

This is a draft of the article after being refereed and just before being published.

Hürol, Y., (2004) "Intellectual Friendship in Architectural Design Education." *Journal of Aesthetic Education*. . 38(3). pp.72-90.  
<http://ejournals.ebsco.com/Article.asp?ContributionID=6321835>

**INTELLECTUAL-FRIENDSHIP  
IN ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION**

Yonca Hurol

**ABSTRACT**

The objective of this paper is to discuss the effects of authoritarian and friendly attitudes of teachers on the design creativity of students in architectural education. The paper contains literary and comparative research on the relation between the authoritarian role of the teacher and the design psychology of the student which affects creativity. A theoretical base is formed for the category of 'intellectual-friendship' which already exists in architectural education.

Is it possible to refuse 'authoritarian limits' in order to provide a better medium for 'creativity'?

# INTELLECTUAL-FRIENDSHIP IN ARCHITECTURAL EDUCATION

## INTRODUCTION

Limits are causes of repression, and it is usually accepted that repression affects creativity. There are two different approaches to the effects of limits on creativity. According to the first approach, creativity increases parallel to the increase of limits and repression.

According to the second approach, any artificial increase of limits produces passionate 'locked in' mechanisms. A decrease of limits is necessary for an increase in creativity. Since it is never possible to eliminate some 'natural' limits, it is not necessary to create some other 'artificial' ones by introducing authoritarian attitudes. Creativity should be directed only towards the natural problems and limits.

The aim of this paper is to develop a theoretical base for the following philosophical statement:

*'Decreasing authoritarian limits causes an increase in creativity in architectural design education.'*

The concepts in such a philosophical statement must be operationalized in order to be applied to the practice of architectural education. The concepts of 'limits' and 'creativity' should be

replaced with some other concepts (variables) which are observable so that they can be applied to the cases in practice.

The paper is based on the post-structuralist philosophy of Deleuze and Guattari because of the concept that they have developed about the relation between the body and the mind.<sup>1</sup> There are also other thinkers who have related poetry and rationality e.g. F.Nietzsche's<sup>2</sup> nomadic thought, G.Bachelard's<sup>3</sup> 'childhood dreams,' and A.Artaud's<sup>4</sup> 'theatre of cruelty.' Deleuze and Guattari's philosophy is used more intensively than the others, because of the clarity of the concepts it contains.

The concept of creativity is operationalized by replacing it with the variable of 'the design psychology of the student' which can, in turn, be replaced by the constants of 'passionate mechanism' and 'desire machine.' These psychological states and the architectural indications of them are analyzed in the first part of the paper.

The concept of limits is replaced by 'the limiting role of the studio teacher,' instead of the natural limits in architecture such as economy and technology. The limiting role of the teacher has two constants: 'the role of the authority figure' and 'the role of the intellectual friend.' The second part of the paper contains an analysis of the limiting roles of the studio teachers. The first three sub-headings of this part are: the authority figure, types of friendship, and the types of intellectual attitudes in relation to architectural education. The final sub-heading is concerned with the relationship between the intellectual approaches and the limiting roles.

In architectural design courses students design buildings which combine the demands of strength, usefulness and aesthetics. This process relates rationality (mind) to irrationality (body/feelings). Students learn about the rational aspects of architecture in their own ways, while

designing the irrational aspects of their projects. They make contact with the studio teachers whenever they need advice or supportive criticism. This is a one-to-one relationship.

The early approaches to design education depend on authoritarian ‘correction,’ whilst the new models propose ‘objective criticism.’ However, none of these concepts cover the existing power relations between teachers and students. Some teachers believe in the positive role of authority, whilst others do not. A conflict arises between the authority figures, and the friendly teachers.

The formation of an intellectual friendship between students and teachers of architecture is not new. It has existed since post-modernism was first founded in architecture with the differing view points about architecture. S.Omacan, was a student of architecture when he described the changing demands of education as follows: *“School is not simply a structure that is abstract. It is not only an institution of discipline that programs, deals with quantities and evaluates. The name of it, the building of it, and the people in it, always give it a certain personality, and the strongest part of this story can only start with the relationship between these personalities. While this medium of personal relationships forms an unpredictable and unavoidable situation for the institution, it becomes exactly the right thing that students are looking for, because the most important aspect for students in a school is the possibility created by unprogrammed time and unplanned space.”*<sup>5</sup>

The paper provides a theoretical explanation of these existing categories for the first time. The concepts which are analysed in the first two parts are used as variables of the comparative research. The third part contains the comparative research which shows the change of ‘design psychology’ of students in respect of the ‘authoritarian or friendly attitudes of the design teachers’ in two different design studios.

Can the contemporary approaches to the doctor-patient relationship (as in Jung's analytical-psychology), and the researcher-subject relationship (as in Gadamer's understanding), which establish a friendly reciprocity between the participants, also be valid for the teacher-student relationship within architectural design education?<sup>6</sup>

The focus of the paper also demonstrates the way in which the concepts of 'limits' and 'creativity' are made operational. If the concepts of 'limits' and 'creativity' were operationalized from the perspective of deconstruction, they could have been replaced with 'grammar' and 'difference' correspondingly. However, they are made operational by replacing them with the 'limiting role of the teacher' and 'design psychology' so that the actual power relationships between the people in architectural education are highlighted.

## **1.PASSIONATE-MECHANISMS AND DESIRE-MACHINES**

The various types of creative attitudes of students of architecture with respect to their teachers are as follows:

- 1.Definition of the personal limits parallel to the natural limits.
- 2.Imitation of the teacher and obedience to the 'criticisms.'
- 3.Realization of the job with the help of the teacher's 'corrections.'

