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“Architecture as a technical practice was instituted in the Renaissance. It is mainly articulated in what we will call the ‘semantic dimension.’ We mean by this that any description or interpretation of either a whole building or parts of a building is made by linking physical ‘indicators’ to functional or expressive meanings.” The functioning of the semantic dimension indicates the fundamental role of the relationship between a building and an ‘external’ meaning ‘residing’ in that object whether it is an aesthetic, a functional, or a structural meaning.”

-Mario Gandelsonas
in Linguistics in Architecture

Through a semiotic analysis of architecture, the process by which buildings are given meaning is seen as the motivation of sign-systems. A general way of accepting the built environment is through the identification of signs. A semiotic approach to architecture questions the role of signs in giving buildings signification, culturally and socially motivated to produce and convey meaning. The problem lies within the codification of signs throughout a given culture, where classifications are developed and exploited to structure the built environment. In the codification of the sign, it is not the sign which is perceived but those phenomena which give cultural meanings. The problem further positions itself in the transformation of phenomena in a given typology, which rely on the codification and habitual cognition of signs in order for architecture to produce meaning. This thesis hypothesizes that through the process of identifying typological intrinsic signs, a semiotic analysis of architecture can begin to speak of a construction of meaning.

Disrupting the habitual sign cognition of a historically established typology involves the displacement of architecture as it used to exist. That is, the destabilization of meanings through the demotivation of architectural signs will begin to speak of an architecture that consciously constructs meaning through the process of building. In the process of building there are two primary methods of constructing meaning: through surface and through spatial experience. As environmental cognition acts upon user perceptions of a building, the construction of meaning through surface and space becomes evident in this process. This enables architecture to consciously produce effects on its users in the production of meaning through formal design structures. The formulation of demotivation is applied to the asylum, a historically established typology which particularly bears a transformative sign-system which generates stigmatized meaning in its contemporary counterpart. Sign-systems are identified through a typological background study, specifically using the work of Michel Foucault to philosophically place architecture as a signifier of Madness. Typology-specific signs are thematically categorized in order to identify intrinsic meaning, resulting in a semiotic analysis used to both negate and construct meaning.
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In the consideration of a semiotic analysis of architecture, Gillo Dorfles affirms our cognitive ability to assign meaning to the very things around us - the built environment. Semiotics allows architecture to be analyzed as a communicative form, conceived as a collection of sign-units which give meaning to a building or built environment. Signs are given meaning through cultural and societal motivation, reaffirming the cognitive process of the production of meaning. A semiotic analysis of architecture acknowledges that the built environment performs a role of signification, building upon schemata in order to structure the milieu. Schemata are used to describe the codification of meanings within a culturally identifiable building type, over time building upon themselves and bringing the meanings attributed to that type closer to reality. Buildings become sign-systems - or syntagms - which use such schemata to validate the implementation of sign-units. The cultural codification of sign-units and systems allows the production of knowledge to become evident across historical forms. Yet this codification of sign-units perpetuates the problem that architecture can produce meaning, where schemata are developed and exploited to structure the built environment. Theoretical texts of Charles Jencks, Diana Agrest, Mario Gandelsonas, and Bruno Zevi assert that this exploitation relies on the habitual cognition of signs within a given cultural in order for architecture to produce meaning. The problem further positions itself in the conveying of such phenomena - his

- Gillo Dorfles, Structuralism and Semiology in Architecture
torically motivated sign-systems which become intrinsic throughout the transformative history of a culturally-identifiable typology. This thesis hypothesizes that through the process of identifying typological intrinsic schemata, the application of semiotics to architecture can begin to speak of a construction of meaning. A conscious application of signs, ill-dependent upon design cognition, will allow for the process of building to draw upon intrinsic schemata as departure points to the disruption of the habitual. The disruption of habitual sign-unit and system cognition of a historically and culturally established typology involves the displacement of architecture as it used to exist. That is, the destabilization of schemata must come from the identification of schemata in order to negate such phenomena. The process by which the hypothesis takes place is through demotivation, as proposed by Jencks and validated in the works of Daniel Libeskind, John Hejduk, and Giuseppe Terragni. The works of these architect’s will be analyzed in order to understand how to approach the process of demotivation, as each building type must develop itself by analyzing its own history in order to establish design conceptions and principles. Precedent studies will show how the process can work, as well as will show how to approach the process of demotivation. Demotivating architectural signs will begin to speak of an architecture that consciously constructs meaning in the process of building. Environmental cognition, acting upon user perceptions, identifies surface and space as the evidentiary architectural principles which particularly allow such cognition. The construction of meaning through surface becomes evident as it is the surface or surfaces by which one first engages the built environment through eye cognition - the interior and exterior envelopes. Secondly, the construction of meaning through space depicts an experiential or sequential process by which one moves through a series of spaces, organized in order to represent specific meanings. Spatial organization has been used throughout the history of architecture in order to convey meaning, such as the church which uses symbolic and numeric representations to assemble spatial experiences.

In order to formulate the intrinsic qualities to demotivate the habitual cognition of signs, a specific typology must be selected which is identifiable and codified across a given cultural system. The asylum becomes evident in this process, a historically and culturally established typology within Western cultures which conveys meaning through the transformative nature of its signs and schemata. The thesis first illustrates the development and transformation of the building type - the asylum - over time in respect to societal and user perceptions which give meaning to the institution. The philosophical text of Michel Foucault’s *Madness and Civilization* and *Discipline and Punish* are used to establish Madness as a psychological and sociological construct, which in turn historically develops through the act of building the asylum. The modernized asylum is afforded meaning from its preceding building type, which is illustrated through a semiotic analysis of signs in the methodology. In order to promote semiotic analysis as a means to identify and negate meaning of a specific typology, a historical investigation of that typology must occur. The typology back-
ground establishes the asylum as a building type which particularly carries meaning throughout time, divided into five specific periods: the Renaissance, the Age of Unreason, early nineteenth-century America, late nineteenth and early twentieth-century America, and post-Deinstitutionalization. The thesis asserts that themes evident since the conception of Madness and the asylum still resonate to its contemporary counterpart, the mental health community center. Themes of isolation, boundary, gaze, and therapeutic efforts used to dictate built form will be founded upon Foucault’s historical account, as well as contemporary literature which points to architecture as the means of destabilizing sociological stigmata.

Following the background to the historical asylum is the argument for a semiotic analysis of architecture, using the aforementioned theoreticians and architects to position the thesis. The argument lies in the codification of signs within the historical transformation of the asylum in Western cultures, hypothesizing that the continual use of historical signs in the contemporary mental health center stigmatizes and perpetuates those historical meanings evident in the asylum. The general accepted view of the asylum by society today is that of repression and stigmatization, denying the existence of the community mental health center which seeks to reintroduce the insane back into the community. Many of the meanings evident in the asylum create contemporary views of the mental health center, furthering psychiatric goals of integration, communication, and rehabilitation. The semiotic literature will be used to analyze and identify signs particular to the asylum in order to understand how they are given meaning. Subsequently in the methodology, the semiotic research will be applied to the established themes of the asylum to begin the process of demotivation. Actionable principles, or rather principles of negation, will be developed in order to bring the thesis closer to the question: can a semiotic analysis of architecture of the asylum begin to speak of a construction of meaning through demotivation?
What is it to be mad? To be mad is for one to be enraged with unreason, the antithesis to the societal notion of ‘norm’. Those without reason are considered Others, as stated by Foucault, vagabonds roaming the exterior of an internally focused world. Internal attention to self-being promotes the notion of psychological exclusion, conditioning society to omit any notion of unreason from thought. In turn, psychological exclusion translates into physical exclusion. The madman ultimately is forced to exist along a blurred boundary of Madness and humanity. The physical exclusion of man comes only as a result of psychosomatic exclusion; thus the emphasis of Madness over the madman becomes significant. Society focuses its judgment of Madness through man. Through exclusion, society gives importance to the construct of Madness and not the being it envelopes. As a consequence Madness becomes the perpetual truth to society, devaluing man as nothing but an organism through which insanity manifests.

And so it was the Renaissance that likened the madman to a beast. As Madness fascinated man, so too did the madman’s knowledge of truth, a utopian ideal of existence within society. It was this knowledge, a strange and fascinating animality, which stalked humanity. The forbidden wisdom of this social idealism that the insane held within revealed to humanity its own truth; those of unreason were afforded judgment through the eyes of a truth-seeking society. Moreover, it was the Renaissance that found humanity succumbing to the hands of nature. No longer did man have power over nature; it was this beast of Madness that tortured man in his search for reason. Through this search man could learn of his unreason and better himself; however, in the inaccessibility of truth man sensed a fear of the madman. It was this fear that led to the confinement of Madness and inevitably, the madman.

Prior to confinement society was cognizant of the madman’s existence as seen through cultural literature, iconography, and art. Reason was unconscious to the extrinsic images of confinement. Subsequent moral torture allowed the bourgeois to govern over those of peasantry tempted by unreason through an illusory presence. Hieronymous Bosch, Pieter Bruegel, and Albrecht Dürer’s paintings, as well as Sebastian Brant’s poems, reflected Madness as provoked in a state of frenzy but not in captivity. Bosch’s Care of Folly naively characterizes foolishness through symbolic and schematic composition. The follied citizen offers his forehead for operation to the charlatan with encouragement by a monk and a nun. A wicked and wide world is portrayed in the Dutch landscape, pointing to meaning in the universe as a whole. Bosch details the folly and uselessness of worldly healing, propagated during the Renaissance through proverbs and didactic poems. Similarly Bruegel stages his Virtues, or Deadly Sins, as a demonstration of humanity’s horror and fear of its sins and folly. Publicizing folly gave those in power ascendancy over unreason, it allowed a norm-control over peasants and acts of Madness. The exterior perception of Madness became fear; madmen came to personify the societal function of the judgment of unreason. Man’s unreason invoked and made Madness necessary to the world’s end, thus death became eminent in man’s life. That is, death was likened to unreason; a perpetual judgment of spiritual authority was governed by these perceptions of Madness.

The evidence of Madness in the light of society was especially clear in the theatre. The Madman, Fool, and Simpleton assumed importance and stood center stage to both the play and culture. Theatrics sought to show madness as comedy, man’s unreason the comedy of reason. The madman reminded each follied man of his truth; hence, the madman and his unreason all embodied the antithesis of man’s reason. Folly in the Renaissance became the measurement by which humanity measured itself to the madman. Society saw its folly upon the stage and measured reason against it. The physical
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2 Foucault, 11.
4 Foucault, 14.
5 Foucault, 17.
illusion of the theatre assured a metaphorical illusion of truth. Thus Madness presented a silhouette of subject and object of temptation to which society gauged its own unreason. Temptation embodied the impossible and fantastic, the hallucinations of the madman. Through this illusion man would be reminded that his temptations could lead to unreason, sin, and ultimately exclusion. Classical ideas of Madness were born through illusion; however, this illusion of truth no longer existed as a tragic reality post-Renaissance. Somewhere in the classical period, Foucault states, Madness transformed from a moral punishment to an image of punishment, which brought illusion and image to its climax. No longer was Madness a transcendence of man’s dreams, hallucinations, temptations, follies, or fantasies; it now secured itself within man. The whole of society could not escape Madness, as it removed itself from theatrics and presented itself amid everyday life.

When the madman was forced from the city proper, he roamed an imaginary landscape by way of the Ship of Fools. The Ship of Fools originated when the city would expell madmen to the hinterlands. In his search for acceptance, the madman often joined the sailing circuitry. A strange “drunken boat” derived from the expulsion of the madman from the city. Society rid itself of unreason through expulsion, thus forcing the madman to further his journey in search of his identity. Historically, Foucault places the disappearance of leprosy in the Middle Ages as the point when society awaited a new rite of ‘purification and exclusion.’ The act of driving out madness from the city walls gave spectacle to expulsion, the first physical sign of the division of reason and unreason. Bosch’s The Ship of Fools depicts this corrupt humanity embarking to such pleasures of folly and sin. As man was released from a physical presence, he carried with him Madness. In physicality the madman had nowhere to go, hence his search for a new homeland began with cargo ships, the Ship of Fools. The madman boarded these ships in hopes of finding a new milieu. Even so this physical search held greater meaning: man searching for a sense of existence, a sense of reason. The notion of the voyage - an exclusion - must enclose the madman; thus he becomes the interior of his exterior. The madman is able to identify himself within an uncontrolled milieu; however, following the Renaissance his existence becomes lost amid a controlling and punishing society.

Remarks: The Renaissance saw the transformation of Madness from an acceptable perversion, to an engagement of societal practice, to finally a deprivation of reason which warranted expulsion. Indeed, expulsion became paramount in the attempt to control unreason within society, giving spectacle to those who unjustifiably merited physical exile by means of the sociological construct of Madness. Much literature and art of the time gave importance to the display of folly but such measures also functioned to elicit fear amid the peasant class. The illusion of Madness was imminent in the theatre, demonstrating society’s own temptation and its sinful consequences. From this illusion stemmed fear - of unreason, of
sin, and ultimately of Madness - which in turn facilitated society's repugnance of the madman. Thus, this fear gives insight to the madman's expulsion from civilized society; yet to where he was expelled raises the question of his being, for he was not man but merely a physical manifestation of Madness.
At the end of the Renaissance, Madness found itself in the interior of the madhouse - and the interior of the exterior - exclusion. No longer was man wandering the interior of the mad realm - the bourgeois milieu. The madman became a spectacle or a marvel, an object within the city proper. Man was Madness, quarantined to the madhouse. Confinement of Madness succeeded embarkation of the Ship of Fools. Tamed, Madness preserved all the appearances of its reign. It took part in the measurement of reason and truth - it played on the surface of things. It hid and manifested in its light and shadow.  

