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ABSTRACT

The dissertation discusses a method of viewing the information exchange process that takes place during the process of designing a large scale urban project through the use of a psychoanalytic approach that exposes some of the designer's psychological conflicts. It shows that there were constraints on the design process caused by the designer's own conflicts that affected the design solution in addition to those institutional constraints usually considered alone. The study describes a complicated design process and the information exchange process used in preparing the plan for a large scale environment in a major city on the coast using fictitious names for real people, places and organizations. Evidence used in the study included interviews, memoranda, reports, and plans as well as the observed behavior of the people involved.

The study traces the design process to show how the designer's inner conflicts interfered with his expressed desire to use the information available to him. Included is an analysis of the designer's behavior consisting of the
use of evidence that indicated ambiguities or anomalies in behavior to make inferences about the motivation of that behavior, and then the seeking of new evidence to strengthen or reject the inferences made. It was found that the psychological factors affected the designer's behavior and had an effect on the results of the design process as important to understand as the effect of institutional constraints.

Finally, it is suggested that further work be done in collaboration with psychoanalysts and that a seminar be formed to attempt to make designers and others aware of the effects their unconscious conflicts have on their functioning as professionals.
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I have spent a period of more than twenty years actively involved in the process of designing and building physical structures. I have been an urban designer, a planner, contractor, developer, owner and a manager of buildings. My early professional years were spent as a mining engineer engaged in the design and development problems related to mining installations, housing, power plants, roads and tunnels. Since 1958 I have been involved in the planning, construction, or design of such diverse projects as more than $55 million of housing in seven states and Puerto Rico, high-rise office, hotel and
residential structures, air-rights over a major turnpike, housing studies, renovation of major buildings and design and planning consulting in France, Costa Rica, Haiti, as well as Boston, New York, Washington, D.C., South Carolina and Texas.

I taught in planning and architectural departments such courses as Urban Design Studio, Development of Housing, Collaborative Design Studio and Urban Land Development. I have also been a principal and a director of an architecture, urban design and planning firm that has been an innovator in participatory planning processes.

During the past ten years I have been interested in the psychological aspects of the design process. I have been engaged in an extensive reading program which initially led me to the work of Freud and the field of psychoanalysis. In 1971 I entered the Massachusetts Institute of Technology as a full-time student to pursue formal studies and continue my work in seeking connections between psychoanalysis and the design process. Prior to entering the Massachusetts Institute of Technology for a period of about four years I was psychoanalyzed and learned the value of self-knowledge.
I first heard of the design study to be done at Sea-
view Peninsula through the Thomas Greene office and I pro-
posed that they allow me to use the project as a case
study in order to observe the information exchange flow
that would take place between clients, users and designers.
When the design contract was given to John White instead
of Greene I had already given considerable thought to
determining Greene's perception of the work needed by the
client. I first met John White when I went to him to
request his cooperation in doing this case study. His
work on the Seaview Peninsula project was just starting
and he allowed me to move into his office and observe all
of the meetings and work done on the project. I spent more
than one year observing and asking questions. He was
generous with his information and discussed freely his
feelings and reactions. He allowed me to take full notes
of all meetings and tape record many of the sessions and
interviews. These notes and transcriptions provide the
data for the case studied. The names of the places and
persons involved in this study have been changed; however,
the study is based on actual events, on close observation
of those events, and on the study of all the pertinent
documents relating to those events.
INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this thesis is to generate a method of viewing the information exchange process that takes place during the process of designing a large scale urban project through the use of a psychoanalytic approach that exposes some of the designer's psychological conflicts. It will be shown that there were constraints on the design process caused by the designer's own conflicts that affected the design solution in addition to those institutional constraints usually considered alone.

In this study I describe the design process and the information exchange process used in preparing the plan for
the revitalization of the Seaview Peninsula, a site located in a major city on the coast, to understand the institutional constraints and their role in relation to psychological conflicts. The institutional setting for the study was complex and is based on real people, places, organizations, institutions, agencies and programs. The site included a physically and socially failing public housing project, a foreclosed and unoccupied shopping center and a misplaced University campus about to receive six thousand new students. The community, from the lonely public housing tenant with fears and hopes to the well-organized residents of the nearby neighborhoods had a history of attempting to participate in the planning process. They were invited to participate in the planning process I have studied and were willing to be an active part of that study. The institutional constraints - economic, sociological and political - combined with poor physical and environmental conditions made the task of designing an exciting and workable solution very difficult.

This study involves a complicated design process involving multiple clients, professionals and community groups. The basis for much of the information was provided by interviews, memoranda, reports and plans as well as the observable behavior of the people involved. In order to discuss adequately the indicators of psychological con-
flict, I have described the full range of information that was available to the designer to indicate the various institutional constraints affecting his process of design. The case study included the State University selection of the Seaview Peninsula as its Gotham campus and some of the reactions to that decision; the history of the large public housing project and the shopping center then existing on the peninsula; and the communities' reactions to the building of the proposed new campus. There had been a long history of information exchange processes at Seaview which recognized the need for sharing decision-making.

Various state, city, University and private studies had been made concerning future development of Seaview Peninsula that had relevance to the revitalization study of the Seaview Peninsula discussed in this case. These studies indicate the amount and quality of information available to John White, the designer of the study I am examining.

The process used to select White as designer when William Brown, President of State University decided there was a need for a new development study by a well-respected outside consultant, allows for the comparison of White's proposals for the study with another proposal submitted at that time. It is possible to judge White's actual work on the study by comparing the two views of goals, objec-
tives and methods with the results obtained by White. Other professionals involved in the study also had opinions of what was needed for this study, which allows for a comparison with what was actually done by White. This comparison is used to understand the relative importance of institutional constraints and psychological factors that interfered with the design process.

The announcement of the completion of White's design study provided an opportunity for the evaluation of the goals of some of the members of the client group. White's work and the process under study could be evaluated in many ways in terms of their success by clients, designer and community. Although the stated goal of all parties was community acceptance, the nearest neighbors, the residents of the public housing project, were opposed to the plan presented. This particular failure, among others, indicated that the information exchange process and the design process was a failure and since this failure was due to factors in addition to institutional constraints, the psychological processes of the designer were analyzed to seek the additional causes of the failure.

The design process used in this study revealed that White arrived at the design decisions in many ways, including from within his own creative abilities, the client's
needs and desires, the institutional reality of development and the information exchange process established through the mechanisms of informal meetings, presentations and Task Force meetings. It is difficult to find any points of "true" influence on the design after the basic assumptions were agreed on that determined the program. From the analysis of the design process it was apparent that White's own compelling needs were preventing him from recognizing what the demands of the situation were and made him minimize those demands in favor of following his instinctual feelings.

Erik Erikson said that when he tries to diagnose a life history he can base his reconstruction upon a continuous series of observations in the present. These permit, he said, "the gradual establishment of strategic intersections on a number of tangents that eventually makes it possible to locate in the observed phenomena that central core which comprises the 'evidence'." In Erikson's judgement "there is enough method in our work systematically to force favorite assumptions to become probable inferences."  

In questioning many of the motivations of White's behavior in the design process, I found the psychoanalytic method offered a way to study the effect a designer has on his own design process, the awareness of the functioning
of his own and his informants' primary and secondary thought processes and the conflicts that might affect his functioning as a designer. In applying some of the parts of this method, I observed White and studied the trends and sequences of his behavior. I gathered my evidence from his writings, speeches and behavior to make inferences of his motivations and to find indications of conflicts within his own thought processes. The psychological factors affected White's behavior and had an effect on the results of the design process as important to understand as the effect of institutional constraints.
Figure 1  Aerial photo of Seaview Peninsula.
CHAPTER 1
THE BACKGROUND TO THE DESIGN PROBLEM:
PREVIOUS STUDIES AND HISTORY OF
DEVELOPMENT ON THE PENINSULA

Introduction

Not many people were in favor of the selection of the Seaview Peninsula as the site for the new campus of State University at Gotham. Neighborhood groups were most apprehensive since the announcement of the move had already adversely affected a bad housing situation. Public housing tenants and other concerned people were fearful that the housing project on the peninsula would be further isolated if transportation policy considered only the University
needs. Though fearful of not having a much needed access to new transportation, if provided, there was a greater fear of not having any new transportation at all. The existing overcrowding of the street and highway system of the nearby South Gotham community was not expected to be able to handle the 15,000 new people expected at the new campus.

The public housing project tenants felt they should receive some benefits from the move by the University into their territory such as jobs, student admission, recreation opportunities and space for community use. They were fearful of the move because there were constant rumors of the "wholesale takeover" of the housing project for University use. Some residents welcomed the University and wanted limited student housing in the housing project in order to bring it new life. On the other hand, some feared that upgraded housing and transportation on the peninsula would make it more likely that more qualified suburban students would compete with and take the State University admission places away from the applicants from the housing project and its surrounding communities.

Most of the people of the peninsula and nearby neighborhoods were confused and fearful. In the late spring and early summer of 1973, before the planned opening of the new
State University campus in the fall, these people were threatening the University by stating they would prevent it from opening. Mass meetings were held, sit-ins in President William Brown's office were attempted, confrontations with other University administrators were common and the threat of preventing the campus from opening by blocking roads, stopping public transportation and other more violent means was made clear.

At this time, President William Brown decided to employ a designer, John White - architect and planner, to prepare a plan for a development proposal to show the potential of Seaview Peninsula, to show that such a proposed plan was economically feasible, and to indicate to the neighbors and public in general what the University commitment to the future of the Seaview Peninsula would be. He wanted to allay the fears of some and excite the imagination of others. He wanted to open the doors of his new campus without incident.

In this chapter I shall describe the conditions in existence on the peninsula including some of the history of the public housing project, the shopping center, the site selection process for the new campus and the University's relations with its neighbors. The University had made many commitments to the community and especially to
the residents of the public housing project that they would be included as an important part of a participatory design process for the future use of the peninsula.

Before the White Study on which this thesis is focused had begun, the University had made serious attempts to come to grips with the intricate, extremely difficult problems threatening the success of State University on Seaview Peninsula. These attempts were documented in consultants' reports, several memos made by University officials, and in other reports sponsored by the University. All this information was available to White and could have been used by him in the design process. Every document stressed the extent of the University's commitment to an open information exchange process with the community.

White's study was done without using most of the information that was available from the studies described. I shall explore some of the reasons why he avoided this information that was made available to him in the following chapters.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Event</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1954</td>
<td>Seaview Peninsula Public Housing Project Opened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964</td>
<td>State Legislature Approved a New Campus for State University in Gotham</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Redevelopment Authority Studied Seaview Peninsula for Urban Renewal Site</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Public Housing Project Established Community Action Office</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Neighborhood Health Center at Project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>Modernization Program for Public Housing at Seaview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Harbor Mall Shopping Center Opened</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>State University Selected Seaview Peninsula as Site for Its Gotham Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1968</td>
<td>Private Development Proposal for Use of Seaview Peninsula - No Action Taken</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1970</td>
<td>Construction Started on University Campus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1971</td>
<td>University Planners Recommended to Trustees University Relate to Nearby Communities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Harbor Mall Shopping Center Closed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Studies, Reports and Proposals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January - CPA Study Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>January-February - Various University Studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>April - CIGS Study Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May - University Memoranda</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>May - CPA Proposal for New Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June - University Proposal for New Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>June - University Development Recommendations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July - Trustees' Policy Statement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July - Greene Proposal for New Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>July - White Proposal for New Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>August - White Final Proposal for New Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January, 1974</td>
<td>White's Revitalization Study Completed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 17, 1974</td>
<td>Press Conference and Public Announcement of Study Results</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>January 26, 1977</td>
<td>State University Campus on Seaview Peninsula Opened</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2 Major events and studies related to White's Seaview Peninsula Revitalization Study.
The Public Housing Project

The peninsula, south of downtown Gotham opposite some of the Harbor Islands, was a tidal marsh, a garbage dump and then, during World War II it served as a site for a detention camp for aliens and prisoners of war housed in Quonset huts built by the army. In 1954, the Quonset huts were replaced by a stark, barren project of more than 1500 units of public housing for the poor. It was isolated by two major highways and the harbor and was ignored by neighboring communities. People moved there because they could not find other housing that they could afford.

For its first ten years, the project and its people were ignored. Virtually no social amenities were available to the tenants, not churches, schools or stores. But during the mid-1960's, as a result of the Federal poverty programs, the desperate need for social services was recognized and an attempt was made to serve the needs of the residents. In 1965 a Community Action Agency Office was established in the project and the first community organizing effort created the Seaview Community Development Council Inc. This tenant organization continues today. In 1966, the first neighborhood health center in the country was opened at Seaview. In 1967, a public housing modernization program was introduced to involve tenants in
planning physical improvements of buildings, recreation and community facilities. Led by members of the Council, tenants became involved in plans for renovation and remodelling of the project. It is important to note the early involvement of tenants in the planning process in order to understand that when participation by community groups in information exchange about needs and design solutions was proposed as an integral part of the study Brown wanted, the tenant group had already accumulated a considerable amount of experience in participatory design.

However, despite these programs, the physical and social decline of the project was exacerbated by high-density, over-crowding in many of the 27 buildings, high turnover rates, vandalism, lack of safety, inadequate maintenance, unemployment, lack of recreation facilities and programs and many other problems typical of some of the worst public housing. And by 1973, prior to the start of the revitalization study proposed by Brown, the make-up of the residents had changed from virtually all white during the first ten years to 64% black, 13% other minority members and 23% white; to 66% under 20 years of age, while 9% were over 65 years of age. Median family income was $4,150; 77% of all families received public assistance and 62% were families on 'Aid for Dependent Children'. It had been more than five years since the last organizing attempt
of tenants and, in a project with a high turnover rate, a new community effort was needed to mobilize tenants to make decisions concerning physical and social changes necessary at Seaview.

Nevertheless, the residents of this monolithic housing development, built in isolation of a peninsula used as a working garbage dump and whose only neighbors were day students attending the High School one half mile away, had reasons to hope that it could become an acceptable place in which to live, work, shop and study. For by 1973, some basic social services had returned to the 5,000 low income people at the project and a few large employers had built major installations nearby. A regional shopping center had also been opened in 1968. However, the problems continued and the isolation and social stigma of Seaview Peninsula were reinforced when on January 1, 1973, the shopping center closed after only five years of operation.
Figure 3. Photo of Public Housing Project.
The Shopping Center

The shopping center, Harbor Mall, had opened with high hopes in 1968. It was a large shopping center with 280,000 square feet and 33 stores, next to the housing project. Harbor Mall was the largest regional shopping center outside down-town Gotham, providing food, clothes, home furnishings and other necessities to residents of the Project as well as the surrounding communities. However, by 1970 the shopping center had lost its first tenant when a junior department store vacated the Mall.

In 1970 construction of the permanent campus on Sea-view Peninsula for State University-Gotham was started on the other side of the housing project from the Mall. The Master Plan for the new campus called for the expenditure of $335 million, which represented the largest single construction project ever undertaken by the State. It was planned to open in September 1973 with 5,800 students and was expected to grow to 15,000 students by 1980. Administration and faculty people would bring additional people to the campus, creating a new and large market for the stores. But nine months before the planned opening of the school the last store in the shopping center closed.
Harbor Mall was designed as a regional shopping center for people living in the southern sections of Gotham. An early market study report prepared by a large supermarket chain considering the location stated that the Mall could potentially serve two trade areas: Seaview Peninsula and the sections of South Gotham contiguous to the Peninsula. The social and economic characteristics of the trade areas were analyzed and the conclusion drawn was that the similarities were many; both areas are urban, with few homeowners, low incomes, many children, and strong ethnic affinities. However, one striking difference emerged: the determination of the residents of South Gotham "to maintain the very white character of the neighborhoods."

Nevertheless, the early market study indicated that by all traditional supermarket marketing standards, the Harbor Mall should have been a profitable center. The study concluded that Harbor Mall was ideally located to draw a large population from a short distance, but that the Project had direct and indirect consequences for the Mall's success. The South Gotham residents were affected negatively by the Seaview Peninsula image and whether or not their preconceptions were true, they were certainly relevant. Finally, the study stated that the University's role would be critical in changing the attitude of potential shoppers.
Figure 4 Photo of Harbor Mall shopping center.
Figure 5: Photo of waterfront area proposed for recreation use. Public housing project in background.
Much later a State University study to determine why the shopping center closed stated that, "Vandalism, shoplifting, and shrinkage within the stores has not been reported as abnormally high for urban centers, but harassment and purse-snatching by young people in the parking lots plus the proximity to the housing project has created a psychological barrier for the people in the neighboring communities." The study concluded that a major portion of the potential market for the Mall would not go there. The report stated the closing of the Mall represented a significant reversal in the trend toward which the resident community and the University have tried to work - "that of making Seaview Peninsula an acceptable place to live, work, shop and study."

State University - Gotham Selection of Seaview Peninsula

The selection of the site at Seaview Peninsula by the State University Trustees in November 1968 seemed to be determined by negative factors: no major landtaking, no immediate neighbors with political clout, no loss of city tax base, no decisions about new concepts of education. The architecture as determined by the Master Plan recognized the negative factors of location, as well as high
noise level from overhead airplanes, poor sub-surface conditions, openness to prevailing winter winds off the sea and the dangerous neighborhood contiguous to the site, and called for a "fortress" isolated in every way possible from its immediate environment.

Based on the site selection process that stressed negative factors, the design solution validated and reinforced all the negatives of isolation and protection from a "harsh" dangerous and threatening environment. When Brown became president, he said he wanted a pleasant, attractive and stimulating environment but came into office too late to change the design of the campus. To illustrate his frustration at that time, Brown recalled a call he made to one of the designers of the Master Plan, at the time the first building was being constructed. Brown said he was concerned about the isolation and asked why it was designed that way. The designer's response, as recalled by Brown, was: "That was the way campuses were designed then." Brown's response to the plan was a desire to change the surroundings, that is, develop the whole Seaview Peninsula since he could not change the physical design of the buildings.
There was no need for a new State University at Gotham which only duplicated those functions of the University at the main campus located at the other end of the state, Brown said. The need that Brown as well as the Trustees perceived was for an urban University serving commuters and those who might not ordinarily have the opportunity to receive a college education. Before Brown became president, the initial plan considered by the trustees was to have the University erect each of its buildings at a different mass transit stop in the City so that students would have to move about the city to attend classes and thereby use the other resources of the City as well. This plan was also meant to distribute the impact the students might have on housing and transportation throughout the whole City. In many ways it was hoped that the University would meld with the City, become an integral part of it and would not be distinguishable from the City. Isolation from the City seemed inconceivable prior to the move to Seaview.

The students and faculty were then located in the dense urban environment of downtown Gotham. Many of the students and faculty were reluctant to move out of the downtown area because they felt a University serving primarily an urban function should have an urban location. Many were suspicious of a change in goals from an urban
institution serving a lesser qualified student body to what the student newspaper called "The Harvard of state universities." Their suspicions were exacerbated by the announced new site at Seaview.

Seaview lacked the strong transportation link to all parts of the City necessary to facilitate student commuting and to provide the opportunity to use the City as classroom easily. It did not have a strong physical link to the community. The feeling stated by many of the students and faculty was: if the University was sacrificing the urban location that was stated so often as a prime requisite for an urban University then was it also questioning its preference for the disadvantaged student, the ones not normally selected for admission at other institutions, those needing training or retraining. They feared the destruction of the concepts of concentrating on undergraduate education, of training professionals to work in urban communities, of using community work by students for college credit, and of relying on local professionals to teach both on campus and in the City. This concept of the functions of the urban university was threatened by the isolation of its location on the Seaview Peninsula. In attributing motivation to those who wanted the Seaview Peninsula revitalized through additional development, the
Figure 6 Photo of State University campus, under construction, at time of White's study.
remaking of an urban area around the University must be considered.

University Relations With Its Neighbors

After Brown became the president, many attempts were made to determine what could be done to improve the campus and improve relations with the neighbors. The University wanted friendly neighbors, as well as friendly legislators. Brown wanted to solve the neighbors' problems caused by the location of the University, but his emphasis was aimed more at a solution that could fit in with his overall plan for the University. Brown's posture of cooperation was seen by many of the neighborhood organizations as false.

The University administration tried to clarify its thoughts about what Seaview should be. Brown came from a strong background in urban planning. He brought with him as staff some of the people who had been with him in Washington and some others who had spent time in urban planning and development. Various people on his staff proposed solutions to the location problem with detailed recommendations of how to change the image of Seaview. During this period, Brown was consulting with a Trustees' Council
mainly composed of businessmen and reporting directly to the Board of Trustees. The equivalent of a first-class faculty in urban planning and development was available to Brown even though the University did not have a department in this field.

Brown thought of the problem of bringing development to Seaview in terms a developer would use: i.e., how to make things happen. He described himself as a frustrated developer. He was further frustrated by his Board of Trustees who answered each of his many requests to be allowed to be a "developer" by telling him his primary goal was education without taking on any development for non-University use. However, Brown could not help but continue to be very concerned with the problem of the environment surrounding the University. His compromise position was to be a catalyst for change on the peninsula. He called on his staff, his friends in Washington, his developer friends, especially those who had done large scale new town development. He could deal effectively with the Mayor of Gotham because Brown could only act as a catalyst thereby allowing the Mayor to receive the credit for any accomplishments on the Seaview Peninsula. Brown had to exercise considerable self-control to stick to this role of catalyst. His tendencies, he said, were to rush forward to accomplish his goal. He said he felt a strong need to
control. It wasn't a very easy thing to try and accomplish anything at Seaview. Gotham Housing Authority, the owner of the housing project, had no funds to spend even for normal maintenance type of work. The residents were discouraged and felt abandoned by the City.

Planners for the University said the University's objective has been an "ever-increasing attempt at building strong working relationships with the Seaview residents." The University set up a field office within the public housing project in 1970 before construction of the University started, to help secure construction jobs for residents and investigate employment opportunities with the University. Other programs of mutual benefit such as housing were initiated and community residents were participating in some recreation and academic planning. These University planners also said: "It is essential that the Gotham campus coordinate and participate to an increasing degree with the residents in the housing project in order to be able to accomplish its primary objective of providing quality, urban-related higher education." A major commitment had been made by the University to change the initial feelings of hostility after the University had announced the move.
Planning Studies

I will now discuss several studies undertaken by the University in order to show the many types of information available to White and to emphasize how important the use of such information and the continued reliance on the open information exchange process was for the successful completion of the White study.

In 1964, at the time the State Legislature passed a bill calling for the establishment of a new campus in Gotham, the Redevelopment Authority was unsuccessfully attempting to create an Urban Renewal area of the peninsula. In 1968, when the peninsula was selected as the site for the Gotham campus, a private study proposed housing and related facilities for the peninsula. No action was taken, but information including a site plan and technical data was available to White but not seen by him.

In the summer of 1971, Brown and his then Vice President for Development recommended to the Trustees of the University that the University work toward two major objectives related to the communities adjacent to the new campus. These objectives were the establishment of a Community Development Corporation that would include and be controlled by the many local resident organizations and the establish-
ment of a Leasing Cooperative to create a significant change in the housing situation at the Seaview Public Housing Project.

It was argued then that the University needed an external vehicle which could represent the various interests in South Gotham and with which the University could work on the difficult issues of housing, transportation, and economic development, areas that are not directly related to its mandate as an educational institution. It was also argued that a significant change in the housing project was needed in order to enable the University to co-exist with it. A method was needed through which it would be possible to change Seaview Peninsula from being a way station for extremely poor people to a neighborhood where people could become upwardly mobile and yet could remain to build some equity in the neighborhood, thereby helping to make it a better place for everyone to live. The Trustees accepted these two objectives as a long-range community relations strategy and directed the University staff to work in that direction. Housing had been the primary concern of community groups.

In 1973, prior to the selection of White in July to do the revitalization study I analyze in this thesis, the following reports, memoranda or policy statements were com-
completed and available for White's use: Community Planning Associates (CPA) completed a housing impact study for the University and a community task force in January; a Campus Impact Study Group, composed of University faculty and staff completed a study based on the CPA finding in April; the University's position was summarized in a memorandum in May; CPA proposed an additional study in May; University staff completed an internal comprehensive development report in June; and in July the Board of Trustees restated their policies on development of the peninsula.

Community Planning Associates (CPA) Study

In late 1971, two local community groups asked the University what was being done to protect the community from adverse consequences related to the use of Seaview Peninsula as the new campus. By early 1972, after being told they did not represent a broad base of community support, these groups organized twenty-six community organizations, representing most factions of the community into a task force. The University then agreed to seek funds to pay for a study by CPA, the independent consultant who was selected by the task force in late spring of that year.
Seventeen corporations from the business community joined the University in financing the study, but only the task force could control the nature of the work and approve the bills submitted by the consultant.

The task force and the University representatives came to believe that housing development, both on the peninsula and in the neighborhoods, was the long-range answer to the anticipated problems and wanted CPA to determine the best method of accomplishing that goal. The University expected the detailing of specific development packages including a five-year development plan, which would include locating housing units and funding sources, and defining management options. The University specifically expected, as stated in an internal memorandum, that the report would conclude by stating that a massive new community organization effort would be required, that the physical conditions of the public housing project must be urgently imposed and that recreation facilities and programs should be instituted. They also expected housing management alternatives to be explored and employment opportunities at the University to be investigated. The memorandum stated that the University believed it necessary to make a major commitment for the planning of the peninsula so that it can become an acceptable and productive place for its residents to live and for others to work, study and shop.
The University believed it was actually the client and had hired the consultant, though through the circuitous route of a community task force. The University had defined the task and expected firm results including development alternatives that would agree with President Brown's concept of a new image for the Seaview Peninsula. CPA, however, felt their client was the task force and wanted to redefine the task. CPA went far into the past and far into the future to determine impact and came up with a lengthy report highlighting the problems but without firm recommendations of a development solution. CPA didn't even show Brown or any of his staff a copy of the report prior to its release.

It is useful to see the kinds of information used in this planning process to see what was available to White in his revitalization study undertaken later that year. The concept of using a task force to include community representatives in the planning process was started and the information exchange process used during the study illustrated the depth of knowledge and level of understanding of the community and its willingness to participate in the details of the planning process.