These attitudes correspond to some psychological states. The relation between creativity and design psychology can be explained with the help of the concepts of 'mechanism' and 'machine.' A 'machine' is able to produce something other than itself, whereas the essence of a 'mechanism' is only to realize itself within the given limits. Mechanisms are closed, whilst machines are open to 'new' results.<sup>7</sup> Here, creativity means identification and reproduction of the new which has already started to exist.

The last two attitudes can only form mechanisms which reproduce the existing limits. The first attitude can be accepted as a machine formation which can produce something new.

### **1.1.PASSIONATE-MECHANISMS**

Psychological mechanisms produce pain when the pre-set limits are crossed. These limits are determined by the environment and personal feelings. Until the limits of feelings are surpassed, mechanisms are as creative as the machines, because the approach to the problem can still produce any result.<sup>8</sup> The pain is created by the result which conflicts with the mechanism. According to Spinoza, pain which turns on the mechanism, eliminates any activity.<sup>9</sup> Both the creative and the passive stages are products of the same mechanism.

This combination of mechanism and pain can be given the name 'passionate mechanism.' Pain relates passionate mechanisms to the body, rather than the mind. A passionate mechanism repeats itself in various forms and content in order to reproduce the same mechanism.

Passionate mechanisms signal the end of creative activities. People who have developed passionate mechanisms can be creative only in terms of binary opposites. They represent a regime of 'either-or's, by selecting their attitudes according to the tensions created by their limits. The student who tries to think in terms of his/her teacher can only detect the binary opposites within the teacher's speeches and make a radical selection from them. It becomes impossible to perceive the shades of grey which exist between the black and the white.

S.Freud is the most famous 'victim' of passionate mechanisms. His limit was determined by his passionate relation to his family. He first became extremely creative because of his awareness of the signs of his psychological problem that he wished to explain. However, his first theory forced

him to face his contradictory feelings, and he gave up this theory to develop the idea of the Oedipus complex which naturalized and generalized his problems.<sup>10</sup>

Psychological traumas appear at any age depending on the existence of physical or psychological violence. Many university psychologists accept design education as a traumatic type of education depending on their experiences with their student patients.<sup>11</sup>

There are no examples for the effects of passionate mechanisms on creativity in professional architecture. This would require intensive biographical studies. B.Tschumi explains his design psychology in terms of limits by mentioning that it is a pleasure for him to be `tied up` with limits while designing.<sup>12</sup> However, since the character of these limits is unknown, it is impossible to identify his design psychology.

Can the physical signs of these passionate mechanisms be seen through architectural projects ?  
Can certain characteristics of the process and the product be accepted as signs of passionate mechanisms ?

## **1.2.DESIRE-MACHINES**

‘Machines’ do not limit the design object with themselves. They give a feeling of pleasure due to freedom. Anybody can produce machines to solve problems without letting the existing authoritarian limit determine the process and the product. If we consider the machines in our lives (such as cranes, trucks etc.), we can say that every new machine makes the impossible possible until people become accustomed to the existence of this possibility and redefine it as a new authoritarian limit.

The concept of 'machine' is joined with the concept of 'desire' in order to produce the concept of 'desire machine' which identifies psychological machines of creativity.<sup>13</sup>

A desire machine desires only the desire itself. It has nothing to do with success, or any other material benefit. Once it is produced, it cannot be stopped by feelings. There occurs an extreme sensitivity directed towards natural limits and the new which already exists in the environment is recognized.

Desire machines put both the body and the mind into service, because of the existence of pleasure. This is a poetical problem showing that without the body the solution cannot be found. Similarly, desire does not separate the content and form of the object, because the poetical existence of desire machines demand continuity between all related aspects.

Desire machines work in terms of maximums, minimums and in-betweens. They create regimes of 'and's which can relate everything to each other. It is the 'either-or' regime which eliminates the existence of desire. The regime of 'and's opens a way to indicate an extreme, or something unusual.<sup>14</sup> Here, an extreme can be defined as more black than the black-black, whilst the unusual can be defined as a forgotten grey in between black and white.

A desire machine always produces something other than itself with the help of the ability 'to become.' The primitive call of the body reminds *becoming* and exaggeration which are against the overemphasized human mind.<sup>15</sup>

*Becoming* is also the main aim of education. The student of architecture should feel repressed and develop a 'line of escape' by *becoming*. S/he is expected not to give up because of these

limits. There is no reaction expected against the teachers, but instead, the student has to find either an in-between position, or an exaggerated solution.

*Becoming* is the result of an extremely fine analysis which cuts the whole content into very small pieces. These parts form an infinite number of compositions with each other. This means that every part is transformed into an intensity, a speed and a direction simultaneously. There remains nothing different between the parts belonging to the constraints of natural limits and the parts which originally belonged to desire. These compositions which are called 'lines of escape,' show that there is always an alternative path to take, as opposed to remaining repressed.

The act of becoming is accepted as a strong personal or social panic strategy against repression.<sup>16</sup>

*Becoming* is a result of being a member of any minority, because the more vulnerable are better skilled in developing such panic strategies than are the members of the majority.

Men become women in order to resist the repression from which men are suffering. Men analyse and transform the activities of women into intensities, speed and direction. They subconsciously might need to *become* women, in difficult situations. This depends on what women can do in the same situation, and "what men's becoming-women can do." *Becoming* means to change in order to open up a way out that has been previously blocked.