“Subject and object, image and goal of repression, symbols of its blind arbitrariness and justification of all that could be reasonable and deserved with it: by a paradoxical circle, Madness finally appears as the only reason for a confinement whose profound unreason it symbolizes.”

-Michel Foucault

At the end of the Renaissance, Madness found itself in the interior of the interior - the madhouse - and the interior of the exterior - exclusion. No longer was man wandering the interior of the mad realm - the bourgeois milieu. The madman became a spectacle or a marvel, an object within the city proper. Man was Madness, quarantined to the madhouse. Confinement of Madness succeeded embarkation of the Ship of Fools. Tamed, Madness preserved all the appearances of its reign. It took part in the measurement of reason and truth - it played on the surface of things. It hid and manifested in its light and shadow.

9 Foucault, 35.
Thus it was the Age of Unreason, beginning in the 17th century and continuing to the Industrial Revolution, which saw Madness confined to torturous chains. Confinement became an abusive system of heterogeneous elements. A social sensibility formed by isolating those who were mad; moreover, the unity of the poor, unemployed, prisoners, and insane in a singular house of confinement created a complex system of signs and stigmas. Poverty and crime became assimilated into Madness; vice versa Madness became likened to poverty and crime. To be a criminal was to be mad. Social idleness rested within the walls of confinement where the community acquired a power of segregation, which rejected all forms of uselessness to society. When Madness became a fear to society, it was then that man was confined and banished. As a triumph over the frenzy of unreason, man tore Madness from its earlier freedom and bound it to Reason and rules of morality. Confinement was an institutional creation peculiar to the 17th century, which gave an importance to imprisonment as practice, an economic measure and social precaution. Madness was no longer freedom from reason but an imprisonment within it.

The paradox of confinement rests between hiding away unreason while explicitly drawing attention to an institutionalized Madness. Images asserted to the madman - his theatrical representation of truth, the temptation of hallucination and dreams, and follies of man - were still inherent in Madness yet were shown to society from a distance. Perception of madness was linked to the iconographic forms of man and beast; confinement glorified this animal-ity of Madness. Madness as the ultimate form of animality in man affords a better understanding of what confinement was historically. Confinement became a paradoxical manifestation of non-being. That is, houses of confinement enveloped Madness but not man, for man failed to further exist when he became enthralled in such temptation. Through this humanized oppression, the madman vanished under confinement.

The immediate paradox evident in the house of confinement was the proximity of confinement to society. By confining Madness, evidence of the madman becomes clearer. The institution bears a quasi-resemblance between itself and images of unreason. It is at this point that the house of confinement becomes a birthplace of evil and the unknown; this idea forever engraved in the minds of society. No longer is it the ‘exterior looking in’ but a ‘looking down upon.’

The fortress of confinement functioned as a long silent memory, maintaining shadows of iconographic power that man had thought to have exorcised; yet those signs engrained within the houses of confinement were preserved and transmitted over time. Confinement afforded such meanings as control, punishment, isolation, and spectacle of both the madman and Madness. It is inevitable that those meanings are carried through by the architecture of those institutions, as it is the physical building face which is per-
created by society. Equally, meaning created within the institutions creates distorted perceptions from the madman’s view. All buildings carry meaning, creating associations within the mind of the beholder. Social contracts exist between society and how objects in the built environment are interpreted. To be precise, as society understood houses of confinement to contain Madness, they also interpreted them as fearful places of punishment and evil. The act of confinement was directly associated with architecture as a means of internalizing and constraining Madness. The act of building houses of confinement subsequently became the physical reality of a built Madness.

Remarks: The Age of Unreason bestowed upon the institution of Madness themes of isolation, boundary, and punishment. Contextually, houses of confinement were located within the city proper but were isolated from humanity. That is, those infected with Madness were seen as non-beings, isolated in their frenzied state. The walls of confinement provided a physical boundary between society and Madness. Within these walls unreason was punished; similarly, the wall provided a psychological connection between unreason and punishment to society. Hence, confinement functioned as a societal tool to control unreason within the normalized community. The wall further existed conceptually through mass and void. Physically it existed as a presence within the city, yet by enclosing those of non-being it acted as void. Thus the walls enclosed a void within the city, a realm of an unidentifiable existence.

The madman was the most insistent and visible symbol of confinement’s power; however, those ‘libertines and criminals of reason’ were still imprisoned within the same institutions. An outcry of this ‘mingling of Madness and other forms of deviance’ led to the madman being isolated from the criminal and libertine. Confine-
ment brought fear to society as they believed that Madness could ‘live, fester, and spread’ within the walls of the institution and become air 
borne. Images of corruption, fermentation, ‘tainted 
exhalations,’ and decomposed flesh were brought to the surface of societal memory. It is because of these pseudo-medical related images that unreason became confronted by medical thought. The term asylum was not used in the context of Madness until the beginning of the 19th century; society sought to assure those of ‘misfortune to lose their reason’ an establishment of all resources of medicine and comforts of life compatible with their frenzied state. Rather than allowing the madman to confront his Madness in confinement, he confronted his Madness through another man - a man of sanity, the psychiatrist. Though, psychiatric movements of the time called for the madman to be responsible for his own Madness. Fear was no longer outside the gates amid society but within the madman’s consciousness. Gaze, control, and perpetual judgment were essential in the asylum for the cure of the madman. Psychiatrists anticipated the cure of the madman through a ritualistic and cleansing environment, which in turn would rid him of Madness. Foucault reiterates:
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“Everything was organized so that the madman would recognize himself in a world of judgment that enveloped him on all sides; he must know that he is watched, judged, and condemned; from transgression to punishment, the connection must be evident, as a guilt recognized by all.”

Contracts among the medical profession led to a new relation between insanity and medical thought, which would later command the whole modern experience of rehabilitation. While the notion of confinement still perpetuated images of isolation, control, and physical punishment, the asylum broke those chains to which the madman was tortured. Thus the first postulate presented by psychiatrists, in order to cure Madness, was the prompt removal of the insane from the community. Superintendents, psychiatrics, and doctors could fulfill their ideas of moral punishment and strict discipline there in order to treat victims of a disorganized society through isolation from chaotic conditions. Behind the asylum walls medical superintendents would create and administer a calm, steady, rehabilitative routine...a well-ordered institution. No principle was more easily or consistently enacted than the physical separation of the asylum from the community. The construction of the asylum gave way to a new building typology. The walls would enclose a new world for the insane, designed ‘image-reverse’ of the one they had left. Though the madman became free from the eyes of societal judgment, the asylum isolated him to an all encompassing realm of Madness by removing the institution from the city proper. This ‘image-reverse’ saw to the construction of massive walls that enclosed the mad-realm, dually isolating man within the institution and removed from his community. Continuing to say that the ‘...walls would enclose...’ personified confinement; the walls of the asylum confined and bred Madness, enduring the tradition of societal fear of such institutions.

To protect, confine, separate, and treat the insane demanded special architectural forms. The common pattern of the asylum was a central structure of several stories in the middle of the grounds with radiating, straight, long patient wings. The main edifice was the most ornate and was fronted with a columned portico and topped with a cupola of height and distinction. The madman’s wings were bare and unrelieved; windows divided the space into regular and exact sequences, giving a uniform and repetitious appearance floor after floor from both exterior and interior perceptions. Many of these institutions were planned in accordance with the Kirkbride plan, a guide to creating the ‘picturesque’ insane asylum that explicitly detailed every function and detail of planning and construction. The regularity of form and banal interiors were to soothe the Madness within man, giving importance to the boundary between the calm milieu of the asylum and the hectic realm of society. Other institutions sought to use gaze and control as main proponents of form, such as Jeremy Bentham’s Panopticon. As Foucault accurately describes:
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“We know the principle on which it was based: at the periphery, an annular building; at the centre, a tower; this tower is pierced with wide windows that open onto the inner side of the ring; the peripheric building is divided into cells, each of which extends the whole width of the building; they have two windows, one on the inside, corresponding to the windows of the tower; the other, on the outside, allows the light to cross the cell from one end to the other. All that is needed, then, is to place a supervisor in a central tower and to shut up in each cell a madman, a patient, a condemned man, a worker or a schoolboy.”

The Panopticon allowed the supervisor to gaze upon all the confined, perpetually judging and seeing those inmates. Paradoxically, the inmates became non-seeing, their focus turned towards themselves. The inmates endured a dual judgment by both the supervisor - a representative of society - and by their own accord. Psychiatric motives were employed to cause the madman to judge himself, derived from this panopticism. The mid-19th century model of the American asylum afforded madmen a specific place and program to overcome their disease, for it was of popular knowledge that insanity could be overcome with strict and rigid discipline. In pre-Civil War America insane asylums were unmistakably different from their surrounding structures; the institutionalization of the insane was a standard procedure of society. By associating those specific structures with specific activities, the historical asylum was stigmatized and categorized as a place of repress, disease, control, and punishment. With an almost complete absence of dissenting opinion, the belief in the curative powers of the asylum spread through many layers of American society.

The publication of Thomas Kirkbride’s Mental Illness and Social Policy proved rigid in the application of a ‘social morale’ code in the curing of mental patients. The details of Kirkbride’s book gave little or not room for interpretation of the ‘rules’ of how an insane asylum should be constructed. In discussing the importance of architectural arrangements, Kirkbride stated:

“These institutions, particularly when put up under State authority, while having a plain, but still good and agreeable style of architecture, should not involve too large an expenditure of money in their erection; but, nevertheless, should be so conveniently arranged as to be economical in their subsequent management, and should have every possible advantage for the best kind of classification and supervision of the patients, and for their comfort and treatment. All extravagance in the way of ornamentation should be avoided; but such an amount of it as is required by good taste, and is likely to be really beneficial to the patients, is admissible. It does not comport with the dignity of any State to put up its public buildings in a style of architecture which will not prevent their being distinguished from factories or workshops. Especially is this the case with those designed for the treatment of a disease like insanity, in which the surroundings of patients greatly influence their conditions and feelings.”

Where Kirkbride miscalculates, beyond the theory of ‘cure through social morale,’ is the intervention of the Beaux Arts style. In its austerity and authority throughout the mid-19th century, the architectural proliferation of style superseded any hint of rehabilitation within the insane asylum. Institutions of immense propor
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tions began to be constructed to house and confine the insane. From a societal perception, these insane asylums glorified the images linked to the thematic device of confinement even though such institutions did not adhere to such rehabilitative efforts. Paradoxically, the madman was not confined to chains but confined to the images present in the historical transformation of the asylum. Thus the physicality of the wall, dually surrounding the asylum grounds and enclosing the interior of Madness, became the face to which society perceived the madman. As the Beaux Arts style became synonymous with ‘appliqué architecture,’ so too did the asylum. With the onset of the Industrial Revolution and mass immigration, insane asylums grew past their capacity as the number of insane persons grew proportionally with the population. In providing adequate asylum for those insane, states constructed myriad institutions adhering to the ideals of the Beaux Arts tradition. The application of ornamentation to such barren walls gave an assurance to its users of its validity in comfort and rehabilitation, masking societal illusions carried over from the Age of Unreason. Similarly, it allowed society to perceive the asylum as a picturesque building in which the insane were confined, resonating blurred meanings of classicism and Madness.

Yet, it was the rigid construction of spaces that dictated the 19th century perception of Madness. Unlike their European counterparts, Americans possessed the predicament of building new structures to house the insane. Europeans utilized existing buildings to house their insane, where the Americans did not boast such ‘ancient ruins’ to renovate and convert.21 The psychiatrist intervened to determine the correct layout and design of the institution since American architects did not have the experience of such building types. This established a pseudo-parallel: the psychiatrist promoting curative efforts through built form and the architect promoting a Beaux Arts tradition of regularity, masking, and discipline. Both affirmations played upon each other, creating a rigid, strict, and orderly institution.

The Beaux Arts tradition became the style with which society associated the asylum. While it would be absurd to say this style was only used for this specific typology, the manner in which it was used allowed society to perceive buildings of such style and composition as places of Madness. As language is a social contract, an agreement among the whole - implicit between persons, so too is style a social contract between persons who agree that certain elements of architecture should embody certain meanings. The Greek Ionic order, for instance, consists of certain features such as columns, an entablature, a pediment, and base which must be put together in a particular way to convey a coherent meaning. It would be unthinkable to put a Doric capital with an order that was entirely Ionic. That is, the element stands for something else - it refers to the Ionic order. Any disruption within the order would interrupt the social contract between persons who see those features as defining the order.
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elements as referring to the order itself. The Gothic cathedral signifies Christianity in Western cultures, as there is an essential relationship between a building of that form and the religion which it symbolizes.\textsuperscript{22} Architecture of the asylum comprised a set of rules for the use of certain elements in a certain way. The hierarchical composition of spaces - the superintended looking down from his lofty deck onto the outstretched arms of patient wings became a compositional element to which society stigmatized the madman. As well, the rigidity of the façade was likened to social morale, a regularization of daily routines in order to overcome Madness. The Beaux Arts style further clarified the building form as that of the asylum, renouncing any questions as to what that building meant. That is, the composition of spaces assimilated into the style provided a clear conception to society that this was the building in which Madness existed. There was no mistaking the asylum for a residence or commercial entity of the same style, as the prolific use of regularity and rigidity through every surface and spatial construction conveyed the existence of a life much different than society’s own. It displayed a life of banality, insanity, and non-existence.

