Shane Sumsion
Fall 2005 – Visual Communications

Design Process Reflection
Planes and Cubes

As previously stated …
"I have always fantasized of the limitless potential of technology to serve efficiency and effectiveness. I believe that something is not efficient if it is not effective – effective being, issue resolution within the parameters defined and/or discovered. The same is appropriate to define efficiency."

In the case of *this* classic exercise, technology was neither inconspicuously absent *nor* profoundly urged. In reality, the validity of using high-technology was the first question raise. Could space be *designed* via computing; parallel to by hands.

As demonstrated in the previous "Sticks and Stones" exercise; technology can reach beyond recording, and appropriately act as a design aid. To progress that experiment forward; the medium of *simultaneous* decision/action needed to be stretched.

The prime difference between the "Sticks and Stones" exercise and this one lies locally in the intent and remotely in the outcome. Meaning, this exercised needed to present dynamic conscious decision, not scripted aleatory. Previously hundreds of instances of the interaction were recorded. Here the critical review of each iteration was of more importance than the object of such. As before, I spent a great deal of time and energy studying the methodology of two aspects of digitally actualizing this design process. The first was the virtual translation necessarily for understanding the proper parameters for the assignment. The second was the virtual validity – what did computing naturally present as advantageous for a design point of view *[not necessarily from a production point of view.]*.

For technical information this involved Discreet's 3D Studio Max 7 (motion capture & MaxScript). This set of methodologies culminated the ability to alter relationally nearly any parameter of the *form & space*. I initially focused on translation path and orientation.

My initial approach lacked appropriate response to the assignment [as I had misunderstood it in the beginning]. I was trying to come up with a "cool" arrangement and then present how it came to be. I now

understand the exercise is in making a move based on the moment in space and time. That lead to each move begetting a moment; from where each potential move was governed by design pedagogy, attitude and aptitude.

I - *again* - discovered appreciation and satisfaction only after relinquishing nearly every parameter of the scene to relativity of a prime avatar. It appears logical to argue that my design process reflection paper from "Sticks and Stones" contradicts this papers review. However; on the same grounds for which I approached these two exercises I argue that they are harmoniously progressive – I do not see the experiences or the methodologies drifting further apart with additional experimentation. I see them converging in a paradigm shift of traditional architectural design pedagogy.

Each object has the potential to fulfill any dimension – to take any size, orientation, and position. Being tied to the avatar or to another object tied to the avatar does not reduce its potential to perform space – it is merely directed in the moment. The final series of presented compositions represent a complete relativizing of the scene, differing spatial qualities based on chosen dimensional relationships.

I very much appreciate the exercise as an opportunity to explore. My desire is to be vigilant in seeking out appropriate exercises to develop these approaches to space design.