Any type of *becoming* including intellectual becoming is immediate as if no new thought has been developed. This immediacy is a result of the contribution of the body to the thought processes. However, this speed of action and thought is different from the speed of 'intuition' in the case of intellectual becoming.

The main source of the ability of intellectual becoming<sup>17</sup> is defined as being “on the lookout for new encounters” in order “to be able to get out” of repression “while remaining within” the same boundaries.<sup>18</sup> The *becoming* of students involves becoming active which in turn invites the knowledge that is necessary for that action.

According to Nietzsche,<sup>19</sup> only the strong ones can consciously become. Although thoughts of Deleuze and Guattari seem to be in contradiction to Nietzsche’s thoughts, it is not in fact, because Nietzsche describes only creative people as strong. Nietzsche’s hero, the philosopher, thinks like a woman who belongs to a minority. The strong men have to become minor (weak), in order to become philosophers who protect those minorities with different moral values. According to Deleuze and Guattari, since women are weaker than men, their ability to *become* is greater than that of men.<sup>20</sup>

Nietzsche’s concept of *becoming* explains how the strong and creative ones can understand and defend the rights of weaker people. Deleuze and Guattari’s concept of *becoming* explains how weaker people can survive in difficult situations. This could be an acceptable way to explain the roles of teachers and students correspondingly.

*Becoming* and desire are opposed to any kind of personal ignorance, specifically to the ignorance of the weak. The need for ignorance causes pain which in turn creates a subjective tendency to destroy ways of thinking rather than destroying one’s own self.

The concept of the desire machine has also not yet been related to the field of architecture. Is the minimization of the aesthetic detailing in Minimalist architecture, a sign of a desire machine?

### **1.3.INDICATIONS OF DESIRE-MACHINES AND PASSIONATE-MECHANISMS**

Poetic character which unites different approaches, is the strongest indication of a desire machine. However, it is impossible to generalize the characteristics of poetic architecture. Desire can produce buildings with any type of physical characteristics. For example, very simple or very complex architectural projects can be outcomes of desire.

The aesthetic characteristics of the products of desire machines cannot be generalized even with the support of any aesthetic theory which highlights only the form. Although desire machines do not produce meanings (unlike passionate mechanisms), meaninglessness cannot be accepted as evidence of desire. The existence of personal meanings besides the cultural ones eliminates this possibility.<sup>21</sup>

The only appropriate way of differentiating between products of desire machines and passionate mechanisms, is to question the general feeling that they create. If there is a deep feeling of pleasure or pain accompanying the design, the project is a product of a desire machine or passionate mechanism correspondingly. This attitude depends on the principle of 'ignoramus' which replaces the principle of rationality which cannot explain the existing poetic character.<sup>22</sup>

The determination of the existence of pleasure or pain during the design process requires the consideration of the first design intension-idea, the designer's psychology during the process, the teachers feelings during the critiques, and the characteristics of the final project.

Figure-1 shows the first design idea (the first photo) and the final form of a station project. Here, the idea which is 'passing through a gap in time,' starts working as a machine by freeing the designer from relating the different design decisions to each other. Everything is determined according to this idea and the playful process is enjoyed.

Figure 1.A student project.

Z.Atatürk,Station Project,Arch201,EMU.(Ö.Dinçyürek's archive)

## **2.LIMITING ROLES OF DESIGN TEACHERS**

There are some inevitable and unavoidable limits in education, which cannot be avoided by the individual teachers. Teachers must follow the regulations according to the agreement they have made with the institution. These might involve requirements such as the evaluation of the students, or their attendance. The distance between teachers and students exists as another limit to ensure that there is only an intellectual relationship between teachers and students. The differences between authority figures and intellectual friends should be explained limits other than these.

### **2.1.LEVEL OF LIMITS AND AUTHORITY FIGURES**

The subjective limits conflict with any type of reasoning. For example, two studio teachers might demand two different solutions without giving any reason. Similarly, the description of the design subjects might be stated in such a way as to eliminate all possible 'lines of escape' for the students. For example, stating that the projects have to be between ten and thirty storeys is such a limit. Such cases are rare.

Elimination of any architectural view point other than the teacher's view point which is usually parallel to the official discourse of architecture, is the most frequent limit in architectural design education. Is it possible to eliminate this limit? If the teacher is a deconstructivist, will s/he expect all the students to imitate him/her? Can this teacher believe in deconstruction and, at the same time direct the students to other approaches?

The answers of authority figures and intellectual friends to these questions differ. The authority figure thinks that s/he knows the right, good and the beautiful, and expects his/her students to adopt the same value system. This person believes that it is ridiculous to be sure about having the right perspective, and directing the students towards other attitudes.

According to the intellectual friend, being very sure about having the right, good and the most beautiful perspective, goes against the ethics of education, which means continuous questioning of the sources of authenticity.

## **2.2.LEVEL OF LIMITS AND FRIENDSHIP**

Friendship<sup>23</sup> is related to philosophy (love of wisdom), and it can be defined as “the very category or condition of the exercise of thought” which is peaceful.<sup>24</sup> Wisdom causes this psychological drive for knowledge to be a selfish one that enjoys the knowledge.<sup>25</sup> This drive differs from the drive for achieving ‘symbolic capital’ such as academic degrees. All human beings have a tendency to exercise the process of thought; thus all human beings can be friends including the teachers and students in architectural education.

