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RANDY HESTER:
The stereotype of participation is that the designer is just a technician and that there’s a will of people, which is expressed through a workshop. A lot of designers and planners don’t bring their own agenda to a workshop, they simply facilitate.

LAWRENCE HALPRIN:
I’m afraid that participation has gotten a bad name because if not done well it can hurt rather than help. It gets to the point where some workshops simply argue about things and don’t get anywhere at all. Or participants say, “All we’ve run into is people telling us what not to do. We can’t do what we want to do.”

Workshops for me are a way to reveal deep-seated needs and desires about people’s lives. When these are revealed they then need to go on and creatively accomplish a way to execute what people desire to have done. In that sense they are action oriented. But they start with a search for enlightenment.

HESTEN:
It’s clear that the stereotypical way is not the way you operate.

HALPRIN:
The basis of our workshops is a sensory-emotional experience process, which uses all of the senses. The workshops are based on the idea of experience, interaction and communication, not just talking. They become more profound because the approach knocks out the usual seminar or lecturing process that goes in the way of most creativity, because it informs people rather than allow them to discover through personal experience. The RSVP cycle represents a holistic, multi-disciplinary approach, not a specialized one. The R, of course, is “resources.” The S is “scores.” The V is a term that I coined, “value action.” It’s a sharing and an evaluation that lead to an action of some kind. And P is “performance.”

“Resources” are subjective and objective. The objective ones everybody knows about, like the location of the workshop, the economic base, the physical conditions. But when you get down to it, these are far less important than the subjective resources people’s expectations, their feelings, their hang-ups, their attitudes, their hidden agendas.
When you start with a project or a design, both kinds of resources are operating. Most people spend their time worrying about the objective form, but that isn’t really what counts. In workshops where you’re working with communities or there is an issue to resolve, the main reason people don’t agree is they have different opinions, different relationships, different takes, particularly different life experiences. So we start off with an “awareness walk,” which gets people on a common ground. We urge them to have certain common experiences during the walk or tour, but we don’t tell them what the common experience ought to be.

**HESTER:** This is the most widely copied of all the things you introduced. But firms that do participation now may not do it with the same objective.

**HALPRIN:** That’s right. It’s easy to copy the form. But I don’t know whether people understand the reason for doing awareness walks, which is to build a common language of experience.

**HESTER:** I think people do. I think people have learned that, for example, if you get a group of people together, they all disagree because they haven’t experienced the place. They have an abstract preconceived attitude about it. “Oh, it’s手术 with crime,” or “No self-respecting people would go there.” And after you’ve gotten them to have that common language, they are more in agreement because they’ve experienced the real place.

**HALPRIN:** What is not understood is that scores are the core of what we do, of how we conduct workshops. Score is a term I use to generate an activity. It is based on the musical analogy of a composer putting down notes on a piece of paper to be handed to a musician to play. The aggregation of notes is called a score, if you extend this to an opera the score also can include other elements like words, costume, activities on stage, etc.

The elements of the score are location, time, space, people, activities and other things, too. Everybody has a different way of writing a score. In an environmental workshop, most people would say “Describe it.” or “What does it look like, what is it made of?” But we ask, “What are your feelings about it?” “Make a sketch of the environment.
Note your feelings about how it should be used. We score every single workshop the way through. If anything influences people in this process most, it’s how you write the score.

HESTER:
My sense is that when I write a score, it is leading people to some likely observations that may lead them to a conclusion. That is, I have some idea of what I think the outcome should be, or a direction. I might, on a scored wall, get people to stop where there is no more traffic congestion, or where there is a beginning of a little park, and they would say it’s obvious we should extend this greenery.

HALPRIN:
I face the same thing. I’ll use a recent project as an example. The rest room looks terrible. There are twenty people standing inside all the time. And it’s in the wrong place. Here is the most spectacular view in the world, right? and a rest room is stage center. So, naturally, my feeling is that it should be moved. Not only that, there’s so much traffic and so many cars and buses parked around.