The University and the task force agreed that the Seaview campus would have an effect on the South Gotham -
Seaview Peninsula communities, but because of difficulties in assessing the magnitude of the effect, a student survey was conducted to measure this impact. The survey carried out in July 1972 "confirmed the community's fears". Through an analysis of where the students lived and why, CPA estimated that between 30 and 35 percent of the student body would be seeking housing accommodations closer to school than where they were then living. Furthermore, that approximately 40 percent of the impact group would be willing to live in student housing. The impact of having a large number of students living away from home according to CPA represented a major threat to the already housing-short community in South Gotham. CPA did not make a firm recommendation for student housing to be built on the peninsula, however, because of many conflicting views held by members of the task force. Lack of transportation could become a major reason for students, faculty and staff to move to the area close to the Seaview campus.

Although not initially charged with a study of transportation effects and alternatives, the task force recognized it was critical to any housing policies. Therefore, the task force studied alternatives and arrived at recommendations such as: "It should be determined before the University opens that either the buses will give adequate service to the campus, or the buses will be replaced by a
People Mover or something like it." There had been a long and interesting history concerning transportation needs of the new University campus on Seaview Peninsula as well as the needs of the resident population. The CPA report had concentrated on transportation needs and possible solutions and had identified the needs as major problems.

To understand transportation as an institutional constraint in White's study, I believe it should be noted that at the time the University decided to move to Seaview it was aware of the inadequacies of public transportation to that site. In a transit accessibility analysis where 100 represents a value for a downtown location where major transit lines intersect, the temporary campus then in use downtown was rated at a value of 65 and the proposed Seaview site, if served by bus, was given an index value of about 35. This would mean, the University study concluded, the Seaview site was approximately twice as hard to get to as the downtown site then in use, and three times as hard as an ideal downtown site. The University required public mass transit, but only one of the lines has a station within one mile of the campus. The University in accepting the Seaview site, planned on shuttle buses as a temporary solution only and an automated People Mover as the permanent solution. It was expected by some local residents that the buses would not work well, that the transit
line would be overloaded with several thousand additional riders during rush hour, and that the People Mover would never be funded. It was feared by the housing project residents that the inadequate bus shuttle system, which did not serve the housing project or the shopping center area, would, by default, be the permanent solution leaving the housing project in continued isolation.

The CPA study, after considering buses, light rail, rapid transit and rapid transit connecting directly to the transit system as well as People Movers, recommended buses as an interim solution only. Their suggested permanent solution was the construction of a People Mover on an exclusive right-of-way, separate from the existing surface street system, with an intermediate station to provide service to the housing development, the High School and the other institutions. The report concluded "a bus solution is not desirable in the long range."

As difficult as it was to imagine the operation of an interim bus system, the funding problems of a People Mover, the needed improvement of the local streets and the provision and control of what was estimated as a need for 6,000 auto parking spaces by 1980 for University use also, the more difficult task was the coordination of all these ele-
ments into a cohesive transportation strategy.

The CPA Report strongly rejected any notion which would turn the housing project into a student housing resource. But, they did feel that admission to the development of those married students eligible for public housing could act as an impetus to obtain new funding to make the Seaview project habitable again. The report explored the advantages and disadvantages of its getting involved in housing development, the housing need and resources in the community, kinds of control over the development process, and the types of housing produced which the community might want to build. The report clearly stated that it was not presenting a development package, but that this did not mean that it rejected such a notion for the future.

The report asked that the University continue its efforts to maintain a strong alliance with the community, committing itself to building on-site housing and to changing its role in the necessary ways.

Unfortunately, the community task force could not commit itself with unanimity to the development of new housing, neither the student housing discussed earlier nor the housing for low, moderate and higher income families,
and so the CPA report did not provide specific development packages. The report did include a special preliminary feasibility study which indicated the potential for housing existed.

Brown said that he was "double-crossed" by CPA and that they did a very poor job in not responding to his needs and in spreading discontent in the community. Brown felt the document didn't serve the purpose the University intended, i.e., to be a vehicle for a development proposal, to win over a doubting City, a doubting State, financing sources and possibly to pacify the community. Betty Blue, Vice President for Planning, stated the CPA report was "trash" and then called CPA "provocateurs" because they alerted the community to "fears and hopes the community would not have thought of without them." At Brown's office, the anger at CPA was intense.
The Campus Impact Study Group reacting to an unwanted move to what many faculty and staff considered a strange location, felt a sense of responsibility to their new neighbors. The faculty committee worked from the CPA Report and was concerned with the same issues raised by CPA. The Report of the Campus Impact Study Group was completed in April, 1973 and stated it was written for the purpose of developing an "appropriate response" by the University to the South Gotham - Seaview Peninsula Task Force Report (CPA Report). Composed of nine faculty members, eleven administrators and ten students, the CISG met frequently for seven weeks. The report summarized their ideas, including both long and short-term recommendations about the housing, transportation and policy issues of the University's impact on the community.

The CISG had three categories of long-term housing recommendations: off-campus student housing, the Seaview Peninsula Housing Project and on-campus student housing. The first set of proposals answered the Task Force Report's statement that no housing development for students should occur in the surrounding community. The CISG agreed with the task force that the University holds the responsibility
to help local community groups strengthen their own housing resources and that these communities must develop and renovate housing to withstand the University impact. However, the CISG sought specific ways to disperse this impact by developing joint community/student housing outside of the impact area. Their idea was to urge the University to consider cooperative efforts with community organizations in communities in outlying areas, not near the University who wish to provide low-rent housing for their residents; who would agree to the University leasing space within these residences in which University learning and community service centers could be established; and in which the University could rent 20 to 30 percent of the units to its students. Such an idea would, according to the CISG, ease the imminent housing crisis for residents and students, provide housing in easily accessible places outside of the major impact area, and extend the University's ability to reach directly a variety of urban neighborhoods through the establishment of learning and community service centers.

The second set of recommendations had to do with the public housing project. The CISG maintained that all of what had been said in regard to housing for the community applied stringently to the housing project as well, but asserted that the University's "first job is education"
and that it couldn't be responsible for all the problems on Seaview Peninsula. They felt, however, that the University must work in cooperation with the Seaview Peninsula community on issues of transportation, safety, recreation and shopping facilities. The CISG asked that the Board of Trustees pass a statement to the effect that the University has "no intention of taking over the housing project for student housing," and would make a commitment to work on housing in areas of mutual benefit and concern.

On-campus student housing was the subject of the final set of long-range recommendations. The CISG was strongly opposed to the University's involvement in such an activity stating that it was not "consonant with the educational role of the University," and could undermine its urban role as well. Other problems they found with on-campus housing were that it was "not popular" nor economically feasible; that it would tend to exacerbate rather than relieve the housing impact in the neighborhoods and finally, that such development would create two "fundamentally different" communities in the same isolated piece of land, increasing tensions between members of the campus, the community and the residents of the housing project.
The most striking statement of the entire report came out strongly as a general recommendation. The CISG asked "that the Campus refuse to agree to move to the Seaview Peninsula Campus then nearing completion until the Board of Trustees adopt the housing policies proposed in this report and in order to permit sufficient indication for progress in these areas, the University should postpone holding regular classes at the campus from September 1973 until January, 1974 at the earliest."

CPA Proposal for A New Study

A few months after the initial CPA report of the task force, CPA wrote a proposal to the University stating that they (CPA) were "dismayed that not one of the parties responsible for allowing the current crisis to develop has supported the recommendations concerning housing. Not one of the parties which will carry the responsibilities for the problems in the future has committed itself to meet the clear need for housing." The proposal called the foreclosing of the Mall a "disaster and an opportunity" to solve the "interdependent problems of the area."
CPA proposed that Harbor Mall be used for high-density mixed-use development to meet the specific needs of the area. They suggested a major residential development with commercial and service facilities on the ground floor. They proposed that the tenants from the project or others with similar needs be moved there with day care, library, post office and dining facilities. According to the report, density will be the mitigating factor in the problem of security. They also stated housing should serve the entire income range and that current tenants in the project need assurances that they will have favorable access to the proposed development.

CPA asked for a strong community participation by a "community advisory board" set up as co-developer with reviewing responsibilities as to the developer's selection of consultants and designers. This community board would retain its share of the proceeds of sales to support an ongoing staff. The proposal stated that by linking the progress of the Harbor Mall housing development with major improvements in physical conditions in the housing project and with involvement on the part of all affected communities, a reduction of the community tensions which underlie much of the hostility and destructiveness within the project can be expected.
It is clear that the University recognized the nature and the complexity of the problems which must be solved and had been seriously exploring avenues of approach. The objectives of the study that White was asked to do later that year were developed in a University confidential memorandum written by the planning staff to President Brown, which expressed the long-range objectives of the University: to change the public housing project into a large neighborhood for low and moderate income families, that could sustain adequate shopping facilities and that could be more effectively linked and could successfully co-exist with the University.

The planners said they were aware that the reason behind many of the problems facing the housing project residents was the extremely high concentration of very poor people isolated on a peninsula of land with few social amenities. This isolation is both physical, because two major roads cut Seaview Peninsula off from almost everything else, and psychological, because the white working class residents surrounding the Peninsula generally prefer to "keep out there" the poor people of which 75 percent are Black and Spanish speaking. The presence of the University campus, a mixed income neighborhood and a major transit
link would serve to break the isolation and social stigma associated with the peninsula, while absorbing a low-income population in a mixed income neighborhood.

This was the problem facing White, but he did not refer to any of the University memoranda, the study data or question any of the University planners available when he started his work. This memorandum proposed the addition of approximately 1,000 - 1,500 new housing units on land adjacent to the housing project, plus the physical renovation of the 1,500 housing project units. The land adjacent to the Harbor Mall and the land between the campus and the project, which the University had the first option to buy, made sufficient land available to permit the doubling of the Seaview Peninsula residential population. Operating from the premise that the area of residential use then in existence for low-income people should be maintained, the additional units proposed would make it possible to add the moderate income mix that was thought desirable for a proper mixed income neighborhood. The income mix could be accomplished without moving out any existing residents, thereby protecting the existing low-income housing for low-income residents.

The method of making such a substantial change was not clear to the planners at that time. However, it was be-
lieved that only a major private developer with experience in "new town" building and shopping centers might have the ability to undertake such a venture. This type of organization, the University planners felt, must also have extensive experience in working with community groups, since their cooperation and limited partnership would be essential to success. There would also be a need for a substantial amount of State and Federal low interest loans, plus low-rent subsidies for such mixed income neighborhood.

The memorandum stated that "The role of the University in implementing such a change at Seaview Peninsula can only be one of a catalyst. Thanks to the experience of Brown, the University has expertise in this type of urban development; however, we have no authority nor mandate to do anything except to work in ways of joint cooperation with the residents."

The memorandum expressed the dual goals of "Self-preservation so that we may successfully accomplish our major mission of higher education" and public interest: "We must insure, as an urban University, that we do not become the 'cutting edge' that gets rid of poor people." To these ends, the cooperation of the University and project residents was essential on "employment, transportation, safety, recreation, shopping facilities and housing."
In June of that year, at the time Brown had decided to undertake the development study White performed, the Vice President for Development wrote a memorandum to provide Brown with basic information about existing sites for development on the peninsula and to identify steps to be taken in further exploration of development possibilities. This memorandum went into considerable detail in determining uses, densities, costs and recommendations for development opportunities. White did not refer to this material during his study.

A concept of private development on the peninsula was described which included use of properties near the public housing project for intensive residential and related retail/service commercial uses. The Vice President said this acreage could accommodate 2,500 apartments at a slightly lower density (33/A) than the density of the present project (37/A), while reserving an area about half the size of the present Harbor Mall for commercial use. This would increase population from the present 4,500 people to 7,500 - 8,000. Higher density might be possible if the given eleven-story height limit was utilized throughout.
The present public housing project of 1,504 apartments was financed by a $20,163,000 bond issue of which the then outstanding indebtedness was approximately $13,500,000. A straight arithmetic calculation produced an acquisition cost figure of approximately $9,000 per unit for the total number of units or, if the number of units were reduced by a third, the figure became $13,500 per unit. Harbor Mall was then valued at $4,700,000 and if no use could be made of the present buildings, the acquisition cost, totally applied to land, was approximately $174,000 per acre, or at a density of 33 apartments per acre, $5,300 per unit for land cost. Acquisition costs at these levels coupled with an assumption of an average $10,000 per unit to rehabilitate and use of 90 percent of the units in the present project and an assumption of an average $20,000 per unit cost of new construction calculated to an overall average cost of $21,000 per unit for 2,500 units. None of these numbers were investigated by White nor did he include a method of determining such costs in his study. Without knowing at this point the cost of acquiring city land, without an estimate of the cost of constructing or remodeling commercial space, these calculations indicated a probable need for a write-down of acquisition costs to meet the necessary rent levels. Still to be calculated, the memorandum states, were needs for parking space, recreation space and open space.
The development of careful cost analyses including calculations of minimum/maximum square footages of commercial development, number of apartments feasible on the acreage and assessment of potential use of the existing project was stressed in the memorandum and it was suggested that such analysis should include a calculation of a pro-forma operating statement for such a development, including calculation of potential tax revenue to City and estimate of probable relocation needs. This was the type of information the University later expected White to obtain, but White never referred to this memorandum nor did he discuss its contents with the author.

Trustees' Policy

The Board of Trustees of the University in July, 1973, restated their determination to "make this campus an asset for its immediate neighbors, the communities adjacent to the Seaview Peninsula campus, and to address promptly any problems associated with the University's new location." The designer had access to the Board's detailed discussion of the problems of Seaview and the necessity for community participation in addressing them.
The Board's statement stressed that the University will remain a commuter institution, with a strong commitment to encouraging the use of mass transit by providing "direct bus and shuttle bus service as indicated by student residential patterns."

The Board emphasized the University commitment to the residents of the Project. They would support "city efforts to rehabilitate and revitalize the Project for the benefit of present residents." They issued further reassurances of their commitment to minimize student housing impact: "The University has no intention of taking over the Project for student use." They stated their intention to cooperate "with City agencies and community groups to discourage conversion of local family dwellings to student use" and they promised to provide "active assistance to students to find adequate accommodations in communities outside of the high impact areas." They would establish a cooperative and consultative process between the campus and the residents of Seaview Peninsula on all matters of mutual concern, including education, employment, transportation, safety, recreation, shopping facilities and housing. The Trustees concluded by calling for further help and cooperation from all possible sources and restated the need for common work with the neighborhoods as partners, not adversaries.
The direction Brown received from his Board of Trustees was certainly clear. The information and development ideas presented were not in a form that could excite the imagination and overcome the fears of skeptics. The immediate neighbors and general community were still hostile and distrustful and Brown wanted the new campus to open without incident.

Status Prior to White's Study

At the time Brown started discussions with design consultants to initiate the new revitalization study of Seaview Peninsula that was done by White, the scene was set for the design to include community participation, open information exchange, use of great amounts of technical, social and political information gathered to that date to achieve a practical, pragmatic, feasible and believable design solution.

When the University announced its move to Seaview Peninsula, the communities and the students and faculty felt they would be affected. Some felt positively but most felt negatively about the move. The public housing tenants, the nearest neighbors, were the most confused. Their pro-
ject had become the worst in the City and though fearful of the consequences of the new campus, they had the most hope for desperately needed aid. They also felt they were running the risk of losing their homes to students and "more desirable" families. It was logical for White, if he were to incorporate community people in his planning, which the University was committed to do, to pay particular and sensitive attention to the public housing tenants.

The shopping center history was an important ingredient in the White design. The shopping center provided the public housing tenants with the only retail area anywhere near the project and its continued operation represented the recognition of the peninsula as a viable living environment. When the center closed, the housing tenants felt abandoned. It was important for White to determine the role of the then vacant and foreclosed Harbor Mall; it was to become a questionable keystone of his design.

When White started his study, the campus construction was nearing completion. Its design reflected many of the physical and social constraints of a difficult site that would be expected also to be important to any other development on the peninsula. The role of the University was determined in part by its location and such factors as transportation and the composition of its staff and stu-
dents. The proposed environment and its physical form as studied by White, should have taken into account the goals of the new campus.

The University needs of creating a better community in which it could exist had been planned for or studied during the year before the start of the White Revitalization Study, but the solution was not apparent or not in the proper form to satisfy President Brown.

The study by CPA contained much information that could have been utilized by White and the new task force formed during the White Study, but the report was never read by White. Some of the members of the CPA task force were invited to be on the White task force and White should have known some of the background in order to work effectively in information exchange. White could have questioned CPA to find out why they were not able to produce the detailed development programs expected of him. Transportation information that could have been used in White's study was not seen by him. CPA's reactions to discussions of student housing needs and its inability to recommend a solution could have been used by White to solve the problem of student housing.

The CPA report failed to meet Brown's expectations. White did not determine if Brown's expectations were simi-
lar for his study; a discussion of the CPA report, which was avoided by White, would have helped define White's role in his study.

At the time the University received the CPA report, two other important things happened. The Harbor Mall virtually closed, leaving the housing project without shopping facilities and President Brown talked with the Ford Foundation about possible sources of funding for long-range development planning. At that time, faced with a defunct shopping mall and a deteriorating housing project next door to the new campus, University planners stated the urgent need to improve the residential facilities and living conditions on Seaview Peninsula "so that our campus can successfully accomplish its mission". For some time the University had been slowly developing a concept for a development planning effort of their own that could bring about change on the peninsula. The talk with Ford Foundation provided an opportunity to prepare a draft of a long-range development proposal which was not intended to be given to the Ford Foundation but was intended to provide a basic concept for exploration. It specified the next stages of the community relations strategy that had been planned to be brought forward following the campus response to the CPA report.
The results of the Ford visit indicated to Brown and his planners that they had to become more specific in terms of the long-range objective for Seaview Peninsula before they might obtain funding from the Ford Foundation. They decided to do this and to gather local support for a much more substantial change for Seaview Peninsula than any of the previous proposals indicated.

The CISG Report also discussed many issues pertinent to White's study but was not read by him. White was not interested in that information nor had he read the Trustees' statement of policy for the future use of the peninsula.

University memoranda completed prior to White's study indicate the level of understanding of the solution to create a better peninsula of Brown and his staff. It led them to believe that a very practical approach by an experienced designer with an understanding of development was necessary to pull all the pieces relating to development on the peninsula into a believable whole.

From the time State University selected the Seaview Peninsula as its Gotham campus in 1968 through June 1973, the development and planning studies described had been completed, but President Brown still felt he did not have adequate evidence to convince others of the viability of
creating a new development to serve as a neighbor to his new campus at Seaview Point. None of the previous studies or statements of good intent had quieted those community people and certain of his staff, faculty and students suspicious of University motives and fearful of University power. Though these various studies done by the University were available to Brown, he said he now required a feasible design solution done by a well-respected outside consultant, a designer who was both architect and planner, to add credibility to a proposal for the development of the peninsula. Brown wanted a new study which would call for the revitalization of the Seaview Peninsula and decided to pay for it with University funds.

Brown believed he needed further study of some of the recommendations made by past study groups: the feasibility and practicality of the proposed renovation of the public housing project, the feasibility, design and program for the addition of subsidy and non-subsidy housing units, the possibility of re-opening the shopping mall, and the ways of creating various environmental and recreational changes. Brown wanted a new entity to be the client even though the University was paying for the study because, he said, he wanted objectivity and felt the designer's objectivity would be suspect if State University was the sole client.
CHAPTER 2
THE DESIGN PROCESS

Introduction

At their initial meeting, President William Brown told John White that a plan that did not recognize all of the constraints, the considerations of economic, physical, political and sociological feasibility, would not be acceptable. He said he wanted a study "that was not only feasible but was practical too." White said of his previous work that he could design where the need was "both to create a more human scale and to satisfy a large and diverse group of decision-makers and other interested people." White said that in the past he had been particularly effective in integrating the institutional needs of a complicated design project.

I shall describe the design process from the time that President Brown decided he needed an outside consultant
to design a development plan for the revitalization of the Seaview Peninsula in June 1973 to the public announcement of the completed plan in January 1974. Brown considered proposals from two architect/planners before selecting John White to design the proposed plan. A comparison of the two proposals and a discussion of Brown's instructions illustrate the needs and methodology considered important at that time. I shall describe the design process to show White's initial concepts, the availability of information through his own perception of needs, the informal meetings he had with key members of the client group, the presentations of his design solutions throughout the process to interested parties, and the regular meetings of the Task Force formed as the formal client. In analyzing White's behavior, it became apparent to me that there were two sets of constraints in action during the design process: the many and complicated institutional constraints that were sufficient to cause the failure of developing a workable plan and those seemingly unexplainable forces that caused White to be indecisive, ambiguous, uncertain and unable to use much of the information available to him and unable or unwilling to seek the additional information he required to do what he said he would do in the study.

Many of the members of the Task Force had specific, assigned tasks to perform as a part of the process. Those
members representing public or quasi-public agencies were asked to represent their agency and also to obtain information and convey it to the group for inclusion in the design solution. Community group members were also expected to represent their organizations and in such representation assure the support of the community group in the solution proposed. Information about the needs and expectations of the organizations was to be conveyed to the Task Force so the design solution would be responsive to those needs and expectations. The gap in the information exchange process, whether it is caused by not using information obtained, or by not obtaining information, or using wrong information, occurs frequently because of institutional pressures but there are also dysfunctions due solely to psychological factors not easily observed or isolated. There are many who feel institutional analysis is sufficient to explain the behavior of the designer and the members of the Task Force, and look to improving the institutional model.

The design process succeeded in attaining certain of the goals of various individuals and failed to attain some of the goals of others. In evaluating some of the areas of failure I have found White's inability to use important information, was a factor in contributing to the failure of the design.
The various and multiple clients of the design study each had a set of goals that were either stated or could be inferred. The designer also had his own goals and agenda including those goals of satisfying the various clients. The initial client, Brown, representing the University, stated to White his major goals: to solve the "serious political problem in the impending opening of the University," and, to do a "feasibility study for peninsula development... to consider other uses for Harbor Mall and help relations with the Community" prior to the arrival of the students on the new campus. The Board of Trustees of the University stated "we are determined to make this campus an asset for its immediate neighbors, the communities adjacent to the campus, and to address promptly any problems associated with the University's new location, and to identify workable alternatives for the future development of the...peninsula." Brown wanted to be a welcomed neighbor by showing that the design study would help the community get what it wanted. But first, the design study would help the community to know what it wanted. Brown wanted to enlist and keep neighborhood and community support for future planning efforts and thereby ensure the cooperation through the formation of the Task Force with a commitment to future growth of the peninsula in accord with University desires. He was very desirous of making the peninsula into a "good" place for the University to be located. Brown also wanted to show he was
able to do what others had failed to do and was able to get the necessary political and community support to implement a plan to change the peninsula. Brown had been mentioned in the press as a possible candidate for high political office in the future and this may have contributed to his complex set of goals for the design study.

White was asked to do the study for a very low fee with the understanding that if preliminary feasibility was shown, there would be an additional design study much greater in scope that would lead to the actual design of the buildings to be built. It would be during these later stages that he would get the fees necessary to do the work. In addition to his "dream," of what the peninsula could be, White's goal was to get on with the next design studies. It was in his interest to show preliminary feasibility, but it was not in his interest to alienate any segment of the community.

Others involved may have had differing goals. The City as stated by the Mayor, his housing advisor, the Redevelopment Authority staff and the Housing Authority staff, wanted to upgrade the existing public housing project to make it a better place to live, bring additional residential development to the peninsula, provide a mixed income residential group by attracting middle and upper income people to the area, cooperate with the needs of the University, and
provide a recreational, commercial, institutional and residential asset to the surrounding communities and all the residents of the City.

Many of the residents of the public housing project thought the major goals were to close down the project, or get rid of the low income people, or get rid of "trouble-makers;" their thoughts were generally based on the assumption that the peninsula was going to be recognized as a liveable area with the asset of the new university, and therefore low income people would no longer be allowed to stay. Residents of surrounding communities feared the upgrading of the peninsula was the start of a process, which was the City's goal, that would upgrade the area contiguous to Sea-view Peninsula and force low and moderate income families out of those areas.

If the primary goal was to determine feasibility for the design of the proposed redevelopment of the peninsula the study failed. This failure was due to White as well as to institutional constraints and the national collapse of the subsidy and non-subsidy housing market. It is not possible to say the failure was due to a failure of the designer in his design process alone. In evaluating other goals, those that were attained, such as the opening of the University without incident and the joint announcement of the revitalization study by the community groups as their own plan, the work of the designer either overcame the
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**Figure 7** White's design process and related meetings and events.
institutional constraints or the institutional constraints were not a factor in attaining those goals. Other goals, especially those relating to acceptance of the plan by public housing residents and the financial and investment community, were not reached and I believe a large portion of the blame should be attributed to the failures of the design process beyond the level of institutional constraint.

Selection of the Designer

Brown sought advice from many people before selecting the designer for his proposed study. Jane Jones acted as advisor to Brown for this purpose and also was a representative and member of the Trustee's Council. She suggested the two architect/planners considered: John White and Thomas Greene. An experienced urban developer and a recently appointed professor at State University, the Vice President for planning, the Vice President for policy, the Mayor of Gotham, his housing advisor and the director of the Redevelopment Authority and some of his staff were also involved in the selection process.

Greene first heard of the proposed project during a
long meeting with Jones who stated she was representing Brown and advising him on the selection. The purpose of their meeting was to enable Greene to obtain information about the scope of the proposed study, so he would be able to determine the cost of such an initial projective study that would explore some of the alternative ways that the Seaview Peninsula might be developed. The purpose of such development she said would be to: (a) improve the environment of State University; (b) improve the condition of the public housing; and (c) make a valuable additional increment to the City's complement of housing. The study Jones was asking for, had more to do with the issue of spatial/physical development, assuming some source of funding and assuming some age and economic mix of population, than with the issue of what social mix of people is likely or desirable and in what ways the plan should aid community relations.

Jones said she was looking for a presentable plan to use as a selling device for Brown's idea of the new community. She also said there was a basic assumption that the State Housing Finance Agency was prepared to finance some important number of dwelling units such as 2,500.

She mentioned an eleven-story height limit and the defunct shopping center owned by the Mortgagee who was
trying to sell it for industrial use. There was the assumption that some portion of the public housing might be torn down or converted in its use. Green's response was to note that a key to the solution of the problem posed was to disaggregate those multi-problem families one from another to some important degree; a key also would be to find relocation housing to do so, possibly in the broader Seaview Peninsula development, which would create a staging problem that was important to solve.

Jones then talked about the problem of adequate funds to do the study. She stated that limited funds were available. She suggested that Greene should look at this initial contract as a "loss leader" but wanted to know how much such a study should cost. Greene estimated the cost at $28,000. When White was called in, he was told the amount available was $30,000.

