



Source: Adapted from the work of Kiyoo Izumi (1968)

FIGURE 24.1
Anthropozemic and anthropophilic environments

The material slum has gone—but what has replaced it? Just mile upon mile of unorganized nowhere, and nobody feeling he is somewhere (Smithson 1969).

There were a number of early groups of critics of the Bauhaus concept of functionalism. One of them was the influential group, Team 10, whose members tried to base their designs on a greater range of human needs than their predecessors (Smithson 1968; Smithson and Smithson 1970). Another was Buckminster Fuller. To him the Bauhaus innovations were mere fashions without a knowledge of science behind them. In Fuller's opinion, the Bauhaus simply

peeled off yesterday's exterior embellishment and put on instead the formalized novelties of quasi-simplicity permitted by the same hidden structural elements of modern alloys which had permitted the discarded Beaux-Arts garments (quoted in McHale 1961).

Much the same argument is today leveled at the work of architects such as Norman Foster and Richard Rogers. The striving for structural and technological dexterity has become an end in itself without a major understanding of issues of solar heat gain, or of the wearing and weathering of the built environment. Places such as the Beaubourg Centre, Place Pompidou, in Paris, which visually appear to be technologically advanced, illustrate this point (Broadbent 1990). The concern is with the symbolism of functionality, not functionality itself. Despite their criticisms, no new concept of functionalism that can be used as a working base for urban design emerged

from the writings of Team 10, Buckminster Fuller, or the recent Neo-Rationalist designers.

Some critics have said the Modern designs are too functional. This point is conceded provided one has a very narrow definition of function. Other critics (e.g., Fitch 1980 and Newman 1980b) say that Modern designs have not been functional enough. This position is the one accepted here. It assumes that the definition of function of the Modernist was simply too narrow. It was based on too narrow a definition of the human being, too simple a model of people and life, and a strong antiurban bias (Wood, Brower, and Latimer 1966; Stringer 1980; Ellis and Cuff 1989).

If urban design is to serve people well, it must be concerned with the needs of people, and thus the mechanisms they use to meet those needs. The term "mechanism" needs to be interpreted broadly. Not only does it mean the patterns of the built environment, it extends to include other people and other animals, the flora of the world, and the machines people have developed to aid themselves in meeting their needs/desires. A functional environment is not simply one that meet people's needs for ease of movement and access to sunlight, but one that meets the broad ranges of needs of many diverse people and the needs of their supportive machinery. All designs involve a tradeoff between the needs of one person and another, between the needs of people per se and the needs of their equipment (Izumi 1968). In some instances the machines required to support human life comfortably, in comparison to humans themselves, have a very low tolerance for variability in the conditions around them. In such situations, paradoxically, to meet human needs, the machines need