Remarks: Those conceptual tools used in the mid-19th century asylum included the boundary wall, the act of confinement, rural contextualization of the institution, and psychiatric measures used to dictate built form. Thematically, the boundary wall, site location, and the act of confinement were conceptualized through isolation. Society perceived the wall as a physical boundary by which the madman could not escape. To further the dislocation of the insane, rural sites were chosen to allow for a calm therapeutic environment. In contrast, the madman perceived the wall as a manifestation of isolation; confinement became a torturous withdrawal from society and self. By isolating the madman, he came to feel as an unwanted member of society, validating Foucault’s reference to non-being. Yet the most prolific conceptual tool used to purvey meaning to both society and the madman was the use of psychiatric measures to dictate built form. Psychiatric intervention brought forth notions of regularized environments and habitual routines in order to calm the Madness within. Moreover, the proliferation of the Beaux Arts style as the ‘architecture of the asylum’ dually exhibited the institution with rigor, regularity, and precision. The asylum became the architectural proliferation of Madness, giving significance to the building in which those madmen were held. Confinement no longer existed as a conception but a demonstration of societal power.

Precision, certainty, regularity, and order were the main weapons in the battle against Madness as proliferated by the architecture of the asylum. The rigidity of planning was clearly likened to the prison towards the later nineteenth-century. Similarly, there was no confusing an asylum for a private residence but perhaps a factory. Many institutions were seen as 'plain and factory like,' as if they were producing and breeding the insane. Rothman iterates:

“The edifice designed for the residence of the insane must be materially different, both in form and interior arrangement, from ordinary habitations.”

23 Rothman, 152.

"Despite all my rage,
I am still just a rat in a cage."

-Bullet with ButterflyWings, Smashing Pumpkins

4 a human warehouse
By the late nineteenth and early twentieth-centuries, moral treatment gave way to custodial care with a preoccupation with security rather than rehabilitation. Alms houses for the poor, houses of refuge for the homeless, asylums, and prisons began to blend together in character as the function of these buildings became indistinguishable. This ‘blurring of meaning’ was most evident on New York City’s Roosevelt Island, where such institutions found themselves dually isolated. The proximity of the island to the city countered previous methods of excluding the asylum to the hinterland yet taunted the madman with this imminence. The madman became familiar with his community surroundings under the control and watchful eye of society. At the same time the continued exterior envelope of the asylum helped to promote and disguise the shift from reform to custody - a holding facility for Madness. The decline of rehabilitation efforts to custodianship gave way again to a mixing of chronically insane, poor, and hardened criminals, likening to the early house of confinement. The cyclical process of psychiatrists searching for a new means of rehabilitation continued as the structure and architectural signs of the asylum stayed imminent within the mind of society. An exaggerated emphasis on physical structure misled the public to believe that these were places of rehabilitation; rather, they served as heterogenic human warehouses. The unimaginative use of industrial concrete and hard materials similar to prisons, both inside and out, became the prevalent design theme of asylums up through the middle of the 20th century.24 While the prison-like atmosphere allowed society to perceive Madness at a distance, in con-
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The attempt to consciously design asylums for the effect they had on its users linked to pragmatics, which dealt with the origins, users, and the effect of signs within the behavior which they occur. This allowed architectural forms the ability to communicate across the ages. Charles Jencks concurs by saying that we (society) build up our schemata through a cyclical process of hypothesis and correction, all the time making our model more habitual and closer to reality. That is, while the rehabilitative efforts of the psychiatric community continually developed and failed, the building form which enclosed those efforts remained constant. Those forms then communicated to society enclosure and isolation through a psychological and physical perception. Erving Goffman summarizes by quoting:

“Every institution captures something of the time and interest of its members and provides something of a world for them; in brief, every institution has encompassing tendencies. When we review the different institutions in our Western society, we find some that are encompassing to a degree discontinuously grater than the ones next in line. Their encompassing or total character is symbolized by the barrier to social intercourse with the outside and to the departure that is often built right into the physical plant, such as locked doors, high walls, barbed wire, cliffs, water, forests, or moors.”

Goffman sees these as total institutions, exhibiting degrees of common attributes and blurring the boundary to which the prison and asylum become meaningful to society. Thus the asylum transpires as a form of the prison, a total institution of total control. The established themes of isolation, boundary, and gaze within the asylum became synonymous with the prison environment. Moreover, perpetual confinement again found its place within the mad realm masked by the face of authority. Along with an increase in industrialization and urbanization through the late nineteenth and early twentieth-centuries came an increase in criminality. States began constructing prisons at an alarming rate in order to isolate and control those criminals within the system. The insane became less evident within society as criminality and its environment became the focus of theoretical observation, furthering the displacement of rehabilitation. As Gresham Sykes recalled:

“The prison is not an autonomous system of power; rather, it is an instrument of the State, shaped by its social environment, and we must keep this simple truth in mind if we are to understand the prison. It reacts to and is acted upon by the free community as various groups struggle to advance their interests. At certain times, as in the case of riots, the inmates can capture the attention of the public; and indeed, disturbances within the walls must often be viewed as highly dramatic efforts to communicate with the outside world; efforts in which confined criminals pass over the heads of their captors to appeal to a new audience. ...The prison as a social system does not exist in isolation any more than the criminal within the prison exists in isolation as an individual; and the institution and its setting are inextricably mixed despite the definite boundary of the wall.”

Thus the prison became the institution to which society perceived control and those themes as they transformed through history. As Diana Agrest and Mario Gandelsonas confer, the particular structure of such cultural phenomena stem from their existence as social institutions and not from their use by individuals. The architecture of these institutions was understood not because it had certain inherent meanings which were natural to it but because meaning had been attributed to it as the result of cultural convention. 29 As Foucault validates Agrest and Gandelsonas:

“…the ‘extravagance of locks, of bolts, of iron bars to shut the doors of cells’ stirs images of a pseudo-human cage…The evil which man had attempted to exclude by confinement reap-peared, to the horror of the public, in a fantastic guide. There appeared, ramifying in every direction, the themes of an evil, both physical and moral, that enveloped in this very ambiguity the mingled powers of corrosion and horror. There prevailed, then, a sort of undifferentiated image of ‘rottenness’ that had to do with the corruption of morals as well as with the decomposition of the flesh, and upon which were based both the repugnance and the pity felt for the confined…These wards are a dreadful place where all crimes together ferment and spread around them, as by fermentation, a contagious atmosphere which those who live there breath and which seems to become attached to them.” 30

Meaning attributed from these images - punishment, control, and torture - resurfaced in the early twentieth-century as the prison became tantamount with the confinement of the insane. Construction practices varied only in their internal spatial configuration, and even then such layouts did but further perpetuate images of isolation and rehabilitation through built form. That is, long, narrow corridors were constructed in both the asylum and prison

with small, mass-produced cells stretching down endless paths. The extravagance of ‘locks, bolts, and iron bars’ filtered both places; however, these security devices physically acted as barriers in the prison and psychologically in the asylum. Yet the proliferation of similar architectural forms perceptually blurred the existence of the two institutions as one. Similarly, the act of confining man spread from the prison to the asylum. As stated, with an abundance of insane and criminal persons, states were forced to physical confine both individuals. That is, the prison perpetually confined man through the justice system, while the asylum both physically and psychologically confined man through learned social meanings. Those meanings stemmed from the motivation of architectural signs, specifically by likening the asylum to the prison. Architecture particularly carries meaning because it is the building of which one speaks of; and that which gives it significance is ascribed through social reaction. There is no social contract for the meaning of architecture in general, for it is the semantic - the meaning given to the object - that gives the architecture of a specific typology meaning. 31

30 Foucault, Madness and Civilization, 203.
Remarks: The period extending from the late nineteenth-century through the middle of the twentieth-century saw a grave transformation of the asylum. A rise in general criminality gave way to the mass construction of state prisons, which were subsequently equated as sister-forms to the asylum. Moral treatment gave way to custodianship, which in turn saw the asylum convert into a human warehouse. Those meanings attributed by boundary, physical and psychological isolation, and control and punishment stayed constant and grew stronger as sizeable institutions employed clearer signs for society to perceive and judge Madness. The asylum transformed from a place of rehabilitation to a place of confinement and control, discharging any progress made by psychiatry in the previous century.
Reactions to the Historical Asylum

Through the middle of the twentieth-century the approach to the asylum was of alienation, condemnation, and psychological confinement. The prison became the precedent to which the asylum reacted, constructing large holding facilities for the insane that enveloped meaning of that criminal institution. During the mid-twentieth-century the federal government responded to this inhumanity by calling for a new type of health facility that would return mental health care to the main stream of American medicine, and at the same time upgrade mental health services. The ‘deinstitutionalization’ enactment provided a unique opportunity for architects to develop new spatial plans and programming that were not of its history. Similar to the period that established the asylum as a building typology, architect’s again had the predicament of designing a three-dimensional interpretation of the concepts of psychiatry without a precedent. Design considerations included order, clarity of form and space, scale, flexibility, community integration and security, unnervingly similar to themes rooted in the historical asylum.

rowly defined institutional models. Bakos and others validate this statement by saying that the local community mental health center operated in physical facilities that repeat in too many ways the dysfunctional environments of the hard institutional architecture they were intended to replace. Whitehead suggests that current psychiatric literature returns to the suggestion C.W.M. Jacobi made in 1841, that:

“The whole (building) should bear the stamp of a large lodging-house or hotel at a watering place, so as not to appear by its outward splendor to mock the miseries of its inmates; but yet, in its elegance and simplicity, its cheerfulness and convenience, affording an ample testimonial of the care which as been bestowed to lighten and alleviate the long separation from their friends, to which the process of a tedious cure may subject the unfortunate sufferers.”

McLaughlin further reiterates that the asylum’s replacements were all too frequently stark, dehumanizing hospital wards emphasizing security and isolated from familiar reality…with a neutral environment and little stimulation. Even when existing structures, such as an old church, house, or bowling alley, were used to house the mental health program, a clear image of what the building was supposed to be was not projected to the community. This evi-

Problems of Deinstitutionalization

Beyond community integration as a major step towards integration, those new mental health centers were greatly influenced by preceding institutions architecturally. Spatial and formal configurations, material use, internal and external boundaries, and hierarchies of historical reference were employed within the new institutions. As lamented by Anderson and others, the ‘many good lessons taught by Dr. (Thomas) Kirkbridge and the moral treatment era of more than a century ago’ were used negatively to construct nar-
dence points directly to the proliferation of social notions of the mentally ill and the buildings in which they occupy. As Broadbent justifies, once those relationships between the signifier and signified become established in social contracts, they cannot easily be changed.

While architects superficially addressed notions of program and form, historical meanings filtered through to the contemporary mental health center since they were not seen as main proponents of stigmatized milieus.

One of the main goals determined early in planning was the elimination of the hospital’s image as an isolated place, void of community interaction. Anderson exhibits the Norwood Mental Health Center in Marshfield, Wisconsin as an example of community integration. The Norwood Center was based on principles that would allow it to be compatible with the existing streetscape, blending it with the neighborhood scale and building forms. The problem with this statement is that the mental health center actually does not relay to the community its purpose. Outstretched wings and unadorned brick and concrete facades gesture only slightly to its community and further succumb to historical institutional references. Additionally, the eighty-thousand square feet of program is spread across a split-level floor plan, questioning whether or not the building actually fits within the community scale. The facility does not integrate itself into the community as seen by the planning diagram (fig 5.3), giving no reference to surrounding commercial, residential, or industrial enterprises. Similarly, the Marin Community Mental Health Center in Greenbrae, California does not be appropriate for acute centers, such as the Mercy Behavioral Health Center in Roseburg, Oregon, which specifically deals with patients with acute-psychotic episodes. The center is located next to the Mercy Medical Center, and patients who exhibit psychotic behavior are admitted to the mental health facility up to seventy-two hours for observation. This would not be appropriate for a mental health center, as in the case of the Marin Center, which serves out-patient clients from the surrounding community. Again, this particular health facility, as well as many others across the country, do not relate to the community by either isolating the facility physically or restraining integration through connections to existing facilities which perpetuate ideas of the historical asylum. Levy reiterates that the mental health center should be within walking distance of movie theatres, shopping areas, recreation centers, school, churches, and synagogues. They should not be hidden behind fences, should not be next to cemeteries or old
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age homes, and should not be in rural areas.\textsuperscript{40}

Stemming from community disintegration is internal isolation constructed spatially within the mental health center, as well as the continual use of historical references in building materials and form. This is specifically denoted in the use of extending corridors with unobstructed views. One feature of mental institutions that environmental psychologists have continually objected to is the long, echoing, glossy corridors that can lead to perceptual distortion of time, speed, distance, and size. Schizophrenics in particular have trouble with size and distance relationships, which is exacerbated by the reflection of silhouettes and fuzzy outlines of approaching people in contrast to stark backlighting.\textsuperscript{41} Persons with mental disorders, particularly those with schizophrenia, bipolar disease, and manic depression, are more likely to be affected by their environments than so-called healthy people. With this general knowledge in the psychiatric community, new health centers have been constructed that regularize and sterilize the interior environment. Yet this differs with psychiatric thought, as recommended by Izumi that spaces should not be bland and stimulus-free but contain elements that are unobtrusive and unambiguous.\textsuperscript{42} That is, the corridor should promote a variety of experiences that negate the perpetual distancing found in typical institutions. The Marin Center uses the corridor as a communal space, creating a triangular pathway to encourage a variety of routes, no dead ends, and non-determinate spaces. Non-determinate spaces are purposely varied, interwoven, and easily adaptable to changing activities. Contrasting, rigidly defined spaces echo the historic institution which employed large open spaces that were sterile and degrading, along with high-ceilinged rooms that do not allow for a feeling of intimacy or freedom.\textsuperscript{43} And as Izumi states, in our culture we seldom find models of environments that abhor those rigidly constructed spaces. Rather, psychiatrics and architects alike have looked to improve the milieu of the madman through minimal architectural change. As provided by Gutkowski and others, the Talbieh Mental Health Center in Jerusalem went through minimal architectural changes in order to provide a better functioning environment. Gutkowski assesses that the center implemented new arrangements of furniture, new entrances, and fresh coats of paint.\textsuperscript{44} Such changes gave patients the perception that the interior had gone under drastic remodeling; however, the exterior of the building remained intact. This did not provide any negation to the fact that the building was once a prison, which questions as to what the building functioned as from a community perspective. Whitehead iterates that such minimal change does not address the deeper architectural questions of observation, protection, and structural security when considering mental health center redesign.\textsuperscript{45} While subtle changes to the physical setting may alter interior perceptions
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of the space itself, it does not address notions of isolation, boundary, or gaze. It ignores these stigmatizing social contracts established by previous generations that give meaning to the mental health institution. Those social contracts stem from the motivation of architectural signs, such as the endless corridor with a monotonous expanse of straight lines without clear directional orientation. The lengthy corridor adds to the negative psychological impact on the patient by further distancing himself from his eventual rehabilitation. As conferred on by many in the psychiatric community, the corridor has been a limiting factor in the construction of new mental health centers. While literature provides a basis to which the design should respond, architects are failing to fully address the corridor as communicating internal meaning to the patient.