Greene said he felt a week's study by two or three of the right people could give some substantial answers to the questions Jones asked but a year's study by many would not be enough to produce the alternative developments that would be valuable to consider.

Jones answered that she wanted the study carried out over the summer and possibly early into the fall. She felt
Greene the most appropriate for the work due to his demonstrated sensitivity to the wide range of problems that exist. Her feeling about the existing problems was aimed at "new community building" she said, not so much in working with "existing and present populations."

Jones had also contacted John White in substantially the same way, with the same information at the same time. Both Greene and White were asked to submit a proposal outlining their concept of the process and the manner in which they would carry out the work.

White in his initial proposal used the opportunity to describe a technique he said he would like to use to assist collaboration on the large scale architectural planning project proposed. He described his technique as "three-dimensional design" through the use of comprehensive movable sketch-models and detailed photography to simulate and predict the total design result. It would be possible to save time, he stated, by using this approach and it would greatly assist in the essential three-way communication between architect and architect as well as architect and client. In projects White had done in the past he said, where a large number of people or groups were involved, he found it proved extremely fast in accomplishing preliminary planning, layout, and design development.
White suggested his technique was based on all ideas, including the first layouts and design studies, being translated into rough scale block models that could be moved and rearranged to test out all possible concepts and alternatives. As ideas are refined, he continued, design proposals would be studied on the model as a group, rearranging the elements to study the implications of massing, open spaces and land planning, distance -- pedestrian and motor views and enclosures, scale re the human occupant, and relationships.

This study process is meant to take place in a large meeting where fifty or more people can become directly involved in the logical resolution of complex problems, he stated. The people could continue to change and rearrange the block models as design development progresses. Constant referral to the evolving model would keep all parties informed and enable them to visualize the effects of the changes, made as a result of new ideas being introduced in the design process. White felt this approach the most efficient and effective method to make architecture the design of the environment rather than the design of isolated buildings.

The rest of White's proposal was quite indefinite. He acknowledged the difficulties and the challenge of the problems facing the University and the necessity of involving numerous private and public agencies and interests.
He stated he felt his philosophy of planning and design as it integrates the social, political and economic realities, and the method of studying problems and developing alternative approaches were particularly relevant to the concerns of the University.

The Greene proposal was more specific. It was dated July 9, 1973, twelve days before White's July 17th proposal.

The type of thinking, even at this point, shows an important variation in approach between Green and White. Where White was vague in his talk of a "creation of a human environment" in broad terms without regard to the immediate hurdles, Greene had focussed on staging problems and relocation, both tough planning and political questions. It seems incongruous that during the study when White was concerned with working with the many public agencies that had gathered a great deal of information about the institutional constraints and was referring to his ability to integrate social, political and economic realities with his design decision, he was being vague, unwilling to use information, unspecific and indefinite. In the context of my investigation it is important to determine if this behavior was due to the inadequacies of the information available or to some other reason White was unwilling or unable to be precise.
Greene proposed to design and analyze development alternatives for the Peninsula based on studies such as: siting studies for each use and including requirements for transportation, foundations and noise control; program and staging options for new and existing housing in relation to preliminary market projections and potential funding sources; institutional options for the development entity, related options for social and institutional innovation in the Seaview housing project; and feasibility studies on the physical renovation of the Seaview project for its possible future as part of a mixed income community, including relocation needs.

The products of this work they proposed would include two or more selected development options including physical, social, financial and institutional dimensions to be presented in schematic form. It would be presented as site plans and physical specifications for development with perspective sketches and slide simulations showing the environment qualities; program and cost analyses of the alternatives; pro-forma operating statements for the alternatives, under different assumptions as to the development entity; an outline of the potential destiny of the Seaview project under each of the alternatives; and schedules of development, funding and relocation requirement for each option.
The schedule of work was then stated and it provides a view of the designers' concept of the study. Greene suggested a short period of orientation and familiarization and development of an initial working model of the problem and its possible solutions for discussion. He then would work on a schematic design and development of a range of valuable options, including simultaneous work on physical, social, financial, institutional and staging parameters. Then two (or more, if necessary) alternatives would be identified and agreed on by State University staff, before the final refinement and presentation of these alternatives in the form of site plans, perspective sketches showing environmental qualities of similar developments elsewhere, and a written report.

The Greene proposal was a well thought out, fairly complete document based on numerous conversations held by Greene with Jones and on a review of the studies completed to date. She articulated clearly the needs of the University as well as the need for the consultant to stay in close touch. The University did not want another situation, she said, similar to the unsatisfactory use of Community Planning Associates as described previously.

In the meantime, White was asked to meet with Brown to review various positions possible on the University's responsibilities to the neighboring community. Brown
mentioned the CPA report as having examined the University's impact on local community facilities, especially transportation. He stated the campus committee response recommended a massive effort for development based on community-university cooperation. It stressed transportation education of local citizens and active hiring from the community. Brown said: Unfortunately, many of the programs recommended were grounded on now-defunct government funding. The Sea-view housing project community, Brown felt, required that any solution should stress adequate housing for project residents as well as students; Brown felt they would oppose University renovation of one building if it neglected the others.

Brown said the desirable mix was some balance of physical and economic development for the whole peninsula that would incorporate all existing forces and in particular the foreclosed Harbor Mall. Brown said he knew the owners were trying to salvage their $4,500,000 investment in Harbor Mall, the result of a defaulted mortgage note, by offering to sell the buildings for light industrial and warehousing use. To do this a re-zoning was necessary and the necessary petition and hearing was being prepared for. Brown was opposed to this use on the peninsula but was resistant to pressures for the University to seek a "quick fix" by aiding in the leasing of Harbor Mall for such suggested uses as a series of younger generation boutiques,
coffee shops and informal meeting places for improving the University-Community dialogue. Brown felt this was an inadequate stop-gap measure.

Brown said to White: "I would like you to do a feasibility study for peninsula development that will include options for housing, the shopping center, recreational facilities along the shoreline, and uses of the offshore lands." He wanted it completed by October 1, 1973 and be directed toward the City and private developers. He felt the study could persuade the owner to consider other uses for Harbor Mall and help relations with the community prior to the new opening date for the Gotham Campus on January, 1974. White mentioned the possibility of looking at the peninsula as a potential site for a "New-Town-In-Town." Brown was most responsive and wanted that possibility explored. The peninsula is large enough, he said, and already has the necessary mix of federal and state involvement, local industries, educational institutions, and community groups to qualify for new community funds and guarantees. He told White that his proposal should head in that direction unless he heard otherwise. Brown was meeting with the Board of Trustees that afternoon and the following Monday with the State for a sounding out of common areas of support for peninsula development of this kind.
Later that month (July 30th) Betty Blue came to White's office to discuss the general transfer of information on the then present state of the work program for Seaview Peninsula, using an outline prepared for a meeting by Brown's and the Mayor's offices. This list was used to delegate needed inputs and results from the participants, particularly city and state agencies.

Two things were highlighted as being of overall import: (1) The Mayor is personally very interested; (2) Brown remains concerned that only feasible alternatives emerge from the study.

It was also decided that a new Task Force be formed, its "organization" would consist of a Policy Level committee including the Mayor and leaders of the various working groups. The Technical Level working group of the task force would consist of the various professionals from City and State Agencies and White's staff. It was planned that meetings of the Technical Committee be open to South Gotham community groups. It was noted that at least eight community groups were interested and one of them "still generates a high level of rhetorical energy, though its local impact is waning;" their major interest is housing with traffic problems secondary.

Blue stated White's involvement in the visual and
hard and soft parts of the program will present an overview that could steer the City Agencies away from a solution overly focused on new housing or new commercial development. She also stated a New-Town-In-Town solution, if its parts are feasible, would be satisfactory to Brown and probably to the Mayor who has posed this as a possibility.

There were still unanswered concerns White had. There was a discussion about the two or three month time period seeming too short to accomplish the ambitious outline. Blue also stressed that White's involvement would be the same with the Task Force as client as when the University was the only client when questioned about the Changing client. The new organizational format of Policy and Technical Committees including agencies with planning, design and research capabilities made White uncertain and uneasy about the feasibility of their joint participation.

As a result of this meeting, White was asked to write a new proposal that would reflect more accurately the concept of the work program required in specific detail rather than the generalities of his previous proposal. He was told about the detailed proposal submitted by Green and was asked to make his new proposal more detailed and precise and was also asked to reflect a willingness to work under the new organizational format as a way of obtaining information to be used in his design process.
One week later (August 6, 1973) John White submitted a formal, detailed, specific proposal to undertake the architectural and planning studies requested related to the University's participation in a joint city-state-neighborhood effort to identify workable alternatives for the future development of the Seaview Peninsula. White had agreed to do the detailed analysis that required the obtaining of information from the many technical sources made available to him. His lack of willingness to obtain some of the information and his inability to utilize the information obtained indicate the presence of forces that had an effect on the design process. A considerable amount of social, economic and physical information was available that could have been used but was not.

Since White's previously submitted proposal, two events had taken place, a new Task Force had been formed with a role function as client and the University had received the detailed proposal from Greene. White's new proposal reflected this new information and stated that in the process of doing the study he would work through and with the technical working group already established, thereby collaborating with representatives of the Mayor's office, city and state agencies, and neighborhood and community organizations. He stressed the importance of this mutual effort in the creation of planning alternatives.
He said he would work closely with the professional staffs that the public agencies made available and would provide the University and its representatives with appropriate professional support. White's proposal further stated: "In seeking and considering alternatives," he would review and analyze his own data and research as well as the research of the cooperating agencies. He included a list of data necessary, titled Study Material, and indicated that a model of the project area would be built. This model would be used to study the alternate plans called for: the designers would be represented as modules that could be inserted into the base to demonstrate comparative impact, effect, and feasibility of each alternate. White said that much of the focus of his proposal was based on the proposal submitted by Greene and would enable the specific study of alternatives and the effects of each set of alternatives.

The proposal listed the elements to be included in the design studies he would undertake:

1. University and expansion areas
2. Existing housing and possible alteration, rehabilitation or redesign;
3. New housing showing income mix, numbers, age groups, unit size, etc.
4. Existing business and expansion areas;
5. New business (potential locations);
6. Service/commercial (optimum locations);
7 Schools - both present and potential
8 Retain shops and complexes (optimum sizes, types, locations);
9 Light industry (locations);
10 Open space and waterfront use;
11 Recreation (indoor and outdoor);
12 Traffic, people-flow, parking, transportation;
13 Outer island relationship;
14 "New-Town-In-Town" potentials.

The list indicated a far more comprehensive study than the one actually done. The master model was to be used to review design progress and White would with the Redevelopment staff prepare a set of reasonable alternatives subsequently to allow the study group to visualize and analyze these plans according to standards established by environmental impact, human needs, community structure and economic feasibility. The model, with its alternative modules, would be adapted and revised during his process with new design modules prepared to reflect the "synthesizing of group objectives." White then agreed to also prepare the essential materials necessary for presenting "these alternatives as the University deems best" for review by the principals of the agencies, institutions, and neighborhood organizations concerned.

The study was proposed as to be done during a 90-day
period, at a fee of $30,000 under the direct supervision of White. He also agreed to have the progress of all work by him reviewed bi-weekly with the Vice-President for Planning of the University to assess then current status and "to reflect any changes for special needs during the period."

Before starting the design process, White though it important to make Brown aware of his thoughts concerning design and planning. At a meeting held just before the study started White showed Brown a slide show of recent work and of illustrations by Darwin from his trip around the world, to help White define his philosophy of urban design. It was a "show" accompanied by taped folk music during which White spoke of beauty, color, light, quality of life, return to old values. It was a show White enjoyed giving and did so frequently, on many types of occasions. He then described, with slides and music, a design solution he developed for a new town at another State University site which he had recently completed. Many of the elements were similar to Seaview: the site was situated near an area thought of as undesirable, near water, and located next to a site of a new town. White duplicated many of the elements of that plan in arriving at an early design solution for Seaview Peninsula.
White made it clear to Brown, prior to the selection of White as designer for the Revitalization Study, that White's attitude on studies of the kind proposed would be to push forward for an overall solution without raising new problems or spending time on difficult ones. Brown did not give White actual instructions to conduct the study in this way. White stated he felt it was the "best way to act in the circumstances." Brown said he understood and agreed with White's approach to urban design. There was established a rapport between them at their initial meetings that remained throughout the design study. Brown said he did not feel it necessary to give White suggestions of possible design solutions. Brown felt the study could be done rapidly. Although Brown and White discussed the approach to the design process and reached apparent agreement it seems almost inconceivable that Brown should be willing to ignore the problems he had investigated so vigorously for the sake of speed. White was selected because Brown felt he could arrive at a solution quickly and Brown wanted the study completed before students were in attendance at the Seaview campus. In view of the details agreed to in the proposal by White, an ambiguous situation was created where Brown's need for speed prevented proper analysis but White's desire for a successful solution required much analysis. The date of opening was originally
planned for September 1973 but was later postponed to January 1974. The design contract with White was started in August and its short term and low fee also gives some indication of the scope of services anticipated by Brown. Right after the contract was awarded, a much publicized murder took place at Seaview Peninsula and Brown called White and asked that the study be completed immediately. He said, as White recalls, he felt it was necessary for some good publicity to come out about Seaview to counteract the bad publicity. White went to work immediately and said all of the design decisions were made over the following week-end. White said he was able to do it so fast because he felt his main instruction from Brown was to be pragmatic; he was not to include any elements in the plan "that could really jar people or appear impractical." To illustrate his point, White said he didn't want to "call for a Marina Towers as a part of the proposed development because that might cause people to question the overall plan or it might polarize people and cause work to be stopped on the whole plan."

Obviously Brown was not concerned about solving the problem of the Peninsula. However, White insisted he was solving the problems of the Peninsula in the way he knew best.
Brown may have selected White, just for White's ability to arrive at a fast solution.

When White began the study the Redevelopment staff had already formed its own idea of the type of study desired and had prepared a preliminary work program to determine who would do what and who should be part of the Task Force. The staff had been involved in planning work concerned with the Seaview Peninsula though it had never been a high priority project. Eight years earlier an attempt was made to create an urban renewal area at Seaview Peninsula and a considerable amount of data was assembled concerning physical environmental and other planning needs. This staff had a great deal of knowledge of many of the constraints operating on future development potentialities and the type of information they felt was required to complete the revitalization study successfully. Meeting with White and University representatives, at the start of White's work, the staff conducted a meeting that defined the study area and called for a review of existing data, plans and proposals relevant to Seaview Peninsula. Called for were an inventory and analysis of: existing land use, employment, environmental data, public housing project, Harbor Mall and market analyses. The environmental data requested included water and sewer needs, noise impact, methane gas and visual impact studies. The housing project was discussed from the
point of view of studying the various options for its future and how they might add to or detract from the livability of the project. The options included maintaining the project as is, and rehabilitating and changing the social structure of the project by the integration of new income groups as tenants.

The market analysis they suggested would look at the supply of housing in the nearby areas and the commercial structures within one half a mile of the site and the demand and marketability of mixed income housing and new retail uses relative to the new housing.

It was proposed that a proper approach to the planning process would be to have the designer, with the help of the Redevelopment Authority and other agencies, synthesize the elements of the study and the analyses, by first developing goals and objectives for Seaview Peninsula. It was suggested that there be developed a schematic land use plan, including the consideration of utility, transportation, recreational and other needs which must accompany each alternative. Alternates should consider a variety of mixtures of incomes, interchanging with old and new housing and economic development. It was requested that discussions with housing project residents relative to their own interior rehabilitation plans should be taken into account. Potential exterior rehabilitation of the housing project and its
integration and relationship with new housing, the Harbor Mall area, the University, transportation and recreation facilities should be accomplished. The preparation of the final plan called for each alternative and its environmental impact to be analyzed and a final plan to be selected from the alternatives. The Plan, they said, should show different development and phasing options relative to: new development of housing, rehabilitation, new development of retail, industrial development and open space and recreational improvements. A policy plan for further action and recommendations for considerations by the community, the University and the City of Gotham should result from the study.

White, in contrast to these suggestions, believed that on studies of the kind proposed he should avoid the problem areas because they could "tie you up and get considerable negative responses." He said it was best to concentrate on an overall concept that would please everyone because he felt that the problem areas would be solved at some later more opportune time. He felt the study would be done badly if it concentrated on the solution of a serious problem in depth. As an example, he said the whole time allotted to the study could be used to explore only various methods of rehabilitating an apartment unit in the existing public
housing project without having any time left to address any of the other problems, if he were required to solve problems as they came up. He stated the question of how to handle the exterior treatment of the public housing project so that it fit into an overall environment in a more humane way was a problem of interest but one that should be solved at a later date. He did not want to get sidetracked on problems that could occupy a major portion of his time, the solution of which might not be possible in the time available. He did not want to dwell on problems that he could assume were solvable at some future time. I feel that White's reaction to the suggestions of analysis in depth, including the analysis of such physical items as soil condition and noise abatement requirements were in conflict with his desire to produce a workable and practical plan.

Three Types of Design Meetings

There were generally three kinds of meetings that took place concurrently during the design process: the informal client meetings, the presentations of the plan to more formal groups and the Task Force meetings. White tried out his ideas and sought guidance from the small group with whom he met or spoke to frequently. Included in this group were Brown, Blue and Jones from the University
and key staff from the Redevelopment Authority. During the process from the very start to the conclusion, White met with one or more of these people on a frequent and informal basis in addition to meeting them at the other two kinds of meetings. The second type of meeting was used for the presentation of White's plan. Its purpose was to allow White to present the material he had developed, including the model of a design solution, in order to obtain information, comments, criticism, approval and to inform the interested groups invited to attend. The people invited to these presentations included members of the Task Force, University staff and faculty, prospective developers and representatives of financial institutions, planners and residents of the public housing project. Most of these meetings took place during September, October and November and the last as late as the end of December. The third type of meeting was the Task Force meeting; it took place generally on a weekly basis, at the Mayor's conference room at City Hall. It met initially in August, and continued regularly until the public announcement of the final report in January 1974. The Task Force was divided into two groups, one the main group that met to discuss the technical planning and community problems on a regular basis and the other, a policy group that met infrequently. The design process was carried out by White and in addition to his work with his staff, consisted of these three streams of meetings, White met with the first group prior to arriving
at his basic design and then again periodically to test out his design solutions. These meetings were held to prepare for the other group meetings or to redefine goals and objectives. The presentation meetings took place at White's office after the model was completed and many of the design decisions were made. The description of these meetings that follows will indicate the great amount of information available to White and the relevance of the information to the design. Those participating felt they were contributing time, effort and information to enable White to come up with the best possible plan. However, I shall show how despite all these institutional provisions, White did not use the information available to him and therefore the design process suffered. I discuss these meetings to indicate the type of input available from both professionals and community groups and the slight affect this information had on the design process.

Informal Client Meeting: First Review of Design Ideas

White first tried out his design ideas with the small informal group when he reviewed his initial impressions of the peninsula and outlined some of the problem areas. He stressed the need for a new image at Seaview Peninsula.
"Generally the Peninsula has a need for scale and an upgrading of conditions," he stated. The main street, is poorly maintained, the closing of the shopping center lowered community morale and the placement of parking lots serving the public housing apartments near the water needs improvement. He did not state that he had already decided on a design but did stress those elements of his design solution as major problems to be solved. To those people who raised the problems of land fill, foundation feasibility, methane gas and airport noise as ones to be solved in the design of the peninsula, White replied that he "would investigate these conditions" in his continuing design. This statement contradicts his earlier response to requests for such study, i.e. he did not intend to do them, and raises the possibility that the difference between White's actions and explanations are indicative of forces other than institutional impeding the design process.

Site Visit: Design Decisions

Immediately after this meeting, White visited Seaview Peninsula with two of his associates to photograph the site and note existing conditions. This was not White's first visit to the site. During the summer, when the design project
was being considered he had stopped at the Seaview Peninsula to drive around to observe conditions. At the later visit he said he was trying to concentrate on those areas of concern that he felt he should address in his study for the revitalization.

At that time Phase I of the new University was near completion and he was able to note the location of the ring road and that the brick covered buildings had small windows because of acoustical considerations to minimize the effect of aircraft noise. He noted that the commercial buildings on the nearby road were well designed and of excellent condition but were not connected to the interior of Seaview Peninsula. They were entered from the outer road and seemed to turn their backs on the rest of the peninsula.

As he looked at the closed shopping center, Harbor Mall and noted the external condition of the buildings as being in good repair except for windows and trim. One small building, used by a tire store, seemed economically healthy, White felt the area and the buildings were usable for retail activity. White looked at Harbor Mall as a key to the future revitalization of the peninsula. His initial impression of the buildings as being reusable and therefore ideal for retail was an important ingredient in his design solution. White felt comfortable in evaluating retail potential. He had been involved in retail and commercial
activities most of his life. He had been part of the development group and had been instrumental in developing the retail concepts and the marketing strategies. He considered himself, as did others who hired him as a marketing consultant, an expert in determining the feasibility of the shopping center. White was aware of market studies made within the past two years by a development company that indicated a need for a regional shopping center then being evaluated at a site less than two miles south of the peninsula. In White's concept of changing the image of Seaview Peninsula, the making of the shopping center into an active regional center which would bring in diverse types of people from many areas, was an important starting point. As White looked at the existing buildings, he felt a change should be brought about there first and the change would then make it easier for other changes to take place afterward.

The Shopping Center became a critical piece of the design puzzle very early in the planning process. At the initial meeting of the newly assembled technical group of the Task Force, it was suggested Harbor Mall be studied to determine whether to revive it as a shopping center, or to encourage industrial development of its buildings, or to demolish and construct new housing and related commercial uses, or other uses such as a high school or occupational research center. That Harbor Mall was closed was obvious
but the reasons for its failure were unclear. Its failure had been used by some to show that a revitalization of Seaview Peninsula was not practical. It was used to show that anything seemingly viable placed near the public housing project with the resultant theft and vandalism, would fail. There were others who felt the shopping center was viable. It was later reported, during the study, that the previous problems of Harbor Mall were due to ineffective and absentee management not due to the location or the quality of construction. It was reported that Harbor Mall could be successful under the proper circumstances, such as a new image of the peninsula as a whole, but could not succeed under the present situation. Further market studies were called for and seemed dependent on the proposed plan for new housing and a new source of higher income residents.

White saw the existing public housing buildings as the part of the peninsula that required the major change. He looked upon the buildings as having an interesting exterior configuration with the materials acceptable for him to retain, and the height of the low rise (four-story) as being preferable. The seven-story structures bothered him and since many of the least habitable structures were seven-story buildings he felt he should get rid of some of them.
Living in the public housing project appeared to him to be like living in an empty parking lot. The several streets that weave through the project and the ring road, a portion of which parallels the shore and had been undermined by high tides, accent the feeling of an empty parking lot. One part of the project area with some of the higher buildings, had the greatest turnover and the poorest families; the air had the smell of recent fires. The other sector where the elderly apartments were, seemed to him in better overall repair.

He felt a major fault of the project was its misuse of the best land, that land along the shore, as a wasted parking lot. He said the problems were: the project was facing the wrong way; the existing road should be a back service road and a new grand boulevard should be placed between the existing project and the shore; that new land should be created along the shore to accommodate new housing; that parking shouldn't exist in the shore area; that existing buildings should be grouped in smaller neighborhoods where new buildings would be part of the new group; entrances to old buildings should change to reinforce the neighborhood concept. In the very plan he was envisioning he wanted to put in new streets, new walkways, small stores, playgrounds and sitting areas to stress the formation of neighborhoods. He wanted to connect the housing areas on the interior side of the proposed boulevard to the
shorefront with a pedestrian bridge to allow all residents the use of a series of parks and walks he proposed along the shore. In the design process considerable thought went into the location of the parks, walks, sea views and other amenities but no discussions were held or plans made for building changes, location and size of parking areas, number of housing units per neighborhood or size and location of various types of dwelling units. Buildings in the way of his proposed road or parks were slated for demolition. It seems White placed more emphasis on improving the aesthetic quality alone of Seaview Peninsula rather than including that quality with the other more obvious needs to make it a functional community.

He also noted a City owned water plant building in seemingly good repair that was planned to be phased out by the City in about five years. The buildings on the main street were noted as: Church -- best condition, schools -- no landscaping and entire play area is black topped, commercial buildings -- operative."

White seemed to be the ideal designer to deal with the wide range of institutional constraints: operative for his proposals. Knowledge of public housing policy, National housing policy, the range and requirements of State and Federal programs, private market feasibility, transportation prospects and the physical and environmental problems of the site. His reputation for pragmatism was
spoken of by Brown. It was expected that he would face the difficult issues and push for practical solutions. After he completed his initial design, he didn't want to consider the constraints that might affect his solution. Instead of getting all the information available, solving what he could, explaining what and why he couldn't solve for certain problems, and defending his design solution, White wanted to avoid difficulties, not be pinned down, get others involved in sharing responsibilities and avoid criticism. Brown remained satisfied with White's behavior throughout the study even though his initial hopes of a practical plan were diminishing. He still had hopes of an exciting design concept that would mollify his critics.

White's first set of what he called "preliminary proposals for the development of Seaview Peninsula" were based on a very limited amount of time spent on planning at Seaview. He said "the entrance to Seaview Peninsula should be made a significant and enjoyable experience." He stressed the need for an important street that could be used as a promenade. He felt the existing main street was inadequate for this new main street but that it should "receive rotaries which would slow traffic and add scale and variety to its length." He then outlined a series of plans which he felt would revitalize the area and mentioned specifically: Town Center, Town Square, Social Service Center, Harbor Activities, Winter Activities,
Moderate and Luxury Housing and a Student Hotel Center. The focus of these plans did not address the complex problems heretofore discussed by the University, the technical people on the Task Force or the Community.

White tested these ideas with Blue and certain Redevelopment staff to "review the directions of the development proposals." These ideas received general approval although nothing more specific than that indicated above was discussed. White said he was preparing the way.

Preparing the Model

During the next ten days, White had his staff prepare a large model of the peninsula to be used as a comprehensive movable sketch-model to accomplish rapid preliminary planning, layout and design development as he had previously discussed in his proposal.

The model was to be constructed in a way to allow for the movement or replacement of any piece. White said his hope was that viewers were to be encouraged to move the pieces around. It was, he described, a "play model" to be used to give "a sense of security to the client."
He reasoned: "They should not be frozen into some scheme you're about to do to them."

