

of Pennsylvania (now called Penn Design) received a transplant from the GSD.

When the Reform Democrats of Philadelphia hired G. Holmes Perkins from Harvard to revamp the GSFA at Penn, he brought with him, among others, William Wheaton, Ian McHarg, and the young Robert Geddes, George Quarls, and David Crane. I was drawn to Penn in 1958 through Louis Kahn's reputation among the English New Brutalists, years before he was known elsewhere, and I was also intrigued by the news of exciting urban planning under way in Philadelphia. But when I entered Penn's planning department I found that, unlike Penn's architecture department, it had moved away from Harvard's urbanism and was under the sway of ideas from elsewhere. The strong, social sciences-based planning program at the University of Chicago was a major influence on Penn's planning thought. And Kahn, from his bastion in the architecture master's program, exerted an influence on the civic design program and a countervailing influence to Harvard's on the architecture department. An unrecognized aspect of Kahn's strength was, I feel, his having learned from the Penn planners—despite the snooty comments he, on occasion, made about them.¹⁷

I found in Penn's planning department the most challenging intellectual environment I had ever encountered. Its multiple skeins of thought included the urban sociology of Herbert Gans. Allied to Jane Jacobs in his understanding of complexity and multiplicity in the social city, Gans took a much broader view of society, its groups and structures. He criticized architect-planners and urban designers for their limited understanding of social questions and their unthinking application of middle-class values to the problems of multivalent groups. This hit home for me, given my experiences of group value conflicts in Africa and England. Beside Gans were the economists and regional scientists who saw city patterns as economically determined, and the transportation and urban systems planners whose computer-based analyses were intended to predict the relation between transportation facilities and regional development. On the other side sat Paul Davidoff, redefining the processes of planning to include the democratic participation of those planned for and to support an underclass that had been neglected in 1950s urban planning—particularly in urban renewal, the great hope of the Harvard conference. Davidoff's planning process and his suggestion that a role existed for planners and architects as advocates for the poor were clarion calls to young