The theme of boundary negatively influences both the external and internal image of the mental health center, appearing through the image of isolation. Means and Ackerman drastically depart in their formulation of the mental health center from conventional construction inspired by both Kirkbride and general hospital ward design. They hypothesize that architectural language can allow a communication between patients, staff, and the community. Yet the architecture of these new institutions fails to poignantly address the meaning behind boundary, both physically and psychologically. In recalling the Norwood Mental Health Center, the use of brick and concrete as an external link to the surrounding community continues the dominance of hard materials in the asylum. While the perceptual issues of boundary are ‘torn down’ by the center’s integration into the community, the psychological constructs are persistent in the eyes of both society and the patient. With the extensive use of ‘punched’ windows and signature entries, the façade becomes structured and individualized. Punched windows give reference to isolation and holding cells, which do not exist programmatically in mental health centers today. Similarly, mental health centers use ‘signature entries’ to give a direct perceptual connection to the community. Yet those entries further uphold the theme of boundary by singling out the entry, similar to that of the historical asylum. The singular or signature entry is attributed meaning through the perception of ‘madmen entering’ and the abolishing of Madness. Those who enter pierce the boundary by which society and Madness exist.

Lastly, the theme of rehabilitation as a proponent of architectural form continually provides historical references to the contemporary mental health center. As Izumi states the cause for new institutions to be ridden of antitherapeutic milieux:

“Like visual stimuli, rhythmic sounds, particularly when they are synchronize, can affect a patient’s perception of space and time and of the people in the environment…They may start or aggravate certain voluntary or involuntary movements…for the mentally ill, such subtle environmental ‘beats’ can become overwhelming. When they coincide with a patient’s psychic rhythms, the patient reacts accordingly; he may move in and out, toward and away from another person, often in harmony with the
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he discerns from the visual and auditory signals."47

That is, the rhythmic and structured environments derived from previous eras should not be instituted as that such features disrupt rehabilitation goals. History pointed to regularity as a means of calming Madness; however, psychiatric literature today negates such efforts. Variety, as well as McLaughlin’s nondeterminate space concept, holds to notions of environmental manipulation by patients. Yet such concepts are not implemented today, as seen in the floor plan of Norwood Mental Health Center. Repetitious wings march along the extended corridor or ‘interior street,’ negating any dynamic movement the design sought to implement. In regards to physical structure of the mental health center, the Marin Center sheds light on how institutions today reconstruct historical architectural form. The direct heavy structure of the poured concrete is exposed throughout the institution, recalling Beaux Arts forms. While the use of concrete itself does not inherently recall such forms, the emphasis on the structure denotes a structured and rigid complex to which the mentally ill were all too familiar.

Recovery Methods

In response to the deinstitutionalization movement’s shortcomings, psychiatric services began to employ a new strategy that encompassed the ideals of community integration and personal development while acknowledging a need for professional and family intervention. Since the mid-1980’s many behavioral health advocates have challenged the belief that severe mental illness is chronic, and that stability, both in daily activities and environments, is the best one could hope for in rehabilitation. William Anthony, Director of the Boston Center for Psychiatric Rehabilitation, developed the cornerstone definition of mental health Recovery in the early 1990’s, stating that:

“(Recovery is) a deeply personal, unique process of changing one’s attitudes, values, feelings, goals, skills, and/or roles. It is a way of living a satisfying, hopeful, and contributing life even with limitations caused by the illness. Recovery involves the development of new meaning and purpose in one’s life as one grows beyond the catastrophic effects of mental illness.”48

Recovery is a personal and unique process to each individual afflicted with a mental illness, and each person must develop his or her own definition of recovery. However, there are certain assumptions and factors common to Recovery in general as stated by Anthony:

• Recovery can occur without professional intervention
• A common denominator of Recovery is the presence of people who believe in and stand by the person in need of recovery
• A recovery vision is not a function of one’s theory about the causes of mental illness
• Recovery can occur even though symptoms may reoccur
• Recovery changes the frequency and duration of symptoms
• Recovery does not feel like a linear process
• Recovery from the consequences of the illness is sometimes more difficult than recovering from the illness itself
• Recovery from mental illness does not mean that one was not “really mentally ill.”
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Much of the literature produced on Recovery focuses on specific factors that consumers (the mentally ill person) commonly identify as being or have been important to their recovery journey. The most common factors, as described by the Hamilton County (Ohio) Community Mental Health Board, include:

- **Hope**: a desire accompanied by confident expectation. It is an intrinsic belief that things can get better. Having a sense of hope is the foundation for ongoing recovery from mental illness.
- **Medication**: While many people are frustrated by the process of finding the right medications and the side effects of medications, most persons with a psychiatric disorder indicate that medications are critical to their success.
- **Empowerment**: This is the belief that one has power and control in their life, including their illness. Empowerment also involves taking responsibility for self and advocating for self and others.
- **Self-Esteem/Self-Efficacy**: Self-esteem has to do with the respect or pride that an individual has in him or her self. Self-efficacy refers to an individual's sense of power and/or ability to produce a desired effect or outcome.
- **Support**: from peers, family, friends, and mental health professionals is essential to recovery from mental illness. It is especially beneficial to have multiple sources of support.
- **Education/Knowledge**: In order to maximize recovery, it is important for consumers to learn as much as possible about their illnesses, medications, best treatment practices, and available resources.
- **Self-help**: While most consumers recognize the value of professional treatment, self-help is often viewed as the conduit to growth in recovery. Self-help can take many forms including learning to identify symptoms and take actions to counteract them, reading and learning about an illness and its treatment, learning and applying coping skills, attending support groups, and developing a support system to rely on when necessary.
- **Clinical Care**: Receiving and benefiting from mental health services.
- **Meaningful Activity**: Consumers frequently report that participating in paid employment and/or other productive activities provides psychological benefits that positively impact recovery.
- **Power & Control**: Power and control refers to a consumer actively engaging in her or her own care and persona decisions.
- **Stigma**: Being able to overcome negative perceptions and stereotypes related to mental illnesses that hinder and/or negatively impact recovery.
- **Community Involvement**: Having the opportunity to interact with people and organizations in the community for social enjoyment and civic fulfillment is thought to both assist a consumer in recovery as well as provide evidence of growth in recovery.
- **Access to Resources**: Interacting with various people and places and gaining use of products, services, and technologies that promote recovery.

**Reactions to Deinstitutionalization**

Given the psychiatric literature on the method and consumer input, Recovery has become the rehabilitative tool to help those with mental illness overcome and live meaningful lives. Within the Recovery method is a visible link to the physical environment in which these activities occur. This new method has allowed psychiatrists and architects alike to re-evaluate the curative milieu. Reactions to deinstitutionalization in psychiatric literature points to the wall as functional boundary, nurse’s stations, break-out rooms, and general hierarchy of the facility as transmitting historical meanings of oppression and stigmatization to the mentally ill and their environment.
Whitehead and others persistently call for the use of natural light, textures, and colors as functional boundaries. The physical-ness of the wall is deconstructed through the use of conceptual tools. This allows for a negation of the patient viewed as a ‘social pariah, a non-person without basic human rights and privileges.’ The historical establishment of the wall as a physical and psychological boundary between society and the patient is broken down in scale. These concepts are also used within the interior of the mental health center, infringing upon the boundary to which the patient and psychiatrist interact. In light of the Recovery method of rehabilitation, which gives the patient sole responsibility of recognizing his or her illness, the hierarchy which exists between the psychiatrist and patient is breached. No longer does the patient passively receive care from staff. Instead, the patient is made responsible for initiating and managing his or her own affairs, and the staff acts to forward the process of Recovery. The aim is to promote a corrective emotional experience, enhance personal understanding, and maximize health ego growth. Yet what often occur, despite the emphasis on new patient-staff roles, are traditional modes of interaction. The problem with Whitehead’s concepts is their facilitation, which often fail to be implemented beyond their literature context.

**Nurses’s Stations** While the nurse’s station does not programmatically exist within the mental health center today, it likens functionally to the reception area. The reception area is the first point the patient comes in contact with when entering the facility, defining the territory to which each person exists. The closed reception area encourages labeling, such as the staff inhabits the station and the patients have the recreation room. In effect, the label becomes of sick and non-sick, which contradicts the Recovery method. It is not the responsibility of neither the staff nor the environment to label such illness but of the patient him or herself. The closed station provides the staff with a further opportunity to avoid contact with the patients. In addition, the glass barrier often necessitates nonverbal communication, conveys to the patients the expectation that they are untruthworthy, and increases the number of patient demands on the staff.

**Break-Out Rooms** Break-out rooms facilitate a hierarchical boundary to the patient with staff conducting learning sessions about personal care, management skills, and general mental illness knowledge. While the staff’s responsibility is to coordinate and teach these sessions, the planning of such spaces does not facilitate the deeper roots of Recovery. The space simply exists as a destination point and does not promote interaction between the patient and the environment. This shows the disjunction between psychiatric literature and mental health environments, as mentioned by McLaughlin that nondeterminate design in architecture should create an atmosphere of spatial variety that allows reaction to the
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changing human condition. Spaces in the mental health center today do not use these notions when considering planning and spatial differences. The general hierarchy of spaces denotes a pejorative relationship between staff and patients.

- **Hierarchy of Spaces** The primary function of the reception area traditionally is surveillance. The area is the observation and control site for the entry door, which itself is a boundary loaded with emotional connotations, and for ward activities. It becomes a symbolic guardpost of authoritarian relationships. In many cases, architects suggest placing the reception area unobtrusively in a neutral zone; however, this placement further promotes the perception of gaze to the patient. He or she is perpetually gazed upon and judged based on personal actions and reactions to the environment. Again, this creates another disjuncture between psychiatric literature and facilitation. As Whitehead concludes, previous eras contributed to the notion of the staff as overseers whose function was to supervise, protect, observe, and order. The Recovery method sees supervision, observation, and authoritarian dicta as less valued than the staff’s availability, trust, and respect of patients’ needs. Yet architectural design hinders Recovery by having to programmatically implement control points.

**Remarks**: The deinstitutionalization movement sought to negate those themes of isolation, boundary, gaze, and rehabilitation through built form, yet failed in their application. Psychiatric literature purveyed concepts and idealistic situations to which architects should react and integrate into design. The disjuncture that occurred left a debilitating mental health center psychologically amid the ruins of the historical asylum. The move to integrate the madman into his community was met by opposition and ignorance, forcing the new institution to exist along the suburban fringe. This allowed meanings behind the physical boundary to further perpetuate the isolation of the facility. Similarly, the use of hard materials on both the interior and exterior recalled historical references, which further psychologically alienated and stigmatized the insane. Spatial reconstructions of gaze and boundary promoted an antitherapeutic environment, distancing the mentally ill from their ultimate goal of Recovery.

- McLaughlin, 567.
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General Argument for Semiotics  The use of semiotics as an instrument for architectural analysis can allow for the understanding of how buildings are given meaning. In advocating its use as a ‘raw material’ from which a building can begin to be understood, semiotics is seen as a system of rules which assign and maintain certain value relationships between forms and meanings for design, use, or interpretation. It becomes a precursor to the existence of an internal architectural dialogue, which speaks from the building and conveys implicit meaning through cognitive perception. Semiotics is the study of signs, a sign being the most fundamental element of signification in language.\(^55\) Semiotics does not limit itself to the study of verbal signs, but encapsulates the visual, architectural, musical, and other cultural signs which, in the context of a culture, are representative of certain meanings.

