**Creating Models for Local Response in Urban Design in Eastern Europe:
The Role of the Urban Design Research Studio**

George L. Claflen, Jr.
Temple University

INTRODUCTION

Throughout Eastern Europe, the opportunity to introduce new paradigms for urban design has opened up, virtually over night. Spectacular possibilities exist in the cities and regions which have been by-passed by state planned large scale development. Equally demanding are the challenges of re-urbanizing the large scale housing estates produced under "functionalist"/technocratic conditions. The possibility of leapfrogging the failures of urban design in the West and developing a "critical regional" architecture and urbanism suited to this environment and cultural tradition may be within reach. The milieu which faces this need is a truly dynamic one fraught simultaneously with economic hardship and tremendous pent-up demand. The planning and development bureaucracies are in disarray, and architects often polarize their own discussions around rigid aesthetic positions. Under these conditions, the most likely result will be the economically watered-down implementation of-models currently employed in western Europe. Alternatively, in some settings the result may be picturesque symbols of ethnic isolation. Neither result is inevitable, however. The implementation of alternative and locally sensitive solutions depends in part upon creating very quickly a resource base of knowledge about local urban form potentials, and equally viable patterns of organization and management for implementing them. One of the few vehicles in place and potentially capable of conducting such interdisciplinary, provocative, and speculative investigations in urban form is in the hands of the architecture faculties through research based urban design studios.

This paper first surveys the theoretical landscape in which such studios might find themselves and subsequently weaves the educational ideas of the urban design research studio as practiced at several North American schools around the specific conditions of several new and characteristic types of urban design problems emerging in the East.

COGNITIVE PRECEPTS OF DECISION MAKERS

The decisions which will shape this massive round of construction and reconstruction will be made according to the architectural expectations of the decision makers, many of whom will not be architects. Concepts of spatial meaning offered by the architect must compete with those offered by the highway engineer, the economist, the developer, various kinds of planners, lawyers, citizens, politicians, and those representing countries or organizations offering assistance. Denise Scott Brown sees these conflicts as negotiable in the short run through the professionalism of the urban designer, working for the client <u>and</u> in the public interest:

> "Idealistic European architects believe they plan for the people. Skeptical designers should know that plans are made for the people who pay for them. This is not nice but true. Only urban designers who understand it will be able to slip through the cracks and plan according to their social concerns."[1]

URBAN DESIGN IS LOCAL

The urban design scale magnifies the impact of site and context considerations in architectural design. Attempts to universalize architectural principles risk degeneration into a battle of the styles, as Gregotti noted last year of the recent debates in Berlin:

> "It would seem as if the "Berlin question" is purely an excuse for exercises in ego-gratification, rather than a problem full of dramatic implications. Preconceived

formulae are applied, with general correction in terms of colour, to make the atmosphere more Berlin-like, or, in the worst cases, the projects are merely plastic-decorative experiments..."[2]

CRITICIZING CRITICAL REGIONALISM

One way to resist this tendency to universalize urban design is to emphasize local and regional concerns. The most famous recent attempt to relate regionalism and modernism is "critical regionalism" introduced to a wide international audience by Kenneth Frampton in 1983 in three related articles.[3] According to Frampton the centralizing effects of mass culture and industrialized technology tend to produce world of banal images, devoid of any authentic relationship to their location:

"Modern building is now so universally conditioned by optimized technology that the possibility of creating significant urban form has become extremely limited."[4]

leading to "the victory of universal civilization over locally inflected culture."[5] Critical regionalism resists this tendency through its own methodology:

"The fundamental strategy of Critical Regionalism is to mediate the impact of universal civilization with elements derived <u>indirectly</u> from the peculiarities of a particular place ....It may find its governing inspiration in such things as the range and quality of the local light, or in a <u>tectonic</u> derived from a peculiar structural mode, or in the topography of the site."[6]

That there is a distinct hierarchy among the possible "governing inspirations" is made clear later:

"Despite the critical importance of topography and light, the primary principle of architectural autonomy resides in the <u>tectonic</u> rather than the <u>scenographic</u>: . . . "[7]

Frampton's formulation is interesting in that it favors natural conditions such as climate, topography, and site, although placing them below the tectonic in importance. It thus mixes natural and semiotic interpretations. The most obvious difficulty for urban design in Frampton's proposal (despite his extensive use of urban scale images of the dreary result of universalization) is its complete lack of explicit concern for any of the generating conditions of urban form, particularly movement and historic patterns of spatial structure. The discussion is focused upon and even emphasizes the autonomy of the architectural object. Frampton appears even to ignore his own concern that optimized technology is the problem in assuming that there are anywhere nearly enough "peculiar" structural forms or other "tectonic" elements to take on the massive task he has assigned them in carrying the principal load of signifying critical regionalism. This argument can be read to suggest that tectonic form should vary for the aesthetic purpose of regional expression.

In contrast to Frampton's tectonic emphasis, (and implicit quest for a natural authority) Alexander Tzonis and Lianne Lefaivre (who first coined the term critical regionalism) have, in a more recent article influenced by considerations of deconstruction, suggested that critical regionalism embraces a challenging of all assumptions, that a critical condition is created when a building (and by extension, urban design):

"...is self-reflective, self referential, when it contains, in addition to explicit statements, implicit <u>metastatements</u> that make the beholder aware of the artificiality of her or his way of looking at the world."[8]

This introduction of more pointed conflict and historical depth into the model of critical regionalism enriches it and also makes it more provocative as a means to deal with the multiple agendas of urban design.

I have elsewhere argued that regionalism is not a fundamental quality, but a generated quality, generated by the layering of many local responses over time.[9] It is a powerful perceptual quality, but a problematic organizing principle for urban design. The difficulties raised here suggest an indirect approach to the question of regional character. Such an approach would be reinforced by more intense

efforts to record and disseminate perceptual information of <u>local</u> significance, thus providing the intellectual resource necessary for intensely grounded design responses.

The narrowing of the architectural media to a limited number of international publications tends to work in exactly the opposite direction. Because of its relatively specialized nature, discourse on architecture and urban design tends to be focused at major schools and their libraries. While there is considerable concern with local issues at some institutions, the infrastructure of "provincial" knowledge of the environment is very thin. We need regional and local institutions to understand, conserve, and contribute to the making of the environment. Such a conceptual infrastructure might rely much more heavily upon local libraries and architecture schools as both knowledgeable conservators and thoughtful speculators on the qualities of the regional environment.

It is unlikely that any top down call for regionalism or even "critical regionalism" will have a great effect unless there are greater rewards and expectations for localized invention in urban design. What is needed is the development of a culture of spatialized research. According to Gregotti:

> "…it will probably be necessary to implement new types of settlement and development hierarchies, capable of creating points of orientation and significant differences, also by utilizing infrastructural and transport nodes and networks to this end, by coming up with design techniques which are effective for the creation of open spaces on different scales, by regimenting the complex placeless typologies and their contextual realignment, through the use of design principles capable of organising and making sense of highly heterogeneous materials. Above all it will be necessary to reconstitute a culture of the morphology of the environment (which is something quite different from the global aestheticisation we are witnessing today) which will permit the collective, constant, natural widespread care of that morphology, free of the ideologies of infinite variability."[10]

URBAN DESIGN STUDIOS AS RESEARCH AND SIMULATION

Taken together these considerations imply a massive effort to create and recover knowledge ignored for fifty and in some cases sixty years. How could this be done? Will the governments enter into a vast enterprise of supporting the creation of numerous architectural research centers, etc.? While indeed this may occur in some cases, and might indeed be a new, if unlikely, mission for some of the large Soviet style, "Insitutes" of architecture, it is not likely that governments strapped for resources are going to invest in this kind of effort. From the point of view of government decision makers, cafeteria-style selection of prototypes already developed in Western Europe and North America is both efficient and a safeguard against mistakes which might occur due to reliance on untested new methods, and faith in local architects. How then might research in urban form making be applied to these new problems and sites?