Different types of friendships can be questioned according to the intellectual characteristics that they offer. *In order to form an appropriate medium for architectural education, intellectual friendship must provide reciprocal communication about general aspects without falling into negation.* Thus, existing types of friendship can be classified as follows:

- a.Non-communicative friendships,<sup>26</sup>
- b.Friendships of negation,<sup>27</sup>
- c.Friendships that are non-communicative about general aspects,<sup>28</sup>
- d.Friendships that cannot provide reciprocal communication,<sup>29</sup>
- e.Friendships that might satisfy contemporary intellectual needs.

The last group of friendships can be analyzed in two groups.

### **2.2.1. INTELLECTUAL-FRIENDSHIP AS A SOURCE OF AUTHENTIC KNOWLEDGE**

According to M. Heidegger the authentic world dwells in authentic thought. There is a possibility of an authentic relation between the world and the people. It is possible for human beings to achieve authenticity without the help of anybody. Questioning the condition of the first teacher of the world, clarifies that s/he had no teachers. Thus, one can always show that there are some people who are able to educate themselves.

The sense of authenticity can never be totally lost. If the world is not authentic any more, the authenticity can be achieved with the help of friends.<sup>30</sup>

If one learns from somebody, and develops that knowledge further, it becomes necessary for him/her to criticise the first source of knowledge thankfully. S. Mulhall describes this attitude as “a model of friendship which depends on conscience.” This friendship is open to the effects of each other’s thoughts, and it provides a possibility to illuminate each other’s ways.

Mulhall gives information about an example of this type of friendship by mentioning the friendship between Kant of Yorck von Wartenburg, Wilhelm Dilthey and Martin Heidegger. Heidegger, in his book “Being and Time,”<sup>31</sup> describes a discussion between Dilthey and Yorck, and then criticizes Yorck. According to Mulhall’s synthesis, this is because Dilthey precedes Yorck, and Yorck precedes Heidegger. Yorck wrote letters to Dilthey both to criticise him and to honour him as his predecessor. He was aware of the fact that his works could only clarify the previously existing path of Dilthey. His criticisms supported and demonstrated to Dilthey that there are some other places which could be reachable with the help of Dilthey, but which Dilthey

himself had not yet reached. Heidegger was criticizing York thankfully, because of the intellectual friendship between them.

### **2.2.2.INTELLECTUAL-FRIENDSHIP FOR THE SAKE OF THE WORK**

Believing in the authentic thought, gives priority to the product, rather than the process. However, the process of work can be accepted as more important than the product. Here, the demand for authentic human relations and understanding between people becomes the main target.

The philosopher and teacher L.Althusser stated that it is for this reason that he never tried to change the thoughts of his students. He tried to support students to see and develop their own ways.<sup>32</sup>

E.Balibar defines his friend Althusser's relation with his students and friends as a model of friendship.<sup>33</sup> Althusser was open to deal with any problem for the sake of 'the work.' Although he was invariably the strongest in all teams, he always tended to listen, and be open to his friends' thoughts. He was always against any kind of artificial competition which demonstrated the hierarchical positions of academicians.

The work oriented friendship enables teachers to eliminate authoritarian relations with their students. Is it intellectually possible to combine different types of thoughts? Answering this question requires the analysis of the different possibilities of intellectual attitudes as well.

### **2.3.TYPES OF INTELLECTUAL ATTITUDES**

The following are the contemporary intellectual attitudes which provide different ways of understanding and remembering.

- A. Being open to the knowledge of only one view point,
- B. Collecting knowledge of different view points,
- C. Integrating the knowledge of different view points.

### **2.3.1. INTELLECTUAL ATTITUDE WHICH CONTAINS ONLY ONE VIEW POINT**

Intellectual attitudes have been related to the existence of a single view point for a long time. This covers even the Modernist intellectual approach which is open only to the Modernist duality of scientific-objectivity<sup>34</sup> and artistic-subjectivity. Modern intellectuality is defined as the ability to be informed about as many actual events as possible. These events are interpreted according to either scientific-objectivity, or artistic-subjectivity. The Modernist intellectual approach is also accepted as the main-stream (official) intellectual approach of the 20th century.

The intellectual attitude which is open to the knowledge of only one point of view, can also house some other singular approaches of thought. For example, the friendship between Heidegger and Yorck provides this type of intellectual approach. These people were not following the main-stream, but they were also not in opposition to it.

The most important difference between this type of intellectual attitude and the following two, is the ability of the others to contain differing types of knowledge systems simultaneously.

### **2.3.2. INTELLECTUAL ATTITUDE WHICH COLLECTS KNOWLEDGE OF DIFFERENT VIEW POINTS (1 + 2 + 3 + 4 + ..... + n)**

This type of intellectual attitude depends on the action of collecting<sup>35</sup> differing systems of thought. In mathematical terms, such an intellectual has extended his/her limit to the outermost parameter of all particular approaches thus enabling him/herself to be able to talk and write about any given subject and from any point of view. With the objects s/he has collected from the

market of knowledge, s/he has built up a much wider range of perspective than that of any young person's.

All of the existing categories within the communication market which continuously reproduces the modern culture, are collected. These categories exist side by side in the mind without being integrated or related. This is a centralized memory system, and this mind is something like a computer program that is able to call on any corresponding constant from the array<sup>36</sup> of variables whenever necessary. These arrays correspond to various knowledge systems that have no effect on the personal life of the intellectual. His/her mind's movements in this digital system of knowledge are in the form of jumps and therefore, cannot provide smoothness and continuity.

