

TABLE 24.1
Model of Human Needs

MASLOW (1987) HUMAN MOTIVATIONS	LEIGHTON (1959) ESSENTIAL STRIVING SENTIMENTS	CANTRIL (1965) PATTERNS OF HUMAN CONCERNS	GROSS (LEWIS 1977)	STEELE (1973)
<i>BASIC NEEDS</i>				
Survival	Physical Security Sexual Satisfaction	Survival		Shelter and security
Safety and Security	Orientation in society	Security, Order		Social contact
Belonging	Securing of love	Identity	Belonging, Participation	Symbolic identification
Esteem	Recognition		Affection Status Respect Power	Growth Pleasure
Self-Actualization		Capacity for choice and freedom	Self fulfillment	
<i>COGNITIVE NEEDS</i>				
Cognitive	Expressions of love, hostility, spontaneity		Creativity	Growth
Aesthetic			Beauty	Pleasure

Adapted from P. Peterson (1969), Lewis (1977), and Mikellides (1980b)

based on a considerably more complex model of the human being than his earlier work (see also Curtis 1986). Perhaps this added richness accounts for its success in terms of the lives of its inhabitants (Avin 1973; Schafer 1974).

The model of human needs has to be richer than that used by the Modernists. It also needs to be a model that can be used for asking questions about how human needs are manifested in different cultures. The failure of Modern architecture (and Post-Modern and Deconstructionist architecture, for that matter) to deal with questions of culture and design is so well documented now (e.g., Rapoport 1969; Perin 1970; Brolin 1976) and has led to a number of treatises on cultural factors in design (e.g., Rapoport 1977; Low and Chambers 1989) that there is no need to review it here. In contrast, Le Corbusier (1923) observed:

All men have the same organisms, the same functions. All men have the same needs. The social contract which has evolved through the ages fixes

standardized classes, functions and needs producing standardized products.... I propose one single building for all nations and all climates.

At a very general level “all men” do, indeed, “have the same needs.” However, Le Corbusier was wrong in assuming that the way in which these needs are manifested and can be met is universal. He comprehended neither the full range of human needs nor the individual differences that exist among people within and across cultures or, alternatively, he largely disregarded them in design. Designers need to be sensitive to and argue for environments that fulfill not only “general human needs” but also the specific needs of specific people within specific cultures.

It is clear now that urban design solutions have to be culture-specific. What makes the problem *wicked* is that it is impossible to specify with certainty the important variables of a culture to be used as the basis for design because cultures are always evolving. A general model of human needs has to be one that can be used to ask sensible questions in any culture.