White stated this "three-dimensional design" would not only save time but would greatly assist in the essential three-way communication between architect and architect as well as architect and client.

The model he had constructed was a topographic base site model that included a significant area around the site with existing structures, landmarks and land formations shown. He wanted all ideas including the first layouts and design studies translated into rough scale block models that would then be moved and rearranged to test out all possible concepts and alternatives. White wanted the design proposals studied in the model as a group so as to show the implications of massing, open spaces, land planning, pedestrian and motor car views and enclosures, scale re the human occupant and relationships. The study process was meant, he said, to take place in a large meeting where people could become directly involved in the logical resolution of complex problems. White said this approach would be the most efficient and effective method of making architecture the design of the environment rather than the design of isolated buildings.
The Master model was to be used to review design progress and White would, prepare a set of reasonable alternatives subsequently to allow the study group to visualize and analyze these plans according to standards established by environmental impact, human needs, community structure and economic feasibility. The model, with its alternative modules, would be adapted and revised during this process with new design modules prepared to reflect the "synthesizing of group objectives." White then agreed to also prepare the essential materials necessary for presenting "these alternatives as the University deems best" for review by the principals of the agencies, institutions and neighborhood organizations concerned.

The First Set of Presentations

Two weeks after his first meeting where he tried out his initial design thoughts and after the model was completed, White was ready for a series of presentations to "insiders" -- people directly affect in their official capacities by the proposal. The first presentation was made to a University group composed of Brown, the Chancellor, his assistant, Blue and Jones, the next presentation the following week was to the Board of Directors and certain key staff of the Housing Authority, owners of the public housing project, and a full-
scale presentation was also made to the Committee on buildings and Grounds of the University's Board of Trustees plus the Chancellor of the Seaview Campus and his buildings and grounds staff during the following week.

The people attending each of these presentations listened attentively and seemed to treat the meetings as informational only. There was no attempt at these initial presentations on the part of the viewers to be critical. White seemed to want to show what a good job he had done and Brown acted quite satisfied with what was shown. There was little opportunity given for critical work by the viewers but the audience felt little need to offer much more than complimentary comments. No attempt was made by any viewer to move a block on the model. White's feelings after each presentation, he said, were satisfaction and relief that no one criticized his work. Yet he had carefully insulated himself from criticism by avoiding all controversial issues. He wanted Brown to see the acceptance of his work by those in attendance. It represented a way for White to test his ideas in the context of a progress report. He did not state he had arrived at the design solution. The model was as he had stated, like a "dream", an ideal city to "take us out of our conflicts."
The actual use of the model was preceded by a talk by White where he tried to put the viewers in the position of the designer. He wanted to convey to them the excitement of the grand or larger scheme rather than the details of how to do specific parts. He wanted viewers to understand the great potential of the site and get caught up in the excitement of trying to think up a design for the future development of the peninsula. The people usually involved in the presentation either had no knowledge of the problems of the site or else had a limited expertise of the problem area and were therefore unable to respond in any way other than on a superficial basis. This method seemed to focus on aesthetic solutions alone rather than considerations of the real problems of the site - the institutional constraints. The talk that White gave was the story of his point of view in approaching a design decision. He started by describing what a new community could be. He would then talk about what a wonderful location the site was, how it was comparable to downtown waterfront luxury sites in Gotham. He described how the shopping center could be rejuvenated into a major regional shopping mall drawing in people from all the surrounding areas. He concluded with a description of how the shoreline represented a major recreational potential for future residents of the peninsula as well as residents of nearby areas. White said he wanted the listeners to get all involved in the process of trying to think of as many good
things that could be said about "this most fabulous of all sites" before he unveiled the proposed solution as shown in the model. White's method of communicating with the client was not to discuss seriously existing problems and how to improve them, but to obscure realities with a cloak of glamour. The site might be "fabulous" but what was on it and surrounding it could not be improved without serious attention to its needs.

White said that when he tried to envision what would have to happen at Seaview Peninsula to change the image, the choices, were then obvious to him. He stated that those designers who claim to have intuitive knowledge of what should be done are doing nothing but stating the obvious. He felt there were so many obvious things that should be done that little study or research was necessary. He said: "As you go through life, certain things are reasonably clear that you see. A planner should not be bogged down by politics, etc., but should perceive the problems which are obvious."

White had undertaken a design project with many and complex institutional constraints. Some were obvious and others required deep analysis to determine their effect on the design process. He was aware - through his own proposal, the recommendations of the technical members of the Task Force
and the requests of the client to be practical - of the need to know the physical, economic, political and sociological limitations of the solution. He chose, however, to ignore many of these limitations by saying the problems and the solution were obvious. This avoidance occurred at a level in the designer's processes beyond the effect of outside institutional forces.

White first concentrated on the need for an image of the peninsula that represented the positive aspects of what could be there. He stressed the need for "an entrance that one would be proud of to create a front door." He then asked himself the question "What would you do if there were no problems?" "One, I would get a Main Street that was attractive, with places to sit. Two, I want a town center, not only a shopping center, to get a relationship to the community. I would do this by increasing the size of the present shopping center by combining it with civic buildings such as a library, city hall, etc. What is needed is a center for people to be in, with the local side connected with the local community and the regional side accessible to serve people of the surrounding areas. Three, the present housing must be 'fixed.' Some housing must be removed, some rehabilitated, but the renovated housing should hold all present occupants. There should be locations for luxury housing, convention center, elderly housing and university housing. About the University housing, someone will build it.
It is advisable to add land to the outside edge of the peninsula."

White's preparatory talk was not meant to elicit an immediate affirmative response but was meant to expose a way of thinking to his listeners without encouraging a negative response. White said he did not want criticism at that time. He wanted to carry the listener into his own thought processes, get affirmation of his premises, and then show the model. The blocks representing the design solution were never moved by the listener. The real communication had to take place on a different level. The solution had no practical meaning to the viewers.

Before showing the model, White had prepared a series of exhibits to draw the viewer into the design process. He started by showing a map of the whole peninsula to give the viewer an idea of its size. He then placed overlays on this map to show its size relative to known areas of development such as: Central Park in New York City, Cedar-Riverside new-town-in-town in Minneapolis, and the Boston Garden and Common. He illustrated some of the basic assumptions made during the design process and the charts that itemized some of the quantities and types of uses shown on the model. White also used a technique he called the "jig-saw map." A plan of the whole peninsula was divided by area of use, such as residential, shopping center,
University, recreation, athletic facilities, and existing commercial, schools and public housing. These areas were mounted on a hard surface and cut into "jig-saw" pieces to be placed on the plan of the peninsula. White would then show each of the pieces and show how they could be placed in many locations on the plan but would conclude by showing how they fit best onto the locations on which he had placed them. He said this exercise would make the viewers aware of the process he went through before showing the model. White used this technique at all of the presentations, the one just described, the two others that occurred during the three week period, and during the presentations given approximately weekly in October and November, 1973.

The model was used to describe the ingredients of the proposed design which White described as: a new entrance, the main boulevard, the Town Center and its Mall, Community Service Center, Singles and Elderly Housing, Harbor Activities, Winter Activities, Transient Student Co-op Center, University Center Apartments and the Conference Center. His concept of an entrance, he explained was "to herald the passing into the re-imaged Seaview community. It was to include plantings, gates and trees." From the entrance, a new street would be constructed, the Main Boulevard, a promenade with benches and kiosks. It would be a place to be seen and a place on which to be seen.
The Town Center would consist of community and city related functions and the town center mall would become the revitalized shopping area. White wanted the Singles/Elderly Housing located near the shopping mall. The middle and upper middle income housing -- University Center Apartments, were characterized by beautiful views, campus environment, marina and restaurant terraces.

White proposed Harbor activities such as a waterfront boardwalk, promenade, boating, rides, slides, bandstand pavillion, fishing, pools, and miniature golf, and a special area for Winter Activities to include a skating pond. He wanted a Transient Student Co-op Student Center located in and around the existing Pump House and separate structure to house the Conference Center with its meeting rooms and hotel. A "dream" world in which all the amenities were represented when, in fact, the actual Peninsula was desperately in need of the essentials of life and fraught with difficult institutional problems.

The model White used for the presentations was kept in "sketch form. The existing buildings were shown to scale as to their height and area of ground coverage but the proposed new buildings were represented as rough blocks of wood placed in various forms. It was not possible to determine the number of units proposed nor the size of the
THEORY ON SEAVIEW PENINSULA HOUSING

- No one moves out
- Everyone's lot is improved
- No group is segregated or isolated
- Utilize vacancies and new construction to achieve a natural redistribution of residents.

SEAVIEW PENINSULA HOUSING IS IMPROVED

- De-institutionalizing - New Image
- Remodeling interior and exterior
- Greater open space - Additional Landscape
- Access to Recreation
- Access to transit
- Available shopping center
- New Civic Services in Town Center

HOUSING DISTRIBUTION

- 1/4 low income
- 1/2 middle income
- 1/4 upper income (market)

Figure 8 Cards shown in Figures 8 to 14 were used by White at presentations to describe the assumptions made and elements of the program used in study model.
EDUCATION FACILITIES

172.5 acres
- University 123.5 acres
- High School 40.0 acres
- Elementary Schools 9.0 acres

EXISTING SEAVIEW PENINSULA HOUSING

47 acres
- 1504 units existing
- 1021 now occupied

EXISTING SHOPPING AREA

26.5 acres Commercial
- 279,000 square built
- 1200-1500 parking places

TOTAL SITE

312 acres
- possible new fill, 15 acres
- bordering waterfront
- not developed for recreation - 2%- miles

Figure 9 Cards used at presentations.
SIZE OF POPULATION

Increased number of units needed because of...
- Developer Economics - to support utilities, roads, beaches
- Shopping Center Economics - to justify adequate services
- Social Distribution - to assure many groups.
  - No dominance.
- Physical Absorption - of old units into new.

NEW HOUSING NEIGHBORHOODS

All residents are accommodated
- Some housing units relocated
- New market housing at various price levels
- Neighborhoods instead of projects

UNIVERSITY CENTER APARTMENTS

- Beautiful views - unique environment
- Marina - Restaurant - Terraces - Services
- Social rooms - Coffee bar - Message center
- Shops & services - Security

Figure 10 Cards used at presentations.
RENOVATED SEAVIEW PENINSULA HOUSING

- Accommodate all existing occupants (+1100)
- Renovate all apartments in stages
- Improve open space, landscape, recreation
- New advantages: shopping, Town Center, Beaches, Transit

SHARED ATHLETIC FIELDS

EFFICIENCY APARTMENTS FOR ELDERLY

- Studio and 1 bedroom units for senior citizens
- Community and activity rooms
- Dining facilities
- Health Rooms

FUTURE CONFERENCE CENTER

- Combined with Inn
- Special facilities and apartment units

Figure 11 Cards used at presentations.
**COOP CENTER**
- Day center for commuters
- Study rooms - music rooms - lockers
- Recreation - message center - meeting and club rooms
- Barbers - launderette - discotheque - cafeteria

**BOULEVARD & MAIN STREET**
- Trees lights strolling lanes
- Benches kiosks landscaping
- A main focus and communication route

**COMMUNITY SERVICES**
- Welfare Field Office
- Community Counselling
- Vocational Retraining
- Planned Parenthood
- Drop-In Center
- Employment Center
- Social Security
- Legal Aid

Figure 12 Cards used at presentations.
### HARBOR - WINTER ACTIVITIES
- Skating Pond
- Candle pins
- Cookouts
- Indoor golf driving
- Indoor game room
- Winter festival shed
- Dance hall
- Indoor volleyball

### HARBOR ACTIVITIES
- Waterfront
- Boating
- Bandstand - pavilion
- Pool (?)
- Picnic areas
- Boardwalk - promenade
- Rides and slides
- Fishing
- Miniature golf

---

**Figure 13** Cards used at presentations.
TOWN CENTER MALL - What should it be?

- Supermarket
- Baker
- Drug Store
- Hardware
- Apparel
- Services
- Cafe
- Bank
- Entertainment

1. Village Center
2. Add furnishings, one larger dept. store, specialties
3. Regional Mall - add 2 major dept. stores, specialties

TOWN CENTER

- Community Meeting Rooms
- Little City Hall
- Branch Library
- Health Center / Clinic
- 3 cinemas
- Youth center
- Day Care
- Craft Center
- Postal Branch
- Religious Center
- Bus / Taxi
- Snacks - Cafes

Figure 14  Cards used at presentations.
Figure 15  Photo of study model used at presentations. Shopping center in foreground left, University in background right.
Figure 16 Plan of existing land use, used at presentations.
Figure 17 Plan of proposed land use, used at presentations.
units. Parking, small neighborhood centers, local school facilities, small recreational areas and other amenities were talked about but not clearly represented on the model. The main road system, the location of the Town Center, the various locations of harbor activities and winter activities the Conference Center and the general areas of all types of housing were shown on the model.

Second Set of Presentations

Brown wanted some friends, representing outside interests, with no particular tie to either the University or the area to be given a presentation of the design. He felt the most critical questioning would be from potential grantors of funds to do further studies or provide seed money for the proposed development. These people, if sold on the idea, would then be used to convince others as well. Brown invited an officer of a large bank and the head of a Foundation. Also present at the presentation were Brown and Blue. White spoke of the need for an image of the peninsula that represented the positive aspects of what could be there. He stressed the need for an entrance that one could be proud of, to create a front door. He stated that if he were starting from scratch on planning the peninsula, he would have placed the uses that now exist about
where they are now. He might reduce the area used for
education, but he would keep the shopping center at
the same location. He was saying to these people
representing potential financing interest, that if this
were a new project, without any of the problems now associated
with it, it would have been designed in substantially the way
the model now represented. The plan was valid in of itself
and was not a compromise based on existing conditions,
or doing only what was do-able. This line of approach was
taken before any questions were asked and without any
previous coaching by Brown as to the questions the visitors
might ask. White was not sure of the roles of the visitors
nor of their interest, in the project.

Both the views were interested in the question of
the market for the shopping center. The concept, White
stated, was a regional shopping center, but he didn't want
to discuss it further but wanted to get on with his
description of the plan. He posed the question: "What would
you do if there were no problems?" and answered the question:
One, I would get a main street that was attractive, with
places to sit. Two, I want a town center, not only a shopping
center, to get a relationship to the community. I would do
this by increasing the size of the present shopping center
by combining it with civic buildings such as a library,
city hall, etc. Three, the present housing must be 'fixed.'
Some housing must be removed, some rehabilitated, but the renovated housing will hold all present occupants. There will be locations for luxury housing, convention center, elderly housing and university housing. It is advisable to add land to the outside edge of the peninsula.

The visitors seemed non-committal to the proposal. They admired the model, they said, but felt some expert opinions about the feasibility of the shopping center as proposed were necessary from shopping center operators.

Brown was pleased with the reception of the model since it wasn't criticized. He did not expect an immediate affirmative response but was more interested in exposing his viewers to a way of thinking without producing a negative response.

White however, was not satisfied with the meeting, not having received a definite response. He did not know if the visitors were impressed, pleased or displeased since he did not give them the opportunity to be critical. He did not know what they reported to Brown.
As I have previously stated, the Task Force had been meeting on a regular weekly basis starting with a small group of mostly technical people in mid-August and then increasing the size with Community people and specialists from September through early January. The members of the Task Force were divided into two groups called Policy Members, which included those expected to take a more active role as professional or technician to White. The Policy members included one resident of the public housing project; one former resident and an activist in public housing matters, representatives of local community organizations; and Brown of the University, the director of State Housing and Finance Agency and the following City officials: the Mayor's Housing Advisor and Chairman of the Task Force; Director of the Redevelopment Authority; Director of Economic Development; Director of Public Service; Director of Public Facilities and Director of the Housing Authority. The staff members included: Blue, who was then appointed Vice President for Planning of State University; an assistant to the Chancellor; Staff from the Redevelopment Authority; Staff from the Housing Authority and staff from the State Housing and Finance Agency. Others, such as Jones representing State University attended as did White and some of his staff.
These meetings usually consisted of the experts each reporting to the group on their investigation of a previously assigned task and then answering questions from members of the Task Force. Members of the group would then discuss next steps and then request new investigations of new questions on the assigning of new tasks. The Task Force was most active during the period after the model was completed and the first round of presentations and during the process of writing the final report in December.

As White recalled later, it was his strategy at the start of the project to assign tasks to the many interested professionals and get them busy worrying about their own element of the plan. This anticipated "busyness" would prevent them from becoming a negative force on White or others who were doing what White considered positive work. Each group - Redevelopment Authority, Mayor's office, Housing Authority, State Housing and Finance Agency - was assigned a task such as investigating previous work on subsoil conditions relating to foundation design, environmental issues such as shoreline shell life, pollution, airport related noise and shopping center negotiations. While these groups were getting ready to conduct their parts of the overall study which were deemed necessary by the group and were to be done prior to any actual physical design, White received the call from Brown asking him to produce the plan immediately. White then went ahead
and produced the design and the reports of the various
groups never did come in, White said. He was not disappointed
because he said he did not want to get a lot of material
that would be used to show how difficult it was to develop
the site. He said he felt at the time, that the people
around him were good at thinking up difficulties and could
thereby stop all creative thinking. He said the reason
he was chosen to do the design rather than the Redevelopment
staff urban designers was because, in terms of his priorities,
an overall concept of what the design should be came first.
If he could show how the image of Seaview Peninsula could be
changed significantly to make it attractive enough to allow
for success, then and only then could he face the problems
that could occur. He said, that it was his experience that
enabled him to determine the proper priorities of action.
This response raised many doubts as to the practicality of
such an approach. White seemed unable to face two
requirements: an ideal new image of the peninsula and a
hard pragmatic analysis of what could be done soon. There
are many ways of interpreting White's behavior but the
anomaly of being practical to get the job, being artistic
and creative to change the image, and then rejecting needed
information during the process indicates more going on than
institutional constraints.

The work of the Task Force can be divided into major
categories of inquiry. The discussions held at the Task
Force meetings were not related to the information used by White at the presentations, although the meetings were held during the same period. The concerns of the Task Force that should have had an effect on the design development were: the attitude of HUD concerning the proposed plan and possibilities of new-town-in-town financing; an analysis of the possibilities and the precedence for transferring public housing ownership to private ownership; possible types of development entities appropriate for further development of Seaview Peninsula and sources of financing, both "front-end" and permanent; and the determination of "costing" the assumptions contained in the White plan. The Task Force was also directly involved in the determination of the form and content of the final report and spent a great deal of time on these deliberations. It is important to describe some of the actions of the Task Force to understand the amount of information available to White, the view of the client group as to the need for further information, and the focus on more specific needs and information than White had considered in the design process. Many of the people working on the information gathering, such as Jones and the key Redevelopment Authority staff checked with White first before presenting information to the Task Force.

The level of knowledge sought by Task Force members and offered to White is indicative of the shared perception
of what was expected of the design study. The discussion that follows is a summary of some of those discussions in sufficient detail to show the level of information available to White. If White had considered the information and either accepted, rejected or checked further and modified it, it could be stated that the institutional factors were the most important factors in the design process. White, however was incapable of using the information in any manner. He was either too bored to attend the meetings or felt the matters being discussed would have no effect on his design.

There had been many questions raised about the assumption in the plan that the public housing project could be acquired by the developer of the new housing proposed. It was asked if acquisition was the only way to achieve the mixed housing goals contained in the design. The City felt, that the public housing should have the same quality as new construction and that if a private developer does the whole project, the developer should have control of the public housing project as well. He seemed to imply that the City wanted to get rid of that public housing project. However, it was known whether private acquisition was even possible. This information was necessary to the design solution. The Task Force had asked the Housing Authority staff to report on what happened at Pruitt-Igoe in St. Louis, Mo. where it was
generally known that a public housing high-rise building had been demolished because living conditions were bad. The Pruitt-Igoe situation was reported as: "doesn't seem to apply": there is "no direct transference of the St. Louis concept" to the problem at the Seaview project. There was some hope that HUD would consider some kind of an arrangement but no precedent for selling a project was found. Blue raised the concern that the Housing Authority had started filling the empty apartments of the project with tenants. She indicated that if this was true, then they were undermining the work of the Task Force. She expressed the feeling that if the public housing units were filled, it would close down the option of changing the character of the present housing. Nothing more was said or done about the matter of the possibility of sale or the use of the empty apartments; White did not consider any alternate design decision that could allow public housing to remain as it was.

The Task Force had asked Jones to meet with HUD in Washington to explore new community development, housing programs, financing possibilities and the general question of feasibility of the proposed development. She met with the HUD Undersecretary and reported to the group her meeting was "excellent" and that he would set up further meetings with HUD officials as necessary or when requested to do so by Jones.
A Presidential moratorium was then in effect on committing funds for new projects. The HUD official advised, with a reported "sense of urgency," that a lot more "detailed analysis" should be done now. He mentioned there is a possibility that "new community" money will become available soon and that Seaview would qualify: it might even be favored because HUD wants more "in-town" projects. The detailed analysis he requested had to do with (a) "Conditions of feasibility of the proposed housing;" (b) Shopping Center analysis; (c) feasibility of a write-down of some kind; and (d) feasibility of a leased housing assistance program.

Jones felt the group should first generate the questions HUD or a developer would ask: such as - size of shopping center, density of housing, possibilities for City to aid with tax abatement and treatment of shopping center. Jones referred to the organization form, stating it could range from a public corporation to private holding companies; that there was "no problem - almost everything is possible." The determination of the development entities could be selected through (a) a political policy, (b) a financial policy, or (c) through an evaluation of the subsidy possibilities. The possibilities suggested included a private developer forming a limited dividend partnership to take advantage of the federal and state subsidy programs and the tax loss possibilities and public corporation that
could be converted from an existing agency and run as a redevelopment or renewal corporation with the ability to sell off parcels. Very little of this information was developed and what was known was not considered in the design.

Jones called for a discussion of how to get front-end money. There was some concern over the question of control, i.e., they did not want to turn the whole peninsula over to a private developer. There was a strong expression of a continuing community participation and of community control of the development corporation. The question was raised as to who is the client and who might fund a development corporation if one was suggested. A discussion about types of development corporations - should it be public or private - was held before all parties decided that further information should be obtained in the form of a description of three models of development corporations with a list of the advantages and disadvantages of each. This information had little to do with the design process. It was also felt at the Task Force that there were more critical problems than the type of development entity or size or feasibility of the shopping center. These problems were related to what the Mayor's representative called community reaction to the City's involvement or other "policy questions - political
in nature." He stated if the design solution was released it could cause chaos in the neighborhoods." "No one could believe it." He said the discussion should be carried to a "political level," which, he further amplified as meaning there was a need for the education of those not involved in the Task Force. Blue said the University would rather go out to the community when they had a good defensible specific plan. A community representative stated that there was "paranoia" in the community because they did not know what was going on. She urged the Task Force to "make a package that community people could understand." Many of the Task Force Members were still concerned about some of the major premises of the design.

The phase of the Task Force work ended with a request by the Task Force that since they were concerned about the feasibility of the plan that further presentations be made to others who might be able to point out flaws and indicate whether the design proposed would be taken seriously by developers, finance people and the general public. Before conducting the presentations, which I shall describe shortly a series of meetings concerning the design was held by White, Brown and Blue. The discussions at these meetings described indicate the status of the design process, the inadequacy of many of the design decisions, the lack of information gathered or used and the attitude of White towards his role in the process.
Brown went to White's home to talk about the project with respect to where to go from that point. Brown felt that a one or two page statement of what could be done -- in simple, easy to understand language -- should be prepared. This paper would represent a position paper of what was feasible. The proposed nature of such a paper was unclear to White. He was not able to formulate the elements of such a paper nor was he sure of the purposes such a paper would have. Brown said he wanted something even simpler to understand than the model, so he could have an easy-to-explain description of what was proposed.

In dealing with a very complicated issue, before all of the proposed inputs were received, Brown was calling for simplification in writing. White had come up with a preliminary solution to open the planning process, prior to meeting with any of the neighborhood groups but Brown, assuming that White had done the necessary work outlined in his proposal, was proposing a final summary, a closing document that would "button up" the loose pieces. White was not able to make a clear statement of his design solution and felt there were still too many unresolved matters to be worked on before committing himself to the summary document.
At this time both Brown and White were looking for a way to divide the development proposed into phases that could be constructed sequentially over time. They felt phasing was critical to starting the project since every element of the plan could not be started at once. It appeared that phasing of the proposed plan was difficult in that each element was dependent on many other elements and could not stand alone. As an example, it was thought that no shopping center operator would consider enlarging and reopening the shopping center until some large percent of the total number of housing units were occupied. No one thought it feasible to build middle income or market level housing until the public housing components were rebuilt and besides, in order to finance the package, every component in its "proper" ratio had to be included.

Brown felt it important to include phasing. White did not try to work on the problem of phasing. White was afraid that phasing would be difficult to do and the solution of the problem of phasing might mean he had to design a new plan. It seemed that if the present plan was so difficult to break up into parts and phased over time then perhaps there was something very wrong with the plan. Maybe a new plan was called for that was designed with phasing in mind. This possibility was avoided by White and he therefore did not deal with the issue of phasing or of
feasibility since decisions on phasing were necessary before feasibility could be determined. Phasing remained an unresolved issue. As a part of the design process, White had prepared a "Fact Sheet," which summarized some of the design decisions shown on the model in terms of areas of each use, number of units of housing, and number of parking spaces. The preparation of those sheets by White and his staff and the questioning and requests for clarification by Blue, illustrate the need for further information that White was unwilling to obtain and the uncertainty he had concerning his design solution. These decisions were not created solely by institutional factors. Other more complicated factors were at work preventing the use of necessary information.

The first Fact Sheet prepared contained two sets of numbers relating to residential development: an 8,000 dwelling unit development and a 4,000 dwelling unit development. The 4,000 unit figure was the only one that had been used by White in his presentations. White's concept was the area could hold optimally 8,000 units of housing or even 12,000 units. He felt 4,000 units was an acceptable number in that it was large enough to change the image of the peninsula but not so large that it would scare people. He wanted the 4,000 used for initial discussions but felt the 8,000 alternate should be shown as
a possibility, especially for discussions with University people and even the Task Force.