Such intellectuals appear to be in a colourful and attractive unity, just like shop windows. This is undoubtedly the well known absolute aesthetic unity of lots of unrelated small pieces. These pieces must be clean, tidy and dust free, as if they were unreal. There must also be a reserve stock in the storage area.

Shop windows are temporary and they must be open to both revolutionary and evolutionary changes of all types. However, this type of an intellectual cannot, as a teacher, be open to the infinite number of hybrid (in-between) possibilities within the field of architecture.

### **2.3.3. INTELLECTUAL ATTITUDE WHICH INTEGRATES DIFFERENT VIEW POINTS**

(Rhizomatic Intellectual Attitude)

This type of an intellectual possesses a certain kind of knowledge which enables him/her to empathize with all other attitudes, including the meta-narratives and hybrid approaches. Since the existence of such sympathies cannot result in the acceptance of any knowledge system as a

whole, they can only, therefore, provide a living knowledge which can also be defined as a continuously expanding non-hierarchical formation; ‘rhizomatic formation.’<sup>37</sup>

Rhizomes are surface plants with several non-hierarchical small roots. They send out their branches and roots to all the sources of water that they can sense. If one of these branches or roots is damaged, the remaining parts can continue to survive, because of their non-hierarchical connections. Deleuze and Guattari use this term to describe a certain type of strategy against repression.<sup>38</sup> They also employ a ‘tree’ metaphor to describe the characteristics of hierarchical thought systems. If one part of a tree is damaged, the whole plant may die. Only rhizomes can survive under such circumstances.

Each system of thought consists of ultimately small effects that can be internalized independently from the whole. The rhizomatic approach is that of empathizing with these ultimately small parts of different speeds, intensities, dimensions and directions of thought. This is a manifestation which demonstrates that it is possible to find something sympathetic in any system of thought. For example, the poet G.Borges, states that whilst he is not religious, he is still interested in religious thought, whilst many people are religious, but not interested in the thought behind their religion.<sup>39</sup> The number of such examples can be increased and reverse cases can also be found.

This type of intellectual is able to relate and integrate different systems of thought sincerely. That is why this attitude can also be described as “becoming multiplicities” by producing “lines of escape” between different systems of thought. Different types of thoughts are attractive for such intellectuals, and the existence of them is seen as an enrichment.

## **2.4.LIMITING ROLES AND INTELLECTUAL ATTITUDES**

When the two types of friendship which can provide an open and reciprocal communication are analyzed according to the intellectual attitudes that they can provide, the following statements can be made.

A.The central thought system of the friendship which is directed towards authentic knowledge is more appropriate to the intellectual attitude which is open only to one point of view.

B.The type of friendship that is purely work-oriented can co-exist with a rhizomatic intellectual attitude which contains many centers in a smooth and continuous manner.

C.There is no such friendship that can provide a collection of knowledge of different types of points of view, because this type of intellectuality requires a fragmented and a de-central world.

When the characteristics of authority figures are analyzed according to the intellectual attitudes that they can provide, the following statements can be made.

A.The authority figure can co-exist with the intellectual approach which is open only to the official point of view such as Modernist scientific objectivity.

B.The authority figure can co-exist with the intellectual approach which provides a collection of different points of view. According to this approach different thoughts have different value systems which can never be related.

C.The authority figure cannot provide a rhizomatic intellectual approach.

Actually, what makes friendship, ‘a very category of exercise of thought,’ is not the centrality of the thought, but the smoothness and continuity of it. These are the characteristics which make certain qualities of a particular path of thought attributable to the thinker. It is the strategy of becoming which adapts the requirements of friendship to the needs of the contemporary intellectual, by giving continuity and smoothness to his/her thoughts.

Any rhizomatic type of behaviour makes the students active in design, whilst making the teachers passive; nothing more than the student's voice of conscience. These teachers can be open to learn from their students. According to Nietzsche: 'One must listen' and look "attentively, because from such cases one learns something concerning the possibilities of life, and just to hear about these possibilities leads to greater happiness and strength..."<sup>40</sup>

Deleuze becomes an intellectual friend by stating that a real 'line of escape' can only be developed by the individual him/herself, because 'lines of escape' can flow in any direction, with an indeterminate amount of intensity and speed.<sup>41</sup> This means that teachers can only draw their own 'lines of escape.' It should not then be assumed that students cannot also discover their own 'lines of escape', and exploit them without the help of the teachers. If teachers attempt to draw a 'line of escape' for students, this would most probably develop a new mode of repression.

## **2.5.INDICATIONS OF LIMITING ROLES**

The two types of authoritarian limits in design studios are: Limiting the architectural view points of students, and application of the rules of discipline.

The following points are accepted as indications of the authoritarian attitude which limit the view points of students.

- a.A belief in the existence of strict 'rights and wrongs' in design,
- b.Developing a series of right decisions that should be given by every student,
- c.Being against some architectural approaches,
- d.Having insufficient knowledge about certain architectural approaches,
- e.Forcing students to follow certain architectural approaches,
- f.Being rude to the students, or having fun with them.

The following points are considered as indications of a friendly approach when considering the view points of students.

- a. Being open to learn from students,
- b. Being able to accept totally unknown architectural approaches; hybrid approaches,
- c. Listening attentively.

The indications of authoritarian and friendly approaches are not opposites.