\(^{55}\) Agrest, Broadbent, Eco, Gandelsonas, Jencks, et al.
The foundation to a semiotic analysis of architecture is that a building performs a role of signification; that is, architecture can be seen as a system of signs which give signification to that building. Those architectural signs are given signification through cultural and social interpretations, essentially becoming a ‘production of meaning.’ A sign, as an element of language, includes a signifier and a signified, united by a social contract. The signifier is the material representation of that word or sign; that which is signified is the concept to which the word or sign refers. Architectural signs can be characterized on the basis of codified meaning in a general cultural context and attributed to a sign-vehicle, an object that which communicates to its possible function. That object which we speak of is commonly a building, a possible function of communication to its users. Semiotics is not to be confused with communication theory; that is, the building’s signification is concerned with the nature of signs and rules that govern of those signs. Semiotics is seen as a system of devices which produce signification - function, symbol, and icon - and a system to determine how this signification is produced. In the traditional sense of semantics, objects in the environment have been understood to have inherent meaning. Yet this meaning is not inherent in the object itself but as determined by a system. Rather, the system becomes signified through meaning attributed to it as the result of cultural convention. As Amos Rapoport adds, an anthropological approach to environmental cognition - the seeing and signifying - takes the position that cognitive process are concerned with making the world meaningful. The anthropological perspective suggests the importance of schemata - classifications, taxonomies, and cognitive splits - used to structure the built environment and behavior in it, in order to understand the way in which the environment is conceived and structured by the individual and society. If we accept the schemata presented - values and meanings organized accordingly to certain rules - then mental images and connotations of those signs are created specific to perceptions people have of the physical environment. Thus the importance of semiotics in architecture becomes imminent; the process by which architectural signs give significance and meaning to buildings must become imperative in the design process. For if semiotics is not considered in design, the process of building becomes an ill-communicative tool. Buildings communicate through an individual’s cognitive process of identifying signs within an established culture and give meaning to those signs. Through the process of building, one must consciously acknowledge what signs are being used and what meaning is given to them. As Broadbent states, signs - or words - chained together become syntagms, a multiple signifier of some complex signified object. That is, base - column - architrave - pediment - portico - triglyph - come together to signify order. In the process of building, like a sentence in verbal language, signs come together to signify a greater whole. A building is a syntagm, the individual members thereof can be isolated, called ‘significant units,’ and be
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operated at the level of both signifier and signified. To refer to the previous argument that semiotics must be considered in the process of building, it can be said that each unit of signification which are used in the process collaborate to give a greater signification to that built object. Consequently, the use of signs as a communicative tool, whether functional, symbolic, or iconic, becomes obligatory in the design process. Buildings do and must communicate the precise meaning which the architect intends, as supported by semiotic works.

Semiotic Analysis

When considering semiotics as a form of architectural analysis and interpretation, it is important to acknowledge that much of semiotic literature focuses on how architecture can facilitate meaning through the codification of the sign. The problem further lies within Dorfles’ statement that ‘the architect builds on a basis of institutionalized and pre-established meanings based on a precise iconographical code, so that the building has precise referents for most, if not all, of its parts.’

Throughout history buildings have been designed this way, allowing a communication across the ages of identifiable building types. We build up our schemata through a cyclical process of hypothesis and correction, all the time making our ‘model’ more habitual and closer to reality. That ‘reality’ that these schemata approach is still only relevant to the rules of the semiological game. Our schemata only allow us to see ‘phenomena,’ not the thing or things in themselves. Language no longer refers to physical entities of the building typology, for it is translated from the plane of content - signified - to the plane of expression - signifiers. That is to say, the Western conception of the church references the divinity through the three-aisle plan, the apostles through the use of twelve columns, and the Virgin’s womb through the sacristy. The spatial patterns of these elements may transform over time, but their meaning resonates notwithstanding modernity. Yet the important position to bear is that language as a system is not determined by its content but is arbitrary. It is those arbitrary references, as dictated by specific cultures, which produce meaning through the signification of signs. The notion of signification depends on the particular internal structure within a given cultural system. The particular structure of such cultural phenomena stems from their existence as social institutions and not from their use by individuals.

That is to say, in attention to current thoughts of adaptive reusability, one may renovate an existing church and alter its interior meaning but those pre-established cultural meanings still exist externally. As Roland Barthes states, as soon as there is a society, every usage is converted into a sign of itself. Once the relationship between a signifier and its signified has become established in language, it cannot be changed at will. Thus the church of which we speak will remain a church and echo those meanings attributed to it until the established language is deconstructed or unmotivated. For as Jencks affirms, fundamental to the idea of semiotics and meaning in architecture is the idea that any form in the envi
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of meaning but the demotivation of signs in a particular typology in order to facilitate the question. In any new movement, by definition, the pre-existing relations between language, thought, and reality have to be razed and the older generation ‘annoyed.’ The avant-garde - as a belief - has become addicted to the notion of change and the animated state of muddled suspension, according to Jencks. The avant-garde insists on the destruction of all past preconceptions and matrices. To value creation of new meaning or the ‘entirely radical,’ one must see it as an entirely relative concept dependent on the past as well as deconstruction. That is, the only way to create a new matrix of meaning is by active use of those past codes, schemata, conventions, habits, skills, traditions, associations, and clichés in the memory of society. To jettison anyone of these decreases creation and freedom. Meaning is derived from both intrinsic properties of isolated signs and the differences or relationships of values between those signs. Intrinsic meaning is derived from the direct connection between ourselves and the universe, where extrinsic meaning is the stimuli from the environment which form meaning. Thus, in any experience there is always a percept, a concept, and a representation. One sees the building, has an interpretation of it, and puts that interpretation into words, which intrinsically gives meaning to that building. The contamination of architecture by language cannot be denied; architecture is created and perceived through non-linguistic codes which have their own
What Jencks describes is the inevitable classification and codification of architecture through non-architectural apparatuses: the motivation of signs through cultural convention. Yet signs and classifications cannot be avoided in creation and perception.

Peter Eisenman affirms Jencks’ call for a ‘demotivated’ architecture that displaces general ways of accepting meaning in the built environment. Eisenman’s architecture questions traditional notions of architecture through semiotic analysis, stating that architecture is problematic in discipline because it has a weak condition of signs. It does not have a system of explicit signs; what language can deal with architecture cannot. In architecture, sign and signified have always been together; function, symbolism, and aesthetic form have always been merged, wherein traditional views of language they have been separated. Structuralist thought questions this tradition by separating the sign and signifier, where one pulls apart the one-to-one relationship between structure, form, meaning, content, symbolism so as to make a multiplicity of meaning.

Eisenman emphasizes a displacing of architecture, one that destabilizes the reality of building in a mediated world. To do so means to displace the conditions of architecture as they used to be. This reaffirms Jencks’ statement of using past schemata as a departure to new meaning. In order to disrupt the habitual cognition of signs and inevitably meaning in a typology, the intrinsic schemata must have an identifiable codification amid that culture in which it presents itself. The theoretical object of a ‘semiotics of the built environment’ must be the development of a conceptual structure which explains the production of signification in the configuration of the built environment. That is, the architectural language which we speak of must develop from intrinsically demotivated signs, which in turn will explain the ‘how’ and ‘why’ of the milieu through a conscious construction of those signs. In using semiotics as an architectural process of demotivation, one must identify those signs existing within a given typology, calculate their transformation and assimilation throughout the history of the typology, and begin to negate those connotative meanings through deconstructing and destabilizing signs. One must begin to speak of those processes which ‘pull apart’ the pre-existing schemata.
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Another proponent of a ‘demotivated’ or displaced architecture is Bruno Zevi. Zevi proposes a ‘speaking’ of architecture in the anti-classical way to codify the modern language of architecture. While it is preposterous to assert that modern architecture can be codified, Zevi stresses the use of semiotics as a way to negate classicist thought and its counterparts. Specifically, in order for architects and architecture alike to ‘speak,’ semiotics must be used as building language, the transference of conscious attempts to give meaning through signs. In the post-modern world, architecture itself cannot have a codified or specific language, with disregard to classicism at the hands of Venturi, Graves, and the like. Thus, it becomes the language of a specific typology, as engrained in the perceptions of society, which must either continue or become ‘decodified.’ In this decodification, verbs and conjunctions must be eliminated so as to no longer be used unless their content and meaning have been analyzed in depth. If those schemata allow the typology to ‘rest upon its historicist laurels,’ then the use of semiotics must be instilled to rethink its architectural semantics. Zevi sets forth rules to the anticlassical code; that of importance is ‘listing as design methodology.’ Implicit in listing, or compiling an inventory of functions, is the dismantling and critical rejection of classical rules and a priori assumptions. This inventory springs from an act of cultural annihilation that Barthes’ discusses in writing ‘zero degree,’ and leads to a rejection of all traditional norms. It demands a new beginning, as if no linguistic system had ever existed before. In an attempt to ‘decodify’ classicism, Zevi touches upon the notion of semiotics in order to ‘speak.’ That is, in order for an architecture to ‘speak,’ it must begin to draw conclusions from its past to oppose. Signs present themselves in opposition or relativity to other signs; the Other as post-structuralist thought has established. The process of semiotics in architecture then becomes the use of the sign - arbitrary, referential, and meaningful - as a negation upon itself. It attempts to negate its meaning through the production of meaning, which is purveyed through the simultaneous dismantling and referring of the original sign. The sign becomes a vehicle to which it responds, interacts, and displaces itself. Semiotics presents the opportunity to internally transform a specific typology through a systematized but arbitrary process, contradicting those signs in order to produce a consciousness of meaning both through surface and space.

Any attempt to design buildings consciously for the effects they have on their users in this sense is a pragmatic affair, as all buildings ‘carry’ meaning in the semantic sense. Thus architecture depends on its perception and creation of meaning, as stated by von Moos, in order to create an image. It is possible to consider architectural meaning in terms of ‘surface’ as surfaces are the very things by which buildings are cognitively perceived. In considering the conscious construction or implementation of meaning through surface, one can begin to look at the strategies of Robert Venturi. While Venturi’s submersion into the classical becomes questionable from a theoretical or stylistic standpoint, it is the process by which he constructs meaning through surface which becomes important. To understand Venturi’s approach to the subject, we must begin by investigating his premise to architecture through semiotics.

**Venturi | Guild House**

Venturi states that the dominance of literal signs over space can be used as an element of subversion and interpretation. In Modernism, meaning was to be communicated not through allusion to previous known forms but through inherent, physiognomic characteristics of form. The creation of architectural form was to be a logical process, free from images of past experiences. Venturi’s argument is for the reintroduction of meaning ‘back’ into architecture. While Modern architecture rejected ornament, it created its own meaning through the basis of technology and industrialization. It is the ignoring of that meaning which Venturi finds problematic in Modernisms’ architectural ‘heroic and original.’ He sees fit to create the ‘ugly and ordinary,’ giving meaning through eclecticism and style.

“These architects’ preoccupation with space as the architectural quality cause them to read the buildings as forms, the piazzas as space, and the graphics and sculpture as color, texture, and scale. The ensemble became an abstract expression in architecture in the decade of abstract expressionism in painting. The iconographic forms and trappings of medieval and Renaissance architecture were reduced to polychromatic textures at the service of space; the symbolic complexities and contradictions of Mannerist architecture were appreciated for their formal complexities and contradictions; Neoclassical architecture was liked, not for its Romantic use of association, but for its formal simplicity. Architects liked the backs of nineteenth-century railroad stations-literally the sheds—and tolerated the fronts as irrelevant, if amusing, aberrations of historical eclecticism.”

The complexity of which Venturi speaks is that of overlapping meanings. By disengaging itself from historical meaning, Modernism lacked conventional meaning in the way in which people traditionally perceived those buildings. That is to say, those particular buildings did not develop a language that most laypersons could understand. It left interpretation to society, disavowing any conscious effort to produce meaning through the process of building itself. For Venturi, complex ornamentation which references historical methods of significance in architecture allows for a deeper meaning, permitting a richness to exist on the façade without engaging the program or structure. These concepts are clear in application in Venturi’s Guild House. Ornamentation is explicit, both reinforcing and contradicting the form of the building it adorns - and to some extent is symbolic. The symbolism of the Guild House is ‘more or less dependent on explicit associations’ which refer to historical signs and their given meaning. It looks like what it is not only because of what it is but also because of what it reminds you of. It provides a layering of meaning beyond the ‘abstract expressionistic’ messages derived from the inherent physiognomic characteristics of forms. Ornament is applied independently of structure, space, and program; thus, it is a decorated shed. Venturi’s explains the decorated shed as a system of space and structure that are directly at the service of program, and ornament is applied independently of them. This is in contrast to his concept of ‘the duck,’ where architectural systems of space, structure, and program are submerged and distorted by an overall symbolic form. Architecturally a contradiction exists in the highly articulated and broken southern façade of the Guild House that
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faces the ‘almost right main street’ and the northern flat façade, which would almost be assumed to be the street façade itself. A tri-part division is suggested with the use of white tile at the base and a higher level string course to represent a traditional Baroque palazzo, which gives contradiction between the representative and functional façade. The south facing façade is open and broken while the striping suggest a more formal and historical reference to something of greater meaning. Conventional architectural elements, particularly scale, were employed to give significance to the program. The dark walls with double-hung windows recall traditional city rowhouses, but the effect of the window is uncommon due to their subtle proportion - unusually large. The scale of the windows also differs according to their distance from the street. This is what Venturi sought: a hybrid type of unity of the ugly and the ordinary. Symbolic elements are beside, behind, and overlapping one another, either ceremonious or common to the apartment complex. The language of the façade consists of multiple architectural and historical references; however, beyond these it also references ‘lower’ sources of imagery of North American apartment buildings with its concrete skeleton, flat roof, and brick façade. It does not negate what it is or what it functions as; it validates its presence and perception by becoming ‘ordinary.’ At the same time Venturi introduces a catalogue of signs, drawing from both architectural high culture, commercial imagery of Main Street, and the low culture of the program. Seemingly the concept of the decorated shed is a conglomeration or cluster of image-related or non-related signs, both architectural and cultural to validate the urban pastiche condition.

