

# POLICY AND DESIGN FOR HOUSING

Lessons of the Urban Development Corporation 1968-1975

**DESIGN:** UDC's Emphasis on Design Quality and Livability  
Panel 2, June 11, 2005, 11:00 AM - 12:30 PM

# POLICY AND DESIGN FOR HOUSING

Lessons of the Urban Development Corporation 1968-1975

**DESIGN: UDC's Emphasis on Design Quality and Livability** Panel 2 - 11:00 AM - 12:30 PM

Symposium Saturday June 11, 2005, 9:00am-6:30pm

@ CUNY Graduate Center, 365 Fifth Avenue at 34th Street

## STUDENT PANEL PRESENTATION:

Christopher Hayner, Aaron Hurnon and Kristen Wisniewski - Students, Community Design Center, Syracuse University School of Architecture

## PANELISTS:

Anthony Pangaro - Director Millenium Partners-Boston; Former Associate, UDC Office of the Chief of Architecture

Theodore Liebman, FAIA - The Liebman Melting Partnership, Former UDC Chief of Architecture

Rolf Ohlhausen, FAIA - Ohlhausen DuBois Architects

Suzanne Stephens - Deputy Editor, Architectural Record

MODERATOR: Robert Campbell - Architectural Critic, The Boston Globe

TED LIEBMAN: This is the panel on design quality, and our moderator is Bob Campbell, who will also introduce the students' work. Bob Campbell is known to everyone as an architectural critic--architectural critic for the Boston Globe, and a writer. He is not often known by many as the great architect that he was, and very important for UDC. I first knew him as the person who went with Josep Lluís Sert and myself to get fire approvals for skip stop elevators in Yonkers, New York, and to solve other difficult problems, and I knew him as someone who could carry through on a very creative project. In a sense the Yonkers project was not a repeat of the Roosevelt Island housing. It was very particular to that site and those courtyards are lovely. Bob Campbell has also through the years been a very important architectural writer. The days of Ada Louise Huxtable, as we remember, are gone, and Paul Goldberger at The Times too, but we always had Bob Campbell in Boston to read. Ed Logue used to remind him of that in later years when items came out that he favored, he would send them to me.

ROBERT CAMPBELL: I was going to make the point about Yonkers not being a replication of Roosevelt Island and I'm going to make it again when I start talking. But first we're going hear again from the students, another video presentation. Elizabeth Kamell is the professor in charge of this group. She is Associate Professor of the School of Architecture at Syracuse University and the Director of the Community Design Center there.

ELIZABETH KAMMEL: Thanks. For more introductions the most important people in this presentation are sitting right here. Christopher Hayner, Aaron Hurnon and Kristen Wisniewski. I'm just going to give you a brief history of the work and describe it very quickly. It's the result of a Vision Fund grant from Syracuse University that I received to start a research initiative within the Community Design Center. Over the course of three semesters, varying students among the

three that are sitting here, visited and did case studies of six UDC projects, and then also visited many more in addition to other housing projects in and around, mostly New York City. For this conference, we also then interviewed architects who worked on UDC projects, one of whom is here today. And we are going to show you some very small clips from those interviews. My intention for the class, was to get students out of the classroom to begin to evaluate projects on the basis of their own observations and to understand the relationship between intentions, results, both design and social policy. And just on a very personal note, I do want to say that as a undergraduate student, I became interested in what the UDC was doing at Cornell because every day I would wake up and look at Werner Seligmann's project across the valley, which was an incredible compelling image out there--this kind of white thing sitting up on the hill in this kind of verdant landscape. So my interest in both housing and the UDC began way back then. I never knew that I would take it to this point.

To give you an idea of what you're going to see here, the architects are interviewed, each of the students is going to do a very short presentation, and then we'll show a little bit of clips at the end. Now before I leave I just want to do a very short plug for this little book which is available, which we produced, called "The Pocket Guide to the Housing of the UDC," which may not be available at any other time. So it will be a rare edition, and its for sale in the lobby when you walk in.

VIDEO CLIPS: Robert Siegel, Rolf Ohlhausen, Kenneth Frampton, Richard Meier

STUDENT Christopher Hayner: I looked at Roosevelt Island, located in the East River, adjacent to Manhattan. This location made an ideal place to put institutions in the 19th century. It housed all the prisons and several hospitals for terminally ill patients. By the 20th century, dilapidation that came as a result, gave it the name Welfare Island. Come 50's, 60's, there were real estate investors who realized the potential of this island and its great views of Manhattan, and its location and everything. So, the city itself had this idea of a newtown-Intown, but they lacked the capital to do it, so when the UDC came into fruition, they could grab the island as a showcase to the world what the state of New York was doing. They wanted to create a diverse socio-economic mix living together in one community. Because of the quality of the site and its potential to do that, they deemed it necessary to acquire an exceptional architect to do the master plan and the individual housing complexes. For the master plan, they hired the best known architect at the time, who was Philip Johnson. And he designed the plan under the pretext the UDC wanted to create a community with a balance of services and amenities highly integrated into residential fabric.

The major idea was to have this main street, winding down the middle of the island. You can see just looking at the photographs this reminds you of Medieval Europe, you know with the heavy street wall and the curvilinear route that winds its way through there. Its really pretty beautiful. As well as an esplanade around, a 4 1/2 mile recreation walk that circled the island. And in terms of the housing, there were three types of housing complexes proposed by Johnson, each with a U-shaped plan. These U-shaped plans would allow all of the residents to have a view and the towers would cascade down towards the water, allowing everyone to have their own private community space and there would be schools and community spaces within the buildings.

And also to have their own view of the river, which was very important in the concept that everyone had the same opportunities offered to them. These were carried into the individual developments of the units.

I studied mainly Sert Jackson's Eastwood complex and Josep Lluís Sert was interesting because as you could hear architects speaking about the UDC typically hiring young architects with fresh innovative ideas, well Sert by no means was a young architect. He already had a rich history in Europe, where he studied under the famous architect Le Corbusier, and he was bringing with him a rich history of housing design. In designing the Eastwood complex, he was not just inventing all his own ideas. He was using Corbusier's ideas as a principle to design Eastwood, and he uses the skip stop elevator and you know you think of it, the skip stop elevator allows you to have the carry through units on top and on bottom, and Sert is looking at this but he's also remedying it. He's realizing the problems that it introduced. Corbusier's design was often criticized for being oppressive corridors, having no views on corridors itself, and so Sert fixes this. He makes the corridor around the outside give the courtyard down below. And he also considers the Marseilles block, in its marketplace, the marketplace was tucked in the middle of the building, and so Sert remedies that by bringing it down to the ground level. And so he not only using that rich recipe but he's also adding to it, he's adding his own ideas. And this is something pretty unique to Roosevelt Island in terms of the design, is that rich design history and it is pretty strong.

To critique it, the main street idea and the courtyard spaces and the units itself are all great ideas, but because as we talked about, because Southtown never came into fruition, which also called, in the master plan Southtown had the bulk of the entertainment, the community devices that would have generated a stronger community. So without them being there, it's kind of hard to know what it could have been, what Roosevelt Island could have been. As now the Southtown is completed, they changed the package and made it completely residential and so you're kind of wondering, well what could Main Street have been, become, if it had been that strong community programming, and what could the courtyards become because they are dilapidated and no one uses them, they're sparse. They don't have the density that was imagined for them, but the units themselves, I think are the best piece of design in this because you can see the totality. Next we have Kristen.