I don’t have to say to people that this has to be taken out. I have to get them there so they will understand, unless they disagree, that this is terrible. When we went there, we put them in a position where they would observe this park and this clutter. We used words like, “How does this make you feel?” We didn’t say, “Take it out.”
Value—action is the most interesting and difficult part of the workshop. We don’t criticize in our workshops. We don’t have a point of view. And we don’t tell people how they’ve done. It is in other words very different than what occurs in architecture school critic. A lot of people confuse our workshops with charrettes or critics. But they are neither. What happens in value-action is that each person or group puts together some material, puts it on the wall, describes it and tells us what their feelings are about it. People then may ask questions or interact on a different level. Now that I think about it, we don’t ever get people who stand up and say “Oh, what you’re showing is terrible. That’s a terrible thing to have done.” We never tell people they shouldn’t do that, but we’ve never had a person like that in a workshop.

HESTER:
Even in really contentious situations?

HALPRIN:
We have contentious situations which emerge all the time. They usually disappear during our workshop.

HESTER:
They disappear?

HALPRIN:
We do not usually have contention. We do have people with different points of view, but suddenly,
they have a common language. They’ve exercised their own creativity, normally personally but in small groups. They’ve had a chance to express themselves and be listened to. This point of course is absolutely vital, that is for people to feel they are really being listened to. And then, what is there to be contentious about? Maybe somebody doesn’t quite agree with somebody else, but now they understand why they did this and why someone else did something else.

**HESTER:**
How is conflict mediation different from your collaborative design approach? Are there instances in which one is more relevant than the other?

**HALPRIN:**
As a workshop leader, I would say why don’t you tell me what you think free.

**HESTER:**
My sense is, frequently, it means getting people to come together and divide up the pie. Now, they even train Forest Service personnel to do conflict resolutions, like with the spotted owl and the timber industry.

**HALPRIN:**
It’s a compromise.

**HESTER:**
Somewhere, recently, I read that you don’t like compromise.

**HALPRIN:**
Compromise means the outcome is not as good as anyone wants it to be. No, I don’t like it. The trouble, of course, is that the spotted owl is not the real issue. The owl is being used as a manipulated device to save what should be saved. You have to get at the core of the real issue and develop something that will work and be creative. I don’t know how I would approach that particular case, but a workshop would be a completely different way of working at it.

**HESTER:**
So it’s not a compromise in your workshop?

**HALPRIN:**
It’s not a compromise at all. What you do is come to a creative consensus based on the situation, having worked through (in the awareness walks and other parts of the workshops) all the issues that people have confronted. Then based on the consensus, we design something that is wonderful for the situation.

**HESTER:**
What about situations in which you are fairly certain that something needs to be done, but the consensus is not to do it, or that it’s a low priority?

**HALPRIN:**
We always have a resolution workshop at the end where we report back to people. If there are things
that still need to be resolved, or some things that I think ought to be resolved, we bring them up again.

Sometimes in a summary, I will say "Now, not very many people mentioned it and so I'd like to see if I have your agreement to add this to the list that I'll be working with."

If someone on this project had said, well, "It's very important to keep this parking," I would have felt that's wrong. I would have said, "Let's look at this more carefully and see what the implications are of keeping the parking where it is and what other possibilities there are. Often, in fact usually, other participants in the workshop make that kind of point. You're not passive in that sense during the workshop. And you're not saying, well, "Gee, this is a terrible idea. I think it's awful." All you really have to do is get people to see what this looks like in reality on the ground.

Sometimes we'll want to emphasize something because it doesn't feel right, or change the score to ask people to look at it more carefully because of the implications of what they are doing.

DEE MULLEN:
We'll interject a new score.

HALPRIN:
And maybe a completely separate workshop at which we look at a particularly important and unresolved issue.

HESTER:
Have you ever gone through a workshop and had an outcome with which you really disagreed?

HALPRIN:
No. I try to keep, as much as possible, a passive attitude at the beginning and don't come up with all kinds of solutions that I have to defend that are then violated by the workshop. But what I won't do is, I won't take a point of view that forces the workshop to come up with a predetermined conclusion. I do not use workshops to manipulate people's thinking.

