

 <b>TAYLOR'S UNIVERSITY</b> Wisdom • Integrity • Excellence		<b>BACHELOR OF SCIENCE (HONOURS) IN ARCHITECTURE</b> <b>THEORIES OF ARCHITECTURE AND URBANISM (ARC61303/ARC2224)</b> <b>SYNOPSIS: REACTION PAPER (AUGUST 2016) [10 MARKS]</b>	
NAME: Ong Ker Sin		ID: 0321719	
LECTURER: Mr. Lam Shen Fei		TUTORIAL TIME: 2-4pm	
SYNOPSIS NO: 3		READER TITLE: The Eyes of the Skin	
		AUTHOR: Juhani Pallasmaa	
<p>I agree with a point that has been mentioned in the article, "Our bodies and movements are in constant interaction with the environment". With this constant interaction produces the existential experience either it's "one's sense of being in a world" or "experience of self". And this is what have to be integrated with our design in the building, to create the sense of existential experience, instead of just for the purpose of designing a visually beautiful building or just building for the sake of building. While this constant interaction between our bodies with the environment occurs through the senses generated by our body, Kent C Bloomer and Charles W Moore argue that "The body image...is informed fundamentally from haptic and orienting experiences early in life. Our visual images are developed later on, and depend for their meaning on primal experiences that were acquired haptically". In my opinion, the visual images together with the sense of haptic and orienting experience redefine each other and so produce a multi-sensory experience. On the other words, the eye is the organ of distance, whereas touch is the sense of nearness, intimacy and affection. Also, the eye observes and investigates, whereas the touch approaches and feels. "Vision reveals what touch already know", or it could be "touch reveals what vision already see"? It could be either way and so, in my opinion is that "touch" and "vision" coexist and redefine each other especially in the world of architecture where we were to design the buildings as it will generate association or bonding that will hold the occupants to it through these senses.</p> <p>Besides, I agree that architecture is not only about creating visual environment, but implying the sense of existential experience, also giving the sense of conceptuality and materiality. Le Corbusier with the statement that "Architecture is the masterly, correct magnificent" is a good example. His statement is clearly leading to architecture for the eye but with his sculpturing talent and his sense for materiality he prevented his buildings from turning into sensory reduction. Also, regarding the statement about the work of authentic art will stimulate the ideated sensations, in my opinion, it's not only about "touch", but together with "vision" and hence this stimulation will be life-enhancing which is needed in the field of architecture as well. Architecture is not experienced as an isolated journey but as a whole with these "ideated sensations" generated through both physical and mental structures, and so creating an existential experiences for the occupants during their journey in the buildings.</p>			

WORD COUNT	421
Key points (2.5)	
Appropriateness of Terminologies (2.5)	
Clarity in Opinions and Reactions (2.5)	
Logical Progression (2.5)	
DATE:	TOTAL MARK & GRADE
ASSESSSED BY:	

		SYNOPSIS DESCRIPTION	ASSESSMENT RUBRIC		
Grades	Marks	Key points (2.5)	Appropriateness of Terminologies (2.5)	Clarity in Opinions and Reactions (2.5)	Logical Progression (2.5)
A	1.8 2.5	- Evidence of outstanding understanding of Key points through clear explanation	Appropriate use of Terminologies In discussing the Issues/ Concepts/Theories	Outstanding Clarity in opinions and reactions - Supported with strong Logical explanation	Outstanding Articulation of logical expressions ending with well-developed paragraphs
B	1.5 1.79	- Evidence of understanding of Key points through reasonable explanation	Reasonable use of Terminologies In discussing the Issues/ Concepts/Theories with Minor unfamiliarity	Reasonable clarity in opinions and reactions - Supported with Logical explanation	Reasonable Articulation of logical expressions ending with well-developed paragraphs
C	1.25 1.49	- Evidence of Some Understanding of Key points through acceptable explanation	Acceptable use of Terminologies In discussing the Issues/ Concepts/Theories with Noticeable unfamiliarity	Acceptable Clarity in opinions and reactions - Supported with satisfactory explanation	Acceptable Articulation of logical expressions ending with some ambiguous statements
D	1 1.24	- Evidence of Some Understanding of Key points through not quite acceptable explanation	Evidence of Terminologies however poorly communicated in discussing The Issues/ Concepts/Theories With	Weak Clarity in opinions and reactions - Supported with Lengthy explanation	Poor Articulation of logical expressions ending with noticeable ambiguous statements
F	0 0.99	- Insufficient Evidence of Understanding of Key points through weak explanation	Insufficient Evidence of Terminologies in discussing the Issues/ Concepts/Theories With	Improper opinions and reactions. Not Matching the Issues/ Concepts/ Theories - Inadequate Reasons	Unable to Articulate / illogical expressions. Poorly written synopsis.