STUDENT Kristen Wisniewski: Thank you Chris. I researched the low rise-high density prototype and its first application at Marcus Garvey Park Village in Brownsville, Brooklyn. As you may or may not know, the prototype was applied, although never built in Staten Island, and both of those were showcased at an exhibition at the Museum of Modern Art, as low rise alternatives. As a result of the failure of Corbusier urbanism specifically Corbusier's Tower in the Park model for housing, the UDC commissioned the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies, or the IAUS, in 1972 to design the prototype as an alternative. Among the many who collaborated on this project were Ken Frampton, Peter Eisenman, Arthur Baker, Peter Wolf, Anthony Pangaro, and of course Ted Liebman. Jointly the UDC and IAUS further exemplified the UDC goals as far as the desire to push innovative design in relation to social needs.

The primary goals of the investigation were to test architecture's ability to create an extensive individual and community identity, both at the scale of the unit and at the urban scale. Priority

was given to defining and enhancing a simultaneously existing proprietary or private space, and community or public space. In his book, "Defensible Space," Oscar Newman promoted along side the UDC, that a sense of ownership or a sense of investment fosters maintenance of both unit and site and further contributes to the safety of all through general surveillance of property or supervision of property. Attention to each unit's amenities was also a concern. Private yards were allowed for child supervision, and flexibility within the larger rooms of the unit maximized functionality.

The site constraints in Brownsville were many, and of course affected the social ideal in the application of the social ideal. Difficulties in applying the prototype surfaced in its adaptation to the half blocks of the city grid, and the discovery that an elevated subway line, the IRT, was planned to bisect the site and although UDC had many powers, it could not oversee this or prevent this from occurring. Consequently, the parking was relocated around the area that you see the IRT bisecting the site, and the elevated line was to allow the parking, was to allow the 100 foot noise buffer zone, and in turn, the stoops of the site were also turned inward according to the city grid constraint. The design model was a direct result of many site influences. One of which is the stoop, which was modeled from the Brooklyn road house entry sequence. Street units and mews where units utilized the street for surveillance and are defined the edges of the platform elevating the ground plane of the unit from the ground plane of the street. Stoops in Marcus Garvey are successful because they activate the street and promote a sense of visual investment of the street through supervision thereby promoting the ideal of community and safety.

The mews provided intermediate transitional zones between street and the unit for which the stoop can operate on a smaller scale knitting the community closer. The so called private courtyards are less successful because they are not exactly so private. They are surrounded by chain link fences and in many cases are not properly maintained by tenants. In conclusion, the low rise-high density prototype works especially when compared to existing adjacent high rise projects where crime rates are actually much higher as studies have shown. Despite its age and location, the ideals intended by the UDC manifested in 1973, exist and still exist today according to its design. And now we have Aaron.

STUDENT Aaron Hurnon: In 1972 the UDC hired Gwathemy Siegel to design the Perinton Housing Development. This is the last project that we chose to present here today. The task was to design a 560 unit low rise-high density residential community on a previously rural 43 acre sloping site outside the village of Fairport. The architects were trying to develop a prototypical solution that could be altered to accommodate a variety of site locations. Perinton was the only UDC project and first in a series of three projects based on the same prototype. Charles Gwathemy and Robert Siegel invented as you can see in the slide a simple and elegant scheme in Perinton. All the units onsite were organized with respect to their orientation to the street and the green space. The units continually line dead end cul de sac streets and back up to pastoral pedestrian as giving the circulation a labyrinthine effect. These you can see, these are the interior courtyards, the path spaces, the green path spaces, the street and the mews section here. The site plan illustrates the complex intricate special definition of exterior and interior while providing definition to Gwathemy and Siegel's term, habitable and non-habitable. Units are arranged so that non-habitable space, programmatically the kitchen, baths and stairs, front the

street and mews, leaving habitable, living and bedroom spaces to the garden. The organization reinforces the distinction between front and backyard.

The mews clustered units seen here, like at Marcus Garvey, place eyes on the street providing a place for kids to play. This was successful and fostered as was the intention, a smaller sense of community providing an intimate scale within the larger complex. The green spaces were intended to be understood at the unit scale as semi-private backyards. On a larger scale, served as naturally landscaped cross-complex paths, as you can see in these two here. The backyards were not constructed as intended by the architects and residents have since devised their own solutions to make up the shortcoming. Here we can see a typical intervention. As a landscape path, the greens are incredible successful in making views across courtyards to streets and courtyards beyond. You can see this here. Here's one of the green pathways, spines, leading into a courtyard. You can see underneath the raised flat units here, there's a view across the street, where kids would play, and to views of other courtyards beyond. So that there's a green this way, a green this way, a circulation, but also one in this direction across the complex. One can infer from the strongly suggested design decisions that Gwathmey Siegel understood the importance of private ownership and communal living environments. The mega structure as a typology is interesting at Perinton because it identifies the project in full while at the same time allowing for smaller communities to emerge from the fabric. And now we'll leave you with the conclusion of the video.

VIDEO CLIPS: Ken Frampton, Rolf Ohlhausen

ROBERT CAMPBELL: Thank you very much. That comment about Richard Nixon and the housing freeze reminds me of something that John Kenneth Gailbraith once said , never blame the diety for any problem as long as Richard Nixon is in the White House. I'm the moderator and I'm going to start by framing things a little bit and the sequence will be Ted Liebman, who was in at the beginning and has the more general view of the UDC and its relationship to architects, and then Rolf Ohlhausen, who was one of those architects, that will sort of be crossing the tennis net. We'll talk about what it was like to be selected and as he said in the interview to be selected never having done any housing before. And then I've asked Tony Pangaro, who was the assistant to Ted Liebman to talk about something that was very important in the UDC which we haven't heard too much about, which was the feedback cycle, the learning cycle. They tried with each time around to learn from what they had done and they developed the low rise-high density scheme as a result of that. And then Suzanne Stephens has the enviable task of telling us how all this could be done again today.

You've heard entirely from big bosses up to this point, and I want you to understand that I was a lowly job captain in a big drafting room, with no contact with these people. Ed Logue has been called an emperor. No, he was far more than an emperor. He was the angelic host up at the top of that enormous building on 6th Avenue. There was a rumor that he had a squash court up there. Did he actually have a squash court? (laughter) We believed anything anyone told us about Ed Logue. And I never saw him. I never saw him once during that time. Later on we became good friends after he moved to Boston. I want to say, sort of emphasize a couple points. One was the incredible risk- taking that the UDC took on the people that were involved in its projects and on

many of the technical and social ideas that were had. I don't know quite where to start with that. I should also say that Gene Norman who was here this morning and last night talked about the Harlem UDC was my counterpart at the UDC. And I think probably in my dying moment on my final bed, I will probably repeat that telephone number which is so much a part of my life. But we were kind of an amateur show.

Sert Jackson was a firm that had done quite a lot of work but it was organized as an atelier, as a kind of European atelier, and we used to draw the organizational chart of the office as a dot and below that a horizontal line. The dot was Sert, and the horizontal line was everybody else. And most of the people working there had very little experience. He took bright people out of school which is common in European atelier, and put them to work, whether they knew anything or not. And I'm not sure whether I was good or bad in the long run, but we certainly learned a lot because we couldn't have gotten those buildings built if we hadn't learned a lot very quickly. There were two or three people in the office and no more than that. It was an office that grew to over 60 during this period, there were only 2 or 3 that knew anything about how to detail anything. And I certainly, I had worked on housing projects at Ben Thompson's office, but it never got, I was not there when it got into construction documents. And I had worked on a very small transit station at Sert's office, and then a plan for a resort in the harbor of Marseilles that never got built, and a small housing project in Boston that never got built.