Beyond the classification of Venturi’s style as neoclassicist or mannerist, the approach to the process of building becomes significant in its application of semiotics. The language game that Venturi plays uses explicit signs in order to create a greater or more understandable meaning of the building. Venturi openly disregards the program and structure of the building in order to give significance to the surface. That is, the overt use of architectural signs from both user and spectator perceptions allow a ‘reading’ of the building, which are derived from codified cultural interpretations of those signs. Venturi gives significance to the construction of meaning through surface, emphasizing historical technique and reference. The use of signs that contain pre-established meanings allows a greater reading and understanding of the building’s surface language. Yet the utilization of surface to convey or allow a construction of meaning can also derive from the classicist mode of sign transfer. For one to derive from this historicist view, they must question established norms, probe conventional wisdoms, and take nothing for granted.

Thus the process by which the surfaces of buildings give meaning, whether historically or theoretically motivated, becomes important in the quest for a semiotic analysis of architecture. Percep

tions of the built environment rest upon the signification of surface and space, where surface becomes the direct physical and cognitive means of expressing meaning. Though not to disconcern the magnitude of space and its impact on the structure and application of surface, as surface befalls the connection between societal perception and signification. It is an architecture of which we speak, know, and translate. That meaning which we give to signs must be incorporated into the conscious application or construction of those surface signs if we propose a destabilization of those meanings.
Meaning can also be generated through spatial configurations. Spatial relationships, sequences, and experiences through given spaces can give meaning to the built environment. Meaning exists when we cognitively perceive forms and are able to establish descriptions of differences between such forms. Space is also the medium of architecture; it represents itself as both function and symbol of the actions of space. While surfaces can convey meaning through a more physical cognition, space becomes the mediator of surface and objects within that space in order to express meaning. Buildings are produced in order to create certain kinds of spaces, structured as a result of the presence of objects, boundaries, and thresholds. In understanding building as formal structure, we recognize in that building abstract properties and principles of organization of wider import. As Peponis states, as particular structures they (can) both point to and challenge previous classifications; their meaningfulness consist in intimating new configurational properties. In general, buildings set up a continuous dialog between their formal structure, generic functions of built space, spatial experiences, and specific functions they accommodate. It is because of this dialog that the process of building suggests new ways or new extensions of our way of designing. Space can be used to manipulate perceived meaning; the process of building can become a tool to design the conscious effect of spaces on both its users and society as a whole.

Spatial configurations and elements within the environment can construct meaning through manipulation and reconstitution. It is this process of reconstituting architectural signs that brings about the work of Daniel Libeskind, specifically the Jewish Museum extension to the Berlin Museum. Libeskind sought to seize the visitor emotionally and infuse him or her with a particular view of history, the history of Jews as Germans. He raises questions through architecture about human relations. The new extension is conceived as an emblem. The invisible, those repressed meanings in the cognition of Other signs, makes itself apparent as the Void. Here Libeskind plays upon the duality of the non-existence of the Void; it is gathered in the space of the city and laid visible. In this gathering, Libeskind says the design amounts to just two lines: one straight but broken into pieces, the other tortuous but continuing into infinity. The two lines develop architecturally and programmatically through a dialogue. They fall apart, become disengaged, and are seen as separated. In this way, they expose a Void that runs through the museum and through architecture. While such a description may lead to a conclusion that the building is a temporal process of spatial manipulation and interpretation, it is also the surface play which leads to a construction of meaning. The exterior façade is richly textured and visually denaturalized, creating a tension between the hand and the eye. The disruption and irregularity of the fenestration references a dialogue internal to the building process. The irregular windows become cognitive elements which give significance to the building through a questioning of their
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established meaning. Their pre-established function as ‘seeing into/out of’ or ‘giving light to’ are destabilized as they become elements not of use but of the signification of process and meaning. Their sign-function is demotivated on a cultural level, giving new meaning to their use and the surface-façade as a whole.

Likewise, the interior surfaces can be seen as becoming symbolic through the questioning of the wall, structure, and material. Linear structures interact to create an irregular and decisively accentuated set of displacements, providing an active path and distancing the view in the investigation of exhibits. One may be presented with an exhibit of an industrious historical period for the Jewish culture, and in turn be presented thereafter with a great downturn, a great disappointment. Architecture facilitates this feeling of this historical ‘up and down’ through the displacement of the typical museum corridor. Through the process of interaction between the two lines a ‘zig-zag’ is created, becoming a precursor to the placement of walls. In turn this correlates to the ‘feeling’ which Libeskind interpolates into the processional path, that of a reintegration through the unhealable wound of faith. The use of heavy concrete walls allows the invisible to become gathered and exposed, tortured and torqued throughout the museum extension. While the interior of the museum becomes more of a play of spatial meaning, the process of building inherently influences the construction of those interior surfaces. Libeskind’s ‘two lines’ becomes a precursor to the existence of the walls and surfaces as ‘producers’ of meaning. They become an essence in themselves, a sign by which users perceive and both give and receive meaning.

Hejduk | Wall House 2

Another instance of reconstituting space and manipulating preconceived notions of building is John Hejduks’s Wall House 2. Hejduk uses the ‘construction of spatial meaning’ as a tool to convey an articulated and symbolic set of architectural signs in Wall House 2. The design communicates a specific idea or feeling over and above satisfying the functional requirements of that building type - the home. Within the overall body of work, the design functions as a language for articulating architectural intentions. Hejduk’s Wall House 2 uses ‘otherness’ as an instrument to give better understanding to the architectural design. The design uses spatial structures that inhere to experience, described in terms of the relationships or sequences of these experiences. It is not a collection of connected spaces but a configuration of connections. Thus the threshold between these spaces becomes the tool by which Hejduk constructs meaning through space. The wall, a stationary trajectory in composition, separates the main living spaces from circulation and service spaces. For Hejduk, the wall registers the moment of the present. The past becomes the elongated passage, the future becomes speculation, and the future a fleeting moment. These elements of past-present-future become the spatial structure which give a greater reading into Hedjuk’s design. The wall becomes a neutral condition,
static in moment and physicality but also envelops a tensional quality. One cannot enter any of the living spaces without engaging and disengaging the wall, creating a spatial relationship between the spaces and wall itself. The wall heightens the moment of passage, as of leaving the past and returning to some future condition to be experienced. The extension of perspective from the passage way to living space embraces the bodily experience of threshold. Similarly, the wall negates any possible involvement with the exterior; the formulation of an interior-focused spatial experience is mediated through this element. The exterior is not claimed in any connection to the interior spaces. The spaces are constructed as particular experiences in and of themselves in accordance to an overriding experiential concept. The main ‘use’ spaces can be read as statements of formulation within the process. The bedroom on the lowest floor is a rectangular space with rounded corners, the dining above is more free form, and the living above that even more free in its design. The perception of increased morphing of forms reads as a continual play and integration to some common language; yet the isolatory nature of each living space plays upon the paradox of existence. The transition between the spaces plays directly to the wall trajectory, thus cyclically characterizing the Hedjuk house as a performance of intrinsic meaning through spatial experience and threshold.

The characterization of Hejduk’s Wall House 2 can be seen as a search for generating principles of form and space. There is an attempt to understand certain essences in regard to an architectural commitment with an expanding of vocabulary. Hejduk uses the wall as a perpetual threshold to which the user must engage/disengage in order to validate the functional environment. The spaces become a formulation in their own right, employing a transitional-morphing form to simulate a process of collaboration. In essence, the forms become one as they ‘speak’ a common language; however, the wall interrupts this dialog internally through spatial isolation and threshold. This formulation develops through Hejduk’s ‘otherness,’ a tool that drives the design conceptually in his search for past-present-future. The effect of conceptualizing ‘otherness’ in this way is fundamental to altering the manner in which architecture notates the experience of space. Referencing semiotics, the wall becomes a sign to which the user perceives an existence of something else - Hejduk’s otherness. While the user may not be aware of this otherness, the wall becomes symbolic beyond its pre-established functional mode. It acts as, as Hejduk would conceive, a ‘presentness’ in the experience of spaces. The trajectory experienced through the elongated corridor gives reference to the past, as if removing the body from its previous being and presenting it in a current context. The wall embodies meaningfulness in its attempt to make the user aware of his own presentness and pre-future experience. This threshold thus establishes a conceptual existence through the physicality of the wall. Once one experiences those space, he or she must re-engage the wall - or
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presentness - in order to reaffirm their existence in the search of a future space.

From this analysis, the relationship between Hejduk’s design and semiotics is founded on a pre-established - perhaps arbitrary - conceptual formulation in order to give meaningfulness to the experience of space. It negates any typological reference in the design of the house, allowing the conceptual structure of spatial experience and threshold to give meaning. Hejduk’s house becomes more of the spatial quality and construction of meaning than of the house itself, constituting a new experience in the exploration of house-space. Hejduk uses conceptual tools to negate pre-established affirmations of the typology and of those signs which give meaning to that typology. Architectural formulations of wall and threshold allow a construction of spatial meaning through signs.

Terragni | Danteum Giuseppe Terragni’s Danteum project can be seen as a formulation to the construction of meaning through space. The Danteum project exemplifies the symbolic and monumentality of space by using Dante’s Divine Comedy as a conceptual tool to adhere to a building language. The project, which was never realized, generates from two figures: a golden-section rectangle and two over-lapping squares. The golden section becomes Terragni’s tie to the ancients; the two squares, reminiscent of his previous work, become purposeful in the spatial sequence of the building and its practical function as entry. The sequence of spaces is Terragni’s interpretation of concepts found in the Divine Comedy and of Mussolini’s New Roman Empire. Fascist ideals add another layer to the matrix of meaning and space, creating a monumental and symbolic building. Yet particular design decisions are more overtly justified through the analogy to the formal compositional structure of the poem. The first element encountered in composition is a free standing wall, giving reference to the one-hundred cantos found in the poem. It hides the building, creating an internal street of slight incline that leads to the entry. The entry, as formed through the over-lapping squares, likens to a similar act in the Divine Comedy, as Terragni explains:

“The entrance to the building, then, situated parallel to and behind the façade, and between two high walls of marble, further restated by another long wall parallel to the front, can also correspond to...a Dantesque ‘justification’: “I do not know how I entered” (canto 1, 10). This securely establishes the character of pilgrimage that visitors must make, lining processionally in single file, and guided only by the intense sunlight that will be reflected on the square space of the court.”

The courtyard that follows forms a quarter of the composition, which is followed by ‘forest’ of one-hundred columns, likening to the forest Dante entered in Canto I of the Inferno. The numbers used seem to explain the manner in which the project is elaborated and detailed to give reference to the poem but not the matter in
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which the project is generated. Thus the project is generated from the aforementioned geometries and the Divine Comedy as a conceptual tool. Numeric references further give validity to the building as a projection of meaning through form in addition to the spatial organization and numerical connections to the poem. Individual elements such as the column, not as a structural element but as a device that organizes space, gives greater depth to the perception of space and its meaning. As Kanekar states, in staging the column as a means of spatial organization the Danteum sets itself up to face both the classical tradition of the column as the bearer of order definition and the modern perception of the column as minimal structural element to free space. Processing from the forest one passes through a corridor into ‘Inferno,’ encountering another set of columns. The seven columns represent the damned in agony, each supporting a corresponding and detached portion of ceiling at variable heights. Light passes through the gaps created, emphasizing the fracture of the overall structure. The planes appear to physically weight upon the visitor’s perception of mortality, so that he or she is moved to experience Dante’s trip. Terragni uses an abstract setting, one that uses the golden sectioning proportion in walls, ramps, stairs, ceilings, and column radii to give perception of isolation, a removal from the external world. The resulting room dedicated to the Inferno is thus a simple rectangle divided according to "a rigorous application of the harmonic rule contained in the golden-section rectangle; this results in a series of squares, which are disposed in a descending spiral, and which are theoretically infinite in number." The play of light and scale reexamines
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the Dante’s trip across the abyss of the Inferno and the mountain of Purgatory. From the Inferno to Purgatory, one enters a column-free space open to the sky with floor steps in proportional intervals. The absence of columns provokes the user, questioning the mystic quality of the space. Beyond the space deemed Purgatory, one enters Paradise. Thirty-three glass columns support a transparent frame open to the sky, surrounded by walls that are decomposed along the same grid. The glass block floor allows the entire space to float, allowing a sense of weightlessness and heavenly aura to occur. The glass columns support this sense of transparency and dematerialization, blurring views to the existence of space while formulating a conceptual interpolation of Dante’s Paradise.

Thus the possibility for a higher spatial meaning is constituted in Terragni’s Danteum, implementing the writings of Dante as a metaphorical transformation of symbolic structures. The column is pervasive in this work, where one does not situate him or herself in space but between columns. The visitor is drawn to circulate around and even occupy the space of the column, questioning his or her bodily existence among such strong structural forms. As Kanekar states, their perceptual prominence is all the more obvious as the floor under one’s feet is continuously brought into question, as if to destabilize any expectation normally associated with the design of buildings. Terragni uses the Divine Comedy as a process to approach meaning in building, conceptually transferring meaning from literature to form. However, Terragni merely does not appropriate spaces according to the text, but references such aspects of sequence and experience through the spatial layout. To coincide with this experience, established through the use of the golden-section as a means of layout, he uses the column to seek relationships between each space. As well, the relationship between each column, and between the column and man, accommodates a referential theory of meaning. The arrangement of columns allows a metaphor to emerge, one that allows us to think about the body and its experience through the column itself. As Kanekar argues, the power of the Danteum is the demonstration of how architecture can ‘speak’ through arrangement even in the absence of a pre-established vocabulary. Rather than primarily residing in what is denoted, meaning arises from what is being constructed in the medium of architecture. Columns become signs, but as signs they infer a meaning not of historical value but of a process. This process becomes evident in the Danteum; an understanding of differences between columns allows a difference to become established in spatial perception. The procession through spaces further validates the multivalent meaning inscribed in the building, becoming a process unto itself in the projection of meaning across symbolic forms.