A variety of methods which have traditionally been employed in architecture to generate new ideas or to apply existing formal knowledge to new conditions. Competitions, exhibits, institutional and intergovernmental cooperation, and commissioned exemplary projects such as the IBA have all achieved significant results. But none of these approaches has the potential for sustained and cumulative impact of the urban design studio. The studio posture is exactly the right one to investigate these problems through the conduct of research in urban form leading to the development of speculative design prototypes. It is right because it is a sustainable potentially interdisciplinary enterprise which is already in place, independently funded, and potentially insulated from intellectually corrupting influences.

URBAN DESIGN RESEARCH STUDIO DEFINED

The type of studio I am suggesting is the antithesis of the haphazard urban design as large-scale architecture studios, which seemed, for example, to characterize the Berlin Summer Program of 1988. In a revealing quotation one of the visiting faculty described his method:

> "Having studied the plans of the Bundesallee together, I first suggested that the students in my unit should walk down the street, in order to try and pick out what

struck them intuitively as being important. Then I asked them to make some kind of graphic representation of what it was they found important, and also gave them the choice of making some kind of analysis of what they found, and/or some kind of proposal."[11]

If this vague groping for the prerequisites of form is inadequate, what then?

The urban design research studio can be defined as a search for and abstraction of the forces shaping urban form in a particular place carefully constructed for the purpose of investigating a defined set of issues pertaining to the design of urban form. Studios may thus be quite "real" or counterfactual in some respects, but not others. For example, exploring the removal the constraints of existing land use rules. Or (as might have been interesting five years ago, an exploration of form making forces without the communist state apparatus in place).

Such studios, while they may or may not involve interdisciplinary faculty are inherently interdisciplinary in subject matter, in that the form making implications of all urban processes are potentially of interest. The ignorance and antipathy of many architects toward an understanding of the spatial implications of transportation, land use, development process, and urban economic forces, is, for example, one of the reasons for architect's marginal influence over some of the pivotal decisions made in these arenas which shape urban form. Some architects fear that disciplined inquiry will somehow rob them of the autonomy of their architectural will. Denise Scott Brown suggests otherwise:

"Some people worry that highly structured studios will be limiting to the creativity of the students. I have rarely heard such worries from students in the studios themselves, particularly when the subject matter is new and challenging to them."[12]

And she goes on to suggest that in a choice between emphasizing "professionalism" or scholarship that such studios:

"...should emphasize scholarship . . . .professional education requires the conversion of academic scholarship for purposes of action and I believe that at the moment we have insufficient academic scholarship in urban design to convert."[13]

URBAN DESIGN EDUCATION IN NORTH AMERICA

The University of Pennsylvania organized the first contemporary formal program in urban design as a post-professional specialization in North America in the late 50's. Harvard followed, while many other schools such as MIT, Yale, and Berkeley offered options within existing degree curricula structures. Many undergraduate and first professional programs offer one or more studios as a part of their architectural curricula. Many of these programs were founded in dual response to the increasing distance between planning and architectural faculties and the perceived "market" of training designers to work on the large-scale urban renewal projects. Later these programs altered, under the influence first, of advocacy planning, and, later, toward a consideration of developer-oriented large project planning. Rarely, some studios, such as those of Robert Venturi and Denise Scott Brown at Yale in the 60's conducted fundamental research involving the development and application of both new types of formal analysis to the vernacular environment and the exploration of new design ideas directly implied by this analysis. The Learning from Las Vegas studio was the most famous of these.[14]

Three contemporary heirs to this legacy, in very different settings will be reviewed below establish a range of conditions under which the pedagogy of urban design has been investigated in North America.