So here I am suddenly in charge of, of first, two UDC projects. The first one was called East Hill, and it was in Ithaca, New York on a site that was later built on by Jim Sterling with a definitely different program. And that's why I wanted to bring up what Gene Norman said about Yonkers having been a replica. Somebody once said to me once, "to design is to distort a prototype". These are very great words of wisdom. To design is to distort a prototype. The prototype for the skip stop housing development goes back to Corbu and Sert with Corbu in '29 and '30, when he was hardly more than a kid. He said nobody in Corbu's office ever got paid, except the accountant. And many years later, when he became Dean at Harvard, and was asked to do the Peabody Terrace Married Student housing at Harvard, he picked up on that skip stop and as one of the students said, he brought the corridor to the edge, rather than in the center as it had been in the Marseilles and the other blocks. So that's the distortion of the prototype number one.

Distortion of the prototype number two, is a result of my conversation as the job captain on Eastville with Abe Levitt, who at the time seem quite terrifying. It was years later that I learned what a pussycat Abe Levitt really was, but he said, I guess, what Sert wanted to do was take Peabody Terrace and replicate it. That's what you do, and we were told by Abe Levitt, in no uncertain terms that you cannot have an apartment opening off a fire stair, which is how they worked in Peabody Terrace. The same stairs that are fire stairs give you access to the apartments. So we had to invent, we had to distort the prototype, and I did. Somebody said Ed Logue liked people to compete, Sert did too sometimes, we did comparable solutions that were a point of pride to me, but after we discussed them all and we had looked at both of them, he said, his is better. And so that was the skip stop we used in Eastville, never built, is exactly the same skip stop that was used in Roosevelt Island and later on in Yonkers. An adaptation of Peabody Terrace to the New York State Building Code. You could override our local codes. He wasn't interested in overriding the state code.

Sert, like any good modernist, believed in innovation. The idea that human beings would pick up bricks and pile them up was an anathema to him. It was OK to do that in Europe, but in America, there were big machines and big things to do. So we had to figure out some way to build the walls, again it was very daring. We invented a brick, 16 inches high and 8 inches wide and deeply striated. Nobody ever seen a brick like that before. Nobody knew whether it would work or not. And we built Yonkers out of it, and it's, in fact, it's worked very well. But there was this constant attempt to sort of innovate whatever you could have a chance for innovation. And secondly, this is very important, he would never give up on a important issue. Sert would never give up on a important issue. He would walk away from the job. He would quit. He would commit suicide. He would do anything, but those corridors were going to be on the exterior and those stairs, the fire stairs were going to be attached to the exterior and not come down through the middle because that was the only way you were going to get any sculptural richness to the thing. And we had, the building were stepped down, so, for various reasons, but to improve the scale, but it related to other things, it drew a lot of sun in and so on. And every time you stepped down, you needed a new external fire stair. And so we had more of those than we needed and it helped the improvement, improved the appearance of the building, a great deal.

I have gone back twice. Once with Ed Logue, and someone else, I forget now, I don't think that was the time I went with Ted. I wrote an article about it for Architectural Record" of looking back at a project 20 years later. And then about 10 years after that, the class of Harvard was studying Riverview and I went and this time with Ted Liebman. And it's held up very very well, but its held up partly because it has very aggressive management, that it finds ways to kick out people that are going to be trouble makers, and you have to do that. Its held up well physically. It was done in two stages, and this is feedback cycle again, after we built stage one, we built stage II. By then, there was more trust in me, and I really was in charge of phase II. The design of it was always Serts, but from that point on, it was mine. And nobody gave me a program. How many four bedrooms, how many three bedrooms, how many two bedrooms? Nobody gave me one, so I made one up. I invented the program for Yonkers phase II, and I invented it for the convenience of the architect. A lot of those things were hard to fit in phase I, and no trouble at all in phase II. People talked about community involvement. There was no community involvement of any significance. It was a world of top down decision making as far as I was aware of it, and this is, I was in Chicago a week or two ago and looking at the new fantastic New Millennium Park, which is the best urban park I've ever seen anywhere including Paris, and how did they do it? Well the Mayor said do it and they continued.

The development of the South Boston waterfront a few years ago after he had more less retired, and it was getting very complicated, Sert would go around and say, "take it by eminent domain." Well, that was going to be impossible in those days. The City didn't have the money or the finances that the UDC had, nor did it have the political power anymore. More and more Boston and other cities are being planned from the bottom up by citizens groups and advocacy groups of all kinds. I think that's a very big, a very big change. Talking a little bit, as far as I could tell, the city of Yonkers wanted that project desperately and we heard this earlier about many cities wanting these projects, and there really was no opposition. It was a six block area and Sert, good modernist that he was, turned it into a single super block. A big mistake in my opinion and



something that in the post Jane Jacobs era, who believed the more street corners the better the city, which I believe is a general truth. We wouldn't have done that, but we did. We took the whole six blocks and put them in one. There were only a few kinds of run down houses on it that weren't allowed demolition, and the only guy we had trouble getting rid of was the man with the wall walkers, I don't know if Tony remembers him, but there was a man who lived in an apartment and ghosts would walk through the walls and trouble him all the time and he would tell us long stories about that and eventually he did get out. Last thing I wanted to say, was also said last night, these projects were seen as independent elements in the city. They were not seen as, Gurgula, each building is a part of something large. I don't think they were conceived as parts of something larger. They were conceived as prototypes, that would stand alone and could be on one site and perhaps on another site and perhaps on another site. And the idea that you would distort the prototype to fit not only circumstance but also physical context I think was one that was not a powerful idea in those works. Now, I quit with that and go to Ted Liebman.

TED LIEBMAN: We've heard a lot of reminiscing, and everyone at UDC loved their job, loved being there. That's very important, but I think the most important aspect of that is we really felt both the honor and responsibility of public service and that's something that must be renewed if we're going to have other programs that will work again. My job in Ed Logue's terminology was to seek out and recommend the best design talent with a passion for building housing. Get them on board and then keep them out of trouble. That translates to architectural selection which involved the local offices, reviewing qualifications, design portfolios, matching architects with projects. All projects were commissioned by the UDC. We did no in-house design work. Once the project began, we reviewed the work, gave schematic approval, but then it went on to the people who had overall responsibility in the design and construction department. Yes, there was tension between our two departments. It was again, the dual responsibility and the tension was there, but it was a creative tension. When engineering threatened the architect, because of a design issue, we were the architect's support. At times when architects thought something was going wrong on a construction, or there were substitutions being made, I, at rather a young age, would be called to go on site and I would act terribly knowledgeable and say, "I don't think that can be done that way, and we better just remove that wall, and do it over", and I was told what to say by the more experienced people.

We should discuss architectural selection today. I think it is now controversial the way we did it. Just as problematic to me is the way it is done today. We are private architects now and we fill out lots of forms and we're on lots of lists for public agencies and they evaluate our work and sometimes it takes years for you to through a lottery system, be called in, but then when you're finally called in and you fill out the forms, the results are, the scores are based on a listing, a very quantitative listing, and I'm wondering if that really gets the true talent, the true excitement, the true desire for doing that particular job, or just gets the one who has done it 42 times before and the one who has the proper balance of engineering services that have done it a million times before. UDC was a client for architects. It's great to commission fine architects to design housing in new communities, but the best outcome pairs a fine architect with an informed client that can give both direction and inspiration. Bill Chaffee was the first chief architect at UDC, and chose most of the first round of architects. He had an enormously great talent for doing that and many of those results you can see in the exhibit, and I hope you all go back to the exhibit which is

divorced from this location today but will be up for three months with a study table where you can hear interviews [of architects] and it really is a marvelous resource for everyone.