Blue when shown the larger number, was very upset with the notion of even considering 8,000 units and was highly critical of the inclusion of the figure in the Fact Sheet. She said she felt the density of housing was too high at 4,000 units and could not consider a greater number of units. She asked: Why are more units more desirable than fewer units? How would they fit on the site? She was told by White: "On the basis of what we have, it looks feasible. Further study is necessary." Blue wanted more answers than were available at the time. She said she thought there should be better explanations. White said he had put down on paper (and on the model) the first cut at thinking through the problems but hadn't had the participation of other knowledgeable people in the process. He said he had no testing of his design solution and no feedback from others. However, White seemed to be increasingly committed to the plan.

Other questions of significance that indicate White's attitudes and commitment to the plan, came up while clarifying the areas used on the Fact Sheet. As an example: the use of land adjacent to the public housing project owned by a small local church, was questioned by Blue as
to its availability for new housing. No one had contacted the church and they were not a part of the task force or involved in the planning process. As easily as the designers had stuck on some housing units in the church area, they removed them when informed that the church might object. The church was never asked about either decision. Blue's questioning about the use of the land resulted in a change in the plan without benefit of an evaluation of the desirability of such a use at that location and without causing the admitted oversight of not inviting the church personnel into the planning process.

The fact sheet also indicated an area of 15 acres shown on the northerly portion of the plan used for recreation that was also questioned by Blue. Blue said it was not possible to tie in the proposed recreation area to the contiguous beach because it was a boundary line between two incompatible areas. Blue reported the fear on the part of the University that blue collar White area would reject any plan that enabled low income Black residents of public housing easy access to the beach. This opinion was not questioned by White nor was it tested by the University. White was accepting of such suggestions and agreed to modify his plan. In reviewing the Fact Sheet, Blue also realized that a large portion of land belonging to the High School was being
planned for use as shared athletic facilities with the University campus. She said she was feeling "apprehensive" about having not checked directly with the High School administrators for permission for such a use. She said the High School people had requested to see the model but she didn't know how it could be done at this late date. An administrator of the High School, was also a trustee of State University and Blue had assumed he was aware, in a very general way, of what was being planned for the peninsula. Officially, however, others at the High School were not told of what was being planned for their land and had not been asked to be a part of the Task Force. However, when the High School group came to view the model, about a month later, they were shocked and sat in "stunned silence" as the sharing of their land with State University for athletic purposes was explained to them. They told a newspaperman at a later date they had been shocked, were opposed and were angry at being excluded from the planning process and they felt betrayed. White felt it should have been the responsibility of State University to have kept the school informed. Through his work on the design, White became the first to be aware of some of the oversights made. He chose not to do anything about them; not to bring it to the attention of the Task Force or the University and not to correct the situation himself. He seemed to want to retain the flaws in the process.
Blue asked about the future needs for schools in the area. The model showed the two existing schools, part of the City School System, remaining as is on their existing site. No provision was made for adding land to that area if additional school space would be required. Neither the staff at the existing schools nor anyone from the School Committee or its staff were included in the Task Force nor in any element of the planning process. White realized the need but did not want to pursue its solution. White's response to the questions about future land use needs for schooling was that such additional classrooms as might be required would be incorporated into the neighborhoods. No special areas in the neighborhoods had been looked at because planning for the neighborhoods would be done at a later date, under a more definite planning project. The existing schools were not modified in any way on the model, even though a neighborhood classroom plan might mean their elimination at that location. White felt he did not want to deal with the School Authorities because dealing on any level might bring about their opposition and he wanted as few opponents as possible, even though, at one point, he was committed to the process of working with many agencies to integrate his solution with practicality. No attempt was made to approximate number of students expected in the 4,000 dwelling units proposed, nor their distribution by age and grade, nor the amount of physical space that would be required, nor parking spaces needed for
staff or such an extensive school system. The question of schools had come up before; it was perceived in two ways; (1) too early in the planning process to get to details of that type; and (2) it was a source of trouble in that opponents of the plan could focus on some element of the proposal to solidify and gain support for opposition.

Parking was another critical item discussed by Blue. She was concerned about the future university parking needs and how the proposed commercial and town centers would affect University parking. Blue questioned many of the parking assumptions made by White on the "fact sheet" and requested they be eliminated from the sheet inasmuch as too little was known about what the actual needs for parking would be. No discussion occurred concerning the location of parking, feasibility of on grade or structured parking or the actual residential, commercial or school parking needs.

Blue's major concern was determining the "need" for 4,000 units, how the 4,000 units would look on a plan, what the 8,000 units would look like on a plan and how the project would be staged. She said she felt this was a reasonable request since she was, she said, "highly critical" of even the 4,000 units. She wanted definite answers concerning the why's of each element of the residential breakdown and wanted alternatives "spelled out". She said she was not satisfied with the response "on the basis of what we have,
it looks feasible ... further study is necessary."

White seemed to be defending the plan that had been used at the initial presentations and acted as though he were fully committed to that plan even before he had gathered information or explored alternative solutions. His plan consisted of some rough approximations of uses and densities and it required testing. He was unwilling to re-do a major portion of the plan. However, White didn't fight hard for any one element of the plan that might be questioned because his study was not sufficient to enable him to defend the plan adequately. White hadn't considered alternatives and his plan represented only his initial analysis. He felt he had to close the process of possible changes. Even though White said he had a lack of knowledge of what really was supposed to come out of the study, the contract was clear in its call for more than one solution, many design studies, identifiable workable alternatives and alternative plans represented to demonstrate impact, effect, and feasibility.

White then said his work was basically over and that further study was not called for in the existing contract. White saw his job as presenting something that looked feasible and then proceeding, under another contract, to do additional planning and design. He was interested in getting approval of his initial plan, the plan that showed
it was possible to design something for this difficult site. White felt he had done all that was asked of him; not necessarily that all the answers were in. He felt he had come up with a plan that could work -- not that it was the best plan. He was not interested in focussing on the problem areas because he said all the problems would be faced during the further study which he thought would be forthcoming under a new contract. He thought there could be many changes made but to evaluate alternatives required much further beyond the scope of the contract. His use of the jig-saw plan and the model with movable pieces rather than encouraging client and users to make realistic suggestions for change, became a way of showing the impermanence of the solution. The judgment of White, however, stated in many ways, was that the model represented a good plan that was do-able -- just what he was asked to produce. The problem areas could be worked out in further studies but the general approach to the problem was proper and good and even could be considered exciting.

White expressed the feeling that President Brown was satisfied with the amount of work done on the contract. He said Brown felt the contract was completed but still wanted a written summary of the plan. Brown said he wanted to think "about where we go from here." White said he wanted to deliver to Brown "a sort of statement" as to where they were then and the issues involved. He mentioned "planning
issues, environmental issues, feasibility issues and other." This statement was not prepared.

White said, "Many of the things we do is intuition, but I don't really believe in intuition. What is meant is the solution is obvious." "There is a role in this field for visual planning -- there is a need for a new seeing-eye man." He said he had a strong feeling of what should happen in "any harbor or city or such."

White described to me, how he came to be involved: a guy, the client Bill Brown, comes in in a nervous tizzy -- 'I think I should hire someone -- I don't know whether I might -- my first problem is whether to hire White vs. other people.' "The University," White continued "did not take the problem of a planning study seriously didn't know of the immense problems."

"Anyway, a guy comes in, in this nervous tizzy. He didn't want me to cause problems." White remembered Brown saying: "I want a planner who understands the art of the possible; who won't propose things that can't be done; no false promises; no leading people on so they will be disappointed later." White recalled, the technical people from the Redevelopment and Housing Authorities saying it can't be done; "all summer they met
and did nothing but identify conflicts." White said he didn't even go to the meetings: "too boring."

"People saying mostly -- 'nothing can be done,'" he said. White began to give indications of conflicts he was having within himself that had effects on the design process other than the institutional effects. At a point when meetings were focussed on institutional constraints, White's inability to attend because of "boredom" raises questions that will be addressed in later chapters that indicates more was going on within White than his reaction to institutional constraints. He continued by talking about using a dream to solve conflicts which is the opposite of a rational, pragmatic approach to the problem. He said: "Now what do you, as a planner, do that doesn't get this warring group into an additional war? Maybe there had to be a dream that takes us out of our conflicts."

"The first step was -- let's build something that shows what a place could be and walks around the reality of how it could get there." He felt it very important to build a model to show what a place could be. When the model was "unveiled, we want people to feel a part of the problem," he said. He did not want a "fixed position model." His technique was to take everyone through the thought process of the designer and by the time they get through, they understand the model. He stressed sharing his thought process not sharing their problems. He has the attitude of an artist - his thought is sacred - not of a collaborator with
clients. When asked about the reaction of the viewer of the model to this process, he stated: "People didn't dictate the reasonableness of the scheme, not to any great degree." White was indicating the uselessness of the process he had recommended so enthusiastically to Brown. It indicates the process was actually closed to the participants and White's intuitive approach really provided the answers needed. But, nevertheless, he was committed to the process and he conducted it throughout as he said he would. He said, the standard situation consisted of an architect "doing a preliminary presentation to someone with a lot of drawings, a model, etc. The architect, unlike himself, then is in the position of defending the proposal like a fool." "The process of work usually freezes the flexibility -- the standard process is wrong." He said that is the reason in this study, "we make models that can be played with." He thought that was what he was doing but actually his freezing of flexibility also eliminated collaboration and even input from knowledgeable sources. White said he was the only designer involved" in this project, that it was "not a team effort" because it was "too complex." He said he "literally had five days to do it." Although it is true that he was asked to produce a fast solution, the process was designed to allow for changes based on information provided by the client, the Task Force, the Community and the many invited experts who viewed the
solution White is talking of opening the process to receive information, closing it because people weren't reasonable, opening it to unfreeze flexibility, closing it because it was too complex, too fast and he was the only designer involved.

Last Set of Presentations

There was still concern about the feasibility of the plan proposed by White. Brown suggested the importance of calling in certain developers who might be interested in pursuing the development of Seaview Peninsula if the plan seemed possible. It was at that point, after White said he was satisfied with his plan that he was obliged to conduct further presentations to three developers, friends of President Brown.

The first developer reported that he thought the plan was "good" and that the peninsula was an adequate site for either 6,000 or 8,000 units of housing. He expressed a willingness to write a letter stating his opinion after he received further information concerning the actual areas and uses proposed.
Brown and White felt more secure about the plan after hearing this. This information was also relayed to others since it was felt his opinion "carried a lot of weight."

The second developer was asked to look at the model and proposal to give his idea of the feasibility of such a project and to find if he is interested in being the developer and under what conditions. White made a full presentation of the model similar to those he made in the past.

The Developer first responded with questions concerning the market for housing, especially luxury and market rent housing. He wanted to know who would move there, but complimented White on the quality of work done by him and said, "It's an excellent sketch model." He raised the issue of the need for land fill and questioned feasibility of the whole without land fill. He wanted to know what would have to be done to the existing public housing to make it attractive.

As these questions were raised long periods of silence followed. Everyone was waiting for White to reply but he waited for an uncomfortably long time before replying. His answers were vague and he seemed unsure of himself. He seemed reluctant to be the one defending the design for the peninsula.
The next day, the University people made their own presentation to the third Developer. Brown reported to White that the developer though it was a good idea and a very interesting design proposal but he was too busy on other developments and was not interested in pursuing it any further. A similar response of no interest was received from the second developer the following week.

After all the developers had responded to the plan, a group of faculty and staff at the University requested to see the model and hear a description of the plan proposed. The assistant Chancellor started the meeting held at White's office by saying White was hired by the Task Force to represent graphically and on the model what the Task Force desired. White surprised everyone by immediately changing the subject and stating he had heard a report from the High School that the Headmaster was "shocked" to learn of the plan to use some of the High School's land for community and University athletic facilities. No one in the group at White's office seemed to know how to react to that information. Nothing was said about it and the meeting then continued with what had been started before the interruption by White.

When the shopping center was about to be converted to industrial use, the Assistant Chancellor continued, the
University and City, through President Brown and the Mayor, decided to bring together all interested parties to form a Task Force which then hired White. In answer to a question about the extent of community representation, he said the community was represented on the Task Force and they have been part of the solution proposed.

White then said, "everyone must cooperate." The word "we" must be used all the time -- in talking about land sharing with the High School, the public housing problems, etc.." He continued, "The (existing) housing is a black-top jungle; there is a lack of maintenance and a repetitious design with too many buildings looking alike."

A question was raised about rumors that White would like to divest the Peninsula of public housing and use the existing buildings for students. White replied, "That's an interesting point -- it gives me an idea." White said he had a concept for student housing that did not show on the plan. He located a place that he said was an ideal location for student housing. He went on to explain that the model came out of a series of assumptions and should be considered only a sketch. The "real relevance at this point," White said, can only be appreciated when looking back at "that business in June when there were many meetings and I was told we want something now that's
practical - no more long-haired planners."

When questioned about "Who initiated this?" by a faculty member, the Assistant Chancellor answered, "The City and the Redevelopment Authority when faced with a request for industrial re-zoning for the shopping center -- then Brown said he would cooperate."

A University person noted White had not spoken to the issue of transportation and said it was the University's primary concern and the primary concern of the residents. White said he hadn't really considered it, except to realize "There has to be transportation. Fundamentally, the bus lines must go through the community and serve both the students and the community." When asked what can be done quickly and visibly, besides a new bus line, White replied: "A new immediate use for reviving the shopping center; the only real hope would be to do something with the shopping center."

None of these comments caused White to reevaluate any of the design solutions shown. He felt he had ample input and just wanted to proceed with getting the model in its final form.

At White's office, the final corrections of the plans had been made and photos were taken of the existing model.
It was suggested that if the model were to be used further, more residential building blocks should be placed on the model to show more accurately the 4,000 unit plan. This was the first time it was stated that the model did not really represent the numbers used in the presentations. At this point, White was notified by the Mayor's office that there would have to be one last presentation for the public housing tenants, most of whom had never seen the plan or model. They came to express their concern of losing their place to live. The questions and answers indicate a major area of failure in the information exchange process.

The twenty-five public housing residents who came to White's office in a chartered bus, were suspicious that there was a plan to use the University to clean out the people from the project and that the placement of the University on the Peninsula would mean the making of a middle class neighborhood with no room for the poor. Many felt that even if the project remained, the period of construction and improvement would be used to remove those tenants deemed undesirable by the Housing Authority - those who were behind in rent payments, those who complained too much, those who were organizers and those who had records of arrest.
The Mayor's housing adviser, opened the meeting with a short speech after a lunch was served of fancy foods and imported drinks by uniformed waiters. He spoke of the "great opportunity to do something for and with the Seaview Peninsula project." He said the designer's fundamental premise was to solve the problems at Seaview Peninsula housing project and that something large would have to happen on the whole peninsula to improve their housing. The Housing Authority can't solve the present problems that exist at the housing project, he continued. He said the City put together a group of people including community people from, not only Seaview Peninsula but also from the nearby neighborhoods. In speaking of the proposed revitalization, he said, "This represents our dream for Seaview Peninsula." The model is not really a plan for what will actually be done, he continued, but it is a suggestion to bring it to as many people as possible. "We want many people as excited as possible." He spoke of "this plan" as being 3-5 years away and cautioned that it is not planned to solve short-range problems. "Let's talk about 'the dream',' he continued. "It's by a team of City, University and Community people trying to answer the question: How to get an integrated -- socially, economically and racially -- community?" As an example, they thought shopping was needed at Harbor Mall he said to the residents who had indicated in the past
that shopping was one of their key needs. "The City killed the proposal to change the Harbor shopping mall to industrial uses because the City wants shopping to be there."

Addressing another major concern of the people there, he said the plan does not provide for student housing, "it is for 4,000 families." The residents were concerned with students occupying the low income units and he said they would be eligible only if "they are families." He emphasized that they were dealing in a design solution; "This is not specific, it is symbolic of what could be." White added, "The idea was to show what might happen -- that a group of people can agree enough on a plan and in a way that might benefit everybody." White said, "the most important thing for people to agree (upon is that) the plan is good, then go out and sell it."

The residents were interested in other matters. They wanted to know why the new plan called for 1,000 units of low income housing when the original plan, when Seaview Peninsula housing was built, called for 1,500 units. The answer that there were only 925 occupied apartments didn't satisfy them. They wanted to know why not increase it to 1,500 apartments and why can't it be 50 percent low income, rather than 25 percent? They were concerned about
the present tenants remaining and asked for a City commitment to ensure the people would stay there. They asked about those tenants who the Housing Authority doesn't want. Will they go to the new units? What does the Mayor's assurance mean, they questioned. The answer, "It is our intention to give the present residents the new housing," didn't seem to satisfy anyone. They were very concerned with what might happen to people the Housing Authority felt were undesirable. They wanted to know why there were 450 vacancies and why the City didn't fill them. It was explained "the people are shaking now -- they don't know what will happen." They said the "Dream is good but it is not reality to the people of Seaview Peninsula." "Where do people go while they're remodelling their apartments," they asked.

They felt the Seaview residents should meet with the Mayor and discuss their demands. They said, "All we seem to see is brick buildings on the model; we don't know anything else." They felt they weren't involved on the Task Force because their so-called representative didn't live there anymore. They said the Head of the Housing Authority told them there would be students, at least 300 young married students and faculty living there and they wanted to know why the story changed. They wondered about a renovation project proposed for one of their buildings
and what role it was, to play on the model of White's. The residents said, "this model has no community input -- with the architect that planned the renovation, there would be community support."

They concluded by saying the community fears the low income people will be phased out. They asked for all future planning meetings to be held at Seaview Peninsula. They wanted the Neighboring community people to come to Seaview Peninsula and they said they wanted the agenda for the planning meetings to be their agenda. They said the Seaview Peninsula public housing people "feel furious that they were not a party to the model."

The Concluding Task Force Meetings: Discussions of The Final Report

However, the Task Force was completing its work on the report of the plan to be released at a public presentation at City Hall. The Mayor's housing advisor had reported to the Task Force, in late November, "We've got to go public - get a report out at once. The University doesn't want to announce anything yet but I feel they must."
At this series of Task Force meetings, while drafts of the final report were being discussed, many critical design questions were raised. The discussion of these elements of the plan shows that White had many opportunities to use information or reflect institutional factors in his design. He did not make any revisions during this period. The comments of Task Force members indicate the extent of their participation and show the nature of their concerns, those concerns that never entered White's design process.

At that meeting the Task Force was still concerned with the viability of the shopping center. It was reported that the problems of Harbor Mall that led to its closing were due to ineffective and absentee management, not due to the location or the quality of construction. Harbor Mall could be successful under the proper circumstances such as the new image of the peninsula as a whole suggested by the plan. The continuation of the present housing situation would not allow for the success of a reopened shopping center.

The community person present was concerned about the availability of construction cost subsidies from State, City, or other sources. Since the only subsidies considered are rent subsidies it was stated that perhaps others should be considered. Nothing further was done about this request. The Redevelopment Authority senior staff member asked,
"Is this the type of document we should use -- less than 12 pages, very superficial, no depth? Does Blue want a more elaborate document?" The implication of these questions was that the needs of the University were critical and they would determine the nature of the final report. No one on the Task Force objected to this implication.

The Task Force was concerned with the question of "tone" of the report. There was too much about Harbor Mall and its failure, in the draft. They wanted the document to say "we are going to do something."

The Community representative raised the question of maintenance of the project after it is built. Was this considered, and if so, why not put it in the report? She also wondered about "the total unmention of the University" in the report. The emphasis on public housing is inadequate -- it's a bad document.

The answer was, the public housing problems on Seaview Peninsula must be mentioned but it has to be said more carefully. The section on crime was commented on and it was asked that it not be highlighted but instead have a focus on the positive aspects of the peninsula. This led the group to feel the need for a narrative description of the proposed design by White. It was stated that White should
be the one to write it since no one there was fully aware of or really understood the proposed design.

The immediate task facing White was the request by the Task Force for a descriptive narrative of the plan for use in the final report. White raised a number of questions before he was able to describe his model: "What is required? What do they want to say? Do they want us to mention overall problems? How do we discuss the solution? What is the purpose of the description? Who will it go to?" White questioned his role and how that role affected the narrative. He was a member of the Task Force with a report to write to summarize the plan based on his work as the Task Force designer. But he felt he was the architect to the University and should try to determine "what do we write for them." It was also discussed that the narrative could also be used as a job development proposal in hopes of White getting the next contract to continue his work on further design and planning. None of these questions were really resolved but it was decided that White would write the draft. There were other concerns expressed by those present, especially about the need of the University to have friendly neighbors, a request for additional material on housing demand and the market's ability to absorb the large number of units proposed, and a request for further discussion of rental rates and the mix for the housing units.
A community representative was concerned because the document didn't include all of the neighboring community as a whole but only focused on Seaview Peninsula. She wanted to know about rents for other areas and how they would be affected. It was decided to describe income levels, not rents for each type of housing unit by size of family.

The State MHFA representative said, the report should contain, first an announcement of what the Task Force wants to do, then the background of the study, and finally a description in detail of what the Task Force wants to do. It was thought a lot more must go into the report and that nothing should come out. The length of report is not important, he said. "What should come out is the problem of the Peninsula -- what a rotten place it is to drive through." The feelings of the staff, he said, were that it is not feasible to revive Harbor Mall. The reviving of Harbor Mall would "gore" the proposed plan. This statement was not questioned.

Another member said he would like to refer to the University in the report. "How about University goals" about their location and desires for Seaview Peninsula "What are they," he asked, and "What can be said"? The Mayor's representative replied, "In order for anything
to happen, and the reason this Task Force was formed was a togetherness of University, community and City." Their goals were the same and they were "planning together" to get to those goals. He wanted to avoid the separation of the University in any way from the group as a whole. He stressed that the cover sheet must read: A Development Proposal for Seaview Peninsula prepared by the Task Force.

At the next meeting one week later, it was stated by the Mayor's representative the audience for the report was the general public and the purpose was to present an idea about the potential of Seaview Peninsula. The method of distribution had not yet been determined. He requested more information about the public housing project "up in the front" and more about the history and function of the Task Force. He wanted it to say when the program would begin and what the benefits would be to the City, such as taxes and jobs, potential public transportation link, as well as what the need would be for new schools based on the additional residential population to be housed in the 3,000 new housing units proposed. He was then asked to indicate in the report the University commitment in terms of area available for new development and the ultimate size of the University.

It was stated the report would have the backing of the
Mayor with the Governor, the University and State Housing Authority "right with him."

Prior to the final Task Force meeting before the release of the report one week later, Brown called in White to see him. Brown was concerned about some of the residents of the public housing project and the community groups on the Task Force, who had raised environmental impact concerns and were prepared to complain in public about the proposed plan. Neither, Brown nor White knew anything further about a possible dissenting view to the plan and decided to ignore the matter and continue with the preparation of the final report and announce the plan as it was.

The final meeting of the Task Force was the largest Task Force meeting held. Many of the community representatives hadn't attended a meeting before and most hadn't been present since the early meetings of the Task Force.

The representatives of the largest of the Community Groups in the Task Force discussed their attitude toward the proposal for the first time. As an organization, they said, they "went along with 1000" housing units for low income families, though some of their members were upset at taking away 500 units of the present 1,500 units at the
public housing project. They had discussed at their meetings the issue of the number of low income or public housing level units in the proposed plan and "came up with 1,400 low income units composed of 3, 4 and 5 bedroom units plus some smaller units for the elderly" as their program for new housing at Seaview Peninsula. They also felt there should be 2,000 units for families in the middle income range and 1,000 units of market rent housing.

They further requested a promise that the present public housing project residents be moved only once, whether their destination was a rehabilitated or new unit in the new plan. They asked that there be simultaneous construction of both rehabilitated and new units and that high income units not be built first. They requested that a "commission be formed to do the developing with 50 percent community control," though they also said, "Maybe we can bargain." They wanted the commission to have "veto power over the selection of developer, plans, hiring, maintenance, etc." They insisted that all recreation created on the peninsula--gyms, playing grounds, beaches, etc. be open to all in the City.

The Mayor's representative responded that it was possible to talk about the number of units at the Task Force meeting but the other things brought up by them were "premature."
He went on, however, to say the "idea of one move is OK," and the "idea of (planning for) 1,000 units vs. (their proposed) 1,400 units" of low income housing reflected an attempt to preserve the level of occupancy that now exists. A lot of units do not house families--they house social services. He also stated the income limits came from State Housing Authorities.

The community people said, "These things should be formalized in this document as goals, and if the goals can't be reached, the project should be dropped."

Another community representative said his group wasn't concerned about the numbers using now as long as they have the power to stop the project if they don't like it. He felt that only the present public housing residents of Seaview Peninsula should speak about retaining tenants or moving tenants. He felt the document should have a firm statement from the City about not doing anything at Harbor Mall that would wreck the proposed project.

Another Neighborhood group representative said there was no mention of an additional high school in the area. She was concerned that the proposal for the peninsula was to build a neighborhood in front of a nearby existing neighborhood and those neighborhood people wanted access to the shore. She said her group wanted to know who will build and where the money is coming from.
It was replied that "it is pretty remote for anything to happen about a High School at the Seaview Peninsula location. The community people on the Task Force then pressed for an answer to the question "Is there a plan for a high school out there?" It was answered that the city would submit a plan for the use of Harbor Mall for a high school to the Task Force but that they needed state approval. Another community representative went on to state, "We want the proposed high school on the plan and on the model right now!"

During the design process, White did not consider putting a school in the plan or on the model. No discussions were held concerning a new high school at the shopping center by the designer or the Task Force. White wanted Harbor Mall to be used as a revitalized regional shopping center. He felt that even though the school problems had not been fully considered, such work would come about in the next stage of planning and design development.

The Task Force meeting continued and another community group representative said that only 1,000 units of low income units proposed would reduce the ability of the City to house people requiring this type of housing; however though the 3,000 units proposed of moderate and market rent housing would make it a better place to live and upgrade
the rest of the community, he felt that the result would be a bad goal because the whole of South Gotham would be affected adversely. He said the plan should contain the maximum amount of subsidized housing units for poor people. He said, "Community groups seem to be always in an obstructionist role, but it is not so here. This is a chance to initiate an 'easy' relationship -- the community wants to see something happen." This statement was agreed to by all of the other community group representatives present.

The City had the ability to house poor people but was looking for a way to make Seaview Peninsula a more desirable place to live and work," the Mayor's representative said. He spoke about the need to develop a racially and economically integrated community. Brown then said he was the one who made the initial reading of the 1:2:1 rating of housing (low income: moderate: market) and that he would want the maximum number of low income housing units. He said the actual numbers are "bound to change," that "this meeting isn't the end of the process" and that "this committee (Task Force) will go on along with the process as a working committee."