ARIZONA STATE UNIVERSITY

At Arizona State University in Tempe, Arizona, Tim McGinty organized an urban design studio for architecture students to explore a large site at the edge Phoenix's downtown. His studio, he said is:

"...like good urban design, a team effort, includes the past, has strategies for influencing the future, and is innovative primarily through assembling and reinterpreting existing ideas, rather than through inventing new ones."[15]

In order for the students to focus on design, McGinty felt that it was necessary to bring the interdisciplinary client to the studio and to focus on the schematic collages constructed from known prototypes as a method of directing the focus quite early toward the spaces between buildings rather than the buildings themselves. He discovered that as students considered the application of prototypes to the site, they often did not initially understand the relationship between the size of the prototype and the size of the site. He viewed the collage method as a crucial step in developing among architects the ability to understand urban scale transformations.

"In each case the bottom line for a designer is to discover both "how big is it?" and "how does it fit into its culture?"" [16]

He goes on to define the key characteristic of an urban design idea in the context of his collage method:

"The collages are also a reminder that urban design is not architectural design. First, by using buildings designed by others, students are reminded that the buildings that might actually be built will be different from the ones they found. If they are to appreciate the difference between architecture and urban design, students need to anticipate the dimension of difference there will be between what is initially proposed and what will actually be built. The difference in many cases will be as great as the difference between their first collage and their own design. The challenge is to find themes that survive these differences. To accomplish this, their proposals must be based on something other than tight geometries and style."[17]

TEMPLE UNIVERSITY

In my own collaborative studio at Temple University in Philadelphia, taught for third year students, we organized probes of several distinctly different types of urban problems organized in a corridor to the northeast from City Hall Philadelphia. We used eclectic forms of analysis because we were trying to teach history, and an understanding of basic urban conditions at the same time as we were establishing the context for design.[18]

The studio focused on five distinct districts within the gaze of the giant statue of William Penn which tops City Hall Tower, Philadelphia: Convention Center/Justice Center: an emerging district of great complexity, Chinatown: a vibrant neighborhood with distinct growth possibilities, and many difficult boundaries, Northern Liberties: a reviving middle class neighborhood with a long industrial history pre-dating the city's expansion; Front and Norris: a major break in the grid, compounded by both racial ethnic, and economic discontinuities and opportunities, and Penn Treaty Park: the focus of William Penn's gaze, an underdeveloped but provocative waterfront site.

The studio commenced with a detailed physical analysis of each study area conducted by teams of four. Next, teams of two proposed master plans for each area, and finally individual students developed building proposals within the context of the master plan. The intent of an urban design studio in the curriculum is to expose students to urban phenomena and the tools with which to study them early in their education. As the students began to understand the collage of formal and social processes which have defined the city, the nature of possible intervention within urban form became enriched and defined. For many students this was also the first exposure to teamwork and to an issue structured studio, rather than a student centered studio in which each student does the same problem.

The complexity and diversity of issues considered required the faculty to stretch continuously to stay ahead of the issues which emerged from the student's research. This is the only studio in the curriculum that requires rigorous exploration at both urban and architectural scales.
Marcia Feuerstein, one of four studio critics captured its essence:

"The city became an aggregate of difficult situations consisting of known cultural representations within many strands of everyday urban life. These exposed underlying

institutions woven into peculiar junctures of the fabric, revealing symptoms of order upon which to build or achieve another kind of aggregate. This discovery became the design project. First asked to take an anonymous attitude, students ultimately struggled with their own need to be autonomous "designers" of an architecture many were unable to realize."[19]

One particularly successful methodology, derived from my exposure to David Wallace's methods at Penn, was the use of "hard" and "soft" analysis as a predictive device. In a hard/soft analysis the physical environment is mapped and indexed according to simple, but comprehensive evaluations of its likelihood for change. A brand new office building is quite hard, for example, while vacant land, or abandoned buildings would be quite soft. This begins, when considered in context, to enable the urban designer to predict and assess the shape and potential nature of urban form.