My UDC contribution I believe can be paired down to adding perhaps livability as an additional piece of the complexity of the design. Hopefully making us a more responsible provider. The live-in: Nina and I and our very young children lived in Europe doing research, prior to my assuming my position, and Ed Logue was very interested in the live-in program. He in fact, was very interested in children and that's why he supported the low rise-high density housing program. He believed that families shouldn't be relegated to elevator dependent structures on double loaded corridors. He supported these efforts and he loved the idea of living in. He thought that it would do two things: One would make UDC personnel more responsible because they would realize what they were working for. And number two, it would really get feedback that could make our work improve each and every year. By 1973, all UDC personnel would live in projects for one or two weeks a year, and live in projects that were outside of New York City, your normal business city, so you really could learn from that experience.

Architects began living-in, and you heard that Richard Meier lived in his own project and I guess that's comeuppance of a certain sort. We instituted qualitative criteria and a more rigorous process needed to occur. There were lots of prescriptive requirements. HUD gave us a lot of requirements. In fact, HUD had a program called Operation Breakthrough at that time, and they had two volumes of criteria, and the criteria were basically on fire control. We learned exhaustively how fire could occur from the outside of a building going in, and from the inside of a wall going out. And we learned in hundreds of pages how to solve that problem, but we never learned anything qualitative on how to make people enjoy their homes and their neighborhoods. And in a sense, our entire cyclical process that we created through the live-in, through having students review ways of denoting both criteria, qualitative criteria for the home and for the street and the neighborhood, in a way to get feedback that would in cyclical process inform each and every years' work.

The post construction evaluation that happened, the live-in debriefings, all really lead to that. It's interesting that although 1973 was a watershed year in the Nixon housing freeze, it did not really begin to slow UDC down. 1973 and '74 were not years that our department slowed down. We pushed forward. In fact, several initiatives occurred after the freeze. Tony is going to discuss the entire 1971, '72 low rise-high density effort. That involved Michael Kirkland and Tony Pangaro's enormous contribution to the low rise-high density prototype along with the Institute's work, and the day care center prototype which seems to be shoved in the background because that wasn't our major purpose, but when I Vito and Robinson who did the first application of that day care prototype and Barry Jackson who did another application and feels its one of his best works during his lifetime. The advance of the criteria studies by graduate school interns was very important and we all sort of enjoyed learning and codifying things in a way that would inform the future. Franklin Becker's "Design for Living," a qualitative environmental psychology based evaluation, not a normal kind of evaluation, the kind that you saw here today and the kind that only could happen after that period, because we felt that environmental psychologists were an integral part of design.

In 1974, Alan Melting wrote the program for the Roosevelt Island housing competition. That's something that never got built. It however, was a very important element of where UDC was heading. The purpose of the competition was to find solutions for very high density urban housing. The low rise-high density housing was ideal for families with children, but there needed to be a solution that was double that density. Inner urban solutions that could handle New York City, and other inner city areas, where land costs were high, the structure made it possible to have and it surely required elevator dependency, but now who should be in those elevators? What could be different about the lower parts of the buildings and the upper parts of the buildings? How do you take elderly and single people and small families and large families and integrate them into a series or one structure. And on the second phase of the Northtown, where 1000 units of housing was going to be, that was the site selected. It was unfortunately the very end, actually my and Alan's last day at UDC, we were fired after we gave the prize money to winners to the first phase of the competition. We were allowed to stay on through the competition. So that was an extraordinary challenge. Had, and it turned out that there were four finalists, had any of those four finalists become the second stage winner and been built, there would be probably the best demonstration of inner urban, mixed income, mixed family type housing ever built. We were really excited with the first results. The demise of UDC stopped it. We feel terrible about that. I hope we'll discuss more about those possibilities that were lost and just advances in the expansion of what design meant.

I'm glad we discussed Roosevelt Island. I don't want to discuss it again, because my time is limited, but I must say it was a very important project, and right now, there are always these great words that we use, now we're all very involved with smart growth and green buildings and sustainable communities. Roosevelt Island, had it been built in Ed Logue's vision of Roosevelt Island, it would have had 5000 families of mixed income, most importantly. It would have been sustainable in the true environmental economic and social ramifications of full sustainability, and as we heard, was a car free island, with an entire ring of green pathways that allowed recreation, a sports park facility that integrated school children and residents, a barrier free island, as someone said before barrier free was a word that we knew. It involved historic preservation where it was usable. Blackwell House was made to be a home for the island. The church became a usable church, and the monuments were not going to be centerpieces of housing projects, they were going to be monuments in themselves. There were I think eight parks that would exist on Roosevelt Island. Now even the Roosevelt Memorial design by Lou Kahn, his last project, during his lifetime, is threatened from being built from people who want to watch fireworks instead. These visions that may have had some impracticalities, also were in fact, visions, and that's where I'd like to leave you, except to say that my love for housing and neighborhoods became my life's work and it's a product of being a very eager student of Ed Logue. Thank you

ROBERT CAMPBELL: You mentioned the Roosevelt Island housing competition and I would just continue my earlier comment about distortion of prototypes, but one of the winners, and probably the most favorite winner was Kuo Sung Woo, who adapted phase II of Riverview, which he had worked on, to the site and improved on it and make something better than the Sert office had ever made I think. We'll now hear from Rolf Ohlhausen, who is a partner in Ohlhausen DuBois Architects, who was previously a partner in Prentice & Chan, Ohlhausen, so there was I guess a

kind of serial beheading that has left him now on top.

ROLF OHLHAUSEN: I joined Lo-Yi Chan and Tim Prentice in 1970, and so the firm was known, we were together 26 years, Prentice and Chan comma Ohlhausen, and in 1970, there was an exhibit in New York City called, "Forty Under Forty Architects."

I haven't seen a list lately, but I wouldn't be surprised if a good percentage of the architects retained at UDC were on that list. We were, I would say looking back, mid-century modernists, trained as mid-century modernist. We had reformer zeal. We really did believe that architecture was a social art. And I think we got Ted's attention when we were in an organization called, "Architects for Social Responsibility." And Ted I think saw us all setting off black balloons at Bryant Park to protest the Vietnam War, so you have to think of all of us in that context as well. In school at that time, housing was really the most, I think the most important building type. And for a young firm that had absolutely no experience in housing to have the opportunity to do public housing, it was a very heady experience. I wanted to also mention since this came up on housing, Lluís Sert, who certainly had an influence on Ted, who was a critic of Ted, and mine as well, and you worked for that firm. I came to Harvard in '59 and I was at first very upset because that month, that, in September of that year, the Palace du Batista, that Sert designed was published, and that went against my social grain at the time, but it was also the same month that Castro appeared, Fidel Castro at Harvard Yard, and the subsequent housing that Sert did, who was a fantastic housing architect, somehow today it all makes sense, but at that time it didn't.