A community representative stated, there is "nothing magic about 25 percent public housing; what I'm afraid of is setting goals."
A representative of the Seaview Peninsula housing project residents requested larger units and said she couldn't talk about the number of units but must talk about who lives there and what they need. She said they had a need for a high school because it was "our kids who are being bussed out of the community." She questioned transportation and asked, what is the short range plan -- "I'm tired of hearing about long term plans. The study is interesting," she said, "but it is by planners -- too bad Seaview Peninsula people weren't involved." She continued by stating no one at the housing project is thinking of miracles. The real job is convincing the present residents that something is going to happen.

Additional comments were made at the meeting: the Chancellor of the University said there were still many questions from the University's point of view, especially concerning the use of University land. He said the University was still trying to determine "if we are on the right track." A community member requested a three-party representation on the report, stating the Community, a certain percent from the public housing and another percent from neighborhoods, the City and the University were behind the study, and its recommendations. Brown added, he thought "we need the State in this representation." Brown also said he wanted a paragraph toward the end that "speaks to the process." He would take the document, within a
A question was then asked: what would happen to the proposed plan if it were not possible to use fill? White answered: "I would like to believe it could be done without the fill." He then talked about the plan and that the existing parking was near the water and he wanted to move it from the water's edge. He spoke of "creating a proper edge that should have been there before. He concluded by saying he couldn't determine the answer without doing some homework.

The following changes proposed for the draft report:

1. Include a discussion about the feasibility of a high school;
2. Make it clear that the new public facilities proposed would be open to all of the surrounding communities;
3. Express a further commitment to use Harbor Mall as a commercial area and not as anything else;
4. Use strong words on flexibility as to size of units, income levels and rental livels;
5. Mention the new community is a family area, not a student housing area;
Stress the continuing importance of the three-party arrangement, in fact, go beyond the University to include other State organizations; State guarantees for present residents of the public housing to protect their interests.

After the above was agreed upon, it was decided the next step would be a "full-fledged announcement" and display that would be open to as many people as possible and would say "here is what we want to see happen."

Brown had found White's plan exciting and the final draft of the report completely satisfactory. He said White has shown everyone how valuable a piece of property the peninsula really is."

The Final Report

The Report was dated January 1974 entitled "The Seaview Peninsula: A Program for Revitalization," and the authorship is attributed to the members of the Task Force "with the assistance of: John White, Architect and Planner."
Figure 18  Photo of revised model used at public announcement and final report. University in foreground left, shopping center in background right.
The report discusses "The Potential at Seaview" and states the proposed uses address them to the vacant and under-utilized land which could be used to make a significant contribution to Gotham's future." It mentions the favorable location, accessibility and amenity and describes the potential "which, if seized, can result in the creation of a new and viable community, serving a broad range of incomes in a superb waterfront location."

It stated the policies that were guiding the proposal:
(1) the present residents will not be displaced from the Peninsula (2) the physical and social conditions of the existing neighborhood must be improved by renovation of existing structures and a more broadly based social structure, including the attraction of new residents in a family-oriented development, (3) the completed development should have approximately 4,000 low, moderate, and middle income units, (4) adequate public facilities must be provided and be available to the surrounding communities, and (5) the shopping facilities must be revitalized to serve the surrounding communities and meet the needs of the new market potential of the major residential expansion proposed.

The major elements of the design were listed as:
1. Housing--4,000 dwelling units including construction of new units, complete rehabilitation
of existing units, and selective removal of some units to increase open space and provide for community services;

2  A "town" center, providing central meeting facilities and municipal services;

3  A major shopping facility;

4  A new main street and public transportation link;

5  Recreation facilities, especially along the shoreline.

The illustrative model is described as suggesting "one way in which the peninsula can be physically changed to create a new environment." The areas on the model are keyed to descriptions of the following area uses: A. A Commercial and Town Center; B. Active recreation needs; C. A New Main Street; D. Existing Housing; E. New Housing; and F. Recreation and Harbor Activities.

A rehabilitated Commercial and Town Center (A), located "around the existing mall," was described as suitable as a shopping area for the neighboring communities.

The concept of a program of shared sports field facilities, under joint sponsorship of the University and the High School is shown as "Active Recreation Needs" (B). The "Recreation and Harbor Activities (F), includes a "unique waterfront park" which would provide "continuous
Figure 19  Photo of illustrative model used in final report. Letters refer to the text.
waterfront Access along the perimeter of the peninsula" and that residential neighborhoods could be "designed so that each has a direct relationship to the waterfront."

"A New Main Street" (C), is described as becoming "the route of a continuous public transportation system serving both resident and University.

The "Existing Housing" (D) would be "thoroughly redesigned and renovated," and existing vacancies would permit the demolition of a limited number of buildings to improve site design by creating neighborhood plus open space and relating the neighborhoods to the waterfront. The "New Housing" (E) structures would have a variety of housing types "without any visible distinction between low, moderate, and medium income housing," and also mentioned the desire for neighborhood grouping, orientation to the waterfront and the location of local services, open space, and play areas in each neighborhood group.

Plans of the Peninsula divide the area into its major uses, one showing existing and other proposed.
Figure 20 Plan used in final report to illustrate areas of existing use.
Figure 21 Plan used in final report to illustrate areas of proposed use.
The Report concluded by stating the proposal represent the work of a broadly-based Task Force which was convened by the Mayor" and that the Task Force came to "unanimous recommendations for a strong commitment to the area's future." They state there are still numerous issues unresolved, "as with any complex significant development," but they are confident of timely resolution since the issues are of "manageable proportions."

The Seaview Peninsula Revitalization Study was completed and the Task Force agreed on the text of the brochure announcing the completion of the study. The 2,000 word brochure and a 10 ft. x 10 ft. land use design model by John White were shown at a press presentation in City Hall. It was explained by the Mayor that the brochure was the result of the "assembly of a Task Force six months ago to, define development policies to best use Seaview Peninsula tremendous location." He had decided to stress at this presentation the commitment to the community was the main theme of the Task Force. The model, he said, is preliminary. "It says: this is one way to go."

The press was told the study resulted in a $150 million proposal that was "really a vision," with $125 million expected to come from the private sector and $25 million from the public sector. The public monies were to be used as "front money, for new utilities, public facilities, land
acquisitions and land fill." What was proposed was 4,000 housing units -- one thousand completely remodelled existing units and three thousand new units, new beaches, parks and renewed commercial center.

The Mayor told the press the "measure of cooperative effort (was) already a major victory." Eighteen city, community, University and State Agencies were involved and the University provided architect White. He further stated that community groups have "invested hundreds of hours of their time, a big sacrifice for working men and women with families." He stressed the policies and goals agreed on are realistic, i.e. public housing residents cannot be displaced and announced that we have already crossed many obstacles that have stymied large development proposals in the past.

He felt it important to contrast the proposals with Seaview Peninsula's present appearance, its history ("a man fishing was stoned there within the life of the revitalization task force"), its image as "a naked, vicious city within a city." He said the site has been the subject of national attention over the years as typical of problems of a housing project. He wanted to compare the existing bad conditions of the public housing with the "clear possibility it can become the most desirable living environment in Boston."
The Mayor was told the participants in the main press presentation would be three community spokesmen, two University representatives -- President Brown "who will make a tribute to your leadership in this effort," and the chancellor "who will praise community groups." He was also told the persons to be recognized from the rostrum.

The formal announcement held eleven days before the arrival of students and faculty at the new campus consisted of speeches, a press release, the brochure, the model unveiling and then questions from those in attendance. Reporters, community representatives, participants in the task force and television news cameras were present at the presentation held in front of the huge model of Seaview Peninsula at the exhibition space at City Hall.

The Mayor spoke from a prepared text and stressed the collective nature of the planning process. He said the "hard won, collective vision...was molded by a task force." He said he was presenting a vision of what could be done to take Seaview Peninsula from near-total decay" to a day "when it is one of Gotham's greatest assets." He said the proposal "represent a deep, long-term commitment to the residents of the area."
The report, he said, calls for a "social, economic and physical revolution of a most depressed community." He emphasized that the preparation of the proposal "has been a joint effort which the City has played a subordinate role to that of the Seaview Peninsula Community and its neighbors..." He concluded that "we have won proof...that a community, an educational institution, and government working together can maximize the potential for constructive change."

Brown spoke next and said University would be an accessible commuter campus and would make every effort to minimize the dislocations of opening a large institution in a predominantly residential area. He stressed the result of the planning process is a "substantial degree of agreement on what Seaview Peninsula can become." He spoke of his limited role but that it was a "bold plan" that could be carried forward in manageable proportions.

The Chancellor endorsed the plan for the Campus of the University as a resident of the peninsula and as a participant in the planning process. He said he wanted to help make the peninsula a community of diverse and divergent interests, people and ideas. He pledged to do everything possible within the resources of the
University and work as closely as possible with community residents to make the plan work. He said: "The plan we see here today is but one step in developing the level of trust and confidence to make such a community a reality." The "cooperation" of the many parties "must continue."

The President of a nearby neighborhood association then commented on the "potential for a beautiful seaside apartment complex."

A former resident of the housing project said she felt that she could speak for the present residents because she knows what they want. She hoped "this togetherness is an ongoing thing." She said she was happy to have been involved from the beginning but had questions about the ongoing process.

In answer to questions from the press, the Mayor said he had already had meetings with business leaders, three banks and a retail developer type interested in pursuing the proposed development. When asked when there would be a ground breaking, he replied, "There is no date -- this is a vision."
A resident of the housing project then asked if there was to be any further involvement of residents in the ongoing project. He was told it would continue.

The project resident then said that a group of residents met that morning to discuss the plan being announced that day. He was asked by them to state the position of the group, which represents all of the residents of the public housing project on Seaview Peninsula: "They are totally opposed to the Seaview Peninsula Revitalization because they had no role in its preparation."
CHAPTER 3
THE ANALYSIS

Introduction

During my observation of the design process described in the previous chapter, I became increasingly aware that an institutional analysis represented a partial description of the behavior of the designer. The institutional analysis was insufficient to account for the failures of the process, not did it have much of an effect on the success. The individuals participating in the process were not aware of the limitation of institutional analysis and even I who was observing White's behavior to seek psychological factors that supplemented the inadequacies of institutional analysis, was not fully aware of the magnitude of those factors until the whole observation period was completed and analysed.

In a process that was to be based on allowing the designer to get a maximum amount of information, from
previous work done about the peninsula, from City and State technical and professional staff assigned to work with the designer and from community representatives and local residents, the institutional information that was developed and given to White was not used by him in his design. When the need for additional information was made clear to White, and the source of that information made available to him, he was unwilling or unable to obtain the information or uncertain of what he would do with it. He did not use much of the information generated even though he had said he had the practical ability to integrate design with reality. I have described many meetings that indicated that a great amount of institutional information was available to White and that that information was relevant to the design process. White was ambiguous and contradictory in that he said he would investigate the problem areas, requested additional information that could have been obtained but did not use that information. The differences in White's stated needs and methods and his actual behavior during the process indicated to me that more than the institutional constraints were involved in the design solution.

This ambiguousness was also reflected in his concentration on the artistic and creative at the expense of the practical and showed to me there was more at work than institutional constraints on the design problem.
White placed more emphasis on improving the aesthetic qualities of the proposed development of the peninsula than on creating a functional workable community. Although White was selected for his pragmatic approach to difficult problems, he avoided the problems; he did not try to solve many of them. He was looking for the "dream" to solve the conflicts not for institutional practicality. White did not discuss the serious problems with the client group but obscured reality with glamour. He avoided those problems that required deep analysis by saying the solutions were obvious. This avoidance was in addition to institutional constraint. White did not attend important meetings where institutional information was being developed or discussed or made available for his use because he said he was too bored. The boredom of the designer is not an institutional constraint, it does reflect the existence of factors other than institutional ones at work in the design process that prevented information from being used.

The final presentation to public housing tenants, in institutional terms, could not have succeeded because it emphasized the differences between the planners and the residents of the Project. White's willingness and then leadership in that venture indicated an ambivalence towards solving institutional problems. Other factors considered in this analysis were his lack of action when he became aware of oversights or flaws in the process, his conducting
the participatory process but making decisions unilaterally and by means of intuitive responses rather than informed views, his failure to reevaluate his design even after suggestions were made by those he recognized as expert, and his lack of consideration of alternate design solutions.

I would like to introduce some new possibilities and new problems concerning the behavior of the designer in the design process. I have tried to pursue new ideas even though the results may seem eccentric. There are signs that the direction I am taking is not as eccentric as I thought when I started thinking out some of these ideas during the period of 1965 to 1970. Of great interest to me is the work of the Center for Psycho-social Research which is affiliated with the Chicago Institute of Psychoanalysis. Robert LeVine's work in Culture, Behavior, and Personality ¹ and Norman O. Brown's Life Against Death² have been of great value to me as well as Daniel Lerner's and Erik Erikson's papers delivered as lectures in the first Hayden colloquium of the Massachusetts Institute of Technology in 1958 on Evidence and Inference.³

The aim of this work is to open up a new point of view and the potentialities of a field of inquiry. As a result of studying the work of Freud, I have come to
question many of the motivations attributed to the participants in the design process. Freud said our real desires are unconscious. It is apparent that all men, unconscious of their real desires, are therefore unable to obtain satisfaction and become hostile to life. This dissatisfaction affects us all. In studying the work of one designer, John White, I am not implying the study is limited to his own set of reactions. It is all designers who live in this world of repressed wishes.

The whole edifice of psychoanalysis, Freud said, is based upon the theory of repression. Norman O. Brown wrote "The essence of society is the repression of the individual, and the essence of the individual is repression of himself. The crux of Freud's discovery is that neurotic symptoms, as well as the dreams and errors of everyday life, do have meaning, and that the meaning of 'meaning' has to be radically revised because they have meaning. Since the purport of these purposive expressions is generally unknown to the person whose purpose they express, Freud is driven to embrace the paradox that there are in a human being purposes of which he knows nothing, involuntary purposes, or, in more technical Freudian language, 'unconscious ideas.' From this point of view a new world of psychic reality is opened up, of whose inner nature we are every bit as ignorant as we are of the reality of the external world, and of which our ordinary
conscious observation tells us no more than our sense organs are able to report to us of the external world. Freud can thus define psychoanalysis as "nothing more than the discovery of the unconscious in mental life." 

Some unconscious ideas are not capable of becoming conscious because they are strenuously disowned and resisted by the conscious self. Freud says: "the whole of psychoanalytic theory is in fact built up on the perception of the resistance exerted by the patient when we try to make him conscious of his unconscious." 

When an individual refuses to admit into his conscious thoughts a desire which he has, the unconscious is established. He then has established in himself a psychic force opposed to his own idea. This rejection of an idea, which nevertheless remains his, is repression. "The essence of repression lies simply in the function of rejecting or keeping something out of consciousness." Dreams and neurotic symptoms represent the entrance of the unconscious into consciousness, producing not a "pure image of the unconscious, but a compromise between the two conflicting systems, and thus exhibiting the reality of the conflict." Freud said: "We obtain our theory of the unconscious from the theory of repression."
Norman Brown, in discussing the relation of neurotic symptoms, dreams, and errors to a general theory of human nature admits that it may seem "like a long step." He says, however: "But the truth of the matter is that Freud maintains that to go from neurotic symptoms, dreams, and errors, to a new theory of human nature in general involves no further step at all. For the evidence on which the hypothesis of the repressed unconscious is based entails the conclusion that it is a phenomenon present in all human beings. The psychopathological phenomena of everyday life, although trivial from a practical point of view, are theoretically important because they show the intrusion of unconscious intentions into our everyday and supposedly normal behavior." 12

In terms of attributing motives and conflicts to White that have been identified by some as neurotic, I feel it is important to state "neurosis is not an occasional aberration; it is not just in other people; it is in us, and in us all the time." 13

In using White as the focus of this study it may appear to the reader that he is subjected to undue criticism of his motivations as neuroses-based. Although I do attempt to discover the roots of White's motivations and possible conflicts, I would like to emphasize here that his
conflicts may have led him to areas of success. I do not imply that White is any more or less neurotic than any of the rest of us.

The Psychoanalytic Method

Many architectural and planning firms are using participatory design techniques to create ways for users to help design their own environment. It was recently stated "The need for and value of participatory design is easy to understand, making it work is not always simple".\textsuperscript{14} This statement appeared in an architectural and design publication as a part of a survey of recent work by many firms throughout the world in using participatory design techniques. The article says that "sponsoring clients are seeing participatory design as an efficient way of understanding what people want, getting their suggestions, and securing community support for their projects."\textsuperscript{15} In its survey of current techniques it lists a number of tested techniques, such as: group dynamics insights of encounter/awareness therapy, problem solving techniques like synectics, "process consultation" approach to group managements, building on political foundations and those
methods based on research ideas of University groups such as Environmental Design Research Association. The article warns: "There are many barriers to open communication on design issues. Most of the environment appears -like water to fish- to be an unchangeable fact of life. So the first challenge of participatory design is to open up possibilities for the way things might be. A second problem is to get through to people's deeper needs. Account must be taken of Freud's familiar division of experience onto two levels: an unconscious, primary level, which finds expression in wishes, dreams and emotional life; and a rational, secondary level, operative in purposive thought and action. People often talk about their environment only on the secondary level, but they are supported or denied by it on a primary level as well." 16

In the ideal design process, the designer should determine what the client, the users and others to be affected may want, and since this is often unclear or even inaccurate, it is also his role to help them become aware of what they want. The designer should work towards the "unblocking"of awareness in the client-user group, whether it is caused by the inability of the client to understand his own needs or his inability to express his own needs in a language the designer can understand. Many designers recognize the desirability of knowing what users want, but
few acknowledge the need for helping users become aware of their needs through a process of "unblocking".

To make it possible for a designer to work effectively towards a client's unblocking, the designer should determine the affect he has on his own processes. Self-awareness is recommended for anyone obtaining and evaluating information. Participatory design techniques are being developed and improved. I am not addressing myself to the growing body of research and implementation in participatory design; however, I am concerned with the problem of the designer's awareness of his own motivation.

Like the analyst, who must be psychoanalyzed so that he may become aware of his own motivations and deep-seated needs before he is able to analyze a patient, the designer must also achieve self-awareness to function optimally. Both the designer and the analyst need such self-awareness for two reasons:

1 through self-awareness the analyst/designer is better equipped to understand the patient/user, and

2 through self-awareness the analyst/designer is better able to understand what he contributes to the process of psychoanalysis/design.
Therefore, in this study I shall concentrate on the self-awareness necessary for the designer.

The psychoanalytic method can be adapted to provide information to the designer in the design process. The designer receives information from the client or user and must be able to determine if the client is willing to give information, and if he is willing, is the information valid if the client is not fully aware of his own desires and needs. The client may give information to the designer that he believes to be valid but is really not valid because of the client's inability to recognize those needs that lie at a level of consciousness not readily accessible. It is important for the designer to be aware of these possibilities when he is obtaining information for use in the design process. He should not be trying to "analyze" the client for preconscious or unconscious motives but should have knowledge about the existence of such motives in order to evaluate the information he is receiving. The designer may look for behavior that indicates thought processes that are not "logical" as a key to testing information for its validity. When information is transmitted to the designer, there may be a conflict caused by the unrecognized and seemingly inaccessible needs of the designer interfering with the information received or the resistance on the part of the designer to receive certain
kinds of information. It is therefore important for the
designer to be aware of such possibilities in evaluating his
own behavior.

The goal of the psychoanalytic method is the
identification of the two thought processes, called primary
and secondary by Freud in *The Interpretation of Dreams*
and the understanding of observable behavior as a compromise
between the thought processes. The identification of these
thought processes during the design process is my goal
since it will provide the information that will enable me
to identify conflicts that the designer may have.

Freud termed logical or directed thinking as secondary
process thought. This thought process is able to perceive
accurate environmental information according to logical
rules and process it for adaptive ends. It is thought of as
the "survival-oriented" activities of awake and alert mature
adults. Secondary process thought represents adaptation to
environmental reality and it exerts a rationalizing influence
on individual behavior.

Primary process thought is attuned to needs affectively
experienced rather than to accurate perceptions of the
environment. It represents the needs metaphorically and is
directed toward immediate subjective satisfaction from the
representation itself. An example of primary process
thought may be found in the mental functioning of small children, the dreaming of adults, and in expressive activities of many kinds including certain of the creative work of designers. Primary process thought represents irrational motives, which become wholly or partially excluded from consciousness but influence the operation of the individual.

The designer tends to use the repertory of methods of coping with any situation of his usual psychological faculties in ways that have become his style. When these responses are mediated by cognitive processes, they generally follow ordinary logical thinking, or the secondary process. Creativity goes beyond this most common way of thinking and reacting in that the designer frees himself from conditioned responses and his usual choices. The designer may be fulfilling a personal longing, or searching for a new state of experience or existence that is not easily found or attained. This search has a conscious and an unconscious motivation. Primary process thought reappears in the creative process in intricate combinations with secondary process thought. It is the synthesis of primary and secondary process thought that is susceptible to psychological interpretation in the study of motivation and behavior as well as in the study of creativity. It is from appropriate matching with secondary process mechanisms
that these primitive forms of cognition, generally confined to abnormal conditions or to unconscious processes, become innovating powers."^{18}

In investigating psychoanalysis as a method for studying the behavior of White in the design process, I shall concentrate on certain aspects of the clinical methods of psychoanalysis. The methodological advantages of psychoanalytic clinical procedures offer the greatest potential to reveal unconscious and preconscious thought and the motivation of the designer. If the designer went through such a procedure, he could then see himself and be able to evaluate his behavior realistically so that he would become able to unblock some of the factors contributing to the disfunction in information exchange.

Psychoanalytic observation is a process that concentrates on both the events that take place in a single session of less than an hour and in the trends of such events over a period of one to four or more years. The critical element of the method called free association, is the requirement that the patient say whatever comes into his mind regardless of how offensive, trivial or silly. The analyst does not question the patient actively though he may encourage free association by some limited questioning or commenting at some times. The analyst
observes the sequence of the patient's spoken thoughts and what connects one idea with those next to it. The psychoanalytic theory of associative thinking was set forth by Freud, summarized by LeVine as follows:

"There are determinate psychological connections between adjacent ideas in an associative sequence, even when these ideas have no apparent (conscious) relevance, to one another from the point of view of the patient or an outside observer. The connections are determined not only by single contiguity in the patient's prior experience but by their remembered relevance to deep-seated motives. When ideas connected to deep-seated motives have been excluded from consciousness (repressed, owing to their unacceptability to the self), they are replaced in associative sequence by ideas more remote from those motives, producing an "illogical" association that can only be understood in terms of the unconscious connection.

If the train of association leads toward an idea closely associated to an unconscious motive, the sequence will be interrupted by the patient, through a lapse into silence or a sudden upsurge of apparently groundless anxiety or emotional feelings or an abrupt change of posture or conversational approach ("resistance").
When the analyst offers an interpretation of the interruption in terms of its motivational relevance, and when that interruption gives recognizable expression to the excluded idea, the patient will be able to associate to it and bring to consciousness ideas that are closer to the unconscious motive. Close observation of the free associations of a patient without interpretation by the analyst provides indications of the unconscious motives connecting ideas. The analyst postpones interpretation until the indications have become strong enough (through repetition of types of sequential behavior, e.g., the ideas that repeatedly precede interruptions), for him to reach a tentative conclusion on which the interpretation can be based.¹⁹

The temporal sequence is at the core of the inference process discussed above. The basic data necessary to build an inference procedure are the ideas produced sequentially in association with one another. The various similar associative sequences must be repeated over a long period (years) before it is possible to arrive at a final motivational meaning.

The inference procedure must be constantly tested and corrected. The analyst's interpretation is tried on the
patient to test validity and if the response is negative, the analyst must offer a different interpretation for testing at an appropriate time.

The process of psychoanalysis has also been conceptualized in terms of five phases each of varying length but all necessary in the proper sequence to make the process effective. At first a therapeutic alliance between patient and a sense of trust by the patient towards the analyst is formed. In the next phase the patient becomes emotionally involved in the analysis and his defenses rise to prevent such involvement. The defenses appear as resistances to the free association process agreed to by the patient and it is the resistance to deeper and deeper involvement with resultant regression that the analyst interprets. The third phase is the development of the transference neurosis made possible by the regression of the patient to child-like feelings toward the analyst which are based on the unconscious experiences of the patient during childhood. This is facilitated by the overcoming of initial defenses and the reproduction of behavior influenced by the intense conflicting motives and emotions the patient experienced as a child toward parents and siblings. The transference neurosis is the reproduction of this behavior, that has been internalized, in the relationship with the analyst. In the analysis of the transference neurosis, the fourth phase of the psychoanalytic
process, each part of the infantile conflict must be re-experienced, usually with great intensity in relation to the analyst. The great emotional energies that had not been released from the child's unconscious fantasies are re-experienced and must be mastered gradually as adult awareness is extended to those experiences. This "working through" stage links neurotic behavior toward the analyst with motivational conflicts of childhood origin. In the final or termination stage, the patient must "work through" the coming separation from the analyst and face the unconscious meanings of separation from a parental object.

There is assumed a definite relationship between the behavior exhibited in analysis and the behavior of the patient in general. The defenses that have become a part of the patient's personality disposition to use that occur in all phases of his everyday life are the ones that will enter into analysis as resistances. The sequence from free association is observable in even the brief components of the analytic session so it is possible to make inferences at even this level. Temporal units of greater length are used for diagnostic inference by fitting together the short-term inferences to determine long-term trends. In looking at the "various strength and quality of resistances the bringing to consciousness of certain motives and the fantasies associated with them, the deepening of regression
and the use of more primitive defenses in resistance, "the development of transference, and so forth." It is possible to compare analytic phases of varying length and focus on associative material. This associative material can be divided according to the level of consciousness and the behavioral functioning it represents to create a number of separable bodies of data usable for longitudinal inference. By analyzing the separate bodies of longitudinal data, and checking the inferences made against each other, the analyst is able to "conform his theoretical assumption that resistances in free association represent the patient's characteristic defenses and the transference neurosis represents the central conflicting motivational forces of the patient's unconscious mental functioning." 