MIT/OXFORD POLYTECHNIC/WARSAW POLYTECHNIC IN LUBLIN, POLAND

One of the most promising developments in applied urban design research is the cooperative project developed between MIT, Oxford Polytechnic, and Warsaw Polytechnic to develop prototypes for new development in the Lublin area of Poland southeast of Warsaw. This project, supported in part by US AID and the Polish Institute of Physical Planning and Municipal Economy involves an ongoing program of technical studies, design charettes, and procedural developments. Supported by many levels of the Polish government and planning establishment, this project was initiated in part to develop new prototypes in both design and development process for altering a large (50,000 pop) Soviet style housing estate called LSM.

After a round of intense background studies of the construction industry and government structure, a series of participatory exercises in the consideration of design alterations to the project were conducted, employing participatory methods developed by Dr. Tony Gibson of the Neighbourhood Initiatives Foundation in England. Unique aspects of the Polish situation were identified and permitted a greater focus on challenging, but likely project developments in several areas of concern pursued in the studios of John R. Myer at MIT.

Centers for existing projects. Many of the large housing estates lack community centers and commercial facilities, although land and utility capacity was provided for them from the beginning. They are thus among the most feasible projects as there is both need, clear land title, and utility infrastructure capable of supporting them. This can be seen as a generic issue to be encountered throughout Eastern Europe. The sudden creation of a free market economy has also meant that many such activities are occurring informally or in unsuitable physical environments due to there having been no need for so long. In the case of the LSM project, the design teams are involved in both extensive participatory consultations with residents and also with an investigation of the formal spatial characteristics of old Lublin.

Creation of prototypes for developers. Despite the staggering interest rate of 70% per annum for construction financing, there is significant private development activity in Poland, with private developers providing approximately 40% of the new housing, mostly in non-urban settings. A common prototype situation is for a farmer to sell off land (the farms were generally not nationalized in Poland although much of the urban land, except for Cracow was) for development along the road. Many of these -developers are small and certainly can support neither research in prototype development nor large design and planning staffs. The challenge here is thus to see if prototypes can be developed which small developers might use with the consequence of enabling their individual projects to "add up" to a larger fabric. John Myer's students, building on the foundation of thirty years of community based architectural projects are trying to develop prototypes of commercial/loft buildings which might have both positive urban form and economic implications by reason of being additive and versatile as to use.[20]

Following are discussions of the nature of several additional urban design issues currently important in Eastern Europe.

LARGE SCALE PROJECT URBAN DESIGN

The large-scale project is the most obvious area of contention for the future and one in which experience in the East and West is most similar. Both milieus will have to deal with the "Marriot" problem, represented by the new Marriot complex in Warsaw. Vittorio Gregotti notes that worldwide:

> "...there has...been a diminishing of the differences between urban design and the large, complex project, in which the latter takes on the role of the generator of the former, especially considering the present weakened state of public initiatives and the programmed acceleration of complex urban initiatives."[21]

Interestingly enough, from the beginning, Giancarlo DiCarlo predicted an increase in this type of development in Eastern Europe:

> "As to architecture, since public control over the environment is bound to grow weaker, we can expect a surge of free enterprise acting on a large as well as small scale and operating on "all-in contracts", with the prospect of offering "turnkey" deals to everybody. This will produce densely-built urban districts and myriads of scattered buildings, placed randomly with no general vision."[22]

This type of development will be an issue in both East and West, but it is particularly significant in the East in that the great risks and difficulties surrounding many kinds of developments tend at the outset to limit them to large well-funded organizations that can afford to wait for a return, and which are naturally attracted to comprehensive "island" type development planning solutions which appear to reduce uncertainties by placing definitive (and exclusive) boundaries upon the project. Furthermore, the lack of competition for the developer who survives the financial and approval hurdles reduces the incentive for a high quality physical execution. One should not underestimate the experience and toughness of the urban planning establishment in the east, as Denise Scott Brown quotes an architect in the City Architect's office of Prague when asked if he were worried about the onset of capitalism who replied: "If I could protect the city of Prague against the Communists, I can protect it against the Capitalists."[23]