HESTER:
You really do learn from the workshop?

HALPRIN:
If I don't, then it's not a good workshop from my point of view.

HESTER:
I urge students to do participatory design because, for me, the most critical aspect is that it teaches them about working with other people. It teaches them about their own human ability. It reinforces democracy. But I think that there are few people who are able to use participation to produce extraordinary projects.

HALPRIN:
Participatory workshops are important for anybody to do. But there's a difference between the workshop and the final design. In a workshop we are not having group design. We're dealing with concepts, philosophy, attitudes, points of view. That's where a lot of this goes wrong, because any facilitator may get as far as this and then, if he's a loony designer, it doesn't turn out well.

HESTER:
I think this is a serious problem. Participation now is contracted out just like hiring an engineer or an architect or whatever. And it's frequently completely separate.

HALPRIN:
The planning field has lost a lot of power and opportunity because planners have become people
who don't know how to design. They show people ideas, and show it seems not to be completely differ-
ent after some designer idea it over and does a
poor job designing it. That's why we don't want to
act as consultants. There's a lot of work between a
general concept and what it looks like at the end.

HESTER:
So you want to do the project from participation all
the way through the design.

HALPRIN:
I could never do a workshop and turn the design
over to somebody else. I can imagine working
with an architect whom I admire as part of a work-
shop, then carrying out the design together. But
working with the designer is a very important part
of this process.

HESTER:
If participatory workshops are such a good thing,
and other people want to do it, why aren't more of
it good?

HALPRIN:
There is an issue of talent and training that nobody
is willing to raise. An awful lot of people who go
into facilitation aren't worldly well trained or able
to extend the workshop from concept to reality.

HESTER:
To do the kinds of workshops you do requires a
complexity of thinking that nobody is willing to
raise. An awful lot of people who go
into facilitation aren't worldly well trained or able
to extend the workshop from concept to reality.

HALPRIN:
If the workshop involves a design, then you either
have to have talent as a designer or somebody else
participates with you in the workshop, somebody
to whom you can turn this over to and motivate
from then on.

Talent infuses both. Running a good workshop and
understanding all the elements that have to go into
it and having the ability to bring the best out of
people and so forth, is a talent. Setting up a work-
shop, designing the scores, running the summaries
all require a lot of ability and training. Designing is
also a talent. The two are separate talents, and they
can be meshed. If the process is going to lead to a
design, you need to link the two together. Bear in
mind that workshops demand knowledge that are
called upon continuously—psychology, active lis-
tening, empathy with others, score writing.

HESTER:
Well, if you think about an artist, and you think
about a person who leads workshops, those require
very different sets of skills and place different sets of
demands on a person. That's the combination
that is unusual to find.

HALPRIN:
You can train someone to be a good workshop
leader if they are an artist or designer and want to
subject themselves to learning that. And some facilitators can design.

HESTER:
But they are different. For an artist, there can be a
huge risk in opening up the process to all those
citizens. Professionals are also threatened, a
transportation engineer is threatened by a work-
shop in which citizens are actually questioning
traffic standards.

HALPRIN:
Also, a workshop is very difficult for professionals
in other fields because they tend to want to take
over. If somebody raises an issue, they say, "Well,
we know that," and so forth. We always make the
point that there are no experts. We're not asking
you for your expertise. We're asking for your par-
ticipation. As in a democracy, expressing opinions
are not based on expertise but on human desires,
programs, attitudes and intentions.
MULLEN: We don’t let them divulge all their information. We’ll ask them at the beginning, as part of the discussion of resources, to present what we need to link up with, to discuss what’s going on. Then, if a question comes up in the workshop, maybe we’ll ask them to change hats and explain.

HESTER: What about all the citizen participation today that really is blocking good stuff from happening? What would you do about it?