Indications of the authority in the application of disciplinary rules are as follows:

- a. Increasing the distance between teacher and student to a level that the student is afraid to talk with the teacher,
- b. The teacher adopts a policing role by continuously checking the attendance of the students,
- c. The number of contacts with the teacher becomes the determining factor of evaluation,
- d. The teacher is in a power struggle with other teachers,
- e. The teacher is clearly dominant amongst the other teachers,
- f. The teacher has likes and dislikes and s/he is not open to discuss them,
- g. The teacher defines the project subject in order to limit the students,
- h. The teacher investigates some extra design limits during the process,
- i. The teacher has likes (stars) and dislikes (pathological cases) amongst the students,
- j. The studio rules are determined in order to eliminate the free behavior of the students.

Friendly indications about the application of the discipline rules are as follows;

- a. Adding no more limiting rules to the regulations,
- b. Trying to change some rules for a free education,
- c. Permitting the students to prepare the building program, or letting them make changes to it.

### **3.A COMPARATIVE RESEARCH:THE DESIGN PSYCHOLOGY AND THE AUTHORITARIAN LIMITS**

According to the above literary research there exists three factors affecting the production of desire machines and passionate mechanisms.

a.Power of people is included in this research as the academic positions of people and their attitudes.

b.The level of the success of students is not an indication of desire machines or passionate mechanisms. However, there might be a relation between success and the authoritarian attitudes of teachers.

c.The relation between the formation of desire machines and gender can be considered in another paper by giving the necessary information.

The comparison of the levels of authority in relation to the formation of desire machines or passionate mechanisms in two different architectural design studios was carried out with the help of two studio observers. The most natural observers of design studios and juries are the young instructors who are in the studio team. They give critiques to the students and they contribute to the evaluation of projects. There cannot be any competition between these people and the studio teachers. There cannot be any arguments between them and teachers about the grades of students. Thus, these spectators can be accepted as the most objective witnesses of the whole process.

These observers evaluated authority levels of studio teachers and psychological states of students according to the criteria which are explained in parts one and two. The results are evaluated by considering each item as equal. Table-1 shows the level of limits applied by the studio teachers of the two studios.

Table-1.The limiting roles of teachers in the studios.

Students are more limited in Studio-1 (70%) then in Studio-2 (10%). The difference between the authority levels in the studios increases when the limits about the architectural viewpoints of students are considered.

The second part of the comparative research contains the differentiation of desire machines and passionate mechanisms. The two observers did the evaluation for each student in their studios by considering whether the feeling of pleasure or pain determined the characteristics of the design and the design process. Table-2 shows the possible desire machines and passionate mechanisms, according to the observers.

Table-2.Percentages of possible desire machines and passionate mechanisms in the studios.

Interpretations can be made about the Table-2 according to the average or matching results. In the first case the number of all the students in the lists of observers are counted without considering if the same names have been given or not. In the second case, only the number of matching students in the lists of the observers are counted.

Table-2 shows that the rate of matches in Studio-1 is very high (60% and 90%), while it is much lower in Studio-2 (45% and 12%). This means that the limits were coded by the studio teachers in Studio-1 which functioned at a high authoritarian level. These codes enabled the differentiation of successful projects which were designed with pleasure. However, the reason for this pleasure

is not desire, but success. Similarly, the projects which could have not produced any desire or motivation, are evaluated as passionate mechanisms.

The number of matching cases in Studio-2 are very low, because the students described their own limits and produced 'real' desire machines which is more difficult for the observers to detect. Similarly, the passionate mechanisms also became less readable than the other studio.

The evaluation of three students in Studio-2 as passionate according to one observer, and desiring according to the other, also supports the same interpretation.

It might have been easier for the students in Studio-1 to define the limits earlier than the students of the other studio. These are the pre-given limits that only need recognition. However, it might have been much more difficult for the students in Studio-2 to define the original limits in order to produce desire machines.

The students who did not attend very well became unable to detect the given limits in Studio-1. Also, those students who insisted on defining their own limits might not have been interested in the pre-given limits. These students might also have had difficulties in forming contact with the teachers. These might have been the students who were mentioned as passionate mechanisms.

## **CONCLUSION**

The main aim of this paper is to develop a theoretical base for the following statement: 'decreasing limits causes an increase in creativity in architectural design education.' The actual power relationship between the students and teachers of architectural design education is studied by relating the concept of 'limits' to the 'authority of the teacher,' and the concept of 'creativity'

to the 'design psychology of the student.' Obviously, education of the architectural design activity is a very special medium which lets this original correlation, which is not possible in many other disciplines and arts.

The existing limiting roles of studio teachers are defined as authority figures and intellectual friends. The theoretical part of the paper shows that the intellectual abilities of authority figures and intellectual friends cannot be the same. Authority figures cannot form smooth paths of thought which relate differing view points to each other. They can defend either the official knowledge system, or they can collect different thought systems without relating them to each other. On the other hand, rhizomatic intellectual friends can relate differing view points to each other in smooth thought processes. Some other intellectual friends can defend singular view points which differ from the official system of thought. The intellectual approaches which cannot be defended by intellectual friends are the formation of a collection of unrelated view points, and the acceptance of the official knowledge system.

It is accepted in this paper that the most preferable relation between the teachers and students of architectural design education, is the rhizomatic intellectual friendship which enables discussion of hybrid approaches to design.

The level of creativity of students of architecture is very much related to their design psychology which can either be an open desire machine, or a 'limited' passionate mechanism. Here, the concept of desire machine can be redefined as being open to any result at the end of the study, whilst the concept of passionate mechanism can be defined as having painful psychological limitations and preconceptions about the characteristics of the result. The natural limits of architecture can inspire students of architecture to develop psychological desire machines that

give positive energy and pleasure during architectural design. On the other hand, the authoritarian limits might cause production or reproduction of passionate mechanisms.