The identification of the two thought processes and the understanding of behavior as a compromise between the thought processes, is a concept of a compromise formation first proposed by Freud when describing neurotic symptoms in 1896 and also applied by him to dreams and other imaginative and "accidental" acts of an individual in 1900. In 1923, he stated:

(Analytic) work has shown that the dynamics of the formation of dreams are the same as those of the formation of symptoms. In both cases we find
a struggle between two trends, of which one is unconscious and ordinarily repressed and strives toward satisfaction—that is, wish-fulfillment—while the other, belonging probably to the conscious ego, is disapproving and regressive. The outcome of this conflict is a compromise formation (the dream or the symptom) in which both trends have found an incomplete expression.

The compromise formed in the dream or symptom is a creative synthesis of the two trends, involving imaginative disguises for the repressed wish, according to the principles (of condensation, displacement, etc.) which Freud presented in The Interpretation of Dreams.

The free association, as used in the psychiatric clinical method, reveals secondary process thought when the chain of associations appears to be logical and objective. When an idea appears that is unrelated sequentially by some logical implications or an obvious perceptual connection, or when the sequence is interrupted, primary process thought is revealed.

In the psychoanalytic method, these resistances to free association are analyzed to bring to consciousness the primary process material and the conflicting motivations indicated. In ordinary adult life, primary process materials
are evident at various times, especially in night-time dreaming, day-dreaming, during fatigue, drunkenness or emotional stress. The individual's "realistic appraisal of the environment is suspended in favor of intensely experienced subjective imagery and associations related overtly or metaphorically to deep-seated motives." \(^{24}\)

The knowledge of the existence of primary process thought, the possible conflicts between primary and secondary process thoughts and the use of both in the process of creation of a design is necessary to avoid dysfunctions in the information exchange process as it relates to the design process. It is the assessment of the relative dominance of primary and secondary process thought at various points in the design process we wish to observe. In the design process, partially due to its creative element, regressions from secondary process thinking to primary process ideation have actually been institutionalized or at least legitimized. The design profession is one that allows and even encourages the emergence of primary process thinking, and when it has been observed, it has revealed the permissible content of the primary process material.

The normative organization of the information exchange process in design permits the emergence of unconscious motives in fantasy and other forms, and when it does occur,
those motives affect the information received or the ability to use information, and thereby affect the design decision making process. A study of ambiguity, cognitive dissonances and conflicting goals and signals, as they affect the design process, may be clearer if the role of primary process thinking is exposed to the view of both designer and client.

The Application of the Psychoanalytic Method

I observed White's behavior during the design process of the study for the Revitalization of Seaview Peninsula to determine instances where there were indications of conflict between his primary and secondary thought processes resulting in dysfunctions in information exchange. The observations took place during many sessions over a period of more than one year. I was able to study the trends and observe the sequences of spoken thoughts and the connections to ideas spoken in association with those thoughts. I noted lapses of silence, apparently groundless anxiety and abrupt introduction of unrelated topics. The many meetings that took place over a long period of time allowed for the longitudinal reference to establish trends and arrive at
inferences of motivation. While the gathering of these observations of behavior are not the same as a qualified professional psychoanalyst observing free association over a long time, the inference procedure used offers some indication of conflict.

In this section I indicate those elements of evidence from White's writings and behavior that enable me to infer conflict. Such conflict affected White's work as a designer and therefore had an affect on the design process described in this case study. This interpretation provides an additional view beyond the analysis of the institutional constraints and behavior described in the preceding chapters.

White, as an articulate creative designer, offers a source of evidence of primary process thought not easily exposed in many others. He uses colors, textures, forms to express himself and relates to nature in landscaping, considering environmental impact and ecology by thinking of flowers, water, birds, fish, bees and frogs. He dreams of what the land could be and how buildings, public areas and space are used. In his writings, teachings and presentations he has tried to communicate his dreams and how he wants to translate those dreams into the built environment. White has had a long history of conflict
between business and art through a life-long desire to meld success in both fields especially when they are interdependent. If the rational businessman approach is thought of as secondary process thought and the art of design as primary process thought, the study of his work will show the relationship of these thought processes. Since there is a symmetrical relationship between the behavior of the designer and the behavior of the client, the type of behavior brought about by the primary process thought by either party can bring about behavior also based on primary process thought by the other.\(^{25}\)

The normative organization of the information exchange process in design permits the emergence of unconscious motives in fantasy and other forms, and when it does occur, these motives affect the information received or the ability to use information and thereby affect the design decision-making process. A study of ambiguity, cognitive dissonances and conflicting goals and signals, as they affect the design process, may be clearer if the role of primary process thinking is exposed to the view of both designer and client. Though the study of White deals in the readily observable behavior observing the nature of resistance and the working of the transference and counter-transference will give some indications of what is happening at the deeper layers, those nearer the unconscious or preconscious forces that control so many aspects of our lives, and what may affect
the information sought for the design process.

White, in his professional career, has tried to combine two major fields of interest--architecture and business. He practiced architecture for twenty years with a world renowned firm of which he was one of the founding partners. He has had his own architectural office since 1966. He was also a professor and chairman of the Department of Architecture of a major university. His major business effort was the founding of a unique merchandising experiment that "created a lively contemporary version of the old general store" with locations in cities throughout the country. He also started and operated various commercial companies.

In his recent work, White played a dual role in the development and design of the renovation of a large commercial area. He initiated the development ideas and was a part of the initial team awarded the project as the designer. White was not only the designer but was also a conceptualizer of the plan. He contacted retail organizations and participated in market analysis. When space was being planned he indicated a willingness to be the retailer himself and establish various types of stores, including restaurants, a plant store and a bakery.
He has said that business without art is not worth pursuing and architecture as an art without its business aspects is not wholly satisfying. The two currents of thought symbolize his divided life experiences and may reflect relationships with his businessman father and artist mother which will be discussed further in this chapter. Intellectually, he has never succeeded in fusing the two traditions, though he has had some short-lived successes. This conflict has been expressed by White in his writings, and has had its affect on his philosophy of design.

White, in his speeches and in articles that have appeared in architectural magazines, has expressed many of his thoughts. In the process of making inferences and seeking evidence, it is appropriate to start by reviewing these speeches and writings. White's attempt to combine the businessman role with his artist-architect role has brought some failures to his career such as loss of control of a company he started, long legal battles for control, a judge determined the extent of the loss, inadequate return on investment for stockholders that he brought in as well as his own, developments where he was excluded from ownership when he thought he would be included.

I have stated earlier in this chapter that the conflicts
in the two currents of thought may reflect deep-seated relationships that have never been resolved. His striving for business success by combining business with his artistic interests has generally failed, by at least one measure -- a standard business measure -- through his own actions that might indicate a conflict in his expressed desire of being a successful businessman. When on the threshold of business success, he has been involved in behavior that has prevented the complete success of that venture. White is known for many artistic successes in design. I have made no attempt to try to judge his artistic work as successful or not or to determine if he also stops short of complete success in the artistic field.

White says the architect must be an artist, that as architects or designers, if we wish to "accept the role of creative men, we must dare to feel as artists." He also said that as a trained observer, the designer should see art "at every level and in every corner" and that it can happen in a natural way. He feels that once the architect is in the process of design "art no longer exists as 'Art,'" because it then becomes a part of the living environment. He is differentiating pure Art, with a capital A, with the art he has talked about existing all around us. He said when he as an artist can have a purpose in performing his artist function, such as designing a building that will be
used, then his "action" in the design process "can be beautiful." In a talk to architects White said:

Values inevitably turn up in our design. I believe that the architect must be an artist ... A person of perception, openness and wholeness of insight. But he cannot expect to work as a pure "fine artist," using the world as a fresh canvas for his personal fantasies.

When White says "we must dare to feel as artists," he follows by equating the artist with the child by saying "and he must be unafraid to cry at the splendor of a mountain sunset." This theme of equating the artist with the child is combined with his belief that equates the child with all that is good and beautiful. He wrote:

Remember as children our easy innocence
When alive with the new ability to see ...

Growing older we surrendered to the tyranny of age;
Not only does he say that the child has the ability to appreciate beauty in the world but that the adult loses that ability to the "tyranny of age." Similarly, Wordsworth has written about the child-like qualities of the artist. Wordsworth's "Ode: Intimations of Immortality from Recollections of Early Childhood" is one of his most lyrical and cogent statements of his concern with retaining the immediacy of childhood sensations despite the numbing effect
of age. In the first stanza of his ode he expresses his sorrow at the loss of the childhood vision:

There was a time when meadow, grove and stream,
The earth, and even common sight,
To me did seem
Apparelled in celestial light,
The glory and the freshness of a dream.
It is not now as it hath been of yore;--
Turn wheresoe'er I may,
By night or day,
The things which I have seen I now can see no more.\(^\text{26}\)

Norman Brown has said "The conception of art derived from what Freud says about wit is substantial enough to constitute at least the outline of a psychoanalytic theory of art. Art as pleasure, art as play, art as the recovery of childhood, art as making conscious the unconscious, art as a mode of instinctual liberation--these ideas plainly fit into the system of psychoanalysis."\(^\text{27}\) Where Freud uses the concept of wit and discusses its function,\(^\text{28}\) we can substitute art and restate it as: The function of art is to help us to find our way back to sources of pleasure that have been blocked by the secondary thought processes which he calls education or maturity. Brown calls it a wish "to regain the lost laughter of infancy."\(^\text{29}\)
Freud wrote, "the unconscious in his (an author's) own psyche, is alive to the possibilities of development, and grants them artistic expression." Psychoanalysis is a way of making the unconscious conscious and art appears to be a way of doing the same thing.

Brown differentiates the two ways of reaching the unconscious by saying psychoanalysis tries to reach the unconscious by extending the conscious while art represents an eruption from the unconscious into the conscious. "Art has to assert itself against the hostility of the reality principle and of reason, which is enslaved to the reality principle. Hence its aim, in Freud's words, is the veiled presentation of deeper truth; hence it wears a mask, a disguise which confuses and fascinates our reason. The mask which seduces us is derived from the play of the primary process.

In a discussion about the teaching of architecture, White called the architectural profession the "stepfather" of the teachers of architecture like himself. He did not call it the father, the sibling or even the colleague, even though he had a dual role at the time of both teacher and practitioner. His use of the word "stepfather" to describe the architectural profession is further clarified
when he discusses the accreditation procedures and describes how they are "attacked by many people...objecting to the rigidity and domination of the 'establishment.'"

Here he uses "the establishment" to refer to the father who is rigid and dominating, the cruel father or the stepfather. By calling the architectural profession the stepfather, and by equating the establishment with this type of father, he is creating an image that is so authoritarian that he is then free to rebel against it.

The theme of stepfather-rebel son, establishment-innovator, accreditation-experimentor, logician-artist, businessman-artist comes up in many ways. In this discussion White has put the architectural profession in the cruel father role and has justified his rebellion; the rebel is the artist defined by White as the "innovator," "beauty seeker," and the father from whom he rebels is in a businessman's role described as "inert," "respectable," "the establishment," "accreditation-giving".

When White talks about rebelling by becoming the artist, he indicates a fear of the consequences as in his statement "new programs of experimentation and innovation... (cause a) risk to its accreditation-neck." This use of neck-risking may have a deeper meaning such as a fear of having his head chopped off by the authoritarian father.
White feels very strongly that art and business must combine but that logic, that adult and business behavior, alone is bad, and from that he must rebel. He says "does the cold shell of logic reduce us to apathy?" And in the same discussion "Before we can write or sing, or draw or plan an environment for others... we have to accept the senses as partners of the intellect. We have to turn off the verbotens and inhibitions that spoil life and our landscape..." He says art and logic must combine, logic alone spoils life. However, when he says "verbotens and inhibitions" must be turned off, he is saying more than logic alone must be rejected, he is again talking of the businessman father with his control over the child-artist and thereby legitimizing the rebellion.

In his discussion on architectural education, when White talks of art and mixing art with what I call business values or identification symbols, he then gets into illogical thought processes which indicate an area of conflict or repression and a warning to the observer that something is going on other than what is being said. In his statement:

architectural schools today, like animals, find themselves impotent, unable to reproduce that hybrid designer who can save our environment and carry out many brave and noble assignments.
He uses affect laden words--animal, impotent, reproduce--and uses them without meaning in this context: "animals, find themselves impotent."

During the design process of the Seaview Peninsula, White frequently made reference to a speech-article he wrote, the title of which was "A new vision of Man and the Environment."

When he wanted to refer to what he had written that explained his feelings about design, he sent a copy of the article to William Brown before the study started; when an architectural critic was interviewing him and questioning him about his reasons for certain design decisions he said: "I can't explain it all now, look at my article "Man and the Environment" to see how I approach these issues."

When I started this study, White asked me to read the article so that I might understand his design philosophy and his approach to what he considered the important issues.

There are many ways to interpret and understand the meaning of the article "Man and the Environment." I shall try to point out various statements made and relate those statements to the inferred conflict involving businessman vs. artist, child vs. adult, establishment vs. rebel and try and find references that may refer to his feelings about his father, mother and childhood and his fears of death.
and the dream of escape. There is much in the article that expresses no more than a clear and understandable wish for a more livable city. I shall not consider those aspects of the article.

One of the major themes is the negation of businessman's values, called "Great American Aspirations," because he feels the acceptance of such values causes the loss of the artist's values. He discusses the theme in the context of describing what the "have nots" of the city want "dignity, a job and a vote..." but he finds... "they must be bought as part of the package of 'Great American Aspirations.'" If he buys them, they degrade and destroy his own values and offer little in return." He also says, "(the issue is really) 'middle-class values,'" when he is talking about adult values and establishment values. This discussion comes in close proximity to a description of two value systems, meaning art vs. business, "a new kind of class war-- (not based on age or color)-- a war mainly about values." In this discussion he makes reference to "deprived classes of citizens" which may refer to the young son or child whose goal is "liberation of spirit... (from oppression) so huge and monolithic" that "few have identified it." Not only do we find the young son identified, we see who he has to be liberated from--the adult father as he appears to the young son. To the child the father is huge. When he says "few have identi-
ified it," that "huge and monolithic" oppression, he may be wondering about the penis and the possible power it gives to the adult. When he talks about the source of the middle-class values he says "blame it on the nefarious 'power structure,'" referring at some level to the powerful wicked father.

White had dreams of the fear of the business life or the life with only business values. Is this his description of that life?

"We walk on crowded, treeless streets, work out our lives in impersonal buildings--many without window or view... travel under-ground... smell of loneliness and violence... eat in greasy plastic snackshops..."

He follows with the antidote, prescribing a cleanser:

"privileged to flee on weekends, the masses wait... to worship the wash of warm sun."

He talks about the environment using aggressive terms and violent images:

"Whenever the total environment becomes meaningless and violent, so do the actions of men."

His analysis of the urban environment has it invading our senses:

"busses turned off 'in restless sleep'"
"harassing road signs"
"blinding night streets"
"masking out the cries for help"
and again the dream of escape described in terms of primary process thought:
"We escape, if only in dreams, to feel... moist spring soil under foot, touch the clear mountain streams."
White talks further of the urban environment in a violent context, saying:
"murder, assassination and riots around the world, the urban environment is more important than a matter of taste, more than a side issue of political expediency or economic reform."
Environment is more than the businessman's values, he is saying. If he is to be free to accept art and its higher values, he must fail as a businessman:
"environment (is) the central physical expression of social and human values..."
He states business destroys and life is lovely without business. Unpredictability is art and therefore it is good; predictability is business and therefore it is bad.
"housing developments, shopping strips, block-long office complexes... that isolates groups and functions, destroying the infinite variety and interaction of life... the lovely unpredictability of life."
His theme of denigrating business is carried by such statements as:
"the vast middle-class slum created by business and bureaucratic indifference... this middle-class slum is worse than the others--an overscaled psychological ghetto, whose inhabitants are disadvantaged and culturally deprived in the truest sense."

He may be referring to the child as the disadvantaged inhabitant and the father as the businessman and bureaucrat and he may be saying, as the child in him might be saying, I don't want to live in that house! Life in that house, "is no fun" without art; business values mean "pleasure is forbidden."

"environment displays our deeper social values as if on giant billboards: BOREDOM, DRABNESS, SQUALOR, CONFUSION, OVERSCALE...LIFE IS NO FUN... PLEASURE IS FORBIDDEN... NO LEFT TURN, NO RIGHT TURN...KEEP OUT...KEEP OFF THE GRASS (If you can find any)."

White talks of the environment as being "a formative learning experience second only to family relationships", thereby tying in closely with experience and to family relationships. He then continues, "and with each level of physical deterioration around us, we are further de-sensitized until caught in a rapidly descending spiral, leading to the depths of sub-human violence." This process could also represent the rejection of art in childhood; he uses words that refer to torture or death.
When White discussed the "explanations for the actions of rebels", he offered a range of possible explanations "from technology to toilet training". He says one explanation is "overriding: The disintegrating quality of modern environment." White ties in his rebellion as a child and justifies it. Where he uses the word environment to mean art, he refers to the rejection of the values of art by businessmen as the disintegrating quality of modern environment. He speaks of art as an ingrained need. He continues his discussion of explanations for the actions of rebels:

"Environment--a very personal experience...full of connections to...the very biological roots of man...if understood better...might help us out of this accelerating class war..."

White continues to talk of rebellion when he discusses middle-class business values as adult values and thinks of himself as a child, a rebel. In saying a good reason to rebel is to rebel against business values, he talks about schools and the education of children and sees schools as a microcosm of the city. "It is there that they (children) get the real message about the values of the adult Establishment. One might suspect they are being consciously tutored in good reasons for rebellion." He continues, saying,
"school is a plot of the Establishment...teachers are middle-class schoolmarm...schools... is the statement of adult values," giving his opinion that the adult world teaches middle-class or business values. In finding a way out, so "the city then is no longer a prison from which to flee," he tells of how designers should act and refers, over and over, to the child, infant reactions, the young and to child-like non-intellectualizations.

"designers with compassion should be able to create the city the 'rioters' are subliminally crying for, a city where the doomed are free to act and grow.

We need models of this positive environment --for the young, the poor...for everyone to see."

It is the infant that knows subliminally and is crying. The doomed are the children who must be freed to grow.

There are many references to the tactile sensations and feelings and understandings that use primary process thought rather than logic or secondary process thought. "for the solely material goals ... wages, housing, leisure, even genuine social equality--are only temporary fillings in cavities that will continue to decay until we recognize the deeper need."
The metaphor used by White recalls prevalent childhood experiences. He continues by saying one must "transform positive values into felt experience" using the term felt to make the feeling non-intellectual and understandable by the child. He continues:

"the education of vision, along with all the emotions, will have to precede the achievement of a better environment. They all must discover their eyes and hands, tongues, noses and ears, and become real participants in the inner life of man for whom (architects, teachers, others) they design and teach."

White wants to be in touch with his primary process thoughts and those of his clients; he wants to do it by "seeing with the heart."

In this section, I have noted that White's professional career has been devoted to the fusing of architecture and business. From discussions with White, I have learned of his unwillingness to practice business without design or design without its business or economic aspects. In each of his business endeavors, however, he has fallen short of his full success and has then found refuge in artistic aspects while finding frustration and anger with the businessmen who ended up controlling his initially successful efforts. I feel there are similarities in White's behavior in entering business ventures with his
behavior in conducting the Seaview Peninsula study. He accepted the difficult challenge of planning and designing Seaview when it was offered by one of the most experienced and pragmatic urban planners, William Brown, because White was pragmatic and felt he could accomplish where others had failed. I have assembled evidence from White's writings and speeches to support the inference of a deep-seated conflict that may have affected the design process.

White has equated himself with the artist and has then equated the artist with the child. He has described an authoritarian profession from which he said he should rebel. He has equated the profession with the businessman and with all middle-class values from which he must rebel. White says art and business must combine, but he has had conflicts at times when he discussed such mixing.

In summary, White's discussion of businessman's values he said the acceptance of such values causes the loss of the artist's values. This theme appears frequently with the child as artist and the father as businessman. He equates art with environment and frequently uses primary process thought to talk of "good" environment, "bad" environment and the dream of escape. When describing "bad" environment caused by the intrusion of business values, he uses words of violence and murder and states that he must fail as a
businessman if he is to succeed as an artist. His talk of environment is tied closely to talk of family relationships and indicates a fear of the rejection of art in childhood. He also defends rebellion in childhood from businessman's values as being permissible if it is to create a better environment.

White took on a seemingly impossible task at Seaview -- impossible because of the many institutional constraints. He was hired because he described himself as pragmatic and knowledgeable in dealing in businessman's values. As I have indicated, Brown may have chosen White because of a recognition of White's approach to design that could serve Brown's institutional needs. White said he could bring beauty and practicality to his design solution. He then avoided many of the practical and difficult issues during the process and didn't seek certain information that I believe necessary to the project and didn't receive other information that was offered.

The evidence gathered to this point is insufficient to determine actual deep-seated motives or unconscious thoughts. It is now necessary to view White's behavior during the design process. I have concluded that the exogenous pressures and constraints during the design process alone do not explain White's behavior. There were
anomalies in his behavior that require explanations. Further evidence is needed before the inference procedure is complete.

Before accepting the design project, White made it very clear to Wood that the needs of practicality could be met. White stated he could be artistic, that is do a pleasing design and create a better environment, and he could be practical and pragmatic by dealing with the economic, political, social and physical constraints imposed by the difficult site and difficult neighborhood, i.e., also be a businessman. White's major selling point was that he could come up with a plan that would work. Yet, his plan was not workable.

In a retrospective examination of the design process and product I have found ample reasons to believe the task undertaken by White was beyond the control of any designer to accomplish. If he believed his only role was to provide a pretty picture, or model, to mollify an angry community, faculty and student body, to allow the University to open easily, he was successful and the process worked. Mollification may have been Brown's primary goal and he therefore used White successfully. However, I am sure White did not feel that was his goal and Brown did not feel that it was his only goal. White's goal was to design a
product that would work; that was economically feasible, that was designed to reflect the needs of his neighbors and the general community, that took into account all of the environmental factors that are so important for the design of a new community. His view of his task was to do enough planning and design to show that his plan was possible and to obtain the support and funds necessary to continue the design to final plans and specifications. White stated many times throughout the process that he really wanted it to be successful. He spent more money on the design than he received in fees, because he wanted the process to work so he could continue it and recover any losses in the following phases. White entered a very difficult design problem knowing that all of his artistic and business acumen were necessary for his success. White, however, avoided the problems—those businessman elements of any good plan, and concentrated on a largely artistic design that would satisfy his aesthetic sense and sidestep "business" problems. What was needed was not to repress "primary" processes (art) but to bring to light and fuse the primary process with his secondary processes (practicality).

What White did not include in his first proposal to Brown outlining what he would do to accomplish this study is an indicator of his wanting to avoid those specifics normally called for in a study of this type. As shown by
Greene proposal made at the same time, the clients had indicated to Greene that they wanted alternate development options, including physical, social, financial and institutional analysis. White did not suggest analyses of many of the design factors that would ordinarily be desired and were seen by other professionals, such as Greene and the technical staff of the Redevelopment Authority as necessary. White avoided the questions of transportation, foundation and noise control, program and staging options, market projections, funding sources, and feasibility studies for renovation of housing project.

White's avoidance of the difficult problem areas occurred throughout the study as I have described previously. This behavior did not seem reasonable even within the context of the many institutional constraints. In seeking evidence of conflict within the designer that affects the flow of information, the promise of a melding of art and business with the resultant concentration on art and avoidance of business must be considered. The anticipated failure of the logical approach to the difficult problem caused White to revert to his primary processes and rely on his artistic vision to avoid being judged a failure at melding art and business. One example of White's failure to obtain and use information adequately was his approach to the extremely complex parking needs of the plan.
White said he could design to satisfy a multiple group of decision-makers, but in contrast to suggestions made by the development Authority professionals to begin by solving for many of the physical, social, financial and institutional constraints, White believed he should avoid the problem areas. He said it was best to concentrate on an overall concept that would please everyone and that problems would be solved at some later more opportune time. He felt that concentrating on a solution of a serious problem in depth would mean the overall general study was being done poorly. He did not want to get side-tracked on those problems that could occupy a major portion of his time, the solution of which might not be possible in the time available. White wanted to work out the overall solution in a way that would not raise new problems or require his spending time on the known difficult ones. White said the basic need at Seaview was for a new image and when asked about the "tough problems" he said he "would investigate those conditions." His strategy at the start of the project to assign a task to any professional interested in a problem and get him busy worrying about that problem, was used to prevent the professionals from becoming a negative force on his "positive" work. He said the people around him were good at thinking up difficulties that could stop all creative thinking. If he could show how the "image" could be changed to make it attractive enough
for success, then and only then could he face the problems that would occur. He said, in his experienced mind, he could determine the proper priorities of action. But from my evidence of the events of the design process, I infer that certain basic conflicts determined much of his behavior and especially influenced his use of available information.

He was unable to seek out and use information that would help solve the difficult requirements for parking to accommodate all the uses proposed in his plan. When questioned at length about many of the parking assumptions used on his plan, White eliminated the numbers from the "Fact Sheet" which initially listed the parking requirements for each use proposed on the plan, since he said too little was known about what the actual needs would be. He made no attempt to locate parking, determine the feasibility of various forms of parking structure or surface, or try to approximate residential, commercial, school, recreational, or other parking needs. White wanted to avoid a difficult problem. If the actual parking needs were estimated, the area for parking for all of the uses proposed would represent more than one-third of the total site. If this area for surface parking was shown, the model would not be aesthetically acceptable. White had not explored parking
needs quantitatively, and he hadn't tried alternate structural solutions. He said he "felt" the plan could work somehow and when he had more time and money he would be able to solve the problem. He said he had to close the process of possible change after his initial analysis and he also said he had a lack of knowledge of what really was supposed to come out of the study. White said his work was over and further study was not called for in the contract. He wanted approval of his initial plan since he had done all that was expected of him; not that all the answers were in nor that it was the best possible plan that he could have done.

I have found other indicators of conflict present where business values interfered with artistic needs causing White to withdraw from obtaining needed information. In such situations and at various times throughout the study White made statements about his plan such as: it will work; he could come up with a solution if he had more time; he really didn't know what he was supposed to do; and he did what was expected of him. These contradictory statements indicate conflict. His inability to design alternative solutions was another indication of conflict. Alternative solutions were called for in his contract but such solutions required a melding of what I have called the art-business components of design. White may have been unable to
successfully meld these components because he was conflicted by a perceived need to fail when relying strongly on business values or because he had undertaken an "impossible" task. Whatever the reasons or the deep motivations for his behavior, the conflict was indicated by his behavior when he avoided the "business" problem and retreated to his perceived safety in "art". His lack of commitment to his plan, his willingness to change "business" elements, his confusion at the contract requirements, and his ambivalence about the plan, stating it was good at times and far from solution at other times, are all indications of conflict that impaired his work as a designer.