---
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A semiotic analysis of architecture acknowledges that the built environment performs a role of signification, culturally and socially motivated in the production and conveyance of meaning. As Dorfles proposes, the problem of an architectural semiotics is the cognitive ability of signs and sign-systems to evoke meaning intrinsic to those particular phenomena. Schemata are codified through cultural conventions and social contracts, justly allowing those signs and sign-systems to purvey meaning of a particular typology over time. Likening to the works of Venturi and Scott Brown, the use of classicist signs evoke those meanings inherent in the process of building. The dependency on the codified sign becomes a method to approach the construction of meaning. Yet this dependency further proliferates the problem when considering an analysis of architecture through semiotics. The perpetual conveyance of meaning through architectural signs does not acknowledge changing cultural and social perceptions of that institution. As instituted by Jencks, Zevi, and others,
Thus the question of an architectural analysis through semiotics comes to play. To what extent does this analytical process give light into the production of meaning? As all buildings ‘carry’ meaning, it must become a question of semiotics as these meanings resonate through signs and sign-systems established by language. In order to question the intrinsic meaning within a given typology, the destabilization of pre-established schemata must take place. That is, an internal demotivation process will begin to identify signs, understand their place in the process of building, and negate those meanings by questioning the norms of its architecture. As environmental cognition acts upon user perceptions of the built environment, the construction of meaning through surface and space becomes evident in the attempt of an internally motivated/demotivated process. This enables architecture to consciously produce effects on its users in the production of meaning through formal design structures.

the cause for the anticlassical or demotivated sign becomes significant in the search for an architecture of semiotics that does not rely on historical meaning but rather negates that meaning through intrinsic transformation. Hejduk’s project evokes an illusionary presence of otherness to question the typology of the house. Meaning is constructed through spatial experience, using programmatic aspects to further validate his attempt in redefining the domestic. An intrinsic reformulation can also exist through the use of symbolic forms as mediator. Both Libeskind and Terragni’s projects conceptualize a theoretical or metaphorical allusion to allow the process of building to ‘speak’ an architecture. Terragni’s use of the Divine Comedy alludes towards a pre-existing mantra of Fascist dictum, a new empire with a historical pride. A metaphorical translation between poem and building formulates a spatial sequence, heightened by a columnar reference which supersedes its functionality. In contrast, Libeskind theorizes an architecture of displacement through the conceptualization of two lines. The dialog between produces a coherent yet subsidiary language, permitting a further reading into the Jewish plight. These lines thus produce a system of internal yet externally referenced schemata, extensively produced through the process of building. The displacement of fenestration gives validity to this process, questioning the permitting of light or view, discourse or play.
A semiotic analysis of architecture becomes evident in the ability of the signs to be culturally, socially, and historically motivated. The ability of a culturally motivated typology must be prevalent in the demotivation process, as the analytical identification and transformation of signs in order to construct meaning from intrinsic values rests solely on the capacity of those signs to carry meaning. As established by the typology background, the asylum perpetuates this problem of architectural conveyance of meaning across time. The consistent use of historical themes, whether consciously or unconsciously used in the building process, is directly correlated with the theory of semiotics. Traditional methods of spatial experience and construction of the asylum have not been questioned architecturally, allowing transference of meaning. Signs which perpetuate those meanings have been culturally codified and resonate through to the asylum’s contemporary counterpart - the mental health community center and other psychiatric services. Themes evident in the transformation of the asylum include isolation, boundary, gaze, and therapeutic measures utilized to dictate built form. The methodology analytically approaches each of these themes in order to develop a sequence of transformations. Through the process of demotivation, principles of negation are established within each theme. These principles of negation will be used to hypothesize the destabilization of signs of the historical asylum, which in turn will guide design conception.
Isolation

The theme of isolation presents itself in three particular scales: site, corridor, and cell. Isolation through site has been in practice since the conception of the asylum in the late-eighteenth century. Its location outside of the city proper perpetuated the idea of isolation physically. Psychiatry further isolated the insane psychologically up through the mid-twentieth century, relying on the prison as a precedent for confinement. Following the deinstitutionalization movement, the madman was brought back to his community but was not accepted, as those ideas of Madness were still evident in the asylum. Contemporary mental health centers were thwarted in their attempt to integrate the insane into their communities. A primary example of isolation is the Spring Grove Psychiatric Hospital of Baltimore, Maryland. The insane asylum was first located outside the city limits, but soon was engulfed by urban growth. While somewhat part of its surroundings, the asylum was isolated from its community through various methods of boundary. The principle of negation that arises from this is integration. While the idea of integration should be taken literally, the conception of a mental health center that dually presents itself within a community and acknowledges its surroundings will better promote this principle.

Internally, the corridor distances the madman from his rehabilitation by individualizing him along an endless corridor. The individual massing of cells further perpetuates isolation, using the corridor as an organizational tool. The second principle derived from isolation is \[\text{dis}\text{membered perspective},\] which questions
the corridor as an organizational tool by becoming an element of sequence and experience itself. In order to demotivate the corridor, it must first become conscious in design conception that the corridor is not a means of journey but a means of expressing individuality. By dismembering the perspective, the experience of the corridor becomes singular: of one. Distortion of the corridor becomes evident in the demotivation process, questioning the traditional role of the corridor in general architectural spatial organization.

Similar to the corridor in isolation is the corridor, which also uses linear organization as a method of rehabilitation through personal reflection. Historically the cell existed to allow the madman to reflect upon his own insanity. Throughout the transformation of the asylum, the cell became more a means of confinement and segregation. While the cell does not exist within the contemporary mental health center, its counterpart - the breakout room - further promotes the idea of isolation and linear spatial sequence. The principle of negation which formulates from the cell is nondislocation, acting against the dislocation of the cell and individual from his community. The dislocation of cells and individuals cannot be overcome through location, as location refers to the locality or distinctness of a being or object within an environment. Nondislocation becomes the negation of dislocation, a way to give reference to a location or connectedness without literal translation.
The demotivation process begins with one cell, then progresses to a mass of cells. The articulation of one cell shows individuality; the removal of one cell shows no cells. By removing one cell, the mass becomes useless. The mass depends on each cell to allow for connectivity. Once one cell is removed, the mass fails. Similarly, the removal of a linear organization begins to speak of a sequence rather than a mass. No longer do the corridor and cells interact. Each becomes its own identifiable part in the design process and spatial experience.

**Boundary**

The theme of boundary further perpetuates the isolatory nature of the asylum through the use of the wall. Historically the wall existed as a means of enclosing Madness, a physical and psychological boundary between that and society. The wall became a physical manifestation of Madness, a way for society to judge its own unreason or folly. That is, the wall became the surface by which society perceived Madness from a distance. The paradox of the wall is its proximity to society, often situating the asylum grounds within the city proper.

The first principle that evolves to negate the wall is **nonwall** or **void**. The nonwall allows a dematerialization of the wall’s physicality, existing as a void rather than a mass. Thus the wall becomes a void, a non-existent boundary. The paradox of this statement is the ultimate function of the wall as boundary. To construct meaning through the demotivation of the wall, the wall is diagrammatically analyzed in fig 7.13. The wall first exists as a double-boundary;
both interior and exterior surfaces of the wall function as memories of Madness, allowing a transference of meaning. In order for society to truly see Madness, the exterior surface becomes transparent. Subsequently, in order for the madman to see his environment beyond the wall, the interior surface also becomes transparent. The transformation of the wall exists in the displacement of opaque and transparent surfaces. Because meanings evident in the asylum are culturally and socially motivated, the cognitive perception of the external wall becomes the point to which the demotivation process acts. By allowing society to truly see the internal workings of the asylum, the external boundary becomes non-existent. Thus the boundary to which society perceives the ‘mad realm’ becomes invisible. Those meanings evident in the wall become destabilized.

To further question the theme of boundary, the second principle of negation that is employed is [non]sequence. [Non]sequence questions the role of boundary in the sequence of spatial experience. It attempts to dislocate user perceptions of the asylum, as well as questions the role of boundary between Madness and society. A non-sequential experience, relative to previous methods of engaging the asylum, attempts to promote experiential-organization within space through sequence. The way in which one engages the functional boundary wall, in relation to the non-existence external wall, is an approach to the negation of the boundary itself. That is, the spatial experience of and through the wall must speak of a negation of boundary. While one may perceive the external wall,
it does not necessarily exist as a boundary nor does should it connotate boundary. The experience must then speak of itself, negating any boundary at all. [Non]sequence dictates the existence of an experience unconscious to the effects on its users. The experience must allow for a glimpse of a destination, which may or may not be reached. The paradox of destination and [non]sequence allows the user to question the existence of any sequence, making the spatial experience all the more real and now rather than historical.

**Gaze and Control**

The theme of gaze and control stems from the establishment of the historical asylum where psychiatrists perpetually gazed upon the madman in hopes to control his Madness. Gaze and control stem from the transformation of confinement. Man was first confined in order to rid society of Madness; later, his confinement was to rehabilitate. Throughout time, the transformation of the asylum saw gaze and control become domineering over rehabilitation. The madman was ‘stashed away’ in human warehouses all too similar to the prison. With his release into the community after the deinstitutionalization movement, his gaze and control came twofold. First, the contemporary mental health center further perpetuated the theme by staging the madman at the hands of staff and psychiatrists. Secondly, society gazed upon the madman as he was evident within his community, roaming the streets as he once did in the Renaissance. From this gaze or ‘looking down upon’ stems control, as our normalized society sees fit to judge those who are different or are of unreason.

The principle of negation which first develops through gaze and control is [non]seeing. The reverse of seeing - a complete control of the spatial environment which gives judgment - [non]seeing questions the status of hierarchy and staff interaction and observation. It attempts to demotivate gaze both internally and externally. Internal hierarchies are reversed by eliminating the disjuncture between staff and patient areas. External hierarchies are reversed by integration and confrontation; the mental health center now ‘looks down upon’ society, providing judgment over society’s control.

The second principle derived from gaze and control is silhouette. Silhouette stems from a hierarchy reversal and nondislocation, a dual looking in and a looking down upon. Man gauges his unreason not by the madman’s unreason but by his own. The principle of silhouette addresses the materiality of boundary, further promoting a seeing through not a seeing onto. The materiality of both the external and internal surfaces must allow for an individual judgment. This parallels current psychiatric thought, which gives the mentally ill the role of personal rehabilitation. For personal rehabilitation to occur, one must be able to judge one’s own actions. By applying the principle of silhouette to the asylum, the boundary is further negated while engaging current thoughts of rehabilitation.
**Built Form through Therapeutic Efforts**

The first principle derived to negate the theme of built form through therapeutic efforts is *displacement*. Displacement questions the rigidity of mental health center facades which gives reference to the historical asylum. In order to negate such rigid applications of spatial organization and surface treatment, displacement begins to question the relationship between solids and voids. The causal relationships between mass/void, circulation/verticality, opening/entry, and wall/barrier are similar instances where displacement may be appropriated. The fundamental idea behind displacement exists in consciously creating variances between normative visual perceptions and what they mean or give meaning to. By displacing typical relationships between building pieces, users are coerced into better understanding relationships intrinsic within the building process.

Displacement begins with the relationship/disrelationship between mass and void as the historical nature of the asylum created such a rigid application of relationships between structure, openings, and programmatic placement. *Figure 7.18* shows an example of the transformation of solids and voids along the facade. This process is underscored by the fundamental idea that the process of displacement and/or transformation, whether literal or metaphorical, must become important in the demotivation of sign-systems intrinsic to the historical asylum and the community mental health center.

*Fig 7.18 - Diagram, Transformation of solids and voids*
The second principle of negation is hierarchy reversal, which questions the habitual experience of a mental health center user. It analyzes the relationship between patient and staff, allowing a greater influence of the Recovery method of rehabilitation on the built environment. The existing relationship between staff and patient relates back to boundary; the most prevalent spatial boundary is the secretary’s station. In order to negate such relationships between staff and patients, the boundary which allows for the hierarchy to exist must be destabilized.

Hierarchical reversal stem from the rigid relationships between structure and program, similar to that of the principle of displacement. Yet hierarchical reversal is dependent upon the existence of an internal hierarchy, that which directly affects its users in some manner. As in the case of the asylum, the rigid corridor sections which relate to the rigid elevations which relate to the rigid plans consume the mental patient in his or her quest of a life beyond the stone walls. By creating such interconnected relationships, the patient becomes subsumed by the architecture. Further, by extending the patient wings from the main entry tower the madman is further catalogued as a mere unit of Madness. Thus the superintendent’s tower becomes possessive of all the wings, creating a dominant stance over the patients. In doing so, these relationships continue between lower staff and patients. Similar relationships find themselves evident in the community mental health center, further distinguishing boundaries between staff and patients. In order for these relationships to be broken down,

a hierarchical reversal must take place. The physical boundaries between staff and patients will only further perpetuate historical hierarchies unless reversed in order to create a same-same relationship. That is, the communication between staff and patient will no longer be one-sided and domineering but guided and respondent.
The third principle of negation is *nondistinction*, which questions how mental health centers are identified within a community. Contemporary signs allow a distinction of such building types through form, envelope, and entry. These signs stem from gaze and control, as society agrees that mental health centers should be distinct in order to know the location of the insane. To negate the distinction of the mental health center, nondistinction comes into play. Nondistinction further promotes [non]sequence, a non-habitual experience of the mental health center.