HALPRIN: I would advocate this process. I’d insist that people come with an open mind, that they understand they will go through this process and abide by it. The guy who’s preventing things usually won’t participate in a workshop. Those activists and NIMBY’s try to destroy situations by not participating.

HESTER: You avoid that confrontation by creating a situation that diffuses it and turns it into a creative act. That’s been your approach and it’s very different than other people who have done participation.

HALPRIN: I suppose there are times that confrontation has got to happen if people won’t get together. But the more people that can be brought into this elective process of creativity, the more you can make it visible to people that this is useful and that it results in adding a wonderful quality to people’s lives, then more things could get resolved in a good way. But you can’t force people into it. You know, the odd thing is that on a personality basis, I’m not really suited to do this, to doing participation.

HESTER: Why not?

HALPRIN: Like any designer, I want to take a pencil and design the thing. I don’t like to be seen as a do-gooder, soft-hearted, sweet man because I’m not any of that. But I learned the hard way: Taking part in workshops is a remarkable process.

I first started on the RSVP cycles as a design tool. Not so much for myself, but for my wife, Anna. It happened because she went to Stockholm to do a performance. We got there and she had some people helping her from the outside who need to learn how to do it. She said I can’t explain to these people what they should do. I had been working on scoring, so I said I’d run a score for them, and it worked. They could follow the score.

Then, I decided for fun one summer to do some workshops with students from different disciplines, starting with sculpture, painting and architecture. That was incredibly creative from my point of view. We weren’t solving any problems. We were just doing creative things, and the experience was wonderful.

Following that summer’s creativity workshops, which was titled “Experiencing Environment,” I was in Texas developing a downtown master plan. Nothing I proposed seemed to work. The mayor, city council, developers and others who had commissioned the study resisted real change to their city. I perceived they had prejudice which did not seem to them to need improvement or change.

At an elegant dinner that night I proposed we all enter into a workshop to advance our planning effort. For some reason they agreed to try it and fortunately it was a rewarding success. I remember some of the scenes from that summer. I started with an awareness walk downtown. It was a very hot day, well over 105 degrees in the shade. Instead of driving around in their air conditioned cars they had to walk. Instead of eating lunch in an elegant restaurant they ate in a cubby hole that was hot and uncomfortable.

When the day was over they came back dog tired and demanded air conditioned buses, better transit, cooling fountains and trees. Their real life experience showed them what they needed to do.

HESTER: Most of us who came into participation from civil rights came in from very different concerns. It was about empowerment, about activism. If you hadn’t been doing participation already, it would have been much more difficult for us to convince cities to use it in the administration of justice and injustice.

But we came at participation from a different angle, and I think that is who, in the end, that you, Larry, still get extraordinary pieces of landscape or city built that touches people’s hearts, and the rest of us are still out here going over the next social issue or whatever.

HALPRIN: It probably is, and I hadn’t thought about it that way.

HESTER: You saw participation as clearly a tool to improve society. I saw it as a tool to get in civil rights agendas. And the students today, many of the students today, see participation as a way of getting a job.
HALPRIN:

Yes, I think that’s true. It concerns me because I can see what it means, what it does is very different. They’re not wanting the same thing. They simply want to have some town meetings.

HESTER:

That’s what is most distressing about the state of participation today. Because NEPA and other legislation requires citizen participation and gives people the right to use it to sue, eighty percent of the citizen participation in this country today is blocking actions.

HALPRIN:

That’s right. It’s engendering terrorism, a form of environmental and NIMBY terrorism.

HESTER:

It is really counter to getting creative solutions.

HALPRIN:

I agree. True participation is a process which takes issues of some complexity where there are different points of view. Within this kind of real-life situation our workshops allow people to understand, to experience, to carefully listen to each other and then allow them to creatively develop solutions which are positive, perhaps different than anyone has thought of, and thus arrive together at a consensus of what and how to do what they have decided needs to be done. We constantly hear from workshop participants that in addition to solving what seemed like insurmountable problems the workshop process has changed their lives. It has opened them up to different and new methods of creativity — it has enriched their lives. Participating can be a joyful process!