The main attitude of the authority figures appear to be the limitation of the architectural view points of students. Disciplinary limits also exist in a more modest manner than the limitation of the view points. The authoritarian limits in relation to the architectural view points of the students, form a code system which serves to differentiate the successful and the unsuccessful students. In the friendly studio, success levels of the un-coded passionate mechanisms and desire machines vary. Thus, it becomes clear that only the desire machines which are produced in the friendly studio, fit with the theory about the 'desire machine' which accepts no relation with power and success.

As a result, it can be stated that the essence of authoritarian attitudes in design education, is to eliminate the formation of desire machines by replacing it with a feeling of pleasure due to success. Students can produce desire machines only if the teachers are intellectual friends who are open to differing view points.

## ENDNOTES

<sup>1</sup> Gilles Deleuze, Felix Guattari, *Felsefe Nedir?* (Qu'est-ce que la Philosophie), İstanbul:Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1995, p.179-194.

<sup>2</sup> Friedrich Nietzsche, *On the Geneology of Morals and Ecce Homo*, NY:Vintage Books, 1967;  
Friedrich Nietzsche, *Philosophy and Truth: Selections from Nietzsche's Notebooks of the Early 1870's*, New Jersey:Humanities Press International, 1993, p.69-76.

<sup>3</sup> Gaston Bachelard, *Seçmeler*, İstanbul:Remzi Kitabevi, 1998, p.15-60;  
Gaston Bachelard, *Mekanın Poetikası* (La Poetique de l'espace), İstanbul:Kesit Yayıncılık, 1999.

<sup>4</sup> Antonin Artaud, *The Theater and Its Double*, New York:Grove Press, 1958.

<sup>5</sup> Sinan Omacan, "Editörün Yazısı," *Beyaz Duvar: İTÜ. Mimarlık Öğrencileri Dergisi*, Şubat 1996, p.1.

<sup>6</sup> Hans Georg Gadamer, *Reason in the Age of Science*, Cambridge:MIT Press, 1981;  
Carl Jung, *The Collected Works of C.G.Jung*, Vol.14, Princeton:Princeton University Press, 1979.

<sup>7</sup> Gilles Deleuze, Felix Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus, Capitalism and Schizophrenia*, Minneapolis:University of Minnesota Press, 1993, p.347.

<sup>8</sup> A materialist approach is open to any result at the end of the work. Louis Althusser, *Gelecek Uzun Süreler* (L'avenir dure longtemps), İstanbul:Can Yayınları, 1996, p.201.

<sup>9</sup> Roger Scruton, *Spinoza*, İstanbul:Altın Kitaplar, 2002, p.83-103.

<sup>10</sup> Marianne Krüll, *Freud ve Babası* (Freud und sein Vater), Ankara:HYB Yayıncılık, 1998.

<sup>11</sup> Centers of psychological guidance of some universities complain about the high rate of psychological problems of students of architecture.

<sup>12</sup> Esra Fidanoğlu, "Tschumi'de Haz Meselesi," *Mimarlık*, Ekim 1997.

<sup>13</sup> Gilles Deleuze, Felix Guattari, *Kafka: Minör bir Edebiyat İçin* (Kafka: Pour une Litterature Mineure), İstanbul:Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 2001.

<sup>14</sup> Gilles Deleuze, Claire Parnet, *Diyaloglar*, İstanbul:Bağlam Yayıncılık, 1990.

<sup>15</sup> Artaud, *The Theater and it's Double*. p.57.

<sup>16</sup> Deleuze, Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus*....., p.291-293.

<sup>17</sup> According to Patton, Deleuze's concept of intellectual is similar to the 'collection maker's intellectual attitude.' Deleuze does not accept himself as an intellectual. However, according to

Stivale, Deleuze's intellectual attitude is similar to the rhizomatic intellectual attitude. Charles J. Stivale, "Pragmatic/Machinic." *Discussion with Felix Guattari*. Wayne State University. 19 March 1985. <http://www.dc.peachnet.edu/~mnunes/guattari.html> (8.8.2000);

Paul Patton, *Godard/Deleuze: Sauve Qui Peut (La Vie)*. <http://www.mailbase.ac.uk/lists/film-philosophy/files/paper.patton.html> (8.8.2000).

The rhizomatic attitude of the mind is accepted as an intellectual attitude, depending on Stivale's interpretation and Deleuze's proposal of 'transcendence replacing transcendental'. Giles Deleuze, *Pure Immanence*, New York:Zone Books, 2001, p.7-20.

<sup>18</sup> Stivale, "Pragmatic/Machinic."

<sup>19</sup> Nietzsche, *Philosophy of Truth*, p.120.

<sup>20</sup> Deleuze, Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus.....*, p.291.

<sup>21</sup> Bachelard, *Mekanın Poetikası*.

<sup>22</sup> Ulus Baker,U., *Ignoramus: Bilmiyoruz: Bilinçdışının bir Eleştirisine Doğru*.  
<http://aries.gisam.metu.edu.tr/theoria/ignoramus.html> (9.5.2001)

<sup>23</sup> Deleuze relates the friendship to philosophy, not the friend. Stivale, "Pragmatic/Machinic."

<sup>24</sup> Stivale, "Pragmatic/Machinic."

<sup>25</sup> Nietzsche, *Philosophy and Truth*, p.5-6.