Gregotti again points out a crucial East-West difference, commenting in the context of Berlin:

> "One essential factor will be the approach to the opportunities offered by the exceptional legacy of public property in the eastern zone. This will probably result in the maintenance of two urban centres, with distinct and complementary characters. Rather than attempt to erase all traces of the historical experiences of the last fifty years, specific characters should be maintained in an overall effort to improve quality."[24]

The studio role. Conceptualizations of the large project are the easiest for urban design studios to explore, because they are familiar to architects and well within international contemporary understanding. Paradoxically, they are also among the less likely research areas to bear great fruit, in that they both lend themselves to stylistic exploration and are themselves up against entrenched, powerful economic forces. Studios with this orientation are, however, easier to organize because of the site focus, and in that sense alone, may be quite useful in building experience and enthusiasm while providing prototypes to counter the "Marriot" complex. Additionally, the public property issue suggests an easy organizing concept for "idea" studios built around the exploration of particular opportunities.

GERMANY: HOUSING AND NEIGHBORHOOD DEVELOPMENT

The situation in the former German Democratic Republic (East Germany) is significantly different from that in Poland: First, the private sector was much more strenuously limited, the character of East German regime having been a much "purer" implementation of state centralized control in all its manifestations. Second, (and obviously), unification means that the East inherits a completely developed, legal, planning, development, and design structure. Efforts are being made to speed unification by assigning planners from West German cities to work with East German cities in preparing plans required under German law. Some German economists feel that economically "convergence" is

being attempted when "transformation" is actually called for.[25] Analogues to this economic concept might be considered with respect to architecture and urban design.

Since East Germany lacked a private construction sector, this placed more emphasis upon the acquisition of the state run construction organizations by large West German companies, somewhat to the consternation of the anti-cartel office. This will increase the tendency to focus on large-scale projects.

Others have pointed out the unique real estate dynamics which occur at the edges of the old districts in West Berlin. Kreuzberg, for example, a residential area near the wall had become a haven for low income people, artists, and fledgling enterprises of all kinds. With the wall removed it is now physically close to the East Berlin center and rents are rising rapidly, a process which will rapidly transform this area from a backwater to a hot spot, while eliminating the possibility of living or working there for many of the current inhabitants, a condition not mentioned in the recent debates in the press over the Potsdamer/Leipziger platz competition.

In general in the East rents have for years been set artificially low, thereby removing from owners small and large an adequate cash flow to permit maintenance. Although private citizens were allowed to keep property in East Berlin at the time of division, much of this property is deteriorated beyond usability due to the gap between income and maintenance. The initial reluctance of the Federal Government to alter either the rent or income structure has thus far prolonged the problem.

During its last decade of existence the German Democratic Republic engaged in large-scale historic preservation efforts in Rostock, Leipzig, Weimar, and Dresden, creating showpiece buildings and districts, restricted to the party faithful. Also during this general time period, cooperative projects tended not to be supported because they were too independent. It remains to be seen what the future will bring to these somewhat artificially created restorations, which are symbolic of both historic value and the inequities of the prior government.[26]

The studio role. These general types of problems are well suited to the neighborhood design studio approach, in which a studio focuses upon a particular area, consults with its residents in order to develop an understanding of its dynamics and opportunities. There is a surprising linkage in project type between North American Community design experience and some of the issues to be addressed, including racial and cultural as well as economic differences. Because many of the neighborhood problems are themselves related to economic conditions and market behavior, these studios could potentially profit from the involvement of urban economists, housing policy experts, and planning students. The participatory methods developed at MIT and in England, may be perceived in some quarters as undermining political or bureaucratic authority, but may still produce prototypes which may be capable of carefully considered application elsewhere with less emphasis upon the participatory components themselves.

