

論文の内容の要旨

論文題目 Reevaluating Collectivity and Linkage in Housing Based on Selected Design Practices in Iran and Japan
(イランと日本の設計事例にもとづく住戸集合性と結節要素の再評価)

氏名 モッタキ ズヘル

The principal goal of this thesis is to articulate a theoretical framework for a more precise understanding of how “collectiveness” has been addressed in housing praxis through an examination of selected cases in Iran and Japan. Over the past half a century, architects and planners in both countries have been confronted with a large-scale transition away from traditional modes of housing in both subsidized and market-based arenas.

Housing offers one of the oldest and most constant demonstrations of the complex interrelationship between people and their overall collective environment. The proliferation of so-called collective housing due to modern urban growth and development, particularly since the 1960s, provides ample and relevant grounds to propose an analytical tool that will more efficiently address collectiveness via collective dwelling proposals, as realized in both Iran and Japan. The ways in which long-established praxis has been either retained or replaced is both of intrinsic interest for those whom it affects as well as of academic import as regards the nature of collectivity as a social phenomenon. Going forward, such knowledge will be vital to the successful implementation of new developments and the adaptive reuse of older facilities.

Major questions driving the present research are the following:

- What are the properties and dimensions of collectivity underlying that which may be termed a “designerly” way of thinking in both these countries?
- What spatial notions of collectivity impel us to regard housing as “collective” rather than simply “multiple-unit”?
- How has such thinking influenced actual present day building and planning practices in both Iran and Japan?

Based upon his experience and study in Iran and in Japan, the author has selected a limited number of case studies, some well known and others less so. The selection criteria are as follows:

- The presence of a well-developed and systematic approach toward housing design as a manifestation of collectivity, suitably articulated whether in theory or practice, or preferably both

- A low to medium density, in order to avoid any overarching formalistic, design-driven parti that might tend to obstruct and hinder the examination of basic unit-to-unit spatial relationships
- Availability of the relevant design professional(s) of any given scheme for personal interview by the author
- In the interest of in-depth examination and submission to back-testing, a distinctly articulated typology and/or design manifesto

In chapter 2, following the above-mentioned questions and aims, a wide range of literature review related to the issue of collective phenomena is studied through socio-psychological, complexity sciences and architectural discoursed.

In chapter 3, the author introduces the research design. Among many analytical methods, two types of analysis are selected for this study. A pilot formal analysis is also conducted to examine meaningful themes in the analysis of collectivity in the built environment.

In chapter 4, Grounded **Theoretical** approach based upon the ways in which each designer describes his own scheme is conducted. Here the key notions and manifestations of collective phenomena are expressed as codes, which were repurposed for this thesis as analytical categories. A broad variety of conceptual expressions may for instance include premeditated design moves, a posteriori interpretation and at times unrealized aspirations. All have been re-encoded and theoretically framed as formal data. Later, these conceptualized categories were correlated in order to formulate underlying relationships addressing “collectiveness”, whether as overtly manifest or self-characterized by designer accounts, mainly as committed to writing or elicited by interview. In Chapter 5 based on the findings of chapter 4, the second type of enquiry pursued a more orthodox **morphological analysis** of the configuration of architectural elements as constructed is conducted. The grounded theoretical findings are used as guides to pinpoint those selected individual or recurring compositions of built form explicitly, or tacitly, defining notions of collectiveness. Such criteria recognize any architectural elements and strategies that may induce, or modify, collectiveness in the formal integration of the housing scheme under consideration.

Outcomes of grounded theoretical analysis inevitably highlight a perceived conception of collectiveness as what we have termed Collectivity. These may include all or some of the following points:

- Importance of an identifiable Micro- and Macro-Habitat to be perceived (or “Collective-Scape”)
- Analogical constructs (such as Here/ There, Inward-/ Outward-Looking)
- A certain visual perception pattern system of housing based on so-called prospects and refuges

- Fixed as well as flexible spatial elements that define visual fields and consequent perceptual patterns
- A mapping of Progressive Disclosure in perceived spatial fields
- Recognition of linkage that provides grounds for relational thresholds with different degrees of strength and intensity
- Spatial modes of sharing and belonging (or atmospheres for Commons)

The latter notion of “sharing” is an overridingly significant theme that evolves from pursuit of a grounded theoretical analysis. In contradistinction to actual physical co-occupation of spaces, this term will refer to diverse and complex underlying patterns of participation. Thus, rather than yielding only formal/ typological data, the present research should be understood as heavily dependent on distinctively shared perceptual grounds in housing, more often than not as initially envisioned by the architect(s). Such perceptual patterns will embody relational and contextual sightlines in actual visual interpretation.