Let me speak a bit about the projects that we did. To give you an understanding of the scope and range of things that we did, I would say, well within five years, and I should also say parenthetically that these were our clients, I never saw Ed Logue either, and Ted and Tony were not intimidating as I heard Ed Logue was to some, but were extraordinarily supportive and provided the guidance that we really needed. Let me just describe the projects and I think that really talks, without the slides, about design. The first wave was Twin Parks, and Tim and Lo-Yi worked on Twin Parks. Twin Parks I and Twin Parks II. Twin Parks I was a simple slab, but it was a contextual building. It had duplex apartments and floor thru apartments, a rather extraordinary mix of unit types. The second project was a cluster scheme that also included a K-6 school. Both those projects were knitted into the surrounding urban fabric. I started at that time while Twin Parks was already in process. A contrasting project in Albany, New York, rowhousing, stick built on a very steep hill in Albany. Both those projects, Twin Parks and Arbor Hill, were then among other UDC projects exhibited at the Museum of Modern Art, I think it was called, "Another Chance for Cities."

TED LIEBMAN: It was at the Whitney in October of 1970

ROLF OHLHAUSEN: I'm corrected. It was, and so already there was a lot of interest and attention in these new housing initiatives. So, after Arbor Hill, there was pressure to increase the number of units being built. We were asked to do something that at first was a bit of a shock. We were asked to replicate one of the Twin Parks projects, the slab, in Coney Island. Twin Parks, if I remember, had 120 families, 120 units. It was 200 feet wide and if you go to Coney Island, you will see three of the Twin Parks slabs in a stepped pattern, 600 feet long for 360 families. That

was a rather extraordinary jump, and it tells you something about the pressure, and the kind of thinking that went on to solve these problems. Then, the, the project that I worked on that I think was rather challenging, and extraordinary was, we were asked to do a prototype for housing for the elderly, and the prototype that we came up with was essentially a kit of parts. I remember coming to a meeting with Ted, and simply putting some wood blocks on the table that I had made the previous weekend and showing the combinations of standard unit parts. By that relatively simple idea, we in fact built three very diverse projects all over the city of New York, Niagara Falls, in Rome, New York and Rochester. The idea was very simple. The structural method was plank and beam because plank and beam, which is motel construction, we were able to extrude that up to 11 stories but also build 2 and 3 story units. So you had a lot of flexibility with height. You could develop all kinds of responses to different sites, and also very important, we delivered those prototypes at \$25,000 per unit. And it went extraordinarily quickly because you could predict costs. We knew the construction methods. We were able to repeat details from our original plans. So it was a kind of prototype replication. I suspect we would have done more if we hadn't run out of time. The postscript is that after our days at UDC, I produced one more replication of the prototype in Mt. Clair, New Jersey, for the New Jersey Housing Authority. The problem there was when we showed them visualizations of the project, they were concerned that it looked too rich. Because the problem of, in their heads, that this did not look like public housing, but it got built.

I should also point out that we did a good number of projects, but believed and were in fact a collaborative practice. Lo-Yi did a number of projects. I did. Tim at the beginning, though Tim left us at some point to become a sculptor, and Frances Wickham was also a partner. Frances worked on Lockport, New York, the Erie Canal, housing and a garage. The parking structure got built. It is the shape of a perfect wheel and it worked. Then, the, two projects on Roosevelt Island, Lo-Yi did. One was a sports park, which had gymnasium, pools, other sports facilities. And this is not a rumor, it is a fact, they did have a squash court for Ed Logue. And Lo-Yi also designed the tramways. I think he had the most fun because in doing his research, he spent I think about two or three weeks in Switzerland checking out tramways. The urban tramway that connects Roosevelt Island to Manhattan is rather interesting that all tramways in the world go this way. At Roosevelt Island, they start at sea level, they're lifted up, cross over and end at sea level, and are powered by what I still believe to be the largest electric motor in the city of New York. I think the UDC was and remains an ideal client for architects. I think that Ted and Tony were the kinds of people that provided such opportunities, so much encouragement and so much guidance that to this day I think that, in my case, I think that my best work remains the work we did at UDC. Thanks.

ROBERT CAMPBELL: Tony Pangaro was one of these, I guess the number two guy in Ted Liebman's office at the UDC, has had a remarkable career in Boston where we both live, first as a transportation planner, and now as a developer. And he's going to talk about, in part, the low rise-high density initiative.

ANTHONY PANGARO: Thanks Bob. I thought I'd try to step back from this a little bit and give you a sense of what's going through my head today. There are a few questions that come to mind having sat through half of this panel and the two earlier ones yesterday and today, and that

is, what do we really think we were doing at UDC. A lot of what we've heard so far is oriented to the answer to that question, we thought we were doing God's work in a certain way, and I think we were doing it at a time when people weren't doing very good work, and we did that by hiring good architects and giving them the best instructions and the best set of marching orders that we could. The question that arises in my mind is you know, what did we actually do? Did we learn anything from it, on a going-forward basis. Let me try to come to each of those in a short way in the next couple minutes. After we had people like Rolf, Tim, and his associates, working with us for a few years, Ted in particular thought it was important to stop and think. And it was hard to think in those days because the mandate was to get the stuff out the door as fast as we could build it, and we all thought there was a housing crisis. We all thought cities were crumbling and we all thought we could do something about it. So, it wasn't necessarily easy to stop and say, well wait a minute, is this really what we had in mind, is this really working the way we thought it should?

But with Ted's guidance and with Ed Logue's tolerance, I think is the right word, and encouragement, later, we tried to think again about what we were doing. Were the projects that we had produced in the first round, the things that showed in up in "Another Chance for Cities," exhibit, were they good enough? Were they as good as we thought they were certainly was the right question. And to try to extrapolate from that analysis, was the criteria that would make them perform as they were expected to, or better yet perform in a way that we can only dream of at that point. And Ted's idea, and he allowed Mike Kirkland and I the time to do this, to allow us to step away from people like Rolf and his colleagues, to examine what was really going on. And we did it in a broad way I think. We looked at not only what UDC had built, but what the City of New York had built in 1939 under the housing act of '39. Much of which survives today. Much of which is actually very good and well maintained. The objective of that analysis resulted, the objective was a resultant set of criteria, where we tried to codify what we were thinking was good about what was known as a set of instructions to architects. A very different set of instructions than the uniform housing code might have dictated, or certainly the HUD standards would dictate.

And I guess I would say that it was hard to communicate that, but if I were to try to distill it today, I think we had a couple very simple ideas. One was that all of the housing that had been produced, when it did not succeed, did not succeed because people had no stake in it. They didn't see how they owned it, and in fact, that was a principle criticism of what we were doing, people were not given ownership positions. The financial and political mechanisms wouldn't allow that, although we knew that at the time, there wasn't anything we could do about it. So we went to the next level, which was how can we occupy the territory. How can people who are in these projects possess them in a way that a renter might possess or any of us might like to use something. And that carried through in a set of criteria that had to tell the architect I think, because architects didn't really understand this concept. I don't mean to say that they didn't know that spaces had to have uses, but they didn't really have the ability to relate the use of the space to how it would actually work, much less to the shape of the space and who should surround it or what should surround it.

So we had a few rules. Let's occupy this territory. Let's not have spaces that no one has control over like elevators or like corridors, as has been pointed out here already today. And on

the positive side, let's make sure that the spaces that are created are possessed, occupied in a positive way. So that when we created outdoor spaces, we wanted people to understand that they should be used, and to understand who should use them. And furthermore, to make sure that they weren't used in an undesirable way. We then moved from that level to saying all right this is a nice set of ideas, characteristics, that we can tell these architects to do, but we'll never really know if they mean anything, unless we try to do it ourselves.

