried to make it clear at the time, I wasn't saying just the spatial world forms some sort of

a sensible entity. I was ~~a~~ saying that is what we can direct ourselves to deal with as an organized body.

Student: I'm saying this - when your taking say the weighting of values and views you should weight everything - even the factors that you think might not be of such great importance --

Chris: Such as what?

Student: Like _____ in this case. If this person were from a higher class say he were from the high high class he would undoubtly almost never run into some where where there were long lines(?) he would not feel intimated . So therefore in this specific situation the economic factor has a lot to do with it.

Chris: Well, it's not being ignored in fact it's actually part and parcel of it. Let's discuss this because your saying something about weighting it and your saying let's weight _____ I mean the context here is an institution where somebody from a certain income group coming into to see some staff member of an agency. In what sense does this have to do with weighting here?

Student: From how I've been interrupting this your saying that if you have big debts it appears horrible which I agree with and then say the lower level (some ting about ~~xx~~ paper work) It's been proven that its good somehow. Now, how is it proven that its good. I should think by either trial and error if its been done before and giving value judgement to the different types of situations available.

Chris: It is true that one comes to this conclusion on the basis as you say of experiments. It is know that people talk more across corners ~~a~~ rather than like this. That's a mor general kind of a view and then if you set up a thing like this then you find that on the average people kind of spilling the beans more and you'll know that your getting somewhere. But I still want to ~~know~~ to get back to the question of weighting.

Student: Let me just get one point across - I'm saying that I see great value in being ~~a~~ as objective as you can and not meaning any value judgement at all - background(somethingor other)~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ There's this sort of background (something) hovering over all

that once in awhile and I think a lot of the time - in fact always - you are taking the factor of zero into account. There are the subjective factors that are having a ~~max~~ major bearing on your problem.

Chris: Now, what is one of them in this case.

Student: The economic group.

Chris: I'm completely at a loss (Me too - signed Lou) Now it's really important to bring this out because this business of weighting things is very central to the whole objectives theory and it is not part of the health theory as I see it. So, I would really like to try and get into it. We're dealing with a situation here which has a certain context - ~~xx~~ let's say people with less -- ~~xxxxxx~~ ^{where} a population of 80% of them have less than \$5,000 a year. And this is an agency which is being set up to help these people and has staff members to interview them. Right. Okay. That's the context - its an interviewing situation. The problem --- the pattern let's say these two statements have made ----- this kind of thing is not permissible within the statement of the pattern. The problem is the conflict between - on the one hand the attempt that people are making to describe the situation they're in, to describe their lives, the difficulties that are arising in it and to get advice - legal aid - whatever else is is. And on the other hand they have the tendency to clam up in the face of authority. And there are probably other tendencies in this problem to. But all we need is that. That problem statement has neither the context statement ~~xx~~ nor the problem statement nor the pattern statement ~~xxx~~ has anything to do with weighting. I don't see that there are weights either implicit or explicit in anything that I've just said. I think it's very important to get this cleared up. If there are - let's see what they are.

Student: Just taking a simple example. Let us assume that there is a tendency for these two people the client and the lawyer If that's true why doesn't the lawyer take the clients chair and move.....

Chris: I'll tell you. If you just talk to lawyer's about this kind of a thing. They'll tell you about - well, I can't speak for all lawyers - there are a number of different things - the most ~~x~~ important one which is that it isn't usual. This means something. What it means is that they feel that they have a certain kind of institutional importance and they want to maintain it.

Student: Another words the lawyer has a tendency to leave the chair exactly where it is.

Chris: Yes, in that situation that's right. But what is the tendency really. It's to maintain his importance as a person of some ~~xxxx~~ ~~x~~ professional standing. Now there is nothing about this that makes that inherently impossible and in fact its quite quite possible to set this situation up so that it has that quality. I think it would be wise to include that tendency which you just brought out in the statement of this problem and make clear the various ways in which his importance can still be _____ in this setting.

Student: Can't get it.

Chris: I do. _____ situation put them into context. I believe this is an important view. Just so as not to loose that - that's a very important thing that was just brought out. I'm glad it was. Let's get to the weighting part.

Student: To me its rather subjective in order to feel that you have to be there and I think that itsPlatform to jump off the bridge.... there are some rules that your not suppose to break because your not trying to interrupt society (?) and these are all these subjective things. As soon as you verbalize these subjective things they ~~&~~ automatic ally become subjective (???)

Chris: It is true of course that all these tendencies have a lot of subjective reality within - in side the people who are involved.

Student: That's as a group though not as a number - its a very subjective thing - there are subjective things that are influencing it.

Chris: Yes, the fact that they are subjective from the point of view of the people involved doesn't make them ~~any more subjective~~ any less real ~~xxxxxx~~ and factual.

Student: There's a definition problem again on what's objective and what's subjective. If You can write it down as a function of the number - if you can give it weight - does that make it objective.

Chris: ~~xxxxxx~~ What makes it objective is its really happening inside the people that you claim it's happening inside. What is really happening is the tendency for him wanting to establish his ~~w~~ own importance - in that lawyer, right - that's happening. ~~&~~ This thing about weighting - remember that I, in general, I just want to recap on this question - because if your trying to construct welfare functions and then you feel that you have to balance the various objectives together - of course you have to give them weight, so you know how much to give them in one direction and how much in another direction, stuff like that. Within the outline that I just described ~~howxxx~~ I don't see how the weight - that is the realitive importance - of the fact that you are taking this into consideration has ~~xxxxxx~~ entered (??) the statement or solution of this problem.