ENVIRONMENTALLY LINKED ISSUES

The linkage between urban design and the environmental movement is crucial and yet to be formed. While the downtown monumental issues are of great interest, and there are models for neighborhood intervention and advocacy, there is not yet a clear picture of the issues surrounding the inevitable development of lands beyond and between the urban centers. The environmental movement seems sure to succeed in protecting and preserving certain sensitive tracts or key monuments, but the combination of ecological concerns over settlement and architectural concerns of "placelessness" are far from settled. Architects have been activists in the green movement and Polish architects were active in efforts to close down a large state steel mill which had a hugely negative effect on the environment of Cracow for many years.[27]

Efforts in this arena are often hampered significantly by the multiplicity of local governments, (all of whom will be exercising greater authority in the East) and the frequent separation of the planning and environmental protection functions in government. In Poland thought is now being given to locating Physical Planning and Environmental Protection in the same ministry as they are in the Netherlands. This would create the greatest likelihood of coordinated efforts.[28]

Linkage between the United States Environmental Protection Agency and its Polish counterpart is quite strong. There have already been numerous missions and studies of common problems. Perhaps the most significant development in the context of urban design and planning is the use of the concept of "twinning" whereby study areas in the two countries are linked and develop solutions in a tandem process of cross referral. As areas of Pennsylvania have significant problems related to coal mining, land subsidence, pollution, etc. a twinning of Allegheny County Pennsylvania and the environmentally degraded Katowice region of Poland is now in the development stage. This type of project can potentially provide a long-term organizational structure within which shorter term problems of great diversity can be addressed. Thus far the nature of the US/Polish environmental linkage has not directly addressed urban development issues, but this could come about within the structure of ongoing activities.[29]

The studio role. The studio role here is probably the most difficult of all to organize and bring off successfully. The most relevant North American model (and one not reviewed above) is that of the grand scale broadly focused landscape architecture and regional planning studios. The broad regional plans sometimes published in Casabella also seem to be the result of such studio research processes. These studios are particularly difficult because, as the geographic scale becomes vast, so to do the quantitative data inputs. The process of sorting through all the technical information to discern that which is relevant and provocative with respect to urban form is one that tries the patience of all designers, and the corresponding faith that there may be a possible contribution for designers to make is not widely shared among those most expert in the necessary information. The newly autonomous districts and regions may find this activity to be useful in their efforts to find their own role in the new governmental structures.

CONCLUSION

There are many possibilities for activities of the general nature discussed and implied here. Some, as in the MIT/Oxford/Warsaw project involve international cooperation and funding on a continuing basis. Other interventions may be quite limited and based upon the enthusiasms of faculty and students for a particular investigation. Numerous kinds of interactions between schools of architecture and planning in Eastern Europe with those in Western Europe and North America are possible. This paper seeks to call attention to this opportunity in order the most advantage may be taken of the vast potential.

For once ideas about urban design count. Every sphere of society is perturbed and in search of models of correct action. Soon new patterns will assert themselves and this opportunity will fade into the past. When historians review the environmental design consequences of this period, hopefully they will be able to state that the faculties of architecture understood and grasped the opportunity to provide a legacy for as yet unborn generations through humane and thoughtful shaping of the environment.

ENDNOTES

[1] Denise Scott Brown, "Between Three Stools, A Personal View of Urban Design Pedagogy," Urban concepts, (New York: St. Martin's, 1990) 20.
[2] Vittorio Gregotti, "Berlin Tomorrow," Casabella 578 April 1991: 59.
[3] Kenneth Frampton, "Towards a Critical Regionalism: Six Points for Architecture of Resistance", chapter in Hal Foster, ed., The Anti-Aesthetic, (Port Townsend, WA: Bay Press, 1983); Kenneth Frampton, "Critical Regionalism", In: The American Dream: A Collection of Essays (Atlanta: Georgia Institute of Technology/ACSA, 1983); Kenneth Frampton, "Prospects of a Critical Regionalism", Perspecta 20, 1983.
[4] Frampton, "Towards a Critical Regionalism..." 17.
[5] Frampton, "Towards a Critical Regionalism..." 17.
[6] Frampton, "Towards a Critical Regionalism..." 21.
[7] Frampton, "Towards a Critical Regionalism..." 27.
[8] Alexander Tzonis and Liane Lefaivre, "Why Critical Regionalism today?" A+U (May 1990) 29.
[9] George Claflen, "Simulated Stimulation/Stimulated Simulation: Regionalism and Urban Design," Architectural Education: WHERE WE ARE (Proceedings of the 80th annual meeting of the ACSA), (Washington DC: ACSA Press, 1992): 244-252.
[10] Vittorio Gregotti, "A Challenge for Urban Design," Casabella 584 Nov 1991: 50.
[11] Riken Yamamoto, "The Proof of the Proposal is in the Process," A+U 281 Nov 88: 56.