So, the idea came out of that and Ted was not only the proponent of this, but I think was able to easily convince Ed Logue that we should do it. Let's actually build something using the criteria. Something very literally an application of those criteria. To use Bob's words, a prototype, but a prototype that had to perform. It wasn't just a theoretical prototype but something that had to be, not just built, not just talked about, but lived in and then evaluated. And Ed, only Ed could do this, behind my wildest dreams and maybe even Michael Kirkland, who's here in the first row, who's a bigger dreamer than I, than most people I know. Ed said, you know what we're going to do? We're not just going to build this, we're going to build it in two places. One in the heart of Manhattan and one in a slightly dense location, which turned out to be Staten Island. I said Manhattan, Manhattan actually became Brownsville in Brooklyn, but the big idea was that we're going to tell everybody about it before we do it, and the best way to do that is at the Museum of Modern Art, dead center in the City of New York. Which was a totally radical idea for us. We were building housing for people with no money and we were going to show it at the Museum of Modern Art. It was in its own way insanely creative and only Ed could do that kind of thing. So it scared the hell out of us, it scared me, because we had a commitment that Ed wrenched out of the arms of Arthur Drexler to show it there, at a certain time, on a certain date, and we didn't have a place to build it yet. And I can remember Ted and I worrying that we would design this thing and it would not be built in time.

The AIA guide according to Susan Saegert's reading of it, called this project the low rise-high density prototype and its actual application at Marcus Garvey Park Village in the Brownsville section of Brooklyn. A scholastic thesis, and I think the word pretentious was also applied to it, which I think in its own way is accurate, although you know we wear these labels often proudly, it was pretentious only to the degree that we thought we could do a better job of this than we had been doing ourselves, and it was a thesis only to the degree that we thought we understood the principles because we had been building this stuff, but we weren't sure. So in that sense, we wear the label. We tried to show ourselves that we could do this better than we had been doing it, because we were actually asking the question, what are we doing here? Are we doing what we think we're doing? And is it good enough? I think the student presentations about the project are really interesting. I'd like to know more about what people really think who live there and Susan Saegert's work tells us that many people thought it was luxury housing in some way. I'm talking about Brownsville which was a very tough place and still is a very tough place. At the time, people had very little to look forward to, very little to hope for. Now, what we didn't do that we thought we were doing is I think the way to learn from this.

This project while it was a prototype, it was meant to apply quite specifically to locations like that. It deliberately kept open existing city streets. It did not create super blocks. We departed in a major way from an important architectural paradigm which we felt did not work at all in loca-

tions like this. It was high density. In fact as high density as many high rise projects of their time. Not because you were stacking people up high, but at 55 units to the acre, which we achieved in Brownsville by the way, we were as dense as certainly Twin Parks and places of that sort, which left large amounts of open space in return for stacking the stuff as high as we could go. What we didn't do is what we knew we weren't doing. And then I'll tell what I think we didn't do because we didn't know that we should do it. We didn't have the ability to complete the picture. We have the ability to provide all of the other things that should go with the place where you live. Beginning at the smallest level we were able to build a day care center to, we built a community building, which is evidence I offer to those who rewrite the AIA guide next time, that we were conscious of social fabric and the necessity for social infrastructure as its called today. And we weren't just acting in a theoretical way. We were really trying to do the best we could. Small pieces of evidence.

What we could not do in Brownsville was rebuild the schools. What we could not do was provide jobs. What we could not do was give people social status and pride. We tried to do that in the small ways, by giving them a good place to live and a few social support structures, but we were the Urban Development Corporation, we weren't the government of the United States of America, by any means. We were not even the City of New York at its level of providing goods and services to people who deserve as much as anyone else, but can't afford it. What I think we weren't smart enough to perceive, and I don't mean to end on a downward note, but to suggest that this is a way of thinking about a problem that has never been solved, is essentially to resolve the conflict, and I'll put it in todays terms, because Bob has done that in a better way than I could have thought of before I got here, we didn't resolve the conflict between a prototype and its context.

We didn't really solve the problem in the right way. We were a bunch of kamakaze architects, you know dropping this project into Brownsville, in the best way we could, but we didn't really see ourselves that way. We were trying to fit this rather particularly to this site, but I think as I suspect Roberta Gratz will tell you later today, we were operating at the wrong scale, at the wrong level, although what you saw here is fairly fine grain. We were still imposing it, and I think we've learned a lot since then. We were the product of our own time, and I'll set the context for you this way. In the late '60's, we were coming out of a lot of turmoil. We all knew that there was a better way to do things. We all loved each other very much, and we worked very hard together and very carefully together, but we only represented the client. You were kind enough to say we were the client, but we were paying the bills at the time. But we knew we represented someone else, we just didn't know how to act effectively on their behalf. There are signs since then that there are better ways to do that. Community Development Corporations play an important role. They were fledgling ideas in those days. None of them really really existed. And they were often used as a sort of front for what we were hoping to do, and I'm not speaking just of UDC, I think this happened around the country.

That's gotten much better today, at a time when the federal government is totally abdicated any responsibility and where the states are doing the same, and the cities cannot do these things alone. So, it's easy to talk about what you'd recommend, but it's very hard to change where we are--so young students its up to you. I would just end on one note. I think the UDC was absolutely the right entity at the right time at the right place. We today can be very critical of its



approach, its authoritarian aspect of it. Bob Litke earlier described his desire at the time to work with local public officials. I think that's absolutely true, and more essential today than ever before. And if there's any hope on a going forward basis, it has to be found there. Thanks.

ROBERT CAMPBELL: I need to correct my introduction of telling that Tony came to Boston as a transportation planner. That's such an understatement. He came to Boston because an interstate highway had been killed, extended from the center of Boston way down to the southwest, and it had already been cleared and the right of way was there and they hired him to figure out what to do there, and one of the things was an orange line transit line, but also a series of parks. And I just wanted to throw in one other thing in connection to what Tony said about Roosevelt Island and Yonkers, of the skip stop, which the elevator stops only every third floor, and then the two floors in between can go all the way through the building with windows at both sides and ventilation that gives you an elevation, that was very important to Sert, where every third floor something different happens, instead just a grid of graph paper. But when on Roosevelt island, we built our second project. The first one was a 236 subsidized affordable housing project. The second one was Mitchell-Lama market rate housing project, and the UDC would not let us do skip stop for people with money. They don't want to climb up and down stairs to get into their apartments, and we weren't allowed to do it. We faked it. You can see on the elevation, every third floor something different happens but it doesn't.

The next speaker, Suzanne Stephens is, I'm sure you all know, one of the most prominent architectural writers and editors and especially at the magazine Architectural Record. Suzanne.

SUZANNE STEPHENS: OK, thank you. I should just make a quick reference to the bio which has me as Deputy Director of "Architectural Record." It's a little grand for what I actually am called as Deputy Editor, and deputy editor includes more housekeeping than director, so I just want to make sure that's clear

TED LIEBMAN: We want you to have a future Suzanne.

