

Dear Richard,

Dear Sung,

I pushed through as much as I could today and got up until the beginning of section 3.5. I added your revised section 3.6 into this text but haven't looked at it yet. I can see that Section 3 must have been difficult for you in terms of trying to connect the thread of the FAR Game to all these graphics in a meaningful way. It's been a bit difficult to edit as well. Can you let me know a little bit more about your intention for Section 3 so that I can approach editing it with a bit more understanding?

Yes, it was difficult because the analysis was done by one of curators and I had to understand them by myself. Thank you for your efforts to understand these. I have not compared my draft with your revision one by one, but they look great. We will use them for designs from now on.

When I worked on the foreword and Section 1 yesterday I had a few questions which are below. For sections 2 and 3 I really didn't have time to formulate questions and not too many came up anyway. I thought it was best to get as much of my editing to you tonight for you to look over and assess. That includes the Titles and Descriptions page, which I have edited and attached here. The new interrogative headings have also been inserted into the main text.

Are we going to change "4. Artist Perspectives on the FAR Game" to "4. How Might Artists Perceive the FAR Game?" at the Layout of Exhibits?

Here are the questions for the foreword and Section 1:

1. You added back a phrase at the end of the second paragraph. Edited, it reads **"but there is room for exceptions and additions for interest groups."** I can see that putting this in to the foreword seems important to you, but I really don't understand why. If you could explain it to me, I would appreciate it.

From my point of view, when we say "public officials have little discretion", it implies there is SOME discretion and therefore your added phrase is unnecessary because it's already implied that there are exceptions. More importantly, this phrase seems to muddle the strength of your overall premise, that "constraints spark creativity". It only seems to weaken

the sense that these constraints are strict and must be followed, and from what I can see that is indeed what the architects in your exhibit must do.

In addition, of all 36 building descriptions I read, not one of them seemed to mention exceptions for interest groups, so while this may be a fact, this fact does not seem to be an intrinsic part of your exhibit. Yet, putting it in the foreword would of course create the expectation that it is somehow an important element of your presentation.

So I have left it in, (blue highlight) but at this point I would strongly recommend it be taken out. I look forward to hearing the reason behind having it in.

I understand your point, "...because it's already implied that there are exceptions..." I will delete "but there is room for exceptions and additions for interest groups."

Thanks for clarifying your intention.

2. I've read over many times my sentence that uses 'stifling', and I can see how it might be misunderstood the way it is constructed. When suggesting that architects use constraints to *spark* creativity rather than *stifling* it, it is a bit of a shortcut way of saying that architects should use constraints to *spark* creativity rather than allowing those constraints to stifle creativity. I therefore changed it to the following with is more orthodox grammatically, though a bit longer and a bit clumsy:

A) The answer from today's Korean architects, evidenced by the 36 buildings showcased in this exhibit, is to use the constraints brought on by the FAR game to spark creativity rather than allowing those constraints to stifle it.

I will take "the constraints brought on by the FAR game to spark their creativity rather than allowing those constraints to stifle it."

If you don't like the verb stifle, we can always change it to suppress, dampen, or curb. I think stifle fits best though. Or, it might be better just to eliminate that 'rather than' clause. This would be the simplest and perhaps best solution.

B) The answer from today's Korean architects, evidenced by the 36 buildings showcased in this exhibit, is to use the constraints brought on by the FAR game to spark creativity.

3. In section 1.1 I thought you were going to put a simple diagram that showed the relationship between floor area and plot size? I think the diagram you have put in there has not been given the proper context up to that point, and is not likely to be fully understood.

OK. We will think about adding one more diagram.

4. In 1.2, I'm curious as to why tenants would be considered 'consumers', in the sense that they would have any impact on the conversation about property values.

I thought about it, and deleted "tenants" for the moment.

So I will continue to work on 3.5 and 3.6 tomorrow, and look forward to hearing back about the edits I'm sending you now.

Take care,
Richard

p.s. I haven't heard back from Prof. Kim since he emailed me to say he would welcome my help and I then asked him to provide me with the main idea (premise) of his paper. Any idea why he hasn't responded? > He is either busy or a slow person. I sent him a message.