Another example of anomalous behavior that indicates conflict occurred at the start of the design process. White in describing his qualifications to Brown prior to starting the project talked of the design process in primary process terms by using the medium of a slide show with taped folk music as a background. The slides were copies of illustrations of Charles Darwin's trip around the world. The purpose of the show was to allow White to talk of beauty, color, light, nature, quality of life, and propose a return to a value system of the past. It was an escape from reality and logic, or secondary thought processes, to his primary process feelings. He tried to capture the mind of the listener in his dream, he said.
When later describing some of his past work, White also expressed his desire to create, using many terms that were non-business and not a mixture of art and business: "human scale," a "comprehensive organic community," "a rich mixture of people and activities," an environment that is lively and interesting--a city in the country," "a natural organic community." He said he wanted to find an approach to town buildings that would restore the scale, the human interaction and participation of village life within the patterns of present day urban design. However, he also described his interest in business and discussed in detail plans he had completed for commercial development, leasing, transportation and renovation. He showed Brown a plan and a model of what White described as a practical, feasible and exciting concept that served the need of the client.

White started his design by immediately focusing on the commercial center of Seaview Peninsula. He saw the revitalization of the shopping center into a major regional retail center as the key to the future of the peninsula. Many of the professionals involved in the planning at that time did not feel such a regional center was feasible. Many Task Force members, financial people and developers who were in attendance at the presentations of the model questioned the feasibility of the shopping center.
White was told initially to use his considerable retail background to design a use for the center that was practical. The application of business values on the design that White had such high hopes for in terms of artistic, human experience caused the conflict with the result that, as White said, "All of the design decisions were made over a weekend." When asked how he could design that way, he said he could do it fast because his main instruction from Brown was to be pragmatic. He was told not to put anything in the plan "that could really jar people or appear impractical."

By immediately focussing on commercial values, a conflict was developed because he felt that he was forsaking art. White later tried to recall "the first step" and stated it was "Let's build something that shows what a place could be and walks around the reality of how it could get there". This statement represents what he wanted to do, not what he actually did. He tried to be logical, business-like and deal in secondary process thought but his wishes were rooted in the primary process and he said of the resultant design process: he shouldn't be judged on the results, it was not his fault, he was asked to do it fast. He did not want to take responsibility for the decisions made.
During the process he had many problems in trying to resolve the business versus the artistic approach to design and the way he could synthesize the approaches. It appeared at times that White was unsure of the synthesis because he never knew if he was favoring one more than the other. The attempt for a perfect blend may have also been an attempt to accomplish an impossible feat.

When White completed his design ideas he called them preliminary proposals for the development and he tested these ideas with the client to "review the directions". He sought only general approval on very unspecific ideas such as "the entrance to the peninsula should be made a significant and enjoyable experience", an important street should be used as a promenade, plus listing the general types of buildings by proposed use. White said he was preparing the way. As a strategy for gaining acceptance of the plan, this approach is certainly a common one; however, in the context of the conflicts it is also subject to interpretation from another point of view. It also appears that White did not want to be judged, he did not want to risk; he wanted to be safe and careful. Though the design was completed, he wanted to include others in the responsibility for the design decisions. The avoidance of responsibility for many of the design decisions could have been the result of White's conflicts.
In White's first proposal to Brown he suggested that he use the movable block model technique that would assist collaboration and assist in the communication between users, clients and the designer. The idea was to use the model to design the environment rather than the buildings, an expression of not wanting to be constrained by secondary thought processes and therefore to attempt to generalize, avoid specific commitments and retain artistic freedom. At this point, White also stated that his philosophy of planning and design integrated social, political and economic realities and thereby revealed his desire to synthesize art and business. The conflict created was resolved by White's dealing in generalities and avoiding specifics.

When the model was constructed it was called a sketch model or play model and it allowed for the movement of any piece that represented the design solution. Unlike a drawing that indicated a fixed solution, it was to be used to give a sense of security to the client. White couldn't be judged if the pieces were made to be constantly moved. It enabled him to answer objections easily without accountability. It was a safe method of presentation that gave White a sense of security. The model could be adapted and revised, White said, during the process of moving the blocks around, with new design modules prepared.
to reflect the "synthesizing of group objectives."
However, it would be difficult to pin-point responsibility onto one person if the product was a synthesis of many ideas. Actually, there was no incorporation of the ideas of others at any time in the process. The use of the model seemed to be a device for not permitting White's work to be judged under the guise of seeking group objectives and solutions.

The model was used at the presentations described in the previous chapters. The presentations, while appearing to be quite informal, were staged in a theatrical manner, i.e. with a very careful orchestration of White's role and the "props" used in each set. White had a strong sense of theater and an ability to stage a show. In theater the outcome is usually predetermined and it is generally a "safe" medium for the performer in that the performer is rarely interacting with the audience. White opened his presentations by setting the scene for the audience. White said he wanted the viewers to understand his position - the "facts" as he saw them. He said he wanted to convey the excitement of the whole rather than the details of any specific part because he wanted the people watching to get caught up in the excitement of trying to think up a design for the peninsula.
As I have described previously, White started by describing what a new community could be, what a wonderful location the site was and how it was comparable to luxury housing sites. He spoke optimistically of the rejuvenated shopping center and the recreational potential of the shoreline. White said he wanted the listener to get all involved in the process of trying to think of as many good things that could be said about "this most fabulous of all sites" before he unveiled the solution represented by the model. This was an artist's view with no complications and no mixture with business reality. It was overly optimistic and did not deal with any of the physical or feasibility problems. He wanted an aesthetically pleasing solution without focusing on details and therefore tried to cue the viewer by clearly defining how the viewer should respond. He dealt in terms such as "fabulous" which had the effect of making the viewer feel uncomfortable in finding fault with details. After this introduction as background for the viewers, White then said the design choices were obvious. He felt he should not be bogged down by politics or other institutional constraints, but should solve the problems which were obvious to him. It was very difficult for those present to criticize what had just been called obvious. It was disarming in that it prevented him from being subjected to criticism.
During the presentations of the model and the explanations of the plan to the various groups and individuals, White exhibited certain types of behavior quite regularly. These meetings were to be the major opportunities for White to obtain information relating to his design. When information was offered, White did not restudy any aspects of his design to consider the information being offered. There were many institutional reasons why White may not have wanted to hear the new information; the main reason could have been the very realistic cost limitations on re-doing a portion of the plan that might then require a new beginning of the lengthy process of gaining approvals. On the other hand, White's goal was to be successful in his design so that he could receive additional commissions to bring the design to fruition. In White's terms, successful meant both good design or artful, and economically feasible or businesslike. In addition to his rational reasons for not wanting new information, White's behavior showed signs of conflict that prevented his using the information he supposedly sought. His responses during the presentations were indicators of conflicts that prevented him from receiving and using the information available.

I have observed White's behavior during the presentations previously discussed and have isolated those elements
of behavior that indicate conflicts that impaired the information exchange process. I am not discussing the whole of White's behavior at these meetings nor am I trying to offer a balanced view of various types of behavior.

The examples of behavior observed are sometimes contradictory, and taken singularly are not adequate evidence of conflict. When grouped after observation over a long period, in this case four months of about twice a week meetings White had with others, the evidence builds and begins to confirm earlier inferences. During this period I found White defensive about the plan with overly strong reactions to criticism; avoiding responsibility and retaining flaws in the plan; avoiding discussions about the details of the plan and only discussing the plan as a whole; responding after long delays, with vague answers, being unsure of himself and unwilling to defend his plan; directing answers to questions and including out-of-context remarks and jumbled thoughts; and being bored at critical points of information exchange.

White was especially defensive about his plan when criticism was implied concerning economic feasibility, or business values. His reaction was overly strong as well as overly defensive and acted as a way to thwart criticism.
His statement as described previously that if he were starting from scratch on planning the peninsula, he would have placed the uses that now exist about where they are now, is an example of an overly-strong reaction, since I have found that statement not to represent his thinking at all times. When talking to financial people at one of the presentations, White was questioned about the advisability of a regional shopping center, a business decision question that questioned economic feasibility and knowledge of retail marketing. His reaction was the statement that if this were a new project, without any of the problems now associated with it, the plan of a new development would be designed in substantially the way the model then represented it.

White, as shown by his behavior during the design process, avoided responsibility for the design decisions in the plan in a number of ways. When asked an accusing question, such as whether he wanted to get rid of public housing to provide for student housing, he discussed a location for student housing not shown on the model and then stated the model was only a sketch. When it became apparent during the determination of land use that certain groups were not participating in the process, such as the small church whose land was planned for housing, the High School whose land was being planned for joint recreational
and athletic uses, the School Department who would be necessary to plan additional school needs of the proposed community, White didn't want to take the responsibility for correcting the oversights. Retaining the flaws is a way of avoiding being judged on the results and keeping antiquities in the process. It reinforced his feelings as an artist because he felt he should not correct the oversights of the client and therefore was not taking a "logical" position. He was avoiding secondary process thought, not synthesizing it with primary process thought and was therefore trying to avoid responsibility and judgment.

A typical reaction White had when being asked by businessmen about an element of the plan was to avoid the question and talk about the plan as a whole. When questioned about the need and use of the proposed shopping center, White felt the questioners were getting tough in that they wanted definite answers about his reasoning process. White couldn't respond until he was able to talk of his dream, the plan as a whole, the environment it would create and the quality of life it would provide. When these businessmen admired the aesthetics of the model but questioned its feasibility, White felt dissatisfied; he said he was less satisfied than at any other meeting. He was fearful of what they might say to Brown in private. At another presentation, before developers and planners,
numerous questions were raised about the feasibility of the plan; market for housing, need for land fill, feasibility of the public housing in relation to luxury and market housing. After each question, long periods of silence followed. Everyone waited for White to reply, but each time he waited for an uncomfortably long time before replying. His answers were vague and he seemed unsure of himself. He seemed reluctant to be the one defending his design.

Another indicator of conflict was sudden out-of-context remarks made by White in the course of a presentation. At one presentation described earlier White interrupted the presentation to suddenly announce that the Headmaster of the High School was "shocked" to learn of the plan to use the school's land. No one in the group was concerned with the use of the High School's land. Those present were waiting for the presentation to continue and did not know how to react to the information just given to them. It was not only an out-of-context remark but it was addressed to the wrong people. Nothing was said by anyone and after a long and uncomfortable silence, White continued the presentation as if there had been no interruption. At another presentation, when questioned about student housing, White explained the "real relevance at this point" can only be appreciated when looking back at "that business in June
when there were many meetings and I was told we want something now that's practical - no more long-haired planners."

White was conflicted by the request by Brown to be practical or business-like rather than "long-haired" or artist-like or impractical. He associated that thought to the many meetings which actually took place much later and were to be information exchange meetings to help determine the design. This confusion in reasons for the design process, reasons for design decisions, a mix-up in the timing of events and the mis-direction of information to an unconcerned group, indicate a much deeper conflict related to his being told to use business not artistic values, or a conflict in primary versus secondary thought processes.

Another indicator of a conflict that was interfering with White's thought processes and preventing him from obtaining information concerning the study was the many references by him to his boredom. When White recalled that during the study other professionals said the planning for the peninsula couldn't be done, he said he didn't even go to the meetings with the other professionals because they were "too boring". He said they met "all summer and did nothing but identify conflicts;" they were people saying mostly "nothing can be done". When White was asked later in the study why he didn't attend all the Task Force meetings, he said they were "too boring". Even when the
Task Force agenda was planned to provide information requested by White, he said he was too bored to go.

Otto Fenichel has written extensively about clinical symptoms of conflict and has said, "The feeling of being bored probably is generally, at least in its neurotic exaggeration, a state of excitement in which the aim is repressed; anything the person can think about doing is felt as not adequate to release the inner tension. Bored persons are looking for distractions, but usually they cannot be distracted because they are fixated to their unconscious aim." There has been much written in the psychoanalytic field about boredom as an indicator of conflict. In White's conflict between business and art, he seems to want to escape from business values but also feels he shouldn't. He was not able to synthesize these values and was the artist at work conflicted by his rejection of business values. He was in the same conflicted situation that his whole career represented.

These examples taken from White's behavior at the various presentations of the plan provide additional evidence to that indicated by his writings and his behavior during the design of the plan. The inferences are based
on the accumulated evidence and appear to be accurate. It is plausible to assume that White's avoidance of responsibility for many of the design decisions was caused by his inner conflicts. This avoidance allowed White to set himself apart from all others working on the project; it appeared as a lack of real commitment and a wish for uninvolved. This setting apart affected his ability to receive feedback and new information and prevented his acting on information when received.

When he was asked specific questions such as: why the need for 4,000 units? Why do you want 8,000 units? Why is more more desirable than less? Where and how will the units fit on the site? White was not able to answer the questions. His conflicts prevented him from participating fully in this information exchange process and he was able to say only: "On the basis of what we have, it looks feasible. Further study is necessary." When questioned further he also said he had put down on paper the first "Cut" at thinking through the problem and misstated that he hadn't had the participation of other knowledgeable people in the process. He said he had no testing of his design solution and no feedback from others. What White seemed to want from the presentations, however, was expressed by him when he said his general feelings after each presentation were satisfaction and relief that no one
criticized his work.

When it was decided that it was necessary to tell the residents of the public housing project the specifics of the plan, after all the presentations were made and the Task Force meetings concluded, a bus was hired to bring twenty-five poor, black, uneducated residents to White's office. The people felt ill-at-ease. White served them a very fancy lunch of crabmeat casserole, roast beef, salads, egg nog and imported beer. The service was china and uniformed waiters and waitresses were used. Rather than discuss the design solution, even at this last presentation, White talked of the model in non-specific and symbolic terms. In talking to the people who were not consulted and were uncomfortable and resentful because they were finally getting their first view of the plan, White said: "The idea was to show what might happen - that a group of people can agree enough on a plan in a way that might benefit everybody. The most important thing for people to agree (upon is that) the plan is good, then go out and sell it." The people present were distrustful, not interested in cooperation and some said they felt "furious that they were not a party to the model." This was the culmination of the failure in the information exchange process. By now it is clear that the causes of the failure reside in factors in addition to institutional con-
straints. This retrospective view of the designer's behavior gives evidence that psychological factors had their effect on the results of the process.
I have carefully traced the design process to show how White's inner conflicts interfered with his expressed desire to use the information available to him. This interference was linked to the institutional constraints, and had an effect on the outcome of the design process. White was not aware of the effect his conflicts had on his behavior. He believed he was reacting solely to the institutional situation. The other participants in the process were unaware of White's motivation and attributed the causes for his behavior to institutional factors. In observing the design process and White's behavior
during that period of almost one year, I noticed his ambiguity and indecisiveness and particularly his failure to utilize available information. However, it was not until I did a retrospective study of the process and the man, through his writings, statements and my observations, that I began to see how his own basic conflicts affected his design performance.

My analysis of White's behavior consisted of obtaining evidence from observable behavior that indicated ambiguities or anomalies, making inferences about the motivation of that behavior, then seeking new evidence to strengthen or reject the inferences made. This process, which was based on seeking indicators of inner conflict or areas of conflict between primary and secondary thought processes, continued until a series of inferences seemed plausible. Although conflict was thought of in psychiatric terms, the process was not comparable to a psychoanalysis in which the analyst is able to check and recheck assumptions of motivation in many ways and allow the analysand to arrive at a full understanding of himself. My approach was closer to that of a psychotherapist who has limited time that allows for a more restrictive focus on the patient's problem area.

White may not agree, initially, with the inferences about his conflicts, motivations or behavior made in this
study. If White were aware of those inner conflicts expressed during the design process, he could have changed his behavior and obtained and used more of the information available; he then would have completed a design study that was more like the one he proposed. The process and the product could have been closer to what he had intended to do and to what the client had wanted. If he had been better able to serve the needs of President Brown, White, rather than the more practically oriented design group later chosen, would be doing the design study for the revitalization of Seaview Peninsula now (March 1977) under way.

Without self-awareness White can only repeat in each similar situation in which he finds himself, the patterns of behavior I have described in this study. This particular situation was not only difficult and complex in that many institutional constraints were involved in every design decision, but was one that required a melding of art and business to achieve the aesthetically exciting and solidly practical solution required by all parties. The complexities of this particular situation produced many opportunities to observe the conflicts of primary and secondary processes in White. In other, simpler design situations, White may be better able to perform satisfactorily — and in fact much of his design work is noted and praised for its success.
I have discussed the psychoanalytic clinical method, which is usually applied to a patient who is not able to function or is dissatisfied. The patient's normal defenses do not operate in the ambiguous psychoanalytic situation and he is forced to regress to more primitive behavior that reveals primary process material and unconscious motives. The analyst is able to observe signs of the unconscious conflicts and enable them to be brought into conscious awareness. Without the disruption in the person's normal functioning, the unconscious conflicts would remain hidden. I have found it as necessary for studying the behavior of a designer in the design process to reveal unconscious conflicts as it is necessary for psychoanalytic observation. I have found the events in the design process, the complexities of institutional constraints, and the ambiguous needs of the multi-client group also induce psychic disequilibrria, maladaptive responses and regression. The situation studied caused adaptive problems and aroused intense affective reactions that disrupted White's ordinary defenses of everyday life. It is this psychosocial instability, induced by the complications of the design process and its ambiguous demands, that creates a defining characteristic of that process suitable for psychoanalytic observation and interpretation. It is important to investigate the institutions, their constraints, the rules and expectations of the process being studied to discover the
range of options that actually occur. When the process is defined and the institutional constraints are understood, it is then possible to investigate the individual acting in the process to determine the degree to which his own conflicts affect the process. The goal of identifying primary process material can be achieved when the person observed experiences instability of psychosocial functioning shown by his actions in selecting among a range of options. "The primary process material should expose unconscious motives and their conflicts that would not be revealed when adaptation was stable and psychic equilibrium well-maintained by smoothly functioning defenses."  

How can the designer achieve the kind of self-knowledge that will enable him to understand his motivation and consequent behavior in the design process? It is not necessary for a designer to stumble along reacting to a combination of exogenous and endogenous factors without being aware that he is behaving in any way other than reacting to the institutional demands of each situation or to his own sense of creativity. Through an awareness of his primary process ideation the designer can minimize the conflicts and utilize both primary and secondary processes to optimize design results. It is not inevitable that the unconscious conflicts will cause the ambiguities and indecisiveness that hampered White's creativity in the design process studied.
I have found that White in considering only the institutional externals as he progressed through the design process was ineffective because of the absence of personal insight. Neither wisdom nor maturity can be achieved without self-knowledge. White had his dreams to carry him away from the institutional constraints; Lawrence Kubie said, "Without self-knowledge in depth we can have dreams but no art." Without self-knowledge, White behaved like the aging children described by Kubie who were "without self-knowledge..." and therefore armed only with "words and paint and clay...none of which they understand." In writing "of man's symbolic processes which constitute the instrument both of his creativity and of his psychological illness" Kubie takes to task the cliche that one must be "sick" to be creative and calls it a "culturally noxious assumption devoid...of the least fragment of truth..." He finds it curious that many psychologically ailing creative people, "including some whose productivity may have been seriously impeded by their neuroses, refuse therapy out of fear that in losing illness they will lose not only their much prized 'individuality' but also their creative zeal and spark." He finds "in reality the neurosis is the most banal and undistinguished component of human nature. This statement is true even for the symbolic language in which the neurosis expresses itself, whether in symptom, dream, or work of art or science." His clini-
cal experience has convinced him that creative productivity compared to potential productivity is severely reduced by masked neurotic influences. Creative people create "in spite of their struggles to overcome their neuroses and not in any sense the fruit of these struggles."\textsuperscript{5}

It is possible to make designers aware of the effect unconscious conflicts have on their functioning as designers, and I shall propose that it be attempted through participation in a small study group or seminar composed of designers and psychoanalysts. It is not necessary or even advisable for every designer to have psychoanalysis or psychotherapy to achieve self-knowledge, although further research and experimentation is necessary before a sure method of teaching can be detailed. In a Massachusetts Institute of Technology seminar, led by a psychoanalyst, Benson Snyder, a group of design students studied models of behavior of designers within a psychiatric context. The kinds of evidence used and the role of behavior in making decisions was applied to various case studies presented by designers who were not members of the group, but who came to present their cases and answer questions. The seminar members then wrote critical examinations of the cases that included analyses of the validity of the evidence, the importance of the behavior of the designer, the designer's understanding of the client, and the role of the
designer's decisions in the design process. This seminar indicated to me that it was possible, in a short period of time, to teach an understanding of the use of evidence to construct a working model of a designer in the design process, and that a three to six hour presentation of a case study was sufficient to initiate meaningful discussions about the behavior of the designer. The seminar did not serve the purpose of training designers to become aware of their inner conflicts.

I would use a seminar, composed of analysts and designers in near equal numbers, to introduce designers first to the need for self-knowledge and then to a method of achieving self-knowledge. I would begin by having the analysts present material, based on their experience that explained the use of evidence and the clinical style in medicine, the role of the analyst, and how the analyst is perceived by the patient. They would give examples of meaningful consultations to illustrate what the analyst needs or wants to know about the patient and the level of specificity of patient needs and defences. During this phase of the seminar, a lengthy reading program in psychoanalytic literature would be undertaken by the designers with time for discussion with the analysts made available. The reading list would be broad and would include Freud's Interpretation of Dreams, Chapter VII as well as Bachelard's
Poetics of Space and many of the books listed in the bibliography of this study. The analysts would read material on the design process and designers.

The second phase of the seminar would focus on my findings in the study of John White and the design of Seaview Peninsula. The third phase would consist of presentations of design projects first by outside designers and then by members of the seminar. These presentations would allow a three-part analysis: (1) define the design process to be studied; (2) identify the institutional constraints and set the institutional context of the problem; and (3) analyze the behavior of the designer studied to identify conflicts and determine if the conflicts affected his work. It is after the three-part analysis is discussed in reference to the Seaview Peninsula case and the outside designers' cases that the seminar participants may be willing and able to learn from their own professional work that could then be discussed by the seminar. It is important for the participants to identify their own conflicts rather than just identify types of behavior and categorize them. It is important to seek the deep inner conflicts that lead to unconscious motivation rather than identify surface behavior.
The use of the behavioral sciences has become widespread in schools of engineering, architecture, planning, and business and there has been a recent growth of knowledge and skill in the use of those sciences in the identification of social problems, the changing of organizational systems and in the evaluation of personality in organizations. There has been a considerable amount of recent work at Massachusetts Institute of Technology by Donald Schon and others in the identification and methods of changing personal theories of action, evaluating effectiveness of those who hold them, and determining how they influence the ability of professionals to learn about and change their own behavior. This work, which is useful, does not attempt to investigate the unconscious conflicts that may truly determine behavior. The aspects of Freud's clinical method that I have discussed in this study, involve more effective and valid procedures for making inferences about the presence and operation of personality dispositions than the use of theories of action and practice and are necessary to a method of teaching professionals self-knowledge.

My study also makes reference to the creative process at times but does nothing to indicate the relationship of White's behavior, motivation, conflicts and needs with the workings of his creative processes. The essence of the creative process, as stated by Anthony Storr after investi-
gating the motivation of creativity, has not been clarified by the psychoanalytic inquiries about motivation. There is a growing body of psychoanalytic and psychoanalytic literature on the creative process, but further research is necessary in the use of psychoanalytic methods to determine motivation in the creative design process. I have concentrated on seeking evidence of primary and secondary thought processes in the design process. There are some, such as Silvano Arieti, who believe that creativity is a synthesis of the primary and secondary processes into what he calls the tertiary process. He wrote: "It is from appropriate matching with secondary process mechanisms that these primitive forms of cognition, generally confined to abnormal conditions or to unconscious processes, become innovating powers." I do not find his thesis any more adequate than the other work in this complex field. However, creativity should not be studied without dealing with the preconscious, which has not been discussed in this study. I have made reference to the conscious and the unconscious but there is an intermediate form of symbolic process that expresses the "nuances of thought and feeling in the form of a coded language which is essential for creative thinking." This is called the preconscious. The creative designer deals with his subject on the conscious level in dealing with communicable ideas and approximate realities, on the preconscious level in "rapid condensation
of multiple allegorical and emotional factors" and "on the unconscious level, without realizing it, he uses his special competence and knowledge to express the conflict-laden and confused levels of his own spirit, using the language of his specialty as a vehicle for the outward projection of his own internal struggles. Since this happens without his knowledge, it is a process which even in his own field can take over his creative thinking, distorting and perverting it to serve his unconscious needs and purposes, precisely as it happens in a dream or in the symptom formations of neurotic and psychotic illness."  

Research in the motivation of creativity would be enhanced by the collaborative work of psychoanalysts and designers participating in the suggested seminar seeking methods of teaching self-knowledge. I have brought the knowledge gained in the two fields to my analysis of this case study. I am a designer with direct experience in similar design processes, but I am not a psychoanalyst and my knowledge of that field is limited. The investigation of this new field of inquiry that I have done in this study is a prologue to more sophisticated work that should be done in the use of psychoanalytic methods to improve the design process.
EPILOGUE

In March, 1977, a new committee, made up of representatives of State University, various interested State and City agencies, bankers, corporate officers and officers of other institutions interested in the future development of Seaview Peninsula, is now active in developing a new design solution for the peninsula using a new designer who has had considerable experience in the development process, financing and the management of complex projects. There are few representatives of local community organizations included on the committee which as client, is working with the designer. The peninsula has changed a little since
White's study. The number of public housing units now occupied of the 1500 built has dropped from 950, the number occupied at the time of White's study, to less than 500, during a period when the need for public housing has increased throughout the City. A large public building is under construction near the University which will attract 3,000,000 visitors a day and the State is considering locating a new facility between the University and the public housing, which will also attract a large number of visitors. The University has 6,000 students in attendance served by University free bus service from the nearest transit station to the campus. There has been no discernable impact on local housing.

The new designer is not considering the use of the shopping center for a regional center but the center has attracted an office user for one-third of its area on a temporary basis and the designer is trying to get the tenant to expand its use and attract related office tenants to that location. The designer would like to remove many of the public housing buildings, get the City and State to improve the waterfront and eventually put in new housing along the waterfront. The community, the designer said he is working with, consists of bankers, institutions and corporations. He said representation from the public housing tenants is negligible. President Brown agrees with this description of the status of Seaview Peninsula.
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