Devising different building segments clustered and ordered via modes of perceptual and functional sharing, creates preliminary ground for collective status. Moreover, when conducive to collectiveness, such built forms stimulate an active linkage with and within their context and thus invite real personal and interpersonal actions. All the same, it is not enough merely to create a public domain with linked building elements to engender a hierarchy of public and private zones.

All of the architects interviewed, more or less referred to the creation of a Collective-Scape as an important touchstone, whether explicit or tacit, in any housing development readily identifiable as collective. This Collective-Scape is analyzed using key metaphorical conceptual terminology, such as “Prospect” and “Refuge,” in order to study how such an ensemble can best be realized in real-life settings though designated “Apertures” and spatial “Articulation.” Since the designers do generally, address issues of Collectivity from the inside out, as well as from the outside in, one must analyze both sorts of vision and sightlines in fully-fledged dynamic formal attitudes via morphological investigation. Hence, the use of these two sets of terms.

Prospect and Refuge, based on our grounded theoretical analysis, assume an influential role in forming further notions of collectiveness as achieved by an Articulation of linkages equipped with appropriate Apertures. When Articulation and Aperture are effectively synchronized in a given housing environment, there will arise a strong chance of providing a lasting configuration of stable Prospect and Refuge components. It is these various Prospects and Refuges that together form a collective topos. Albeit the underlying perception seeks to yield the optimal collective setting, the latter must necessarily be formed of individual perceptions of single and multiple units creating an interactive milieu. There must be choices for the members of the community continually to visualize, to feel, and to contemplate within their surroundings. Only once a sufficiently enabling

or “affording” array of collective Prospects and Refuges has been established, and manifested in the design, are those connective processes capable over time of generating an emergent and self-sustaining collective housing fabric.

An increased sharing of experience progresses hand and hand with an opportunity to recognize and confirm collective self-consciousness. A mere arbitrarily defined physical typology or version of prescriptive zoning is convincingly demonstrated to be insufficient on its own. That which is physically shared must include the opportunity to be perceived as such, by means of active involvement and participation. This need will be optimally fulfilled by an appropriate spectrum of Refuges and Prospects affording the expectant eye different modes, ranging from what have been called by the Anglo-Hungarian psychoanalyst Michael Balint (1896-1970): “philobatic” (structured by safe distance and sight) to “ocnophilic” (structured by close proximity of familiar objects). Moreover, since these modes of perception are often temporally linked, a suitable and adequate range of choices needs to be made available for inhabitants, not to speak of visitors and even, to a limited extent, passers-by.

To sum up in Chapter 6, based on this study there are numerous latent functional and experiential features of collective housing capable of linking diverse individuals to the larger urban setting, as well as to their own particular housing domain. Selecting and disclosing such attributes nurtures a complexity that in turn is necessary for the “continuity” and “change” that characterize everyday life. In order to achieve and maintain this quality in housing, spatial enablement of a Collective-Scape is of the essence. A network of Prospects and Refuges thus can be said to constitute an urban fabric of a certain character based on life-sustaining patterns that promote the selective adaptation and endurance of a community. Another important finding concerns the concept of a spatial Togetherness that entails two aspects: one relating to the condition of being collective in a substantive manner generally referred to as Collectiveness in this research. The other aspect is the faculty of built form and its corresponding spatial “affordances” to render a scheme collective in a procedural manner here termed as Collectivity. These two together provide grounds for a **Collective Morphemes**, which is the complex relationship of Configuration System (Prospect-and-Refuge / Socio-Temporal), and Composition System (formation of Linkage Network). This network provides all observer-participants with the kinesthetic perceptual data conducive to a vivid mental image of a given neighborhood milieu, which needs to be shared between residents, as well as by outside visitors. The present work attempts to unpack and demonstrate the effectiveness of all such mechanisms, through case studies based upon on-site analysis and personal interview in two historically impactful modern Asian cultures.