<sup>26</sup> There is not enough exchange of knowledge in the case of aristocratic friendship which depends on respect between men. Jürgen Habermas, *Ideoloji Olarak Teknik ve Bilim* (Technik und Wissenschaft als Ideologie), İstanbul:Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1993, p.9-30.

<sup>27</sup> Traditional friendship involves a kind of joint total opposition, which unites the members of the community, under a single value system. Since the stronger one does not harm the weaker one, unification appears around a silent acceptance and love. Habermas, *Ideoloji Olarak Teknik ve Bilim*, p.9-30.

Friendships which are parallel to Critical Theory, also depend on negativity.

<sup>28</sup> Some relationships which have religious origins, depend on physical action. Although they produce high amounts of mental energy, sudden actions or no action are required to develop a smooth desire. For example, the leaving of the loved one is accepted as a way of developing the deepest love which is impossible. Deleuze, Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus.....*, p.400. They provide a communication without words.

The friendship which is proposed by Sartre, depends on political groups of friends, who are in consensus without detailed reasoning.

<sup>29</sup> Friendship in Ancient Greece depended on the mental and physical demands which friends made upon each other. The teacher expected material benefits from his/her students, and this caused some moral problems. He (the teacher) was an authority figure who did not lose himself in the thought paths of his students. Instead, he used questions to direct the dialogues. Michel Foucault, *Dostluğa Dair* (Vor der Freundschaft Michel Foucault Im Gespräch), İstanbul:Hil Yayın, 1994, p.70-84.

<sup>30</sup> Stephen Mulhall, *Heidegger ve Varlık ve Zaman*, İstanbul:Sarmal Yayınevi, 1998, p.241-247.

<sup>31</sup> Martin Heidegger, *Being and Time*, New York:State University of New York Press, 1996.

<sup>32</sup> Louis Althusser, *Gelecek Uzun Süreler* (L'avenir dure longtemps), İstanbul:Can Yayınları, 1996, p.174.

In opposition to job, work is always on the side of pleasure. Focusing on the final product (job) hides the insufficiencies of education that are compensated by the “correction” of students. Robert Pirsig, *Zen and the Art of Motorcycle Maintenance, An Inquiry into Values*, London:Vintage, 1989.

<sup>33</sup> Etienne Balibar, *Althusser İçin Yazılar* (Ecrits pour Althusser), İstanbul:İletişim Yayınları, 1991, p.130-131.

<sup>34</sup> Scientific objectivity and instrumental rationality produce useful knowledge which depends on measurement and certainty.

<sup>35</sup> This collection is different from the selective collection of Benjamin. Walter Benjamin, *Pasajlar* (Das Passagenwerk), İstanbul:Yapı Kredi Yayınları, 1995, p.33-43.

<sup>36</sup> Array means a drawer which contains pieces of information, in computer programming.

<sup>37</sup> Rhizomatic approach to knowledge is different from Gadamer's ‘understanding’ which does not start with an immediate sympathy. Here, questions are asked so as to understand and to transform. Gadamer, *Reason in the Age of Science*.

<sup>38</sup> Deleuze, Guattari, *A Thousand Plateaus.....*, p.10-11.

<sup>39</sup> Alberto Manguel, *Borges'in Evinde*. Yapı Kredi Yayınları. İstanbul: 2002, p.60.

<sup>40</sup> Nietzsche, *Philosophy and Truth*, p.120.

<sup>41</sup> Deleuze, Parnet, *Diyaloglar*, p.45-56.

## Figures



Figure 1. A student project.

Z. Ata, Station Project, Arch201, EMU. (Ö. Dinçyürek's archive)

## Tables

| Studio-1                                 |      |  | Studio-2            |      |  |
|------------------------------------------|------|--|---------------------|------|--|
| Limits about the architectural viewpoint |      |  |                     |      |  |
| Authority figure                         | 70 % |  | Authority figure    | 10 % |  |
| Intellectual friend                      | 30 % |  | Intellectual friend | 80 % |  |
| Limits about the studio discipline       |      |  |                     |      |  |
| Authority figure                         | 85 % |  | Authority figure    | 30 % |  |
| Intellectual friend                      | 35 % |  | Intellectual friend | 55 % |  |

Table-1. The limiting roles of teachers in the studios.

| Studio-1 48 students<br>(Authoritarian) | Production of<br>desire machine |     |                             | Production of<br>passionate mechanism |     |                           |
|-----------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|-----------------------------|---------------------------------------|-----|---------------------------|
| Average results                         | 17                              | 36% | 10---<br>----high<br>grades | 11                                    | 23% | 6---<br>----low<br>grades |
| Matching results                        | 10                              | 21% | 8-----high<br>grades        | 7                                     | 15% | 5---<br>----low<br>grades |

10 of 17: 60% matching names among desire-machines,  
7 of 11: 90% matching names among passionate-mechanisms.

| Studio-2 41 students<br>(Friendly) | Production of<br>desire machine |     |                           | Production of<br>passionate mechanism |      |                             |
|------------------------------------|---------------------------------|-----|---------------------------|---------------------------------------|------|-----------------------------|
| Average results                    | 11                              | 27% | 6---<br>---high<br>grades | 8                                     | 22%  | 3----<br>---low<br>grades   |
| Matching results                   | 5                               | 12% | 3---<br>---high<br>grades | 1                                     | 2,5% | 1----<br><b>-high grade</b> |

5 of 11: 45% matching names among desire-machines,  
1 of 8: 12% matching names among passionate-mechanisms.

Table-2. Percentages of possible desire machines and passionate mechanisms in the studios.