SUZANNE STEPHENS: Yes, I like that title but, I'll bring it up. At any rate, when I was writing back in the thirty some odd years ago on UDC for "Architectural Forum" and also I was with PA, "Progressive Architecture" in those days too, there were certain things about the context of architecture that were very, we were very aware of, and some of them have been brought up today, but I thought I would bring out a little, just touch on the design context in those years so that we can see where we were in terms of architectural design and why the UDC was so unique in its selection of architects. The establishment besides Sert, included Louis Kahn of course, he was the pioneer, the master, the maestro, the God, and he was working on the Kimball at that time, around '73, when Twin Parks first was published in "Architectural Forum." I wrote an essay on it and Ken Frampton and Miles Weintraub wrote essays and I edited theirs. At any rate, so Louis Kahn, Ed Barnes, Roche Dinkallo, Ulrich Franzen, Philip Johnson of course, and I.M. Pei, did I say him? No. S.O.M., and Venturi and Rauch were kind of out there, coming up, noticeable John Johanson was always getting involved in architectural you know, big splashy, publishable things that people were paying attention to, but the kids in those days, who had just a few houses and other small projects, they were Richard Meier, Charles Gwathmey and Bob Seigel, and

Pasanella, Polshek was a kid, and Prentice & Chan, Ohlhausen, it was quite amazing.

You'll notice what's different from today's kind of line up would be that there are no internationals, we didn't have this international global situation. We didn't have the star architects. Rem Koolhaas had just arrived in this country and was studying at Cornell and then moved to the Institute where he was working on "Delirious New York." Some of the people who are now prominent today, in terms of total media attention, were around, but they were still sub rosa. And also, I should say that the architectural magazines were covering UDC and we were very supportive, but we were also critical. However, being an architectural magazine, your criticism is never really noticed because you're not the "New York Times" or the "Boston Globe," but I have to point out just for the sake of architecture magazines, which I'm committed to my whole life, in saying that, in the "Architectural Forum" pieces, Ken Frampton brought out that Gio Pasanella's Twin Parks had many strengths but that the pilotti borrowed from Le Corbusier were really not going to work as it created a kind of problem area in urbanistic terms for the community there. It was a wasteland with ill maintained foyers, and I pointed out, this is not new in 1973, that the construction was often shoddy, in terms of low budgets, that the room sizes, and especially the bedrooms were very small because it was FHA minimum standards. The minimum became the maximum, and so that you had these 8' by 10' bedrooms for two people, or something like that, I could be corrected, so you had small rooms, and maintenance in '73, I was calling out was always a problem even then.

As I was interviewing people in Twin Parks about their having lived there for about a year or less, and I should say that Lo-Yi Chan and Rolf Ohlhausen's schemes, 511, came out the best in that whole article. But I did also point out that architects tended to focus on one or two things. If they focused on the public space, that was great, but the apartment layouts were ordinary. Or if they came up with interesting apartment layouts, then the public spaces were often ordinary. It is interesting though, when you go back and look at what Bob Seigel and Charlie Gwathmey were doing in their housing that we saw today with the courtyards in Perinton, and also what Werner Seligmann was doing up in Ithaca with the hill, and those are the incredible legacies too. Marcus Garvey was always going to have a problem because it had to be, as you say, dropped in to an urban site that existed, and often the best housing then that was done was actually vest pocket, what they called vest pocket scatter site housing, and it still would be good, but sometimes you have to go with the towers as we found out UDC did. They tried to as Bob Campbell said, not make them look like a piece of graph paper but, you know, there are the problems of budget and construction.

Now, let me ask some questions, what do you do as a design model, what can you take out of the UDC? We know we don't have leaders today. We don't have the money, the subsidies. We don't have the will any longer, and in those days, the social responsibility among the younger generation, the practitioners was amazing. It came out of a lot of things. The Vietnam war, and I too was apart of the Social Responsibility with the flag in the park and all that kind of stuff. So, we were all protesting everything and this was the cultural moment. Since then, the UDC officials have often gone into private real estate and done well. The architects have gone on to museums and other things and have done well, and journalists have not done so well financially, but we write about museums, and we write about large institutional works, and we do and often

in the private sector, we do what we can do. Everybody, in a sense follows the money. I mean except for this group here, who's willing to come and converse today, but how we can get some of the old days, the idealism that we had back then and the methods back on the table today. So what I want to do is ask a few questions that are related to design. For example, Ted you worked with young willful architects, who were idealistic. Did you feel that you ever gave in too easily to them, or were you pretty tough on Richard Meier who said he lived in his projects, but I also wrote about gang wars occurring in the plaza in his project, so...

TED LIEBMAN: My major problem with Richard Meier was that I thought that a nice pattern on the outside of a building on the facade, when it was big window, small window, big window, small window, big window, small window, would mean living room, bedroom, living room, bedroom, living room, bedroom, when it didn't but it still was big window, small window, big window, small window, I had a problem, and I voiced the problem, and you should just please go upstairs and look. But let, I'll tell you one other thing about Richard Meier's project which was one of the first live-in projects, and what we did learn from Richard Meier's project, that had 8' by 10' bedrooms, because we had to do that in the first instance. We couldn't go beyond that. It was a requirement. Remember, the comment that Rolf made about New Jersey not liking his New York prototype because it looked too rich? Washington didn't like good, they liked ordinary, because they honestly felt and still feel that people who move into subsidized housing don't quite deserve it as much as we do, where, because we can afford to buy our own homes and of course be heavily subsidized by the federal government by doing that.

So, in the first live-in--I'm telling a story: the general manager was going to be the first person to move in to a 2 bedroom apartment on a double loaded corridor and I knew that interior kitchens on double loaded corridor buildings sometimes were a little stuffy. And, it was July. And two air conditioners were moved in. I asked my secretary to buy the furniture for the apartment. I didn't get it at a good modern place. I asked her to buy it, and she said, well, what sort of furniture should I get? And I said, fancy. Fancy furniture. Big headboards that won't fit in an 8 by 10 bedroom. And he moved in shortly after I removed the two air conditioners. With the beds in the bedroom and the heavy rococo furniture in the living room, the standards at UDC were raised shortly after that. So, it, I think what UDC learned, and what Ed Logue wanted them to learn by the live-in, was that we all are humans who deserve wonderful places to live. And he tried to create that and we learned by that live-in that we had to create it too. So that was the best way to raise the standards, and we said after that, HUD is going to have to deal with it.

SUZANNE STEPHENS: If ahh, what I was asking actually was...

TED LIEBMAN: I didn't answer her question. You all noticed.

SUZANNE STEPHENS: What did you learn working with young architects? What would you do today to sort of get the certain things to come out better, more sophisticated?

TED LIEBMAN: I wouldn't be 31 years old, and be in slight awe of some of those people even though I tried to act bold at that time. And in a sense I was probably too young for my job, but I probably had enough energy to overcome that.

SUZANNE STEPHENS: OK, and I'd like to ask Tony on the same level, I think you must have been about...

TED LIEBMAN: Eleven!

SUZANNE STEPHENS: Eleven, and you were working, you brought in on the low rise-high density, you brought in the Institute for Architecture and Urban Studies which was doing urban design, and as well as housing and all that, but they were looked on, let's face it, as being a little on the academic cloud line, above the cloud line in academia, and yet somehow they have this, they're brought in to do a UDC low rise-high density prototype, and somehow it ends up at the Modern as a show, and then it gets built at Marcus Garvey. How was it working with them, and what would you advise if we were to try to do that again today? How do we learn from that?