[12] Scott Brown, Urban Convents… 20.

[13] Scott Brown, Urban Convents… 20.

[14] Scott Brown, Urban Convents… 9-20.

[15] Tim McGinty, "Methods for Teaching Urban Design Studios in an Architecture Curriculum: Focusing on Design and Translating Analysis into Design," The Architecture of the In-Between (proceedings of the 78th annual meeting of the ACSA), Washington DC: ACSA Press 1988): 187-196.

[16] Tim McGinty, "Methods…"

[17] Tim McGinty, "Methods…": 190.

[18] Temple University Urban Design Studio fall 1991, George Claflen; leader, Brigitte Knowles, John Pron, Marcia Feuerstein; critics.

[19] Marcia Feuerstein, Adjunct Assistant Professor, Temple University, Statement for AIA Urban Design Committee Exhibit Panel on the Temple Studio, February 1992.

[20] The above reports on the MIT/Lublin projects are based upon the following: John R. Myer, Professor of Architecture, MIT, Telephone Interview, April 10, 1992. John R. Myer, Telephone Interview, April 28, 1992. And the following documents:
SIGUS (Special Interest Group in Urban Settlements), "Preliminary Construction Sector Inventory and Assessment, Lublin Region, Poland" (Cambridge: MIT School of Architecture and Planning, Summer 1991).
SIGUS, "Assessment of the Development Process: Lublin, Poland" (Cambridge: MIT School of Architecture and Planning, Summer 1991).
SIGUS, "Sigus Reports: The Poland Housing Initiatives Preparatory Field Work in Lublin, Poland: Summary" (Cambridge: MIT School of Architecture and Planning, Summer 1991).
SIGUS, "Summary of the Participatory Planning Exercise: Lublin, Poland" (Cambridge: MIT School of Architecture and Planning, Summer 1991).

[21] Vittorio Gregotti, "A challenge for urban design," Casabella 589 Nov 1991: 60.

[22] Giancarlo DiCarlo, "More Changes," Spazio a Societa XIII #49 Jan-Mar 1990: 4-5.

[23] Denise Scott Brown, Personal Communication, April 22, 1992.

[24] Vittorio Gregotti, "Berlin Tomorrow," Casabella 578 Apr 1991: 59.

[25] Jens Holscher and Anke Jacobsen, "Eastern Europe in Transition: German Post War and Post Cold War Experience," Free University of Berlin, Institute for Economic Policy and History, Discussion Paper 2 1992.

[26] Except as noted otherwise, the comments on East Germany stem from the following: Dr. Horst Tooman, Professor at the Free University of Berlin interviewed at the University of Pennsylvania, March 30, 1992.

[27] John R. Myer, Telephone Interview, April 28, 1992.

[28] Elaine Wright et. al., "An Organizational Assessment of Poland's Ministry of Environmental Protection, Natural Resources, and Forestry," United States Environmental Protection Agency, Interim Report, 1992.

[29] Except as noted otherwise, the comments on Environmental Protection linkages with Poland stem from informal working papers of the United States Environmental Protection Agency, Region III which were made available to me through the courtesy of John Krakowiak, Chief, Facilities Management and Services Branch, and Francesca DiCosmo, senior officer of the Office of Public Affairs, April 1992.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS