Self-Applied Orientation Test for Central Boston

1. Identification & assoc. with test area:
   Present home add. – 38 Dana St., Cambridge, Mass, -2 mos.
   Former “ “ in receding order –
   - Travelling in Italy – 8 months
   - Central Manhattan, NYC, NY – 30 months
   - Graduate Center, Harvard University, Cambridge – 24 mos.
   - Georgia Tech campus, Atlanta, Ga. – 48 mos.
   - Davidson College “ , Davidson, N.C. (small town)- 12 mos.
   - U.S. Navy, U.S. and Overseas (no city living)- 24 mos.
   - Davidson College Campus – 18 mos.
   - Tuscaloosa, Alabama (pop. 35,000) – 24 mos.
   - Davidson, N.C. – 12 mos.
   - APCM Mutsto, Belgian Congo (white compound of 10 families, 2 miles from African settlement of 50,000 pop.) – from birth to age of 14.


Assoc. with test area: infrequent visits in 1950-52 to Symphony Hall, Opera House, legit. theatre, and restaurant dining (in evenings and Sunday lunch); perhaps 5 visits in all (1950- present) for shopping or related (Wash. St. area); infrequent visits in 1950-52 to Back Bay for social purposes and dentist; 2 days this year of apt.- hunting in Back Bay and
Beacon Hill; and occasional through – auto trips via Mass. Ave. to Huntington & Rte. 9 and along drive (can’t name) south bank of Charles, going west from Beacon Hill area. Also, in 1950-52, habitually passed through the area by subway going from Harvard to So. Station. Used to use bus to go to dentist on Commonwealth. Otherwise, all travel by auto and subway. Have seen Boston in day and night, rain and shine, about equally.
2. Associations with the word “Boston”:

The first thought is to remember with satisfaction the 2 years as a student here. This period represented the first time in which I felt my personal intellectual & creative capacities were challenged in full; I think of Boston, but mostly of Cambridge, as a center of culture and learning.

An inseparable aspect of this attitude is its reinforcement by physical evidences of age, tradition, the weathering of time and crises. I like to think of Boston as a city with a personality, forced on its contemporary citizens, that is all-knowing and sagacious. Whereas other American cities, enjoying greater economic prosperity at present, are brash, “moderne”, and “tinny”, Boston has had these phases and has outlived them. Boston’s physical environment conveys the idea that there are deep-seated values which outlive materialism (as displayed by gaudiness, the screams of false-prophet-advertising, etc.). Some of these physical clues are: a) age of buildings and fidelity to the more sincere architectural styles (Richardson bldgs., North Church, but not John Hancock!); b) an imposed order and communal feeling as evidenced in homogeneity of facade color, texture, material; building mass-height; continuity
of street facade-planes; repetition of contrast and
detail-types (e.g., white fenestration trim against
red-brick walls;) a forest of chimneys—(at a
pervading sense of form repetition, but having
variety in color, size, etc. (e.g., chimneys—
these are also a clue to age). I do not
regard Boston as a homogeneous city; but I
think of it as a city with a discipline which
emphasizes that human individuality is achieved
more by the fruits of mind and heart than
by display of material acquisitions. (Note the
stylistic homogeneity in men’s clothes in Cambridge,
a center of individual & creative thought).

Boston, to me, also means a sense
of home and warmth. In part this is due
to its people (residents), whom I regard as being natural
and spontaneous (as against neurotic New Yorkers).
In part it is due to physical clues such
as: tree-lined streets, with children seen and heard;
chimneys and glowing lights in windows;
ability to recognize faces in a crowd at several
widely-spaced points; the sight of pumpkins on
most doorsteps and front porches (in outlying
areas); the identity of my own apt. (with a
private entrance and front porch) and the
ability to identify people I know with individual buildings
(easy in which they live (easier for smaller-sizes, even if they don’t occupy the whole building); the coincidence in area of home and workplace (I can walk home for lunch); etc.

I am aware that the my mental image derived from the word “Boston” does not fit the facts of the metropolitan area. Through student planning problems, I have learned that Boston is not compact and that at its fringes there is a sprawl. The city metropolitan area, for me, will always be a pattern of nuclei settlements, some weak, some strong, arranged about a center concentrically. I cannot relate many of the actual nuclei to means of transportation between them. But my conception of a pattern is stronger for the metropolitan
area as a whole than for any of its parts. Cambridge and central Boston, for instance, are more amorphous in overall shape and interrelation of parts. When I try to relate the parts of Cambridge and Boston, I have a mind cluttered with detail, much of it conflicting. But for the metropolitan area as a whole, I can easily find a conceptual principle of organization. This concept would at least furnish enough information so that I can search radially and circumferentially for any given part.

As for the character of outlying Boston, I know that, in most cases, it is far from the picture of discipline, age, home, etc. above. Some areas (Concord, Lexington) reinforce my immediate picture of “Boston”. Most, though, represent a squalid, drab destruction of the picture. Unlike other American cities, Boston fringes seem to bespeak already-spent efforts to break with the discipline of the core. I don’t remember too much new subdivision; but I have a vivid picture of endless rows of dilapidated frame houses, covered with the pall of factory smoke. The one strongest unifying
element for the metropolitan area, is the continuity of trees, grass and the feeling of nature. Major roads seem to have this one common sensation.

3. Area stereotypes:
   a.) Central business district – for small towns, a “main street”; with one major point of activity on it; lots of auto traffic (but no public transit and few taxis); people walking leisurely & speaking; stores arranged in a linear hierarchy of types; office buildings indistinguishable as such; familiar loafers; dead at night. For larger towns, a complex organization of centers of activity with a radio concentric hierarchy of activity; wedge-like structure of definable districts other than retail shopping (e.g. offices, warehousing, wholesale, etc.); noise of vehicles drowning out humans; people hurried and impersonal (perhaps cruel, impolite, etc.); frustration when driving; soot, dirt and refuse; dark in day, buildings reaching beyond my comprehension of height; endless perspectives of cold, inanimate street-channels; occasional islands of relief (a park, Fifth Ave.,
or a small, secluded space). It is at night that American cities have charm for me. Darkness confines and limits my view to selected points of light and activity. I am not usually in those areas without life; the sub-areas I do frequent at night are usually those I do not see in the day. This change is a relieving note.

b.) Slums are at the centers or edges of a city, representing natural obsolescence or someone's recent mistake. Slums mean dirt and filth and lack of care. They also mean too many people, the chief index of which is squawling, untended babies. Many areas which have these characteristics but which are inherently interesting, architecturally or in area structure, I do not think of as slums. Others, where obsolescence is obvious but where care and attachment by people are evident, are also not slums. A slum is also where one is apt to find immigrants, Negroes, and people of Catholic faith – though this association is extremely unpleasant to me.
c.) Retail shopping – is an area of non-descript arch. styles; extreme variety in plastic qualities elements; profusion of confusing signs; building hlights between 2 and 4 stories; continuous street planes; nervous roof and cornice profiles; glass fronts which cannot be seen through; cheap and stereotyped shop-front materials (carrara glass, glass block, etc.); conventional forms and combinations (a 5 & 10 store, a drugstore, etc.); tremendous activity of people and vehicles; and dead at night.

d.) Office districts – are areas of relative homogeneity in a faceless, neo-modern arch. style; tall buildings; grey in color; no trees or vegetation – cold, untextured surfaces everywhere; endless vistas of glistening pavement and deep street-channels; windows that are not windows and are not absolutely dead at night; all women seen are young.

e.) Wholesale and warehouse districts – are similar in feeling to office districts, except: that buildings are lower and all too bulky and massive in the relation of height to surface coverage; that the bawl and
curses of truckers, and the extreme congestion of unloading give a feeling of life and animation; that the street patterns are not as simple and consistent as in office districts; and that, at night, these districts are not just dead – they are terrifying.

f.) Entertainment districts – are subareas of retail shopping which are dead in day and blossom at night. These don’t stand out as distinct areas except for Manhattan. In many cases, I think of individual facilities, as against an area grouping.

g.) Hotel and restaurant districts – these areas are not distinct in character but are distinct locationally – they are either near railroad & bus terminals or they are bordering the busiest part of retail. Hotels as buildings are a distinct impression, however.

h.) Apartment districts – until I went to Italy, these were always close to the city center. They are distinct from “projects”. Buildings have a non-descript arch. style; mostly
very tall (but st.-channels are not dark and deep); materials are grey, untextured, and lacking in name. Lobbies and attendants are in evidence and bldgs. are always of a "restricted look" - no low-income tenants, no Negroes, etc. Street facades are continuous, at least at eye-level, but there is space in front of bldgs. for occasional trees and bushes, few of which ever give a sense of personal care. There is not enough greenery to sense as a continuity and outstanding feature – nothing really stands out – but there is enough to distinguish the area from retail and other areas. An apt. district has enough pavement to reinforce the pleasant sensation of a woman’s high heels clicking as she walks. It feels like a city should in this sense.

i.) Housing projects – are areas where consciously-designed homogeneity has not enough detail to give interest. Greenery is the unifying force; man-made homogeneity has not been used to unify or provide a background against which variety can be sensed. Space is non-existent or dissipated; individual buildings are set out spatially in the false
notion that each is in itself interesting. There isn’t enough vertical plane continuity and pavement to give a city feeling. Projects are a false pretense of giving the amenities leading to a sense of individuality. In most cases, any given building is of an undistinguished architectural treatment.

j.) Suburban areas – mean pretentious, single-family houses, with all the lush accompaniments of land, trees, and sophisticated retail-services facilities. They are distinguished from “developments”. These are “developments”, to me, are the worst manifestation of misinterpretation, on the part of the public, of what “freedom”, “individuality”, “private interests – public interests”, etc. Developments are infinites areas of small houses, closely spaced, each different from its neighbors in a literal sense, but all sinking into an amorphous, faceless mass. Streets are curved and winding arbitrarily; land is all flat; and there are no objects visible over roof-tops in the immediate vicinity. There is no sense of spatial contrast in driving through.

k.) Railroad yards – are infinite in length,
difficult to cross. They coincide or with or are accompanied by wholesale warehouse areas; they have give some of the same feelings. They are dark grey, overhung with smoke, and they make the surrounding area black (and, therefore, cold). Men, walking on the tracks, look inhumanly small – like ants or worker bees. The engines, their movement, noise, and intermittent smoke-puffs, are fun and make the yards seem larger.

I.) Civic centre – has no distinct correspondence for me, except that, if they existed, they might seem like Rockefeller Centre in some ways. I think of individual public bldgs. – not of an area. It is still an interesting architectural concept for me – not a reality that I have seen. On second thought, the Worth St. City Hall area of New York is one – its chief characteristic is tall that of having tall blgs. arranged around a park. At lunch time, in the spring, and summer, and fall, people workers are in evidence – eating, making love, sleeping, etc.
4. Map drawing – miscellaneous comments as I draw
   a.) Have to start with Cambridge & the approaches
to cen. Boston I know.
   b.) Started my map badly – can see things
as I go along and have no vivid mental
map which flows out immediately – in
architectural sketching this is common
and is adjusted by making a series of
increasingly-refined overlays – why not here?
E.g., I know there is more area northeast
of Beacon Hill than I have shown; there
is a greater distance between Copley and
Beacon than I have shown.
c.) There are additional pieces of information
I know which are difficult to represents:
   {number circled} 1. General locations of pts. or bldgs.
which, if shown in the area of a
grid or near some other definite thing,
would give an inaccurate sense of
specific location – e.g., Hotel Vendome,
somewhere near and to right of Commonwealth, west
of Copley; John Hancock, not far from
Commonwealth, between the Public Garden
and Mass. Ave.; the State House, on
Beacon, but don’t know whether east or
west of the projected line of Boylston St.

{margin: over ↓}
{number circled} 2. Distinction between developed- amorphous areas and other white spaces on my map. I know the area north & south of Tremont & Washington is patterned, though I assume amorphously – but how can I represent it – I have only a vague idea or attitude about its character. China Town is equally amorphous, but I think of it with more ease of classification because of its name, the restaurants I have been to, and an awareness certainty that it is a jumble.

{number in circle} 3. Pts. and bldgs. whose locations I know only in a general way in areas which I can’t structure at all. These are so many as to be almost impossible to show in a short time, even more impossible to prove how I could find them on demand.
5. Characterization of Subareas – subareas which have distinct and nameable qualities and/or an overall relation to other areas are:

a.) “Back Bay” and “Back Bay X”: these two differ from each other in popular name (I think “Back Bay” refers to area east of Mass. Ave.) and in distinctness of their extent. Qualities I name are true, in general, of areas on both sides of Mass. Avenue. “Back Bay” is a rectangle, bounded by Beacon; the Pub. Garden; one or another street south of and parallel to Commonwealth; and the west boundary would extend about 4 or 5 blocks west of Mass. Avenue. It is true that I think of “Back Bay X” as having less feeling of high social status, somewhat more run-down, and a little less homogeneity of plastic qualities than “Back Bay”. “Back Bay” is first of all a high-status residential area; its status seems to be lower than it might once have been – all of its styles are reminiscent of other times; residents of the area include many young, single people as against stable, prosperous families; there are a number of converted uses (doctor's offices, etc.) That it is
high quality residential is the prime classification, but I seldom think of the above qualifying considerations. Back Bay has also a strong visual image, best described in unconnected phrases: red-brick; a forest of chimneys and flues; Mansard roofs and dormer windows; clean-swept walks & street surfaces; carefully-tended planting in front of many bldgs.; wide, shallow street channels; gridiron street pattern, with emphasis and detail on east-west streets; uniformity of 4-5-floor bldg. heights; white wood or stone window trim; rectangular window openings, spaced evenly about 5-10 ft. on centers on each floor; continuous facade planes; continuous tree and bush strips along east-west streets; well-dressed people walking, but no crowds; expensive cars at curbs; moderate auto and taxi circulation, no transit; a small-interval, slow-paced experience in time – there are no major centers and contrasts within the area, but many small and personal details on individual buildings; stone steps; ornate wrought-iron lamp posts (which I vaguely wish still produced a flickering light at night). There are generalities for “Back Bay” – I know there
are many exceptions, such as the cut stone, with struck joints, on facades of part of Commonwealth.

b.) “Beacon Hill North” and “Beacon Hill South” – These 2 are combined because they are both on the hill and have essentially the same form qualities. Beacon Hill North is almost a slum, but its outstanding characteristics are interesting and pleasant. The slum status is indicated by filthy streets, grimy building entrances; poorly-dressed and unshaven people; hordes of people leaning and bawling from windows (in Italy this would seem normal for higher-class areas); and less planting (again, normal for Italy). The areas have in common the narrow, steeply-sloping streets which seem to give a small-scale feeling – the end is not infinite, and the steps & doors stacked up seem to make it easier to count the houses & est. the distance. Buildings are uniformly of same height as Back Bay but seem to have more variety because of the step-down of the slopes. There is a strong overall homogeneity of red-brick (redder, & more uniform than Back Bay); severe rectilinearity in facade shapes & pattern; white wood or stone to dark wood trim;
peculiar and extremely personalized entrances, fences and gates, private courts, wrought-iron lamps & accessories at entrances, and an occasional “doll-house” built in left-over alleys. Building fronts are more very narrow and openings are smaller (though proportionately spaces) than in Back Bay. The architectural is style is obviously older and gives a suggestion of very early colonial days – it is sincere and straight-forward. There is very little vehicle movement, and the sounds are of people. In Back Bay Beacon Hill South this activity of people is a clue to prosperity, along with its cleanliness, carefully-tended planting, polished brass on doors, and the greater pretension of its buildings. Louisburg Square is a wonderful space, but is a “center” to me only in a visual sense, because its activity is limited. As a visual relief or focus, it is important in the higher feeling of status that one has of B.H. South.

c.) Boston Common and Public Garden – This area is a distinct and striking entity because it has an obvious homogeneity of color, texture, and material. It is also an “island” of relief in
a sea of activity. It may also have its own dynamic activity (Father Fenney et al.) but I have not often seen it. In any case, the area is big enough to absorb this and still provide a place for quiet meditation, etc. Its' boundaries are the surrounding streets, but the exact shape is hard to define.

d. Back Bay, Beacon Hill, and the Common-Garden seem to belong together as a distinct and definable area – perhaps only because I am unable to organize any other part of central Boston. Two of the parts are residential; the third a buffer between them and the commercial core. The arrangement, if I knew the core, might be made in other ways: 
{see drawing in PDF of original}

6. Characterization of centers: centers which are distinct and important as foci to me are those where I have a distinct impression of contrast in activity and a visual sense. These are:
a. Copley Square- this square is fixed for me in location because I can find it at the intersection of 2 known streets. The chief impressions I have of it are: monumental, neo-classic architectural style; white-grey limestone, moderately textured; the lush hotel (Sheraton Plaza or Statler?); tremendous volume of vehicular traffic, particularly the disturbing diagonal movement on Huntington; fancy people on sidewalks; moderate-to-high-style stores; tall buildings, but well-proportional to the rectangular space. I don’t think of this center as belonging visually or functionally to Back Bay. To me it is an international element, with moderate deference to Boston character and tradition. I don’t like to walk in the square because of the traffic.

b. Park and Tremont- this point is a center to me because of its strong activity of movement against a visual tension of park green vs. city. It is at this point that the high relief of the park in contrast to strongly developed commercial area seems greatest. With this as an backdrop overtone, the movement on the sidewalk (which seems 50 yds. wide) of people – rushing to and from subways, strolling, chatting in
groups; whistling at girls, etc. – is an intense sensation. Vehicles are there but don’t seem as important.

c.) Jordan-Filene area – somewhere on Washington Street, not far from Park and Tremont, is a point where buildings seem to get higher, streets more narrow, and crowds impossible. The ridiculous situation of cars and people rivals anything I have seen in Italy, except that here there is mutual fear between pedestrians and auto drivers.

d.) South Station – which I could find only by getting on a subway from Harvard or Park, is a ghastly desert of pavement with cars and pedestrians crossing at all angles. It is not a space nor an intersection – it is like turning 100,000 cars loose at an airport standby apron, to go in any desired direction, and an equal number of pedestrians to rival the best of All-American back broken-field running. Buildings seen on the horizon give the stereotype impressions I have for wholesale-warehouse districts.
7. Blindfold-Recognition Places. For me, these are divided into degrees and qualifications as noted on the overlap. Brief descriptions of these places follow.

a. Mass. Ave. Bridge over the Charles. broad, undivided roadway; low stone balustrades; progression of lamp-posts; MIT at one end; fun-profile of Back Bay at the other (with the rise of Beacon Hill at the left as I face it).
b. Mass. Ave. Commonwealth. Commonwealth is certain because of its width; the treelined median; the limestone rows of apt. houses. I am less certain that Mass. Ave. is the only very broad and very heavily-travelled street intersecting Commonwealth. However, my uncertainty would be dispelled if I also saw the sign for the Eliot Lounge at this point.
c. Mass. Ave.- Huntington – This is certain because Symphony Hall on the NW corner is unmistakable (though hard to describe other than weather-beaten, neo-classical, limestone, monumental). I also assume that the Huntington St. underpass, fenced off with wrought iron, is unmistak has no counterpart elsewhere.
d. Beacon St. – This is the epitome of my
In the east end the State Hse, slope of Beacon, and the Common would reinforce.

The view of the river at block ends is the identifying clue.

- **Commonwealth** – see 7 b. above
- **Copley Square** – see 6 a. above. The only clue I would have to getting out of Copley to another desired point would be the diagonal of Huntington & its relation to Commonwealth. Without it, & binding Commonwealth alone, I could move east-west or north-south, but could not distinguish north from south or east from west without difficulty (sun; the uncertain feeling that the hotel is on the north side & Public Library on the south)

- **The bridge between Broadway St. and Boston.** Arched, divided, metal-grill paved roadway; iron balustrades; the view of Beacon Hill and traffic interchange at one end, lower bldgs. on the Cambridge side.
- **Traffic interchange at this bridge (g above).** A combination of overhead NW-SE movement and complex, center-vision-blocked rotary below.
-I'm too busy to see Beacon Hill and the river on either side, but I assume this is the only such interchange in Boston.