ANTHONY PANGARO: Well, let me tell you first, the deal was that Arthur [Drexler], I assume everybody knows this, 20 years later, 30 years later, the deal was that Arthur was chairman of the board of IAUS, and also the curator of the architectural section at the Modern, so the deal was, and this was Ed's conception, we'll fund it, your IAUS guys can design it. You put it in the museum because we want to be there. We want people to understand the level of what's going on here is at that level, and then we'll build it. And the deal was fulfilled. It was not easy by any means, Michael and I spent a fair amount of time explaining what we already knew and took for granted to a bunch of fellows who had never done it before. But that was the deal. We certainly didn't complain about that. I will tell you one other story. We were getting very close to crunch time, I mean we were getting to the end of it and we were all running thin on patience because we, there weren't enough of us working on the project, and the division of labor became an issue at the end, not the substance of the project, because they were all very good at understanding and trying to do what we all agreed was the right course of action. There was no disagreement about what the job was in terms of the outcome. The disagreement was, how beautiful the drawings would be, and we had Craig Hoggetts doing very beautiful and romantic Los Angeles style renderings, which we were a little troubled by as an image, particularly given the context of Brownsville but, at the end of the day, it had to be shown at the Museum of Modern Art. So, we found a way to resolve the conflict.

TED LIEBMAN: The working drawings were done by David Todd & Associates, and he was very helpful, but then again Arthur Baker who worked with Ken Frampton at that time was extraordinarily good and they were patient with us and we were patient with them.

ANTHONY PANGARO: And Peter Wolf, who I think is not an architect, was a wonderful administrator. I mean he really did keep his eye on the budget and the ball. Couldn't have done it without him on it.

SUZANNE STEPHENS: OK, so they proved to be more pragmatic than their reputation at the time. In the interest of anecdotal full disclosure, I wrote a little piece in "Architect Forum" in July of '73 saying that the--it was unsigned, because it was just in that section, it was unsigned, and saying that you know there was this kind of nexus of power and influence where the Institute somehow

got this commission, the UDC got the position in the Modern for its low rise-high density show, and all because of the connection with Ed Logue and Arthur and the back and forth, and that other low rise-high density housing was being built in San Francisco for example, that the Modern should have had a more national point of view about that, being the Museum of Modern Art. Anyway...

ANTHONY PANGARO: That wasn't the deal.

SUZANNE STEPHENS: Yeah, but today, I would say, today worked for the Institute later, for skylines. So, life goes around, comes around. I'm writing about him today on the memorial in Berlin. So things happen. At any rate, I think Bob has a question.

ROBERT CAMPBELL: We're going to the audience, I'm not going to ask any questions. Let's try to make them brief.

AUDIENCE: A question and comment. First of all, when you talk about skip stop housing. It's wonderful, unless there's a fire, because God forbid, a firefighter comes into a smoke filled hall, goes into an apartment and falls down a flight of stairs. That's the problem with skip stop housing. That's one reason it's not...

ROBERT CAMPBELL: I'd like to comment on that before you go on because we had a great deal of interaction with the Yonkers fire department on that issue, and we ended up sprinklering all those buildings and having fire escapes only for the lower buildings, because the firemen said, we don't want to go down into heat and smoke if its rising against us. Sert was very unhappy about that. I don't find it unreasonable myself.

AUDIENCE: Roosevelt Island Eastwood do not have sprinklers. The apartments are not sprinklered, the corridors are. By the way, our current developers would be glad to live-in because they could all pick Penthouses to live in.

ROBERT CAMPBELL: The Athenians discovered in the time of Alsobiedes that there is such a thing as too much democracy. When I started writing, I was very much for community involvement in the design of the world because it was really very much about them. I've come around about 45 degrees on that anyway, because I see all over the place in my city of Boston, good things do not happen because somebody doesn't like them. It's reached the point that you can only build something that nobody hates, and that means you get a lowest common denominator of development. And my theory is that for ten years out of every century, we should appoint a dictator and all the good things would get done, and then he would gracefully retire and we'd go back to democracy.

TED LIEBMAN: Bob Litke recently invited me to Houston to deal with some issues that they have in Houston. What I noticed there is the city has very cleverly created enough community development corporations, each wanting their own turf, that no one is able to do anything. And they'd like 500 hundred of them, and then they would have no interference from anyone.

AUDIENCE: I'd like to make a quick comment about Tony's question of what people of Marcus Garvey think about the project, I want to recount a talk that Ted gave about a year and a half ago at the housing committee, and after the talk, a young gentlemen got up and he's an architect and he grew up at Marcus Garvey and credits that decision in his life to growing up there.

TED LIEBMAN: Skip stop elevators can no longer occur because the disabled laws do require that 100 percent of apartments are accessible or adaptable and you cannot have a full bathroom on a stairway down.

ROBERT CAMPBELL: You can have a full bathroom all right, but you've got the stairway, that's the problem .

AUDIENCE: I'm Kathleen Kelly. I was under Linda Meyers, the project manager for relocation, acquisition and relocation and clearance for Twin Parks sites. And I worked on the model City's program that allowed those sites which were purchased by the city after the 60's. I was subsequently project manager of Twin Parks Project for UDC, also under Linda. And later Bob Litke, and I want to comment on the subject on bottom-up versus top-down planning. What I noticed in the model cities process was that there was this tremendous pent up reserve of having spent so many years not having any substantive part in determining the future of their physical community, people felt that community participation, the power of community participation was the power to say no. And I think a large part of the difficulty that we have of this sort of thing that you describe Bob, and that I know is taking place in Houston and New York and other places, is because this is a very new thing really. People have never been trained to be good planners, citizen planners. People don't learn in grammar schools about streets and parks and schools and community facilities and housing and how all these things work together. And they have not been trained as citizen participants. How to deal with those things responsibly. And its going to take at least a generation and very concerted effort to turn that around. Subsequent to UDC, I also worked on trying to do a master plan for the city of Newark, and led a year long series of workshops there, and the same thing happened.

ROBERT CAMPBELL: I agree with you completely. Sometimes, I think the world is governed by the only people who are willing to keep drinking cold coffee out of Styrofoam cups at 11pm meetings.

AUDIENCE: My name is Peter Stand, I'm a principal in an architectural planning firm here in New York and I believe very deeply in bottom-up planning. However, I think it is most effective if you were creating all these CDC's, and yet on the governmental level in the City of New York, the Department of City Planning and the Department of City Planning and the Department of Housing Preservation and Development, there is no cohesive entity looking at the City in any realistic way, in my opinion, because we have these neighborhoods that are doing, and the CDC's doing what they should, we have city planning that has no development authority, and we have HPD that's solely looks at housing so any kind of comprehensive planning effort, or redevelopment effort is bound to fall short, in my opinion, and only exists in small pockets. There's no broader municipal, political will to create a more comprehensive view of things, which I think UDC did bring to the picture.

BOB LITKE: Would this distinguished panel of architects agree with my following thought; that the problems we have with government, the problems we have with communities trying to plan and saying no, and the problems we have with the bureaucracy, might be somewhat tempered if the architectural profession would learn to be more coherent and politicize the issues that they need to sell to the public?

ROBERT CAMPBELL: A very good comment.

ROLF OHLHAUSEN: I can respond to that. I think in recent years those of you aware of have been to the Center for Architecture, know that in the city of New York, I would say the culture of our profession at the AIA has changed because we've gone public. The Center for Architecture is on street level as many of you know, engages the public and serves the membership. It's also now attracted city interest and a much wider constituency of builders, developers, manufacturers, fabricators, and so forth. So I think, in some ways we are, we do have a more coherent voice and there is place now where this exhibit is for UDC and you all know about so you can see for yourself that is filling that vacuum.

ROBERT CAMPBELL: We're going to finish but I just wanted to say that I was going to ask a question to the whole panel and maybe we can think about this for this afternoon. You're Ed Logue. You've got political backing. You've got binding power. You've got a federal facet. What do you do in today's world? How do you do it differently? But let's save that for this afternoon. Thank you.