

6 Mar 73

Dear Dick,

1) Without explicitly developing the question of "whether it makes sense to talk about learning in terms of architecture and why" that seems to have been skipped over in our recent letter, creating a situation as regards our presentation that would seem to require asking such a question of "... automobile design, submarine, yurt design, etc" in an expanding (perhaps) and active (hopefully) possibly 'political' frontier. To make the game of playing used car lot and consultants more than a game requires the explication of these questions.

2) What makes the talking about political realities in poetic terms valid?

It is this kind of talking which psychoanalysis does*. This validity is the "hunch" that Norman O. Brown follows as a "worthwhile" attempt at understanding man's modern situation. In our case with "architecture"

there seems to be a movement involved perhaps like an avalanche, hopefully with more "control" or giving of order than that, but we do seem to be on the run catching up to the questions which "move" our experiments in presentation.

3) Anyway the presentation of what we think we are presenting is more important than these various epistemological problems- or is it?

* Santa Cruz lectures of N.O.B.

** see Norman O. Brown

4) Anyway I shall now pursue a basic problem which any good horse would notice about our letter exchange. This problem is that we seem to lack priorities in our discussion. Can you offer some suggestions as to priorities?

5) We should also more firmly establish our ground and product: catalogues- we need to make a thorough review of our correspondence so far.

One big problem here has been the lack of copy machines. Maybe I will hence forth do all writing by typewriter and carbon paper.

6) The whole philosophical, spiritual, and reasonable economy of our project seems really minimal. Maybe I should invite Terre Smith as an economics consultant.

7) Perhaps the appreciation of others in an independent study architecture, depends upon recognitions (which are personal of a kind with cultural) of what others do and are interested in, rather than one of those ground recognitions i.e. Marxism the laboring humanity

i.e. technologists: the limitless frontiers of new gadgets and get theres i.e. Sartre 1968 Paris: the real political grasp of the students etc., etc.

8) I hope that Pat Grim can help us outline some interesting structural questions.

9) Let me jump back into the roll and tumble.

It seems that there is in the poetic "architecture" discussion of learning, a flight to greater and greater architectural dimensions. Understanding the architecture on one seminar in I.S. today, (does not require) but invites considerations of the program design generally, the school system politics, the world. The seems to be a flight to greater and greater architectural considerations. Our study does not remain at the comparative level. We are trying to make suggestions which bring about larger(?) questions.

10) We are trying to present something in a reasonable way. However, the proportion of reasonable presentation to very mixed bag of etcs, etc. so far is about equal to the proportion of your participation to the entire volume of our exchange.

$$\frac{\text{reason}}{\text{mix}} - \frac{\text{your letters}}{\text{total exchange}}$$

the proportion is low. I would like to say a thing or two about this.

II) So far you have said (in the letters, and I am not exaggerating too much) that the ideas in a short list including those which set up this opportunity for relativistic propositional discourse, are "good". You have said that there might be problems in maintaining an up-to-date data file on all U.S. students and graduates. And you most recently stress that this presentation "should not" be half-thought-out or harebrained.

I2) I realize that what I say must come ~~to~~ over to you like a "full roll head-over-heels spin". To give our presentation some grace you must "take me by the hand" in dialogue. I wonder how many people realize that it is not necessary to be asking or answering questions or responding to mundane purposes (wiping your ass, earning your beret) to speak.

I3) The only reason (which I will thus call, but as soon say Jesus) which this dialogue recognizes is that of dialogue between us.

As a limit, you and I could agree that 2 and 2 is 4 and between this would be reasonable.

Science is a dialogue between theory and experimental observation.

What's language all about? What's it there for?

II) Now, back to our stage problems- presentation. Let us begin consolidating the flows and tumbles and catalogues and make some neat sense of what has gone before. Do you agree? Perhaps this is pre-mature; you may still have something to write about. And then we might establish some priorities and begin the working of scoring in to current events, traditional political and philosophical landmarks, etc.. I have some reason to believe that our "architectural consultant" may be able to help quite a lot, as soon as we can get some copy of this exchange to him- he now has only a very incomplete transaction. I urge you to make the best use of the money sent- the nearest (i.e. the quickest) 10¢ Xerox machine and airmail stamps. As they say in first aid medicine: first in an effective triage, and don't slow down until the patient's condition stabilizes. I appreciate your environmental ethics very much, but what would you say about my job: should I stay home because my means of transportation are so extremely non-thrifty?

love,

Mike