- **North Slope of Beacon Hill.** That it is Beacon Hill seems certain. If I am in a position
to see the direction of slope the indices of slum mentioned in 5 b. above would furnish fairly rapid recognition. Without the slope, I would be uncertain because I might be at some of the slummy parts on the hills’ crest.

j. West slope of Beacon Hill. ditto, except qualities reversed.
k. Louisburg Square – trees; {see drawing in PDF of original} 2-way street boundaries; houses as described in 5 b. above; a sculpture in the middle; and a slope in one direction.
l. Boston Common- Public Garden – see 5 c above.
m. Jordan-Filene on Washington – see 6 c above.
I would know how to get out of this point by the fact that Filene’s is NE of Jordan’s.
n. Old North Church – this would be uncertainly based on the assumption that no other early Colonial, frame church exists in Boston.
o. South Station – see 6 d. above.
p. Tea Wharf – this would be uncertainly based on the assumption that no other ship bay in Boston {see drawing in PDF of original} has delapidated, frame, 2-3 story houses, closely-spaced or continuously-joined, with small row boats alongside – instead of warehouses & boat yards.
8. Walks and rides.
      Leaving MIT on my left, I head into the
      bridge (crossing Chas. R. Drive) and, with
      Beacon Hill (stacked-up facade planes) and
      {margin: P.S. I think I would see John Hancock Tower to my left, but am not sure
      how far left.}
      Back Bay (crazy profile) on my left on
      the far bank, I come to the all far
      bank; crossing overhead of the parkway (which
      runs along the bank), I make my first
      left turn (Beacon St.). I follow Beacon
      as straight as I can, passing through Back
      Bay (a residential area of red-brick, 3-4-
      story buildings), and come to a green park
      on my right. This is the Public Garden.
      I keep the Garden on my right for one
      block and turn right on Boylston St. On
      Boylston I go all the way to the lower
      end of the park, the Common green on my
      left, the Garden on my right. At the lower
      end of the Park I may be no more than
      20-30 feet from the subway entrance. But, I
      really think I have to turn left, keeping the
      Common on my left, and go one block to the
      intersection of the st. I’m on with Tremont.
      Following Tremont to the left, still with the
      Common on my left, I go one block to Park St.
      On the Common corner of this intersection, I should find the subway
      station.
b. From Symphony Hall to Jordan-Marsh. Leaving Symphony Hall, I would cross Mass. Ave., with the Ave. on my left, travelling on Huntington. I would continue on Huntington until I came to Copley Square – a big rectangular space surrounded by a hotel, a church, the Public Library, and shops – on Huntington I would be crossing the square on a diagonal. At the far corner of the diagonal I would turn half-right onto Commonwealth Avenue – After leaving the square, Commonwealth becomes a broad, tree-lined avenue. I would follow this until I saw a park – the Public Garden – dead-ending Commonwealth. At the dead end, I turn right and then make the next left turn. once or twice until I was on Tremont Street. In making these left turns, Crossing one street on my left. I would probably take the second left, keeping the Boston Common green on my left. After this last left, I should be on Tremont. At On this street I go until I can turn right. I go one block after turning right and then turn left on Washington Street. After turning left, I keep going until I find Jordan Marsh on my right.
c. By subway, after leaving Cambridge to Symphony Hall. In the subway, I come up to the surface over the Charles River. I have a wonderful impression of Boston ahead. In daytime, I can see the crazy, cubistic pile-up of red-brick houses on Beacon Hill ahead of me; the flatter, “lacier” profile of Back Bay on the right background (with a strong red-brick river-front wall); somewhere behind, the silly John Hancock tower, trying unsuccessfully to be both modern, and Cape Cod and big, all at the same time; and, in the foreground, a blue expanse of water with patches of white sail – always a delight to me. During this experience, the subway clatter, crowdedness, and mechanistic bridge elements seem incongruous. I am bothered by the Chas. St. Station shed which blocks my view of Boston as we stop. When we start again, the city view is snatched too rapidly from me – I wish it could be more gradual – as we go below surface. The next stop is Park St., where I change for the “Huntington” or some other unidentified car. Park St. Station is unmistakable – it is like a barn – high, long, drafty, draughty, uneven floor, unlike
any subway station I ever saw. People are milling about everywhere: they add to my uncertainty and confusion concerning the location of my car. I have to climb some steps and walk under some tracks overhead, relayed from one to another of about 3-4 signs. Finally I find the right car, under one of 2 or 3 possible waiting stations, identified to me only by reading many markers. After boarding, I stay aboard for 5-6 stops, but after the 3rd or 4th I have to crane around to read the station names. I know the Symphony Hall station only by its sign, and this is where I get out. I have no idea when I emerge from the station stairs which direction to take to Symphony. Looking around in all directions, I see the Hall.