Student: I think the reason it hasn't is because you have restricted your contact to one group. I think what your talking about is what happens to the guy who makes 20,000 dollars comes into this same office and is ~~xxx~~ sitting on the corner with the guy - that's not his usual expectation of a lawyer. The lawyer has difficulty - maybe they need a ~~xxxx~~ big table between. That's the kind of relationship that they have. So how would you solve that situation.

Chris: Well, I don't know that theres ~~andx~~ any problem in that situation so I ~~wxx~~ wouldn't try to do anything about it.

Students: Well, let's say that 5 minutes later another guy comes in he's dealing with who's under 5,000 dollars and has to have this corner relationship ~~xx~~ - do they shift rooms or do they use the same situation and there comes the conflict - how do you weight the situation. You selected a specific ~~contextxxxwhichx~~ context which has a specific solution but if you had several --

Chris: Your not - ok you've got lots of different kinds of people coming in, ~~xxxx~~ now what makes you think that you can't have a situation which is capable of dealing with both of those. Your immediately assuming again that they have to be weighted whereas it may ~~xxx~~ almost certainly again be possible to ~~x~~ invent a new pattern in which ~~xxxx~~ these things are capable of slipping by each other. Let me give a classic example of this~~x~~ because I think the assumption that you have - I want to characterize the assumption that is usually at stake when you get into problems of weighting. I'll give a very very simple minded example - I was talking about doorknobs with somebody and they said - look, ^{if} your trying to establish the height of a doorknob ^{problem} and suppose you have the following ~~xxxx~~ to content with - on~~x~~ the one hand adults are trying to open this - a door in a house lets say - and their hands are kind of characteristic range of levels and on the other hand you want the door to be something that the children can open to - little children and they can't reach up to the normal doorknob and so it was presented to me then in that situation ~~xx~~ inevitably since the adult range is say somewhere around there and the children's range is somewhere around there that you must make a compromise and try and choose a position for the doorknob which -- now the point is - this is a very absolutely characteristic in abstract terms whats happening is that there's a range of solutions which is essentially one-dimensional _____ and somebody's assuming that one must locate the best compromise somewhere along that one dimensional range of variations. Now in fact, of course, the way to deal with that problem - if it's a real problem - is to change the discussion altogether and say will not talk about doorknobs anymore, we'll have a push plate, which is an object like that which is hung low and no matter where you put it it opens the door. Always these conflict disappear if you can get off the one-dimension which happens to contain the existing known solution. This is always the case and this is - I think in every single case one ~~x~~ imagines oneself to be necessarily making a compromise or weighting things so one can find a balance point -

there is implicit a one-dimensional variable which is presumed to be necessary.
Density is another example.

Student: What ~~ix~~ if the pattern is institutionalized - there is the big desk and people expect to be on one side or the other and their fed up with the pattern - I mean when you want to change a pattern like that - I mean are you changing to much to have it on a corner for this ~~kx~~ guy who's making 20,000 a year.

Another student: You can change the lighting - you can have windows in the corner and have a panel come down and cover the window behind the lawyer - little cables and ~~w~~ everything

Student: What you say is true - but what if you have sort of physical solutions that have be comed so institutionalized that to change that you really - you might be on a higher level of abstractions but I think ---

Chris: All right - as long as your prepared to recognize that you only need to get into relative evaluations and weighting and compromises and welfare functions so long as you are talking within an exsisting realm of solutions. Then I'm perfectly prepared to accept that. I don't presume that that's the part of design and in fact to me the whole point of inventing new patterns is precisely to avoid that situation. But if you accept that situation your right - then you do ~~kx~~ need these things - I agree.

Student: Can't hear him - he's way in the back.

Chris: Well, that's not clear - could you give an example.

Student:

Chris: I see what your saying -- One of the things, I believe I mentioned this before - in practice when you start~~x~~ working with patterns and remembering always that what your trying to do is to absta~~act~~ the crucial qualify that is really at the heart of the pattern, one ~~w~~ finds that they are very rarely in the kind of conflict that your describing. The particular realization of a pattern that you sketch may be

compatible with another realization of another pattern but if you - I know a few cases - I suppose I - in fact I've never run across a case where it is not possible by appropriate abstractions to eliminate those kinds of apparent conflict. I feel that the - you see in -- there's a ~~xx~~ tremendous amount of feeling in design that one is always trying to make these compromises and ~~xxk~~ resolutions and when you stop to take the view that there are no inherent conflicts but the conflicts are always created generally by the situation in front of you or the view of the situation that you have temporarily. This changes it quite radically. It is a working attitude and I think the only way to confound that situation that I just make is to bring examples which are in absolute loggerhead kind of contradiction. Can you give one?

Student:

Chris; I think it would be worth trying to do this. To see whether you can find a - forget the street pattern - or use it if you want - but if you can find patterns that are stated in the most abstract way possible to solve a given problem and are ~~x~~ apparent in conflict - and not just the situation under discussion - that is hard to do and if you can find ~~xx~~ examples that would be useful.

~~Axxxxkxxxxpxxxx~~