Lastly, the fourth principle within the theme of built form through therapeutic efforts is *one-to-none relationships*. This relationship questions the connectivity of structure, envelop, program, and spatial experience and sequence within the contemporary mental health center. The historical asylum has afforded its contemporary counterpart much control in construction. In order to demotivate the aforementioned established relationships, a disjunction between elements much occur. The process of destabilization, as seen in fig 7.24, identifies the existing condition and approaches the method of one-to-none relationships. In allowing the envelope to exist beyond a pre-determined structural system, both systems begin to speak of a process of building. This process of building refers to the demotivation of the one-to-one relationship. The one-to-none relationship, similar to displacement and/or transformation, may allude to literal or metaphorical translations to further give meaning to the end demotivation process.
Program

The project begins with the established program type - the community mental health center - and further questions the structuring of such environments according to historical themes. Through design iterations and the transference of principles to the program itself, the projected program outcome is visibly and spatially different than its contemporary predecessor. The process by which the program is established depends upon the principles which literally and metaphorically transform it from a historically-referenced building to a construction of meaning through process. The program projects a future-like existence of the community mental health center, a program that metaphorically responds to historical sign-systems in order to create an environment that specifically overcomes mental illness through sign demotivation.
are no high-functioning persons with mental disorders, for it is the act of coming to and engaging with the mental health center which allows for a person to become more mentally sound. Various activities occur within the behavioral health center, such as learning activities, art therapy, social sessions, dining, and personal reflection with staff members. The terms ‘patient,’ ‘consumer,’ and ‘client’ are interchangeable in allocating occupant requirements. The number of users varies with client fluctuation. Staff will provide a minimum of 12 persons, with a ratio no greater than 15 clients per 1 staff member per day. The center may provide support for up to 900 clients in a single week with single visits, though a more appropriate number is 500 clients with multiple visits, either 2 or 3 days per week.

Program Spaces and Descriptions

- **Entry/Vestibule/Reception/Mail Room**
  Area - 650 sf
  General entry area for all visitors. The reception area becomes the point at which guests are led to the offices, art gallery, or auditorium or patients are allowed to circulate to any given space. Circulation points either begin or stop at this area.

- **Storage**
  Area - 300 sf
  Located at various points within the building, but particularly near the social lounge, library, computer room, and entry. Storage should be easily accessible but not visually obtrusive within each area.
• Staff Offices  
*Area - 1200 sf (10 @ 120 sf)*
Located near the lower part of the building, the staff offices function more as a touch-and-go base to each individual staff person rather than a confined module. Staff are more engaged within the daily activities of clients than their historical counterparts, thus negating the staff offices as a control device. Privacy between offices is important for staff-client relationships.

• Staff Manager Office  
*Area - 225 sf*
Located within the staff office area, the staff manager requires more space for small client or manager meetings.

• Staff Work Room  
*Area - 400 sf*
Located within the staff office area, the staff work room is a general work area for large group activities, staff meetings, and other activities. The work room should include typical office supplies such as a copy machine, printer/fax, and supply storage.

• Learning Labs  
*Area - 2500 sf (5 @ 500 sf)*
Learning labs are rooms specific to learning tasks, meetings, and group activities. The goal of the learning lab is to allow clients to express themselves in discussion, learn about mental illness, how to cope their mental illness, and how to begin to integrate themselves into their community. Learning labs, at points, correspond to the mock apartments in order to bring learning-then-doing to fruition.

• Social Lounge Area  
*Area - 4000 sf*
The lounge area should be a large, continuous space yet broken up into smaller areas for variation in activity and group size. The lounge should be the first space which clients encounter, as it should also be the most calm or reminiscent of what mental health community centers used to be. The lounge serves as the social nucleus of the facility, yet to enter this space one must encounter the entire building, whether visually or physically. This allows clients to see where they may go after attending activities within the lounge.

• Dining Area & Kitchen  
*Area - 2000 sf*
The dining area should be directly adjacent, either vertically or horizontally, to the social lounge. To some effect, the dining area also may serve as a secondary social lounge. Access to the elevator for food shipments is required.

• Art Therapy Room  
*Area - 750 sf*
Art-related program spaces will also develop themselves as a ‘tower,’ that which shows a transformation of spaces, control, and supervision. First in the sequence of spaces is the art therapy room where clients participate in group activities intended to allow mental development and emotional output. The space should be open yet structured with storage space and flat-wall area for pin-ups, presentations, and discussions. Flexible furniture should be employed to accompany multiple group sizes and activity types.
• Art Studios

*Area* - 750 sf

The art studios are second in the sequence of art-related program spaces. The art studios are more open and free, again with flexible furniture. Individual lockers and lockable desks should be used, as the art studios allow for individuals to take art beyond a more therapeutic nature to a specific, individual purpose and exploration.

• Sculpting Room

*Area* - 500 sf

The sculpting room should be located near the art studios in order to allow those clients who are interested in sculpture the opportunity to do so in a more controlled environment. That is, the environment of the art studios should be more conducive to two-dimensional art while the sculpting room should allow for three-dimensional art exploration.

• Art Gallery

*Area* - 1500 sf

The art gallery is the ‘final’ step within the mental health community center that addresses the art tower. In addition to clients’ work, other artists within the Pearl District will have the opportunity to have displays and shows within the center. The art gallery should be directly accessible from the entry/vestibule area and should also have greater security from the public. A small bar/snack area will be incorporated to facilitate public crowds. Access to the south side of the site is important for possible art installations, equipment, and service.

• Reading Room/Library

*Area* - 1700 sf

The purpose of the reading room and library is to collect literature important to the recovery of clients, as well as to provide a social gathering space. The library will house mainly literature on mental health recovery, but it will also function as a social organization space for clients to involve themselves in the community. Leisure books will also be available, and a connection between the main public library and the health center will be made in order to teach clients how to use resources.

• Computer Lab

*Area* - 1200 sf

The computer lab should be located directly adjacent or within the reading room and library. This serves a two-fold purpose: teach clients how to use the computer for daily activities and facilitate the use of the computer for library use. A minimum of (10) stations should be implemented, as well as wireless access and laptop connections.

• Restrooms

*Area* - 2380 sf (7 @ 340 sf)

• Auditorium

*Area* - 2000 sf

The auditorium should have direct access from the entry/vestibule and should formally be different from the rest of the complex. The auditorium mainly serves public presentations but may also serve in-house group meetings.
• Mock Apartment

* Area - 2000 sf (5 @ 400 sf)

The mock apartment serves as the third ‘tower’ that transforms as it progresses throughout the building. The purpose of the mock apartment is to teach clients how to take care of themselves in individual living conditions, down to specific details such as making the bed, cleaning the bathroom, making lunch, and hosting friends over. Each apartment in succession will incorporate more ‘accurate’ and individualistic spaces typically found in apartments, with the ultimate goal of integration and living by oneself. The mock apartment will take advantage of the existing condos next to the site, renovating one condo as the ‘final’ point at which the mock apartment climaxes. In time, it is projected that the northern half of the condos will be bought by the mental health center in order to create an apartment ‘family’ for those individuals who are able to live on their own but do not yet want to truly venture into the community and individual housing.

• Parking

The project proposes removing the surface parking lot and adding a three-story parking garage below. This would increase the existing parking 300%, allow connections to the existing condo complex, the MNOP, and NW 12th Avenue. Parking entry would be from NW Glisan Avenue, with the exit located at NW Flanders Avenue. The minimum required spaces for the MNOP is 49. By increasing the parking surface 300%, the new parking allotment will equal 169 parking spaces (33,900 sf @ 200sf/parking space).

---

**Program Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Description</th>
<th>Square Feet</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Entry/Vestibule/Reception-Mail Room</td>
<td>650 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storage</td>
<td>300 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Offices</td>
<td>1200 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Manager Office</td>
<td>225 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Work Room</td>
<td>400 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Break Out Rooms</td>
<td>2500 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Lounge Area</td>
<td>4000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dining Area &amp; Kitchen</td>
<td>2000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Therapy Room</td>
<td>750 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Studios</td>
<td>750 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sculpting Room</td>
<td>500 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Art Gallery</td>
<td>1500 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reading Room/Library</td>
<td>1700 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Computer Lab</td>
<td>1200 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mock Apartments</td>
<td>2000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Restrooms</td>
<td>2380 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auditorium</td>
<td>2000 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Net Total</strong></td>
<td>24,055 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mechanical increase (15% net)</strong></td>
<td>3610 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Circulation increase (10% net)</strong></td>
<td>2405 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Building Total</strong></td>
<td>24,455 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Parking</strong></td>
<td>33,900 sf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Project Total</strong></td>
<td>58,355 sf</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Site

The site is located in Portland, Oregon at the corner of NW 12th and NW Glisan in the Pearl District, an area located north of downtown between the Northwest and Old Town/Chinatown. Portland is situated in northwestern Oregon at the northern end of the Willamette Valley. To the east are the Cascade Mountains, to the west the Coastal Range. Central Portland is divided east and west by the Willamette River, with the west side sloping up to the southwest on a narrow shelf. Average rainfall is 41 inches per year occurring almost half of the time. Snowfall is infrequent, with the winter average temperature being 42 degrees and the summer average temperature being 65 degrees. Portland was first platted as a townsite in 1845 and incorporated in 1851.

The Pearl District was originally an industrial district, only recently within the past decades renovated and transformed into a thriving central city subdistrict. The name ‘Pearl’ was coined by a local businessman, referencing the existing warehouses as ‘crusty oysters’ and the art galleries within the ‘pearls.’ Being so, the Pearl District thrives on artisan galleries, a variety of shops and boutiques, and a unique mix of restaurants, bars, and wine shops. It also boasts a growing trend of condo and apartment development, as the Pearl is ‘where it’s at.’ The creative and open atmosphere of the Pearl will undoubtedly embrace the MNOP. The Pearl also has a distinct architectural and post-industrial flavor, with a somewhat parasiticness to building additions.
Situated on the northeast corner of NW 12th and NW Glisan, the site slopes slowly towards the west-northwest with a change in grade of 6 feet. The lot measures 100 feet from east to west and 50 feet north to south. The change in grade will be beneficial when configuring underground parking. The small scale of the site, approximately an 1/8th of the block, will present many design opportunities but may also be of hinderance.

To the immediate west of the site is a recently renovated warehouse that is now an apartment complex. Given that the existing buildings on site are only one story, the apartment complex begins its fenestration just above the roofline. This will play a major part in design conception, as the proposed building should not block morning eastern light or obstruct views from those east side apartments. Another apartment complex, this one new, sits to the east. Boutiques, art galleries, a Starbucks, small clothing stores, and a mix of small commercial ventures sit to the north. To the south, a parking lot for the renovated apartment complex situates itself.

The site is situated within the Central City Plan District and Subdistrict, which promotes a variety of building types. It is zoned EX-Central employment, which allows mixed-uses and is intended for areas in the center of the city that have predominantly industrial type development. The intent of the zone is to allow industrial and commercial uses which need a central location. Residential uses are allowed, but are not intended to predominate or set development standards for other uses in the area. The development standards are intended to allow new development which is similar in character to existing developments.

CCPDS Maximum FAR (Floor Area Ratio) is 6:1

100’x50’=5000’(x6)=30,000 gross sf
(not including parking)

CCPDS Maximum building height is 100’

Building coverage is maximum 100%
Design Development

The following images present a pseudo-sequence of project development through multiple media. While the document describes physical features of the asylum that cast historical shadows on its contemporary counterpart, much of the design development comes through theoretical and metaphorical manipulation of concepts within those physical features. The main conceptual ideas realized include the inhabitable column, journey of Recovery, silhouette, surface (skin) play and manipulation, contrast of mass (program) and void (circulation), multiple circulation routes, un-folding braid, and contrast of horizontal and vertical circulation.

Initial conceptual ideas focused on the journey which one would/could partake through the building from top to bottom. The top floor consists of the social lounge, a learning lab, and a mock apartment. From top to bottom, one begins to witness the building change from opaque and secure to open and unknown. Metaphorically, this describes the client’s journey they must take to become integrated into society. Further, the formal language of the building reinforces this movement by providing a material palette that dematerializes and concludes itself but not fully to the ground floor. For one to fully become integrated, one must take the step to acknowledge his or her illness and take the steps needed to have a meaningful role in life. A static-fluctuatory-dynamic change from top to bottom in the building further iterates the client’s aspirations of becoming an individual and not fully relying on others for help and security.

A horizontal ‘slow bar,’ consisting of social spaces and open circulation, begins to develop itself in a zig-zag manner. This allows the vertical ‘fast columns’ to begin to play upon ideas of boundary, mass versus void, and (dis)connectivity of spaces. Three main columns - learning labs, mock apartments, and art therapy - develop as programmatic columns which are manipulated around a main atrium. Their interation between themselves and the horizontal ‘slow bar’ create a dynamic endeavor that one encounters. The atrium controls views from the top floors in order to force client’s to want to move downward. As the building progresses down, views begin to open and the atrium becomes more dynamic to allow a reading of where one came from and where one may go. Ramps, open and enclosed bridges, and short vertical-stack stairs revolve and puncture the atrium, creating a nexus of circulation and activity.

The exterior formalizes the horizontal ‘slow bar’ into a concrete shell which wraps the top floor corners but starts to expose its vulnerability through displacement and slicing. The concrete shell resolves itself by footing down through the auditorium to the entry and entry plaza. Conceptually, the programmatic towers neither dictate or refute a beginning and an end; rather, they exist as entities which create a dialogue around the atrium. A ‘knuckle’ is created by introducing the art therapy tower mid-way through the atrium. The learning labs do not resolve physically but conceptually resolve where the art therapy starts. The mock apartments dissolve into the adjacent condos, connecting to the community.
8.13 - Conceptual Recovery journey
8.14 - Conceptual journey sketch
8.15 - Conceptual journey 3D model
8.16 - Column transformation
8.23 - Column transformation within grid

8.24 - Section - Column scheme

8.25 - Corner perspective - Column scheme
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